

ABSTRACT

Title of Dissertation: JACQUES LE MOYNE DE MORGUES (c. 1533-1588) AND THE ORIGINS OF SEVENTEENTH-CENTURY NETHERLANDISH FLOWER STILL LIFES

Sohee Kim, Doctor of Philosophy, 2009

Dissertation directed by: Professor Arthur K. Wheelock, Jr.
Department of Art History and Archaeology

This dissertation examines the contribution of the French artist Jacques le Moyne de Morgues to the development of seventeenth-century Netherlandish flower still lifes, a heretofore understudied subject. Le Moyne has mostly been discussed as a cartographer and as the official artist for the French expedition to Florida from 1564 to 1565, and his impact on the origin of seventeenth-century Netherlandish flower still lifes has been largely overlooked because he was from abroad and active in England.

Le Moyne was a botanical artist who gained his early training in the French manuscript tradition and continued to develop his career as flower painter in a world fascinated with collecting rare and exotic plants. Le Moyne's experiences of collecting and recording plants during the Florida exploration encouraged him to portray botanical specimens as living plants after his return to France. Soon after, his accurately and delicately illustrated floral images were known to seventeenth-century Netherlandish

flower artists, including the printmaker Crispijn de Passe the Elder and the painter Jacques de Gheyn.

At the core of this study is the conclusion that the collaboration between botanists, artists and publishers was a crucial component in the development of independent flower paintings. Botanists and publishers were at the center of a network of flower collectors, gardeners and artists, focusing on collecting and exchanging rare and exotic plants as well as illustrations of them. In particular, the renowned botanist Carolus Clusius and the publisher Hans Woutneel were important links between Le Moyne and seventeenth-century Netherlandish flower artists, involving a young generation of flower painters with projects that incorporated floral illustrations.

In circulating botanical illustrations, Clusius and Woutneel supplied precisely colored drawings by Le Moyne to early Netherlandish flower artists, including Jacques de Gheyn and Crispijn de Passe the Elder, encouraging them to expand on Le Moyne's approach in their own floral images. Clusius engaged Jacques de Gheyn to illustrate flowers and small creatures in an album containing twenty-two watercolors (1600-1604, Paris: Institut Néerlandais), and Woutneel encouraged De Passe to base many of the images in his *Cognosite Lilia* on Le Moyne's delicately rendered watercolors.

JACQUES LE MOYNE DE MORGUES (c. 1533-1588) AND THE ORIGINS OF
SEVENTEENTH-CENTURY NETHERLANDISH FLOWER STILL LIFES

By

Sohee Kim

Dissertation submitted to the Faculty of the Graduate School of the
University of Maryland, College Park, in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy
2009

Advisory Committee:

Professor Arthur K. Wheelock, Jr., Chair
Professor Anthony Colantuono
Professor J. Robert Dorfman
Professor Meredith Gill
Professor June Hargrove

©Copyright by
Sohee Kim
2009

Acknowledgements

This dissertation would have never been completed without the assistance and support of many individuals and several institutions. I am grateful to the staff of the British Library, British Museum, and Victoria & Albert Museum in London, the Dumbarton Oaks Garden Library and the Folger Shakespeare Library in Washington, D.C., the Oak Spring Garden Library in Upperville, Virginia, the Pierpont Morgan Library in New York, and the Rijksbureau voor Kunsthistorische Documentatie in the Hague, for kindly offering me assistance with my research and inquiries. In addition to these institutions, I would like to extend a special thanks to Dr. Sam Segal for his insightful thought and feedback on my project.

The research necessary for this project was made possible through the generous financial support from the University of Maryland, including several teaching assistantships and museum fellowships from the Department of Art History and Archaeology. Also, with an Ann G. Wylie Dissertation Fellowship from the Graduate School, I was able to dedicate an entire academic semester to writing which proved invaluable for the advancement and completion of my project.

There have been many others who have assisted me in my research and teaching while in graduate school. I was fortunate to have had the opportunity to work with many great teachers in the Department of Art History and Archaeology. In particular, Professor Meredith Gill has unfailingly supported my research in numerous ways, not only for her thoughtful and instructive comments on my dissertation, but also for her invaluable advice on navigating fellowships and jobs.

I am extremely grateful to my friends from Washington, D.C., and Seoul, Korea; they have always been on my side, supporting my studies and research. Soonwon Chung and Yoojoung Lee deserve special thanks for offering me a place with great hospitality while I was visiting London for research.

I would like to thank the members of my committee, all of whom have been incredibly enthusiastic about my project. My sincere thanks go to my advisor and mentor, Dr. Arthur Wheelock, who took me on as his student eight and a half years ago, and has committed to me ever since. With my research, he read chapters of this dissertation from the critical early stages of the writing process and gave me insightful feedback. He made my years in graduate school incredibly meaningful and fruitful. The enthusiasm and dedication that he gives to his teaching will always be my inspiration both inside and outside the classroom.

Most of all, I have to express my deepest thanks and love to my family. My sister Soyeon has tremendously supported my effort to complete this dissertation, always offering to help in any way possible. Finally, to my parents I owe eternal gratitude. They have offered me nothing but encouragement and admiration, and have constantly been by my side throughout this journey, praying for me every single day. There is no way I could have done this without them. Thank you.

Table of Contents

Acknowledgements.....	ii
Table of Contents.....	iv
List of Illustrations.....	viii
Introduction.....	1
Questions Surrounding the Origins of Flower Still Lifes.....	3
State of Existing Scholarship.....	9
Structure of Study.....	18
Chapter 1: The Sixteenth-Century Ambition for Botanical Illustrations.....	20
Illustrated Herbals: The Rebirth of Naturalism in Botany.....	22
Botany from Antiquity to the Middle Ages.....	22
Albrecht Dürer.....	26
Hans Weiditz II.....	27
Leonart Fuchs.....	30
Hand-Colored Herbals.....	37
Rembert Dodoens.....	38
Floral images in Manuscripts	42
Naturalism in Flower Border Decorations.....	42
From Border Decorations to Independent Subjects.....	44
Jean Bourdichon.....	45
Master of Claude de France.....	49
Joris Hoefnagel.....	52
Emblematic Botanical Illustrations.....	53
Chapter 2: Jacques Le Moyne De Morgues.....	59
Biography.....	60
Le Moyne in France c. 1533-c. 1572.....	60
Le Moyne in England c. 1572-1588.....	62
Le Moyne's <i>Florilegia</i>	68
Le Moyne in French Manuscript Tradition.....	68
The Dumbarton Oaks Watercolors.....	68
The Victoria and Albert Museum Watercolors.....	71
The Sotheby's New York 2005 Watercolors.....	74
Le Moyne as a Botanical Artist in England.....	77
The British Museum Watercolors.....	77
<i>La Clef des Champs</i>	81
Miniatures Formerly in the Collection of Rudolf II.....	82
Chapter 3: Le Moyne's <i>Florilegia</i> in the Emblematic Interpretation of Natur.....	84
Flower-Motif Books in the Late Sixteenth Century.....	84
William Smith's Flower Poem.....	86

Esther Inglis’s Flower-Illustrated Manuscripts.....	89
Thomas Palmer’s “Vegetable Emblem” Manuscripts.....	94
Joachim Camerarius’s Botanical Emblem Book.....	97
The Combination of Emblematics and Natural History in England.....	102
Didactic Functions of Botanical Emblems.....	102
Le Moyne’s “Emblematic” <i>Florilegia</i>	104
“Madame de Sidney”.....	105
The Meditational Use of Floral Images.....	111
Lady Drury’s Oratory.....	114
Chapter 4: Carolus Clusius: Mediation between Le Moyne and Early Flower Painters.....	120
Clusius’s Network and Exchanges.....	121
A Short Biography.....	121
Clusius’s Studies and Exchanges of Plants and Botanical Illustrations.....	123
Looking for Flower Painters.....	128
Pieter van der Borcht.....	128
A Flemish Artist from Vienna.....	131
Clusius’s Interest in American Flora.....	134
American Plants in Clusius’s Publications.....	134
Clusius and Le Moyne.....	136
More than a Botanist: Clusius’s Spiritual Approach to Plants.....	138
Chapter 5: Le Moyne’s Contributions to the Development of Netherlandish Flower Still Lifes.....	142
Crispijn De Passe the Elder.....	143
<i>Cognoscite Lilia</i>	144
Collaboration with Hans Woutneel.....	146
Le Moyne’s Contributions.....	148
<i>Hortus Floridus</i>	149
Early Training in Botanical Drawing.....	150
Collaboration with Local Gardeners.....	151
Instructions for Coloring Floral Images.....	156
Jacques de Gheyn II.....	158
Early Colored Drawings.....	159
Training in Goltzius’s Studio.....	159
Nature Studies in Leiden.....	162
The Lugt Album.....	164
Clusius’s Involvement.....	166
Le Moyne’s Influence.....	169
Arranging Flowers in a Bouquet.....	171
Flower Still-Life Paintings.....	173
De Gheyn as Flower Painter.....	173
De Gheyn and Early Seventeenth-Century Netherlandish Flower Painters.....	178
Roelandt Savery.....	179
Ambrosius Bosschaert the Elder.....	182
Jan Brueghel the Elder.....	186

Conclusion.....	194
Appendix 1: Selected <i>Florilegia</i> Printed in 1586-1620.....	197
Appendix 2: Joris Hoefnagel’s Poem Dedicated to Albrecht Dürer.....	199
Appendix 3: A List of the Plants Illustrated in Sotheby New York 2005 Watercolors...201	
Appendix 4: Le Moyne’s Dedication to “Madame de Sidney” in <i>La Clef des Champs</i> ..203	
Appendix 5: Esther Inglis’s Flower-Illustrated Manuscripts.....	205
Appendix 6: The Lugt Album.....	207
Bibliography.....	209

The dissertation that follows has had referenced materials removed in respect for the owner's copyright. A complete version of this document, which includes said referened material, resides in the University of Maryland, College Park's library collection.

List of Illustrations

1. Hugo van der Goes, *Portinari Altarpiece*, c. 1476. Tempera and oil on wood, 8' 3½'' x 10' (center panel). Galleria degli Uffizi, Florence.
2. Detail of fig. 1.
3. Hans Memling, *Flowers in an Earthenware Jar*, c. 1485/90. Oak panel, 292 x 225 mm. Fundación Colección Thyssen-Bornemisza, Madrid.
4. Hans Memling, *Portrait of a Young Man at Prayer*, c. 1485/90. Oak panel, 292 x 225 mm. Fundación Colección Thyssen-Bornemisza, Madrid.
5. *Benedetto Portinari Triptych*, 1487. Oak panel, 455 x 345; 415 x 315; 450 x 340 mm. Staatliche Museen, Berlin (central panel); Galleria degli Uffizi, Florence (left and right wings).
6. Ludger tom Ring the Younger, *Vase of Wild Flowers on a Ledge*, c. 1565. Oil on panel, 613 x 410 mm. Teresa Heinz Collection.
7. Ludger tom Ring the Younger, *Poppy and Other Field Flowers*, c. 1560. Oil on paper, 315 x 420 mm. Österreichische Nationalbibliothek, Vienna.
8. *Opium Poppy* (fol. 222r), from Dioscorides, *Codex Vindobonensis* (Constantinople, c. 512). 370 x 300 mm. Österreichische Nationalbibliothek, Vienna.
9. *Artemisias* (fol. 17r), from Apuleius Platonicus, *Herbarium* (England, c. 1200). 292 x 197 mm. British Library, London.
10. Albrecht Dürer, *The Great Piece of Turf*, 1503. Watercolor and body color on paper, 403 x 311 mm. Graphische Sammlung Albertina, Vienna.
11. Albrecht Dürer, *Iris*, 1508. Watercolor and bodycolor on paper, 775 x 313 mm. Kunsthalle, Kupferstichkabinett, Bremen.
12. Hans Burgkmair the Elder, *Lovers Overcome by Death*, 1510. Color woodcut from three blocks, 212 x 151 mm. British Museum, London.
13. Hans Weiditz, *Coat of Arms of Cardinal Matthäus Lang von Wellenburg*, 1520. Color woodcut from seven blocks, 274 x 206 mm. British Museum, London.
14. Hans Weiditz, *Common Comfrey*, c. 1529. Watercolor and bodycolor on paper, University Bern, Systematisch-Geobotanisches Institut, Platter Herbarium, Bern.

15. Hans Weiditz, *Common Comfrey*, from Brunfels, *Herbarum Vivae Eicones* (Strasbourg, 1530-36). Woodcut, 308 x 195 mm. Staatsbibliothek, Berlin.
16. Hans Weiditz, *Bitter Dock*, from Brunfels, *Herbarum Vivae Eicones* (Strasbourg, 1530-36). Woodcut, 308 x 195 mm. University Library Special Collection, Amsterdam.
17. *Maiz*, from Leonhardt Fuchs, *De Historia Stirpium* (Basel, 1542). Hand-colored woodcut, 356 x 254 mm. Dumbarton Oaks Garden Library, Washington, D.C.
18. *Portrait of Three Artists at Work*, from Leonhart Fuchs, *De Historia Stirpium* (Basel, 1542). Hand-colored woodcut, 356 x 254 mm. Dumbarton Oaks Garden Library, Washington, D.C.
19. *Crown Imperial*, from Leonhart Fuch, *Vienna Codex* (c. 1540-c.1560). Watercolor. Österreichische Nationalbibliothek, Vienna.
20. *African Marigold*, from Leonhart Fuch, *Vienna Codex* (c. 1540-c.1560). Watercolor. Österreichische Nationalbibliothek, Vienna.
21. *Cherry Tree*, from Leonhart Fuchs, *De Historia Stirpium* (Basel, 1542). Hand-colored woodcut, 356 x 254 mm. Dumbarton Oaks Garden Library, Washington, D.C.
22. *Bitter Dock*, from Leonhart Fuchs, *De Historia Stirpium* (Basel, 1542). Woodcut, 380 x 240 mm. Staatsbibliothek, Berlin.
23. *Sunflower*, from Rembert Dodoens, *Florum et Coronariarum Odoratarumque Nonnullarum Herbarum Historia* (Antwerp, 1568). Woodcut. 175 x 115 mm. Dumbarton Oaks Garden Library, Washington, D.C.
24. *The Annunciation* (left) and *Christ in Majesty* (right), from *Warburg Hours* (c. 1500). Illumination on vellum, 114 x 95 mm. Library of Congress, Washington, D.C.
25. Jean Bourdichon, *Daffodil* (fol. 17v), from *Les Grandes Hours d'Anne de Bretagne* (Tours, 1500-1508, 300 x 195 mm). Bibliothèque de Nationale de France, Paris.
26. Jean Bourdichon, *Bottle Gourd* (fol. 81r), from *Les Grandes Hours d'Anne de Bretagne* (Tours, 1500-1508, 300 x 195 mm). Bibliothèque de Nationale de France, Paris.
27. *Bottle Gourd* (*Cucurbita minor*; cap. 137, p. 369), from Leonhart Fuchs, *De Historia Stirpium* (Basel, 1542). Hand-colored woodcut, 380 x 240 mm. Biblioteca Nazionale Central di Roma.

28. *Daffodil* (left) and *Chicory* (right) from *Book of Hour* (Loire River Valley, c. 1500). Illumination on vellum, 66 x 41 mm. Pierpont Morgan Library, New York.
29. *White Convolvulus*, from *Book of Hour* (Loire River Valley, c. 1500). Illumination on vellum, 66 x 41 mm. Private Collection.
30. Jean Bourdichon, *Chicory* (fol. 31r), from *Les Grandes Hours d'Anne de Bretagne* (Tours, 1500-1508, 300 x 195 mm). Bibliothèque de Nationale de France, Paris.
31. Jean Bourdichon, *White Convolvulus* (fol. 53v), from *Les Grandes Hours d'Anne de Bretagne* (Tours, 1500-1508, 300 x 195 mm). Bibliothèque de Nationale de France, Paris.
32. Master of Claude de France, *Violet* (fol. 50), from *Book of Hours* (Tours, c. 1520, 4 x 2 $\frac{3}{8}$ in). British Library, London.
33. Master of Claude de France, *Rose* (fol. 66v-67), from *Book of Hours* (Tours, c. 1520, 4 x 2 $\frac{3}{8}$ in). British Library, London.
34. Master of Claude de France, *Heures à l'Usage de Rome* (fol. 26v-27r), Tours, c. 1510-1515. 135 x 88mm. Bibliothèque de l' Arsenal, Paris.
35. Joris Hoefnagel, *Tulips* (fol. 51), from *Mira Calligraphiae Monumenta*. 1590s. Watercolor on vellum, 6 $\frac{2}{3}$ - 4 $\frac{7}{8}$ in. J. Paul Getty Museum, Los Angeles.
36. Albrecht Dürer, *Hare*, 1502. Watercolor on paper, 250 x 225 mm. Graphische Sammlung Albertina, Vienna.
37. Albrecht Dürer, *Stag Beetle*, 1505. Watercolor on paper, 142 x 114 mm. J. Paul Getty Museum, Los Angeles.
38. Hans Verhagen, *Beech Marten*. Watercolor on paper, 215 x 394 mm. Österreichische Nationalbibliothek, Vienna.
39. Joris Hoefnagel, *Hares, Raurackl, and Squirrel (Terra, fol. XXXXVII)*, from *The Four Elements*, 1575-1580. Watercolor on vellum, 143 x 184 mm. National Gallery of Art, Washington, D.C.
40. Joris Hoefnagel, *Stag Beetle (Ignis, fol. V)*, from *The Four Elements*, 1575-1580. Watercolor on vellum, 143 x 184 mm. National Gallery of Art, Washington, D.C.
41. Joris Hoefnagel, *Marten (Terra, fol. XXXXVI)*, from *The Four Elements*, 1575-1580. Watercolor on vellum, 143 x 184 mm. National Gallery of Art, Washington, D.C.

42. Albrecht Dürer, *Madonna with a Multitude of Animals*, c. 1503. Pen and ink on paper, 315 x 241 mm. Graphische Sammlung Albertina, Vienna.
43. Joris Hoefnagel, *Iris (Ignis, fol. LXXV)*, from *The Four Elements*, 1575-1580. Watercolor on vellum, 143 x 184 mm. National Gallery of Art, Washington, D.C.
44. Jacob Hoefnagel, Pars II: 6, from *Archetypha studiaque patris Georgii Hoefnagelii* (Frankfurt, 1592). Engraving, 245 x 338 mm. National Gallery of Art, Washington, D.C.
45. John White, *A Timucuan Chief of Florida* after Jacques le Moyne de Morgues, 1585. Pen, ink and watercolor, 268 x 137 mm. British Museum, London.
46. John White, *The Wife of a Timucuan Chief of Florida* after Jacques le Moyne de Morgues, 1585. Pen, ink and watercolor, 261 x 135 mm. British Museum, London.
47. Title page of *Brevis Narratio*, published in Theodor de Bry, *America 2* (Frankfurt, 1591).
48. Jacques le Moyne de Morgues, *Damask Rose*, from Manuscript of Flowers and Insects, Early 1560s. Watercolor and bodycolor on vellum, 106 x 80 mm. Dumbarton Oaks Garden Library, Washington, D.C.
49. Jacques le Moyne de Morgues, *A Purple and Blue Wild Pansy*, from Manuscript of Flowers and Insects, Early 1560s. Watercolor and bodycolor on vellum, 106 x 80 mm. Dumbarton Oaks Garden Library, Washington, D.C.
50. Master of Claude de France, *Red Carnations* (fol. 38), from *Book of Hours* (Tours, c. 1520, 4 x 2 ³/₈ in). British Library, London.
51. Jacques le Moyne de Morgues, *Red Carnations*, from Manuscript of Flowers and Insects, Early 1560s. Watercolor and bodycolor on vellum, 106 x 80 mm. Dumbarton Oaks Garden Library, Washington, D.C.
52. Charles Jourdain, *Red Carnations* (left) and *Iris* (right), from *Blason des Fleurs*, 1555. Hand-colored on vellum, 68 x 48 mm. Private Collection.
53. Jacques le Moyne de Morgues, *Iris*, from Fifty-Nine Drawings of Flowers, Fruits and Insects, 1560s-c. 1572. Watercolor and bodycolor on paper, 174 x 188 mm. Victoria and Albert Museum, London.
54. Jean Bourdichon, *Iris* (fol. 25v), from *Les Grandes Hours d'Anne de Bretagne* (Tours, 1500-1508, 300 x 195 mm). Bibliothèque de Nationale de France, Paris.

55. Jacques le Moyne de Morgues, *Lily of the Valley*, from Fifty-Nine Drawings of Flowers, Fruits and Insects, 1560s-c. 1572. Watercolor and bodycolor on paper, 174 x 188 mm. Victoria and Albert Museum, London.
56. *Lily of the Valley* (cap. 88), from Leonhart Fuchs, *De Historia Stirpium* (Basel, 1542). Woodcut, 380 x 240 mm. Staatsbibliothek, Berlin.
57. Jacques le Moyne de Morgues, *Daisy*, from Fifty-Nine Drawings of Flowers, Fruits and Insects, 1560s-c. 1572. Watercolor and bodycolor on paper, 174 x 188 mm. Victoria and Albert Museum, London.
58. *Daisy* (cap. 53), from Leonhart Fuchs, *De Historia Stirpium* (Basel, 1542). Woodcut, 380 x 240 mm. Staatsbibliothek, Berlin.
59. Jacques le Moyne de Morgues, *Cyclamen*, from Fifty-Nine Drawings of Flowers, Fruits and Insects, 1560s-c. 1572. Watercolor and bodycolor on paper, 174 x 188 mm. Victoria and Albert Museum, London.
60. *Cyclamen* (cap. 171), from Leonhart Fuchs, *De Historia Stirpium* (Basel, 1542). Woodcut, 380 x 240 mm. Staatsbibliothek, Berlin.
61. Jacques le Moyne de Morgues, *Daffodile*, from Fifty-Nine Drawings of Flowers, Fruits and Insects, 1560s-c. 1572. Watercolor and bodycolor on paper, 174 x 188 mm. Victoria and Albert Museum, London.
62. Jacques le Moyne de Morgues, *Corn Poppy*, from Fifty-Nine Drawings of Flowers, Fruits and Insects, 1560s-c. 1572. Watercolor and bodycolor on paper, 174 x 188 mm. Victoria and Albert Museum, London.
63. Jacques le Moyne de Morgues, *Strawberry and Emperor Moth*, from Fifty-Nine Drawings of Flowers, Fruits and Insects, 1560s-c. 1572. Watercolor and bodycolor on paper, 174 x 188 mm. Victoria and Albert Museum, London.
64. *Strawberry* (cap. 329), from Leonhart Fuchs, *De Historia Stirpium* (Basel, 1542). Woodcut, 380 x 240 mm. Staatsbibliothek, Berlin.
65. Jacques le Moyne de Morgues, *Common Vetch and Black-Veined White Butterfly*, from Eighty Watercolor Drawings of Flower, Fruits and Insects, 1560s-c. 1572. Watercolor and bodycolor on paper, 195 x 140mm. Private collection.
66. Jacques le Moyne de Morgues, *Common Vetch*, from Fifty-Nine Drawings of Flowers, Fruits and Insects, 1560s-c. 1572. Watercolor and bodycolor on paper, 174 x 188 mm. Victoria and Albert Museum, London.

67. Jacques le Moyne de Morgues, *Double Daisy and Lady Butterfly*, from Eighty Watercolor Drawings of Flower, Fruits and Insects, 1560s-c. 1572. Watercolor and bodycolor on paper, 195 x 140mm. Private collection.
68. Jacques le Moyne de Morgues, *Lily of the Valley*, from Eighty Watercolor Drawings of Flower, Fruits and Insects, 1560s-c. 1572. Watercolor and bodycolor on paper, 195 x 140mm. Private collection.
69. Jacques le Moyne de Morgues, *Cyclamen*, from Eighty Watercolor Drawings of Flower, Fruits and Insects, 1560s-c. 1572. Watercolor and bodycolor on paper, 195 x 140mm. Private collection.
70. Jacques le Moyne de Morgues, *Species Rose*, from Fifty-Nine Drawings of Flowers, Fruits and Insects, 1560s-c. 1572. Watercolor and bodycolor on paper, 174 x 188 mm. Victoria and Albert Museum, London.
71. Jacques le Moyne de Morgues, *Species Rose*, from Eighty Watercolor Drawings of Flower, Fruits and Insects, 1560s-c. 1572. Watercolor and bodycolor on paper, 195 x 140mm. Private collection.
72. Jacques le Moyne de Morgues, *Sonnet*, Fifty Watercolor Drawings of Flowers, Fruits and Insects, 1585. British Museum, London.
73. Jacques le Moyne de Morgues, *Almond*, from Fifty Watercolor Drawings of Flowers, Fruits and Insects, 1585. Watercolor and bodycolor on laid paper, 213 x 142 mm. British Museum, London.
74. Jacques le Moyne de Morgues, *Almond*, from Fifty-Nine Drawings of Flowers, Fruits and Insects, 1560s-c. 1572. Watercolor and bodycolor on paper, 174 x 188 mm. Victoria and Albert Museum, London.
75. Jacques le Moyne de Morgues, *Lemon*, from Fifty Watercolor Drawings of Flowers, Fruits and Insects, 1585. Watercolor and bodycolor on laid paper, 213 x 142 mm. British Museum, London.
76. Jacques le Moyne de Morgues, *Lemon*, from Fifty-Nine Drawings of Flowers, Fruits and Insects, 1560s-c. 1572. Watercolor and bodycolor on paper, 174 x 188 mm. Victoria and Albert Museum, London.
77. Jacques le Moyne de Morgues, *Pedunculate Oak and Dragonfly*, from Fifty Watercolor Drawings of Flowers, Fruits and Insects, 1585. Watercolor and bodycolor on laid paper, 213 x 142 mm. British Museum, London.
78. Jacques le Moyne de Morgues, *Wild Daffodil*, from Fifty Watercolor Drawings of Flowers, Fruits and Insects, 1585. Watercolor and bodycolor on laid paper, 213 x 142 mm. British Museum, London.

79. Jacques le Moyne de Morgues, *Wallflower, Small Tortoiseshell Butterfly, and Snail*, from *Fifty Watercolor Drawings of Flowers, Fruits and Insects*, 1585. Watercolor and bodycolor on laid paper, 213 x 142 mm. British Museum, London.
80. Jacques le Moyne de Morgues, *Rosemary and Lackey Moth Caterpillar*, from *Fifty Watercolor Drawings of Flowers, Fruits and Insects*, 1585. Watercolor and bodycolor on laid paper, 213 x 142 mm. British Museum, London.
81. Jacques le Moyne de Morgues, *Hollyhock*, from *Fifty Watercolor Drawings of Flowers, Fruits and Insects*, 1585. Watercolor and bodycolor on laid paper, 213 x 142 mm. British Museum, London.
82. Title page of *La Clef des Champs* (Blackfriars, 1586). Oak Spring Garden Library, Upperville.
83. Dedicatory letter to “Madame de Sidney,” *La Clef des Champs* (Blackfriars, 1586). Oak Spring Garden Library, Upperville.
84. Sonnet, *La Clef des Champs* (Blackfriars, 1586). Oak Spring Garden Library, Upperville.
85. Jacques le Moyne de Morgues, *Marigold*, from *La Clef des Champs* (Blackfriars, 1586). Woodcut, 155 x 218 mm. Oak Spring Garden Library, Upperville.
86. Jacques le Moyne de Morgues, *Apple* (left) and *Vegetable Marrow* (right), from *La Clef des Champs* (Blackfriars, 1586). Woodcut, 155 x 218 mm, Oak Spring Garden Library, Upperville.
87. Jacques le Moyne de Morgues, *Marigold*, from *Fifty Watercolor Drawings of Flowers, Fruits and Insects*, 1585. Watercolor and bodycolor on laid paper, 213 x 142 mm. British Museum, London.
88. Jacques le Moyne de Morgues, *Apple* (left) and *Vegetable Marrow* (right), from *Fifty Watercolor Drawings of Flowers, Fruits and Insects*, 1585. Watercolor and bodycolor on laid paper, 213 x 142 mm. British Museum, London.
89. Jacques le Moyne de Morgues, *Hollyhocks*, from *Miniatures Formerly in the Collection of Rudolf II*, c. 1585-1588. 142 x 109 mm, New York and Europe: Private Collection.
90. Nicholas Hilliard, *Elizabeth I*, c. 1587. Gouache, 44 x 37 mm. Victoria and Albert Museum, London.
91. Title page of Esther Inglis’s *Octonaries upon the Vanitie and Inconstancie of the World, writin and limd be me, Esther Inglis the xxiii, Decemb: 1607*. Washington D.C.: The Folger Shakespeare Library.

92. Esther Inglis, *Octonaries upon the Vanitie and Inconstancie of the World, writin and limd be me, Esther Inglis the xxiii, Decemb: 1607* (fol. 30). Washington D.C.: The Folger Shakespeare Library.
93. *Self-Portrait of Esther Inglis*, from *Octonaries upon the Vanitie and Inconstancie of the World. Writin by Esterh Inglis, the first of Ianuar 1600*. Washington, D.C.: The Folger Shakespeare Library.
94. *The Bending Reed*, from Thomas Palmer, *The Sprite of Trees and Herbes*, 1598/99. British Library, London.
95. *The Bending Reed*, from Joachim Camerarius, *Symbolorum et Emblematum ex re Herbaria Desumtorum* (Nuremberg, 1590).
96. *Crown Imperial* (71), from Joachim Camerarius, *Symbolorum et Emblematum ex re Herbaria Desumtorum* (Nuremberg, 1590).
97. *Aloe* (87; left) and *Tulips* (88; right), from Joachim Camerarius, *Symbolorum et Emblematum ex re Herbaria Desumtorum* (Nuremberg, 1590).
98. *Violets* (fol. 9v), from Joachim Camerarius, *Camerararius-Florilegium*, 1576-1590. Universitätsbibliothk Erlangen-Nürnberg.
99. *Iris* (fol. 36r), from Joachim Camerarius, *Camerararius-Florilegium*, 1576-1590. Universitätsbibliothk Erlangen-Nürnberg.
100. *Sunflower* (fol. 130), from Joachim Camerarius, *Camerararius-Florilegium*, 1576-1590. Universitätsbibliothk Erlangen-Nürnberg.
101. *Tulips* (fol. 3) from Joachim Camerarius, *Camerararius-Florilegium*, 1576-1590. Universitätsbibliothk Erlangen-Nürnberg.
102. *Heliotropes* (72), from Joachim Camerarius, *Symbolorum et Emblematum ex re Herbaria Desumtorum* (Nuremberg, 1590).
103. *Rose*, from Jeremias Drexel, *Zodiacus Christianus* (Munich, 1618).
104. *Fig Tree*, from Jeremias Drexel, *Zodiacus Christianus* (Munich, 1618).
105. *Balsam Tree*, from Jeremias Drexel, *Zodiacus Christianus* (Munich, 1618).
106. *Cypress Tree*, from Jeremias Drexel, *Zodiacus Christianus* (Munich, 1618).
107. “*Vitae, aut morti*” from Geoffrey Whitney’s *A Choice of Emblemes* (Leiden, 1586).

108. “*Turpibus exitium*” from Geoffrey Whitney’s *A Choice of Emblemes* (Leiden, 1586).
109. Jacques le Moyne de Morgue, *Young Daughter of the Picts*, c.1585-88. Watercolor and bodycolor on vellum, 260 x 185 mm. Paul Mellon Collection.
110. Simon de Passe, *Mary Herbert, Countess of Pembroke*, 1618. Engraving, 179 x 109 mm. National Portrait Gallery, London.
111. Nicholas Hilliard, *Mary Sidney, Countess of Pembroke*, c. 1590. Watercolor on vellum, diameter 54 mm. National Portrait Gallery, London.
112. Lady Drury’s oratory. Christchurch Mansion, Ipswich.
113. “*Patria cuique chara*,” from Geoffrey Whiney, *A Choice of Emblems* (Leiden, 1586)
114. Bee scap, “*Cum melle aculleus*.” Lady Drury’s oratory. Christchurch Mansion, Ipswich.
115. Camel muddying water with its foot, “*Pura juvent alios*.” Lady Drury’s oratory. Christchurch Mansion, Ipswich.
116. “*Turbata delectat*,” from Joachim Camerarius, *Symbola et Emblemata II* (Nuremberg, 1595).
117. Lady Drury’s oratory. Christchurch Mansion, Ipswich.
118. *Pansy* (center). Lady Drury’s oratory. Christchurch Mansion, Ipswich.
119. Drawing of a daffodil, attached to a letter from Carolus Clusius to Matteo Caccini in Florence, dated 10 October 1608. Universiteits-bibliotheek Leiden.
120. *Dragon-tree*, from *Libri Picturati* (A23.028). Jagiellonian Library, Kraków.
121. *Dragon-tree*, Clusius’s *Rariorum aliquot per Hispanias observatarum historia* (Antwerp, 1576).
122. Jacques de Gheyn II, Title page of Carolus Clusius’s *Rariorum Plantarum Historia* (Antwerp, 1601).
123. Jacques de Gheyn II, *Portrait of Carolus Clusius*, 1601. Engraving, 218 x 180 mm. Amsterdam University Library.

124. Crispijn de Passe the Elder, *Self-Portrait*, c. 1600. Pen in brown ink on paper, 285 x 198 mm. Graphische Sammlung Albertina, Vienna.
125. Crispijn de Passe the Elder after Maarten de Vos, *Spring*, from *The Four Seasons*. Engraving. 197 x 217 mm. Rijksprentenkabinet, Amsterdam.
126. Crispijn de Passe the Elder, title page of the *Cognoscite Lilia*. Engraving, 126 x 208 mm. Oak Spring Garden Library, Upperville.
127. *Field Pea*, from Crispijn de Passe the Elder, *Cognoscite Lilia*, Engraving, 126 x 208 mm. Oak Spring Garden Library, Upperville.
128. Jacques le Moyne de Morgues, *Field Pea*, from Fifty Watercolor Drawings of Flowers, Fruits and Insects, 1585. Watercolor and bodycolor on laid paper, 213 x 142 mm. British Museum, London.
129. *Wild Daffodil*, from Crispijn de Passe the Elder, *Cognoscite Lilia*, Engraving, 126 x 208 mm. Oak Spring Garden Library, Upperville.
130. *Almond*, from Crispijn de Passe the Elder, *Cognoscite Lilia*, Engraving, 126 x 208 mm. Oak Spring Garden Library, Upperville.
131. *Common Mallow*, from Crispijn de Passe the Elder, *Cognoscite Lilia*, Engraving, 126 x 208 mm. Oak Spring Garden Library, Upperville.
132. Jacques le Moyne de Morgues, *Common Mallow*, from Fifty Watercolor Drawings of Flowers, Fruits and Insects, 1585. Watercolor and bodycolor on laid paper, 213 x 142 mm. British Museum, London.
133. Hans Collaert I, *Frieze with Eleven Birds*, early 1570s. Engraving, 36 x 182 mm. Prentenkabinet van Koninklijke Bibliotheek van België, Brussels.
134. Crispijn de Passe the Younger, Title page of the *Hortus Floidus*, 1614. Engraving, 147 x 214 mm. Oak Spring Garden Library, Upperville.
135. Crispijn de Passe the Elder, *Evening Primroses, Violets, Dandelions and Narcissus*. Pen and brown ink, brown wash, 117 x 190 mm. Private collection.
136. Crispijn de Passe the Elder, *Mallow and Nightshade*. Pen and brown ink, brown wash, 117 x 190 mm. Private collection.
137. Crispijn de Passe the Elder, *Oak-Branches and Leafs*. Pen and brown ink, 123 x 178 mm. Private collection.
138. Crispijn de Passe the Elder, *Ivy and Poppy*. Pen and brown ink, brown wash, 117 x 190 mm. Private collection.

139. Crispijn de Passe the Elder, *Primula*. Pen and brown ink, 112 x 175 mm. Rijksprentenkabinet, Amsterdam.
140. Crispijn de Passe the Elder, *Study of Plants*. Pen and brown ink, 110 x 113 mm. Rijksprentenkabinet, Amsterdam.
141. Crispijn de Passe the Elder, *Lily*. Watercolor, 185 x 130 mm. Formerly in the collection foundation P. & N. de Boer, Amsterdam.
142. Willem de Passe, *Lily*, from the *Hortus Floridus*, 1614. Engraving, 147 x 214 mm. Oak Spring Garden Library, Upperville.
143. Crispijn de Passe the Younger, *Spring Garden*, from *Hortus Floridus*, 1614. Hand-colored engraving, 147 x 214 mm. Oak Spring Garden Library, Upperville.
144. Hendrick Goltzius, *Portrait of Gillis van Breen*, 1588. Colored chalk, 377 x 295 mm. Städelsches Kunstinstitut, Frankfurt.
145. Hendrick Goltzius, *Lumpsucker*, 1589. Colored chalk and brush, 230 x 310 mm. Koninklijke Bibliotheek, Brussels.
146. Hendrick Goltzius, *Study of a Tobacco Plant*, c. 1592. Metalpoint on tablet, 100 x 70 mm, Museum Boijmans van Beuningen, Rotterdam.
147. Hendrick Goltzius, *A Foxglove in Bloom*, 1592. Pen and brown ink on laid paper, 175 x 98 mm. National Gallery of Art, Washington, D.C.
148. Jacques de Gheyn II, *Study of Blooming Prunis*, 1590s. Metalpoint on paper, 88 x 82 mm. Kupferstichkabinett, Berlin.
149. Jacques de Gheyn II, *The Skinned Head of a Calf*, 1599. Watercolor, 157 x 202 mm. Foundation of P. en N. de Boer, Amsterdam.
150. Jacques de Gheyn II, *Four Studies of a Frog*, c. 1600. Watercolor, 143 x 197 mm. Rijksprentenkabinet, Amsterdam.
151. Jacques de Gheyn II, c. 1600. *Two Studies of a Blow-fish*, Pen and brown ink on paper, 150 x 197 mm. Rijksprentenkabinet, Amsterdam.
152. William Swanenburgh after Jan Cornelisz Woudanus, *Leiden Garden*, 1610. Engraving, 33 x 40 mm. Rijksprentenkabinet, Amsterdam.
153. Jacques de Gheyn II, *Lady's Slipper Orchid* (center), 1600. Watercolor and gouache on vellum, 227 x 175 mm. Institut Néerlandais, Collection Frits Lugt, Paris.

154. Jacques de Gheyn II, *A Madonna Lily and a Garden Pea*, 1600. Watercolor and gouache on vellum, 227 x 175 mm. Institut Néerlandais, Collection Frits Lugt, Paris.
155. Jacques le Moyne de Morgues, *Madonna Lily*, from *Fifty Watercolor Drawings of Flowers, Fruits and Insects*, 1585. Watercolor and bodycolor on laid paper, 213 x 142 mm. British Museum, London.
156. Jacques de Gheyn II, *Three Roses*, 1603. Watercolor and gouache on vellum, 227 x 175 mm. Institut Néerlandais, Collection Frits Lugt, Paris.
157. Jacques le Moyne de Morgues, *Cabbage Rose* (left) and *Alba Rose* (right), from *Fifty Watercolor Drawings of Flowers, Fruits and Insects*, 1585. Watercolor and bodycolor on laid paper, 213 x 142 mm. British Museum, London.
158. Jacques de Gheyn II, *A Variety of Insects and Flower Petals*, 1600. Watercolor and gouache on vellum, 227 x 175 mm. Institut Néerlandais, Collection Frits Lugt, Paris.
159. Jacques le Moyne de Morgues, *Insects and Shells*, from *Fifty Watercolor Drawings of Flowers, Fruits and Insects*, 1585. Watercolor and bodycolor on laid paper, 213 x 142 mm. British Museum, London.
160. Jacques de Gheyn II, *Early Summer Flowers: a Spanish Iris, an Austrian Briar, two Wild Pansies or Heartsease*, 1603. Watercolor and gouache on vellum, 227 x 175 mm. Institut Néerlandais, Collection Frits Lugt, Paris.
161. Jacques de Gheyn II, *Six Flower Studies*, from the Album of Rudolf II. Watercolor. Österreichische Nationalbibliothek, Vienna.
162. Jacques de Gheyn II, *Fritillary and Three Tulips in a Vase*, 1600. Watercolor and gouache on vellum, 227 x 175 mm. Institut Néerlandais, Collection Frits Lugt, Paris.
163. Joris Hoefnagel, *Still Life with Flowers, Insects and a Frog*, 1592. Watercolor on parchment, 23 x 17 cm. Present whereabouts unknown.
164. Jacques de Gheyn II, *Flower Still Life*, c. 1600. Oil on copper, 15 x 10 cm. Formerly in Brian L. Koetser Gallery, present whereabouts unknown.
165. Joris Hoefnagel, *Flower Piece*, 1594. Watercolor and gouache on parchment, 16.1 x 12 cm. Ashmolean Museum, Oxford.
166. Jacques de Gheyn II, *Glass Flask with Flowers*, 1612. Oil on copper, 58 x 44 cm. Royal Picture Gallery Mauritshuis, The Hague.

167. Jacques de Gheyn II, *Vanitas Still Life*, 1603. Oil on panel, 82.6 x 54 cm. The Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York.
168. Jacques de Gheyn II, *Tulips and Roses in a Glass Vase*, 1613. Oil on copper, 39.5 x 28.8 cm. Private collection.
169. Jacques de Gheyn II, *Vase with Flowers with a Curtain*, 1615. Oil on panel, 109.8 x 74.5cm. Kimbell Art Museum, Fort Worth.
170. Roelandt Savery, *Flower Piece with Two Lizards*, 1603. Oil on copper, 32 x 23 cm. Private collection.
171. Joris Hoefnagel, *Rose (Ignis, XXIV)*, 1575-1580. from *The Four Elements*, 1575-1580. Watercolor on vellum, 143 x 184 mm. National Gallery of Art, Washington, D.C.
172. Roelandt Savery, *Vase of Flowers*, 1611. Oil on panel, 25 x 16 cm. Private collection.
173. Roelandt Savery, *Vase of Flowers*, 1612. Oil on panel, 49.5 x 34.5 cm. Collection of Prince of Lichtenstein, Vaduz.
174. Jacques de Gheyn II, a love-in-a-mist (fol. 8, left) and a mouse (fol. 22, right), 1600-1604. Watercolor and gouache on vellum, 227 x 175 mm. Institut Néerlandais, Collection Frits Lugt, Paris.
175. Jacques de Gheyn II, *A Salamander*, 1600. Watercolor on parchment, 53 x 62 mm. Städelsches Kunstinstitut, Frankfurt.
176. Jacques de Gheyn II, *A Witches' Sabbath*, c. 1608. Black chalk, pen and brush on paper, 44.8 x 67 cm. Graphische Sammlung, Staatsgalerie Stuttgart.
177. Roelandt Savery, *A Bouquet in a Niche with a Cockatoo and a Kingfisher*, 1624. Oil on panel, 130 x 80 cm. Centraal Museum, Utrecht.
178. Ambrosius Bosschaert the Elder, *Flowers in a Glass*, 1606. Oil on copper, 35.6 x 29.3 cm. The Cleveland Museum of Art, Cleveland.
179. Ambrosius Bosschaert the Elder, *Bouquet in an Arched Window*, c. 1618. Oil on panel, 64 x 46 cm. The Royal Picture Gallery Mauritshuis, The Hague.
180. Ambrosius Bosschaert the Elder, *Roses in an Arched Window*, 1618-1619. Oil on copper, 27.5 x 23 cm. Private collection.

181. Ambrosius Bosschaert the Elder, *Bouquet of Flowers in a Glass Vase*, 1621. Oil on copper, 31.6 x 21.6 cm. National Gallery of Art, Washington, D.C.
182. Jan Brueghel the Elder, *Rosebuds, Mouse, Caterpillar and Butterfly*, c. 1605. Oil on copper, 8 x 10 cm. Pinacoteca Ambrosiana, Milan.
183. Jan Brueghel the Elder, *Flowers in an Earthenware Jar*, 1606. Oil on copper, 65 x 45 cm. Pinacoteca Ambrosiana, Ambrosiana.
184. Jan Brueghel the Elder, *Bouquet with Mourning Iris in a Stoneware Jar*. Oil on panel, 60.3 x 42.2 cm. Fitzwilliam Museum, Cambridge.
185. *Mourning Iris (Iris Susiana)*, from Pierre Vallet's *Le Jardin du Roy très Chrestien Henri IV* (Paris, 1608).

Introduction

This dissertation examines the contribution of the French artist Jacques le Moyne de Morgues (c. 1533-1588) to the development of seventeenth-century Netherlandish flower still lifes, a heretofore understudied subject. While Le Moyne has mostly been discussed as a cartographer and as the official artist for the French expedition to Florida from 1564 to 1565, this study investigates Le Moyne as a flower painter, focusing on his experiences of collecting and recording plants during the Florida exploration. I also hope to situate Le Moyne's *florilegia*, or specialized collections of illustrated flowers, in the culture of collecting in the late sixteenth century.¹

Le Moyne's experiences in Florida inspired him to create *florilegia* after his return to France. He created these floral images not merely as extensions of the tradition of herbal books or botanical treatises, but as collectors' items. The poetic and emblematic qualities of these realistic images, as well as their aesthetic beauty, appealed to English aristocrats.

Le Moyne's accurately and delicately illustrated floral images influenced a number of early Netherlandish flower artists—among others the printmaker Crispijn de Passe the Elder (1564-1637) and the painter Jacques de Gheyn (1565-1629). Le Moyne's

¹ Sam Segal defines the definition of a *florilegium* in depth: "In Latin *flos* means flower as well as perfect object, jewel, something with sheen or luster, the best, while the meaning of *lego* is to choose or select as well as to pick and to read: one reads what one has selected. Hence, a *florilegium* is an anthology, the meaning it holds in literature, namely a collection of fine literary pieces. [. . .] they refer to books with illustrations of beautiful flowers produced for flower connoisseurs in France, the Netherlands, Germany and England during a few decades at the end of the sixteenth century and the beginning of the seventeenth century." See Sam Segal, "On florilegia," in *A Double Celebration: Antiquariaat Junk 1899-1999; Junk's Rara Historico Naturalia 1900* (Amsterdam: Natural History Booksellers, 2000-2001), 9. The word *florilegium* first appears in the title of a series of engravings *Florilegium* by Adriaen Collaert in 1600. It consists of a title page and twelve sheets of flowers. There are several later reprints published by Justus Sadeler in Antwerp and Jean le Clerc in Paris at the beginning of the seventeenth century. For more information about these later copies, see *Ibid.*, 15. For the *florilegia* printed between 1586 and 1620, see Appendix 1.

impact on the origin of seventeenth-century Netherlandish flower still lifes, however, has been largely overlooked because he was from abroad and active in England. Le Moyne's watercolors not only provided early flower painters with pictorial sources for their floral images but also demonstrated how to illustrate flowers "*naer het leven*" ("from life"). De Gheyn and De Passe, who had both experienced Le Moyne's *florilegia* through their extensive collaborations with botanists and publishers, transferred their knowledge of Le Moyne's subtle manner of modeling and accurate coloring to contemporary flower painters.

This dissertation argues that the Flemish botanist Carolus Clusius (1526-1609) was an important link between Le Moyne and seventeenth-century Netherlandish flower painters. Clusius was at the center of a network of flower collectors, gardeners, publishers and artists, exchanging information by circulating plants as well as visual illustrations in drawings, watercolors, woodcuts, or engravings. He involved flower painters with numerous projects and provided them with botanical drawings, access to his gardens, and professional botanical knowledge. Clusius engaged Jacques de Gheyn to illustrate flowers and small creatures in an album containing twenty-two watercolors (1600-1604, Paris: Institut Néerlandais, F. Lugt Collection), encouraging him to expand upon Le Moyne's accurate modeling and coloring of flowers from life.

The primary goal of this dissertation is thus to ascertain the nature of this connection between Le Moyne and Netherlandish flower painters. It will examine the cultural context in which the late sixteenth-century fascination with collecting rare and exotic flowers stimulated the process of cataloguing botanical specimens and recording their images. It will also demonstrate that botanists and publishers aggressively involved

professional artists in the production of accurately illustrated floral images, thus, had an important impact on the development of flower still lifes.

Questions Surrounding the Origins of Flower Still-Life Painting

Flower Symbolism

Since the Middle Ages, flowers have appeared in many works of art, not only to please the eye but also to enrich the symbolic meaning of the work. In the Christian tradition a variety of flowers mentioned in Biblical texts came to symbolize the virtues of the Virgin, Christ and the Saints. For example, it is written in the Song of Songs 2:1: “I am a rose of Sharon, a lily of the valleys. Like a lily among thorns in my darling among the maidens.”² While the Bible does not identify individual flowers with specific meanings, St. Bernard of Clairvaux (1090-1153) gave specific symbolic meanings to flowers in the twelfth century: “Mary is the violet of humility, the lily of chastity, the rose of charity, and the glory and splendor of the Heaven.”³

The symbolic association of flowers to the Virgin often appears in Renaissance art in the illusionistic border decorations of books of hours or in oil paintings of flower bouquets. For instance, Hugo van der Goes’s (d. 1482) *Portinari Altarpiece* (c. 1476, figs. 1, 2) contains two flower bouquets arranged in vases in the foreground: one of which contains a lily and three irises, and the other columbines and carnations. Violets are

² For more discussion about flower symbolism, see Elizabeth Haig, *Floral Symbolism of the Great Masters* (London, K. Paul, Trench, Trübner & CO., LTD., 1913); Erwin Panofsky, *Early Netherlandish Painting: Its Origins and Character*, 2 vols. (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1953); rpt. in (New York: Harper & Row, 1971); Teresa McLean, *Medieval English Gardens* (New York: Viking, 1980); and Beverly Seaton, *The Language of Flowers: A History* (Charlottesville and London: University Press of Virginia, 1995).

³ Yrjö Hirn, *The Sacred Shrine: A Study of the Poetry and Art of the Catholic Church* (Boston: Beacon Press, 1957), 306, note 19.

scattered on the ground and a bundle of corn lies behind the vases. All the flowers have symbolic associations to the Virgin and Christ.⁴ Erwin Panofsky discussed the symbolic meanings of these flowers in connection to the Passion of Christ. The scarlet lily referred to the blood of the Passion; the iris to the sword that pierces the heart of the *Mater Dolorosa*; and the seven columbine blossoms to the Sorrows of the Virgin.⁵ While Panofsky's interpretation of flowers has been largely accepted, we do not know the extent to what the artist intended such flower symbolism in his painting. Sometimes, more than one symbolic meaning was intended by artists in their flower paintings.

In the seventeenth-century Netherlands, flowers were often used as *vanitas* (vanity) motifs, serving to remind the viewer of the fleeting of life. In his *Vanitas Still Life* of 1603 (fig. 167), Jacques de Gheyn depicted a tulip as a symbol of *vanitas* in combination with a skull and an extinguished candle.

Flower Still Lifes before 1600

Prior to the appearance of the independent genre of flower still lifes in the early seventeenth-century Netherlands, German artists Hans Memling (1430/40-1494) and Ludger tom Ring the Younger (1522-1584) had painted a few flower bouquet still lifes. Hans Memling's *Flowers in an Earthenware Jar* (c. 1485/90, fig. 3), which appears on the verso of the *Portrait of a Young Man at Prayer* (fig. 4) depicts a bouquet of flowers—lilies, irises and columbines—in a jar, that rests on an oriental carpet in a niche.⁶ These

⁴ For more discussion about symbolic meanings of these flowers, see Robert A. Koch, "Flower Symbolism in the Portinari Altar," *The Art Bulletin* 46 (March 1964): 70-77.

⁵ Panofsky, *Early Netherlandish Painting*, 333.

⁶ For more information about this painting, see Dirk De Vos, *Hans Memling: The Complete Works*, trans. Ted Alkins (Antwerp: Fonds Mercator Paribas & Ludion Press, 1994), 262-263, cat. 72.

flowers have symbolic associations with the Virgin: white lilies refer to her purity, irises with her sorrows, and columbines with Christ's birth and death. The appearance of Christ's monogram *IHS* on the jar further emphasizes the religious character of this flower bouquet.⁷

Memling's devotional use of flowers relates to the male portrait on the recto. The portrait of a praying young man probably was once part of a diptych or triptych, as for example, the *Benedetto Portinari Triptych* (1487, fig. 5).⁸ As in the male worshiper of the Portinari triptych, the young man in the *Portrait of a Young Man at Prayer* probably once faced a panel depicting the Virgin and Child. The flower bouquet on the verso of the portrait thus was once part of a complex group of images symbolizing the young man's devotion to God and was not created as an independent work of art.⁹

Ludger tom Ring the Younger created his floral still life paintings in the 1560s. In his *Vase of Wild Flowers on a Ledge* (c. 1565, fig. 6), for example, a variety of wild flowers, including peonies, daisies, dog roses and violets, which seem to have just been picked from a field, are arranged in a form of a bouquet. As in Memling's choice of flowers, these species also have allegorical or religious significance even though Tom Ring rendered them with accurate modeling and coloring.

⁷ Flowers as a symbol of the Virgin are also represented in the *Virgin and Child Enthroned* (c. 1480/90), in which Memling placed an identical jar and a similar form of a flower bouquet, appeared in the *Flowers in an Earthenware Jar*, next to the Virgin. For more information about the painting, see *Ibid.*, 217-219, cat. 54.

⁸ *Ibid.*, 262.

⁹ Moreover, Memling's devotional use of plants is also found in the verso of the portrait of the Portinari triptych. A new twig sprouts of an oak tree is wrapped by banderole where a motto "*DE BONO IN MELIUS*" ("from good to better") is written. See Angelica Dülberg, *Privatporträts: Geschichte und Ikonologie einer Gattung im 15. Und 16. Jahrhundert* (Berlin: Gebr. Mann Verlag, 1990), 260, cat. 237. Dülberg has argued that Memling often employed plants as "a kind of emblem of the donor's personal Christian vocation."

Tom Ring based his flowers on separate studies on paper that were later attached to an album owned by Rudolf II.¹⁰ Among these, *Poppy and Other Field Flowers* (c. 1560, fig. 7) depicts various species of flowers, including the poppy, cornflower and foxglove that bloom during the summer.¹¹ He depicted flowers from different angles and at various stages of blooming, providing each species with detailed information that would enhance their use later in his studio. The identical images are found in his 1565 painting.

Tom Ring composed his flower still life with great originality and objectivity. However, he had virtually no impact on the tradition of Netherlandish flower still lifes. His works were little known beyond the cities of Münster and Braunschweig where he worked. In comparison to seventeenth-century Netherlandish flower painters, who concentrated on rare and exotic plants newly imported from all around the world, Tom Ring depicted primarily uncultivated flowers, many of which appeared in the border decoration of books of hours.

First Known Flower Still Lives in the Netherlands

Flower still lifes as an independent art form already existed in the Netherlands in the second half of the sixteenth century. In his *Schilder-Boeck* (the Book of Painters;

¹⁰ This album consists of 170 animal and flower images by different artists between 1530 and 1585. It also includes several independent flower pieces such as *The Jug with Flowers* (fol. 167). The album was assembled at the end of the sixteenth century and now in Vienna: Österreichische Nationalbibliothek (Cod. min. 42). For more study on this album, see Fritz Koreny, *Albrecht Dürer and the Animal and Plant Studies of the Renaissance*, trans. Pamela Marwood and Yehuda Shapiro (Boston: Little, Brown, 1988), 30, note 1, and 240-243, cat. 88, ill. 88.4: this book is the English edition of *Albrecht Dürer und die Tier- und Pflanzenstudien der Renaissance* (München: Prestel-Verlag, 1985). Also see: Beatijs Brenninkmeijer-de Rooij, *Roots of Seventeenth-Century Flower Painting: Miniatures Plant Books Paintings* (Leiden: Primavera Pers, 1996), 43, fig. 42.

¹¹ Koreny, *Albrecht Dürer*, 246-245, cat. 90.

Amsterdam, 1604) the Dutch theorist Karel van Mander (1548-1606) discussed the flower painter Lodewijck Jans van den Bosch (or Lodewijck Jans van den Valckenborgh), who was born around 1520 in Den Bosch:¹²

There was also a certain Lodewijck Jans van den Bos, born at 's-Hertogenbosch, who was very adept at fruit and flowers, which he sometimes painted as if they were standing in a glass of water, to which he applied much time, patience and precision so that everything appeared natural. He also painted heaven's dew on the little flowers and plants and some little creatures, butterflies, flies and suchlike around and about. Thus one finds his works here and there in the possession of art-lovers. He was also clever at figures, as can be seen at the home of art-loving Melchior Wijntgis in Middelburg where there is a most beautiful *St. Jerome* by his hand, and large tondos, fires and fruit as well as pots of flowers, and other pieces very well and accurately painted. Furthermore, at Jaques Razet's there is a glass with flowers by him, most subtly painted; and because I do not know much else to write about him, I set him down here next to his compatriot or fellow townman so that his name and praise are remembered among painters.¹³

According to Van Mander, Van den Bosch specialized primarily in the subject of fruit and flowers. Van Mander's description of Van den Bosch's flower pieces with "flowers standing in a glass of water" and "dew on the little flowers and plants and some little creatures, butterflies, flies and such like" suggests that the artist was a pioneer in the independent genre of flower still lifes. Although none of his paintings has survived, Van den Bosch must have had an enormous impact on early seventeenth-century flower painters in the Netherlands.

¹² Ingvar Bergström, *Dutch Still-Life Painting in the Seventeenth Century*, trans. Christina Hedström and Gerald Taylor (New York: T. Yoseloff, 1956), 39-40; rpt. in (New York: Hacker Art Books, 1983).

¹³ Karel Van Mander, *Het Schilder-Boeck* (Amsterdam, 1604), fol. 217r; rpt. in *Karel van Mander: The Lives of the Illustrious Netherlandish and German Painters, from the First Edition of the Schilder-Boeck (1603-1604)*, ed. Hessel Miedema, 6 vols. (Doornspijk: Davaco, 1994), 126-127.

Seventeenth-Century Netherlandish Flower Still Lifes

In the first decade of the seventeenth century, the independent genre of flower still lifes emerged simultaneously among Netherlandish artists including Jacques de Gheyn, Jan Brueghel the Elder (1568-1625), Ambrosius Bosschaert the Elder (1573-1621) and Roelandt Savery (1576-1639).¹⁴ Their beautiful flower bouquets share certain essential stylistic characteristics. The flowers that they displayed in vases, for example, often feature disproportionately large blossoms attached to short stems. The blossoms hardly overlap so that artists could focus upon their individual characteristics. Flowers are often symmetrically arranged and are given equal attention in an even lighting. They are illuminated by the luminosity of colors rather than by strong light and shadow effects.

Many questions surround these early flower still-lives.¹⁵ How is it that similar characteristics are found among them, even though all four of these artists were in different towns—De Gheyn was in Leiden, Brueghel was in Antwerp, Bosschaert was in Middelburg, and Savery was in Amsterdam or Prague—when they began their career in flower painting? From whom did these flower painters learn to depict flowers in such accuracy and delicacy? Who gave them access to these specimens or botanical knowledge?

The origin of early seventeenth-century Netherlandish floral still-lives as an independent subject has intrigued numerous art historians.¹⁶ Their studies, however, have mainly focused on the ornamental quality or the religious symbolism of floral images,

¹⁴ Although the first dated flower pieces of each painter are known as in between 1600 and 1606, however, all these artists had most likely begun their career in flower still-life painting before these dates.

¹⁵ “Early floral still-lives” refer to those of the Netherlands in the early seventeenth century unless otherwise stated. This study limits to the countries north of the Alps, which excludes Italy.

¹⁶ See the state of existing scholarship below.

and have often overlooked the cultural context in which these paintings were created.¹⁷

To answer those questions posed above this study will examine the cultural context, in which these early flower painters interacted with botanists, publishers and flower lovers, and responded to the evolving culture of collecting and recording plants in the early seventeenth century.

State of Existing Scholarship

The subject of Netherlandish flower still-lives was not discussed as an independent subject until 1928, when Ralph E. Warner published *Dutch and Flemish Flower and Fruit Painters of the XVIIth and XVIIIth Centuries*.¹⁸ In 1933, A.P.A. Vorenkamp expanded upon Warner's study and interest in organized still lifes by category.¹⁹ In later studies, scholars have probed deeper meanings of floral still lifes beyond their representations of reality. J. G. van Gelder, for example, examined floral symbolism in relation to religious devotion and vanitas symbolism in his article "Van

¹⁷ Several publications made the discussion about the subject: Charles Sterling, *La Nature Morte de l'Antiquité à Nos Jours* (Paris: Éditions des Musées nationaux, 1952); Norbert Schneider, "Vom Kloostergarten zur Tulpenmanie. Hinweise zur materiellen Vorgeschichte des Blumenstillebens," in Gerhard Langemeyer and Hans-Albert Peters, ed. *Stilleben in Europa* exh. cat. (Münster: Westfälisches Landesmuseum; and Baden-Baden: Staatliche Kunsthalle, 1979-1980), 294-312; Paul Pieper, "Das Blumenbukett," in Langemeyer and Peters, *Stilleben*, 314-349; and Sam Segal, *Een Bloemrijk Verleden. Overzicht van de Noord- en Zuid-Nederlandse Bloemschilderkunst 1600-heden* exh. cat. (Amsterdam: Kunsthandel P. de Boer; and 's-Hertogenbosch: Noordbrabants Museum, 1982). Also see the state of existing scholarship below.

¹⁸ Ralph E. Warner, *Dutch and Flemish Flower and Fruit Painters of the XVIIth and XVIIIth Centuries* (London: Mills & Boon, 1928); rpt. in (Amsterdam: B.M. Israël, 1975).

¹⁹ A.P.A. Vorenkamp, "Bijdrage tot de Geschiedenis van het Hollandse Stilleven in de Zeventiende Eeuw," Ph.D. diss. (University of Leiden, 1933).

Blompot en Blomglas” (1936).²⁰ Ingvar Bergström, building upon Erwin Panofsky’s pioneering study *Early Netherlandish Painting: Its Origins and Character* (1953),²¹ discussed the hidden symbolism with flower paintings in “Disguised Symbolism in ‘Madonna Pictures’ and Still-life” (1955).²² In his book *Dutch Still-Life Painting in the Seventeenth-Century* (1956) Bergström expanded upon the idea that flowers should be understood as symbols of earthly transience.²³

Inspired by the iconological approaches of Panofsky and Bergström, Eddy de Jongh wrote about the “disguised symbolism” in seventeenth-century Dutch art in his essay “Realism and Seeing Realism in Seventeenth-Century Dutch Painting” (1971).²⁴ For De Jongh, moralizing or didactic meanings are hidden beneath the “seeming reality” of Dutch paintings. According to him, the concealed meanings of Dutch painting were intended to both instruct and delight the viewer. Sam Segal, in his exhibition catalogue of

²⁰ J. G. van Gelder, “Van Blompot en Blomglas,” *Elsevier’s Geïllustreerd Maandschrift* 46 (1936): 73-82, 155-166.

²¹ Panofsky, *Early Netherlandish Painting*. For Panofsky’s method, see Erwin Panofsky, “Iconography and Iconology: An Introduction to the Study of Renaissance Art,” in *Meaning in the Visual Arts* (Garden City, New York: Doubleday, 1955); rpt. in (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1982), 26-54.

²² Ingvar Bergström, “Disguised Symbolism in ‘Madonna Pictures’ and Still-life,” *The Burlington Magazine* 97 (1955): 303-308, 342-349. His interest in this subject is first found in his dissertation in Swedish. See Ingvar Bergström, “Studier i Holländskt Stillebenmåleri under 1600-talet,” Ph.D. diss. (University of Gothenburg, 1947).

²³ Bergström, *Dutch Still-Life Painting*.

²⁴ Eddy de Jongh, “Realism and Seeming Realism in Seventeenth-Century Dutch Painting,” in *Looking at Seventeenth-Century Dutch Art: Realism Reconsidered*, ed. Wayne E. Franits (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1997), 21-56. It was first published in “Realisme en Schijnrealisme in de Hollandse Schilderkunst van de Zeventiende Eeuw,” *Rembrandt en Zijn Tijd* exh. cat. (Brussels: Paleis voor Schone Kunsten, 1971). See also: *Zinne- en Minnebeelden in de Schilderkunst van de Zeventiende Eeuw* (Amsterdam: Nederlandse Stichting Openbaar Kunstbezit, 1967); *Tot Lering en Vermaalc: Betekenissen van Hollandse Genrevoorstellingen uit de Zeventiende Eeuw* exh. cat. (Amsterdam: Rijksmuseum, 1976); and *Still life in the Age of Rembrandt* exh. cat. (Auckland: Auckland City Art Gallery, 1982).

Flowers and Nature; Netherlandish Flower Paintings of Four Centuries (1990),²⁵ and Paul Taylor, in *Dutch Flower Painting 1600-1720* (1995),²⁶ also stressed the importance of symbolism in flower paintings.

Other approaches for interpreting Dutch still lifes have also been advanced. N.R.G. Vroom, in *De Schilders van het Monochrome Banketje* (1945),²⁷ did not believe that the symbolic meaning existed in Dutch still life paintings: “the majority of still lifes appear to have been painted out of purely pictorial conviction, for which their attraction needed neither emblem nor symbol.”²⁸ In a series of articles from 1955 to 1959,²⁹ and the exhibition catalogue in 1959,³⁰ Laurens Bol stressed the “scientific realism” of floral still lifes painted by artists working in Middelburg. In 1969 in his *Holländische Maler des 17. Jahrhunderts nahe den Grossen Meistern*, Bol paid attention

²⁵ Sam Segal, *Flowers and Nature: Netherlandish Flower Paintings of Four Centuries* exh. cat. (Osaka: Natio Museum of Art; Tokyo: Tokyo Station Gallery; and Sydney: Art Gallery of New South Wales, 1990). See also Sam Segal, *A Prosperous Past: The Sumptuous Still Life in the Netherlands 1600-1700* exh. cat. (Delft: Stedelijk Museum ‘Het Prinsenhof’; Cambridge: Fogg Art Museum; and Fort Worth, Texas: Kimbell Art Museum, 1988).

²⁶ Paul Taylor, *Dutch Flower Painting 1600-1720* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1995).

²⁷ N.R.G. Vroom, “De Schilders van het Monochrome Banketje,” Ph.D. diss. (University of Amsterdam, 1945); rpt. in *A Modest Message as Intimated by the Painters of the Monochrome Banketje*, trans. Peter Gidman, 3 vols. (Schiedam: Interbook International, 1980).

²⁸ *Ibid.*, 14.

²⁹ Laurens J. Bol, “Een Middelburgse Brueghel-groep I,” *Oud Holland* 70 (1955):1-20; “Een Middelburgse Brueghel-groep II,” *Oud Holland* 70 (1955): 96-109; “Een Middelburgse Brueghel-groep III,” *Oud Holland* 70 (1955): 138-154; “Een Middelburgse Brueghel-groep IV,” *Oud Holland* 71 (1956): 132-182; “Een Middelburgse Brueghel-groep V,” *Oud Holland* 71 (1956): 183-203; “Een Middelburgse Brueghel-groep VI,” *Oud Holland* 72 (1957): 20-40; “Een Middelburgse Brueghel-groep VII,” *Oud Holland* 73 (1958):59-79; “Een Middelburgse Brueghel-groep VIII,” *Oud Holland* 73 (1958): 128-147; “Een Middelburgse Brueghel-groep IX,” *Oud Holland* 74 (1959): 1-19. These articles formed the basis for his study on Bosschaert and his school, as published in Laurens J. Bol, *The Bosschaert Dynasty: Painters of Flowers and Fruits* (Leigh-on-Sea: F. Lewis, 1960); and Noortje Bakker et al., *Masters of Middelburg: Exhibition in the Honour of Laurens J. Bol* exh. cat. (Amsterdam: Kunsthandel K. & V. Waterman, 1984).

³⁰ Laurens J. Bol, *Goede Onbekenden* exh. cat. (Dordrecht: Dordrecht Museum, 1959). See also: Laurens J. Bol, ‘Goede on Bekenden’: *Hedendaagse Herkenning en Waardering van Verscholen, Voorbijgezien en Onderschat Talent* (Utrecht: Tableau B.V., 1982).

to the growing interest in collecting exotic objects and gardening flowers in the early seventeenth-century Netherlands.³¹ In 1979 catalogue of the large still-life exhibition in Münster, Gerhard Langemeyer similarly approached flower still lifes with a purely aesthetic point of view, focusing on the way artists presented a plausible sense of reality.³²

During the last two decades of the twentieth century, the investigation of flower painting has greatly broadened with vigorous debates about the nature of realism in Dutch art.³³ In *The Art of Describing: Dutch Art in the Seventeenth Century* (1983), Svetlana Alpers argued that realism in Dutch painting was not based on the hidden meaning of each object, but rather on a scientific observation and description of the natural world.³⁴ Alpers questioned the concepts of disguised symbolism and moralizing meanings, as did Eric Jan Sluijter in 1988,³⁵ and Peter Hecht in 1989.³⁶ All of the authors

³¹ Laurens J. Bol, *Holländische Maler des 17. Jahrhunderts nahe den Grossen Meistern: Landschaften and Stilleben* (Braunschweig: Klinkhardt & Biermann, 1969); rpt. in (München: Klinkhardt & Bierman, 1982).

³² Gerhard Langemeyer, "Die Nähe und die Ferne," in Langemeyer and Peters, *Stilleben in Europa*, 20-45.

³³ Seventeenth-century Netherlandish flower still-lifes received much attention in publication and exhibition during the 1980s and 1990s. Among the most important exhibitions were: Langemeyer and Peters, *Stilleben in Europa*; Sam Segal's two exhibitions, *Flowery Past: A Survey of Dutch and Flemish Flower Painting from 1600 until the Present* exh. cat. (Amsterdam: Gallery P. de Boer, 1982), and *Flowers and Nature* (1990); Beatrijs Brenninkmeyer-de Rooij, *Bouquets from the Golden Age: The Mauritshuis in Blom* exh. cat. (The Hague: Mauritshuis, 1992); Peter Mitchell and Paul Taylor, *Dutch Flower Painting 1600-1750* exh. cat. (London: Dulwich Picture Gallery, 1996); Alan Chong et al., *Still-life Paintings from the Netherlands 1550-1720* exh. cat. (Amsterdam: Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam; and Boston: Cleveland Museum of Art, 1999); Arthur K. Wheelock, Jr., *From Botany to Bouquets: Flowers in Northern Art* exh. cat. (Washington, D.C.: National Gallery of Art, 1999). Important publications include: Paul Taylor, *Dutch Flower Painting*; Brenninkmeyer-de Rooij, *Roots*; and Epcó Runia, *In the Maueritshuis: Flowers*, trans. Katy Kist and Jennifer Kilian (The Hague: Mauritshuis; and Zwolle: Waanders, 2007).

³⁴ Svetlana Alpers, *The Art of Describing: Dutch Art in the Seventeenth Century* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1983). See also: Svetlana Alpers, "Picturing Dutch Culture," *Looking at Seventeenth-Century Dutch Art: Realism Reconsidered*, ed. Wayne E. Franits (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1997): 57-67.

³⁵ Eric Jan Sluijter, "'Een Volmaekte Schilderij is al seen Spiegel van de Natuer': Spiegel en Spiegelbeeld in de Nederlandse Schilderkunst van de Zeventiende Eeuw," in *Oog in oog met de spiegel*, ed. N. Brederoo et al. (Amsterdam: Aramith, 1988), 146-163; rpt. in "Didactic and Disguised Meanings? Several

argued that the seventeenth-century Dutch were more fascinated with the visual appeal of works of art rather than with veiled symbolism.

David Freedberg, in his 1991 article “Science, Commerce, and Art: Neglected Topics at the Junction of History and Art History,” emphasized the importance of interdisciplinary methods in art history.³⁷ He drew attention to the relationship between the scientific naturalism found in Dutch art and the flourishing prosperity, scientific curiosity, commerce and trade in Dutch Republic. Celeste Brusati, in her 1997 article “Natural Artifice and Material Values in Dutch Still Life,” argued that the meaning of still lifes is achieved by the artist’s self-conscious process of painting.³⁸ For her, an image of a bouquet of rare and exotic flowers, for example, represents “the activity of collecting, as well as the collections themselves, as attributes of the universal interests and intellectual curiosity of the collectors who amassed them.”³⁹ Most recently, Julie Berger Hochstrasser discussed still life in relation to the culture that produced it. In her book *Still life and Trade in the Dutch Golden Age* (2007), Hochstrasser argued that still life

Seventeenth-Century Texts on Painting and the Iconological Approach to Dutch Paintings of This Period,” in Franits, *Looking*, 78-87. See also: “New Approaches in Art History and the Changing Image of Seventeenth-Century Dutch Art between 1960 and 1990,” in *The Golden Age of Dutch Painting in Historical Perspective*, ed. Frans Grijzenhout and Henk van Veen, trans. Andrew McCormick (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1999), 247-276. This book was published in Dutch in 1992 under the title *Gouden Eeuw in Perspectief: Het Beeld van de Nederlandse Zeventiende-Eeuwse Schilderkunst in Later Tijd* (Nijmegen: SUN, 1992).

³⁶ Peter Hecht, *De Hollandse Fijnschilders van Gerard Dou tot Adriaen van der Werff* exh. cat. (Amsterdam: Rijksmuseum, 1989-1990). See also “Dutch Seventeenth-Century Genre Painting: A Reassessment of Some Current Hypotheses,” in Franits, *Looking*, 88-97.

³⁷ 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. David Freedberg and Jan de Vries (Santa Monica: Getty Center for the History of Art and the Humanities, 1991). See also: David Freedberg, “Iconography between the History of Art and the History of Science: Art, Science, and the case of the Urban Bee,” in *Picturing Science Producing Art*, ed. Caroline A. Jones (New York: Routledge, 1998).

³⁸ Celeste Brusati, “Natural artifice and material values in Dutch still life,” In Franits, *Looking*, 144-157.

³⁹ *Ibid.*, 148.

painting belonged to the material world of the Dutch and reflected their prosperity and pride. She denied any possibility of Christian associations to flower still lifes or vanitas paintings.⁴⁰

Scholars have also focused on the late sixteenth- and early seventeenth-century European culture of collecting *naturalia*, or objects from nature, including shells, minerals, flowers and mounted animals, and *artificialia*, or man-made objects, such as scientific instruments, porcelain, paintings, and sculpture. Among others, Joy Kenseth's *The Age of the Marvelous* (1991),⁴¹ Paula Findlen's *Possessing Nature* (1994),⁴² and Oliver Impey and Arthur MacGregor's *The Origins of Museum: The Cabinet of Curiosities in Sixteenth- and Seventeenth-Century Europe* (2001)⁴³ provided fundamental studies on the relationship of flower still lifes and the fascination with collecting and recording rare and exotic species in collectors' cabinets, such as Emperor Rudolf II's *Wunderkammern* and *Kunstkammern*.

A number of recent studies have examined the increased production of botanical illustrations at the end of sixteenth century, in particular, Wilfrid Blunt and Sandra Raphael's *The Illustrated Herbal: The Art of Botanical Illustration* (1979),⁴⁴ F. de Nave

⁴⁰ Julie Berger Hochstrasser, *Still life and Trade in the Dutch Golden Age* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2007). Also see: Julie Berger Hochstrasser, "Life and Still Life: A Cultural Inquiry into Seventeenth-Century Dutch Still-Life Painting," Ph.D. diss. (University of California Berkeley, 1995).

⁴¹ Joy Kenseth, ed., *The Age of the Marvelous* (Hanover: Hood Museum of Art, 1991).

⁴² Paula Findlen, *Possessing Nature: Museums, Collecting, and Scientific Culture in Early Modern Italy* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1994).

⁴³ Oliver Impey and Arthur MacGregor, ed., *The Origins of Museum: The Cabinet of Curiosities in Sixteenth- and Seventeenth-Century Europe* (London: House of Stratus, 2001).

⁴⁴ Wilfrid Blunt and Sandra Raphael, *The Illustrated Herbal: The Art of Botanical Illustration* (London: Frances Lincoln Publishers, 1979); rpt. in (New York: Thames and Hudson, 1994).

and Dirk Imhof's *Botany in the Low Countries* (1993),⁴⁵ and Jan de Koning's *Drawn after Nature: The Complete Botanical Watercolours of the 16th-Century 'Libri Picturati'* (2008).⁴⁶ Lee Hendrix, in her 1984 dissertation *Joris Hoefnagel and the 'Four Elements': A Study in Sixteenth-Century Nature Painting*, explored the origins of independent flower paintings in relation to the late sixteenth-century nature studies, focusing on the Flemish miniaturist Joris Hoefnagel (1542-1601).⁴⁷ In 1993, Thomas DaCosta Kaufmann and Virginia Roehrig Kaufmann argued that Hoefnagel's manuscript, created for the collection of Rudolf II in Prague, was as a starting point for naturalistic illumination in Netherlandish books, pointing out the presence of *trompe l'oeil* devices and naturalistic content in its marginal decoration.⁴⁸ These studies by Hendrix and Kaufmann that do approach early flower paintings in the culture of collecting exclusively focus on Joris Hoefnagel's manuscripts.

Scholars have also stressed the important role of botanists in the culture of collecting. Florike Egmond, in *Carolus Clusius: Towards a Cultural History of a Renaissance Naturalist* (2007),⁴⁹ discussed the Flemish botanist Carolus Clusius, who played a vital role in the activity of collecting and exchanging plants with his

⁴⁵ F. de Nave and Dirk Imhof, ed., *Botany in the Low Countries: End of the 15th Century-ca. 1650* exh. cat. (Antwerp: Plantin-Moretus Museum, 1993).

⁴⁶ Jan de Koning et al., ed., *Drawn after Nature: The Complete Botanical Watercolours of the 16th-Century Libri Picturati* (Zeist: KNNV, 2008).

⁴⁷ Lee Hendrix, "Joris Hoefnagel and the Four Elements: A Study in Sixteenth-Century Nature Painting," Ph.D. diss. (Princeton University, 1984).

⁴⁸ Thomas DaCosta Kaufmann and Virginia Roehrig Kaufmann, "The Sanctification of Nature: Observations on the Origins of *Trompe l'Oeil* in Netherlandish Book Painting of the Fifteenth and Sixteenth Centuries," in Thomas DaCosta Kaufmann, *The Mastery of Nature: Aspects of Art, Science, and Humanism in the Renaissance* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1993), 18. The article was first published in *The J. Paul Getty Museum Journal* 19 (1991): 43-64.

⁴⁹ Florike Egmond et al., ed., *Carolus Clusius: Towards a Cultural History of a Renaissance Naturalist* (Amsterdam: Koninklijke Nederlandse Akademie van Wetenschappen, 2007).

correspondents, including collectors, gardeners, publishers and artists. He also demonstrated that Clusius was involved in the production of botanical illustrations.⁵⁰ Finally, Claudia Swan, in *Jacques de Gheyn II and the Representation of the Natural World in the Netherlands ca. 1600* (1997),⁵¹ examined the role of botanical studies in early seventeenth-century flower still lifes.⁵² In her 2005 book *Art, Science, and Witchcraft in Early Modern Holland: Jacques de Gheyn II (1565-1629)*, Swan specifically noted Clusius's significant role in Jacques de Gheyn's decision to paint flower pieces.⁵³

Beatrijs Brenninkmeyer-de Rooij, in *Roots of Seventeenth-Century Flower Painting: Miniatures Plants Books Paintings* (1996),⁵⁴ and Arthur Wheelock, in *From Botany to Bouquets: Flowers in Northern Art* (1999),⁵⁵ paid particular attention to the origin of flower paintings in the development of gardens, botanical illustrations, miniature paintings, and collections of natural and man-made wonders. They both argued that the popularity of botanical studies related to the interest in flower collecting and that that interest resulted in independent flower pieces. They also suggested significant

⁵⁰ More studies on flower still lifes in relation to collections include Giesela Luther, "Stilleben als Bilder der Sammelleidenschaft," in Langemeyer and Peters, *Stilleben*, 88-128; and Elizabeth Honig, "Making Sense of Things: On the Motives of Dutch Still Life," *Res* 34 (Autumn 1998): 168-183.

⁵¹ Claudia Swan, *Jacques de Gheyn II and the Representation of the Natural World in the Netherlands ca. 1600*, Ph.D. diss. (Columbia University, 1997).

⁵² 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. Pamela H. Smith and Paula Findlen (New York and London: Routledge, 2001), 109-136; and Claudia Swan, "Collecting Naturalia in the Shadow of Early Modern Dutch Trade," in *Colonial Botany: Science, Commerce, and Politics in the Early Modern World*, ed. Londa L. Schiebinger and Claudia Swan (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2005).

⁵³ Claudia Swan, *Art, Science, and Witchcraft in Early Modern Holland: Jacques de Gheyn II (1565-1629)*, (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2005).

⁵⁴ Brenninkmeyer-de Rooij, *Roots*.

⁵⁵ Wheelock, *From Botany*.

contributions of Le Moyne in the development of floral still lifes, noting the close relations of Le Moyne to Crispijn de Passe and Jacques de Gheyn.⁵⁶ However, these studies did not discuss Le Moyne's complicated network of acquaintances, which evolved the artist to establish his connections to early Netherlandish artists, a subject this dissertation will explore.

The only extant monographic study of Jacques le Moyne de Morgues is Paul Hulton's 1977 book *The Work of Jacques Le Moyne De Morgues: A Huguenot Artist in France, Florida and England* is.⁵⁷ Hulton and his co-authors not only included a rich documented biography of Le Moyne, including his *Brevis Narratio* reproduced in facsimile with a translation, but also examined his career both as an artist and a collector. They approached Le Moyne's work from different perspectives—historical, ethnographic, cartographic, and botanical. They did not, however, discuss the relations of Le Moyne to early flower painters.

Most recently, Robert A. Gerard, in his two essays “Woutneel, de Passe and the Anglo-Netherlandish Print Trade” (1996)⁵⁸ and “De Passe and Early English Natural History Printmaking” (1997),⁵⁹ and Ilja M. Veldman, in her *Crispijn de Passe and his Progency (1564-1670): A Century of Print Production* (2001),⁶⁰ made specific investigation of Le Moyne's contributions to Crispijn de Passe the Elder. They explored

⁵⁶ Brenninkmeijer-de Rooij, *Roots*, 42-43; and Wheelock, *From Botany*, 27-28.

⁵⁷ Paul Hulton, *The Work of Jacques Le Moyne De Morgues: A Huguenot Artist in France, Florida and England*, 2 vols. (London: British Museum Publications, 1977).

⁵⁸ Robert A. Gerard, “Woutneel, de Passe and the Anglo-Netherlandish Print Trade,” *Print Quarterly* 13 (December 1996): 363-376.

⁵⁹ Robert A. Gerard, “De Passe and Early English Natural History Printmaking,” *Print Quarterly* 14 (Jun. 1997): 174-179.

⁶⁰ Ilja M. Veldman, *Crispijn de Passe and his Progency (1564-1670): A Century of Print Production* (Rotterdam: Sound & Vision Publ., 2001).

the role of the publisher Hans Wousteel who connected Le Moyne and De Passe, suggesting that Le Moyne's botanical watercolors served as an inspiration for Crispijn de Passe the Younger's *Hortus Floridus* (1614).⁶¹

Structure of Study

As this survey of the literature has shown, the relations between Jacques le Moyne de Morgues and Netherlandish flower painters have not been discussed in depth. The studies that do approach early flower paintings in the culture of collecting focus exclusively on Joris Hoefnagel's manuscripts created for the collection of Rudolf II in Prague.⁶² This study of Le Moyne and his influence on early seventeenth-century Netherlandish flower painters suggests different roots for early flower paintings than those proposed by earlier authors. By concentrating on Le Moyne's *florilegia*, which were created with an accuracy built upon the experience of collecting plants and recording images during the French expedition to Florida in 1564-1565, the dissertation aims to place Le Moyne's work in the culture of collecting in the late sixteenth century.

In order to understand the cultural context of Le Moyne's work, I examined firsthand accounts of his contemporaries' ambitions for collecting and recording flowers. Chapter one looks at the fascination with collecting and recording plants in the sixteenth century. It also discusses a range of botanical studies, including manuscripts, woodcuts,

⁶¹ Crispijn de Passe the Younger, *Hortus floridus in quo rariorum & minus vulgarium florum icons ad vivam veramq formam accuratissime delineatae, et secundum quatuor anni tempora divisae exhibentur* (Arnhem and Utrecht, 1614); rpt. in Eleanour Sinclair Rohde, intro., *Hortus Floridus: The Four Books of Spring, Summer, Autumn, and Winter Flowers*, trans. Spencer Savage (London: Minerva, 1974).

⁶² It is discussed in chapter one under the section "Joris Hoefnagel."

drawings, and paintings that demonstrate the relationship of such floral images to the beginnings of independent flower paintings.

Chapters two and three discuss Le Moyne's biography, focusing on his career as a botanical artist. Le Moyne's experiences in Florida inspired him to create a number of watercolor studies after his return to France in 1565. The wide circulation of botanical emblem books in late sixteenth-century England encouraged Le Moyne, who moved to England and stayed there until his death in 1588, to portray botanical specimens as living plants in his *florilegia*. The poetic and emblematic qualities of Le Moyne's *florilegia* were admired by contemporary English aristocrats, and they were assimilated into their gift-exchange tradition.

In chapters four and five, I investigate how Le Moyne's images were disseminated among painters by the botanist Carolus Clusius, who hired artists to create accurately colored floral images in his botanical publications. I aim to offer a more complete understanding than has been attempted heretofore of the working relationships among artists, botanists and publishers. The stylistic connections between Le Moyne's images and those of early flower artists, including Jacques de Gheyn and Crispijn de Passe the Elder, are examined in the context of their collaboration with botanists and publishers. I also investigate how other flower painters, such as Roelent Savery, Ambrosius Bosschaert and Jan Brueghel the Elder, created their flower still-lives, responding somewhat differently to the culture of collecting and exchanging activities. Finally, this study presents Le Moyne's work as a key link between botany and fine art, arguing that he was a crucial figure and a critical innovator in flower painting at the late sixteenth century.

Chapter 1

The Sixteenth-Century Ambition for Botanical Illustrations

I do not need to expound at length the pleasure and delight that the knowledge of plants brings, since there is no one who does not know that there is nothing in life more pleasant and delightful than to wander through the woods, and over mountains and meadows, garlanded and adorned with these varied, exquisite blossoms and herbs, and to gaze at them with keen eyes. The pleasure and delight is increased not a little if an understanding of their usefulness and powers is added. For there is as much pleasure and enjoyment in learning as in looking.

- Leonhart Fuchs, *De Historia Stirpium*, 1542

This chapter examines firsthand accounts of sixteenth-century ambitions for collecting and recording plants to provide an understanding of the cultural context in which Jacques le Moyne de Morgues later created his floral images. The invention of the printing press in the fifteenth century and the revival of classical learning brought significant changes to herbals produced in the sixteenth century.¹ The rediscovery of Antiquity in the Renaissance provided humanists and scholars a foundation for botanical studies as well as new approaches to plants, encouraging them to travel and observe living plants and to collect rare and exotic species *in loco*.² This sixteenth-century fascination with botanical illustrations, which is found in a wide range of botanical

¹ The Oxford English Dictionary defines an “herbal” as “a book containing the names and descriptions of herbs, or of plants in general, with their properties and virtues; a treatise on plants.” <http://www.dictionary.oed.com>. As Wilfrid Blunt pointed out, an herbal deals primarily with useful plants, while a *florilegium* is concerned with plants grown more for their beauty than for their utility. See Wilfrid Blunt and Sandra Raphael, *The Illustrated Herbal* (New York: Thames and Hudson, 1994), 10. Among the vast quantities of herbals produced since Antiquity, this study mainly concerns those illustrated with pictures and their relationship to the beginnings of the independent flower still-life paintings.

² Karen Meier Reeds, “Renaissance Humanism and Botany,” *Annals of Science* 33 (1976): 519-542.

studies, including manuscripts, woodcuts, drawings and paintings, contributed to the appearance of *florilegia*, or books depicting ornamental plants and with little descriptive text, and to the beginning of independent flower still-life paintings.

The first important innovation in the character and form of herbals was made by the German Fathers of Botany, including Otto Brunfels (1489-1534), Hieronymus Bock (1498-1554), and Leonhart Fuchs (1501-1566).³ While they followed medieval and fifteenth-century traditions in which botanical studies served functional purposes such as providing information about medicinal healing, they gave new life to this field of study by including accurately illustrated woodcuts of plants. These woodcut illustrations were intended to be hand-colored in correspondence with verbal descriptions to provide readers a more effective way of identifying each plant.

This chapter also investigates the sixteenth-century fascination with botanical illustrations in manuscript illuminations. In the second half of the fifteenth century, realistic images of flowers appeared in the border decorations of Flemish books of hours for both symbolic and aesthetic reasons. Early sixteenth-century French miniaturists even took further steps by bringing a “scientific” quality to their manuscripts. For example, in his book of hours for Anne of Brittany, Jean Bourdichon (1457-1521) not only included a wide collection of floral images drawn from nature, but also labeled each species by its

³ Kurt Sprengel called these three the “*Deutsche Väter der Pflanzenkunde*” (German fathers of botany) in his *Geschichte der Botanik*, 2 vols. (Altenburg and Leipzig: Brockhaus, 1817-1818; quoted in Frederick G. Meyer et al., *The Great Herbal of Leonhart Fuchs*, 2 vols. (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1999), 1:10. Conrad Gesner (1516-1565), physician naturalist from Zürich, also included botanical woodcuts with notes about the habitat, uses, and coloring the plants. In his botanical study *Epistolarum medicinalium conradi gesneri [. . .] per Casparum Wuolphium* (Tiguri, 1577; 107v), Gesner mentions the functional purposes of botanical illustration: “*Sic snim soleo fructus ac semina pleris meis addere, ut in tanto stirpium numero singular facilius dignoscuntur; et ipsae picturae descriptionum fere loco esse possunt*” (“I am accustomed to add fruit and seed to many pictures, so that among such a large number of plants, each one can be recognized more easily; and the pictures themselves can almost stand in place of descriptions”); rpt. in Heinrich Zollner et al., *Conradi Gesneri Historia Plantarum*, 3 vols. (Zurich: Urs Graf-Verlag, 1972-1974).

botanical name. This chapter will examine how this combination of “scientific” and “religious” approaches to flowers provided a new perspective for flower painting.

Illustrated Herbals: The Rebirth of Naturalism in Botany

Botany from Antiquity to the Middle Ages

Enthusiasm for botany was already evident in Ancient sources among others, the treatises of Theophrastus, Pliny, Dioscorides, and Galen.⁴ The earliest surviving botanical treatise was penned by the Greek herbalist Theophrastus of Eresos (c. 372-288 BC), often called the Father of Botany. Theophrastus, who had studied under Plato and Aristotle in Athens, wrote on a diversity of subjects, including plants. In his most important work, *De Historia Plantarum* (Enquiry into Plants), Theophrastus analyzed all the parts of plants and developed a botanical lexicon.⁵ In his second surviving work, *De Causis Plantarum* (Plant Etiology), Theophrastus studied the genesis of plants, focusing on their function and adaptation.

Theophrastus’s distinctive achievement in botany was followed by the naturalist Pliny the Elder (c. 24-79) in his thirty seven books of *Naturalis Historia* (Natural History), a comprehensive encyclopedia of the natural sciences, including astronomy,

⁴ Because of the blurred boundaries between botany and medicine, botanical studies until the Renaissance are often found in treatises on medicinal botany. For a list of Greek herbalists, whose original treatises have not survived, see Charles Singer, “The Herbal in Antiquity and Its Transmission to Later Ages,” *J. Hellenic Studies* 47, 3; quoted in Meyer et al., *The Great Herbal*, 1:4.

⁵ He divided plants into trees, shrubs, undershrubs, and herbs, and categorized them more specifically as being cultivated and wild, flowering and flowerless, and deciduous and evergreen plants. These nine books of *De Historia Plantarum* include 1. The parts of plants and their composition / 2. Propagation of trees / 3. Wild trees / 4. The trees and plants native to particular districts and positions / 5. The timber of various trees and its uses / 6. Undershrubs / 7. Herbaceous plants, other than coronary plants: potherbs and similar wild herbs / 8. Herbaceous plants: cereals, pulses, and “summer crops” / 9. The juices of plants, and the medicinal properties of herbs; rpt. in *The Enquiry into Plants and Minor Works on Odours and Weather Signs*, trans. Arthur Hort (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1999).

meteorology, geography, mineralogy, zoology, and botany.⁶ In books 20 to 27, Pliny made specific botanical studies of exotic trees, fruit trees, forest trees, agriculture, and garden plants.⁷ Pliny's treatise was widely circulated and admired in the Middle Ages and the Renaissance.

The Greek Pedanius Dioscorides (fl. 40-80) was the most frequently cited name in medicinal studies.⁸ In his *De Materia Medica* (The Materials of Medicine), Dioscorides discussed the medicinal properties and uses for almost one thousand *naturalia*, including more than five hundred plants.⁹ The chapters on plants include a description of the plants, the parts of the plants that are to be used for the preparation of medicines, and side effects of the medicines. To prepare each medicine in an appropriate way, Dioscorides emphasized the need for observing plants in all seasons and studying them in relation to their habitats. The physician and philosopher Galen (c. 129-199), who was the author of *De Simplicium Medicamentorum Temperamentis ac Facultatibus* (On the Functions of Simple Drugs), was also frequently cited by later botanists.¹⁰ Largely based in

⁶ In his preface to *Naturalis Historia*, Pliny wrote that "the work deals with 20,000 matters of importance, drawn from 100 selected authors, to whose observations he has added many of his own." See Pliny the Elder, *Natural History*, trans. H. Rackham, W.H.S. Jones, and D.E. Eicholz, 10 vols. (Cambridge: Harvard University Press; and London: Heinemann, 1938-1962), 1:ix.

⁷ It was first translated into English by Philemon Holland and published under the title *The Historie of the World* (London, 1601).

⁸ For instance, in *De Historia Stirpium* (Basel, 1542) by Leonhart Fuchs, Dioscorides is cited more than two hundred times for the names used as chapter heads. See Meyer et al., *The Great Herbal*, 1:771.

⁹ *De Materia Medica* is divided into five books: 1. Aromatics, oils, ointments, trees, and shrubs; 2. Animals, animal parts and products, cereals, potherbs, and sharp herbs; 3. Roots, juices, herbs, and seeds; 4. Roots and herbs not previously mentioned; and 5. Wines and minerals. See Singer, "The Herbal," 19; quoted in Meyer et al., *The Great Herbal*, 1:770. While the earliest manuscript of Dioscorides's *De Materia Medica* was lost, the texts were survived in the *Codex Vindobonensis* (Constantinople, c. 512). The codex is further discussed in the section "Illustrated herbals in the Middle Ages." For more comprehensive analysis of Dioscorides's *De Materia Medica*, see John M. Riddle, *Dioscorides on Pharmacy and Medicine* (Austin: University of Texas Press), 1985.

¹⁰ For works of Galen cited by Fuchs, see Meyer et al., *The Great Herbal*, 1:777-778.

Dioscorides's *De Materia Medica*, Galen's work describes plants that could be used as medicines.

These Ancient botanical treatises consist only of text. In Antiquity, the use of botanical illustrations was discouraged because Ancient authors believed images illustrated in books caused confusion. When the first illustrated herbal was made by Cratevas (or Krateuas), physician to Mithridates VI Eupator, King of Pontus (reigned 120-63 BC), his botanical illustrations were rejected by Pliny in *Naturalis Historia* 25.8:

Cratevas likewise, Dionysius also, and Metrodorus [. . .] painted every herbe in their colours, and under the pourtraicts they couched and subscribed their severall natures and effects. But what certentie could there be therein? Pictures (you know) are deceitfull; also, in representing such a number of colours, and especially expressing the lively hew of herbs according to their nature as they grow, no marveile if they that limned and drew them out, did faile and degenerat from the first pattern and originall. Besides, they came far short of the marke, setting out hearbes as they did at one onely season (to wit, either in their floure, or in seed time) for they change and alter their forme and shape everie quarter of the yeare.¹¹

For Ancient authors, pictures of plants were considered “deceitful” in that they could cause misunderstanding in readers.

Following the Ancients, botanical studies were produced in the Middle-Ages as medical reference works rather than as field guides. The individual species included in these early herbals were not categorized by botanical type, but were still arranged alphabetically by name. While many authors from the Middle Ages copied Ancient texts, images of relevant plants were also added despite the prohibition against them in Antiquity. For example, a number of Middle-Ages versions of Dioscorides's *De Materia Medica* were produced with colored botanical illustrations, which now survive as: *Codex*

¹¹ Pliny the Elder, *The Historie of the World*, trans. Philemon Holland (London, 1601), 25:8; quoted in Blunt and Raphael, *The Illustrated Herbal*, 13.

Vindobonensis (or *Juliana Anicia Codex*; Constantinople, c. 512),¹² *Codex Neapolitanus* (seventh century),¹³ Paris manuscript (Egypt, ninth century),¹⁴ and New York manuscript (Constantinople, ninth century).¹⁵

The *Codex Vindobonensis*, the largest of all of Dioscorides's manuscripts, contains 392 full-page colored illustrations of plants. As evident in the *Opium poppy* (fig. 8), these botanical images depict the organic form of the plant, with each of its parts—flower, stem, leaves and roots—recorded in an accurate manner. Such a scientific approach suggests that these botanical illustrations were based on live specimens.¹⁶ Significantly, this beautifully colored manuscript was dedicated to Juliana Anicia, daughter of Flavius Anicius Olybrius, Emperor of the West, in 472.¹⁷ This fact indicates that illustrated herbals served not only as botanical studies but also as highly favored gifts

¹² The *Codex Vindobonensis* is written in Greek and consists of 491 folios. The manuscript is in the Österreichische Nationalbibliothek Vienna (Med. Gr. 1). For more information and illustrations of the codex, see *Ibid.*, 14 and 18-19.

¹³ The *Codex Neapolitanus* consists of 172 folios. It is now in the Biblioteca Nazionale Naples (Ms. Gr. 1).

¹⁴ The Paris manuscript is in the Bibliothèque Nationale de France (MS. Grec 2179)

¹⁵ The New York manuscript, which consists of 385 folios, is in the Pierpont Morgan Library (M. 652). John Riddle lists fourteen Dioscorides manuscripts. See Riddle, *Dioscorides*, 258; and Blunt and Raphael, *The Illustrated Herbal*, 12-31. Apuleius Platonius's *Herbarium* was another very popular botanical study in the Middle Ages. Like Dioscorides's *De Materia Medica*, Platonius's *Herbarium* is survived in several different manuscripts. Its earliest known manuscript, produced in Southern Italy or France around AD 650, is now in the library of Leiden University (Voss.Lat.Q9). As shown in the *Comfrey* (*Symphytum* sp.), botanical images illustrated in this Leiden manuscript are somewhat crude and are too stereotyped to be able to identify the relevant species of plants. There is no resemblance between illustrations of the Leiden copy of Platonius's *Herbarium* and the *Codex Vindobonensis*, which suggests that the *Herbarium* had other pictorial sources than the Middle-Ages version of Dioscorides's work. For more detailed studies and illustrations of Platonius's *Herbarium* in different manuscripts, see Blunt and Raphael, *The Illustrated Herbal*, 28-55. Another version of Platonius's *Herbarium* is in the British Library in London (MS. Sloane 1975, c. 1200). In this manuscript, a much more decorative style of botanical illustrations than the style of those in the Leiden manuscript is found; as shown in *Artemisia* (fig. 9), stereo-typed plants are surrounded by fictive frames where the roots are illusionistically illustrated across the borders.

¹⁶ Some botanical figures rendered in the Middle Age were probably derived from earlier botanical illustrations, among others Cratevas's herbal. See Blunt and Raphael, *The Illustrated Herbal*, 17.

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, 14.

to be presented to important patrons.¹⁸ Later, in 1569, the manuscript was purchased by the Emperor Maximilian II (1527-1576) in Vienna.

Albrecht Dürer

During the early sixteenth century, scholars began to question the accuracy of Ancient sources. They realized that a number of botanical studies from Antiquity conflicted with their own observations. They also found that the Ancients had not known many species that had been discovered in new parts of the known world. This recognition is particularly evident in the drawings and watercolors of living plants by the German artist Albrecht Dürer (1471-1528). Dürer expressed his conviction about the importance of close observation of nature in his *Vier Bücher von Menschlicher Proportion* (Nuremberg, 1528):

But life in nature manifests the truth of these things. Therefore observe it diligently, go by it and do not depart from nature arbitrarily, imaging to find the better by thyself, for thou wouldst be misled. For, verily, “art” [that is, knowledge] is embedded in nature; he who can extract it has it.¹⁹

Dürer’s passion for naturalistic illustrations is evident in, for example, *The Great Piece of Turf* (1503, fig. 10) and *Iris* (1508, fig. 11).²⁰ In these watercolor drawings, Dürer devotes his attention to the details of everyday grasses and flowers that had not previously been selected as independent subjects in art. His interpretations of nature as mirror of the whole universe as well as the delicacy and accuracy of his masterful botanical renderings

¹⁸ Illustrated herbals as gift items will be further discussed in chapter three.

¹⁹ Translated in Ervin Panofsky, *The Life and Art of Albrecht Dürer* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1955), 279.

²⁰ For more studies of these works, see Fritz Koreny, *Albrecht Dürer and the Animal and Plant Studies of the Renaissance* (Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1988), 178-179, cat. 61; 188-189, cat. 66.

were admired and emulated by a number of artists, including Hans Weiditz II (c. 1500-1536), Ludger tom Ring the Younger (1522-1584), Hans Hoffmann (c. 1530-c. 1591), and Joris Hoefnagel (1542-1601).

Dürer's nature studies had an immediate impact on the evolution of the herbal in the sixteenth century. In particular, German herbalists and publishers, who were deeply inspired by Dürer's new approach to nature, came to realize the great importance of botanical illustrations in publications. The botanical studies of the so-called German Fathers of Botany—Otto Brunfels, Hieronymus Bock and Leonhart Fuchs—which contain highly accurate illustrations drawn from living plants, were notably more advanced than the crude illustrations of earlier botanical studies.²¹

Hans Weiditz II

The turning point of botanical illustrations began with the *Herbarum Vivae Eicones* (Living Portraits of Plants; Strasbourg, 1530-1536), the first botanical study of the Renaissance by the German botanist, preacher, and physician Otto Brunfels. With its

²¹ Hieronymus Bock began his study of herbs and other plants in the gardens of Count Palaine Ludwig. Bock did not illustrate the first edition of his *New Kreütter Buch* (Strasbourg, 1539) because he thought botanical illustrations were not necessary for those who had the same plants grown in their own gardens: "As far as illustrated herbals are concerned, it is clear that they are useful to a certain degree, when we do not have any living plants, or cannot get hold of recently-collected ones. But whoever has his own gardens and gardeners can plant many and various plants and contemplate their living images. For such people there is no need of pictures, except for those plants that are truly foreign and that we cannot see recently collected in every place, and that completely refuse to be acclimated to our soil." See Hieronymus Bock, *De stirpium maxime earum, quae in Germania nostra nascuntur [. . .] Commentariorum libri tres*, trans. David Kyber (Strasbourg: excudebat Vuendelinus Rihelius, 1552), d vii; quoted in Brian W. Ogilvie, *The Science of Describing: Natural History in Renaissance Europe* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 2006), 198. The second edition under the title *Kreütter Buch* (Strasbourg, 1546) was printed with 465 woodcuts, mostly drawn by David Kandel (1538-1587). My study does not include Bock's herbals because most of his figures were taken from Brunfels and Fuchs.

eighty-six woodcuts based on watercolor drawings by the German artist Hans Weiditz II (c. 1500-1536), this publication achieved the Renaissance ideal of portraying plants.²²

Weiditz had his early training in Augsburg, where he met many skilled artists, including Albrecht Dürer and Hans Burgkmair the Elder (1473-1531).²³ From Burgkmair, he learned how to make chiaroscuro woodcuts, as exemplified by Burgkmair's three-block print *Lovers Overcome by Death* (1510, fig. 12), in which the artist created the striking effect of a wash drawing by using two tone blocks in conjunction with a line block.²⁴ Encouraged by his teacher, Weiditz produced a number of chiaroscuro color woodcuts, including the seven-block print *Coat of Arms of Cardinal Matthäus Lang von Wellenburg* (1520, fig. 13).²⁵ In 1522-1523, Weiditz returned to Strasbourg and continued to create woodcuts for book illustrations. His best known works produced during these years include his woodcuts for Petrarch's *De Remediis Utriusque Fortunae* (On the Remedies of Good and Bad Fortune; Augsburg, 1532).²⁶

Albrecht Dürer's new approach to nature in his watercolor nature studies encouraged Weiditz to depict living plants when he created his seventy-seven watercolors

²² It was the publisher Johann Schott who decided to include Weiditz's botanical woodcuts in the herbal.

²³ Since the Imperial Council was located in the town, Augsburg was an important place to coordinate Emperors' publication projects. For example, Albrecht Dürer and Hans Burgkmair made numerous woodcut designs for Maximilian I's publications until his death in 1519.

²⁴ For the beginning and the evolution of the chiaroscuro woodcuts, see "Color Printing," in David Landau and Peter Parshall, *The Renaissance Print 1470-1550* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1994), 179-202. For more studies about the 1510 woodcut, see Ibid., 198-199, fig. 209; and Giulia Bartrum, *German Renaissance Prints 1490-1550* (London: British Museum Press), 1995, 136-137, no. 136.

²⁵ The tone blocks are in red, blue, green, grey, pink, and gold. See Bartrum, *German Renaissance Prints*, 162, no. 164.

²⁶ Published under the title *Von der Artzney bayder Glück, des guten und widerwärtigen*. See Ibid., 161, no. 163.

(c. 1529) as models for the woodblock prints in *Herbarum Vivae Eicones*.²⁷ Existing today in the library of Bern University, such watercolors as the *Common Comfrey* (fig. 14) represent the level of detail with which Weiditz depicted each plant species. In these watercolors Weiditz first outlined the plants with a pen and then colored them with a brush. He sometimes foreshortened and shaded his images to give them a more naturalistic quality. Weiditz's botanical images are characterized by his focus on each part of a single plant rather than on the organic form as a whole. As its title, "Living Portraits of Plants," tells us, Weiditz drew the plants exactly as he saw them. He depicted torn and wilted leaves, crippled stems, and withered flowers as portrayed in the *Bitter Dock* (fig. 16).

A comparison of the watercolor and the woodcut of the *Common Comfrey* (fig. 15) demonstrates how carefully Weiditz's watercolor drawing was transferred onto the woodblocks.²⁸ The precision and delicacy of this woodcut suggests that Weiditz also made a drawing on the block. Nevertheless, recent studies by David Randau and Peter Parshall raise the question of whether Weiditz's watercolors were created to serve as templates for the woodcuts.²⁹ They argue that the watercolors served as models for hand-colored copies of the *Herbarum Vivae Eicones*, pointing out the different scale of the woodcuts and the watercolors. Whatever their role, Weiditz's accurate watercolor

²⁷ A number of these watercolors were seriously mutilated in the late sixteenth century when they were cut out and remounted in an herbal compiled by the botanist Felix Plattner. See Landau and Parshall, *The Renaissance Prints*, 250, note 213. For more studies on these watercolors, see Walther Rytz, *Pflanzenaquarelle des Hans Weiditz aus dem Jahre 1529; die Originale zu den Holzschnitten im Brunfels'schen Kräuterbuch* (Bern: Haupt, 1936).

²⁸ For more description about these figures, see Landau and Parshall, *The Renaissance Prints*, 250, fig. 256 and 257.

²⁹ *Ibid.*, 250.

renderings of plants were extremely important in the evolution of the printed herbal in the early sixteenth century.

Leonhart Fuchs

Shortly after the *Herbarum Vivae Eicones* was published, Leonhart Fuchs, a professor of medicine at Tübingen, wrote *De Historia Stirpium Commentarii Insignes* (Notable Commentaries on the History of Plants; Basel, 1542).³⁰ In this botanical treatise, Fuchs examined the medicinal value of plants in the Classical tradition. However, recognizing the practical and naturalistic value of botanical illustrations from *Herbarum Vivae Eicones*, Fuchs decided to include more than five-hundred full-page woodcuts of plants in his book. This publication was an immediate success, and the following year, Fuchs published an edition in German entitled *New Kreüterbuch* (New Herb Book; Basel, 1543) for members of the public who could not read Latin.³¹

In *De Historia Stirpium*, Fuchs created a true encyclopedia of botanical illustrations: its 511 woodcuts of plants consist of 325 from Germany, 77 from other parts of Europe, and 57 non-European plants, including specimens from America and Asia.³² Not all of the plants included in this herbal are medicinal; in fact, Fuchs selected some species because of their exotic properties: he included five New World plants: maize (*Zea*

³⁰ The facsimile is recently reprinted in the volume 2 of Meyer et al, *The Great Herbal*, with a hand-colored copy of the herbal in the collection of the Hunt Institute for Botanical Documentation at Carnegie Mellon University. For the in-depth study on *De Historia Stirpium*, see Ibid., 1:45-114. I consulted another hand-colored copy of the herbal in the Dumbarton Oaks Garden Library (RBR N-1-4 FUC) in Washington, D.C.

³¹ In the preface to the German edition, Fuchs explains the purpose of the copy: “*mein Kreüterbuch hette wollen inn die Teütschen sprach bringen damit auch der gemein man kündte ihm selbert in der notartzney geben und aller kranckheit hehlen.*” See Fuchs, *New Kreüterbuch*, 2; quoted in Landau and Parshall, *The Renaissance Prints*, 254, note 231. Dedicated to Princess Anne, queen of Hungary and Bohemia, the German edition includes 517 woodcut figures, six more than in the Latin edition.

³² For the list of non-European plants, see Meyer et al., *The Great Herbal*, 1:129-132.

mays; fig. 17), the chili pepper (*Capsicum annuum* L.), the pumpkin (*Cucurbita pepo* L.), the kidney bean (*Phaseolus vulgaris* L.), and the French marigold (*Tagetes patula* L.), all of which had recently been introduced to Europe.³³ Of these 511 plants, 91 appear for the first time in *De Historia Stirpium*.³⁴

In order to attain accurate portrayals of plants, Fuchs worked closely with artists. On the final page—entitled “*Pictores operis*” (Artists of the work)—of *De Historia Stirpium*, Fuchs included a full-page chiaroscuro woodcut of three artists at work (fig. 18): Albrecht Meyer drawing a plant from a live model, Heinrich Füllmaurer (d. 1545) transferring a drawing to a wood block, and Veit Rudolf Speckle (d. 1550), who cut the blocks. As mentioned in the dedicatory epistle (*Epistola nuncupatoria*)³⁵ of the herbal, Fuchs admired their excellent work together, particularly extraordinary craftsmanship of the block cutter, Speckle:

Veit Rudolf Speckle, by far the best engraver in Strasbourg, has admirably copied the wonderful industry of the draftsmen, and has with such excellent craft expressed in his engraving the features of each drawing that he seems to have contended with the draftsmen for glory and victory.³⁶

By identifying these three artists by their names and portraits, Fuchs not only gave them unusual acknowledgment, but also identified his botanical illustrations as being drawn from living plants.

³³ Fuchs 1542, 825; rpt. in the facsimile of Meyer et al, *The Great Herbal*, 2:825.

³⁴ But many had previously been described by Hieronymus Bock. For a summary of the plants depicted in *De Historia Stirpium*, see *Ibid.*, 1:143-144.

³⁵ The 1542 Latin edition was dedicated to the elector Joachim II von Brandenburg (1505-1571).

³⁶ Fuchs, *De Historia Stirpium*, no page number; trans. in Meyer et al., *The Great Herbal*, 2:213.

The Vienna Codex (or the *Codex Vindobonensis Palatinus*), the three-volume manuscript of an unpublished herbal by Fuchs, provides a clear idea of the character of Albrecht Meyer's original drawings for *De Historia Stirpium*.³⁷ Fuchs worked on the Vienna Codex for almost two decades after publishing *De Historia Stirpium* and completed it just before his death. The codex includes, in addition to his expanded text, 1,525 images of plants, three times as many illustrations as does *De Historia Stirpium*.³⁸ Such a vast number of watercolor drawings must have been made by several artists, probably including Albrecht Meyer and Jörg (Jerg) Ziegler. The latter's monogram, in the form of a Z with an I (or J), is found on 413 drawings.³⁹ In the preface Fuchs briefly acknowledges the notable quality of his own work:

Before me there was no one of the more recent writers on botany who offered illustrations of more plants, and took care to display them more elegantly and splendidly, or related their histories with better method and order.⁴⁰

Fuchs's written instructions for his artists on these indicate how closely he worked with them on the project. For example, on the image of the *Ligusticum maius sive siler montanum*, he wrote: "*Diese blomen sollen grosser sein*" ("These flowers should be larger").⁴¹

³⁷ *De stirpium historia commentarii illustres maximis impensis [. . .]*, the so-called Vienna Codex is in the collection of the Austrian National Library in Vienna. For more information and study about the Codex, see chapter 5 of *Ibid.*, 1:147-194.

³⁸ The codex includes all the images from *De Historia Stirpium*. In the letter of April 3, 1563, to his friend Camerarius the Elder, Fuchs mentioned that he had completed the codex. However, he still added 45 figures of plants after 1563. See *Ibid.*, 1:153.

³⁹ *Ibid.*, 1:159.

⁴⁰ *Ibid.*, 1:149.

⁴¹ The Vienna Codex (11,121, p. 351); quoted in *Ibid.*, 1:166.

Many plants depicted in the codex are illustrated with great detail. Exotic flowers that had recently been introduced to Germany, such as the daylily, French marigold, tulip, and crown imperial, were given special attention from Fuchs. The relatively large blossoms in the depiction of the crown imperial (fig. 19) and the detailed rendering of the African marigold (fig. 20) demonstrate the botanist's specific interest in the organic form, shape and color of these plants, features that could only be observed from living plants.

Fuchs had a garden in his Nonnenhaus at Tübingen, where he lived for thirty-five years. This garden is documented in the *Dienerbuch* (Service Book) of the town of Tübingen for the year 1549:

Doctor Leinhart Fuchs occupies the nunnery at Tübingen, wherein much construction has been done for him. He uses the garden by the house and expects that he might realize 20 pounds from it [. . .] the house is being improved and rebuilt, which he deserves, with window, stove, and all other things. The university has so much income that it can well support the doctor.⁴²

In this garden, Fuchs grew a variety of plants. He mentions this garden in his description of the *Wilder Galgan* (*Cyperus longus* L.) in the *New Kreüterbuch*: “In our country, so far as I know, it does not grow wild, but must be planted in gardens, as I have done with the one that is depicted herein.”⁴³ This note suggests that Fuchs allowed artists access to his garden, encouraging them to observe the delicacy and subtlety of living plants.

⁴² *Dienerbuch* of the town of Tübingen for 1549 (Stuttgart; Hauptstaatsarchiv).

⁴³ Fuchs, *New Kreüterbuch*, cap. CLXXII; quoted in Meyer et al., *The Great Herbal*, 1:123-124.

Fuchs, who had never traveled out of Europe, could even grow rare and exotic plants in his garden from seeds he obtained from colleagues and friends.⁴⁴ In the dedicatory epistle to *De Historia Stirpium*, Fuchs introduces a physician of Nuremberg Hieronymus Schaller, from whom he had received some exotic plants:

In acquiring from abroad roots and seeds that, immediately planted, came up successfully for us, we owe much to Hieronymus Schaller, a physician of Nuremberg, a man of the greatest skill in plants and many other matters. I have desired to mention this [. . .] so that there should exist for posterity some testimony to our friendship and affection, and so that students will clearly understand how much they owe to this good and learned man, who never failed to help us.⁴⁵

An ardent botanist, Fuchs diligently exchanged botanical information, plants, including bulbs, seeds, and flowers, and possibly botanical illustrations with many correspondents in his network. As demonstrated by his 511 full-page woodcuts of plants, Fuchs had an extraordinary interest in botanical illustrations. In the dedicatory epistle to *De Historia Stirpium*, Fuchs emphasizes the importance of pictures in botanical studies:

It is the case with many plants that no words can describe them so than they can be recognized. If, however, they are held before the eyes in a picture, then they are understood immediately at first glance.⁴⁶

Fuchs was well aware of the potential benefits of accurate botanical images. He knew how people could immediately identify plants with such images, but not through his texts.⁴⁷ Nevertheless, he also understood the danger of providing this botanical

⁴⁴ Ibid., 1:133.

⁴⁵ Fuchs, *De Historia Stirpium*, no page number; quoted in Ibid., 1:125.

⁴⁶ Translated in Reeds, "Renaissance Humanism and Botany," 529, note 41.

information through images. In his description of the *Maize*, he warns his readers to not be fooled by the image, which shows four differently colored kernels in a corn:

From the tip of the sheaths thin hairs hang, spotted sometimes with white, sometimes yellow, sometimes purple, as is quite well shown in the one picture, which will depict for you all the types. This shows you four colors of grain in one sheath, although actually each one has all its grains of only one color, other yellow or purple, russet or whitish. We thought there should be warning, lest anyone be deceived by the picture.⁴⁸

In Fuchs's herbal, botanical illustrations do not always represent the exact appearance of plants. Rather, they aim to provide people with as much information about plants as possible, as, for example, that four different colored kernels might be found in a corn. Such functional and practical uses of botanical images are further evident in the image for *Cherry Tree* (fig. 21), which depicts two different colors of cherries side by side, as well as flowers and fruits that could never occur together at the same time in nature.

Fuchs's perspective on visual representation was different from that of Weiditz. While Weiditz portrayed the exact condition of plants, as shown in the torn and wilted *Bitter Dock* (fig. 16), the same specimen in Fuchs's herbal (fig. 22) was illustrated as perfect and idealized. Fuchs even ordered his artists to eliminate shadows and any other artistic effects from his woodcuts, so as not to distract from the perfect form of the plants. Fuchs mentions in the dedicatory epistle of *De Historia Stirpium*:

⁴⁷ In comparison to Hieronimus Bock, Fuchs' writing is less descriptive and quotes a lot of Dioscorides. In the *New Kreütter Buch* (Strasbourg, 1539), which was published without illustrations, Bock described the structures and habits of plants in such detail, relying more on his own field experience.

⁴⁸ Fuchs, *De Historia Stirpium*, 824-825, cap. CCCXVIII; trans. in Meyer et al., *The Great Herbal*, 1:119-120; 2:825.

As for the pictures themselves, every single one of them portrays the lines and appearance of the loving plant. We were especially careful that they should be absolutely correct, and we have devoted the greatest diligence to secure that every plant should be depicted with its own roots, stalks, leaves, flowers, seeds and fruits. Over and over again, we have purposely and deliberately avoided the obliteration of the natural form of the plants should they be obscured by shading and other artifices that painters sometime employ to win artistic glory. And we have not allowed the craftsmen so to indulge their whims as to cause the drawing not to correspond accurately to the truth.⁴⁹

Such practical functions, as well as the vast number of botanical illustrations, brought huge success to both *De Historia Stirpium* and *New Kreüterbuch*. Between 1542 and 1600, more than forty derivative editions were published in Germany, France, Spain and the Netherlands.⁵⁰ For instance, in 1545, the publisher Michael Isingrin of Basel published *Vivae imagines* (Lifelike Illustrations of Plants), which included 517 smaller (12 cm in height) woodcut figures from both the Latin and German editions of Fuchs's herbal.⁵¹ On the title page, Isingrin notes the specific function of this small herbal, which only contained figures and no text:

Three years ago I published my commentaries entitled *De historia stirpium*, adding to the same more than 500 pictures, always very large and most skillfully drawn and fashioned to reproduce nature. Further, because of the size and weight of this work, it could not be used except at home, another idea occurred to me, by which I should accomplish for the good of students of botany, so that even on trips and hikes they would have [something] to consult when they encountered native plants in the country. For there is no more convenient way to identify plants correctly than an accurate collection of pictures of native plants. Wherefore in order that we may remedy the need [of] the students in this respect also, we have taken care to fashion the pictures reduced into a smaller size, with

⁴⁹ Fuchs, *De Historia Stirpium*, no page number; quoted in Meyer et al., *The Great Herbal*, 1:115.

⁵⁰ For the list of these editions, see the table "Chronology of the *Historia Stirpium* and Its Derivatives," in *Ibid.*, 1:138-139. Although Fuchs's herbal was not published in England during those years, William Turner, the Father of British Botany, owed his botanical study *New Herball* (London and Cologne, 1551-1552) to Fuchs. Turner's name appears from the note of the Vienna Codex. The complete edition of Turner's herbal was published in Cologne in 1568.

⁵¹ This figure-only herbal is accompanied by plant names in Latin and German.

Latin and German names added, not all, indeed, but only the most useful, so that in this way a little book reduced to a form small enough to fit the hand could easily be carried around on hikes and trips as a companion that would add very little to baggage and pack. And clearly there is no need for the descriptions, as anyone could more conveniently study these at home in his own study, from our commentaries.⁵²

Fuchs's octavo edition of *De Historia Stirpium* was handy and convenient to use, fitting for use as a field guide. In France, the woodcut figures were even reduced from 12 cm to 6.5 cm in height.⁵³

Hand-Colored Herbals

Sixteenth-century botanists' growing interest in the accurate rendering of flowers is evident in the appearance of hand-colored herbals. As shown in some hand-colored copies of Leonhart Fuch's *De Historia Stirpium* and Otto Brunfels's *Herbarum Viae Eicones*, flowers were colored in accordance with written descriptions.⁵⁴ The consistency in coloring among different copies of these publications suggests that woodcuts were hand-colored under the eye of the author before they were sold. This mode of production was done to provide readers with "an authoritative commentary on the text and to

⁵² From the title page of Leonhart Fuchs, *Vivae Imaines* (Basel, 1545); quoted in Meyer et al., *The Great Herbal*, 1:677.

⁵³ The Fuchs's herbal with the 6.5 cm woodcut figures was first published by Balthazar Arnoullet in France in 1549, and again in 1550, 1551, and 1558.

⁵⁴ The thin outlines of the woodcuts included in Fuchs's herbal indicate that the plates were intended to be colored. See Blunt and Raphael, *The Illustrated*, 125. Among the known 150 copies of *De Historia Stirpium*, 48 are colored. However, many copies are identified as colored by later hands. For the chronological list of the published works of Fuchs, see Appendix 7 in Meyer et al., *The Great Herbal*, 1:633-759.

emphasize the intentions of the author.”⁵⁵ Wealthy patrons paid extra money to have colored herbals. For instance, Severinus Gobelius, physician to the Duke of Prussia, paid an extra 105 florin for the colored copy of Lobelius’s *Kruydtboeck* “*pictum ad vivum* (painted to life),” whereas the black and white edition costs 8 florin.⁵⁶ Although little is known about the identity of those painters who colored herbals, they seem to have had their own position as professionals. For example, three women—Lisken Zegers; Myncken, the widow of Hans Liefrinck; and Lyncken, the widow of Abraham Verhoeven—are identified as employees hired by the Plantin Press, the largest printing house in Antwerp, to color herbals.⁵⁷ The revival of botanical illustrations in sixteenth-century Germany made a huge impact on other European countries, most significantly on the Southern Netherlands in the second half of the century.

Rembert Dodoens

In the Netherlands, the Renaissance in botany came with a physician named Rembert Dodoens (1517-1585) from the city of Malines. Following the authority of the classical authors, his botanical studies stemmed from his interest in the medicinal properties of plants. In 1543, Dodoens translated Fuchs’s *De Historia Stirpium* and published it under the title *Den Nieuwen Herbarius* (The New Herbal; Basel, 1543). Encouraged by the success of this Dutch edition, the Flemish publisher Jan van der Loe

⁵⁵ Agnes Arber, “The Coloring of Sixteenth-Century Herbals,” *Nature* 145 (May 1940): 803-804. The original watercolors of Hans Weiditz, who designed Brunfel’s 1530 herbal, are a main source for its colored copies.

⁵⁶ L. Voet, “Christopher Plantin as a Promoter of the Science of Botany,” in De Nave and Imhof, *Botany*, 44. Also see Sachiko Kusukawa, “Use of Pictures in Printed Books: The Case of Clusius’s *Exoticorum libri decem*,” in Egmond et al., *Carolus Clusius*, 228.

⁵⁷ Arber, “The Coloring,” 804.

(d. 1563) urged Dodoens to write the first original herbal in Dutch, which he entitled the *Cruijdeboeck* (Antwerp, 1554).⁵⁸ In this herbal, Dodoens broke away from the tradition of arranging plants alphabetically by their names and adopted a new classification system based on the utilitarian properties of plants.

Van der Loe decided to include a large number of botanical illustrations so as to make this herbal more accessible to a wide public that would be able to use it as a field guide. Of a total of 710 figures of plants included in the herbal, almost 500 were copied from Fuchs's woodblocks, and the remaining 210 were newly added.⁵⁹ Dodoens's pride in these botanical images was extraordinary.⁶⁰ He writes in the preface: "*naer dat leven gheconterfeyt ende met hueren colueren ende verwe[n] wel ende perfectelick afgheset*" ("drawn to life and their colors and paint beautifully and authentically carried out").⁶¹ As represented in this passage, Dodoens's herbal was intended to be hand-colored before it was delivered to the audience.

Shortly after completing the revised version of the *Cruijdeboeck* (Antwerp, 1563), Dodoens started on a new herbal of scented flowers entitled *Florum et Coronariarum Odoratarumque Nonnullarum Herbarum Historia* (Antwerp, 1568). In this book,

⁵⁸ The preface of Rembert Dodoens, *Stirpium historiae pemptades sex* (Antwerp, 1583), f. A2 r., line 25: "[...] nisi Ioannis Loëus Antwerpiensis typographus quo familiari utebar amico, a me impetrasset, ut vernaculo dialecto stirpium earum bistoriam prosequerer, quae in cognitionem meam venissent"; quoted in De Nave and Imhof, *Botany*, 100. More editions of *Cruijdeboeck* were followed: *Histoire des Plantes* (Antwerp, 1557), French edition translated by Carolus Clusius; *Cruijdeboeck* (Antwerp, 1563), a revised version; *A Nieuve Herball* (London, 1578), English edition translated by Henry Lyte.

⁵⁹ These woodcuts cost Van der Loe: "[Jan van der Loe] has additionally incurred very high costs and still does every day, for printing the herbs and for cutting to prepare them for printing." See Dodoens, *Cruijdeboeck*, f. a1 v., lines 15-16; trans. in De Nave and Imhof, *Botany*, 36, note 14.

⁶⁰ However, Dodoens did not mention any artist's name in this herbal.

⁶¹ From the preface of Dodoens, *Cruijdeboeck*; quoted in De Nave and Imhof, *Botany*, 50. Arthur Wheelock argues that a term "*naer dat leven gheconterfeyt*" should be translated as "drawn lively" or "in a lively fashion," because 500 of the 710 plant illustrations included in Dodoens's herbal were, indeed, copied from Fuchs's *De Historia Stirpium*. See Wheelock, *From Botany*, 23, note 27.

Dodoens's choice of flowers did not rely on their medicinal properties, but on their ornamental features. Many of these rare and exotic species, including the tulip and the sunflower, had recently been imported to the Netherlands to be cultivated in the gardens of flower lovers such as Jean de Brancion (or Joannes Brancio, d. 1584), a senior official in the court of Malines. Between 1568 and 1573, Dodoens stayed with De Brancion, whose botanical garden provided the botanist access to a rich variety of exotic flowers. One of the plants that he took special note of was the sunflower.⁶² He writes in the epilogue:

There is, however, also an annual *Chrysanthemum Perunianum*, but this is a very tall plant: an attractive flower at an unusual height. It is said that is to be found in Peru and some other regions of America. When sown in the Royal Gardens in Madrid it grew 24 feet high. It has a straight stalk as thick as an arm. The leaves are very broad; the flower is similar in shape to a *Chrysanthemum* but is much larger. The diameter of its disc or circumference is a foot across and it weights two to three ounces. The petals surrounding this disc are somewhat similar to those of the great purple lily, but are larger and of a golden yellow colour. They call this plant the *Sun of India* (or *Indian Sun*) because it so resembles a sun surrounded by rays. We saw this plant in the delightful garden abundant with any variety of plants belonging to the excellent and worthy Joannes Brancio, a man who is very knowledgeable about the diversity of plants and whose generosity and goodwill has resulted in a not inconsiderable number of flowers being added to this treatise which otherwise would not have been included. You may seek it is vain elsewhere, only to find it in his garden. A *Chrysanthemum Perunianum* could be seen in his garden, but this only grew to a height of 10 or 11 feet.⁶³

This passage reveals the botanist's fascination with this exotic species. Dodoens's description of the sunflower was exclusively concerned with its ornamental properties as

⁶² It seems that Dodoens had received the drawing of the sunflower before he saw the species in De Brancion's garden: "While we were still preparing the edition of this treatise, we were given illustrations of two very rare plants which are important for this part of the work: the *Chrysanthemum Perunianum* and the *Aphodelus palustris*." See Dodoens, *Florum et Coronariarum Odoratarumque Nonnullarum Herbarum Historia* (Antwerp, 1568), 295- 296; quoted in De Nave and Imhof, *Botany*, 62.

⁶³ From the epilogue of Dodoens, *Florum*, 296; quoted in *Ibid.*, 144.

a garden flower. This approach to plants is also well represented in the woodcut (fig. 23), in which the sunflower is illustrated as an organic form of a garden flower. It does not show any extra detail in its components, such as its seeds and roots.

The *Florum et Coronariarum* includes 108 woodcuts of flowering plants based on the drawings of a draftsman named Peeter van der Borch (c. 1540-1608), who was active as one of the principal designers of illustrations for the Plantin Press, the largest printing house in Antwerp.⁶⁴ Born in Malines, Van der Borch was registered as a master in the Painters Guild of the city in 1559. Between 1566 and 1589 he designed more than three thousand illustrations for the publisher Christopher Plantin (1520-1589).⁶⁵ To have these botanical illustrations be “*naer dat leven*” (“from life”), Van der Borch was heartily encouraged to draw living plants.

Finally, Dodoens’s passion for botany was fully displayed in the *Stirpium Historiae Pemptades sex* (Six Lectures on the History of Plants; Antwerp, 1583), a revised later edition of the *Cruijdeboeck*. The number of images had increased from 710 to 1,358. In this herbal, Dodoens included more exotic plants, which he may have studied in Vienna in the gardens of Maximilian II and Rudolf II, for whom he worked as a personal physician from 1574 to 1578. For the expanded number of woodcuts included in the *Stirpium Historiae Pemptades sex*, Plantin reused many of these contained in his previous publications as well as some from Van der Loe’s publications.⁶⁶

⁶⁴ Arnold Nicolai and Gerard Janssen van Kampen cut the block based on Van der Borch’s design. See Ibid., 104. After Van der Loe’s death in 1563, Christopher Plantin made the further development on botany in the Southern Netherlands, publishing botanical works, including six works by Dodoens, three by Clusius, and three by Lobelius. See Ibid., 41.

⁶⁵ For more information about Van der Borch, see C. Depauw, “Peeter Vander Borch (1535/40-1608): The Artist as *Inventor* or *Creator* of Botanical Illustrations?” in Ibid., 47-55.

⁶⁶ Ibid., 106.

In the Netherlands, Mathias Lobelius (1538-1616) and Carolus Clusius (1526-1609), continued in Dodoens's footsteps in their botanical studies. In particular, Dodoens's study of flowers as a specialized field of botany was crucial for Clusius's botanical publications and, in turn, on the development of independent flower still-life paintings.

Floral Images in Manuscripts

In France in the early sixteenth century, floral images that had previously only occupied parts of border decorations began to fill entire pages of books of hours.⁶⁷ In particular, French miniaturists, such as Jean Bourdichon and the Master of Claude, illuminated their books of hours with scientifically accurate species of flowers, enhancing the illusionism of the floral border decorations to the entire page. For those floral images rendered with precision and accuracy, artists were encouraged to be familiar with the appearance of each species of plant as it occurred in nature.

Naturalism in Flower Border Decorations

A book of hours is a kind of prayer book that began to increase in popularity in the late medieval and Renaissance periods.⁶⁸ Its contents vary depending on its date and province of creation and patrons for whom it was created. As books of hours became

⁶⁷ Some of Flemish manuscripts also show the tendency of floral image's expansion toward the full-page. For example, *Book of Hours*, c. 1520-1530, in Vienna; Österreichische Nationalbibliothek (Cod. 1979) is filled with more than half-page floral images by minimizing texts. The Flemish manuscript was taken attention by Brenninkmeijer-de Rooij. See Beatijs Brenninkmeijer-de Rooij, *Roots*, 15, 17, fig. 4 and 5.

⁶⁸ For introductory studies about books of hours, see Christopher de Hamel, *A History of Illuminated Manuscripts* (London: Phaidon Press, 1994); and Roger S. Wieck, *Painted Prayers: The Book of Hours in Medieval and Renaissance Art* exh.cat. (New York: Pierpont Morgan Library, 1997).

accessible to lay people in the mid-thirteenth century, they began to be ordered as presents for private use in weddings or other family occasions. Individual preferences for what a prayer book should include often resulted in the deletion of the Psalter section and the inclusion of several other parts, such as a calendar, the Hours of the Virgin, and the penitential Psalms, all of which came to be features typically found in fifteenth- and sixteenth-century books of hours. The Hours of the Virgin, which became a centerpiece of books of hours, was designed for hourly prayer on a daily basis: *Martins* and *Lauds* were for before daybreak, *Prime* for 6:00 am, *Terce* for 9:00 am, *Sext* for noon, *None* for 3:00 pm, and *Vespers* and *Compline* together for some point during the evening. At each hour, patrons were invited to meditate upon the life of the Virgin. Scenes depicting patrons praying in front of the Virgin and Child were often illustrated between the hours. The text of the hours, often independent from the illustrations, was based on Psalms and the Roman breviary, and consisted of repeated *versicles* and *responses*.⁶⁹

Artists from Ghent and Bruges developed the tradition of book illumination in the mid-fifteenth century when manuscript illumination had begun to decline elsewhere as a result of the rise in popularity of panel painting. Books of hours produced in this school are characterized by the presence of border decorations, in which a variety of *flora* and *fauna* is illuminated.⁷⁰ These decorations recall earlier traditions of pilgrims, who, during their travels, often collected and tacked rare flowers onto the borders of their prayer or

⁶⁹ A *versicle* is said or sung by the officiant, after which the congregation recites a *response*.

⁷⁰ For the study of the origins and the development of illusionistic border decorations, see Celia Margaret Fisher, "The Development of Flower Borders in Ghent-Bruges Manuscripts 1470-1490," Ph.D. diss. (University of London, 1996). For more floral border decorations produced by the Ghent and Bruges, see D. H. Turner, *The Hastings Hours* (London: Thames and Hudson, 1983).

songbooks.⁷¹ Eventually, illusionistically depicted flower images came to replace the real objects.

As shown in *The Annunciation* and *Christ in Majesty* from the *Warburg Hours* (c. 1500, fig. 24), these flowers are symbolically related to the miniatures they surround: red and white roses signifying the virtue of the Virgin and daisy, violet, pansy, and strawberry plants as heavenly flowers representing Christ. The stylized flowers that were found in earlier manuscripts were now replaced by much life-like floral images. They are illuminated in vivid colors, very realistic detail, and a less decorative quality. Fictive shadows projected from each flower and insect fall onto the gold background, creating a convincing space around them. This remarkable illusionism and naturalism was admired by the artists' contemporaries. French miniaturists, in particular, diligently adopted the Flemish tradition of manuscript illumination and, over time, developed it in their own way.

From Border Decorations to Independent Subjects

Engraved illustrations began to be inserted in books of hours in the 1480s, which reduced their prices significantly. Hand-made manuscripts, however, were still being commissioned by royal families, aristocrats and rich merchants. Books of hours decorated with floral images in their borders were popular with royal families throughout Europe, not only because of their aesthetic beauty but also because of their religious symbolism. Flower-illustrated books of hours soon became a favorite collectable item. Among these members of royalty, French queens Anne of Brittany (*Anne de Bretagne*,

⁷¹ For more information on the popularity of pilgrimage and collecting activities in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, see Kaufmann and Kaufmann, "The Sanctification of Nature" 11-48.

1477-1514), Queen of Charles VIII and Louis XII, and Claude (1499-1524), her daughter and the Queen of Francis I, were known for their extensive collections of books of hours, in which a variety of floral images are depicted with great illusionism and naturalism.⁷²

Jean Bourdichon

Jean Bourdichon (1457-1521) came from Tours, the most renowned center for manuscript illumination in fifteenth-century France. An official court painter, Bourdichon served under four consecutive French kings—Louis XI, Charles VIII, Louis XII, and Francis I. During these years, he developed a delicate and sophisticated style of court art, including a prayer book for Queen Anne of Brittany entitled *Les Grandes Hours d'Anne de Bretagne* (Tours, 1500-1508); the book now resides in the Bibliothèque Nationale de France (Lat. 9474).⁷³ This manuscript contains prayers, calendars, and fifty full-page paintings of religious scenes from the Gospels and the Golden Legend.⁷⁴ The pages of prayers are beautifully illuminated with 387 miniature paintings of plants and insects along the outside margins of the text.⁷⁵ The plants consist of both wild and cultivated species.

⁷² For more specific discussion about French books of hours, see François Avril and Nicole Reynaud, *Les Manuscrits: À Peintures en France 1440-1520* exh. cat. (Paris: Bibliothèque nationale de France), 1993; and Lilian M.D. Randall, *Medieval and Renaissance Manuscripts in the Walters Art Gallery*, 3 vols. (Baltimore: Walters Art Gallery, 1989); II: France, 1420-1540.

⁷³ For a list of other manuscripts illustrated by Bourdichon or in his workshop, see David Mac Gibbon, *Jean Bourdichon: A Court Painter of the Fifteenth Century* (Glasgow: The University Press, 1933), 159-161. For more studies on Jean Bourdichon, see Avril and Reynaud, *Les Manuscrits*, 293-305; Léopold Delisle, *Les Grandes Heures de la Reine Anne de Bretagne et l'Atelier de Jean Bourdichon* (Paris: Librairie Damascène Morgand, 1913); and Emile Mâle, *Art & Artists of the Middle Ages*, 5th ed., trans. Sylvia Stallings Lowe (Redding Ridge: Black Swan Books, 1986), especially chapters XI and XII.

⁷⁴ For a list of these religious scenes in the book of hours of Anne of Brittany, see Gibbon, *Jean Bourdichon*, 151-152.

Following the Ghent and Bruges school of manuscript illumination, Bourdichon illustrated these botanical figures in vivid color against a gold ground, displaying a convincing sense of space and perspective. However, while the Flemish artists were mainly concerned with blossoms scattered on the borders of books, Bourdichon emphasized the organic form of the whole plant. As shown in the *Daffodil* (fig. 25), Bourdichon depicted the individual qualities of the entire flower, complete with elongated stems and leaves. Moreover, he limited border decorations to a single specimen where he illustrated the flower in its various stages of blossoming.

Bourdichon must have drawn these various species of plants from live specimens that grew in the royal gardens of Tours and Blois. Louis XII and Queen Anne of Brittany had a great passion for gardens, spending a large amount of money on gardening.⁷⁶ Of these, the garden of the Château de Blois, which was also known as “The Queen’s Garden,” was the one of which they were the most proud.⁷⁷ To satisfy the queen’s curiosity about a variety of plants, Bourdichon also included newly cultivated species, such as the bottle gourd (*Cucurbita*, fig. 26), a plant that had recently been imported to Europe from the New World, in his book of hours. Recent studies by Harry Paris and his colleagues argue that the bottle gourd depicted in *Les Grandes Heures d’Anne de Bretagne* is the first known image of the *Cucurbita* species in Europe, and suggest that botanists had possibly adopted the image from Bourdichon’s book of hours in their

⁷⁵ Of total 387 flower miniatures, 17 surround the whole text, 32 partly enclose but do not surround the text, and 282 are illuminated strips filling the outer margin only. For the most recent study about Bourdichon’s botanical illustrations, see Michèle Bilimoff, *Promenade dans des Jardins Disparus: Les Plantes au Moyen Age, d’Après les Grandes Heures d’Anne de Bretagne* (Rennes: Editions Ouest-France, 2001).

⁷⁶ The “*comptes de l’argenterie*” of Louis XII, 1501-1503 (Bibliothèque Nationale de France, MS. 3463, fol. 57v) mention an amount of 660 “*livres tournois pour icelle convertir aux fontaines de marbre qui ont esté faictes à Tours pour le jardin du château de Blois:*” quoted in Gibbon, *Jean Bourdichon*, 63.

⁷⁷ *Ibid.*

herbals (fig. 27).⁷⁸ Bourdichon's scientific approach to plants is more evident in his labeling of each species in both Latin and French, something that had never been attempted in earlier manuscripts, but was practiced regularly in botanical studies.⁷⁹

Bourdichon's book of hours was widely admired by French kings for centuries. It would belong to their personal libraries or private cabinets, where the manuscript would often be circulated for its scientific characteristics as well as aesthetic beauty. For example, Louis XV lent Bourdichon's book of hours to a well-known botanist named Antoine de Jussieu (1686-1758), who had a particular interest in plant illustrations.⁸⁰ On November 14, 1722, Jussieu mentioned the scientific quality of Bourdichon's botanical images in a talk at the French Academy of Sciences.⁸¹ Moreover, in his botanical catalogue, Jussieu listed the Latin and French names of the plants illustrated in *Les Grandes Hours d'Anne de Bretagne*.⁸²

Bourdichon's independent use of floral subjects in his books of hours coincided with the appearance of the miniature flower "portrait," which is best exemplified in the Pierpont Morgan Library's three single leaves—*Forget-Me-Not* (M. 1051.1), *Daffodil* (M. 1051.2, fig. 28), and *Chicory* (M. 1051.3, fig. 28)—and two currently missing leaves—

⁷⁸ Harry S. Paris et al., "First Known Image of *Cucurbita* in Europe, 1503-1508," *Annals of Botany* 98 (2006): 41-47.

⁷⁹ There are many mistakes found in the Latin names. For more information about these labels, see Gibbon, *Jean Bourdichon*, 71-72.

⁸⁰ *Ibid.*, 62.

⁸¹ Paris, "First Known Image," 42.

⁸² Antoine de Jussieu, *Catalogus Stirpium Elegantissime* (Paris: Bibliothèque de Nationale de France, no. 5052), 1722, 150-159.

White Convolvulus (fig. 29) and *Creeping Buttercup*.⁸³ These five individual leaves originally derive from the same manuscript, the *Book of Hours* (Loire River Valley, c. 1500). In each leaf, a single specimen of flower occupies the center of the page, the section where religious miniatures or texts had once been placed. These floral images are now surrounded by stylized plant border decorations.

These five floral images reveal a striking resemblance to Bourdichon's floral images of the same species (figs. 25, 30, 31, respectively). They are, like Bourdichon's images, illusionistically depicted on a gold background and are accompanied by insects. Each species is depicted as a whole plant growing up from the ground. The limited number of blossoms and the compact size of the book (107 x 76 mm), however, create a greater sense of intimacy than does Bourdichon's book of hours.

Each leaf with an image often occurs independently of the text on the back of the sheet. For example, M. 1051.1 is adjacent to Hours of the Virgin at *Lauds* (incomplete), M. 1051.2 to Suffrage to St. Eustace (incomplete), and M. 1051.3 to Suffrage to St. Andrew. Given a book of hours consisting of several parts, one could assume that more flower "portraits" were once included that corresponded to the remaining hours. Although there seems to be no association between a particular choice of flowers and its accompanying text, the artist's close observation of various species of flowers represents his devotional approach to nature as God's divine creation. The spirituality, subtlety and accuracy of these floral images were further developed in the next generation of flower painters, among these, the Master of Claude de France.

⁸³ These two currently missing leaves were once in the collection of Michael S. Currier, New York. For images and descriptions, see Richard Day, *Master Drawings and Manuscripts 1480-1880* exh. cat. (London: Richard Day LTD, 1990), no. 3. They have a text on the verso as well. I appreciate Roger S. Wieck, curator of the Pierpont Morgan Library, New York, for sharing his curatorial file, where I learned about these two images.

Master of Claude de France

The Master of Claude de France was trained in Tours in the first quarter of the sixteenth century.⁸⁴ He worked mainly for Claude, Queen of Francis I and the daughter of Louis XII and Anne de Bretagne. Among his recently identified manuscripts, the *Book of Hours* (Tours, c. 1520), which is now in the British Library (Add. Ms. 35214), reveals his extraordinary use of floral subjects in the style of Bourdichon.⁸⁵ In this small manuscript (original size 4 x 2 $\frac{3}{8}$ in), the Master of Claude included seven near full-page floral miniatures (fol. 29, 38, 48, 50, 52, 67, 72) in the section of Hours of the Virgin.⁸⁶

These floral images, including *Violet* (fig. 32) and *Rose* (fig. 33), are portrayed with *trompe l'oeil* illusionism, in which the center of each page appears to be partially cut out, so as to create the impression of being able to read the text on the next page. Like Bourdichon, the Master of Claude chose a single species of flower for each page, and emphasized the organic form of the flowers as they had grown from the ground. By dramatically minimizing the text and removing the border decorations, this book of hours draws our full attention to the floral image, which was now extended to occupy the full page.

The Master of Claude's full-page floral images seem to have provided the next generation of flower artists, such as Jacques le Moyne de Morgues, with the prototype for

⁸⁴ Roger S. Wieck, *Late Medieval and Renaissance Illuminated Manuscripts 1350-1525 in the Houghton Library* (Cambridge: Harvard College Library, 1983), 44.

⁸⁵ Charles Sterling is the first who identified the artist as the name in his book. See Charles Sterling, *The Master of Claude, Queen of France: Newly Defined Miniaturist* (New York: H. P. Kraus, 1975). For more information about the Master of Claude, see Avril and Reynaud, *Les Manuscripts*, 319-324.

⁸⁶ For example, folio 48, 50 and 67 is for *Lauds*, *Prime* and *Sext*, respectively. For more information about this manuscript, see Brenninkmeijer-de Rooij, *Roots*, 38-42, fig. 36-37.

florilegia.⁸⁷ Specifically, Le Moyne's *florilegia* in Dumbarton Oaks Garden Library and the ten miniatures formerly in the collection of Rudolf II have direct correlations with the Master of Claude's London manuscript.⁸⁸

The Master of Claude's independent use of floral subjects is even more evident in his *Heures à l'usage de Rome* (Tours, c. 1510-1515), which today resides in the Bibliothèque de l'Arsenal (Ms. 291) in Paris. The Master of Claude most likely made his hours for Queen Claude, since this type of small books of hours, especially those illuminated with flowers, was found among the most favored gifts dedicated to queens and princesses. In this manuscript (135 x 85 mm), he depicted a flower bouquet (fig. 34) with several specimens including daisies, pansies, and columbines.⁸⁹ He chose species that were among the most common flowers grown in contemporary gardens as well as frequently appearing in flower border decorations. In the manner of Bourdichon, the Master of Claude rendered each flower in vivid color against a gold background. The rather stylized shape of each blossom is also reminiscent of Bourdichon, who valued the idealized beauty of flowers.

These full-page floral images are often found as dismembered single leaves that have been clipped out of the main body of the manuscript, as, for instance, in the Pierpont Morgan Library Hours. The flower bouquet image in the Arsenal manuscript was also once clipped out, but, was later reattached. Although we do not know when these single leaves were cut, they could represent people's fascination with floral images and might

⁸⁷ Janet Backhouse briefly mentioned that the appearance of full-page floral miniatures in the border decorations of early 16th-century books of hours prefigures the works of Jacques le Moyne de Morgues. See Janet Backhouse, Review of *The Master of Claude, Queen of France: A Newly Defined Miniaturist*, by Charles Sterling, *The Burlington Magazine* 118 (July, 1976): 524-526.

⁸⁸ For more discussion about the Master of Claude's impact on Le Moyne's *florilegia*, see chapter two.

⁸⁹ Avril and Reynaud, *Les Manuscripts*, 321-322.

be an evidence of their wide circulation. Floral images, released from manuscripts, could be even handier to travel across countries, providing artists with the earliest form of flower still lifes.⁹⁰

As Italian Mannerism was becoming popular in France, floral border decorations in books of hours came to be replaced by illusionistically carved and gilded wood or metal strapwork frames.⁹¹ These frames were often decorated with clusters of stylized garden vegetables. Illusionistic floral images, such as those created by Bourdichon and the Master of Claude, only reappeared in the latter half sixteenth century in manuscripts created by, among others, Joris Hoefnagel.

⁹⁰ Many watercolor drawings of flowers on vellum remained single, unbound sheets. Pieter Biesboer has found a reference in a seventeenth-century Haarlem inventory from the Haarlem City Archives (NA 242; 17 November 1660, fol. 68v) where such drawings are described as independent works as being framed and displayed on a wall: “*Specificatie ofte Cedulle vande goederen de welcke bij den eersame Abram Rogiers bij sijne huysvrowe ten huwelijck oprechtelijck heft aengebracht [. . .] vier tulpaer met witte eycken lijsten*” (“Specification or schedule of the goods given by the honorable Abram Rogiers to his wife on the occasion of their marriage [. . .] four tulips in white oak frames”); quoted in Pieter Biesboer, “Judith Leyster: Painter of ‘Modern Figures’,” in James A. Welu, Pieter Biesboer et al., *Judith Leyster: A Dutch Master and Her World* exh. cat. (Haarlem: Frans Halsmuseum; and Worcester: Worcester Art Museum, 1993), 85, note 38.

⁹¹ A few floral border decorations appeared in the half of the sixteenth-century France, among them the *Book of Hours* (c. 1570, 7 $\frac{1}{8}$ x 4 $\frac{3}{4}$ in), which is in the Austrian National Library (Cod. Ser. N. 13241) in Vienna. Produced by the School of Fontainebleau, this book of hours features decorative qualities of floral borders rendered in the Flemish tradition. It was dedicated to Henry III as a royal gift in honor of the Polish coronation. For more discussion about borders and frames in French manuscripts, see Myra D. Orth, “What Goes Around: Borders and Frames in French Manuscripts,” *The Journal of the Walters Art Gallery* 54 (1996): 195-199. The mid-sixteenth century French miniaturists, among them the Master of the Getty Epistles and the Master of the Hours of Claude Gouffier, worked in the style of Italian Mannerism: for example, Getty Epistles Master, *Hours of Claude de Guise* (before 1550), Paris: Bibliothèque de l’Arsenal (MS. 654); and Master of the Hours of Claude Gouffier, *Hours of Claude Gouffier* (c. 1555), New York: Pierpont Morgan Library (M. 538). For more information about these two miniaturists, see Emmanuelle Brugerolles and David Guillet, *The Renaissance in France: Drawings from the Ecole des Beaux-Arts, Paris* exh. cat. (Paris: Ecole nationale supérieure des Beaux-Arts; Cambridge: Fogg Art Museum; and New York: Metropolitan Museum of Art, 1994), 82-84; and Myra D. Orth, “French Renaissance Manuscripts: The 1520s Hours Workshop and the Master of the Getty Epistles,” *The J. Paul Getty Museum Journal* 16 (1988): 33-60.

Joris Hoefnagel

The Flemish artist Joris (Georg) Hoefnagel (1542-1601) began his career as a miniaturist with Hans Bol (1534-1593) in Antwerp in the 1570s. Soon after the Spanish occupied the city in 1576, Hoefnagel fled Antwerp and entered the court of Duke Albrecht V of Bavaria in Munich. He continued to work as court artist for Duke Wilhelm V after the Duke of Albrecht V died in 1579. Between 1582 and 1590, Hoefnagel illuminated the missal for Archduke Ferdinand of the Tyrol, and in 1590, while living in Frankfurt, he began his service as court painter for Emperor Rudolf II.⁹² During his Frankfurt period, Hoefnagel must have met Carolus Clusius, who was living there from 1588 to 1593.⁹³ Clusius, one of the most famous botanists in Europe, maintained a broad network of artists specializing in natural history, collecting and exchanging their works of art with his correspondents. Hoefnagel would certainly have shown the botanist his botanical illustrations, including his four-volume manuscript *The Four Elements*.⁹⁴ The emblematic component of plants as well as scientific approach to flowers represented in this manuscript must have dazzled Clusius. In 1594, Hoefnagel left Frankfurt and settled in Vienna, where he continued to work for the court of the emperor until his death in 1601.

Following the Ghent and Bruges school of manuscript illumination, Hoefnagel often depicted *flora* and *fauna* in the margins of manuscripts, as in Georg Bocskay's

⁹² The missal is in Vienna: Österreichische Nationalbibliothek (Cod. 1784).

⁹³ Clusius's involvement in making and exchanging botanical illustrations is discussed in depth in chapter four.

⁹⁴ Hoefnagel's *The Four Elements* was copied by Aegidius Sadeler in his *Theatrum Morum* in 1608. It also provided models for the still lifes of Roelandt Savery.

Mira Calligraphiae Monumenta (Model book of Calligraphy, 1590s).⁹⁵ Illustrated in this manuscript are not only common flowers but also exotic specimens such as tulips (fig. 35), irises (fol. 52) and maltese cross (fol. 37). Hoefnagel illustrated many of these images with a *trompe l'oeil* illusionism as the flowers appear to cast shadows on the page.⁹⁶

In the 1590s Hoefnagel painted flower bouquet still lifes, which are among the earliest independent floral still life paintings in the Netherlands.⁹⁷ The similarities between his manuscripts and still life paintings have shown that he was a crucial figure in the tradition between manuscript illumination and independent genre of the still life.⁹⁸

Emblematic Botanical Illustrations

Among Hoefnagel's projects in Munich between the years of 1575 and 1582 was the illumination of a four-volume manuscript entitled *The Four Elements–Ignis* (Insects), *Terra* (Animals), *Aqua* (Fish) and *Aier* (Birds).⁹⁹ In these volumes executed in watercolor and gouache on vellum, thousands of living creatures are organized according to individual concepts of the four elements. Hoefnagel made many of his drawings from life,

⁹⁵ The J. Paul Getty Museum (inv. 86, MV 527) in Los Angeles; published in Lee Hendrix and Thea Vignau-Wilberg, ed., *Mira Calligraphiae Monumenta* (Los Angeles: The J. Paul Getty Museum, 1992). For more study on this manuscript, see Lee Hendrix, "An Introduction to Hoefnagel and Bocskay's Model Book of Calligraphy in the J. Paul Getty Museum," in *Prag um 1600: Beiträge zur Kunst und Kultur am Hofe Rudolfs II* (Freren: Luca Varlag, 1988), 110-117.

⁹⁶ Kaufmann and Kaufmann, "The Sanctification of Nature," 11-17.

⁹⁷ Hoefnagel's involvement with flower still-life painting will be further discussed in chapter five.

⁹⁸ Lee Hendrix determined Joris Hoefnagel as a catalyst in the development of the independent floral still life and animal easel painting in Northern art. See Hendrix, *Joris Hoefnagel and the "Four Elements."* Also see Kaufmann and Kaufmann, "The Sanctification of Nature," 11-48.

⁹⁹ The manuscript is mentioned in Van Mander, *Schilder-Boeck*, fol. 263r; rpt. in Miedema, *Karel van Mander*, 1: 310-311. These four volumes of *The Four Elements* contain 277 illustrations and are now in the National Gallery of Art (gift of Mrs. Lessing J. Rosenwald, 1987. 20. 5-8) in Washington, D.C.

but has also based his images on earlier pictorial sources, including woodcut illustrations from Conrad Gessner's *Historia Animalium* (Tiguri, 1551-1557) and nature studies by Albrecht Dürer and Hans Verhagen.¹⁰⁰ For example, Dürer's watercolor drawings *Hare* (1502, fig. 36) and *Stag Beetle* (1505, fig. 37), and Verhagen's *Beech Marten* (fig. 38) appear in the volume *Terra* (fig. 39), *Ignis* (fig. 40), and *Terra* (fig. 41), respectively.¹⁰¹ These earlier nature studies rendered in astonishing detail and vibrant color provided Hoefnagel's manuscripts with a lifelike quality, as evident, among other sheets, in *Hares*, *Raurakl*, and *Squirrel* (*Terra*, fol. XXXXVII). In this page, Hoefnagel copied Dürer's nature study *Hare*, imitating his short, rhythmical brushstrokes and details of the coloring with the final touch in white pigment that created a realistic impression of the animal as drawn from the living model.

Despite their naturalism, Dürer's nature studies not only sought to please the eye of the viewer, but also to encourage a spiritual approach to nature, in which the smallest creatures were seen to represent the essence of God's creation. Dürer's *Madonna with a Multitude of Animals* (fig. 42), for instance, depicts the holy family with diverse specimens of animals and plants, suggesting the scene as the Garden of Eden. These animals and plants—such as the parrot, dog, owl, leashed fox, irises and peonies—have symbolic meanings in the Christian tradition. The parrot symbolized Eden; the owl wedding; the dog faithfulness; a leashed fox, evil tamed; and irises and peonies the

¹⁰⁰ For more discussion about Verhagen's influences on Hoefnagel, see P. Dreyer, "Zeichnungen von Hans Verhagen dem Stummen von Antwerpen, Ein Beitrag zu den Vorlagen der Tierminiaturen Hans Bols and Georg Hoefnagels," *Jahrbuch der Kunsthistorischen Sammlungen in Wien* 82-83 (1986-87): 115-144.

¹⁰¹ For more study on these Images, see Lee Hendrix, "Natural History Illustration at the Court of Rudolf II," in *Rudolf II and Prague: The Court and the City*, ed. Eliska Fucíková, (London and New York: Thames and Hudson, 1997), 157-171; Korney, *Albrecht Dürer*, 114-119, cat. 35, 124-125, cat. 38, 130-131, cat. 41, 136-137, cat. 43, and 138-139, cat. 44; and Thea Vignau-Wilberg, "Naturemblematik am Ende des 16. Jahrhunderts," *Jahrbuch der Kunsthistorischen Sammlungen in Wien* 82/83 (1986/87), 146-147, abb. 152 and 154.

virtues of the Virgin.¹⁰² Many of these small creatures are also found in Dürer's individual nature studies.

Hoefnagel admired Dürer not only for his skill in drawing and coloring, but also for his way of conveying the spiritual quality in the guise of realistic nature studies.¹⁰³ Hoefnagel followed Dürer's approach to nature, and even went a step further, in *The Four Elements* by including emblematic inscriptions in Latin from a variety of literary sources such as the Bible and the *Adagia* of Erasmus.¹⁰⁴ In the *Hares, Raurakl, and Squirrel*, for example, he included an emblem "*TUTE LEPUS ES ET PULPAMENTUM QUAERIS*" ("You are a hare and yet hunt for game"), a quotation from the *Adagia* (1.6.7) that warns readers that they must know who they are. Also, in *Iris* (fig. 43) from *Ignis*, Hoefnagel carefully surrounded an iris with several different flies. In this image he accompanied with the emblem "*HABET ET MUSCA SPLENEM*" ("Even a fly has a spleen").¹⁰⁵ The text is a warning that no enemy should be despised, even if it is weak and insignificant like a fly or a flower.¹⁰⁶

¹⁰² Korney, *Albrecht Dürer*, 114-118, cat. 35.

¹⁰³ Dürer's "Academic ideals" stimulated Hoefnagel's philosophical approaches in his manuscripts. Hoefnagel's extreme admiration of Dürer is well represented in his poem dedicated to the German artist (see Appendix 2). For more study of Dürer's impact on Hoefnagel's philosophical approach to nature, see Thomas DaCosta Kaufmann, "The Nature of Imitation: Hoefnagel on Dürer," in *The Mastery of Nature*, 79-99.

¹⁰⁴ Recent studies by Lee Hendrix and Thea Vignau-Wilberghave have examined Hoefnagel's works not only with scientific naturalism, but also with larger philosophical perspectives. In this regard, Vignau-Wilberg discussed the devotional elements in Hoefnagel's manuscripts, also focusing on their symbolic and emblematic contents. See Hendrix, *Joris Hoefnagel and the "Four Elements"*; and Thea Vignau-Wilberg, *Die Emblematischen Elemente in Werke Joris Hoefnagels*, Ph.D. diss. (Leiden University, 1969); "Naturemblematik," 145-156; *Archetypa studiaque patris Georgii Hoefnagelii 1592: Nature, Poetry and Science in Art around 1600* (Munich: Staatliche Graphische Sammlung, 1994); and "Devotion and observation of nature in art around 1600," in *Natura-Cultura*, ed. Giuseppe Olmi et al. (Firenze: Leo S. Olschki, 2000), 43-56.

¹⁰⁵ Erasmus, *Adagiorum* (Antwerp, 1564), 3.5.7.

Because it includes such emblems, Hoefnagel's *Four Elements* can be considered to be a fusion of art, science, and emblematics. The purpose of Hoefnagel's work is clarified in a letter from the German traveler Philip Hainhofer in the early 1610s, in which Hainhofer describes the manuscript as an object of "*contemplirn und medirtirn*" ("contemplation and meditation").¹⁰⁷ The emblematic qualities of Hoefnagel's manuscript were admired by his contemporaries, including Rudolf II, who later purchased it.

In 1592, Hoefnagel's son Jacob (1575-c. 1630)¹⁰⁸ published a series of emblematic prints of plants, fruits and small animals—*Archetypa studiaque patris Georgii Hoefnagelii* (Frankfurt, 1592)—patterned after his father's manuscripts.¹⁰⁹ The series consists of four sections consisting of twelve leaves. Each section begins with a title page. Each leaf includes a composition of flowers, plants, and insects, and emblematic quotations are inscribed in both the upper and bottom portions of the leaf. As Hainhofer identifies this series of engravings as "*4 bucher die nach deß hueffnagles blumenbuecher auff miniatur art vom Hertzog*" ("four books by Herzog in miniature after Hoefnagel's flower books") in his letter of 1612, it is clear that Hoefnagel's primary focus was on flowers.¹¹⁰ In the depiction of a bouquet of flowers in Pars II, 6 (fig. 44), a vase of spring flowers is surrounded by frogs, a snail, cherries, peas, and a variety of

¹⁰⁶ H.T. Riley, B.A., ed., *Dictionary of Latin Quotations, Proverbs, Maxims, and Mottos, Classical and Medieval, including Law Terms and Phrases* (London: Bell & Daldy, 1866), 141.

¹⁰⁷ Chr. Häutle, ed., "Die Reisen des Augsburger Philipp Hainhofer nach Eichstädt, München und Regensburg in den Jahren 1611, 1612 und 1613," *Zeitschrift des Historischen Vereins für Schwaben und Neuburg* 8 (1881): 37; quoted in Vignau-Wilberg "Devotion and observation," 53.

¹⁰⁸ He also entered the service of Rudolf II in 1602.

¹⁰⁹ Reprinted in Vignau-Wilberg, *Archetypa*.

¹¹⁰ Hainhofer's letter in 1612; quoted in *Ibid.*, 9.

insects, including butterflies, dragonflies, and beetles. A lily of the valley and a globe flower flank both sides of the image. These flowers, animals, and insects provide symbolic references to spring: for instance, the frogs, which sleep through the winter and awake again in the spring, symbolize birth. The motto above and under this image reads “*Una hirundo non facit ver*” (“One swallow does not make spring”), indicating that one day is not enough time to acquire virtue or education, and “*Omnia vere vigent, et veris tempore florent et totus feruer Veneris dulcedine mundus*” (“All things flourish in spring, and in springtime all things are in flower and the whole world glows with the sweetness of Venus”).¹¹¹ These are warnings that spring is but a fleeting moment in life. In Hoefnagel’s manuscript, even the smallest creatures, such as flowers and insects, can be seen as objects of nature through which people could meditate upon God.

Evidence of Hoefnagel’s spiritual approach to nature is further found in the *Archetypa*: “*Hoc variare decus mundi est; haec Gloria summi Artificis*” (“Abundance and wealth of nature reflect and give evidence of the glory of its creator, the Highest Artist); and “*Dedit mihi Dominus Artem mercedem meam, et in illa laudabo nomen eius*” (“The Lord gave me art as my reward, and I will praise his name with it”).¹¹² Along with the character of the images themselves, this emblematic component of Hoefnagel’s manuscript was admired by his contemporaries, including nobles, botanists, publishers and artists. In particular, his impact on the first generation of flower still-life painters, among others Roelandt Savery (1576-1639), who arrived at the Prague court in 1603, was

¹¹¹ Ibid., 68. Vignau-Wilberg identified the source of this text is Erasmus’s *Adagiorum* (Antwerp, 1564), 262 (1.7.94).

¹¹² Hoefnagel, *Archetypa*, Pars IV, 1; quoted in Ibid., 48.

significant.¹¹³ The *Archetypa* made Hoefnagel's imagery further accessible to those early flower painters, serving as models for their own works.

A burgeoning interest in collecting and recording plants in the Renaissance parallels the increasing production of botanical books in Germany and the Netherlands. These publications contributed extensively to the development of botany, and, more importantly, the large collections of woodcuts of plants included in these books caused an enormous change in botanical iconography in subsequent centuries. At the same time, full page floral illustrations in French books of hours reveal that these artists also began to view flowers as individual subjects. The combination of their close scientific observations of flowers and devotional approach to nature as God's divine creation helped inspire Hoefnagel when conceiving his emblematic manuscripts. These developments in botanical illustration—the combination of scientific and religious approaches to flowers—also provided the next generation of flower painters, including Jacques le Moyne de Morgues, with new perspectives for flower painting.

¹¹³ Thomas DaCosta Kaufmann, *The School of Prague: Painting at the Court of Rudolf II* (Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press, 1988), 228; and Joaneath. A. Spicer-Durham, "The Drawings of Roelandt Savery" Ph.D. diss. (Yale University, 1979), 1:19.

Chapter 2

Jacques Le Moyne De Morgues

[. . .] things of chiefest importance liuely drawn in coulours at your no smale charges by the skilfull painter Iames Morgues [. . .]

- Richard Hakluyt's dedication to Walter Raleigh, *A Notable Historie*, 1587¹

In late sixteenth-century the passion for collecting rare and exotic flowers encouraged the process of cataloguing botanical specimens and recording their images in botanical treatises. From c.1560 to 1588, the French artist Jacques le Moyne de Morgues was one of those artists who created *florilegia* in manuscripts, watercolors and woodcuts. This chapter examines Le Moyne's biography, focusing on his career as a botanical artist. He has mostly been discussed as a cartographer and as the official artist for the French expedition to Florida from 1564 to 1565 and his importance as a flower painter has been largely overlooked. Le Moyne's experiences in Florida, however, inspired him to create a number of watercolors of plants after his return to France in 1565. His experience of collecting and recording plants during the Florida expedition encouraged him to portray botanical specimens as living plants, an approach that influenced early seventeenth-century Netherlandish painters in their depictions of flowers.

¹ René de Laudonnière, *L'Histoire Notable de la Floride [. . .] contenant les trois voyages faits en icelle par certains capitaines [. . .] françois* (Paris, 1586); translated and published by Richard Hakluyt in *A Notable Historie Containing Foure Voyages Made by Certayne French Captaynes unto Florida* (London, 1587), f. Iv; quoted in Hulton, *The Work*, 1:11.

Biography

Le Moyne in France c. 1533- c. 1572

Jacques le Moyne de Morgues was born in c. 1533 in the little harbor town of Dieppe. The name of Morgues seems to come from the region of his origin.² Although little is known about his life until 1564, Le Moyne must have been trained in the French manuscript tradition of Jean Bourdichon and Master of Claude de France in Dieppe, a renowned center of cartography and manuscript illumination. The French manuscript tradition evident in all of his *florilegia*, particularly the manuscript of flowers and insects in the Dumbarton Oaks Garden Library, Washington, D.C., suggests that Le Moyne was allowed access to the king's garden as well as to the royal collection of manuscripts where he learned how to illustrate botanical images. This tradition was important throughout his career, and will be further examined in this chapter.³

Although little is known about his early artistic career, Le Moyne was renowned enough by age thirty-one to be selected as an artist to accompany the French Huguenot expedition to Florida in 1564 to 1565. Le Moyne wrote in his *Brevis narratio eorum quae in Florida Americae provincia Gallis acciderunt* (1591):

From Dieppe were summoned two of the most celebrated naval commanders of our time, Michel Le Vasseur and Captain Thomas Le Vasseur, his brother, both employed by the King in the royal fleet. I was ordered to join these men and make my way to Laudonniere. On our arrival he received us kindly and with splendid promises, but being well aware that courtiers are in the habit of making profuse promises, I wanted to know what he really intended and for what purpose that King wished, as he said, to take advantage of my loyalty.⁴

² Ibid., 1:3.

³ All flower identifications are from Hulton, *The Work*, unless otherwise noted.

In 1560s, the French King Charles IX (1550-1574) attempted to challenge the Spanish military, which had already claimed the territory of Florida four times between 1559 and 1564, since, for both countries, Florida was an ideal base for trade.⁵ The French Admiral and Huguenot leader Gaspard de Coligny (1519-1572) also advised the king to establish a settlement in Florida for Protestants who had suffered from religious persecution since the early 1560s.⁶

The first French expedition to Florida was in 1562. It was commanded by Jean Ribault (1520-1565). René de Laudonnière (c. 1529-1582) served as second commander. The second expedition of 1564, which was commanded by Laudonnière, included three-hundred Huguenot colonists, among them Jacques le Moyne de Morgues. In his *Brevis Narratio*, Le Moyne writes that his role for the journey was “to chart the sea-coast and to observe the situation of the towns and the depth and course of the rivers, and also the harbours, the houses of the people, and anything new there might be in that province.”⁷ The expedition not only collected precious metal and stones, but also a variety of plants

⁴ Jacques le Moyne de Morgues, *Brevis Narratio Eorum Quae in Florida Americae Provincia Gallis Acciderunt*, in *America 2*, engraved and published by Johann Theodor de Bry, translated from French to Latin by Carolus Clusius (Frankfurt, 1591), 6-30; rpt. in *Voyages en en Floride*. Nanterre: Editions de l'Espace Européen, 1990. For the English translation of the quote, see De Bry, *America 2*:87 and Hulton, *The Work*, 1:117.

⁵ It is likely that Catherine de Médici, mother of Charles IX, actually commissioned the expedition, since she ruled France in the place of the young king who was only 14 years old at the time. For more details about the colonization of Florida, see chapter 3 of *Ibid.*, 1:17-44. Unlike Hulton, recent studies show different views toward the wars in Florida between the French and the Spanish. See Sarah Lawson and W. John Faupel, ed., *A Foothold in Florida: The Eye-Witness Account of Four Voyages made by the French to that Region and their Attempt at Colonisation 1562-1568* (London: Antique Atlas Publications, 1992).

⁶ For an account of the religious wars in the late sixteenth-century France, see Mack P. Holt, *The French Wars of Religion, 1562-1629*, 2nd ed. (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2005).

⁷ Hulton, *The Work*, 1:119-138, especially 119, for Le Moyne's role in the expedition.

for food supplies and medicinal uses.⁸ Le Moyne's knowledge of botany allowed him to discern the edible and medicinal possibility of plants, including different species of trees and fruits.⁹

The fifteen-month-long expedition, which lasted from June 1564 to September 1565, ended in tragedy when the French colony was attacked by the Spanish. Despite reinforcements brought by Jean Ribault, only fifty Frenchmen survived the massacre, among them Laudonnière and Le Moyne. Le Moyne's original watercolor drawings made in Florida were lost during his escape from the brutal Spanish slaughter. According to De Bry, after his return from Florida in 1565, Le Moyne was urged to record his observation for Charles IX, and soon afterwards his "true picture" of Florida was completed and dedicated to the King.¹⁰ Le Moyne's experience of recording nature in Florida inspired him to create a number of watercolors of plants after his return to France.¹¹

Le Moyne in England c. 1572-1588

Le Moyne soon moved to England, probably in 1572 at the time of the St. Bartholomew massacre in France.¹² He became an English citizen in 1581 and settled

⁸ Ibid., 1:120.

⁹ Ibid., 1:139-152.

¹⁰ De Bry does not mention exactly when Le Moyne's observation was presented to Charles IX. For the Latin text of De Bry's writing, see De Bry, *America* 2:87; quoted and translated in Hulton, *The Work*, 1:87 and 117. Some recent studies of W. John Faupel suggest that Le Moyne's presentation to the King was not written but verbal, despite the fact that Le Moyne was encouraged to "write them down on paper." See Lawson and Faupel, *A Foothold*, 153.

¹¹ While Spencer Savage, who first identified Le Moyne as the artist of the Victoria and Albert Museum watercolor, dated the watercolors at 1568 or later, Le Moyne seems to have begun his career as a botanist artist as early as 1550s. Further detailed study of these watercolors is discussed in this chapter below. See Spencer Savage, "The Discovery of Some of Jacques Le Moyne's Botanical Drawings," *The Gardeners' Chronicle* 71 (1922): 44.

down at the parish of St. Anne's in Blackfriars, the center of the Dutch-French Huguenot community nearby London.¹³ His name appears in an account dated April 28, 1583:

“James le Moyne, *alias* Morgan, paynter, borne vnder the obezance of the Frenche Kinge, and his wife, came for religion, and are of the French Church, Denison ij yeares. He hath one childe borne in Englande.”¹⁴

Le Moyne seems to have been well known as a botanical artist in England. Between c. 1572 and 1588 he had close relationships with botanists, gardeners, publishers and artists. The gardener and herbalist John Gerard (1545-1612), author of *The Herball or Generall Historie of Plantes* (London, 1597), shared his interest in flowers with Le Moyne.¹⁵ Gerard had come to London in 1561 and begun his career as a barber-surgeon working as a supervisor of the gardens of William Cecil, Lord Burghley, who was Queen Elizabeth's Lord Treasurer in the Strand and at Theobalds. Gerard's gardens could have provided specimens for Le Moyne's flower images—not only rare and exotic new specimens but also ordinary humble garden flowers such as those recorded in Gerard's garden catalogue.¹⁶ Other contemporary botanists Le Moyne would have known

¹² While Paul Hulton insists that Le Moyne came to England c. 1580 based on data that his name was not mentioned by English colonists until 1587, recent studies suggest Le Moyne left France around 1572. There was no reason for Le Moyne to wait for a decade to travel to England after the St. Bartholomew massacre. For both arguments, see Hulton, *The Work*, 1:10, and Lawson and Faupel, *A Foothold*, 154.

¹³ Hulton, *The Work*, 1:10-12.

¹⁴ R. E. G. Kirk and Ernest F. Kirk, ed., “Return of aliens in the city and suburbs of London from the reign of Henry VIII to that of James I, Pt. 2, 1571-1597,” *Proceedings of the Huguenot Society of London* 10 (1902), 354; quoted in Hulton, *The Work*, 1:12.

¹⁵ Gerard's *The Herball* was illustrated with over 2,000 herbs, which were mainly from previous herbal studies, for example Rembert Dodoens's *Florum et Coronariarum Odoratarumque Nonnullarum Herbarum Historia* (Antwerp, 1586). Gerard's 1597 edition was recently reprinted in *The Herball or Gernerall Historie of Plants*, 2 vols. (Amsterdam: Walter J. Johnson, 1974). For some observations on Le Moyne's plants taken from *The Herball* by Gerard, see Hulton, *The Work*, 1:59-68.

include Thomas Penny (c. 1532-1589), who was working actively in his wide circle of friends, which included Gerard, fellow botanists Mathias Lobelius, Carolus Clusius, Conrad Gesner and Henry Lyte (1529-1607), who translated Clusius's French version of Rembert Dodoens's *Cruydeboeck* and published it as *A Niew Herball or Historie of Plants* (London, 1578).¹⁷

Among the works completed by Le Moyne in England were fifty watercolors of plants and insects (1585) in the British Museum and his published book *La Clef des Champs* (Blackfriars, 1586), which consists of forty-eight woodcuts of animals, birds, flowers and fruits. The woodcuts were dedicated to "Madame de Sidney," whose identity will be discussed in depth in chapter three. Le Moyne's connection to the Sidney family should be considered through his relationship to Sir Philip Sidney (1554-1586), the well-known poet and courtier. It is possible that Philip Sidney met Le Moyne in France even before the artist left for England. Sidney visited France in 1572 to sign the Treaty of Blois, and during his stay in Paris he had close connections with Huguenots, including the English ambassador Sir Francis Walsingham (c. 1532-1590), his future father-in-law, and Hubert Languet (1518-1581), renowned scholar and diplomat.¹⁸ Languet introduced Sidney to many French Huguenots, possibly including Le Moyne.¹⁹

¹⁶ John Gerard, *Catalogus Arborum, Fruticum ac Plantarum tam Indigenarum, quam Exoticarum in Horto Johannis Gerardi*, 2nd ed. (London, 1599); now in Washington, D.C.: The Folger Shakespeare Library; 1st ed. in 1596 and reprinted in (Amsterdam and New York: Walter J. Johnson, 1974).

¹⁷ For information on the English naturalists, including Penny and Lyte, see Charles E. Raven, *English Naturalists from Neckam to Ray* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1947).

¹⁸ The Treaty of Blois allied England and France against Spain in order to protect French Huguenots. During his stay in Paris, Philip Sidney witnessed the massacre of St. Bartholomew's day on August 24, 1572.

¹⁹ Roger Kuin, "Sir Philip Sidney and the New World." *Renaissance Quarterly* 51, no. 2 (Summer, 1998): 556. Their life-long friendship between Sidney and Languet lasted until Languet's death in 1581.

Le Moyne's experience in Florida seems to have been of interest to Sidney's circle, which included Sir Walter Raleigh (1554-1618) and Richard Hakluyt (c.1552-1616), who had a great passion for New World explorations.²⁰ Raleigh may have asked Le Moyne to join his 1585 expedition to Virginia, but the artist John White (active 1585-1593) was the one who eventually joined the expedition and served as a collector and a draughtsman, just as Le Moyne had done for the French expedition to Florida.²¹ White's watercolor drawings from Virginia, preserved in the British Museum, give some idea of the character of Le Moyne's missing ethnographic and botanical drawings from Florida.²² Indeed, White's inscription "Of Florida," which appeared in his two drawings *A Timucuan Chief of Florida* (fig. 45) and *The Wife of a Timucuan Chief of Florida* (fig. 46) demonstrates that White based some of his drawings on Le Moyne's missing ones.²³

Whoever introduced Le Moyne to Sir Walter Raleigh and John White did the artist a great service by connecting him with an important patron and a worthy colleague,

²⁰ For Raleigh's biography, see Mark Nicholls and Penry Williams, "Raleigh, Sir Walter," *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, <http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/printable/23039>; and John Aubrey, "Sir Walter Raleigh," in *Aubrey's Brief Lives* (Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press, 1957), 253-260. For Philip Sidney's interest in the New World exploration, see Kuin, "Sir Philip," 549-585. Sidney's circle of friends, writers, and poets included Abraham Fraunce (fl. 1587-1633), Edmund Spenser (c. 1552-1599), Nicholas Breton (c. 1545-c. 1626), and Nathaniel Baxter (fl. 1606). See Mary Lamb, "The Countess of Pembroke's Patronage," Ph.D. diss. (Columbia University, 1976), especially Ch. III.

²¹ For De Bry's engravings after John White, see Thomas Harriot, *A Briefe and True Report of the New Found Land of Virginia*, in *America* 1, engraved and published by JohannTheodor de Bry (Frankfurt, 1590); rpt. in *A Briefe and True Report of the New Found Land of Virginia* (New York: Dover Publications, 1972).

²² For the most recent studies on White's watercolor drawings, see Kim Sloan, *A New World: England's First View of America* (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 2007).

²³ Paul Hulton, *America 1585: The Complete Drawings of John White* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press; and London: British Museum Publications, 1984), 184, pl. 61-62. Given the fact that Le Moyne drew these figures from memory almost two decades later after his return from Florida, he probably had a hard time to recall the pattern in such detail but made them up. See Sloan, *A New World*, 134. While this Timucuan chief and his wife are both illustrated in De Bry's 1591 engravings *Florida Indians Going to War* (XVIII) and *Florida Chief with his Wife and Attendants* (XXXIX), respectively, their patterns of tattoo appearing in De Bry's engravings are quite different from the one of White's drawings after Le Moyne.

respectively. Raleigh's role as Le Moyne's patron was noted in the epistle of Laudonniere's *Notable Historie de la Floride* (1587), which Hakluyt translated from French to English and dedicated to Raleigh:

things of chiefest importance liuely drawn in coulours at your no smale charges by the skilfull painter Iames Morgues [...] (Iames Morgues) hath put downe in writing many singularities which are not mentioned in this treatise: which he meaneth to publish together with the purtraitures before it be long, if it may stand with your good pleasure and liking.²⁴

The passage indicates that Raleigh gave Le Moyne the commission for the drawings, which De Bry engraved and published four years later in 1591.²⁵

During his residence in England, Le Moyne's lively illustrated watercolors dazzled local and foreign collectors, print publishers and botanists. One of the most important contacts Le Moyne had during his English career was Carolus Clusius. Clusius probably met Le Moyne through Philip Sidney. Sidney had met Clusius, who was working as gardener to the Emperor Maximilian II, when he visited Vienna in August 1573.²⁶ As evident in the letters between Sidney and Clusius from 1575 to 1577, their friendship continued for the rest of their lives.²⁷ It is possible that Sidney introduced Le Moyne to Clusius when the botanist visited England in 1579. Clusius subsequently introduced the artist's botanical watercolors to Jacques de Gheyn in Leiden. Le Moyne's

²⁴ Laudonniere, *Notable Historie de la Floride* (London, 1587), f. I verso; quoted in Hulton, *The Work*, 1:11. Laudonniere's original French version *L'Histoire Notable de la Floride* was printed in 1586 at Hakluyt's expense. For more information about Laudonniere, see Charles E. Bennett, *Laudonniere & Fort Caroline: History and Documents* (Gainesville: University of Florida Press, 1964).

²⁵ Hulton, *The Work*, 1:11.

²⁶ Katherine Duncan-Jones, *Sir Philip Sidney, Courtier Poet* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1991), 65.

²⁷ This topic will be further discussed in chapter four.

connection to the early seventeenth-century Netherlandish flower painters, particularly through the mediation of Clusius, will be further discussed in chapters four and five.

Laudonniere's *L'Histoire Notable de la Floride* was published in Paris in 1586 and its English translation, *Notable Historie de la Floride*, in London in 1587. It seems that this publication inspired Le Moyne to record his own account of the expedition. Two decades after his return from Florida Le Moyne wrote his observation of the journey to Florida in *Brevis narratio eorum quae in Florida Americae provincia Gallis acciderunt*. In 1587 German publisher Theodor de Bry (1528-1598) met Le Moyne on a visit to London and discussed the possibility of publishing the artist's illustrated account. After Le Moyne's death in 1588 De Bry bought the account from Le Moyne's widow and asked Clusius to translate it into Latin. De Bry published Laudonniere's *L'Histoire Notable de la Floride* and Le Moyne's *Brevis Narratio* and accompanying illustrations together under the title *America 2* (Frankfurt, 1591, fig. 47).²⁸ While the watercolor drawings Le Moyne made in Florida were lost when he escaped the Spanish attack, the illustrated maps and images of Indian life he made after his return from Florida served as sources for De Bry's engravings. Although these images are now also lost, and it is not certain whether or not De Bry faithfully copied Le Moyne's drawings, his engravings are, nevertheless, essential for understanding Le Moyne's distinct style.²⁹ De Bry also may

²⁸ The original French account is now lost, but the Latin copy is available in the Royal Library in The Hague. A German version *Des Ander Theyl der Newlich Erfundenen Landtschafft Americae* was also published in Frankfurt in 1591, with one copy remaining in the Huntington Garden Library (No. 122198). The copy of the colored prints consists of forty-two illustrations and a map of Florida based on Le Moyne's drawings. See De Bry, *America 1*.

²⁹ It is possible that De Bry used other pictorial sources for his engravings, for example, the woodcuts of Hans Staden (c. 1525-c. 1576) depicting the life of Brazilian Indian between 1548 and 1555, published in *The True History of his Captivity* (Marburg, 1557), and the works of André Thevet (1502-1590): *Cosmographie de Levant* (Lyon, 1556) and *Les Singularities de la France Antartique* (Paris, 1558). See Karl Fouquet, *Hans Staden: Zwei Reisen nach Brasilien 1548-1555* (Marburg an der Lahn: Trautvetter &

have bought Le Moyne's other botanical watercolors when he obtained the artist's Florida works in 1588, and brought them to the attention of Netherlandish flower artists.³⁰

Le Moyne's Florilegia

Le Moyne in French Manuscript Traditions

Le Moyne painted botanical images throughout his life. While only a limited number of his *florilegia* have survived, each represents the evolving character of his style. Nevertheless, it is evident that the French manuscript tradition, which was influenced for Le Moyne's early career as a botanical artist, influenced all his subsequent *florilegia*. Its early impact on Le Moyne's style is best seen in a wonderful manuscript of flowers and insects from the early 1560s at Dumbarton Oaks.

The Dumbarton Oaks Watercolors

Manuscript of Flowers and Insects, early 1560s, watercolor and bodycolor on vellum, 106 x 80 mm (4 $\frac{1}{8}$ x 3 $\frac{1}{8}$ in), Washington, D.C.: Dumbarton Oaks Garden Library (RBR C-3-1 LEM).

The Dumbarton Oaks manuscript demonstrates that Le Moyne was trained in the French manuscript tradition before his departure for Florida in 1564.³¹ Not only does the

Fischer Nachf., 1963); Malcolm Letts, ed., *Hans Staden: The True History of his Captivity 1557* (New York: Robert M. McBride & Company, 1929); and Andre Thevet, *André Thevet's North America: A 16th-Century View* (Kingston: McGill-Queens University Press, 1986).

³⁰ See Brenninkmeijer-de Rooij, *Roots*, 42.

³¹ The Dyson Perrins sale catalogue (Sotheby's New York, 20 November 1960) describes the coat on the binding appeared in France around 1580. However there is no evidence as to whether the binding was made

small size (106 x 80 mm) of this manuscript suggest that Le Moyne was familiar with private prayer books, such as Master of Claude de France's *Book of Hours* of 1520s in the British Library (Add. 35214), but also the flower specimens illustrated in it—sweet violets, daisies, strawberry plants, roses (fig. 48), carnations, and pansies (fig. 49)—are all religious flowers symbolizing the Virgin Mary and are to be found in the Master of Claude's London manuscript.³² We do not know whether the Dumbarton Oaks manuscript has been rebound, but one could imagine that it once had more floral miniatures and that some folios have been lost.

As already examined in chapter one, in the early sixteenth-century floral images began to replace texts in Hours of the Virgin. The almost-full-page floral images in the Master of Claude's British Library manuscript became full-page floral images in Le Moyne's Dumbarton Oaks manuscript. The manuscripts not only depict similar flowers but they are also identical in the way heads of flowers are arranged, as seen in the images of red carnations (figs. 50, 51). In various other folios in this manuscript, Le Moyne similarly limited the number of flowers, trimmed leaves, and placed eye-catching butterflies on carnations.

In sixteenth-century France, flower miniature books were favored as a popular gift items. In particular, the genre called *Blason*—"a minute description of the qualities of an object, person or moral quality," which often appeared as poetic forms, was widely

by the first owner or not. It is unlikely that the Dumbarton Oaks manuscript dates to the same time period as the British Library watercolors (1585). For the Dyson Perrins catalogue, see Hulton, *The Work*, 1:174.

³² Other examples of small-sized books of hours (without floral images) include *Très Petites Heures d'Anne de Bretagne* (66 x 46 mm), c. 1498, Paris: Bibliothèque Nationale de France (Lat.3120); and *Book of Prayers of Claude* (69 x 49 mm), c. 1515, New York: Kraus Collection. For the Paris manuscript, see Avril and Nicole, *Les Manuscrits*, 265-267.

circulated among aristocrats and royal families.³³ Charles Jourdain's *Blason des Fleurs, ou sont contenuz plusieurs secretz de Medecine, dédié à tres illustre et tres docte Princesse Madame Marguerite de France, sœur unique du tres puissant Roy Henti de Valois* (1555), is one of the finest example:³⁴ this little book (68 x 48 mm) consists of thirty-two vellum leaves, including Jourdain's dedication to Princess Marguerite de France (1523-1574) and twenty-five poems mostly in eight lines. Each poem is devoted to a flower or fruit—a variety of roses, lily, borage, cornflower, periwinkle, marigold, poppy, columbine, strawberry, alkanet, daisy, mallow, clove, pansy, carnation, iris, sweet pea, gooseberry, broad bean and apricot—which is illustrated on the facing page with a full-page woodcut (fig. 52). Jourdain's choices of flowers and fruits, most of which could be found in the floral borders of books of hours, would have pleased the Princess. They would have satisfied her interest in the aesthetic qualities of floral subject but also particularly for their moral and mythological symbolism, or "*secretz de Medecine*" (medicinal secrets), as described in the title. Each image, as finely illuminated in colors on a gold ground and surrounded by blue borders, recalls the floral images of the Dumbarton Oaks manuscript, indicating the relationship of Le Moyne's *florilegium* with flower miniature books being printed in France.

Le Moyne's debt to the tradition of flower miniature books is evident in his uses of a gold ground and *trompe l'oeil* effects framing his watercolors. While created within the tradition of the books of hours or the *Blason*, the function of the Dumbarton Oaks

³³ The definition of "Blason" is from the Christie's New York auction catalogue, *Important Natural-History Books including The Birds of America by John James Audubon* (New York: Christie's, 10 March 2000), 11.

³⁴ For the most recent information about this book, see *Ibid.*, 10-12. Another copy printed on paper is in the Pierpont Morgan Library (inv. no. 76443) in New York, and six later editions survive mostly in France. I am grateful to Sam Segal who has kindly introduced me to the *Blason des Fleurs* and generously sent me its scanned images.

manuscript is still unknown because it does not include poems or texts for praying. It may be that Le Moyne presented the *florilegium* as a gift to the French royal family or to an upper class lady for private consultation, much as Jourdain dedicated *Le Blason des Fleurs* to the Princess. By depicting God's creations in nature, the Dumbarton Oaks manuscript evokes a deep spirituality. It would have encouraged patrons to meditate on the beauty of nature as part of their private devotion to God. This meditational use of flower miniature books will be further discussed in detail in chapter three.

The Victoria and Albert Museum Watercolors

Fifty-Nine Drawings of Flowers, Fruits and Insects on Thirty-Three Sheets, 1560s-c. 1572, watercolor and bodycolor on paper, 274 x 188 mm (10 ³/₄ x 7 ³/₈ in), London: Victoria and Albert Museum (AM 3267a-56 ~ 3267hh -56).

Le Moyne's watercolors in the Victoria and Albert Museum had only been examined for their original sixteenth-century French binding until 1922. In that year Spencer Savage, librarian of the Linnean Society, identified the inscription "*demorogues*" on the bottom of the first drawing as being the artist's name.³⁵ While the binding demonstrates that Le Moyne created the volume in France before his left for England around 1572, the watercolors of the group of thirty-three folios, which are now preserved in separate mounts, reinforce the conclusion gained from an assessment of the Dumbarton Oaks manuscript that Le Moyne worked as a botanical artist as early as the 1560s. The pot watermarks on the sheets with the letter ISIMO/NNET are very similar to

³⁵ Spencer Savage, "The Discovery," 44; and Spencer Savage, "Early Botanical Painters, no. 3, Jacques Le Moyne de Morgues," *The Gardeners' Chronicle* 63 (1923): 148-149. There are another sixty watercolors of flowers, fruits and insects in the Oak Spring Garden Library, Upperville, Virginia, attributed to Le Moyne by Lucia Tongiorgi Tomasi. For the Oak Spring manuscript, see Lucia Tongiorgi Tomasi, *An Oak Spring Flora: Flower Illustration from the Fifteenth Century to the Present Time* (Upperville, Virginia: Oak Spring Garden Library, 1997), 23-29.

Briquet 12826.³⁶ Peter Bower attributes the paper to a French manufacturer Simonnet and dates it to the early 1560s.³⁷

The Victoria and Albert Museum watercolors depict flowers, fruits and insects, with each drawing mainly representing a single specimen. As in the Dumbarton Oaks manuscript, Le Moyne's choices of flowers are found in early sixteenth-century books of hours. A comparison of Le Moyne's *Iris* (fig. 53) with folio 25v of Bourdichon's *Les Grandes Hours d'Anne de Bretagne* (fig. 54) confirms that the manuscript was one of Le Moyne's pictorial sources. Similarities of treatment are also found in their drawings of daffodiles, violets, foxgloves and corn poppies.

Le Moyne's floral images in the Victoria and Albert Museum are not only based on books of hours, but also on printed botanical treatises. When the Latin edition of Leonhart Fuch's *De Historia Stirpium* was introduced in France in 1543, it was an immediate success.³⁸ Its French edition was soon published under the title *Commentaires de l'Histoire des Plantes* (Lyon, 1548).³⁹ Between 1549 and 1560, seventeen more editions were published in France.⁴⁰ The extreme popularity of Fuchs's herbal books is reflected in Le Moyne's Victoria and Albert Museum watercolors. Le Moyne's adaptation of Fuchs's herbal is best exemplified in his *Lily of the Valley* (fig. 55). The flower (fig. 56), which is illustrated in Fuchs's treatise, appears here in reverse. Other

³⁶ See no. 12826 (Paris, 1556-1562; Amiens, 1561; St-Germain-en-Laye, 1561; Orléans, 1568) in C. M. Briquet, *Les Filigranes: Dictionnaire Historique des Marques du Papier*, 2nd ed. (New York: Hacker Art Books, 1966), 3:639; quoted in Hulton, *The Work*, 1:155.

³⁷ For more details about the watermarks, see Sotheby's, *Old Master Drawings* (New York: Sotheby's, 26 January 2005), 32.

³⁸ The Latin edition was text only with index of French plant names. For more information about the 1548 publication, see Meyer et al., *The Great Herbal*, 1:690, no. 81.

³⁹ The French edition includes 516 small (12 cm) woodcuts of plants.

⁴⁰ *Ibid.*, 1:138-139.

adaptations from Fuchs's publication include *Daisy* (figs. 57, 58) and *Cyclamen* (figs. 59, 60). Characteristic of the early stage of his career as a botanical painter Le Moyne's floral images after Fuchs' prints include the plants' roots. However, unlike plants illustrated in printed herbals, Le Moyne's flowers and fruits were depicted from several different viewpoints—front, side and behind—as in his illustrations of the *Daffodile* (fig. 61) and *Corn Poppy* (fig. 62) so that Le Moyne was able to portray their differing features and different stages in development.

Some floral images in the Victoria and Albert Museum are illustrated with insects, in most cases butterflies. In some respects their inclusion relates to the tradition of books of hours where the religious symbolic meanings of butterflies—death and resurrection—were important, or where their *trompe l'œil* possibilities were exploited. Unlike the miniaturists of the books of hours, however, Le Moyne often ignored insects' proportions and placed them independently of the flowers, as in the *Strawberry and Emperor Moth* (fig. 63). While the somewhat simplified form of strawberry plants is derived from Fuchs (fig. 64), the details in the moth suggest that Le Moyne drew this insect from life.

The ways in which Le Moyne adapted images from religious manuscripts, printed botanical treatises, and utilized life studies in the Victoria and Albert Museum watercolors reveal much about Le Moyne's early career as a botanical artist. Moreover, these watercolors appear to have been ones that he later used as preliminary sketches in more finished works. This conclusion is based in part on the large size of the Victoria and Albert Museum watercolors: 274 x 188 mm (10 $\frac{3}{4}$ x 7 $\frac{3}{8}$ in), the largest of Le Moyne's known *florilegia*. The spaciousness allowed Le Moyne freedom to depict his observation

either from books or nature. Moreover, among his *florilegia* the Victoria and Albert Museum watercolors are the only ones without illusionistic frames.⁴¹ *Trompe l'œil* shadows, which are commonly formed in manuscript traditions, do not exist in these watercolors, which gives them a sketch-like quality. Many of these drawings are rendered on both sides of a sheet, and some of them are identified by the inscription of the name of the plant or insect. In some folios underdrawings in black chalk are still visible. As exemplified in the *Almond*, Le Moyne composed the almond plant over a black-chalk underdrawing and adjusted its form while coloring the image. Their unevenness in style, which is shown throughout in the Victoria and Albert Museum watercolors, also could be explained by their different pictorial sources.

The Sotheby's New York 2005 Watercolors

Eighty Watercolor Drawings of Flower, Fruits and Insects, 1560s-c. 1572, watercolor and bodycolor on paper, 195 x 140mm (7 11/16 x 5 1/2 in), Sotheby's New York (26 January 2005).

Le Moyne may have used the Victoria and Albert Museum watercolors as a model book for other works, such as the eighty watercolor drawings of flower, fruits and insects that were auctioned at Sotheby's New York in 2005.⁴² The group of drawings,

⁴¹ The British Museum watercolors were intended for illusionistic frames. As mentioned below in this chapter, the original sheets seem to have been trimmed to the inner border of two lines drawn in red ink when they were mounted and bound in the eighteenth century.

⁴² Sotheby's, *Old Master Drawings* (New York: Sotheby's, 26 January 2005), 24-38. Some of these watercolors were recently auctioned at Sotheby's New York in 2009. See Sotheby's, *The Graham Arader Sale* (New York: Sotheby's, 19 June 2009), 42-51, lots 58-84. Four of them were sold at the auction, and most of Sotheby's New York 2005 watercolors are currently in the Graham Arader Gallery in New York. There is another group of twenty-seven watercolor drawings of flowers, fruits, insects and birds (1560s), attributed to Le Moyne, which was recently sold in Sotheby's New York in 2004. See Sotheby's, *Old Master Drawings including an Important Set of Natural History Studies by Jacques le Moyne de Morgues* (New York: Sotheby's, 21 January 2004); 38-66. More than one specimen illustrated in different size of paper sheets recalls the sketch-book quality of the Victoria and Albert Museum watercolors. However, the

once in an eighteenth-century French binding, is now detached and preserved in separate mounts. The eighty watercolors, dated the early 1560s, contain the same watermarks as those found in the Victoria and Albert Museum watercolor papers.⁴³ The Sotheby's New York 2005 watercolors comprise eighty-one leaves, including the first sheet with an architectural cartouche on the recto and a four-line poem on the verso.⁴⁴ They are the largest group in Le Moyne's known botanical drawings. The group of fifty-nine watercolors in London may once have been as extensive as the group sold at Sotheby's.

Le Moyne's choices of subject in the eighty watercolors are similar to those in the Victoria and Albert Museum watercolors. Not only are fifty-nine out of the eighty plant species listed in Sotheby's drawings found in the London manuscript (see Appendix 3), but also identical images are found in evident on every single illustration of those species. In some cases where plants are attended by insects, for example, in the *Common Vetch and Black-Veined White Butterfly* (fig. 65), Le Moyne rearranged them. Here a

Sotheby's New York 2004 watercolors are much more delicately illustrated and highly finished than the London drawings. The twenty-seven watercolors are excluded in this study.

⁴³ For details about the watermarks, see Peter Brower's study of the papers in Sotheby's New York 2005, 32.

⁴⁴ The inscription under the architectural cartouche on the first page reads "*Cela(?) este donne par DuMarry*" indicating the former owner of the album. The four-line poem on the back is written in a sixteenth-century calligraphy style, which suggests that it was originally bound together with those eighty drawings as a set just like Le Moyne's fifty watercolors in the British Museum. The poem is as follows:

*il ne fault plus chercher l'efmail d'un gay Printēps
De qui les uiues fleurs fe fannent en une heure,
Icy la douce Flore, en fa beaulté demeure,
Et ne perd fes honneurs par la rigueur des tēps.*

(Seek no more the colors of a gay Spring
which in the living flowers fade in an hour
here sweet Flora remains in her beauty
and does not lose her distinction through the rigors of time)

Quoted in Sotheby's New York 2005, 24.

butterfly, which Le Moyne depicted on the far right side in the Victoria and Albert Museum watercolors (fig. 66), appear in the left corner of the Sotheby version.⁴⁵

Compared to the Victoria and Albert Museum watercolors, the Sotheby's drawings are on smaller sheets and are executed in a more complete and finished manner. Eighty different flowers or fruits are depicted on eighty sheets and only a single species appear on the recto of each. Each subject is carefully arranged within a fictive frame. These frames, heightened with a gold line, include darker brown lines representing illusionistic shadows. The real sense of depth on these borders is best exemplified in the *Double Daisy and Lady Butterfly* (fig. 67) where the leaves of the plant overhang the border and cast shadows onto it. Moreover, Le Moyne's extremely delicate presentation successfully draws the viewer's focus to the flowers, with no roots or inscriptions distracting the eye, as evident in the *Double Daisy* (fig. 67), *Lily of the Valley* (fig. 68) and *Cyclamen* (fig. 69), compare his treatment of the same species in the Victoria and Albert Museum watercolors (figs. 57, 55, 59, respectively). In order to emphasize on the beauty of blooming flowers, Le Moyne limited the number of flowers as well as trimmed their leaves and stems in each drawing. Sometimes he combined separately illustrated parts of a plant—for example, *Species Rose* of the Victoria and Albert Museum watercolors (fig. 70)—into a living organic form as shown in the same flower of the Sotheby's watercolors (fig. 71). In the Sotheby's drawings, each flower is independently illustrated in self-contained compositions. Le Moyne used a stone-glazed paper to achieve a vellum-like smoothness, which suggests that this album was made for a patron.⁴⁶

⁴⁵ Above the butterfly "Black Veined, White Butterfly" is inscribed in pencil.

Together, the Victoria and Albert museum and Sotheby's New York 2005 watercolors demonstrate that Le Moyne was already one of the most original botanical artists in his early years in France. The specific function of these *florilegia* will be discussed in depth in chapter three.

Le Moyne as a Botanical Artist in England

Not long after his return from Florida in 1565, Le Moyne a Huguenot, moved to England to flee Catholic persecution in France at the time of the St. Bartholomew massacre (1572). He settled down in Blackfriars where he forged close relationships with nobles, artists and publishers. In particular, Le Moyne's experience in Florida was of interest to Sir Philip Sidney and his circle, stimulating their passion for the New World exploration.

Besides his career as an ethnographic painter in France, Le Moyne had already made his name as a botanical artist. However, his connection to renowned gardeners and botanists, including John Gerard and Carolus Clusius, during his years in England inspired him to devote his career even further to painting flowers. Le Moyne's known *florilegia* executed in England include the fifty watercolor drawings at the British Museum, forty-eight woodcuts *La Clef des Champs*, and ten miniatures formerly in the collection of Rudolf II in Vienna.

The British Museum Watercolors

Fifty Watercolor Drawings of Flowers, Fruits and Insects, 1585, watercolor and bodycolor on laid paper, 213 x 142 mm (8 3/8 x 5 5/8 in), London: British Museum (1962-7-14-1).

⁴⁶ For the detailed working process of the paper, see Sotheby's New York 2005, 32.

Two decades after his return from Florida Le Moyne created the fifty watercolors of flowers, fruits and insects, which now reside in the British Museum.⁴⁷ His name and date “*Jacques le Moïne, dit de Morgues, Peintre, 1585*” appears at the bottom of a sonnet (fig. 72) that was formerly bound together with these watercolors:⁴⁸

Sonnet

Discordant harmony and balanced movement,
Winter and Summer, Autumn, reborn Spring,
Renewing her sweet scents and colouring,
Join in the praise of God’s unfailing judgment.

This loving God gives every argument
To look for zeal from each created thing,
To bless His Name eternally and sing
All He has made in earth and firmament.

Above all He made man with head held high
To watch each morning as new light arrives
And decorates earth’s breast with varied flowers.

There is no fruit, or grain, or grub, or fly
That does not preach one God, the least flower gives
Pledge of a Spring with everlasting colours.

Jacques Le Moyne
called Morgues, Painter
1585

⁴⁷ Formerly in an eighteenth-century binding, these fifty watercolor drawings were unbound and separately mounted after the British Museum acquired the volume in 1962.

⁴⁸ The sonnet was originally handwritten by the French Huguenot writing master Jean (or John) de Beauchesne (c. 1538-c. 1610s), who had emigrated to England by 1567 and stayed in the parish of St. Anne’s in Blackfriars. See H. R. Woudhuysen, *Sir Philip Sidney and the Circulation of Manuscripts 1558-1640* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996), 40-41. For more details about the sonnet, see Hulton, *The Work*, 1:12 and 165, no. 36. It is the English translation from the French by R. N. Currey.

In the fourteen-line sonnet Le Moyne praises God's unfailing creation of nature, by comparing the "everlasting colors" of his floral images to God's never-ending blessing to the dedicatee.⁴⁹

Many of the flowers in the British Museum watercolors are found in the Victoria and Albert Museum and Sotheby's New York 2005 drawings.⁵⁰ While there are a number of identical images in these albums, for example, *Common Mallow* and *Almond*, the British Museum watercolors look quite different from the other two in terms of its pictorial sources and finished qualities.⁵¹ Le Moyne's careful observation of flowers and fruits in the Victoria and Albert Museum and Sotheby's New York 2005 watercolors is here confined within ruled borders. As in *Almond* (figs. 73, 74) Le Moyne added extra leaves to his plants and reduced their scale to create a harmonious and balanced image.⁵² Moreover Le Moyne freed himself from traditional botanical studies, by not depicting seeds and roots of fruits (figs. 75, 76). Le Moyne sought to depict the essence of the nature of these plants rather than copying their specific details. To achieve these results Le Moyne seems to have augmented the physical world with his imagination and humor, as in *Pedunculate Oak and Dragonfly* (fig. 77), where he depicted a dragonfly as holding a shell of acorns that it shows to the viewer.

⁴⁹ There is no dedication, so for whom these watercolors were created is still debated by scholars. More discussion about their possible dedicatee and function will be discussed in chapter three.

⁵⁰ See Appendix 3.

⁵¹ *Common Mallow and Butterfly*, British Museum (1962-7-14-I.28); *Mallow and Damselfly*, Victoria and Albert Museum (A.M.3267h-56); *Common Mallow and Damselfly*, Sotheby's New York 2005 (fol. 3); and *Almond*, British Museum (1962-7-14-I.43); Victoria and Albert Museum (A.M.3267r-56); Sotheby's New York 2005 (fol. 65).

⁵² The filling space by numbering leaves is evident all the fruit drawings in the British Museum watercolors.

It is possible that illusionistic frames were intended for the British Museum watercolors similar to those in the Sotheby's New York 2005 watercolors. As Paul Hulton points out, the original sheets seem to have been trimmed to the inner border of two drawn lines in red ink when they were mounted and bound in the eighteenth century.⁵³ Le Moyne placed his subjects within imagined borders where stems and leaves are cut by their edges as in *Wild Daffodil* (fig. 78). In *Wallflower, Small Tortoiseshell Butterfly, and Snail* (fig. 79), a snail is even seen climbing up along the side border. These motifs give the British Museum watercolors the spontaneous quality of a snapshot. Moreover, as evident in *Rosemary and Lackey Moth Caterpillar* (fig. 80) and *Hollyhock* (fig. 81), their frontality, one of the significant characteristics of floral illustrations in botanical treaties and later in early flower still-life paintings, makes them look somewhat flat, like dried flowers tucked between sheets of books.

Even though preliminary underdrawings in black chalk are still visible, the works have a finished quality. Unlike the Victoria and Albert Museum watercolors, in which Le Moyne used different pictorial sources, all the British Museum drawings seem to have been executed from his close observation of living plants. The pastel-like tonalities evident in each drawing give all the British Museum watercolors a delicate and subtle quality. The sketch-book character of the Victoria and Albert Museum watercolors, further developed in Sotheby's New York 2005 watercolors, is transformed into a highly finished style in the British Museum watercolors.

⁵³ Hulton, *The Work*, 1:165.

La Clef des Champs

Forty-Eight Woodcuts of Animals, Birds, Flowers and Fruits (Blackfriars, 1586), colored in watercolor and bodycolor probably later, 155 x 218 mm, Upperville: Oak Spring Garden Library.

Le Moyne's *La Clef des Champs, pour trouuer plusieurs Animaux, tant Bestes qu'Oyseaux, avec plusieurs Fleurs & Fruitz* (The Key to the Fields, to distinguish various animals and birds as well as a number of fruit and flowers) is the only printed work among his surviving *florilegia* (fig. 82).⁵⁴ It begins with a letter (fig. 83) and sonnet (fig. 84) dedicated to "Madame de Sidney" followed by forty-eight woodcuts. Each leaf is composed of two subjects side by side and each one is identified in Latin, French and English, and in some cases in German. As Le Moyne expresses in his dedication, it was made as a pattern-book to "serve those to prepare themselves for the arts of painting or engraving, those to be goldsmiths or sculptors, and others for embroidery, tapestry and also for all kinds of needlework."⁵⁵

While it is unknown who cut these woodblocks, Le Moyne would have designed the original drawings for these woodcuts. Their pictorial sources are derived not only from zoological and botanical studies by Gesner and Fuchs, but also from Le Moyne's own floral watercolor drawings. As demonstrated in his letter to "Madame de Sidney," Le Moyne emphasizes the importance of drawing in his working process: "for all of which skills portraiture is the first step without which none can come to perfection." When Le Moyne noted that pictorial sources were "from life"—"the most beautiful

⁵⁴ As *La Clef des Champs* literally means "a key to the fields" the title demonstrates, as Tongiorigi Tomasi points out, "the author's intention of providing the reader with a 'key' to the interpretation and appreciation of the beauties of nature." See Tomasi, *An Oak Spring*, 33. Two more copies survive in the British Museum (162.a.25) and the British Library in London.

⁵⁵ For the whole English translation of Le Moyne's dedication to Lady Sidney, see Appendix 4.

flowers and fruits which I judged most fitting, all taken from life”—his choice of the words “from life” would have referred to his own watercolor drawings such as the British Museum watercolors. Identical images are evident between *La Clef des Champs* and the British Museum watercolors, for example, the woodcut images of *French Marigold* (fig. 85), *Gilliflower*, *Violet*, *Primrose*, *Apple* and *Vegetable Marrow* (fig. 86) in *La Clef des Champs* correspond to watercolor drawings of the same subject in the British Museum manuscript (figs. 87, 88).

Miniatures Formerly in the Collection of Rudolf II

Ten Miniatures of Plants, Insects and Birds, bodycolor and gold leaf on vellum, c. 1585-1588, 142 x 109 mm, New York and Europe: Private Collection.

Miniatures of plants, insects and birds by Le Moyne that were formerly in the collection of Rudolf II, including *Hollyhocks*, *Clove Pinks and Butterfly*, *Peaches*, *A Thistle and Caterpillar*, *Rosemary and a Fly*, *Linnet on a Spray of Barberry*, were subsequently acquired by Eric Korner in London. These six drawings, later sold at Sotheby’s New York in January 1997, are currently dispersed in private collections in Europe and the United States.⁵⁶ Two of the drawings, *A Sprig of Wild Cherries* and *Violets with a Dragonfly*, recently appeared at auction in 2004, while two others are still missing.⁵⁷ On the verso of each drawing are numbers ranging from 13 to 58, indicating that this group of miniatures may once have been as extensive as the group of the British Museum watercolors.

⁵⁶ Sotheby’s, *Six Guaches by Jacques Le Moyne de Morgues to be included in the Sale of Old Master Drawings* (New York: Sotheby’s, 29 January 1997), lots 55-60.

⁵⁷ Francois Borne and Alan Wintermute, *Old Master Drawings and Paintings* (New York: Artemis-C. G. Boerner, 2004), lot 3. I am grateful to Kathleen Stuart, the Pierpont Morgan Library, and Armin Kunz, Artemis Fine Arts, for sharing their curatorial files with me.

Each drawing is illustrated against a gold or blue ground and surrounded by an illusionistically painted frame. These works are executed with great attention to detail and are fully modeled with minutely applied brushstrokes and rich colors. All the objects, as well as the fictive frames, appear to cast shadows on the page, enhancing the *trompe l'oeil* illusionism of the imagery. Close connections between these miniatures and the British Museum watercolors exist, particularly in Le Moyne's emphasis on flowers and the snap-shot quality of the images. For example, the *Hollyhocks* (fig. 89) is quite similar to the flower in the London manuscript (fig. 81), with Le Moyne orienting their fully opened flowers toward the viewer. The images of flowers, stems and leaves cut by illusionistic frames provide each drawing with a spontaneous character.

The highly finished quality of these images as well as the similarity in his choices of flowers with the British museum watercolors of 1585 suggests that these ten miniatures were executed as independent works of art late in Le Moyne's career. Each image fills the space inside the frame. A colored ground of either gold or blue, and the decorative ornaments on the fictive frames, recall portrait miniature paintings, for example, Nicholas Hilliard's (1547-1619) *Elizabeth I* (c. 1587, fig. 90).⁵⁸ Designed as collector's cabinet pieces, these miniatures were widely circulated among royal families and aristocrats in late sixteenth-century England. Le Moyne's use of bodycolor (gouache) on vellum, instead of watercolor on paper, also belongs to the tradition of miniature portrait paintings. Indeed, Le Moyne's highly finished miniature drawings were most likely created as independent works of art to be presented and placed in a collector's cabinet.

⁵⁸ The miniature painting (44 x 37 mm) is in the Victoria and Albert Museum in London (P23-1975).

Chapter 3

Le Moyne's *Florilegia* in the Emblematic Interpretation of Nature

Le Moyne, who gained his early training in the French manuscript tradition, continued to develop his artistic career after he arrived in England, where floral emblem books were also widely circulated. This chapter will examine flower-motif books in the English gift-exchange tradition in which Le Moyne created the poetic and emblematic qualities in his *florilegia* during his years in England.

Flower-Motif Books in the Late Sixteenth Century

Early modern English culture saw the development of a gift-exchange system consisting of complex social, cultural and political interchanges between donors and recipients.¹ By exchanging gifts, givers and receivers established, maintained and strengthened their social bonds. In this custom, as Marcel Mauss points out, gift giving and receiving “form[ed] the social system, involving members in the multiple obligations to give gifts, to receive them, and to repay them.”² A variety of gifts, including food, needlework, jewelry, medicines, cash and prayers, were circulated between donors and recipients, affirming their hierarchy in the social system.³

¹ Jane Donawerth, “Women’s Poetry and the Tudor-Stuart System of Gift Exchange,” in *Women, Writing, and the Reproduction of Culture in Tudor and Stuart Britain*, ed. Mary Burke et al. (Syracuse: Syracuse University Press, 2000), 4.

² Marcel Mauss, *The Gift: Forms and Functions of Exchange in Archaic Societies*, trans. Ian Cunnison (London: Cohen & West, 1974), 10-11.

³ Donawerth, “Women’s,” 3-4.

During the Elizabethan reign (1558-1603), more women became an integral part of the gift-exchange system. Their active participation in producing and exchanging of handmade needlework and handwritten poems was presented as a token of esteem. While many gift items were limited by the social and political relationships of givers and receivers, presenting needlework and books were allowed in a broader social network than otherwise possible at that time. Also, books and embroideries were available at any season of the year unlike food or plants.

Books as a popular gift item particularly demonstrate the value that contemporaries placed on spiritual objects. Much as in the Middle Ages, Renaissance people believed that “knowledge is a Gift of God and cannot be sold.”⁴ In the age of printed books, illuminated manuscripts were particularly valued as gifts. As Lisa Klein points out, “a personal gift such as an embroidered dress or book is particularly appropriate for fostering the mutual obligation that was the aim of the gift exchange. A hand-wrought gift has a particular intimacy, authority, and efficacy that other gifts, like money or plate, lack.”⁵ In his embroidered book *De Antiquitate Ecclesiae Britannicae* (1572) presented to Queen Elizabeth, Matthew Parker, archbishop of Canterbury, designed the pattern of a rose bush, a personification of the queen.⁶ Using the symbolic allegory of the Tudor rose, Parker was able to represent his social as well as spiritual relationship to the queen: the enclosed garden flourished with flowers—carnations, daisies

⁴ Natalie Zemon Davis, “Beyond the Market: Books as Gifts in Sixteenth-Century France,” *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society* 33, (1983): 71. For more information about gift exchanges, see also her book *The Gift in Sixteenth-Century France* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 2000).

⁵ Lisa M. Klein, “Your Humble Handmaid: Elizabethan Gifts of Needlework,” *Renaissance Quarterly* 50 (1997): 471.

⁶ This book is in the British Library (C.24.b.8). For more discussion and the illustration, see *Ibid.*, 472-474, 486, fig. 1.

and, pansies along with a rose—and four deer embroidered in the book refer to the queen as the Virgin Mary in the Garden of Eden.⁷

As exemplified in Parker's embroidered book dedicated to the queen, the flower was a favorite subject among women. Flower-motif books were often presented to aristocratic patrons, as evident in William Smith's flower poem, Esther Inglis's flower-illustrated manuscripts, and Thomas Palmer's botanical emblem books.

William Smith's Flower Poem

Handwritten poems were one of the most popular New Year's gifts among the English aristocracy during the reign of Queen Elizabeth. In the contemporary gift-exchange system, poets often dedicated their works for recompense such as money, lodging, patronage, or political protection. While little is known about the English poet William Smith, it seems probable that he, like other poets, hoped for a reward when he dedicated his poem *A new yeares Guifte: made vpon certen Flowers* to Lady Mary Sidney Herbert (1561-1621), countess of Pembroke.⁸ Although Smith was not known to Lady Herbert, he fully describes and praises her virtue and beauty in his handwritten manuscript:⁹

⁷ For more discussion about Parker and the symbolic meaning of the embroidered copy, see Cyril Davenport, *English Embroidered Bookbindings* (London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trübner and Company, 1899), 60-63; and Klein, "Your Humble," 474-475.

⁸ The manuscript is in the British Library, London (MS Add. 35186); rpt. in *The Poems of William Smith*, ed. Lawrence Sasek (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1970). Also the whole poem is quoted in Frances B. Young, *Mary Sidney, Countess of Pembroke* (London: David Nutt, 1912), 181-184.

⁹ In the introduction, William Smith addresses Pembroke: "My Muse presumes to offer you, Although unknown [. . .]" In the system of exchanging gifts, it was not necessary that the giver be known to the receiver. See Young, *Mary Sidney*, 182. For more discussion about Lady Mary Sidney Herbert, see the section "Madame de Sidney," in this chapter.

It is a saying true, and that of oulde,
 Dutie, and zeale, can neuer bee to boulde,
 Throughe. wch: My Muse presumes to offer you,
 Althoughe unknown, yet dutious loue, and trewe:
 Wishing your honors, may still with. virtue. runne,
 And lieu, for length (euen to outstrip the sunne:
 Your pietie, bee such, that you may charme,
 The hightest Heaun's, to garde you from all harme.
 Liue longe, and proper still, and let your eies,
 behoulde all happynes: who otherwise,
 shall wish, The Ruler of the Earthe,
 shall cause, that he himself, shall curse his Birthe.
 Thus I deuine, the keeper of the skies,
 Shall still protect you, from your enemies.
 Your ho: Ladyshippes.
 Deuoted seruante
 Will'm: smithe.

I have no lande therefore the fertile earthe,
 Affordes mee nothing unto you to presente:
 The Flowers, I offer, in my braine had Birthe,
 They wante sweete smells, yet may they yield content:
 For eie, or Nose, small pleasure they do beare,
 They have their being, but to please the eare.

THE PRIMEROSE.

The Primerose, is the faire Spring's harbinger,
 And first sweete flower the wealthie Earth: doth yeeld,
 After the Heaun's, haue newlie crown'd the yeare,
 No flower appeares, before it, in the feelde:
 So: in trew worthe, and virtue, I do finde,
 You are the firste, the rest come lag behinde.

THE MARYGOULD. 2.

The marigoulde. Unto the newyeares **Sunne**
 Doth sprede it self like the eye spotted traine,
 Of **Juno's Birde**, But his daies iourney done
 In discontent, Shee shrowdes hir cheeks againe:
 So: your brighte fauours shine
 Do make mee sprede:
 But your least showe of frowens,
 Do strike mee deade.

THE GILLYFLOWER.

The **Gillyflower** hath an odoriferous smell,
 And beares an intermingled pretie hew,

But whether the carnation or it doth most excel
For showe, and coler, that I leaue to you:
Even so I knowe not, whether yor: honor. Or your Face
Both sett together, Giues the greather grace.

THE VIOLETT.

The **violet** doth growe in groue or feeldes,
In hedges, or in gardens, or high waies,
But whereso'ere it growes, it pleasure yeeldes:
So: where I come, I allwaies finde yor: praise,
Your name, and virtue too, all people heare
and touch with wounder, euerie common care.

THE. COWSLIPP.

The Cowslipp. Doth couer all the feeldes,
With purp'led state: all ritchlie beautified,
For then Dame Flora mickle pleasure yeelds,
All smelling flowers: most heau'nly glorified:
So: your ritch vertues, dispers'd both farr and neare,
Make all your honors shine, your name full deare.

TIME.

Time is no flower, but an hearbe of grace,
More pretious, then the pearles on Libyan shore
Who gathers Time. Sure planted in his place:
Shall fine, all heauenly sentes, In heau'ns faire Bower
In wch faire Garden: the seate of Glorious rest:
God graunte your Soule, with Saincts may e're bee blest.

THE ROSE. 3. F.

The Garden's beautie, the fragrant smelling ROSE.
Doth daigne amongst the lowlie weedes to growe,
And doth by humblenes, no glorie loose,
But smells with sweeter sente, by growing lowe:
So: you faire **ROSE OF HONOR I**, haue harde,
Doth wish goodwill, the least desert regarde.

In the introduction and seven stanzas of his flower poem, Smith creates an image of the flower bouquet containing six different flowers—the primrose, marigold, gillyflower, violet, cowslip, and rose—and one herb—thyme. His choice of flowers originates not only from their beauty and aroma, but also from their religious symbolism. Even since the

Middle Ages, these species were the flowers most often illustrated in books of hours. By adopting flowers as the subject of his poem, Smith was able to give visual expression to Lady Herbert's beauty and virtue.¹⁰

Esther Inglis's Flower-Illustrated Manuscripts

The calligrapher and miniaturist Esther Inglis (1571-1624) was a contemporary of Le Moyne. She created floral illustrated manuscripts as gifts in England and Scotland. After she was born in London, her parents, Huguenot refugees who had escaped from the French Protestant persecution around 1569, settled in Edinburgh.¹¹ Educated by her parents—her father Nicholas Langlois, master of the French School in Edinburgh, and her mother Marie Presot, skilled calligrapher, both from Dieppe, a city renowned for cartography and calligraphy—Inglis was well aware of the French manuscript tradition, which became one of main prototypes for her manuscripts. After her marriage around 1596 to Bartholomew Kello (d. 1631), an official at the court of James VI, Inglis produced her manuscripts as gift books hoping for some kind of reward from the recipients of her husband's services. In most cases Inglis was not known to her dedicatees, including Queen Elizabeth, Prince Maurice of Nassau, the Earl of Essex and the Vicomte

¹⁰ In England, painting was considered inferior to poetry because the subject of painting was believed to be reality while poetry was considered imagination. Only a few artists, such as miniaturists Nicholas Hilliard and Issac Oliver, were mentioned and praised by contemporary poets. See Graham Parry, "Van Dyck and the Caroline Court Poets," in *Van Dyck 350*, ed. Susan J. Barnes and Arthur K. Wheelock (Washington, D.C.: National Gallery of Art, 1994), 247. For the further discussion of the rivalry between poetry and painting in seventeenth-century England, see Claire Pace, "'Delineated lives': Themes and Variations in Seventeenth-Century Poems about Portraits," *Word and Image* 2 (1986): 1-17.

¹¹ For more information about her biography, see Elspeth Yeo, "Inglis, Esther (1570/71-1624)," *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004, <http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/15292>; A. H. Scott-Elliot and Elspeth Yeo, "Calligraphic Manuscripts of Esther Inglis (1571-1624): A Catalogue," *The Papers of the Bibliographical Society of America* 84 (March 1990):11-86; and Susan Frye, "Materializing Authorship in Esther Inglis's Books," *Journal of Medieval and Early Modern Studies* 32 (Fall 2002): 469-491.

de Rohan.¹² For example, in her dedication in *Quotations from the Psalms and Proverbs* (1605) Inglis, “a stranger,” enthusiastically sought to reach out to Lady Susanna Herbert (1587-1629), who had recently married Philip Herbert (1584-1649):¹³

To the Right Noble Vertuous and Honorable Ladie Susanna Ladie Herbert:
The Bee draweth noght (most noble and vertuous Ladie) huny [honey] from the
fragrant herbis of the garding for hir self: no more have I payned myself many
yearis to burie the talent God hes geven me in oblivion–And therefore albeit I be a
stranger and no way known to your Ladyship yitt have I tane the boldnes to
present you with thir few flouris that I have collected of Dame Floras blossomes:
Thrusting your Ladyship will accept heirof als kindlie as from my heart I have
done it, and in humilitie offers the same to your Ladyship and the rather becaus it
is the work of a woman of one, desyrus to serve and honour your Ladyship, in
any thinge it shall please your Ladyship to command. Gif heireafter I may
understand this litill thing to be agreeable to you, truelie I shal accompt my selfe
the more fortunat to have the favourable acceptance of one of the most renowned
Ladies of this Isle in godliness and verteu. Not myndit to werie your Ladyship
with forder Epistle, I pray God blis and preserve your Ladyship, and your noble
husband in long life, good health and prosperitie. At London this XX of Februar
1605. Your Ladyship’s humble and obedient servant for ever to command,
ESTHER INGLIS.¹⁴

By expressing her “desirous [desire] to serve Lady Herbert,” Inglis seems to have expected Herbert’s future patronage in addition to a reward for this manuscript. As Tjan-Bakker points out, seeking patronage was highly competitive in Inglis’s time and required extra effort from new applicants.¹⁵ In order to please Lady Herbert, Inglis presented her with “thir few flouris [flowers] that I [Inglis] have collected of Dame Floras blossomes,” illustrated as a pot with vines, flowers, and a bunch of fruits surrounding the text.

¹² Anneke Tjan-Bakker, “Dame Flora’s Blossoms: Esther Inglis’ Flower-Illustrated Manuscripts,” *English Manuscript Studies 1100-1700*, 9 (2000): 49-50.

¹³ The manuscript is in the Houghton Library, Harvard University (MS. Typ.428.I).

¹⁴ Quoted in Scott-Elliot and Yeo, “Calligraphic,” 26-27.

¹⁵ Tjan-Bakker, “Dame Flora’s,” 52.

Flower-illustrated manuscripts seem to have been popular as New Year's gift items in sixteenth- and early seventeenth-century England. Sixteen of the over fifty-five manuscripts identified as being by Inglis include flower illustrations that accompany religious texts such as the Proverbs and Psalms (see Appendix 5). At least six of her flower-illustrated manuscripts were dedicated as New Year's gifts, and the recipients included Robert Sidney, the Countess of Bedford (1581-1627) and Lady Erskine of Dirletoun (d. 1621).¹⁶ Written on vellum and in small size (79x104 mm, 81x105 mm, and 79x105 mm, respectively) they look significantly different from her other manuscripts. Typically they include a title-pages (fig. 91) illustrated with flower borders in a gold ground. Each text page (fig. 92) contains a species of flowers, herbs, birds or butterflies at the top, recalling the books of hours in the Ghent-Bruges style.¹⁷ Inglis, who was mostly known for her writing skills, copied most of those images from already existed materials, including books of hours, model books and prints.¹⁸

Inglis was aware of the appeal of flower-illustrated manuscripts as a valuable collector's item.¹⁹ In her dedications to William Douglas, Earl of Morton (1607), and Queen Elizabeth (1599), Inglis suggested that they place her flower manuscript in their cabinets:²⁰

¹⁶ See no. 2, 3, and 4 on the list of Appendix 5.

¹⁷ The same observation is found in *Ibid.*, 52.

¹⁸ The sources for Inglis's illustrated images are discussed in *Ibid.*, 54-. The pictorial sources for Inglis's flower manuscripts include *Florae Deae* (c. 1590), a set of engravings, private collection, and *Fiori Naturali per Ricami d'ogni sorte* (c. 1600), a set of engravings, New York: Pierpont Morgan Library (PML 37979).

¹⁹ For Inglis's manuscript as a collector's item, see Tjan-Bakker, "Dame Flora's," and Georgianna Ziegler, "Hand-Ma[i]de Books: The Manuscripts of Esther Inglis, Early-Modern Precursors of the Artist's Book," *English Manuscript Studies 1100-1700* 9 (2000): 73-87.

That one unknown to your Lo[rds]hip] has emboldned hir selfe to present you with a few grapes of hir collection, I hope your Lo: shal not altogether mislyk therof. Therefore sen I hard of your cumming to this countrie, I have bene exercised in perfyting this little book dedicated to your Lo: Beseeching you accept of it and the rather because it is a womans work. Thus assuring thir blossomes I have collected of Dame Flora shall have sum hid corner in your Lo: cabinet, I pray God (most noble Lord) to have your always in his keeping.²¹

This little present, written by my hand, in a foreign land, might obtain a place in some retired corner of your cabinet.²²

Although Inglis was not an inventive writer or miniaturist and adopted her texts and images from existing sources, her hand-drawn floral images gained her manuscripts significant acclaim as collectors' items. As Tjan-Bakker points out, "it is not in Morton's 'library' that Esther Inglis hopes her work will find a place, but in his 'cabinet'."²³ Her flower-illustrated manuscripts must have been attractive as collectible items for those interested in collecting rare and exotic plants from the New World for their cabinet of curiosities. Furthermore, the religious symbolism of flowers provided her manuscripts with spiritual qualities. In *Octonaries upon the Vanitie and Inconstancie of the World*, Inglis discusses flowers as a vanitas symbol:²⁴

The world a gardine is: The floures her pleasures are:
Of faire and fragrant ones, it hath exceeding plainty
The pale-hewde Flowre de Luce, The Rose so sweet and dainty,

²⁰ Esther Inglis, *Argumenta in singulorum, capitum Evangelii Matthaei Apostoli, per tetrasticha manu Estherae Inglis exarata Londini xxvi Iuanuarii, 1607*, dedicated to William Douglas, Earl of Morton, now in private collection; *Le Livre des Pseaumes escrites en diverses sortes de letters par Esther Anglois francoise. A Lislebourg en Escosse 1599*, dedicated to Queen Elizabeth, currently in Oxford: Christ Church (MS. 180).

²¹ Quoted in Tjan-Bakker, "Dame Flora's," 61.

²² Quoted in Frye, "Materializing," 483.

²³ Tjan-Bakker, "Dame Flora's," 61.

²⁴ See no. 1 on the list of Appendix 5.

All sortee of Gillifoure, whose fine parfume be rare,
And there the Soussy doth beyond his fellows thryve,
The Vyolet is there, and there the Pansye groce;
But Death the winter is, that straight away doth dryve
The Luce with all the reste; The Gillifloure and Rose.²⁵

It was crucial for gift books to have spiritual value as well as aesthetic beauty.

Inglis's handmade books must have impressed the recipient's spiritual nature, since handwriting and illustrating skills were praised as a gift from God since the Middle Ages. To emphasize the handmade quality of her manuscripts, Inglis included her self-portrait as holding a pen (fig. 93) in the *Octonaries upon the Vanitie and Inconstancie of the World* (1601). Moreover, in her "hand-wrought" Psalms, embroidered with a Tudor rose and crown and dedicated to Queen Elizabeth in 1599, Inglis constantly reinforced that the manuscript was made as "fruits [fruits] de ma plume [pen]" and once again expressed her wish for placing the book in the queen's cabinet: "petit present, escrit de ma main, au pais estranger, pourra obtenir place en quelque coing retire de vostre cabinet."²⁶

As Susan Frye emphasizes, once accepted, gifts in a collector's cabinet, whether private or public spaces, set up social bonds between givers and receivers.²⁷ In one account (1564), Sir James Melville (1535-1617), the Scottish ambassador, for example, recalls precious items in Queen Elizabeth's bed-chamber: "She [Queen Elizabeth] took me to her bed-chamber and opened a little cabinet, wherein were divers little pictures

²⁵ Quoted in *Ibid.*, 66.

²⁶ For more discussion about this manuscript, see Klein, "Your Humble," 474. Inglis continually mentioned that her manuscripts were "*escrit de ma main*," "*fait de ma main*," "*escrit et trace par ma plume et pinceau*." See Ziegler, "Hand-Made Books," 76. Ziegler further approaches Inglis's manuscript with the concept of book as holder or container. See *Ibid.*, 83.

²⁷ Frye, "Materializing," 483. For more study of women's use of needlework for political and social purposes, see Susan Frye and Karen Robertson, ed. *Maids and Mistresses, Cousins and Queens: Women's Alliances in Early Modern Europe* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1999), 167-168 and 180, n. 4.

wrapt within paper, and their names written with her own hand upon the papers.”²⁸

Bedroom accommodations in sixteenth-century English royal palaces and aristocrats’ houses were generally furnished with a small chest or cabinet richly ornamented for public display. Jewel-like miniature paintings, dedicated poems and other valuables were placed in this cabinet. For example, Philip Sidney offers a glimpse of such a cabinet in his sonnet:

some faire booke doth find,
with gilded leaves or colourd Velume playes,
or at the most on some fine picture styayes,
but never heeds the fruit of writer’s mind:
So when thou saw’st in Nature’s cabinet [...]”²⁹

The illustrated manuscripts “with gilded leaves or colourd velume” recall Inglis’s handmade book that was offered to establish intimacy with her patrons. Designed for pleasing both the recipients’ eyes and spirits, Inglis’s flower manuscripts achieved their goal and were widely placed in collector’s cabinets as independent works of art.

Thomas Palmer’s “Vegetable Emblem” Manuscripts

While little is known about Thomas Palmer (1540-1626), he is the author of the so-called “vegetable emblem” books made at the end of the sixteenth century.³⁰ There are two known botanical emblem manuscripts by Palmer, including the first collection of Ashmole 767 in the Bodleian library, Oxford, and two volumes of *The Sprite of Trees*

²⁸ A. Francis Steuart, ed., *Memoirs of Sir James Melville of Halhill, 1535-1617* (New York: E. P. Dutton and Company, 1930), 94.

²⁹ See Sidney’s sonnet 11, *Astrophil and Stella*. The passage is quoted in Patricia Fumerton, “‘Secret’ Arts: Elizabethan Miniatures and Sonnets,” *Representations* (Summer, 1986), 75.

³⁰ Thomas Palmer’s manuscript Ashmole 767 has been known as the “vegetable emblems” since the description appeared in the Bodleian catalogue.

and Herbes in the British Library (Add. MS. 18040).³¹ *The Sprite of Trees and Herbes* is the amplified and revised version of the badly mutilated Ashmole 767.³²

Comprising 223 emblems in two volumes, the British Library manuscript was created as a New Year's gift for Lord Burghley (1520-1598) in 1598.³³ However, the gift was dedicated instead to his son Robert Cecil (1563-1612) in 1598/99 because of Lord Burghley's death in August of that year. In his letter to Cecil, Palmer mentions the title of this manuscript:

The worke I have intituled the sprite of trees, & herbes, which I thinke fitte to be bestowed vppon your honour, being the sprite of that tree, from whence I have to my no smale comferte, gathered so often, & so good fruite.³⁴

Each of these emblems consists of a handwritten motto or Bible quotation in Latin, commentary in English, and a hand-painted illustration in a square between them. Palmer adapted many of these emblems in *The Sprite of Trees and Herbes* from the works of others, such as Joachim Camerarius the Younger (1534-1598).³⁵ For example, Palmer's bending reed (fig. 94) is illustrated similarly to the reed in Camerarius's *Symbolorum et*

³¹ The Ashmole 767 consists of two collections of emblems. The first manuscript of 200 emblems has 127 completed in watercolors of flowers, trees, herbs and fruits along with poems and mottoes attached. The second manuscript, which English poet William Browne of Tavistock (c. 1590-c. 1645) adapted after the first collection, is mostly identical to the first except for the arranged order. For details of Ashmole 767, see Gillian Wright, "The Growth of an Emblem: Some Contexts for Bodleian Library MS Ashmole 767," in *Emblems and The Manuscript Tradition*, ed. Laurence Grove, Glasgow Emblem Studies 2 (Glasgow: University of Glasgow, 1997), 81-99.

³² Percy Simpson first identified the author of Ashmole MS 767 as Thomas Palmer and dated in 1598. For details, see Percy Simpson, "Two Emblem Books: Thomas Palmer's Emblems in Ashmole MS. 767," *The Bodleian Quarterly Record* 6 (1930): 172-173.

³³ An index by plant's name and author's explanation in Latin is attached in the end of the manuscript. It has been generally assumed that Ashmole 767 was also made to be dedicated to the same Lord. See Rosemary Freeman, *English Emblem Books* (New York: Octagon Books, 1966), 235-236 and Wright, "The Growth," 84.

³⁴ *The Sprite of Trees and Herbes*, British Library (Add. MS. 18040), fol. 2.

³⁵ Camerarius will be further discussed in depth in this chapter.

Emblematum ex re Herbaria Desumptorum (Nuremberg, 1590, fig. 95), but with some slight alterations.³⁶ In order to achieve the effect of a “pure” vegetable emblem Palmer eliminated Camerarius’s detailed landscape and allowed his plant to occupy all the space available in the square. He also replaced Camerarius’s emblematic motto “*Flectimvr non frangimvr*” (“bending not broken”) with a quotation from 2 Corinthians 12:10: “*Cum infirmor, potens sum*” (“For when I am weak, then I am strong”), and added commentary under the illustration:

The whistlinge reed that in the marish growes
Is bent and bowde with euerie winde yt blowes,
And for it giues and yeilds it is not seen
It by those windes hath euer broken been.
Right soe the Church of some one did personate
That worldinges check but neuer giue’t the Mate.

By selecting the plant that applies to the Bible and including his own contemplation Palmer stresses how plants relate to spiritual teaching.

Palmer’s *The Sprite of Trees and Herbes* is an ideal example of the emblematic interpretation of nature. In his dedication to Lord Burghley, he associates the political power of his dedicatee with trees and herbs by naming plants after powerful kings. For instance, he cites the “*telephium*” named after *Telephius*, king of Mysia, and the “*gentian*” named after *Gentio*, king of Illyria. He also refers to the virtues of plants in classical contexts; for example, focusing on “the association between certain plants and the gods of Greece and Rome: such as Apollo and the laurel, Bacchus and the ivy, Venus

³⁶ For these illustrations, see Wolfgang Harms and Ulla-Britta Kuechen, ed., *Joachim Camerarius, Symbola et Emblemata (Nürnberg 1590 bis 1604)*, 2 vols. (Graz: Akademische Druck- u. Verlagsanstalt, 1986/1988), 1: 105, no. 95; and MS Ashmole 767 in the Bodleian Library, fol. 7v. Due to the badly mutilated condition of the British library manuscript, I would like to use its revised version Ashmole 767 for the comparison. Both images are found also in Wright, “Growth,” 91-92, fig. 1 and 2.

and the myrtle.”³⁷ Moreover, Palmer notes how such association between great leaders and botany existed in the Bible, pointing out Solomon who was the wisest man of all and especially knowledgeable about botany. He quotes Matthew 7:20: “*De fructu arborem cognosco*” (“by their fruit you will recognize them”).³⁸ For Palmer, the potential of plants for teaching moral and spiritual lessons was crucial to his approach to his vegetable emblems. While most other printed emblems were intended to be targeted at local and expatriate public, Palmer’s handmade manuscripts, accompanied by Bible quotations and his own commentary, would have instead appealed to his dedicatee for private and devotional contemplation.³⁹

Botanical emblems are, in fact, found in most sixteenth-century emblem books, beginning with Andrea Alciati’s *Emblematum Liber* (Venice, 1546), which includes fourteen tree emblems. Viewing flowers as means of meditation is most thoroughly examined in the late sixteenth-century emblem book by Joachim Camerarius the Younger, who devoted his entire publications of emblems to plants.

Joachim Camerarius’s Botanical Emblem Book

A physician from Nuremberg, Joachim Camerarius the Younger, the older son of humanist Joachim Camerarius the Elder (1500-1574), was also renowned as a botanist.⁴⁰

³⁷ Ibid., 88.

³⁸ Ibid., 90. All English quotations from the Bible follow the New International Version (NIV).

³⁹ Palmer’s vegetable emblem manuscripts were never printed.

⁴⁰ Camerarius is introduced as a “Doctor et Botanicus celeberr” in his portrait engraving in the National Museum, Nürnberg (P.167). For the image as well as his biography, see Harms and Kuechen, *Joachim Camerarius*, 2: the facing page 1* (no number) and 1*-41*; and Jan Papy, “Joachim Camerarius’s Symbolorum & Emblematum Centuria Quatuor: From Natural Sciences to Moral Contemplation,” in

Educated first by his father in Nuremberg, Camerarius gained more knowledge of botany during his medical studies in Wittenberg, where he was able to build up a broad network of highly esteemed botanists, such as Conrad Gesner and Carolus Clusius. Not long after he had edited Pierandrea Matthioli's herbal *Compendium de Plantis Omnibus* (Frankfurt, 1586) Camerarius wrote his own *Hortus Medicus et Philosophicus* (Pharmaceutical and Philosophical Garden; Frankfurt, 1588) where, as evident from the title, his interest in combining botany and philology is well demonstrated.⁴¹ In this catalogue of his garden, he proclaims that a garden should be a museum for the purpose of instruction and adornment. Camerarius's use of classical and biblical quotations to achieve emblematic qualities in natural history was further developed in *Symbola et Emblemata* (Nuremberg, 1590-1604).⁴² Based on some of his own manuscript (1587) in the Stadtbibliothek Mainz (Hs. II/366), the Nuremberg emblem book consists of four hundred emblems concentrated in four collections. Each contains one hundred cuts of plants (1590), animals (1595), birds and insects (1596), and fishes and reptiles (1604). Each plate is illustrated with a copper engraving in a circular border by Hans Sibmacher (d. 1611).⁴³ A motto and a two-lined poem in Latin are included above and below each image. Camerarius's commentary on each emblem is inscribed in Latin on the facing page.

Mundus Emblematicus: Studies in Neo-Latin Emblem Books 4, ed. Karl A.E. Emenkel and Arnoud S.Q. Visser (Turnhout: Brepols, 2003), 201-234.

⁴¹ *Hortus medicus et philosophicus: in quo plurimarum stirpium breves descriptions [. . .] autore J. Camerario* (Frankfurt: J. Feyerabend, 1588).

⁴² The first collection of plants in Camerarius's *Symbola et Emblemata*, one of original copies is currently collected in the Glasgow University Library (SM260). It is reprinted in the first volume of Harms and Kuechen, *Joachim Camerarius*.

⁴³ For more information about Hans Sibmacher, see Mason Tung, "From Natural History to Emblem: A Study of Peacham's Use of Camerarius's *Symbola & Emblemata*," *Emblematica* 1 (Spring 1986): 54 and note 5.

Camerarius devoted the first collection of one hundred emblems, titled *Symbolorum et emblematum ex re Herbaria Desumptorum* (1590), entirely to plants. In his dedication letter to Jacobus Kurz à Senftenau, head chancellor of the empire, Camerarius mentions the reason why he chose plants as the first subject of his emblem book:

There can be no doubt that the souls of men will be advised in the first place by such a compendious and at the same time ingenious teaching, and that they will be instructed in various ways as well. For in this way moral precepts, packed up in certain wrappers and artistic inventions, are indeed impressed more easily and even in a better way (especially with the common people), the more because at once even qualities of wonderful natural things and memorable from history are explained with various examples.⁴⁴

Considered as the most pure creations, plants were selected in the first place to praise and celebrate God the Creator. Camerarius further emphasizes his admiration of God's Creation by including new discoveries of the New World such as the crown imperial (fig. 96), aloe and tulip (fig. 97). In the crown imperial, for example, Camerarius presents botanical knowledge of this hardly known species at that time. Moreover by including the motto "*Modesta iuventus, honesta senectus*" ("a modest youth, an honest age") above the image, he defines the plant as the object for contemplation. A poem written below the image explains the meaning of the emblem: "*Disce puer virtutem ex me, nec flore superbi: Matura tollat fruge senecta caput*" ("Learn, my age of the plant: Learn, my youth, from me the virtue, and not from the flower of the arrogant: old age may carry his

⁴⁴ Camerarius 1590, fol. A2r-A2v: "*Nec ulli dubium esse potest per ejusmodi compendiosam ac simul ingeniosam doctrinam animis hominum inprimis moneri, ac multis modis instrui. Nam haerent profecto, (praesertim apud vulgus) hac ratione sub quibusdam involucre et artificiosis inventionibus praecepta de virtute ac bonis moribus eo facilius ac melius, quod simul etiam rerum Naturalium proprietates admiratione dignae, nec non rerum gestarum memorabiles eventus variis exemplis exponantur*"; quoted in Papy, "Joachim Camerarius's," 203-204.

head upright, with ripe fruit of the mind”).⁴⁵ These spiritual qualities of plants were regarded as most suitable to teach “the souls of men.” Here again Camerarius’s interest in the combination of natural history and emblematics is successfully revealed.

Mason Tung rightly describes Camerarius’s emblem book as “an emblemized natural history,” as it drew fully from the botanist’s encyclopedic knowledge of natural history.⁴⁶ Camerarius gained his botanical knowledge from his own observations of nature as well as from his study of books by natural historians, such as Gesner, Otto Brunfels and Hieronymus Bock, among others. In particular, Camerarius’s botanical studies after life are illustrated in his flower drawing book, the so-called *Camerarius-Florilegium*, 1576-1590.⁴⁷ It consists of 469 drawings of plants on 193 sheets, where Camerarius worked diligently with all different colors and patterns of each species of flowers: for example, in *Violets* (fig. 98) and *Iris*es (fig. 99). His professional knowledge of botany gained while working on *Camerarius-Florilegium* must have been the basis for his botanical emblem book *Symbolorum et Emblematum ex re Herbaria Desumptorum*. His studies of sunflowers (fig. 100) and tulips (fig. 101), both introduced in Europe in the mid-sixteenth century, were used in the emblem “*Non inferior secutus*” (“following not the inferior”; I: 49) and “*Langvesco sole latente*” (“without the sun, I will languish”; I: 88).⁴⁸

⁴⁵ Quoted in Vignau-Wilberg, “Devotion,” 47.

⁴⁶ Tung, “From Natural,” 53.

⁴⁷ The manuscript is in the Universitätsbibliothk Erlangen-Nürnberg (Ms. 2764). The original size of these drawings is 35 x 24 cm. See Konrad Wickert, *Das Camerarius-Florilegium*, (Erlangen: Kulturstiftung der Länder, 1993); and “Süddeutsche Gartenkultur in der Zweiten Hälfte des 16. Jahrhunderts und das ‘Camerarius-Florilegium’,” in *Natur im Bild: Anatomie und Botanik in der Sammlung des Nürnberger Arztes Christoph Jacob Trew* exh. cat. (Erlangen: Universitätsbibliothk Erlangen-Nürnberg, 1995), 74-97.

⁴⁸ For both emblems, see Harms and Kuechen, *Joachim Camerarius* 1:49 and 88, respectively.

In the collection of *Symbolorum et Emblematum ex re Herbaria Desumptorum*, a variety of plants appear, but only one species is selected for each emblem. Camerarius's choice of plants depended solely on how effectively they represented the emblematic meaning. For example, he chose the heliotropes to illustrate the emblem "*Sidere 'mens eadem' mutata*" ("the stars change [but] the mind [remains] the same"; fig. 102), because the flower's consistent response to the sun, as portrayed with its blossoms and upper stem bending toward the sun, best fits into the intended spiritual meaning of the soul's sincere response to God. In this emblem, Camerarius explicates that the soul must always be oriented towards seeking God.

The interaction between emblematics and natural history was not new in the sixteenth century. In his zoological study *Historia Animalium* (Zurich, 1558), Gesner viewed animals in terms of their moral meanings, and transformed his knowledge of science into an emblematic contemplation. In some cases, he even brought Italian writer Andrea Alciato's (1492-1550) emblems into his *Historia Animalium*.⁴⁹ In Gesner's time, the two genres of emblematics and natural history were so closely related that the empirical knowledge of natural history provided the reader a key for uncovering the disguised meaning of emblems. Within the blurred boundaries between emblematics and natural history, it was not strange for a physician and botanist such as Camerarius to create an entire collection of botanical emblems.⁵⁰

Camerarius's *Symbola et Emblemata* was so popular that a variety of editions were published not only in Nuremberg, but also in Frankfurt, Heidelberg and Mainz, and

⁴⁹ For this specific example, see Wolfgang Harms, "On Natural History and Emblematics in the 16th Century," in *The Natural Sciences and the Arts* (Stockholm: Acta Universitatis Upsaliensis, 1985), 69.

⁵⁰ Wolfgang Harms points out that "the boundaries between natural history and emblematics are fluid." See Harms, "On Natural," 82.

distributed throughout European countries.⁵¹ Because of the spiritual and the natural historic value placed on Camerarius's emblem book, this work was esteemed by nobles, scholars, preachers and botanists, and used in various ways, for example, as references in their publications and in the decoration of public and private buildings.⁵²

The Combination of Emblematics and Natural History in England

Didactic Functions of Botanical Emblems

Emblem books, which first emerged as an important genre of literature in Italy in the 1530s, spread in importance throughout Western Europe by the end of sixteenth century.⁵³ The earliest known emblem book in England was Thomas Palmer's manuscript *Two Hundred Poosees* (1565-66).⁵⁴ The first printed emblem books in England were *A Theatre wherein be represented[...]* (London, 1568) by Jan van der Noot (1539/40-1595)⁵⁵ and *A Choice of Emblemes* (Leiden, 1586) by Geoffrey Withney (1548-1603).⁵⁶

⁵¹ For those different editions of *Symbola et Emblemata* printed between the sixteenth and the eighteenth centuries, see Papy, "Joachim Camerarius's," 221.

⁵² For example, Camerarius's emblems were used for decorating ceiling of the Knights' Hall of the castle of Dillingen. See Ibid., 222. His emblems designed for the purpose of meditation at the Lady Drury's Oratory in Hawstead Hall will be further examined in this chapter.

⁵³ Andrea Alciati's *Emblemata* (1531) is the first emblem book published in Italy.

⁵⁴ Thomas Palmer's emblem manuscript is in the British Library (Sloane 3794) and it is reprinted in John Manning, ed., *The Emblems of Thomas Palmer: Two Hundred Poosees, Sloane MS 3794*, (New York: AMS Press, 1988). Dedicated to Robert Dudley, Earl of Leicester (d. 1588), the manuscript is illustrated with sixty-nine woodcuts from continental emblem books. For details about Palmer's diverse use of continental emblem books, see Manning, *The Emblems*, and his article "Continental Emblem Books in Sixteenth-Century England: The Evidence of Sloane MS. 3794," *Emblematica* 1 (Spring 1986): 1-11. Also see Peter M. Daly, *The English Emblem and the Continental Tradition* (New York: AMS Press, 1988).

⁵⁵ Jan van der Noot's *A Theatre* was originally published in Dutch in London in 1568.

⁵⁶ For Geoffrey Withney's *A Choice of Emblemes*, the first printed English emblem book, see Henry Green, ed., *A Choice of Emblems by Geoffrey Whitney (1548-1603)* (New York: Benjamin Blom, 1967); and

During the Counter Reformation, the symbolic nature of emblems was widely exploited in Roman Catholic devotional art and literature as a tool for enhancing people's devotional practice. In England Catholic devotional emblem books were also widely circulated among the non-Catholics, as is evident in the extremely popular *Zodiacus Christianus* written by German Jesuit and preacher Jeremias Drexel (1581-1638). The original Latin version was published in Munich in 1618 and the earliest English version *The Christian Zodiack* was printed in Rouen in 1633.⁵⁷ Accompanied by a motto and a biblical quotation, each of the twelve emblematic images—a candle, a skull, a golden pyx, an altar, a rose bush with thorns, a fig tree, a balsam tree, a cypress tree, two spears and an olive wreath, a scourge and rods, anchor, and a lute—is a symbolic representation of God's word. The emblems appealed to readers because of their widely known moral and spiritual meanings. Drexel's choice of four different plant species—rose, fig tree, balsam tree and cypress tree—denote a contemporary spiritual emphasis on botanical subjects in particular.⁵⁸ For instance, the thorny rose bush (fig. 103), illustrated with the motto "Patience in Tribulation" and the Bible verse "Blesed are yee yt weepe now for yee shall laugh" (Luke 6:21), represents God's blessing promised to those who endure a painful

Geoffrey Whitney, *A Choice of Emblemes and Other Devises; Leyden 1586* (New York: Da Capo Press, 1969).

⁵⁷ For Drexel's biography and bibliography, see Karl Pörnbacher, *Jeremias Drexelius. Leben und Werken eines Barockpredigers*, (München: F. X. Seitz, 1965); and J. M. Blom, "A German Jesuit and His Anglican Readers: The Case of Jeremias Drexelius (1581-1638)," in *Studies in Seventeenth-Century English Literature, History and Bibliography: Festschrift for Professor T.A. Birrell on the Occasion of His Sixtieth Birthday*, ed. G.A.M. Janssens and F.G.A.M. Aarts, (Amsterdam: Rodopi, 1984), 41-51. Drexel's emblem book was too popular to be published in several different languages and versions. The original copy was engraved by Raphael Sadeler (c. 1560-1628). Later, in 1643, another English version, engraved by Wenceslaus Hollar, was published in London under the title *The Christians Zodiacke*. Later editions were published in Munich and Cologne, and again in London. For more about the popularity of Drexel's works in England, see Blom, "A German," 41-51; and Alan R. Young, "Wenceslaus Hollar, The London Book Trade, and Two Unidentified English Emblem Books," in *The English Emblem and The Continental Tradition*, ed. Peter M. Daly (New York: AMS Press, 1988), 151-202.

⁵⁸ For these illustrations, see Young, "Wenceslaus Hollar," 172-175, fig. 6-9.

earthly life. A fig tree (fig. 104) with the motto “Frequenting Sermons” symbolizes a wise man who listens to God’s word: “the wise man shall increase his wisdom by hearing” (Proverb 1:5). A balsam tree (fig. 105) represents a man of charity as reinforced in the motto “Almes deedes” and the verse “And hee gaue [gave] euery [every] man comadement [commandment] concerning his neighbour” (Ecclesiastes 17:14). A cypress tree (fig. 106) symbolizing a man of integrity is illustrated with the motto “Selfe-Contempt” and the verse “Except yee become as little Childeren, you shall not enter into ye kingdome of Heauen [Heaven]” (Matthew 18: 3).

Along with religious meanings, moral messages are also found in botanical emblems. For example, in Geoffrey Whitney’s *A Choice of Emblemes* (Leiden, 1586) the motto “*Vitae, aut morti*” (“For life, for death”) is illustrated with flowers and small creatures (fig. 107): flowers were seen to represent both life and death, because bees and spiders suck from the same flowers, but one makes honey and the other, poison.⁵⁹ In another motto “*Turpibus exitium*” (“Destruction for the wicked”) in *A Choice of Emblemes*, a rose with thorns (fig. 108) becomes a symbol of the wicked as its scent draws a beetle sitting on the flower to its death.⁶⁰

Le Moyne’s “Emblematic” Florilegia

As depicted in Le Moyne’s watercolor drawing *Young Daughter of the Picts* (c.1585-88, fig. 109), which includes a variety of flowers from the New World, such as the garden tulip, mourning iris and marvel of Peru, Le Moyne was aware of new species

⁵⁹ Whitney, *A Choice*, no. 51.

⁶⁰ *Ibid.*, no 21.

of flowers that had been recently imported to Europe.⁶¹ However, he did not include those new species in his *florilegia*, but rather used common garden flowers. For Le Moyne, the spiritual meaning attached to each flower was important, much as its aesthetic beauty was. The popularity and wide circulation of emblem books in late sixteenth-century England also gave rise to the emblematic nature of Le Moyne's *florilegia*. The illusionistic frames found in his images recall the circular or rectangular shapes often used in emblem books. One could even suggest that an explanatory text or poem was intended to be added later into his *florilegia*. Much as in contemporary emblem books, Le Moyne's *florilegia* represent the distinctive worldview of the late sixteenth century, with its combination of art, science, and emblematics.

As evident in the botanical emblem manuscripts by Thomas Palmer and Joachim Camerarius, flowers were popular motifs in late sixteenth- and early seventeenth-century English literary traditions long after the production of books of hours had ceased. As the spiritual qualities and the aesthetic beauty of flower subjects made them appropriate gifts for English aristocrats, the poetic and emblematic qualities of Le Moyne's floral watercolors would have fit comfortably into this English gift-exchange tradition.

"Madame de Sidney"

Little is known about the recipients of Le Moyne's watercolors. The sonnet accompanying the British Museum watercolors, for example, does not specify to whom and for what purpose they would have been created. Given the fact that Le Moyne's woodcuts *La Clef des Champs* were dedicated to "Madame de Sidney," most scholars

⁶¹ Hulton, *The Work*, 1:164.

agree that Le Moyne created his watercolors for her as well.⁶² While the identity of “Madame de Sidney” is still debated, this study argues that Mary Sidney Herbert, the Countess of Pembroke, was the Lady Sidney of Le Moyne’s dedication.

Many scholars, including Paul Hulton, believe her to be Lady Mary Dudley Sidney (1530/35-1586), wife of Sir Henry Sidney (1529-1586) and mother of Sir Philip Sidney. Hulton discounts her daughter Mary as a possible recipient of the watercolors by pointing out that it would not have been appropriate for her to be called “Madame de Sidney” after her marriage to Henry Herbert (c.1538-1601) in 1577.⁶³ Along with Mary Sidney and Mary Herbert, two other possible individuals should also be considered: Frances Walsingham Sidney (1567-1632), countess of Essex, wife of Philip Sidney, and Barbara Gamage Sidney (1559-1621), countess of Leicester, wife of Robert Sidney (1563-1626).⁶⁴ However, little information exists about their lives or their patronage of literature and the arts.

The Sidneys were well known to French Huguenot refugees, including Le Moyne, since their London residence, St. Anthony’s, was leased to them to stay and was one of the meeting places for French Protestant congregation during the 1560s and 1570s.⁶⁵

⁶² Jacques le Moyne de Morgues, *La Clef des Champs* (Blackfriars, 1586). See Appendix 4 for the entire English translation of Le Moyne’s dedication to Lady Sidney.

⁶³ Hulton, *The Work*, 1:186, and 2: pl. 65.

⁶⁴ Frances became Lady Sidney in 1583 and gave birth to her first child Elizabeth (1585-1612) on October, 1585. Barbara married to Robert Sidney in 1584 and gave birth to her eldest daughter Mary probably in 1587. Their limited biographies are sometimes found in accounts of the lives of others. For information on Lady Frances Sidney, see H. R. Woudhuysen, “Sidney, Sir Philip (1554-1586),” *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, <http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/printable/25522>; and Simon Adams et al., “Walsingham, Sir Francis (c. 1532-1590),” *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, <http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/printable/28624>. For information on Barbara Sidney, see Madeleine Gray, “Sidney, Barbara, countess of Leicester (c. 1559-1621),” *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, <http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/printable/67993>.

However, it was Mary Sidney Herbert, not Lady Mary Dudley Sidney, who was at the center of the social and political power structure of England in 1586 when Le Moyne's woodcuts were dedicated to "Madame de Sidney." Having failed to earn Queen Elizabeth's trust, Henry Sidney had played no role at court since 1579.⁶⁶ Moreover, Lady Mary Sidney, who had once been one of Queen's favored court ladies and a member of her privy chamber, had encountered trouble at court after she was terribly disfigured by small-pox while nursing Queen Elizabeth in 1562. Her affliction made it difficult for her to appear in public and apparently forced her to leave court life in 1579.⁶⁷

As mentioned in his biography, Le Moyne's connection to the Sidneys was made through Philip Sidney. Philip, who had had an enthusiastic passion for the journey to the New World since childhood, must have been interested in Le Moyne's experiences in Florida.⁶⁸ He not only introduced the artist to his friend Walter Raleigh and the botanist Carolus Clusius, but also to his family members, including his sister Mary.

Lady Mary Herbert began into her official court life by joining the Queen's ladies-in-waiting in 1575. Two years later, in April 1577, she married Henry Herbert, the

⁶⁵ Duncan-Jones, *Sir Philip*, 25-26. Moreover, the Sidney family hired several talented refugees as their tutors from whom they learned the French language and literature. For example, Philip Sidney's French tutor was John (Jean) Tassel.

⁶⁶ For the biography of Sir Henry Sidney, see Wallace T. MacCaffrey, "Sidney, Sir Henry (1529-1586)," *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, <http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/printable/25520>.

⁶⁷ For an account of the Sidneys in crisis, see Michael G. Brennan, *The Sidneys of Penshurst and the Monarchy, 1500-1700* (Burlington; Ashgate Publishing Company, 2006), 69-70. For the biography of Lady Sidney, see Simon Adams, "Sidney, Mary, Lady Sidney (1530/35-1586)," *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, <http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/69749>; and Elizabeth Darracott Wheeler, *Ten Remarkable Women of the Tudor Courts and Their Influence in Founding the New World, 1530-1630* (Lewiston, Queenston, Lampeter: E. Mellon Press, 2002), especially chapter 5, entitled "Mary Dudley Sidney."

⁶⁸ Since Henry Sidney was appointed as an ambassador to Paris in 1556, the Sidneys indeed became part of the French expedition to Florida. They sponsored the journey as well as Grenville's voyage to Roanoke Island.

Earl of Pembroke. The marriage not only established bonds between the Sidneys and the Herberts, but also provided Lady Herbert with the political and social authority of the Herberts, one of the wealthiest and most powerful families in England. She also remained closely connected to the Sidney circle even after her marriage. Like her brother Philip, a renowned poet and the author of *Arcadia*, Lady Herbert was an art lover and patron of both art and literature. As in William Smith's flower poem dedicated to her, contemporary artists and writers often praised Lady Herbert's virtue and beauty.

Lady Herbert was also deeply involved in her brother's publications. For example, when Philip sent her his working copy of *Arcadia*, he gave her the right to control the circulation of the manuscript: "Now, it is done onely for you, only to you: if you keepe it to your selfe, or to such friends, who will weigh errors in the balance of goodwill."⁶⁹ Lady Herbert's influential position in the publication of her brother's poem attracted the attention of both contemporary writers and artists. For instance, when Le Moyne dedicated his woodcuts *La Clef des Champs* to "Madame de Sidney" in 1586, he asked for her protection for publication: "Since I know you favour the liberal arts, I have made bold to dedicate to you what I have prepared, for publication under the protection of your name."⁷⁰

After Philip died unexpectedly in 1586, Lady Herbert dedicated herself to publish his works as well as to translate the Psalms from French to English.⁷¹ Since Lady Herbert's fame was not from her own writings but from those of her brother Philip, she

⁶⁹ Margaret P. Hannay, "The Countess of Pembroke's Agency in Print and Scribal Culture," in *Women's Writing and the Circulation of Ideas: Manuscript Publication in England, 1550-1800*, ed. George L. Justice and Nathan Tinker (Cambridge; Cambridge University Press, 2002), 26.

⁷⁰ See Appendix 4.

⁷¹ Lady Herbert first published *The Arcadia* in 1593. There are several different editions printed later.

often introduced herself as the “sister of Sir Philip Sidney,” as found in her business letter (British Library, Add. MS 12503, fol. 151): “it is the Sister of Sir Philip Sidney who yow ar to right and who will worthily deserve the same.”⁷² Moreover, in her portrait engraving (1618, fig. 110), the artist Simon de Passe (c. 1595-1647) identifies her as “Mary Sidney” not “Mary Herbert.”⁷³ In this portrait, which depicts her holding of her translation of *Dauids Psalmes*, the pride she felt as Sidney’s sister is significantly engraved above her in an engrailed broad arrow that appears in the Sidney coat of arms.⁷⁴ Two more portraits were also dedicated to her as “Lady Sidney”: Nicholas Hilliard’s watercolor on vellum (c. 1590, fig. 111) and Jean de Courbet’s engraving.⁷⁵ As evident in the inscription “*The Lady Mary / Sydney Countess / of Pembroke*” on the reverse of Hilliard’s miniature portrait, Mary Herbert was frequently referred to “Lady Mary Sidney,” even after her marriage to the Earl of Pembroke.

Around 1578, the Countess of Pembroke opened Wilton House in Wiltshire to writers, scientists and artists, and the house soon became the most important center in England for cultural and artistic activities. As John Aubrey (1626-1697) describes in his *Memoires of Naturall Remarques in the County of Wiltshire* (1685), where he writes about Wiltshire’s plants, beasts, fishes, birds and insects, Wilton House was surrounded by a rich natural habitat, one that would have provided writers, scientists and artists an

⁷² Margaret P. Hannay, “Herbert [née Sidney], Mary, countess of Pembroke (1561-1621),” *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, <http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/printable/13040> (accessed April 9, 2007).

⁷³ The engraving is in the National Portrait Gallery in London (NPG D19186).

⁷⁴ For more discussion about Lady Mary Herbert’s pride as Sidney’s sister, see Hannay, *The Countess*, 21.

⁷⁵ Both are in the National Portrait Gallery in London (NPG 5994 and NPG D5493 respectively).

ideal place to study life.⁷⁶ According to Aubrey, Philip Sidney often stayed at Wilton while he was working on *Arcadia* and “she [the Countess of Pembroke] kept for her Laborator in the house Adrian Gilbert (vulgarly called Dr. Gilbert) halfe-brother to Sir Walter Raleigh, who was a great Chymist in those days and a Man of excellent naturall Parts.”⁷⁷ Other scientists and writers, including Thomas Howell (fl. 1567-1581), Gervase Babington (1550-1610), Hugh Sanford (fl. 1590-c. 1600), Samuel Daniel (1562-1619), Thomas Moffett (1553-1604), John Davies of Hereford (c. 1565-1618) and William Brone (1591-c. 1643), also joined the Herbert household at Wilton.⁷⁸ In particular, Moffett, renowned for his entomological study *Insectorum Sive Minimorum Animalium Theatrum* (1589), came to Wilton as the family physician and a pensioner in 1593.⁷⁹ He dedicated his poem *Silkewormes and their Flies* (1599) to “the most renowned Patronesse, and noble Nurse of Learning MARIE Countesse of Penbrooke.”⁸⁰ In the poem, Moffett not only grieves the death of silk moths, but also gives practical instructions for caring for sick worms, since Wilton was a center for wool and cloth production.⁸¹

⁷⁶ John Aubrey, *Aubrey's Natural History of Wiltshire: A Reprint of The Natural History of Wiltshire* (New York: Augustus M. Kelley Pub., 1969).

⁷⁷ Oliver Lawson Dick, ed., *Aubrey's Brief Lives* (Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press, 1957), 278-279 and 139. Written sometime between 1669 and 1696, *Aubrey's Brief Lives* includes 134 short biographies.

⁷⁸ For more details about the household at Wilton, see Lamb, “The Countess,” especially chapter 2.

⁷⁹ For information about Moffett's residence at Wilton, see Dick, *Aubrey's*, 139. Moffett was also spelled Moufet, Moffet, Muffet or Muffett. Moffett's *Insectorum* was dedicated to the Queen and is currently in the British Library (Sloane MS. 4014). Its 1200 folio-pages book was first published in London in 1634 and reprinted in George Thomson, ed., *Insectorum Sive Minimorum Animalium Theatrum: The Butterflies and Moths* (Lochmaben: George Thomson, 2000).

⁸⁰ Thomas Moffett, *The Silkewormes and their Flies* (1599), ed. Victor Houliston (Binghamton: Renaissance English Text Society, 1989).

⁸¹ Margaret P. Hannay, *Philip's Phoenix: Mary Sidney, Countess of Pembroke* (New York and Oxford, Oxford University Press, 1990), 113.

Moffett's *Silkewormes and their Flies* was a composite production indebted to other entomologists, including Conrad Gesner and Thomas Penny. As evident in his original manuscript of *Insectorum*, Moffett played an important role in coordinating the works of active incorporation of artists, scholars and publishers. He pasted about five hundred watercolor illustrations of insects, mostly butterflies and moths, from several different pictorial sources—Carolus Clusius, John White, and possibly Jacques le Moyne de Morgues—into his *Insectorum*.⁸² Moffett probably continued his interaction with these colleagues even after he moved to Wilton. Lady Herbert's passion for literature and the arts would have encouraged not only Moffett, but also other scholars and artists to continue their network of creative and scholarly activities at Wilton.⁸³

The Meditational Use of Floral Images

Pious women in sixteenth- and seventeenth-century England were encouraged to develop their private spiritual life through reading sacred books.⁸⁴ Protestant women read their Bibles and many of them had their own “prayer closet” where they prayed and meditated every day.⁸⁵ Anne Bathurst described her spiritual meditations in her closet in her diary:

⁸² Thomson, *Insectorum*, 16. Hulton suggests Moffett's folio 102.2 is probably by Le Moyne. See Hulton, *The Work*, 1:14.

⁸³ Unfortunately, very little is survived from Pembroke's Wilton House archives due to two large fires in the seventeenth century.

⁸⁴ Women devoted specific hours daily to their spiritual life. For example, Lady Anne Halkett set five hours a day for prayer and devotion. See Patricia Crawford, *Women and Religion in England 1500-1720* (New York; Routledge, 1993), 79.

⁸⁵ D.C. Mantz et al., “‘The Benefit of an Image, Without the Offence’: Anglo-Dutch Emblematics and Hall's Liberation of the Lyric Soul,” in *Anglo-Dutch Relations in the Field of the Emblem*, ed. Bart Westerweel, (Leiden: Brill, 1997), 262.

18 October 1680, 'went to my closet where all my devotions this day have bin full of incomparable sweetness'; 19 October, 'in good time went to my closet where my devotions were full of comport.'⁸⁶

Such closet meditation was encouraged by the Bishop of Exeter and later of Norwich, Joseph Hall, who was renowned for directing his contemporaries' spiritual lives. In his book *The Art of Divine Meditation* (1607), Hall emphasized the importance of spiritual meditation in the medieval tradition.⁸⁷ This medieval "*libro della natura*" (biblical book of nature) encouraged people to meditate on God as He was revealed in nature, including plants and creatures people encounter on a daily basis.⁸⁸ For example, Hall describes the spiritual lesson to be learned from garden flowers in his *Occasional Meditations* (1633):

LV. Upon the Sight of Tulips and Marigolds, etc. in His Garden

These flowers are true clients of the sun. How observant they are of his action and influence! At even they shut up as mourning for his departure, without whom they neither can nor would flourish; in the morning they welcome his rising with a cheerful openness; and at noon are fully displayed in a free acknowledgement of his bounty. Thus doth the good heart unto God. 'When thou turnedst away thy face I was troubled,' saith the man after God's own heart [Ps. 102:2]. 'In thy presence is life, yea, the fullness of joy' [Ps. 16:11]. Thus doth the carnal heart to the world; when that withdraws his favor he is dejected and revives with a smile. All is in our choice; whatsoever is our sun will thus carry us. Oh. God, be Thou to

⁸⁶ Ann Bathurst's "The fourth Booke of my daily observations on myself" (1680) is in the Bodleian library (MS Rawlinson Qe27). This passage is quoted in Crawford, *Women*, 82.

⁸⁷ Frank Livingstone Huntley, *Bishop Joseph Hall and Protestant Meditation in Seventeenth-Century England: A Study With the texts of The Art of Divine Meditation (1606) and Occasional Meditations (1633)* (Binghamton: Medieval & Renaissance Texts & Studies, 1981).

⁸⁸ In his book *The Devout Soul; or Rules of Heavenly Devotion* (1643), Joseph Hall emphasizes the importance of the meditation of God in nature: "Every herb, flower, spire of grass, every twig and leaf, every worm and fly, every scale and feather, every billow and meteor speaks the power and wisdom of their infinite Creator. Solomon sends the sluggard to the ant; Isaiah sends the Jews to the ox and the ass; our Saviour sends his disciples to the ravens, and to the lilies of the field. There is no creature of whom we may not learn something. We shall have spent our time ill in this great school of the world, if, in such store of lessons, we be non-proficients in Devotion:" rpt. in Joseph Hall, *The Works of Jeseeph Hall* (Oxford: D.A. Talboys, 1837), 6:482; quoted in Huntley, *Bishop*, 34.

me such as Thou art in Thyself. Thou shalt be merciful in drawing me, I shall be happy in following Thee.⁸⁹

Holy images, formerly forbidden in churches or homes after the Protestant Reformation, were now replaced by depictions of a variety of creatures found in nature.

This iconographic transformation changed the character of people's spiritual lives. As meditating God through "seeing" nature became a crucial part of their devotional lives, the sense of "seeing" began to be considered the supreme of the five senses. This idea is expressed by John Davies of Hereford (c. 1565-1618) in his poem *Microcosmos. The Discovery of the Little World, with the Government Thereof* (London, 1603):

Amonge the *pleasures* which are sensuall,
The vilst is that we *fee*le, by that we touch;
Because it is the Earthli'st *sense* of all:
The Tast's of better temper, though not much:
Smelling is light, and lightely more will grutch

At Vnsweete Savors, then in sweete will ioye;
The *Hearing* is more worthie farre then such,
Sith it's more *Airey* and doth lesse annoy,
Whereby we gaine the *faith* which we enjoy.

But *Seeing*, (*Sov'raigne* of each outward *sense*)
Holds most of Fire, which is in nature neere
To the *Celestiall Nature's* radiance;
Therefore this *sense* to *Nature* is most deere,
As that which hath (by *Nature's* right) no peere.
Thus much for *pleasures* which these *senses* giue,
Whereof the *best* must needs most *base* appeare
Compared to the *worst* our *Soules* receive,
Whose *powres* haue much more pow'r to take and giue.⁹⁰

⁸⁹ Quoted in Huntley, *Bishop*, 151. For more about Hall's meditation on flowers, see Chapters LXXXV: "Upon the Vision of a Lily" and XCIII: "Upon the Smell of a Rose," both from *Ibid.*, 168-169 and 174.

⁹⁰ Quoted in Norman K. Farmer, Jr., "Lady Drury's Oratory: The Painted Closet from Hawstead Hall," in *Poets and the Visual Arts in Renaissance England* (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1984), 78.

Sight, as praised in the poem, “holds most of Fire, which is in nature neere to the Celestial Nature’s radiance.” Because men depended primarily on sight to appreciate nature fully, the accuracy of pictures became more important for conveying images of nature. The naturalism of images in emblem books thus grew in significance for delivering symbolic and allegoric meaning, as Henri Estienne, a French publisher, points out in *The Art of Making Devices* (1646): “The chiefe aime of the Embleme is, to instruct us, by subjecting the figure to our view, and the sense to our understanding: therefore they must be something covert, subtile, pleasant and significative.”⁹¹

Lady Drury’s Oratory

Emblematic images were important for the everyday meditation of women, as illustrated by the painted closet of Lady Anne Drury (1572-1624). In this little room (seven feet square), three of the walls contain seven panels of mottoes at the top and fifty-eight emblematic paintings below in four levels (fig. 112). Originally built in the Hawstead House of Sir Robert and Lady Drury, the room was used for her meditation, encouraged by Joseph Hall, her chaplain and spiritual director at Hawstead.⁹² Sir John

⁹¹ Henri Estienne, *The Art of Making Devices*, trans. Thomas Blount (London: W. F. and J. G., 1646), 7; quoted in Michael Bath, *A Collection of Emblemes; George Wither* (Hants: Scolar Press, 1989), 3. One of the best-known emblem illustrators was Crispin de Passe the Younger. His engravings for Gabriel Rollenhagen’s *Nucleus Emblematum Selectissimum* (Arnheim, 1611) were so extremely popular as to be used over and over in later emblem books, including Francis Quarles’ *Emblemes* (London, 1635) and George Wither’s *A Collection of Emblemes Ancient and Modern* (London, 1635).

⁹² The Hawstead panels were dismantled and moved to the Hardwick House, Suffolk, around 1612, and are currently situated in the Christchurch Mansion in Ipswich. For further studies on this room, see Farmer, “Lady Drury’s,” 77-105; Heather Meakin, “Lady Anne (Bacon) Drury, Photograph of her closet (c. 1612),” in *Reading Early Modern Women: An Anthology of Texts in Manuscript and Print, 1550-1700*, ed. Helen Ostovich and Elizabeth Sauer (New York: Routledge, 2003), 480-481; and a booklet by Mary Halliwell, ed., *A Guide to the Hawstead Panels at Christchurch Mansion, Ipswich* (Ipswich: The Friends of the Ipswich Museum, 2006).

Cullum describes the Hawstead panels in his *History and Antiquities of Hawstead and Hardwick*, 1784:

Contiguous to one of the bedchambers was a wainscoted closet, about seven feet square, the panels painted with various sentences, emblems and mottoes. It was called *the painted closet*; at first probably designed for an oratory, and from one of the sentences “NVNQVAM MINVS SOLA, QVAM CUM SOLA” (never less alone than when alone) for the use of a lady. The dresses of the figures are of the age of James I. This closet was therefore fitted up for the last Lady Drury, and perhaps under her direction. The paintings are well executed; and now put up in a small apartment at Hardwick House. As some of these emblems are perhaps new, and mark the taste of an age that delighted in quaint wit, and laboured conceits of a thousand kinds, I shall set them down, confessing myself unable to unravel some of them.⁹³

While little is known about the painter of these panels, it is highly probable that Lady Drury, a niece of the court painter Nathaniel Bacon, made the paintings on its walls herself. In 1610, Sir and Lady Drury lost their daughter Elizabeth, aged fifteen. In their grief, they commissioned the renowned poet John Donne (1572-1631) to write an elegy to commemorate her death.⁹⁴ While we do not know if there is any link between Donne’s writings and Hawstead panels, this little room certainly provided Lady Drury with a place for her contemplation and devotion, as clearly inscribed in the first–“*FRUSTRA NISI DOMINUS*” (“In vain without the Lord”)–and fourth upper panels –“*PARVA, SED APTA MIHI: NEC TAMEN HIC REQUIES*” (“small, but fit for me: and yet there is no rest here”).

⁹³ Quoted in Farmer, “Lady Drury’s,” 78-79. The feminine singular used in the sentence, which is inscribed in the third upper panel, indicates that the room was used by a lady.

⁹⁴ Titled “An Anatomy of the World, wherein by occasion of the untimely Death of Mistris Elizabeth Drury, the frailty and decay of the whole World is represented,” the poem was printed in 1611. A second part called “The Second Anniversarie of the Progresse of the Soule” was added in the second version of 1612. See Halliwell, *A Guide*, the first page.

Lady Drury's meditational use of Hawstead panels is further evident from their pictorial sources, which were derived from the contemporary emblem books including Joachim Camerarius's *Symbolorum et Emblematum*, 1590-1604, and Geoffrey Whitney's *A Choice of Emblems*, 1586. For example, a honeycomb surrounded by bees illustrated on the emblem "*Patria cuique chara*" from Whitney (fig. 113) appears in one of Hawstead panels (fig. 114) accompanied by a motto "*Cum melle aculeus*" ("With honey a sting"), meaning that good things come with difficulties. A camel muddying some water with its foot with a motto "*Pura juvent alios*" ("Let pure things delight others," fig. 115), in the Hawstead finds its pictorial source from Camerarius in his emblem "*Turbata delectat*" ("I love to drink out of troubled water," fig. 116), a warning against ignorance of the impurity.

While Latin mottoes appear in all of the paintings in the upper three registers, the fifteen panels on the bottom level contain only floral images (fig. 117). Each of these fifteen panels consists of two or three species of flowers and herbs, including a rosemary, columbine, borage, strawberry, honeysuckle, ivy, cowslip, lungwort, orchid, gladiolus, gillyflower, buttercup, anemone and pansy (fig. 118). While the pictorial sources for these botanical images are unknown, they could have been from Lady Drury's manuscripts, since her choice of plants includes most of the species of flowers and herbs found in the floral borders of books of hours. Illustrated in a lively fashion, these botanical images of the Hawstead are depicted, like garden flowers, as growing from the earth. In this way the images provided Lady Drury with the feeling that she was in her garden where she would have meditated on God amidst the plants, and found her peace of

heaven as stated in the fifth upper panel: “*AMPLIOR IN COELO DOMUS EST*” (“A larger home in heaven”).

The important role of nature in spiritual meditation revitalized the flower motif in contemporary arts and literatures. Both the weighty symbolism—in relation to the Virgin Mary and to death and resurrection—as well as the easy accessibility of flowers made them ideal for spiritual meditation. Reading the Psalms, which mention a variety of plants, was a favorite activity for women during meditation. For example, the Psalms liken a blessed man to a tree or fruit:

He is like a tree planted by streams of water, which yields its fruit in season and whose leaf does not wither. Whatever he does prospers. (Psalm 1:3)

But I am like an olive tree flourishing in the house of God; I trust in God’s unfailing love forever and ever. (Psalm 52:8)

The righteous will flourish like a palm tree, they will grow like a cedar of Lebanon; planted in the house of the LORD, they will flourish in the courts of our God. They will still bear fruit in old age, they will stay fresh and green. (Psalms 92:12-14)

Your wife will be like a fruitful vine within your house; your sons will be like olive shoots around your table. (Psalm 128:3)

Along with these trees and fruits, flowers are often found in Psalms, referring to the transience of life:

For like the grass they will soon wither, like green plants they will soon die away. (Psalm 37:2)

They are like the new grass of the morning—though in the morning it springs up new, by evening it is dry and withered. (Psalm 90:5b-6)

As for man, his days are like grass, he flourishes like a flower of the field; the wind blows over it and it is gone, and its place remembers it no more. (Psalms 103:15-16)

References to plants are also found frequently in the New Testament. Jesus, for example, used fig trees to foretell the last days of the world: “Now learn this lesson from the fig tree: As soon as its twigs get tender and its leaves come out, you know that summer is near” (Matthew 24:32). He also introduced himself as a vine and its branches: “I am the true vine, and my Father is the gardener” (John 15:1).

Le Moyne dedicated his carefully drawn floral watercolors to Lady Mary Herbert to please both her eye and spirit, as Esther Inglis did with her flower-illustrated manuscripts. Lady Herbert had an enthusiastic passion for spiritual learning. Her pride in her translation of Psalms is well illustrated in her portrait engraving (fig. 110) by Simon de Passe: “Davids Psalms” is clearly inscribed on the opened book she holds. As an ardent reader and translator, she must have been aware of the moral and spiritual meaning of plants mentioned in the Bible. While Lady Drury prayed in her painted closet, Lady Herbert would have meditated on the spiritual lesson of God’s creation that is represented in each plant illustrated in Le Moyne’s watercolors. Delicately depicted, vividly colored and individually executed, Le Moyne’s *florilegia* were designed to be held and observed on the lap, encouraging spiritual meditation. With the blurred boundary between emblematics and natural history in the late sixteenth-century England, Le Moyne’s poetic, emblematic and still naturalistic *florilegia* fit comfortably into his contemporaries’ emblematic way of looking at plants as an aid to meditation.

The emblematic qualities of Le Moyne's *florilegia* would have encouraged English writers and poets to appreciate fully both the aesthetic beauty and the symbolic and allegoric meaning represented by each plant. At the same time, his demonstration of botanical knowledge in detail and accuracy would have dazzled botanists, gardeners and publishers. Such limited person-to-person circulation of Le Moyne's watercolors explains though why his *florilegia* were known only to a few Continental artists, such as Jacques de Gheyn and Crispijn de Passe. These artists could have only known Le Moyne's *florilegia* through direct connections to botanists and publishers who had already seen Le Moyne's work. The next chapter will explore the great botanist Carolus Clusius through whom Le Moyne's pioneering efforts with flower paintings, specifically his depiction of still lifes as an independent subject, inspired a younger generation of Netherlandish flower still-life artists.

Chapter 4

Carolus Clusius: Mediation between Le Moyne and Early Flower Painters

The functional uses of plants as well as their symbolic and religious significance were of great importance for collectors and scholars during the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries. Stimulated by the discovery of the New World and the importation of exotic *naturalia* to Europe, they developed a great interest in collecting and exchanging rare species of flowers and bulbs. Botanists, who were at the center of a network of flower collectors, gardeners, publishers and artists, for these exchanges, would have obtained and shared information by circulating plants as well as visual illustrations in drawings, watercolors, woodcuts or engravings.

This chapter will demonstrate the significant role of botanists, among others Carolus Clusius (1526-1609), in the development of Netherlandish flower still-life painting. In his network, the wide circulation of botanical drawings, which seems to have developed first with hand-colored herbals, involved a young generation of flower painters with a number of projects that incorporated floral illustrations. Clusius provided these artists with botanical drawings he made *in loco* or allowed them access to his gardens, so that they could achieve accurate modeling and coloring of flowers from life. He also supplied these early flower painters with precisely colored drawings by other botanical artists, such as Jacques le Moyne de Morgues, encouraging them to expand on Le Moyne's approach in their own floral still-life paintings.

Clusius's Network and Exchanges

Botanists' intense connections to flower collectors, gardeners, artists and publishers throughout Europe played a significant role in the growing market of flower still-life painting, providing flower painters with patronage for their production of *florilegia*. Because of his experience, Carolus Clusius, physician, humanist and one of the most celebrated botanists, was a key figure in this network of correspondents. It was through Clusius's mediation that Le Moyne's *florilegia* were introduced to the first generation of Netherlandish flower painters. Le Moyne's flower watercolor drawings provided those painters with a new approach to flower paintings, engaging them to learn how to draw flora from life.

A Short Biography

Carolus Clusius (also known by his French name Charles de l'Ecluse) was born in Arras, which was Flemish territory at that time, and had his early education at Ghent, Louvain and Marburg.¹ In the end of 1540s he left for Wittenberg to study medicine under a renowned Greek scholar Philip Melanchthon (1497-1560). In the University of Wittenberg, Melanchthon's theological view that all creation represents God's presence formed the basis of Clusius's approach to natural science.² Clusius completed his medical education at Montpellier from 1551 to 1554, after which he took a long trip through

¹ For Clusius's biography, see De Nave and Imhof, *Botany*, 109; Egmond et al., *Carolus Clusius*, 137; De Koning et al., *Drawn after Nature*, 45-46.

² Together with Martin Luther, Melanchthon was one of the leaders of the Protestant Reformation. He believed that botany made pleasures suitable for Christians, emphasizing the importance of knowledge on what the plants in the Bible signified. He encouraged botanists to publish their herbals with the verses from the Bible. See Karen Meier Reeds, *Botany in Medieval and Renaissance Universities* (New York and London: Garland Publishing, 1991), 13.

Spain and Portugal. In September 1565, shortly after he returned from Spain, Clusius visited Van Sint-Omaars at Moerkercke. For a few months in 1567, Clusius also stayed in Malines (Mechelen) where he lived with botanist Rembert Dodoens. In 1573, Clusius arrived at Vienna and started his career as prefect of the gardens of Emperor Maximilian II, who reigned from 1564 to 1576. Clusius stayed there until 1577 when he was dismissed by Rudolf II, and continued to live in Vienna until he left for Frankfurt in 1588.

During his years in Vienna, Clusius stayed at the house of Johann Aicholtz (d. 1588), a professor of medicine at the University of Vienna as well as the owner of a renowned garden.³ Clusius had his own garden in Vienna, which he described as a “small garden where, when I was living in Vienna, I used to grow and to cultivate various kinds of bulbous plants commendable for their elegance and variety.”⁴ Clusius’s experiences in Vienna tending the garden of the Emperor, as well as Aicholtz’s and his own gardens, provided him with opportunities to cultivate and study a variety of rare and exotic plants from around the world. He continued to correspond with numerous botanists, such as Dodoens, who had also been in Vienna in 1574 and had served Rudolf II in Prague between 1575 and 1577.

During his years in Frankfurt from 1588 to 1593, Clusius must have known the Flemish artist Joris Hoefnagel, who was staying there working for Emperor Rudolf II. Hoefnagel, who was renowned for his illusionistic renderings in a variety of natural creatures, including a number of species of flowers, would have shown Clusius his botanical images. In 1593, Clusius moved to Leiden to lay out the famous botanical

³ F. W. T. Hunger, *Charles de l’Escluse: Nederlandisch Kruidkundige, 1526-1609*, 2 vols. (The Hague: M. Nijhoff, 1927-43) 1:127, 139, 143, 167, 343, 350, 354.

⁴ Carolus Clusius, *Treatise on Tulips* (Antwerp, 1601), trans. W. van Dijk (Haarlem: The Associated Bulb Growers in Holland, 1951), 54.

garden *Hortus Botanicus* at Leiden University. He worked as a prefect of the garden until his death in 1609.

Clusius's Studies and Exchanges of Plants and Botanical Illustrations

Clusius established his career both by writing and translating botanical treatises as well as by collecting and exchanging a number of plants and their illustrations. His publications include, among others, his French translation of Dodoens's *Cruijdeboeck* in 1557; *Rariorum Aliquot Stirpium per Hispanias Observatarum Historia* (Antwerp, 1576), which was his own account of rare plants observed in Spain and Portugal; *Rariorum Aliquot Stirpium per Pannoniam, Austriam et Vicinas Quasdam Provincias Observatarum Historia* (Antwerp, 1583), an account of rare plants observed in Pannonia (Hungary), Austria and neighboring regions; *Rariorum Plantarum Historia* (Antwerp, 1601), a complete account of rare plants; and *Exoticorum Libri Decem* (Antwerp, 1605), which consisted of ten books of exotic life forms.⁵ In these botanical treatises Clusius expressed his passion for rare and exotic plants from Spain, Austria, Hungary, and even America and Western Asia. As stated in the preface to his *Rariorum Plantarum Historia*, Clusius felt that "to discover many plants unknown to Antiquity was like digging up a great hidden treasure."⁶

To make his studies successful, Clusius made extensive notes on the plants he found in each place. The reader's preface to his 1576 treatise on the plants of Spain and

⁵ For Clusius's publications, see De Nave and Imhof, *Botany*, 109-121.

⁶ Clusius, *Rariorum Plantarum Historia*, 3. For the English translation, see Florence Hopper, "Clusius's World: the Meeting of Science and Art," in *The Authentic Garden*, ed. L. Tjon Sie Fat and E. de Jong (Leiden: Clusius Foundation, 1991), 14.

Portugal shows that he occasionally drew plants *in loco* himself and brought some dried specimens with him when he returned home.

During that trip I noted the form, place of growth, and names of many of them, to aid my memory; I sketched some of them with charcoal or red chalk; and I brought almost all of them with me, having dried them; or I sent to my friends the seeds or even the plants themselves, if they could survive being shipped.⁷

For example, Clusius's drawing of a daffodil (fig. 119), which he attached to a letter he sent to Matteo Caccini in Florence on October 10, 1608, shows the botanist's fascination with nature.⁸ Such visual descriptions of plants provided Clusius and his correspondents with the most accurate images of the species he observed during his travels.

Contemporary flower lovers, collectors and publishers admired Clusius's knowledge and collections of rare and exotic plants from the New World. They were eager to contact the botanist to obtain and exchange information and specimens of plants. For example, in his letter to Clusius of May 8, 1597, the Middelburg gardener Johan (or Jan) Somer made a request of the botanist:

Since I understand that your honor also shares liberally with those who consider themselves connoisseurs of flowers, among whom I consider myself to be the very least, I pray your honor with friendship not forget me, and to honor me with two, three or four of your beautiful colors of tulips, yes, even if it were only one, for however small it is that comes from your honor's hand I shall receive with the greatest thanks.⁹

⁷ Clusius, *Rariorum Aliquot Stirpium*, 7; quoted Ogilvie, *The Science*, 170.

⁸ For the illustration, see Egmond et al., *Carolus Clusius*, pl. 2.

⁹ UBL Vul. 101; quoted in Anne Goldgar, *Tulipmania: Money, Honor, and Knowledge in the Dutch Golden Age*, (Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press, 2007), 23.

In some cases, luxurious gifts were offered to Clusius for rare specimens. Between 1560 and 1609, Clusius corresponded with almost three hundred individual from around Europe, including people from Spain, Austria, Greece, Italy, Germany, the Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, France and England. About fifteen hundred of these letters survive.¹⁰ The great desire to contact Clusius is implied by the fact that more than twelve hundred of these surviving letters were received by the botanist, while only about three hundred were sent by him.¹¹

Not only live flowers but also floral drawings were exchanged between Clusius and his correspondents. In a letter to Clusius dated May 14, 1596, Johannes de Jonghe Jr., an amateur botanist and a minister of the Reformed Church at Middelburg, included “the counterfeit of a certain sort of Tulipan [that he] has had reproduced as correctly as possible, the bulb being bare too: so that the painter would be able to see it.”¹² It seems that over time Clusius received more and more floral drawings from his correspondents. Clusius writes in his *Rariorum Plantarum Historia* (1601):

I had not yet seen in flower when I wrote this, but a drawing of which had been sent to me by Johan van Hogelande, Esq, of Leyden, in the year 1590.¹³

I have not seen, but I received a drawing in natural colors of it in the year 1596 from the learned Johan de Jonghe, Minister at Middelburg, to which had been added the following description: “I send you a picture of a certain tulip, drawn after the plant itself, that is to say of natural size in regard to the plant as well as to the stalk, the flower, the leaves (which should have been drawn slightly

¹⁰ Florike Egmond, “Clusius and Friends: Cultures of Exchange in the Circles of European Naturalists,” in Egmond et al., *Carolus Clusius*, 15. For more detailed information about the exchange of letters between Clusius and his correspondents, see Ibid., 64-66.

¹¹ Ibid., 14. The letters of Clusius’s correspondence are kept in several different libraries, including the Leiden University Library and the library at Erlangen in Germany.

¹² Bol, *The Bosschaert*, 18.

¹³ Translated in Clusius, *Treatise*, 47.

longer and narrower) and the bulb, which I have dug up in order to enable the artist to properly draw it.”¹⁴

De Jonghe’s letter to Clusius, which was cited in *Rariorum Plantarum Historia*, reveals that a flower painter was indeed hired to make the drawing he sent to Clusius.¹⁵ While the artist’s identity remains unknown, F. W. T. Hunger has suggested that the Middelburg flower painter Ambrosius Bosschaert the Elder (1573-1621) may have made the drawing.¹⁶

While colored herbals were produced continually in the late sixteenth century, hand-colored botanical treatises and *florilegia* were only produced at the personal request of botanists and amateur flower lovers. The Flemish aristocrat Karel van Sint-Omaars (or Charles de Saint Omer, 1533-1569) was one of many wealthy patrons who corresponded with botanists like Clusius and hired artists to depict flowers blooming in their gardens.¹⁷ As evident in his 1569 inventory, Van Sint-Omaars possessed a menagerie, farms, mills, gardens, and parks around his castle of Moerkercke, and a townhouse in Bruges.¹⁸ He also had extensive collections of books and paintings, including a number of botanical watercolors. Recent studies by Helena Wille and Jacques de Groote argue that Clusius stimulated Van Sint-Omaars’s interest in botany and may have inspired him to start collecting botanical watercolors in the early 1560s. Although Van Sint-Omaars’s

¹⁴ Clusius, *Rariorum Plantarum Historia*, 148-149; trans. in *Ibid.*, 52. De Jonghe’s letter sent to Clusius is kept in the Leiden University Library.

¹⁵ Clusius, *Rariorum Plantarum Historia* 2:153, cap. xi.

¹⁶ F.W.T. Hunger, *Archief Zeeuwsch Genootschap der Wetenschappen* (Middelburg: Altorffer, 1925), 111-113.

¹⁷ Clusius stayed for a while at Van Sint-Omaars’s house and shared his knowledge and experience of botany with his patron.

¹⁸ For the list of the inventory, see Jacques de Groote’s website at www.tzwin.be.

collection of botanical illustrations titled *Centuriae Plantarum Rariorum* was not published, these watercolors formed part of the *Libri Picturati* A. 16-30, an album of botanical and zoological watercolors in the Jagiellonian Library in Kraków.¹⁹ For his collection of botanical watercolors Van Sint-Omaars commissioned Jacques van den Corenhuyse (d. after 1584), who had a close connection to the Van Sint-Omaars family, to record plants cultivated in his gardens.²⁰ Van den Corenhuyse was occasionally identified with the monogram *IC*, which is found on a few watercolors in the bird volume of the *Libri Picturati*, and seems to have mainly worked in Bruges since he was admitted to the St. Lucas Guild of Bruges in 1554, though little else is known about his life and work.²¹

As more botanical works were published, more artists became involved in this process of making botanical illustrations. Clusius also looked for professional painters with whom he could work closely in preparing his publications. As accurate images became more important in botanical books, finding skillful painters was a key to make the publications successful.

¹⁹ Helena Wille, "The Discovery of the Scientific Heritage of Karel van Sint Omaars (1533-1569): *Libri Picturati* A. 16-30 in the Jagiellon Library in Kraków," *Scientiarum Historia* 22 (1996): 67-80. For De Groote's study on Sint-Omaars and the *Libri Picturati*, see his website at www.tzwin.be. Also see Florike Egmond, "Clusius, Cluyt, Saint Omer: The Origins of the Sixteenth-Century Botanical and Zoological Watercolors in *Libri Picturati* A. 16-30," *Nuncius* 20 (2005): 11-67.

²⁰ *Ibid.*, 53-54.

²¹ *Ibid.*

Looking for Flower Painters

The more that botanists and flower lovers were aware of the aesthetic beauty and the illusionistic capability of colored flower drawings, the more they sought qualified flower painters. Botanists and gardeners particularly admired artists with the knowledge of the proper coloring of flowers. Sometimes apothecaries or botanists were hired to illustrate plants because of their professional experience and knowledge in the field. For example, the Nuremberg apothecary Basilius Besler (1561-1629) was commissioned to draw over one thousand flowers on over 367 plates cultivated in the garden of his patron Prince-Bishop Johann Konrad von Gemmingen.

Pieter van der Borch

After Clusius returned from his journey to Spain and Portugal sometime between 1564 and 1565, he began to look diligently for a painter who could depict the plants he had collected *in loco* for his book *Rariorum Aliquot per Hispanias Observatarum Historia* (Antwerp, 1576). He describes his search for a specialized flower painter in his letter of November 25, 1567, to Jean Craton:

Bimestri jam Mechliniae fui, intra octiduum, Deo volente, eo rediturus: etenim exprimi curo earum plantarum icons, quas per Hispanias observavi, earumque interea historiam describe. Ducentarum numerum explore puto, quae a nemine hactenus sunt exhibitae, praeter paucas admodum, viginti forsitan, quae ab aliis perperam. Nactus sum sane pictorem ex animi sentential. Utinam sculptor aequae sit diligens

(It is already two months since I was in Malines (Mechelen) where, if God wishes so, I will return: I am having figures painted from the plants that I observed in Spain, while at the same time writing the history. I expect to do as many as 200 not as yet presented by anyone else, except just a few—perhaps 20—

badly done by others. I have discovered a painter, truly I have. If only the engraver were equally diligent!)²²

The painter Clusius found in Malines was most probably Pieter van der Borcht (1535/40-1608), the botanical illustrator who made drawings for Rembert Dodoens's *Fruventorum, leguminum, palustrium et aquatiliu herbarum, ac eorum, quae eo pertinent, historia* (Antwerp, 1566) and for Matthias de l'Obel's *Kruydtboeck* (Antwerp, 1581), both published by Plantin.²³ On October 27, 1567, Plantin received "encores 52 figures du livre de M. Charles" (52 more figures for Mr. Charles's book) from Van der Borcht, and here the "livre de M. Charles" certainly referred to Clusius's *Rariorum Aliquot per Hispanias Observatarum Historia*.²⁴ In 1566, shortly after Clusius returned from his trip to Spain and Portugal, he began to work together with Van der Borcht in 1566. His note in the summer of 1568 informs us that Clusius advised the painter to draw pictures of plants from dried specimens that he brought from his recent trip.²⁵

*Eaque adeo de causa, biennio post, industrium et diligentem pictorem nactus, stirpium icons in tabellis ligneis depingendas curavi, et plerunque etiam ipsi pictori adstiti, ut de his quae in siccarum plantarum forma exprimenda diligentius errant observanda, commonefacerem.*²⁶

²² The Latin text is originally from L. C. Treviranus, *Caroli Clusii atrebatensis et Conr. Gesneri, tigurini, Epistolae ineditae* (Leipzig; L. Vossius, 1830), 45-46; quoted in De Koning et al., *Drawn after Nature*, 99.

²³ Depauw, "Peeter Vander Borcht," 51. For more information on Dodoens's botanical work, see De Nave and Imhof, *Botany*, 103, cat. 31. The woodcutters for the copy included Cornelius Muller, Arnold Nicolai and Gerard Janssen van Kampen.

²⁴ Depauw, "Peeter Vander Borcht," 51, 54, note 56.

²⁵ Clusius 1576, 8: "Eaque adeo de causa, biennio post, industrium et diligentem pictorem nactus, stirpium icons in tabellis ligneis depingendas curavi, et plerunque etiam ipsi pictori adstiti, ut de his quae in siccarum plantarum forma exprimenda diligentius errant observanda, commonefacerem"; quoted in Egmond et al., *Carolus Clusius*, 226, note 29.

²⁶ Clusius, *Rariorum Aliquot Stirpium*, 8; quoted in Egmond et al., *Carolus Clusius*, 226, note 29.

(Having found an industrious and diligent artist, I had the images of plants depicted on wood blocks, and often I was beside the artist to indicate those aspects that had to be carefully observed when expressing the forms of dried plants.)²⁷

In his letter of December 26, 1584, to Camerarius, Clusius introduces Van der Borcht as a skillful artist specializing in botanical illustration:

I discovered in my Hispanic flora how difficult it is to produce good illustrations from dried plants, unless the illustrator is aided by someone truly skilled in botany, even though I had an illustrator who was practiced in botanical illustration. Moreover, it is a hard job to write descriptions on the basis of dried plants, unless you have seen them growing.²⁸

As mentioned in the letter, Clusius had difficulties working with dried plants. Clusius, who would have produced “good illustrations from dried plants,” must have relied on Van der Borcht’s mastered draftsmanship in botanical illustration.

Van der Borcht’s botanical watercolor drawings, which Clusius used as templates in his *Rariorum Aliquot Stirpium per Hispanias Observatarum Historia*, are partly found in the *Libri Picturati* A18-30. For example, a Dragon-tree of the *Libri Picturati* (fig. 120) appears in reverse in Clusius’s *Rariorum Aliquot per Hispanias Observatarum Historia* (fig. 121).²⁹ As Luis Ramón-Laca has demonstrated, about 129 watercolors of the *Libri Picturati* were used in Clusius’s publications. However, the resemblances between watercolors and templates are not always striking. Van der Borcht’s watercolors, delicately modeled and accurately colored, must have been used as more than preliminary

²⁷ Quoted in Ogilvie, *The Science*, 199-200.

²⁸ Hunger, *Charles*, 2:403; quoted in Ogilvie, *The Science*, 170.

²⁹ Luis Ramón-Laca, “Charles de l’Écluse and *Libri picturati* A. 16-30,” *Archives of Natural History* 28, no. 2 (2001): 195-243. For the engraved illustration of the Dragon-tree, see Clusius, *Rariorum Aliquot Stirpium*, 12. More watercolors of plants of the *Libri Picturati* that Clusius used in *Rariorum Aliquot Stirpium* are listed in De Koning et al., *Drawn after Nature*, 100-105.

sketches for woodcuts of the *Rariorum Aliquot per Hispanias Observatarum Historia*. Depauw has suggested that Clusius had the collection of botanical watercolors for “a visual memorandum in his library.” In that way Van der Borcht’s watercolors could have been part of his collection of botanical illustrations.³⁰

As evident in his collaborations with Dodoens, Matthias de l’Obel and Clusius, Van der Borcht was one of the most skillful botanical artists available to his contemporary botanists. Clusius knew Van der Borcht at least as early as 1567, when they both worked on Garcia ab Orto’s *Aromatum et simplicium aliquot medicamentorum apud Indos nascentium historia* (Antwerp, 1567). Clusius edited and translated the text of this publication, and Van der Borcht made sixteen accompanying drawings that were transferred into woodcuts by Arnold Nicolai.³¹ Clusius must have liked Van der Borcht’s works because in 1576 he asked the artist to depict plants for his own publication. Almost two decades later, during the 1590s, when Clusius was working on the *Rariorum Plantarum Historia* (Antwerp, 1601), he again had Van der Borcht make watercolor drawings for his botanical treatises.³²

A Flemish Artist from Vienna

Soon after Clusius achieved enormous success with the publication of Spanish and Portuguese flora, he started working on Hungarian and Austrian flora, which he published as *Rariorum Aliquot Stirpium per Pannoniam, Austriam et Vicinas Quasdam*

³⁰ Depauw, “Peeter Vander Borcht,” 52.

³¹ De Nave and Imhof, *Botany*, 110.

³² *Ibid.*, 118-119. The work was completed in 1595, however, Clusius had to wait until 1601 to have the book published.

Provincias Observatarum Historia (Antwerp, 1583). During his stay in Hungary for his studies *in loco*, Clusius often visited his friend and patron, the Hungarian aristocrat Boldizár (Balthasar) Batthyány (1537-1590), for whom the botanist made garden designs and planting instructions.³³ For this 1583 publication, Clusius's desire to have plants depicted by professional painters seems to have intensified. In his letter to Batthyány, dated October 21, 1577, Clusius writes:

I have decided to engage myself into the description of plants which I have observed on my way towards you, and others which I found while going for the mountains in Austria, and a part of next summer (if God gives me long life) to have the plants painted, so that on my return to the country I can have them published.³⁴

Batthyány was one of the most powerful nobles, intellectuals and humanists of his time. His lifelong passion for natural sciences is revealed in his extensive correspondence with numerous humanists and scientists. He was also renowned for his library where he had several books of botany, including Dodoens's *Fruventorum [. . .] herarum* (Antwerp, 1566) and *Florum [. . .] historia* (Antwerp, 1568), and Clusius's *Aromatum [. . .] historia* (Antwerp, 1579).³⁵ Moreover, it seems that Batthyány would have collected accurately colored botanical illustrations made by skillful artists. Clusius's three letters to Batthyány of June 2, 1578; July 5, 1578; and July 23, 1578, reveal that Batthyány asked the botanist to find a painter to make botanical illustrations for him:

³³ For more information about Batthyány, see Dóra Bobory, "'Qui me unice amabat.' Carolus Clusius and Boldizár Batthyány," in Egmond et al., *Carolus Clusius*, 119-144.

³⁴ Clusius to Batthyány, Vienna, 21 October 1577, MOL, letter no. 8014, in Gy. Isvánffi, *A Clusius-Codex Mykologiai Méltatása Adatokkal Clusius Életrajzához* (Budapest, 1900), 205-206, quoted in Egmond et al., *Carolus Clusius*, 139.

³⁵ He had approximately one thousand volumes in his library. For more details about the libraries in Hungary in Batthyány's time, see *Ibid.*, 124, notes 17, 18. For the list of books of botany Batthyány possessed in his library, see *Ibid.*, 131.

I have spoken to one of the better painters in this town who is from our country, and who is very good at the art of wall painting and so on [. . .] I assure you that it is very hard to find a good painter here who is able and who knows his art well enough: mostly they are nothing more than apprentices. Thus, I spoke to one who is among the better masters and one of the main ones. He is good at painting natural subjects (“*contrefaire au naturel*”) and certain historical subjects, and any similar thing that you may desire.³⁶

The painter I wrote you about, My Lord, each day promises me to offer you his services in the job you have for him in Szalónak.³⁷

The painter that I spoke first with said that as soon as he is dismissed from his position, he will go to Your Magnificence, since he has accomplished the better part of the work which His Majesty the Archduke entrusted him with. That job will take another 8-10 days, then he will be completely free. In the meantime, he wanted to see what he will have to do in the castle of Your Magnificence, and to agree with Your Magnificence about the price, then he would like to come back here [. . .] and he could have 8 to 10 days of free time. [. . .] I will go with him (if Lord Althan comes back) to you, bringing along bulbs which I will arrange in your garden at Szalónak, as I promised last time.³⁸

The painter Clusius found for his patron was a Flemish artist who had been working in a certain position at the Viennese court as a master. Clusius described him as “good at painting natural subjects and certain historical subjects.” Recent studies by Andrea Ubrizsy Savoia have identified the painter as Esaya le Gillon, Clusius’s nephew and a miniature painter who had worked in the court of Rudolf II since 1574.³⁹ During his short stay in Hungary, he likely made several watercolors of mushrooms and toadstools which form part of the collection of the *Libri Picturati* at Kraków and the collection of the so-

³⁶ Clusius to Batthyány, Vienna, 2 June 1578, MOL, letter no. 8017, in Isvánffi, 1900, 205-206; quoted in *Ibid.*, 137.

³⁷ Clusius to Batthyány, Vienna, 5 July 1578, MOL, letter no. 8018, in Isvánffi 1900, 206-207; quoted in *Ibid.*

³⁸ Clusius to Batthyány, Vienna, 23 July 1578, MOL, letter no. 8018, in Isvánffi 1900, 207; quoted in *Ibid.*, 137 and 139.

³⁹ Andrea Ubrizsy Savoia, “Some Aspects of Clusius’s Hungarian and Italian Relations,” in *Ibid.*, 275-276. Clusius invited Le Gillon to come to Vienna in 1574 and later to Prague.

called *Clusius Codex* in the University Library of Leiden.⁴⁰ These watercolors also laid the foundation for the thirty-two woodcuts of the *Fungorum Historia*, which was published as an attachment to the *Rariorum Plantarum Historia*.

Clusius's Interest in American Plants

American Plants in Clusius's Publications

Throughout his career, Clusius was interested in exotic *naturalia* from the New World. Although he was not able to study its *naturalia in loco*, since he never set a foot on the new continent, he could observe newly imported exotics cultivated in European gardens.⁴¹ He also gained knowledge of exotic herbals while editing and translating the studies of others, including Nicolaus Monardes's *De simplicibus medicamentis ex Occidentali India delatis, quorum in medicina usus est* (Antwerp, 1567), Garcia ab Orto's *Aromatum et simplicium aliquot medicamentorum apud Indos nascentium historia* (Antwerp, 1574), and Christophorus a Costa's *Aromatum et medicamentorum in Orientali India nascentium liber* (Antwerp, 1582). These studies were the basis of Clusius's revision that became part of his own publications on exotic *naturalia*.

Clusius's interest in American exotic *naturalia* began when he was working on the *Rariorum Aliquot Stirpium per Hispanias Observatarum Historia*, in which he included American plants such as the American avocado tree, sweet potato, thuya and

⁴⁰ See the *Libri Picturati* (A21.105, A22.017, A22.018v, A22.019, A22.019v, A23.043v, A23.044, A26.079, A27.099) and the *Clusius Codex* under the title *Icones fungorum in Pannoniis observatorum*, BPL 303, 87 fols. Its facsimile is reprinted in Stephan A. Aumüller's *Carolus Clusius Fungorum in Pannoniis observatorum Brevis Historia et Codex Clusii. Mit beiträgen von einer internationalen Autorengemeinschaft. Herausgegeben von S. A. Aumüller und Jozsef Jeanplong* (Budapest: Akadémiai Kiado, 1983).

⁴¹ Also, the East India Company enabled him to collect exotic *naturalia* from all over the world.

agave, along with Spanish and Portuguese flora.⁴² Clusius's studies of American plants were, however, most significant in his *Exoticorum Libri Decem* (Leiden, 1605). The first six volumes of the book (*Libri I-VI*) introduce entirely new plants from distant countries, including about sixty American plants.⁴³ In the next three volumes (*Libri VII, IX, X*), Clusius incorporated his notes on the studies of exotic *naturalia* by Garcia ab Orto, Christophorus a Costa, and Nicolaus Monardes, mentioning more than twenty American plants.⁴⁴ For his studies of these American plants, Clusius contacted friends and correspondents, especially those from England, and received several American *naturalia*, which had been brought to England through expeditions to the New World. Clusius's English correspondents, including William Winter, Sir Francis Drake, Richard Garth, Jacob Garet, Petrus Garet, Hugo Morgan, Sir Walter Raleigh, shared with him their knowledge and experience of America.⁴⁵ For example, in the *Exoticorum Libri Decem*, Clusius noted that he received several different kinds of Brazilian beans from British apothecaries Richard Garth and Jacob Garet.⁴⁶

The *Exoticorum Libri Decem* also includes ethnographic details of those plants from the New World. When Clusius introduced the Virginian Macoqwer, a kind of gourd, given to him by Garet, he described precisely how Virginian Indians used it as a rattle:

⁴² Peter Mason, "Americana in the *Exoticorum Libri Decem* of Charles de l'Écluse," in Egmond et al., *Carolus Clusius*, 198.

⁴³ For the list of Clusian plants from America, see the Appendix to Andrea Ubrizsy Savoia and J. Heniger, "Carolus Clusius and American Plants," *Taxon* 32 (Aug. 1983): 430-435.

⁴⁴ *Ibid.*, 427.

⁴⁵ *Ibid.*

⁴⁶ Clusius, *Exoticorum Libri Decem*, 60-61, 69. In 1591, Garth sent Clusius another Brazilian 'Junipappeeywa.'

they emptied it first, filled it with stones, and attached it to a stick.⁴⁷ For such detailed information, Clusius must have had personal contacts with his correspondents who joined the New World explorations.

Clusius learned more about English experiences in America through his editing and translating of the publications of others. He translated into Latin Thomas Harriot's *A Briefe and True Report of the New Found Land of Virginia* (1588), which was published under the title *Admiranda narratio, fida tamen, de commodis et incolarvm ritibvs Virginiae [. . .]* (Frankfurt, 1590). In this book, Harriot, who joined the English expedition to Virginia in 1585 under the command of Sir Walter Raleigh, reports on the English exploration of Virginia during the years 1584, 1585 and 1586, mentioning forty-three species of local plants.⁴⁸ The book was illustrated by John White, who accompanied the 1585 journey. In 1588, Clusius translated into Latin another text on New World exploration: Le Moyne's *Brevis Narratio Eorum Quae in Florida Americae Provincia Gallis Acciderunt*. The book includes twenty-two plants Le Moyne observed on his journey to Florida in 1564-1565.⁴⁹

Clusius and Le Moyne

While Clusius became more involved in the production of floral drawings, his rich and broad network of correspondents benefitted from his search for skilled artists. In England, Clusius's network owed much to the friendship and patronage of Philip Sidney,

⁴⁷ Clusius, *Exoticorum Libri Decem*, 23; cited in Egmond et al., *Carolus Clusius*, 200.

⁴⁸ Savoia and J. Heniger, "Carolus Clusius," 432.

⁴⁹ *Ibid.*, 431-432

whom he probably met on one of his field research trips to England in the early 1670s.⁵⁰ As evident in five known letters between Sidney and Clusius—one from Sidney to Clusius in 1577 and the other four from Clusius to Sidney between 1575 and 1576—they freely shared their common interests in botany, humanity, and literature.⁵¹ It is probable that Sidney, who had had a lifelong passion for the New World, introduced Le Moyne to the famed botanist, knowing that Le Moyne's experience in Florida and knowledge of American plants would appeal to Clusius.

In 1582, Clusius dedicated his Latin translation of the third part of Nicolaus Monardes's *De simplicibus medicamentis ex Occidentali India delatis, quorum in medicina usus est* to Sidney.⁵² The treatise about medicinal uses of plants such as peanuts, pineapples, cocoa, ginger, guava, figs and sunflowers, seems to have pleased Sidney's great curiosity about New World plants.⁵³ Sidney and Clusius must have opened their collections to each other and, in this way, Le Moyne's *florilegia*, dedicated to the Sidneys,

⁵⁰ Starting in 1571, when Clusius accompanied a German aristocrat Thomas Rehdiger (1540-1576) to England, he made several journeys to the country. See De Nave and Imhof, *Botany*, 109.

⁵¹ Sidney to Clusius; Prague, Apr. 8, 1577; Bayerische Staatsbibliothek Munchen (MS Lat. 10364, 575), rpt. in George Gomori, "Philip Sidney's to Charles L'Ecluse in 1577," *Notes and Queries* 44 (March 1997): 29-30; Clusius to Sidney, London, Dec. 4, 1575: British Library (MS Add. 17520, 6-7); Clusius to Sidney, Paris, Mar. 19, 1576: Museum national d'histoire naturelle, Laboratoire de cryptogamie, Thuret-Bornet autographs; Clusius to Sidney, May 28, 1576, London: British Library (MS Add. 15914, 29-30); Clusius to Sidney, London, Jun. 8, 1576: British Library (MS Add. 15914, 31-32). Also see Charles S. Levy, "A Supplementary Inventory of Sir Philip Sidney's Correspondence," *Modern Philology* 67 (Nov. 1969): 177-181. Their relationship also extended to Vienna and Prague: in 1573, Sidney visited Vienna, then in 1575 and 1577 to Prague, where Clusius was working for the court. Sidney's friendship with Hubert Languet helped him to make contacts in Vienna. In 1577, Sidney revisited Prague upon the death of Maximilian, as the official representative of Queen Elizabeth. For information about Sidney's dealings in Prague, see P. W. Zandvoort, "Sidney in Austria," *Wiener Beiträge zur Englischen Philologie* 66 (1957): 227-245; and Robert J. Evans, *Rudolf II and His World: A Study in Intellectual History 1576-1612* (Oxford; Oxford University Press, 1973), 121-122.

⁵² Published under the title *Simplicivm Medicamentarvm ex novo Orbe delatorvm [. . .] Liber Tertivs* (Antwerp, 1582).

⁵³ De Nave and Imhof, *Botany*, 111.

could have been accessible to Clusius. A rich partnership between Clusius and Sidney ended with Sidney's early death in 1586.

Clusius could also have known Le Moyne's botanical drawings through Theodor de Bry, who published Le Moyne's illustrated *Brevis Narratio* in his *America 2* (Frankfurt, 1591). In 1588 when De Bry asked Clusius to translate Le Moyne's text, the publisher would have brought Le Moyne's botanical drawings along with his text.

More than a Botanist: Clusius's Spiritual Approach to Plants

Clusius was interested in the medicinal benefits of plants, but his primary concern was with the flower as an object of beauty. In the introduction to his *Rariorum Plantarum Historia*, Clusius writes:

In this second we will deal with a family composed of bulbous and tuberous roots which attract attention because of their elegance and variety. We will begin with the lilies on account of their large size and beautiful flowers.⁵⁴

While traditional herbal books categorized plants by botanical type, Clusius chose lilies as the first among plants in the second volume of his *Rariorum Plantarum Historia* because of their "large and beautiful flowers." As Florence Hopper points out, "beauty was the criterion for determining his [Clusius's] choice of plants and the order in which the genera were described in his publications."⁵⁵ Clusius also noted his contemporaries' growing fervor for exotic flowers.

⁵⁴ Clusius, *Rariorum Plantarum Historia*, 127; trans. in Hopper, "Clusius's World," 15.

⁵⁵ *Ibid.*

As I have been unable to observe it, having cut off the upper part of the stalk with two of the leaves and the flower to give it to the artist for being drawn, and I think this is the reason why the plant did not flower the next year.⁵⁶

In this passage, Clusius describes the working procedure of early flower painters, explaining why they sometimes chose to illustrate only blossoms. The artist, to whom the gardener provided the upper part of plants, was encouraged to focus on the blooms rather than the other parts of the plant.

The auction catalogue of Clusius's personal belongings after his death in 1609 indicates the extent of his collection of botanical watercolor drawings and oil paintings:

Peracta Librorum auctione, in ysdem ædibus habebitur auctio Plantarum rariorum hortuli Caroli Clusy: qua etiam vendentur Carta Geographica, designations plantarum, florum, fungorum, fructuum, bestiarum, etc. vivis coloribus: olea item et liquors partim naturals, partim artificiales: Supellese prætereæ numismatum, et aliquot manufactorum peregrinorum, et imprimis fructuum, radicum, seminumque Exoticorum: mineralium insuper compl [...] rium: terrarium sigillatarum: et permulta alia similis curiositatis.

(Once finished the auction of the books, in the same building will take place the auction of the rare plants of Clusius' tiny garden, and also will be sold one geographic map, figures of plants, flowers, fungi, fruits and beasts in vivid colours, oils and liquors partly natural, partly artificial, utensils, old coins and a number of exotic manufactures, and mainly exotic fruits, roots and seeds, as well as minerals, *terra sigillata* and a large quantity of other, similar curiosities.)⁵⁷

Clusius's collection of botanical works "in vivid colours, oils and liquors partly natural, partly artificial" suggests that he was a collector of art. As chief director of the imperial gardens in Vienna and a worldwide traveler for his research, Clusius established a broad network of artists specializing in natural history.

⁵⁶ Translated in Clusius, *Treatise*, 66.

⁵⁷ Anonymous, *Catalogus librorum bibliothecae clarissimi viri Caroli Clusii Aula Cæsareæ quondam familiaris. Quorum auctio habebitur in ædibus Pauli Stochij xx die Maij MDCIX* (Leiden: T. Basson, 1609); quoted in De Koning et al., *Drawn from Nature*, 100.

Clusius was interested in both the aesthetic beauty as well as the spiritual meaning of flowers. In the title page of his *Rariorum Plantarum Historia* (fig. 122), the biblical ancestors of horticulture—Adam, the first gardener, and Solomon, the connoisseur of plants—are depicted along with the Greek botanists and philosophers Theophrastus and Dioscorides.⁵⁸ Above the title the inscription reads “*Plantae cuique suas vires Deus indidit, atque praesentem esse illum, quaelibet herba docet*” (God gave every plant its own force and every plant witnesses His existence).⁵⁹ For Clusius, the spiritual approach to botany was a crucial part of his study. The value Clusius placed on the wonders and harmony of God’s creation was also emphasized in the inscription of his 1601 portrait (fig. 123):

*VIRTUTE ET GENIO non nitimur: at mage CHRISTO
Qui nobis istaec donat, et Ingenium*

(We do not rely on VIRTUE and GENIUS, but rather on CHRIST, who gives us these gifts, and aptitude)⁶⁰

This fusion of the didactic function and the spiritual qualities of plants is one of the most important characteristics of botanical publications produced at Clusius’s time. Clusius, like other botanists, encouraged flower painters with whom he worked to adopt similar emblematic meanings into their flower still life painting.

⁵⁸ Jacques de Gheyn II designed the title page. See I.Q. van Regteren Altena, *Jacques de Gheyn: Three Generations*. 3 vols. (The Hague, Boston and London: Martinus Nijhoff Publishers, 1983), 2:78, cat. 465; 1:66-68, ill. 54.

⁵⁹ Clusius, *Rariorum Plantarum Historia*, title page; quoted in Vignau-Wilberg, “Devotion,” 48.

⁶⁰ Clusius, *Rariorum Plantarum Historia*, title page, trans. in Sam Segal, “Jacques de Gheyn’s Plants,” in A.W.F.M.Meij, ed., *Jacques de Gheyn II Drawings* exh. cat. (Rotterdam: Museum Boymans-van Beuningen; and Washington, D.C.: National Gallery of Art, 1986), 28.

Clusius searched for artists capable of creating exquisite colored botanical drawings for his publications and library collections. Soon after he moved to Leiden, Clusius began his collaboration with the Dutch artist Jacques de Gheyn, including a new project of creating twenty-two watercolor drawings of flowers and small creatures, the so-called Lugt album, between 1600 and 1604. In this collaboration, Clusius provided De Gheyn with Le Moyne's precisely colored drawings, and seemingly encouraged him to expand on Le Moyne's sensitive, scientific and even spiritual renderings in his own flower pieces.

Chapter 5

Le Moyne's Contributions to the Development of Netherlandish Flower Still Lifes

In addition to learning a variety of subjects and languages, the investigator of nature, in order to become better, should acquire skill in painting and drawing, or at least a knowledge of it. Someone who is entirely ignorant of the art of painting cannot make true images of things whose descriptions and 'differentiae' are clear in his mind.

- Fabio Colonna, *Ecphrasis* I, 1606¹

This chapter will demonstrate how Netherlandish flower painters responded to the demanding culture of collecting and exchanging activities that was then being undertaken by botanists and publishers. This collaboration between botanists, artists and publishers, which seems to have first developed with hand-colored herbals, also influenced the development of independent flower paintings. The botanist Carolus Clusius and publisher Hans Woutneel encouraged a younger generation of flower painters and printers to expand upon Jacques le Moyne de Morgues's approach in their own flower paintings and engravings. In particular, the stylistic connections between Le Moyne's images and those of early flower artists—among others the printmaker Crispijn de Passe the Elder (1564-1637) and the painter Jacques de Gheyn (1565-1629)—demonstrate the close involvement of botanists and publishers in the production of the Netherlandish flower still-lives.

¹ Quoted in Ogilvie, *The Science*, 198.

Crispijn de Passe the Elder

Crispijn de Passe the Elder was born in 1564 in Arnemuiden, a city located in the province of Zeeland in the Netherlands, and was trained as an engraver in Antwerp. Early in his career he collaborated with Maarten de Vos (1532-1603), a mannerist painter in Antwerp.² After Antwerp's surrender to the Spanish, De Passe, a Mennonite, was forced to leave the city. He settled in Cologne in 1589 and set up his print business. In 1611, De Passe and his family were compelled to leave Cologne because of their Protestant faith. They moved to Utrecht, where De Passe resumed his print business. With the assistance of his three sons, Crispijn the Younger (c. 1594-1670), Simon (1595-1647) and Willem (1587/98-1636/37), and a daughter, Magdalena (1600-1638), his workshop successfully produced a number of different religious, mythological, and allegorical prints, as well as portraits of nobles, politicians and scholars.³

Throughout his career, Crispijn de Passe maintained close connections with other artists, including Hendrick Goltzius (1558-1617), a master engraver from Haarlem. In 1594 De Passe dedicated his engraving, the *Last Supper*, to Goltzius and wrote, "The engraver Crispijn de Passe offers this, merely a little work from his hand, to the engraver Hendrick Goltzius, exceptional jewel of our Germany, in order to foster a close friendship."⁴ De Passe admired Goltzius's style, imitating his astonishingly subtle and

² De Passe married Magdalena de Bock, a niece of De Vos's wife in Antwerp. See Ilja M. Veldman, *Crispijn de Passe and His Progeny (1564-1670): A Century of Print Production*, trans. Michael Hoyle (Rotterdam: Sound & Vision Publ., 2001), 20-21.

³ More than fourteen thousand prints and fifty print books of illustrated works were produced by the De Passe family.

⁴ Quoted in *Ibid.*, 78.

delicate technique of “pen works,” which is evident in De Passe’s *Self-Portrait* (c. 1600, fig. 124).⁵

De Passe also admired Joris Hoefnagel’s miniature paintings of flowers, fruits, animals and insects, which his son Jacob Hoefnagel redesigned for his *Archetypa Studiaque Patris Georgii Hoefnagelii*. De Passe dedicated a series of engraving *Four Seasons* (fig. 125) “with friendship and respect” to Hoefnagel.⁶ The flower border decorations on these engravings recall Hoefnagel’s floral images.

Cognoscite Lilia

De Passe the Younger’s renowned *florilegium*, *Hortus Floridus* (Utrecht and Arnhem, 1614), consists of two parts.⁷ The first part, which De Passe the Younger engraved most of images of flowers and bulbs, comprises approximately one-hundred plates.⁸ They are arranged by the seasons with a title page for each section: forty-one spring flowers, nineteen flowers for summer, twenty-seven of autumn, and twelve winter flowers. Each flower is labeled in Latin, French, Dutch, and occasionally in Italian, as

⁵ Crispijn De Passe the Elder, *Self-Portrait*, pen in brown ink on paper, 28.5 x 19.8 cm, (Vienna: Albertina, no. 3341). Huigen Leeftang argues that De Passe probably knew Goltzius through his brother Conrad Goltz, a printmaker active in Cologne. Also, in 1614, De Passe’s son, Simon, engraved a portrait of Goltzius. See Huigen Leeftang, Ger Luijten et al., *Hendrick Goltzius (1558-1617): Drawings, Prints and Paintings* exh. cat. (Amsterdam: Rijksmuseum; New York: Metropolitan Museum of Art; and Toledo: Toledo Museum of Art, 2003), 20, especially note 57.

⁶ For more details about De Passe’s relationships with Hoefnagel and Goltzius, see *Ibid.*, 77-78. Moreover, De Passe’s close colleagues during his stay in Cologne include Jacob Kempener (or Kempenaer), a flower painter. See *Ibid.*, 76.

⁷ Crispijn de Passe the Younger, *Hortus floridus in quo rariorum & minus vulgarium florum icons ad vivam veramq formam accuratissime delineatae, et secundum quatuor anni tempora divisae exhibentur* (Arnhem and Utrecht, 1614).

⁸ As described on the title-page—“*incredibili labore ac diligentia Crisp: Passaei junioris delineatae ac suum in ordinem redactae*”—Crispijn de Passe the Younger engraved the botanical images of the *Hortus Floridus* with an unimaginable amount of labour and diligence and arranged in the proper order. One section title-page, nos. 22, 32 and 33 of the spring flowers and nos. 1, 3, 8 and 9 in the summer section were engraved by his younger brothers Simon and Willem. See Veldman, *Crispijn de Passe*, 205-206.

well as described in a Latin text penned by the renowned Utrecht scholar Aernout van Buchell (1565-1641).

The second part (*altera pars*) is a reprint of a book that De Passe the Elder had published a decade earlier in association with Hans Woutneel.⁹ The imprint “*Formulis Crispiani Passaei et Joannis Waldnelij*” (“According to the agreements of Crispijn de Passe and Hans Woutneel”) appears at the base of the title page of this second part. For a long time, the engraver of this section was incorrectly identified as Crispijn de Passe the Younger since it was bound in his *Hortus Floridus*. Recent studies by Ilja Veldman have determined, however, that the second part was engraved by De Passe the Elder or members of his studio, and published in Cologne before 1604.¹⁰ De Passe the Younger, who was only ten years old in 1604, would have been too young to engrave his series of more than one-hundred botanical images.¹¹

The title of the second part begins with “*Cognoscite lilia agri quomodo crescant [...] gloria sua sic amictum fuisse ut unum ex his*” (“See how the lilies of the field grow.

⁹ The letterpress inscription begins with “*Altera pars Horti Floridi in qua praeter flores, varia etiam reperiuntur arborum fructiferarum, fruticum, plantarum quoque et herbarum medicinalium genera. Per Crisp[ini]m Passaeum in lucem, edita*” (“The second part of the garden of flowers, in which, in addition to flowers, will be found various kinds of fruit trees, shrubs, plants and also medicinal herbs. Published by Crispijn de Passe”); quoted in *Ibid.*, 208-209. The original edition is found in the same album as the *Florae Deae* without text, together with the *Florilegium* by Adriaen Collaert. For more information about the original edition of the *altera pars*, see Segal, “On Florilegia,” 14-15.

¹⁰ This conclusion was based on the fact that Matthias Quad, engraver of its title plate, had had to leave Cologne in 1604. Moreover, Veldman added that De Passe the Elder had possessed the copperplates of the second part and included them in the *Hortus Floridus*. See Veldman, *Crispijn de Passe*, 209. Savage was the first to attribute the second part to Crispijn de Passe the Elder and to recognize that it had been printed earlier than the four main sections of the *Hortus Floridus*. See Sencer Savage, “The Hortus Floridus of Crispin vande Passe the Younger,” *The Library* 4 (Dec. 1923): 181-206. In his 1982 exhibition catalogue, Sam Segal also attributed the second part to De Passe the Elder. See Sam Segal, *A Flowery Past*, 1982, 10, 74. While the initial publication date of the second part has been debated, Robert Gerard suggests that this part should be dated no later than 1608, the approximate year of death of the publisher Hans Woutneel died. See Gerard, “Woutneel,” 375-376, note 43; and Lotte Helinga et al., *The Bookshop of the World: the Role of the Low Countries in the Booktrade 1473-1941* (’t Goy-Houten: HES & De Graaf, 2001), 160-161.

¹¹ Crispijn de Passe the Younger began signing his prints in 1611.

They do not labor or spin. Yet I tell you that not even Solomon in all his splendor was dressed like one of these”), a quote from Matthew 6:28-29 (fig. 126). The section consists of 63 engraving plates of 120 fruits, plants and herbs, all of which are labeled in Latin, French, English, and occasionally in Dutch, indicating that it was produced for English, French, and Dutch markets.¹² The book’s Latin commentary was added in 1616.

Collaboration with Hans Woutneel

Crispijn de Passe the Elder, who had already run a productive print business in Cologne since 1589, was certainly an engraver with whom contemporary print publishers would have wanted to work. Late sixteenth-century English publishers, in particular, were looking for skillful engravers from the Netherlands, since the production of engravings in England was not very well developed. The Flemish publisher Hans Woutneel (fl. 1576-1603/08), who worked in England, began to collaborate with De Passe in the early 1590s. They published jointly three portraits of Queen Elizabeth I—in 1592, 1596, and 1603-1604, respectively.¹³

A Protestant immigrant from Antwerp, Hans Woutneel arrived in England in the late 1570s, and settled in Blackfriars, where he built up his business as a bookseller and print dealer.¹⁴ His broad network of correspondents included the Flemish cartographer and humanist Abraham Ortelius (1527-1598) and his nephew Jacob Cole (or Jacobus

¹² Compared to the *Cognoscite Lilia*, the four main sections of the *Hortus floridus* include only one English label among 180 plates. For more discussion about the *Cognoscite Lilia* and the English print market, see Gerard, “Woutneel,” as well as his 1997 article, “De Passe.”

¹³ Arthur M. Hind, *Engraving in England in the Sixteenth & Seventeenth-Centuries*, 3 vols. (Cambridge: University Press, 1952-1964), 1:284-285.

¹⁴ For Woutneel’s biography, see A. W. Pollard and G. R. Redgrave, *A Short-Title Catalogue of Books Printed in England, Scotland, & Ireland and of English Books Printed Abroad 1475-1640* (London: The Bibliographical Society, 1991), 3:189; and Gerard, “Woutneel,” 366-.

Colinus, 1563-1628), a botanist, writer, and prominent member of the Dutch refugee community in London.¹⁵ Woutneel was able to extend his connections to the Flemish botanists through Cole, who had maintained close friendships with numerous botanists, including Clusius and Lobelius.¹⁶

Woutneel's neighbor in London was Le Moyne, who had already arrived in Blackfriars in the early 1570s. He would have been familiar with Le Moyne's *florilegia*, including the Victoria and Albert Museum watercolors, the British Museum watercolors, and *La Clef des Champs*, which was published in Blackfriars in 1586. Woutneel, who was fascinated with Le Moyne's botanical images, almost certainly encouraged De Passe to produce printed *florilegia* largely based on Le Moyne's work.

It is probable that Woutneel provided De Passe with Le Moyne's drawings as pictorial sources for a set of botanical images in the *Cognoscite Lilia*. Woutneel had already supplied De Passe with a pictorial source for one of his prints, a portrait drawing of Queen Elizabeth by Isaac Oliver (before 1568-1617), one of his neighbors in Blackfriars, which was the model for the full-length portrait they published together in 1603.¹⁷ Whether or not Woutneel purchased the originals of Le Moyne's watercolor drawings, he must have at least had copies of them made to send to De Passe in Cologne.

¹⁵ Ole Peter Grell, "Cool, Jacob (1563–1628)," in *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, ed. H. C. G. Matthew and Brian Harrison (Oxford: OUP, 2004), <http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/20853>. Cole's botanical studies include the *Syntagma Herbarum Encomiasticum* (Leiden, 1606).

¹⁶ Cole married Lobelius's daughter in 1594.

¹⁷ The fact that Woutneel provided De Passe with Oliver's drawing is evident in the inscription of the portrait "*Crispin van de Passe incidit procurante Joanne Waldnelio*." See Hellinga et al., *The Bookshop*, 160.

Le Moyne's Contributions

The organization of *Cognoscite Lilia* is similar to Le Moyne's *La Clef des Champs* (1586): two subjects arranged side by side on each leaf.¹⁸ However, as Paul Hulton has pointed out, many of the images in the *Cognoscite Lilia* are based on Le Moyne's delicately rendered watercolors in the Victoria and Albert Museum and the British Museum rather than on his rendered woodcuts, including *Field Pea* (figs. 127, 128), *Clove Pink*, *Wild Daffodil* (figs. 129, 78), *Almond* (figs. 130, 73), *Borage*, *Hautbois Strawberry*, and *Common Mallow* (figs. 131, 132).¹⁹ In these engravings De Passe reinforced the impression that Le Moyne's watercolors were drawn from live specimens by introducing effects of light and shadow and modifying, if necessary, Le Moyne's botanical images by trimming stems and leaves.²⁰ Aside from such borrowing of floral images, De Passe also drew his illustrations of birds from an earlier source: Hans Collaert I's (1525/30-1580) engraved *Friezes with Birds* (early 1570s, fig. 133). The twelve plates of bird friezes were so popular that these bird motifs frequently appeared on such decorative objects as Dutch glass goblets.²¹

¹⁸ Hatton first argued the close connection between Le Moyne's woodcuts and the *Cognoscite Lilia*. See Richard G. Hatton, *The Craftsman's Plant-Book: Or Figures of Plants* (London: Chapman and Hall, 1909), 9.

¹⁹ See Hulton, *The Work*, 1:81; and Gerard, "Woutneel," 374.

²⁰ De Passe added some other floral images, for example, from preliminary page of Abraham de Bruyn's (1540-1587) *Omnium pene europae, asiae, africae atque americanae gentium habitus* (Antwerp, 1581) to his *Cognoscite Lilia*. De Bruyn's 1581 copy is the 2nd ed. of *Omnium poene Gentium images* (Cologne, 1577). See F. W. H. Hollstein, *Dutch and Flemish Etchings, Engravings and Woodcuts ca. 1450-1700* (Amsterdam: M. Hertzberger, 2004), 4:7. Also see Hulton, *The Work*, 1:81, pl. 139. Images that are identical between Bruyn's and De Passe's works are found, for example, in Melon, Pomegranate, Cucumber, Quince and Grape-Wine.

²¹ For reproductions of these images, see Arnout Balis and Marjolein Leesberg, ed., *The New Hollstein Dutch & Flemish Etchings, Engravings and Woodcuts 1450-1700: The Collaert Dynasty 1* (Ouderkerk aan den IJssel: Sound & Vision Publishers, 2005), xlv-xlvi.

Before De Passe published the *Cognoscite Lilia* with Woutneel, he had never before engraved an entire collection of botanical images, which suggests that *Cognoscite Lilia* was produced primarily for the English market in response to its demands for botanical illustrations. Like Le Moyne's *La Clef des Champs*, the *Cognoscite Lilia* was created as a pattern book to serve various types of artists, including painters, engravers, sculptors, and embroiderers. With its detailed illustrations and subtle effects of lighting and shading, the *Cognoscite Lilia* became one of the most widely circulated collection of botanical images in England. John Payne's (active 1620-1639) *FLORA Flowers Fruicts Beastes Birds and Flies Exactly Drawne* (London, 1620) and Francis Delaram's (active 1615-1624) *A Booke of Flowers Fruicts Beastes Birds and Flies Exactly Drawne* (London, early 1620s) are among those later publications that drew images directly from *Cognoscite Lilia*.²² The experience that De Passe had gained in the production of the *Cognoscite Lilia* aided him with a knowledge of botanical illustrations that was essential for his publication of *Hortus Floridus*, the most influential flower book of the seventeenth century.

Hortus Floridus

In 1614, Crispijn de Passe the Elder published the *Hortus floridus in quo rariorum & minus vulgarium florum Icones ad vivam veramq[ue] formam [...] Et secundum quatuor anni tempora divisae exhibentur* ("A garden of flowers in which images of rare and less common flowers are delineated from life and according to reality,

²² For De Passe's influences on the early English print-market, see Gerard, "De Passe," 174-179; and Anthony Griffiths, *The Print in Stuart Britain 1603-1689* (London: British Museum Press, 1998), 133-138. These English botanical prints were adapted and republished in other works until the eighteenth century.

and classified in accordance with the four seasons of the year”) in Utrecht and Arnhem.²³ The title-page (fig. 134) of the first section contains portraits of the celebrated botanists Rembert Dodoens and Carolus Clusius, whose botanical studies must have been essential sources for the *florilegium*. The *Hortus Floridus* was so popular that its text was translated into Dutch, French, and English. It was later enlarged and reprinted in a variety of different versions.²⁴

Early Training in Botanical Drawing

De Passe the Younger, who was trained as an engraver in his father’s studio, must also have learned to draw from his father. In particular, De Passe the Elder’s experience working on the *Cognoscite Lilia* and his knowledge of Le Moyne’s flower watercolors must have served him well in teaching his son about depicting flowers. Although little is known about De Passe the Younger’s nature studies, several of his father’s botanical drawings provide a glimpse of the type of drawings that would have been used to prepare *Hortus Floridus*. Botanical drawings from De Passe the Elder’s sketchbook demonstrate his manner of representing *naturalia*, capturing the organic form of the plants according to his careful observation of nature. The first of these, two pen drawings with brown wash, depict numerous species of plants—mostly flowers—including evening primroses, violets, dandelions, and narcissus (fig. 135); mallow and nightshade (fig. 136); oak-branches and leafs (fig. 137); ivy and poppy (fig. 138).²⁵ Two plant studies are found in

²³ The structure of the book is discussed under the section *Cognoscite Lilia*.

²⁴ A number of different versions of the *Hortus Floridus* are organized by Savage in his article. See Spencer Savage, “The Hortus Floridus of Crispijn vande Pas the Younger,” *Transactions of the Bibliographical Society* 4 (Dec. 1923): 180-206.

brown ink and black chalk, one of which bears the artist's monogram *C v P* (figs. 139, 140).²⁶ Another watercolor drawing of a lily (fig. 141) by De Passe the Elder appears in the same species of the flower illustrated in the *Hortus Floridus* (fig. 142), indicating that De Passe the Younger rendered his original drawings for the *florilegium* in the manner of his father's style.²⁷

Collaboration with Local Gardeners

In the *Hortus Floridus*, Crispijn de Passe the Younger created entirely new floral engravings that stand apart from those in *Cognoscite Lilia*. De Passe the Elder had produced the *Cognoscite Lilia* as a pattern book by using floral images from Le Moyne's watercolors, but his son, Crispijn, design his own images for the *Hortus Floridus*.²⁸ In his foreword to the section of autumn flowers, De Passe the Younger describes his independence from his father and how had he had worked to find and draw rare and exotic flowers:

For since I had decided to end the training in my craft (having until now concealed myself behind my father's fame) yet planned to follow in his laudable footsteps, I believed that I could do nothing better than mingle profit with pleasure, mindful of the precept of Horace, which I hope to manifest to you, especially with the book that now lies before you, for truly not one mighty labour

²⁵ These drawings were auctioned at Christie's Amsterdam in 1992. See Christie's, *The Hans van Leeuwen Collection: 16th and 17th Century Dutch and Flemish Master Drawings* (Amsterdam: Christie's, 24 November 1992), no. 154. These botanical drawings appear on both sides of each sheet.

²⁶ Formerly in the collection foundation P. & N. de Boer in Amsterdam. See *Oude Tekeningen: Een Keuze uit de Verzameling P. en N. de Boer* (Laren: Singer Museum, 1966), 29, cat. 176. For more information about the drawing, see as Karel G. Boon, *Netherlandish Drawings of the Fifteenth and Sixteenth Centuries*, 2 vols. (The Hague: Government K. Publishing Office, 1978), 1:143, pl. 396.

²⁷ De Passe, *Hortus Floridus*; rpt. in Rohde, *Hortus Floridus*, no. 9 (Summer).

²⁸ This was the only florilegium that De Passe the Younger ever engraved. He had never produced such complete collection of flowers elsewhere in his life.

whatsoever has withheld me from tracing and painting the delineations of the rare and far from common flowers.²⁹

In the *Hortus Floridus*, De Passe often noted that he gained his knowledge in botany from botanical treatises by ancient authors and sixteenth-century botanists, including Conrad Gesner, Leonhart Fuchs, Rembert Dodoens, Lobelius, and Carolus Clusius. Of these, he cited most frequently Clusius, the most famous botanist in his day.³⁰ By relying on Clusius's professional knowledge, De Passe demonstrated that he sought to provide scientifically accurate floral images.

Each of the four sections of the *Hortus Floridus* begins with an image of a garden appropriate to that section's season. The garden for spring (fig. 143), for example, is illustrated with a variety of herbs, such as lavender, thyme and chamomile, and flowers such as irises, tulips, lilies, and a crown imperial. The geometric designs of the garden and seasonal flowers and herbs planted in each of the small beds represent the contemporary style of the gardens where De Passe the Younger observed his plants.³¹ In *Hortus Floridus* he notes that he had found exotic flowers in the local "gardens of the curious":

In Italy and Spain it [*Clematis Altera*] grows freely by the sides of hedges and roads; but with us Dutch it is only found in the gardens of the curious.³²

²⁹ "Cum [e]n[im] proposuissem artis meae Tyrocinium (quo hactenus sub patris insignia delitui) deponere, eiusque nihilominus laudabilibus insistere vestigiis in animo haberem, nihil mihi prius faciendum putavi, quam ut memor Horatiani praecepti, miscerem utilia dulcibus, quod maxime praesenti hoc opera palam me quamcumvis ingentes labores deterruerunt, in vestigandis depingendis[ue] imaginibus rariorum ac minime vulgarium florum [. . .]"; quoted in Veldman, *Crispijn de Passe*, 208 and note 91.

³⁰ Mentioned, for example, in the description of the *Crown Imperial* (no. 12, Spring), the *Anemone* (no. 17, Spring), the *Narcissus* (no. 24, Spring), the *Tulip* (no. 27, Spring), the *Lily* (no. 9, Summer), the *Rose* (no. 13, Summer).

³¹ The contemporary style of gardens is shown in Hans Vredeman de Vries' *Garden of Love*, 1583; quoted in Wheelock, *From Botany*, 26, fig. 17.

It [The Rush-leaved Daffodil] grows wild in the mountains of Spain, and is now to be seen in Dutch gardens.³³

This plant [The Snowdrop] abounds in Italy; but is not to be found here except in the gardens of the curious.³⁴

This plant [*Primula Veris*] is now being cultivated with the utmost care in the gardens of Belgium by lovers of Nature's wonders, with its remarkable form not a little delighting the eyes of those who see it.³⁵

On each page, De Passe the Younger illustrated plants as they grow from the ground, thereby placing observers close to the plants, much as they would experience them in a real garden.³⁶ In these images, Crispijn was able to capture the subtle and delicate quality of each plant and even describe his personal experiences in the gardens, as expressed in his description of *The Lesser African Marigold*: "Its smell is hateful, nay, I should rather say, injurious."³⁷ In his images of plants he often included depiction of insects and small creatures so as to provide readers with a greater sense of reality.

De Passe the Younger worked for four years to complete the *Hortus Floridus*, which, like other *florilegia*, was made to provide flower lovers "both pleasure and delight." In honor of these flower lovers, De Passe dedicated a poem to them.

Aensiet Liefhebbbers wel/siet aen en wilt bemercken/De Scheypsels
veelderhant/Let op Gods wonder wercken/Aen-schout doch met verstant/dese
Bloemkens seer playsant/Door groote moeyten hier/met sorghe ghebracht int

³² De Passe, *Hortus Floridus*; rpt. in Rohde, *Hortus Floridus*, no. 1 (Fall).

³³ *Ibid.*, no. 9 (Winter).

³⁴ *Ibid.*, no. 4 (Winter).

³⁵ *Ibid.*, no. 4 (Spring).

³⁶ This observation is also found in Gerard, "Woutneel," 364.

³⁷ De Passe, *Hortus Floridus*; rpt. in Rohde, *Hortus Floridus*, no. 7 (Fall).

Lant/En door des Schilders const/yder voor oghen ghestelt/Wt uwe Hoven
schoon/Oock uyt het luselijck Veldt/Voort wilt het hert aensien/die door u
Gonstich wesen/In het boeck des Autheurs/met reden werdt ghepresen.

(Behold, votaries/Behold and observe/The multifarious creations/Heed
God's wondrous works/But behold with understanding/These most delightful
blooms/Carefully brought to this country/With great travail/And placed before the
eyes of all/Through the painter's art/From your fair garden/And from the
bewitching fields/Take heed, furthermore/Of the person who was rightly
praised/In the author's book/Through your kind disposition.)³⁸

In *Den Blomhof* (Utrecht, 1614),³⁹ the Dutch version of the *Hortus Floridus*, De Passe the Younger lists the “names of some amateurs and those who love flowers, in particular the flowers and herbs depicted in this book” (“*Namen eenigher Liefhebbers ende der genigher die de Bloemen beminnende zijn, insonderhey daer de Bloemen ende Cruyden die in desen Boeck vervat, gheconterfeyt zijn*”).⁴⁰ In the introduction, De Passe the Younger particularly acknowledges the names of thirty-two of these “flower lovers” and “flower and herb devotees” from Utrecht, Amsterdam, Haarlem and Leiden:

From Utrecht, Joha Wolfswinkel, Willem vande Kemp, apothecary, Iacobus van Nelthorp, surgeon to his Princely Excellency, Iacobus Vermeer, the brothers Hendricus and Andries van Helsdinghen, the brothers Ioannes Sem and Michiel Sem, Sr. Octavius and Sr. Ieronimus Dall Pont., Sr. Iacob van Cleve, Steven Hoevenaer, Petrus and Antonius van Daell, Mistress Catharina Vermerren, Mistress Vriana de Liefvelt, Gerraert Ianssz. Vander Hoolck, the brothers Willem and Albrecht van Haeclum, Ernst van Leeuwaerden; from Amsterdam, Abraham Cattelijn, Petrus Garret, apothecary, Sr. Guilliam Bartelloti, Willem Janssz., Carolus Clutius; from Haarlem, Francois Byts, Sr. Boll, Sr. Quackel, Willem

³⁸ Translated in Veldman, *Crispijn de Passe*, 210.

³⁹ The full title reads: “*Den Blom-hof inhoudende de rare oft ongemeene blommen die op den tegenwoordighen tijdt bij de Liefhebbers in estimatie ghehouden warden. Ghedeelt naar de vier deelen des Iaers, ende door Crispian vande Pas de Jonghe in ordre gebrocht, ende met groote moete naer het leven gheconterfeyt. Ghedruckt tot Utrecht voor Crispijn vande Pas 1614*” (“The garden of flowers, containing the rare or uncommon flowers presently esteemed by devotees. Divided into the four seasons of the year and classified by Crispijn de Passe the Younger, and delineated from life with great travail. Printed at Utrecht by Crispijn de Passe 1614”).

⁴⁰ Quoted in Brenninkmeijer-de Rooij, *Roots*, 52, note 27.

Jacobs, Cornelius Hovenier; from Leiden, Christian Porret, apothecary, and Sr. Honestus.⁴¹

These “flower lovers” allowed De Passe the Younger to make a permanent record of the rare and exotic flowers that bloomed in their gardens. Some of their names are even mentioned in his descriptions of the plants:

This rare kind of Narcissus [*The Largest Narcissus*] which Christianus Porretus [Christian Porret] pharmacist of Leyden in Holland, patron of all the graces, grows in his garden, and with which is found no other of its kind comparable, or equal in size.⁴²

Elsewhere, De Passe the Younger identifies other garden owners, particularly in his description of exotic flowers: *The Broad-leaved Tulip* (no. 31, Spring) from the garden of Honestus from Leiden; *The Unknown Narcissus of Clusius* (no. 25, Fall) from the garden of Peter Perrett, apothecary of Amsterdam;⁴³ *The Early Broad-leaved Tulip* (no. 26, Spring) from the garden of Wolfwinckel; *The Broad-leaved Tulip* (no. 30, Spring) from the garden of Michael Semmius; *Giant Gilliflowers or Carnations* (no. 20, Summer) from Fr. Buchominus.⁴⁴ De Passe, who was allowed access to these exotic gardens, was able to describe accurately the colors of the flowers of each species.

⁴¹ Quoted in Veldman, *Crispijn de Passe*, 414, note 95. Veldman suggests the *Hortus Floridus* was patronized even before it was published, pointing out that “the list of names, which gives a good idea of the kind of people whom De Passe the Elder hoped would buy the book, is very reminiscent of a list of subscribers.” See *Ibid.*, 210.

⁴² De Passe, *Hortus Floridus*; rpt. in Rohde, *Hortus Floridus*, no. 4 (Spring).

⁴³ “This Narcissus, unknown to any writer except Clusius, nor by him fully described, was shown to me by Peter Perrett, apothecary of Amsterdam, a most curious lover of foreign plants”; quoted in *Ibid.*, no. 25 (Fall).

⁴⁴ *Ibid.*, no 26 (Spring), no. 30 (Spring), and no 20 (Summer).

Instructions for Coloring Floral Images

While the *Cognoscite Lilia* was widely circulated as a pattern book, *Hortus Floridus* was created more for De Passe's broad circle of flower lovers in order to provide them with knowledge of each flower—for instance, information about colors, as in his description of the *Auricula Ursi Major*.⁴⁵

The stem also is shorter and bears flowers not indeed so numerous but larger, with a deep purple color and in a measure recalling a ripe mulberry, which however gradually shows a beautiful violet; becoming somewhat pale purple around the centre and approaching rather to whiteness.⁴⁶

Along with such detailed color descriptions of each flower in the English version of *Hortus Floridus*, which was published in Utrecht in 1615, De Passe added instructions for hand coloring the floral images on his title page:

A Garden of Flowers, Wherein very lively is contained a true and perfect Discription of all the Flowers contained in these foure followinge bookes. As also the perfect true manner of coloringe the same with their naturall colores, being all in their seasons the most rarest and excellentest flowers that the world affordeth; ministringe both pleasure and delight in the spectator and most especially to the well affected practisioner. All which to the great charges and almost incredible labour and paine, the diligent Authore by foure yeares experience, hath very Laboriously compiled, and most excellently performed; both in their perfect Lineaments in representing them in their coper plates: as also after a most exquisite manner and methode in teachinge the practisioner to painte them even to the life. Faithfully and truly translated out of the Netherlandish originall into English for the common benefite of those that understand no other language, and also for the benefite of others, newly printed

⁴⁵ Several copies of the *Hortus Floridus* appear to have been colored by their first owners. They could also have been colored in De Passe's workshop. The subtle and delicate character of *Hortus Floridus* was considered independent from other engraved *florilegia*. When John Payne and Francis Delaram engraved their *florilegia*—*FLORA Flowers Fruicts Beastes Birds and Flies Exactly Drawne* and *A Booke of Flowers Fruicts Beastes Birds and Flies Exactly Drawne* respectively—both in 1620s, they were aware of the English version of the *Hortus Floridus*, the most recently published *florilegium*. However, they chose much cruder quality of the *Cognoscite Lilia* for their pictorial source because they determined that the subtle painterly style of the *Hortus Floridus* was not appropriate for their purpose as a pattern book.

⁴⁶ *Ibid.*, no. 8 (Spring).

both in the Latine and French tongues all at the Charges of the Author. Printed at Utrecht by Salomon de Roy, for Crispin de Pass, 1615.⁴⁷

Once handed to those flower enthusiasts, the *Hortus Floridus* was circulated as a gift among friends, botanists, and flower painters in their circles. More importantly, this book was also intended to teach “practitioners [how] to paint them [floral images] even to the life.” In other words, the *Hortus Floridus* was created to be used by professional flower painters for their particular training in coloring floral images. Indeed, a number of images in a copy of the *Hortus Floridus* in the Folger Shakespeare Library were stippled for transfer. The publication of the *Hortus Floridus*, thus, should be considered in the context of the growing market for flower still-life paintings and the appearance of the first generation of professional flower painters in the early seventeenth century. De Passe’s instructions for “the perfect true manner of coloring” were targeted at this young generation of flower painters in their efforts to build up their careers in the emerging genre of flower still-life painting.

⁴⁷ Crispijn de Passe the Younger, *A Garden of Flowers* (Utrecht, 1615), Washington, D.C.: Folger Shakespeare Library (STC 19459 Passe, A).

Jacques de Gheyn II

If DE GHEYN SIR. had been granted a longer life, then he would have undertaken what I had already begun to urge him to do [. . .] namely to depict precisely the most diminutive things and insects with an extremely fine brush, to combine them in a book, the examples in which could possibly have been engraved on copper and to give it the title THE NEW WORLD.

- Constantijn Huygens, 1629-1631⁴⁸

In his biography of Jacques de Gheyn II, Constantijn Huygens (1596-1687), a Dutch poet and secretary of the Stadholder Maurits, Prince of Orange (1584-1625), highly praises the artist's fine techniques as being most suitable for depicting the natural world. Born in Antwerp to Jacques de Gheyn I (1537-1581), a glass painter, miniaturist, and print-seller, De Gheyn II was first trained under his father.⁴⁹ Not long after his father's death in 1581, De Gheyn II moved to Haarlem and entered the studio of Hendrick Goltzius for two years between 1585 and 1590. De Gheyn was trained in the drawing and engraving of portraits, allegorical, biblical, and mythological subjects in the mannerist style of Goltzius. He also maintained close relationships with other Haarlem mannerists, including Karel van Mander (1548-1606), poet and biographer renowned for his *Schilder-Boeck* (the Book of Painters; Amsterdam, 1604), Cornelis Cornelisz van

⁴⁸ “*En als DE GHEYN SR. zijn leven langer had mogen benutten, dan had hij, geloof ik, dat ondernomen, waarop ik reeds begonnen was bij hem aan te dringen [...], nl. Om juist de nietigste dingen en insecten met een uiterst fijn penseel aft e beelden, ze in een boek te vereenigen, waarvan men de exemplaren mogelijk in koper had kunnen graveeren, en daaraan de title DE NIEUWE WERELD te geven*”; quoted in Constantijn Huygens, *De Jeugd van Constantijn Huygens* (Rotterdam; A Donker, 1946), 122. Huygens wrote the book in May 1629 to May 1631, and the biographical accounts end with c. 1614. Translated in Meij, *Jacques de Gheyn*, 83.

⁴⁹ Van Mander had already settled in Haarlem since 1583. De Gheyn's biographical information is derived from Van Mander, *Het Schilder-Boeck*, and Van Regteren Altena, *Jacques de Gheyn*, unless otherwise noted.

Haarlem (1562-1638) and the Utrecht artist Abraham Bloemaert (1564-1651).⁵⁰ The connections between De Gheyn and other mannerists continued throughout his years in Amsterdam from 1590 to 1595. After his stay in Amsterdam, where De Gheyn worked as an independent printmaker and print publisher and produced a number of engravings based on his own designs as well as those of Haarlem mannerists, De Gheyn moved to Leiden in 1595. In the scholarly environment of the University of Leiden, De Gheyn began to make close studies of nature together with professors of medicine, botany, and zoology, including Pieter Paauw (1564-1617) and Carolus Clusius. Finally, in 1603 De Gheyn moved to The Hague, where he joined the painters' guild in 1605.⁵¹ He worked for the Court, maintaining close connections with Prince Maurice and many other intellectuals, such as Constantijn Huygens, who would be his next-door neighbor until 1623. Among the numerous works he made in these years was the 1607 book *Wapenhandelinge* ("The handling of matchworks, musquets and pikes, in accordance with the order of His Excellency Maurice, Prince of Orange"), which was dedicated to the States General.⁵² De Gheyn died in The Hague in 1629.

Early Colored Drawings: Training in Goltzius's Studio

De Gheyn's drawing technique developed throughout his career. He learned how to use colored chalks for his drawing from Goltzius, who had already made a series of

⁵⁰ The life-long friendship between De Gheyn and Van Mander is evident from his *Portrait of Carel van Mander on his Deathbed* as well as from more than fifty engravings based on Van Mander's drawings. For the portrait, see Van Regteren Altena, *Jacques de Gheyn*, 2:113, cat. 693.

⁵¹ In 1605, De Gheyn was listed as a painter in the registers of The Hague guild.

⁵² Prince Maurice awarded De Gheyn two hundred guilders for the book. For these drawings, see *Ibid.*, 2:67-78, cat. 342-464; and for the title page, see Meij, *Jacques de Gheyn*, 12, fig. 3.

drawings of *Christ and the Twelve Apostles* in 1586.⁵³ Goltzius also often combined two or more colors of chalk in his drawings, especially in his portraits, sometimes with touches of watercolor or body color.⁵⁴ The earliest known portrait drawing in colored chalk is *Gillis van Breen* (1588, fig. 143), where Goltzius drew the likeness of the sitter in red, black, brown and white chalk.⁵⁵ By using this new technique, he was able to portray the sitters not only in vivid light and dark contrasts, but also to reflect in their “personalities.” These characteristics are more distinctive when compared with his metalpoint drawings, in which sitters are drawn in a stiff with the exclusive attention to detail. Goltzius further explored the potential of this chalk drawing technique during his travels to Italy between 1590 and 1591.

Albrecht Dürer’s nature studies were the important models for Goltzius in both technique and subject.⁵⁶ Like the German master, Goltzius drew small creatures directly from nature by using different techniques, including pen and ink, chalk, watercolor, engraving and metalpoint. As evident in his fish drawing *Cruyck Vis* (Lumpsucker; 1589, fig. 145) and several other animal drawings, Goltzius effectively used his knowledge of drawing with colored chalks in his nature studies.⁵⁷ He also used diverse techniques in his

⁵³ Reznicek argued that the series was inspired by Dürer and related to a series of glass paintings. For more information and illustrations, see E. K. J. Reznicek, *Die Zeichnungen von Hendrick Goltzius*, 2 vols. (Utrecht: Haentjens Dekker & Gumbert), 1961, 1: 255-256, K 63-65; and its supplement in E. K. J. Reznicek, *Hendrick Goltzius Drawings Rediscovered 1962-1992* (New York: Master Drawings Association, Inc.), 1993, 38-39, K 62a-64a.

⁵⁴ For more discussion about the models for Goltzius’s portrait drawings in colored chalks, see Leeftang, Luijten et al., 149.

⁵⁵ *Ibid.*, 152-153, cat. 47.

⁵⁶ Dürer’s drawings were found in the late sixteenth-century Dutch collections, including that of Aarnoud van Beresteyn of Haarlem. Goltzius made the portrait of Beresteyn in 1579. See *Ibid.*, 169.

⁵⁷ Reznicek, *Hendrick Goltzius*, 1: 355-356, K 264 and 441-442, K 418. As Van Mander writes in his *Schilder-Boeck*, “he [Goltzius] is not inexperienced in the knowledge of nature, being a natural

plant studies as in his metalpoint drawing *Study of Tobacco Plant* (c. 1592, fig. 146) and pen and ink drawing *A Foxglove in Bloom* (1592, fig. 147),⁵⁸ in which Goltzius depicted the plants from nature, probably from his garden where he collected and cultivated a variety of plants.⁵⁹

Goltzius's nature studies and drawing techniques inspired De Gheyn in both subject and technique. De Gheyn's metalpoint drawing *Study of a Blooming Prunis* (fig. 148) is highly reminiscent of Goltzius's *Study of Tobacco Plant* in such a rapid and sketchy quality captured from nature.⁶⁰ Moreover, De Gheyn, who had until then executed his drawings mostly in pen and ink and occasionally in black chalk, became interested in coloring his drawings. However, unlike Goltzius, De Gheyn's significant study of coloring appeared in watercolors rather than in chalk drawings. *The Skinned Head of a Calf* (1599, fig. 149), which the Leiden Professor Pieter Paauw commissioned, is De Gheyn's earliest known watercolor drawing from real life.⁶¹

philosopher." See Van Mander, *Het Schilder-Boeck*, fol. 286v; rpt. in Miedema, *Karel van Mander*, 1:404-405. Goltzius was also interested in drawing rare animals that would have fitted in a cabinet of natural history.

⁵⁸ Reznicek, *Hendrick Goltzius*, 1: 437-438, K 409 and 411r. After his return from Italy, Goltzius's use of metalpoint is less found in his portrait drawings but rather in his nature studies.

⁵⁹ In 1597 Goltzius made a drawing of *A View of a Garden* (Metalpoint on tablet, 59 x 88mm, Berlin: Staatliche Museen zu Berlin, Kupferstichkabinett) on the verso of a study of dogs, suggesting that he had had a garden behind his house in the *Gasthuisstraat*. The engraver and historian Matthias Quadt von Kinkelbach also mentioned Goltzius's garden, which was behind his new house on the *Jansstraat* that he bought in 1603, in *Die Jahr Blum* (Cologne, 1605): "[grown] in it together many foreign and native Crops, Flowers, Foliage." For more information about Goltzius's garden, see Leeftang, Luijten et al, *Hendrick Goltzius*, 171-172, fig. 72, and 310, note 78.

⁶⁰ Van Regteren Altena, *Jacques de Gheyn*, 2:127, cat. 792v, pl. 425. It is drawn on the verso of the figure study *Twice the Head of a Peasant Girl*.

⁶¹ *Ibid.*, 2:131, cat. 837, pl. 83.

Nature Studies in Leiden

During his years in Leiden, De Gheyn established close contact with scholars from Leiden University. They were aware of De Gheyn's abilities to represent nature in a realistic manner and encouraged De Gheyn to portray the natural world of *flora* and *fauna*. For example, De Gheyn's pen, ink, and watercolor drawing, *Four Studies of a Frog* (fig. 150), testifies to his successful draftsmanship in depicting such small creatures. His direct observation from life is not only evident in his rendering of the frog in four different positions, but also in his accurate use of colors.⁶² De Gheyn sometimes noted colors in his inscription, as on his pen and ink drawing of a *Zee Eeghel* (Blow-fish; fig. 151).⁶³

Zee Eeghel

*Dese vis is van omber wit en swart ijser graeuachtich
van den rugghen neerewert al lichter tot den buijck
Die is wit nae de staert is hij noch bruijnder hij al
gestippelt met Keulse aerden de penne sijn
geelenoocker achtich licht graeu De vinne sijn
omber en keulse aerdeachtich teghen tlijf geleoocker
en wit wat root oock wat en blaeu achtich gekolleureert
ende oock met keulsche aerden gestippelt aenden muijl
wat omber achticher gecolloreert*

(The blow-fish

This fish is umber white and iron black grayish becoming lighter from the back down to the belly This is white towards the tail it is even browner and spotted with Cologne earth the spines are yellow ochreish light grey The fins are umber and Cologne earthish against the body yellow ochre and white somewhat red and also somewhat blueish in color and also spotted with Cologne earth and the jaw rather umber-like in color)

⁶² Ibid., 2:138, cat. 888, and 140, cat. 900a.

⁶³ It is in the Rijksprentenkabinet, Rijksmuseum (L. 2228; inv. A3971) in Amsterdam. See Ibid., 2:139-140, cat. 896, pl. 370. For the English translation, see Meij, *Jacques de Gheyn*, 80, cat. 83.

This note not only reveals how important accurate coloring was for De Gheyn, but also demonstrates the scientific manner in which he studied nature, an approach he would have learned from Goltzius and his collaboration with scholars at Leiden University.⁶⁴ It seems highly probable that De Gheyn saw the blow-fish in the University collection of fish since the creature appeared at the bottom of the plan of the *Hortus Botanicus* (Leiden Garden; fig. 152) of 1610, which was engraved by William Swanenburgh after Jan Cornelisz Woudanus's drawing. Its accessibility allowed De Gheyn to describe the fish's colors in such detail.

De Gheyn's abilities as a draftsman working with brush and oil colors are most evident in Van Mander's description of it in the *Schilder-Boeck*:

For, being inclined to the art of drawing since he [De Gheyn] was young, he has persisted so long and so very hard that he has, with great diligence and constant improvement, at last devoted himself to work and paint properly with the oil brush in color – for that is the highest point of art and the most choice means of all with which to come closest to representing Nature in all her aspects.⁶⁵

Van Mander also mentioned De Gheyn's scientific approach to the study of colors:

Now that he had planned to start using colors, and having further considered that it would be difficult for him to distinguish and know colors well in their variety straight away, he thought to gain time by this means: he divided a panel up into some hundred squares and marked them with numbers in figures in a little book and painted these squares with various colors, various shades, green, yellows, blues, reds, flesh colors and other mixtures, giving each as much as he could its own shade, and for each of them wrote that down separately in the little

⁶⁴ Goltzius's careful studies of nature would have been admired by scholars at Leiden where he had contacts as early as 1592. In that year he was commissioned to engrave the portraits of Julius Caesar Scaliger and his son, the scholars at the University, and in 1595 Professor Pieter Pauw invited the artist to attend an anatomy session. For more details about the commission of the portrait engravings, see Leeftang and Luijten, *Hendrick Goltzius*, 147-148. For Goltzius and Prof. Pauw, see Van Regteren Altena, *Jacques de Gheyn*, 1:115.

⁶⁵ Van Mander, *Het Schilder-Boeck*, fol. 294r; rpt. in Miedema, *Karel van Mander*, 1:434-435.

book, as described. This method, unusual though it was, stood De Gheyn in very good stead in recognizing his paints, so that he felt ready to start working in oil paint in order to find out how he would fare using it.⁶⁶

It is possible that De Gheyn learned this method of recording colors in hundreds of squares from his father, a renowned stained-glass painter. He probably studied the character of colored glass in preliminary drawing books before beginning to work on the windows of churches in Antwerp and Amsterdam.⁶⁷

The Lugt Album

De Gheyn's closest collaborator at the University of Leiden was the botanist Carolus Clusius, who probably induced De Gheyn to begin portraying *flora*. It is probable that Clusius, who had come to Leiden in 1593 as a prefect of the *Hortus Botanicus*, was the one who asked De Gheyn to come to Leiden to work with him.⁶⁸ Clusius was almost certainly the one who recommended to De Gheyn that he undertake the project of the Lugt album.

The Lugt album in the Fondation Custodia (Collection Frits Lugt; inv. no. 5655), Institut Néerlandais in Paris, consists of fifty-nine life-size drawings of rare and exotic cultivated flowers, insects, a crab, and a mouse on twenty-two vellum sheets.⁶⁹ Painted in

⁶⁶ Van Mander, *Het Schilder-Boeck*, fol. 294v; rpt. in *Ibid.*, 1: 436-437.

⁶⁷ Van Mander, *Het Schilder-Boeck*, fol. 294r; rpt. in *Ibid.*, 1: 434-435. For the practice of coloring in squares, see Swan, "Jacques de Gheyn," 74-76.

⁶⁸ See Hopper, "Clusius' World," 21, note 36. De Gheyn engraved the first printed plan of the university garden *Hortus Botanicus* in 1600, which was published in Pieter Pauw's catalogue of the garden, *Hortus Publicus Academiae Lugduni-Batavae* (Leiden, 1601), Amsterdam; Rijksmuseum, Printroom (Holl. 297). It shows not only a plan of the existing plants but also small figures including Professor Pauw, Clusius, and De Gheyn himself. See Van Regteren Altena, *Jacques de Gheyn*, 2:47, cat. 165, 1: 69, ill. 55.

⁶⁹ For the general information about the album, see Carlos van Hasselt, *Le Héraut du Dix-Septième Siècle: Dessins et Gravures de Jacques de Gheyn II et III* exh. cat. (Paris: Institut Néerlandais, 1985), 18-33; Karel

watercolor, tempera, and occasionally heightened with white bodycolor, each of these illusionistically framed drawings is signed and dated. Five of the sheets are dated 1600, two 1601, five 1602, seven 1603, and three 1604. The album is not in its original binding, for it was rebound in the early nineteenth century.⁷⁰ The numbers inscribed in pencil on each sheet were done by a later hand, probably when these drawings were regrouped in the order in which they are now presented. In his account of De Gheyn in *Het Schilder-Boeck*, Van Mander introduces this album:

en nam voor eerst voor een cleē Bloempotken nae t' leven / t' welck noch tegenwoordigh is tot d'Heer Heyndrick van Os t' Amsterdam: dat is heel suyver ghehandelt / en nae een eerste begin verwonderlijck. En hoewel zijnen hooghsten lust was tot Figueren / nam hy tot een ander pfoef onder handen / noch eenen grooteren Bloempot / met meeninghe te verbeteren t' gene hem in den eersten mishaeghde / en maeckte een groot glas / daer in staende eenen tuyl van bloemen / waer in hy groot gedult en suyverheyt te weghe bracht. Dit stuck heeft de Keyserlijcke Majesteyt ghecocht / met oock een cleen Boecxken / daer de Gheyn metter tijt eenige bloemkens van Verlichterije nae t'leven in hadde ghemaect / met oock veel cleene beestkens.

(To begin with he undertook a little pot of flowers from life which today is still with Mr Heyndrick van Os in Amsterdam; this is very precisely executed and admirable for a first attempt. And even though his greatest desire was toward figures, he took in hand a larger pot of flowers for another test-piece with the aim of improving on what he did not like in the first, and he made a large glass containing a bouquet of flower and he put much patience and precision into that. This piece was bought by His Imperial Majesty, with a little book as well in which De Gheyn had, in the course of time, drawn some little flowers from life in gouache, with many small animals too.)⁷¹

As Van Mander noted, the Lugt album is “a little book [in which are] drawn some little flowers from life (*nae t'leven*) in gouache with many small animals.” It was purchased by

G. Boon, *The Netherlandish and German Drawings of the XVth and XVIth Centuries of the Frits Lugt Collection*, 3 vols. (Paris: Institut Néerlandais, 1992), 1:132-147, pl. 162-183; Van Regteren Altena, *Jacques de Gheyn*, 2:141-143, cat. 909-930.

⁷⁰ Boon, *The Netherlandish and German*, 1:142.

⁷¹ Van Mander, *Het Schilder-Boeck*, fol. 294v; rpt. in Miedema, *Karel van Mander*, 1:436-437.

Emperor Rudolf II, one of Europe's most renowned collectors of nature studies, in 1604.⁷² Images of *naturalia* were becoming popular for their own sake in late sixteenth-century collections, as is evident in J. Antonio Buoni's note on his visit to Ulisse Aldrovandi's museum in 1571:

Either the skeleton [of an animal] or at least a picture of it, made *al vivo* and imitated excellently in colors by one of his artists [...] very gifted in painting from nature—or should I say nature herself—with whom he vied with his brush, presenting natural things portrayed so vividly to the eyes that viewers remain fooled, unable to discern the artificial from the natural.⁷³

In this passage, those colored images are appreciated as being more than mere replacements for the perishable and fragile objects. Rather, the images “portrayed so vividly to the eyes” provided viewers with a certain form of amusement, as they blurred the boundary between the world of *artificialia* and *naturalia*. Like those images in Aldrovandi's museum, De Gheyn's rare and exotic floral images of the Lugt album would have been a welcome addition to the Emperor's *Wunderkammern* and *Kunstkammern*, his encyclopedic collections of natural and artificial wonders. They satisfied his ambition of collecting rare and exotic *naturalia* as well as *artificialia*.⁷⁴

Clusius's Involvement

While it is not known whether the Emperor commissioned the Lugt album, it is probable that Clusius, who was the Emperor's agent in the Netherlands, had

⁷² Both Van Regteren Altena and Boon suggest that Clusius was probably introduced as Rudolf's agent when the Emperor purchased the album immediately after its completion in 1604. See Van Regteren Altena, *Jacques de Gheyn*, 1:70. See Boon, *The Netherlandish and German*, 1:143.

⁷³ Buoni, *Del terremoto* (Modena, 1572), 45; quoted in Swan, *Art*, 72.

⁷⁴ Reznicek argues that the Lugt album was commissioned directly by the emperor after his court painter Joris Hoefnagel's death in 1600. See Reznicek, *Hendrick Goltzius*, 1:210, note 65.

recommended De Gheyn to Rudolf II. Indeed, while creating the Lugt album, De Gheyn worked closely with Clusius, from whom he gained specific knowledge and experience about newly cultivated plants.

The collaboration between Clusius and De Gheyn seems to have begun around 1600 when the artist began to create the Lugt album. In a letter from September 19, 1600 addressed to Clusius, Italian botanist Giovanni Vincenzo Pinelli mentions that Clusius had found an artist to make his portrait:

I see what you [Clusius] tell me in connection with Mr l'Obel, which will delight Mr Imperato, who still asks about the portrait of l'Obel, and by the way I would like to send you one of his works. I am also delighted that your excellence has found a painter able to represent more naturally than others and I will be waiting willingly to participate in it, according to the courtesy you offer.⁷⁵

In this letter, the phrase “a painter able to represent more naturally than others” refers to De Gheyn, whose portrait engraving of Clusius was inserted in some gift copies of the *Rariorum Plantarum Historia*, published in Antwerp in 1601 (fig. 123).⁷⁶ This portrait of the seventy-five year old botanist illustrates Clusius’s life-long interest in rare and exotic bulbous plants, as it also includes depictions of tulips, Lady’s slipper orchids, scarlet Turk’s cap lilies and fritillaries. Those same plant specimens, not surprisingly, are also found in the Lugt album. Indeed, all of the flowers in the album (see Appendix 6) are listed in Clusius’s *Rariorum Plantarum Historia* as well as in the 1594, 1599 and 1601

⁷⁵ De Toni, 1911, 148-149: “Vedo poi quanto mi a(visa) in relatione del S.r Lobelio, che sarà di piacere al S.r Imperato, il quale mi tiene tuttavia solecitato per il ritratto di esso Lobelio et parendo cosa al proposito lo vorrebbe mandare una delle sue opera. Enmi anco stato di piacere che la S.V.E si sia incontrata in pittore ch'ha Saputo esprimerla più naturalmente de gl'altri et starò attendendo con desiderio di poter partecipare anch'io di questo bene, second l'intentione che per sua cortesia me ne dà”; quoted in De Koning et al., *Drawn from Nature*, 66.

⁷⁶ Van Regteren Altena, *Jacques de Gheyn*, 2:103, cat. 656, 1: 66-67, ill. 53.

inventories of the *Hortus Botanicus*.⁷⁷ It seems highly probable that Clusius had provided De Gheyn with live flowers that had been cultivated at the *Hortus Botanicus* and engaged him to record each specimen in the most accurate manner.

Besides allowing De Gheyn access to the garden, Clusius would have guided the project with his knowledge of botany, much as he had supervised the artist Peeter van der Borcht when they worked together in Malines in 1567.⁷⁸ In fact, Clusius had long had a deep involvement in the production of botanical drawings, as is evident in his letter to the publisher Jan I Moretus on June 18, 1592:

It would be better if the remaining drawings were painted onto the blocks here, by a painter who works very well, and to whom I can convey my intentions for him to follow, one who has already painted 20 or so, except for the living plants, which I need to have painted differently by someone else in color on paper, and send to you.⁷⁹

In this letter Clusius stresses his role of directing the painter. Much as with his collaboration with a painter in 1592, Clusius would have encouraged De Gheyn to follow his instructions while creating the Lugt album. For example, it seems that De Gheyn based his watercolor of *Lady's Slipper Orchid* (fig. 153) on Clusius's description of the flower in his *Rariorum Plantarum Historia*:

⁷⁷ 1594: *Index Stirpium terrae commissarum sub extremum anni 1594 in Lugdunensi Academia apud Batavos horto*, currently collected in Leiden; Leiden University (inv. no. 101); printed in Hunger, 219-235. 1596: *Catalogus Arborum, Fruticum, Stirpium, Herbarum omnium, tam silvestrium, quam hortensium in Horto Medico Universitatis Batavo-Lugdunensis, hoc MDXVI Anno nascentium*, Leiden; Leiden University (inv. no. 225). 1601: *Hortus Publicus Academiae Lugduno-Batavae*, (Leiden, 1601). For further information, see the Appendix in Hopper, "Clusius' World," 31-36.

⁷⁸ This is discussed in chapter four under section "Pieter van der Borcht."

⁷⁹ E. Roze, "Huit lettres de Charles de L'Escluse," *Journal de Botanique* (1895), 2-3: "*Il vaudra mieux que le reste des figures qui sont à faire, soit icy peindt sur les planches de bois, par un painter qui travaille fort bien, et auquel je peux declarer de bouche mon intention et luy monstret ce qu'il suyve, auquel en ay fait peindre ja une vingtaine hors des plantes vives, lesquelles autremet il m'eut fallu faire peindre sur papier avec les couleurs par un autre pour les vous envoyer*"; quoted in Depauw, "Peeter vander Borcht," 52.

The first and most elegant [of this genus] has a single, slightly woolly stem, one foot or more long, which is encompassed one after the other by four or five clearly veined leaves. A single flower on a stem rises from the axil of a leaf lying upon a long pedicel. [The flower] is composed of four intersecting leaves [perianth segments], forming a cross which are elongated (*oblongis*) and lanceolate and of a blackish purple color. The upper and lower leaves are larger than the lateral ones, which are very narrow and have woolly inner parts. A membraneous, swelling, and concave utricle, nearly the size of a dove's egg, emerges and protrudes from the umbilicus. The upper part directly behind is somewhat open and gaping, resembling the mouth of an open shoe. The color is yellow or pale yellow ; there are some rather stiff hairs on the inner side and the lower part has some distinct purple veins running lengthwise. The aperture is covered by a double handel, the upper one, whicte and thin, sprinkled with purple spots [staminode], the lower one, thick and of a grassy green color [stigma], while the lateral sides resemble the eyes of a crab [anthers].⁸⁰

De Gheyn exactly illustrated all the plant's features in this account.

Le Moyne's Influence

The Lugt album differs from other botanical studies of the period. The absence of both plant root structures and verbal identification of each plant makes the album unsuitable for botanical or medical studies but no less suited for aesthetic appreciation.

The watercolors of the album are quite similar in style to Le Moyne's *florilegia*. Beatrijs Brenninkmeijere-de Rooij has suggested that De Gheyn was aware of Le Moyne's

⁸⁰ Clusius, *Rariorum Plantarum Historia*, 271-272, Cap. LXIII: "*Primae & omnium elegantissimae caulis est singularis, pedalis aut majoris longitudinis, firmus, aliquantulum lanuginosus, quem quaterna aut quina ambiunt folia, venosa [. . .] ex folioli quod extremo cauli insidet, nonnumquam & ex proximi, sinu, prodit flos unicus, longo pediculo nixus, quatuor foliolis crucis forma decussatis, oblongis & mucronatis constans, coloris ex purpurâ nigricantis, quorum superum & inferum majuscula sunt, lateralia verò, admodum augusta, & interiore parte lanuginosa : ex horum umbilico emergit & protuberat membranaceus quidam, tumens, concavusque utriculus, columbinum ovum ferè aequans magnitudine, wuperiore parte secundum umbilicum nonnihil apertus & hians, instar calceoli patuli oris, cui color aut luteus, aut pallidus, interne nonnihil villosus, inferno autem purpureis quibusdam venis secundum longitudinem distinctus : hiatum tegit duplex ansula, quarum superior alba, tenerior, purpureisque maculis conspersa, inferior verò densa herbidi coloris, & veluti cancrorum ocellos in lateribus habens*"; quoted in Hopper, "Clusius' World," 26, note 48.

watercolors while he was working on the Lugt album.⁸¹ She argues that De Bry brought Le Moyne's botanical drawings or copies to Clusius, but it is also probable that Clusius knew Le Moyne's works through his connection to Philip Sidney, to whose family Le Moyne had dedicated his *florilegia*.⁸² Inspired by Le Moyne's botanical drawings, Clusius would have encouraged De Gheyn to adopt Le Moyne's careful manner and style in the Lugt album.

Close associations between De Gheyn's Lugt album and Le Moyne's British Museum watercolors of 1585 are many. For example, De Gheyn's *A Madonna Lily and a Garden Pea* (fig. 154) is almost identical to Le Moyne's *Madonna Lily* (fig. 155), and his *Three Roses* (fig. 156) recalls Le Moyne's *Cabbage Rose* and *Alba Rose* (fig. 157).⁸³ Just as with Le Moyne, De Gheyn depicted flowers for their own sake, not only excluding labels and the plants' roots, but also providing each flower with a certain space inside the illustrated frame. Each artist concentrated on depicting individual blossoms, which they delicately rendered with careful underdrawing and small brush-strokes. De Gheyn's fine and smooth manner of drawing gives his watercolors almost pastel-like qualities. Both Le Moyne and De Gheyn placed their flowers in upright gold illustrated frames. Indeed, the twenty-two signed and dated watercolors of De Gheyn's album achieve the quality of independent finished works. The connections between De Gheyn and Le Moyne are further evident in their drawings of insects. The way in which De Gheyn arranged insects in his *A Variety of Insects and Flower Petals* (fig. 158) looks very similar to Le Moyne's arrangement of *Insects and Shells* (fig. 159).

⁸¹ Brenninkmeijere-de Rooij, *Roots*, 42-43; and Wheelock, *From Botany*, 34-36.

⁸² Le Moyne's connection to the Sidney family is discussed in chapters two and three.

⁸³ The observation is also found in Brenninkmeijere-de Rooij, *Roots*, 42-43.

While Le Moyne depicted a single specimen on each sheet of his British Museum watercolors, De Gheyn illustrated several different flowers together on many of the twenty-two sheets in the Lugt album. De Gheyn mostly grouped flowers by the seasons in which they bloomed, as shown in the sheets containing *Three Summer Flowers: a Rose, a French Marigold and a Spanish Iris* and *Early Summer Flowers: a Spanish Iris, an Austrian Briar, two Wild Pansies or Heartsease* (fig. 160). It seems that De Gheyn was exerted to represent the variety of colors, patterns, and shapes found in the same type of plant. While Le Moyne had included only a blue colored columbine (*Aquilegia vulgaris* L.) in his work, De Gheyn included a variety of different specimens of columbine – a double deep blue one (fol. 3), one that is a variegated white and blue (fol. 5), three double white, pink, and purple ones (fol. 7), and a double deep blue and variegated white and blue one (fol. 8). In these choices of rare and exotic flowers, Clusius' professional knowledge and experience must have been influential. De Gheyn's approach to grouping the flowers by their own appearance is further evident in his choices of tulips, roses and irises.⁸⁴

Arranging Flowers in a Bouquet

While little is known about sketches or model works for the Lugt album, a recent discovery of flower studies (fig. 161) originally from the library of Rudolf II (Vienna: Österreichische Nationalbibliothek, fol. 32) seems to have been presented to the emperor as a sample of De Gheyn's botanical drawing.⁸⁵ These six watercolors would have

⁸⁴ For example, a Spanish Iris (*Iris xiphium* L.) appears three times in different colors and shapes in folio 10, 12, and 13.

⁸⁵ The discovery was made by Brenninkmeijer-de Rooij. See Brenninkmeijer-de Rooij, *Roots*, 43, fig. 41.

provided Rudolf II with knowledge of De Gheyn's floral images before the Emperor determined to purchase the artist's finished flower pieces, including the Lugt album.⁸⁶

Unlike the Lugt album, these watercolors depicting tulips, roses and carnations rendered on vellum have been cut out of their original album and are now glued on a folio-sized page of a large album, including drawings of plants and animals by different artists between 1530 and 1585.

Although it has been argued that the Lugt album served as a model for De Gheyn's oil paintings, its highly finished quality, not only in the flowers' coloring and arrangement but also in the fact that each drawing is framed, signed, and dated, suggests that De Gheyn made the Lugt album as an independent work.⁸⁷ As evident in Joris Hoefnagel's manuscript illumination in the court of Rudolf II, the medium of watercolors was widely practiced for its own sake. De Gheyn's Lugt album was similarly made as an individual work together to be placed in the emperor's renowned collections of *naturalia* and *artificialia*.

The way in which De Gheyn grouped together flowers in *Fritillary and Three Tulips in a Vase* (1600, fig. 162) in the Lugt album, was, in many ways, the prototype for De Gheyn's painted floral bouquet still lifes. The artist arranged the bouquet of a red fritillary and three tulips, each in a different stage of blooming, in an earthenware vase. A

⁸⁶ The Vienna album contains several flower pieces by Ludger tom Ring the Younger. Among others, *Basket with Flowers* and *Jug with Flowers* belong to preparatory studies for the large painting *The Marriage at Cana* of 1562. See Koreny, *Albrecht Dürer*, 240-243.

⁸⁷ Bergström and Hopper argue that De Gheyn used his watercolor drawings as model books for his oil paintings, including the formerly Koetser gallery painting and *Vanitas Still Life* of 1603 in the Metropolitan Museum of Art (1974.1). See Ingvar Bergström, "De Gheyn as a *Vanitas* Painter," *Oud Holland* 85 (1970): 143-157; Florence Hopper, "An Early Flower Piece by Jacques de Gheyn II," *Simiolus* 8 (1975/76): 195-198; Florence Hopper, "Science and Art at Leiden: Carolus Clusius and Jacques De Gheyn II's Flower Drawings for Rudolf II," in *Rudolf II, Prague and the World*, ed. Lubomír Konečný, (Prague: Artefactum, 1998), 128-133.

butterfly perches on one of the tulips, and a snail, two flies, and a caterpillar are placed around the vase.

While De Gheyn adopted the individual qualities of the flowers he portrayed from Le Moyne's *florilegia*, he learned how to group them into bouquets from Joris Hoefnagel.⁸⁸ For example, De Gheyn's *Fritillary and Three Tulips in a Vase* is largely derived from Hoefnagel's 1592 watercolor *Still Life with Flowers, Insects and a Frog* (fig. 163), where three tulips are similarly arranged in a vase that is surrounded by a variety of insects.⁸⁹ In order to create a more naturalistic arrangement of flowers, however, De Gheyn broke the pattern of Hoefnagel's radial composition by adding a fritillary to the flower bouquet. He also omitted the side ornamental decorations and limited the number of insects. De Gheyn again used the same arrangement of three tulips in his 1601 portrait of Clusius. De Gheyn's floral bouquets from the Lugt album became further developed in his still-lives in oils.

Flower Still-Life Painting: De Gheyn as Flower Painter

As Van Mander writes in his *Schilder-Boeck*, De Gheyn most likely moved from engraving to oil painting during his years in Leiden.

But since he found (as has been told before) that painting is the most suitable approach to life or nature, the desire in him to paint became more and more powerful so that he abandoned engraving and printing and lamented the

⁸⁸ Hoefnagel's influence on De Gheyn has been studied by several scholars, including Ingvar Bergstrom, Florence Hopper, Lee Hendrix, Thea Vignau-Wirberg, and Claudia Swan.

⁸⁹ Signed and dated *G. H. f. A° 1592*, this watercolor drawing is currently lost. For illustrations and studies of it, see Ingvar Bergström, "Flower Pieces of Radial Composition in European 16th and 17th Century Art," In *Album Amicorum J. C. van Gelder*, ed. J. Bruyn (The Hague: Nijhoff, 1973), 22, fig. 1; and Thomas DaCosta Kaufmann, *The School of Prague: Painting at the Court of Rudolf II* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1988), 204, cat. 9-3. Bergström refers to this drawing as one of the first examples of a radially composed flower piece.

time he had wasted, which he felt he had spent uselessly in those techniques. Now that he had the intention of devoting himself to practicing he realized that it was very necessary to work a great deal both from life and at the same time from imagination, so as to learn to understand all the rules of art.⁹⁰

De Gheyn's shift from engraving to painting, "the most suitable approach to life or nature," was made via the medium of watercolor. He continued to train himself in the art of coloring by working with oils. Soon after, De Gheyn's reputation as a flower painter became so esteemed that the Court in The Hague commissioned him to paint a *Flowerpiece* as a gift for the French Queen Marie de Medici (1575-1642) during her visit to the Netherlands in 1606. De Gheyn was paid an extraordinary sum of 600 guilders for this flower painting.⁹¹

According to Van Mander, De Gheyn created two flower still lifes in oils before 1604.⁹² The first one, "a little pot of flowers from life" that was "very precisely executed," was made for Heyndrick van Os (c. 1555-1615/21), a wealthy merchant and art-lover in Amsterdam.⁹³ The second, whose subject was "a large glass containing a bouquet of flower," is described as having been executed with a highly polished quality with "the aim of improving on what he did not like in the first." Rendered in "much

⁹⁰ Van Mander, *Het Schilder-Boeck*, fol. 294r and 294v; rpt. in Miedema, *Karel van Mander*, 1:434-437.

⁹¹ The present whereabouts of this painting is unknown. See Ulrich Thieme et al., *Allgemeines Lexikon der Bildenden Künstler von der Antike bis zur Gegenwart*, 37 vols. (München: Deutscher Taschenbuch Verlag, 1992), s.v. De Gheyn; and Bergström, *Dutch Still-Life*, 45.

⁹² See note 71 above.

⁹³ In the *Schilder-Boeck* Van Mander mentions that Van Os owned numerous drawings and paintings by Gillis van Coninxloo, Cornelis Ketel, Hans von Aachen, Paulus Brill along with De Gheyn II. For more about Hendrick van Os, see Marten Jan Bok, "Art-Lovers and their Paintings: Van Mander's *Schilder-boeck* as a Source for the History of the Art Market in the Northern Netherlands," in Ger Luijten et al., ed., *Dawn of the Golden Age: Northern Netherlandish Art 1580-1620* exh. cat. (Amsterdam: Rijksmuseum, 1993), 141-142.

patience and precision,” the second painting was purchased alongside the Lugt album by Rudolf II. Unfortunately, both these flower still life paintings are untraceable.

Flower Still Life of c. 1600 (fig. 164), formerly in Brian L. Koetser Gallery, is De Gheyn’s earliest known still-life painting in oils.⁹⁴ In this small (15 x 10 cm) copper painting, a variety of flowers are arranged in a pot, which is placed on a ledge. A moth rests in the center of the vase and a butterfly hovers at the upper left-hand corner of the painting. A shell and a caterpillar are at each side of the ledge. As Bergström points out, the radial composition of flowers and the moth placed on the axis of the bouquet are reminiscent of Hoefnagel’s *Flower Piece* of 1594 (16 x 12 cm, Ashmolean Museum in Oxford, fig. 165).⁹⁵ The close connection between these two flower pieces is further evidenced by the tulip at the top of the bouquet.

De Gheyn’s choice of flowers is more varied than Hoefnagel’s bouquet of a tulip, roses, and columbines. He replaced each of the columbines and roses in Hoefnagel’s drawing with a fritillary and a love-in-a-mist, respectively. He also added a pansy and lilies of the valley to the bouquet. He also illustrated each flower in a much more accurate and subtle manner than did Hoefnagel. It is probable that De Gheyn executed the painting while he was working on the Lugt album since identical flowers—fritillaries, loves-in-a-mist, tulips, dog roses, columbines, pansies, and roses—are found in both. The fritillary

⁹⁴ Its current whereabouts is unknown. The painting was first published by Ingvar Bergström in his 1973 article “Flower-Pieces,” 22-26. Florence Hopper attributed the painter to Jacques de Gheyn II and argued that the painting could be the one he made for Van Os. See Hopper, “An Early,” 195-198. Sam Segal identified De Gheyn’s initials *I, D,* and *G* on the painting. See Sam Segal, “Roelandt Savery als Blumemaler,” in *Roelandt Savery in Seiner Zeit (1576-1639)* exh. cat. (Cologne: Wallraf-Richartz Museum; and Utrecht: Centraal Museum, 1985), 57, Abb. 3. Also Van Regteren Altena, *Jacques de Gheyn*, 2:20, cat. 31; 3: 13, pl. 1, cat. II P 31.

⁹⁵ Bergström, “Flower-Pieces,” 22-23, fig. 2; and Kaufmann, *The School*, 207, cat. 9-7.

and the tulip in the painting appear on folio 2 of the album; the love-in-a-mist and the columbine on folio 8; and the dog rose, the pansy, and the rose on folio 14.⁹⁶

Van Mander mentions De Gheyn's significant improvement with his second flower piece, "a large glass containing a bouquet of flowers." While the whereabouts of this painting is unknown, *Glass Flask with Flowers* (fig. 166) of 1612, a copper painting in the Mauritshuis in The Hague, is one of De Gheyn's earliest known flower paintings with "a glass containing a bouquet of flowers." Its large and weighty blossoms, including roses, tulips, and irises, are precisely rendered. The strict symmetry of De Gheyn's former Koetser gallery painting has now become more casual. Moreover, the glass vase enhanced the naturalistic character of the bouquet through the interplay of light and shadow on the flowers. A reflection of the window on the surface of the glass is clearly visible, further strengthening the illusion of reality. De Gheyn's use of a semi-circular stone niche in The Hague painting seems to have originated from his *Vanitas Still Life* of 1603 (fig. 167), one of the earliest vanitas still lifes in Netherlandish art.⁹⁷

The stylistic connections among the Lugt album and De Gheyn's flower still lifes, including the painting in The Hague and *Tulips and Roses in a Glass Vase* of 1613 (fig. 168), are many. These two paintings on copper include many of the same flowers as found in the album—among others, a large orange-and-red tulip in the center, two yellow daffodils at the top right, large and weighty blossoms of roses, and lilies-of-the-valley and pansies at the bottom of the bouquets.⁹⁸ Compositionally they are also similar. Each has a frontal composition with little depth, a focus on individual details of flowers with

⁹⁶ The similarities between the two are also pointed out in Hopper, "An Early," 198.

⁹⁷ Roelandt Savery had already set his flower bouquets in a stone niche as early as in 1603.

⁹⁸ Runia, *In the Mauuritshuis*, 7.

little overlap, blossoms that are disproportionately large compared with their stems and leaves, and even lighting and vivid color illumination.⁹⁹

Not long after De Gheyn's career evolved from engraving to painting, he became firmly established as one of the first flower still life painters in the Netherlands. His exceptionally large (109.8 x 74.5 cm) panel painting *Vase with Flowers with a Curtain* of 1615 (fig. 169), which is now in the Kimbell Art Museum in Fort Worth, demonstrates his masterful skills with fine brushwork and subtle and delicate manner of coloring in a rich variety of flowers.¹⁰⁰ De Gheyn bequeathed this flower piece to his son Jacques De Gheyn III, who described it in his will in 1641, as "the great flower-piece with a bunch of lilies at the top, painted by the father."¹⁰¹ It is highly probable that De Gheyn II kept the painting with him until his death, using it as a demonstration piece in his studio.

De Gheyn's flower still lifes were admired by connoisseurs of the period. In particular, Constantijn Huygens, when introducing the term '*miniatura*' in his autobiography, judged De Gheyn as being equal in artistry to Hoefnagel and Isaac Oliver, the most renowned miniaturists in the end of the sixteenth century.¹⁰² For Huygens, De

⁹⁹ The characteristics of early flower still lifes are discussed in the Introduction under the section "*Questions Surrounding the Origins of the Flower Still-Life Painting: Seventeenth-Century Netherlandish Flower Still Lifes.*"

¹⁰⁰ For more information about the painting, see Van Regteren Altena, *Jacques de Gheyn*, 2:21, cat. 41. Another flower painting of the 1620s is believed to have been rendered in De Gheyn's last years. Slightly larger (113 x 75 cm) in scale, this painting was once possibly owned by Constantijn Huygen, and its present whereabouts are unknown.

¹⁰¹ "[. . .] den grooten blompot daer een tros lelien boven uut comt, geschildert van des comparants vader za., soe die staet in sijn ebbenlijst besloten in een houten casse [. . .]"; quoted Bergstrom, *Dutch Still-Life*, 47.

¹⁰² Huygens, *De Jeugd*, 69.

Gheyn was far superior to other artists, including Jan Brueghel the Elder and Ambrosius Bosschaert the Elder.¹⁰³

De Gheyn and Early Seventeenth-Century Netherlandish Flower Painters

Aside from De Gheyn, there were other outstanding Netherlandish flower painters at the beginning of the seventeenth century, including Roelandt Savery (1576-1639), Ambrosius Bosschaert the Elder (1573-1621) and Jan Brueghel the Elder (1568-1625). Compositional similarities exist in the works of these four flower painters. They all created intimate bouquets of flowers that focus on the individual flowers whose blossoms are disproportionately large. In their frontal compositions each species of flower is portrayed with even lighting and vivid colors.

Although no document links these artists, they certainly would have known each another's work through their extensive connections with botanists, publishers and collectors. A particularly important patron was the Emperor Rudolf II, whose fascination with natural history played a significant role in the development of an independent genre of flower still life painting. His collection, which was renowned for its rare and exotic *naturalia* and *artificialia*, offered flower painters access to a number of botanical images by, among others, Dürer and Hoefnagel. Rudolf II, who had his own gardens on the Prague Hradčany and at other imperial residences in Bohemia and Austria, commissioned the Dutch artist Emanuel Sweerts (1552-1612) to illustrate over three thousand flowers and herbs cultivated in his extensive garden at Brandeis for *Florilegium* (Frankfurt,

¹⁰³ “Wanneer hij bloemen schilderde, een ondertwerp, dat hem bijzonder aantrok, kon niemand zelfs maar zijn roem benaderen, en aan BRUEGHEL en BOSSCHAERT, die toch beiden even vermaard zijn, heeft hij voor goed de eerepalm ontruk”; quoted in *Ibid.*, 70.

1612).¹⁰⁴ In the preface to the *Florilegium*, Sweerts called the emperor the “greatest most enthusiastic admirer and lover” of flowers “as well as of the arts” and referred to him as the “god of gardens.”¹⁰⁵

Once they had entered the Emperor’s collection, De Gheyn’s floral pieces encouraged the Emperor’s passion for still lifes, making the Rudolfine court one of the earliest centers for the production of flower still lifes. De Gheyn’s flower pieces provided other artists at the court with the most accurately colored floral images. In particular, for Roelandt Savery, who began his imperial service in Prague in 1603 and already pursued his career in flower painting as early as in 1603, De Gheyn’s floral pieces must have been a welcome addition to the Emperor’s collection.¹⁰⁶

Roelandt Savery

Roelandt Savery, who was born in the Southern Netherlands, began his training in art under his brother Jacques (1570-1603), with whom he stayed in Amsterdam beginning in 1591.¹⁰⁷ Shortly after his brother’s early death in 1603, Roelandt went to Prague to serve at the court of Emperor Rudolf II until 1615. In 1618, he settled in Utrecht and remained there until his death in 1639.¹⁰⁸

¹⁰⁴ For more information about the garden of Rudolf II, see Jamila Krčálová, “Die Gärten Rudolfs II,” *Leids Kunsthistorisch Jaarboek* 1 (1982): 149-161; and Kaufmann, *The School of Prague*, 75-76.

¹⁰⁵ Reprinted in Everett F. Bleier, ed., *Early Flower Engravings: All 110 Plates from the 1612 Florilegium by Emanuel Sweerts* (New York: Dover Publications, 1976), xi; quoted in Kaufmann, *The School of Prague*, 75.

¹⁰⁶ Whether Savery began his career in flower painting before or during his service in Prague is not known.

¹⁰⁷ Van Mander, *Het Schilder-Boeck*, 260v. Nothing is known about flower still lifes by Jacques Savery. Limited information about him is found in Bergström, *Dutch Still-Life*, 87-89; and Sam Segal, “The Flower Pieces of Roelandt Savery,” *Leids Kunsthistorisch Jaarboek* (1982): 309-310.

Savery already began his career in flower still-life painting before having seen De Gheyn's floral pieces, which entered the Emperor's collection in 1604. The copper painting *Flower Piece with Two Lizards* of 1603 (fig. 170),¹⁰⁹ which is in a New York private collection, is Savery's earliest extant flower painting, as well as one of the earliest dated flower still lifes in Netherlandish art.¹¹⁰ In this painting, a bouquet of flowers—including an iris, a fritillary, a sweet briar, a tulip, and roses—are arranged in a stone niche.¹¹¹ They are compositionally balanced around a central axis. The shading of the stone niche and the overlapping of leaves and flowers creates the illusion of depth. The thorns of the sweet briar in the center of the bouquet symbolize death and resurrection, as do the vanitas motifs of faded flowers and butterfly. Along with the niche motif, thorns appear repeatedly in Savery's flower paintings throughout his career.

Whether Savery created this floral piece before or during his service in Prague is not known;¹¹² however, its illusionistic naturalism in the portrayal of exotic *naturalia* brings to mind the works of nature studies by Joris Hoefnagel and Jacques de Gheyn that were in Rudolf II's collection.¹¹³

¹⁰⁸ In 1619, he joined the St. Luke's guild in Utrecht. In Utrecht, Savery had a garden behind his house. See Spicer, "The Drawings," 390.

¹⁰⁹ There is an almost identical painting of this work that Savery made the same year. This painting, which is in the Centraal Museum in Utrecht (inv. no. 6316), is also on copper. It is slightly smaller (29 x 19 cm) than the New York painting (32 x 23 cm) and is signed and dated *ROELANDT SAVERY 1603*.

¹¹⁰ There is an even earlier flower painting by Savery that was recorded at the sale (14 March 1873) by the Gsell Collection in Vienna. Signed and dated *R. Savery, 1600*, this painting is currently lost.

¹¹¹ For the identification of each species of flowers, see Segal, "The Flower," 314.

¹¹² In her dissertation, Joaneath Spicer argues that this painting was done in Prague. See Spicer, "The Drawings."

¹¹³ De Gheyn's six floral watercolors in the Vienna album already entered in the Emperor's collection before the Lugt album was completed in 1604.

Savery also knew Hoefnagel's *Four Elements* since he used Hoefnagel's drawing of a rose from the volume *Ignis* (fig. 171) when he painted *Vase of Flowers* of 1611 (fig. 172).¹¹⁴ The two grasshoppers flanking the vase in this painting, on the other hand, rely on De Gheyn's insect drawings from the *Lugt* album (fig. 158). De Gheyn's impact is even more striking in Savery's *Vase of Flowers* of 1612 (fig. 173), which is in the collection of Prince of Lichtenstein in Vaduz. De Gheyn's weighty blossoms of roses (fol. 16), a flamboyant tulip (fol. 20), and a love-in-a-mist (fol. 8), are all based on images in the *Lugt* album, as is the mouse (fol. 22) he depicts in this painting (fig. 174). It is also probable that Savery copied a lizard, which became one of the most frequently depicted creatures in his still lifes, from De Gheyn's work (see *A Salamander* signed and dated *IDG. F. Anno 1600* (fig. 175) and *A Witches' Sabbath* signed *IDGeyn in.* (c. 1608, fig. 176), where a large lizard is shown crawling in the right foreground).¹¹⁵ Given the fact that Van Mander described the *Lugt* album as being "a little book drawn some little flowers from life in gouache with many small animals," it is likely that the album at one point contained more animals than it does now.¹¹⁶

Savery enhanced the genre of flower still lifes with characteristics that were independent from De Gheyn's. In his masterful flower piece *A Bouquet in a Niche with a Cockatoo and a Kingfisher* of 1624 (fig. 177), Savery composed a large bouquet with more than one hundred specimens of flowers and small animals, creating an illusionistic

¹¹⁴ Joaneath A. Spicer, "The Role of 'Invention' in Art and Science at the Court of Rudolf II," *Studia Rudolphina: Bulletin of the Research Center for Visual Arts and Culture in the Age of Rudolf II* 5 (2005): 12, fig. 6 and 7. Present whereabouts of the painting is unknown.

¹¹⁵ For more information about these two drawings, see Van Regteren Altena, *Jacques de Gheyn*, 2:139, cat. 895; 84-85, cat. 519.

¹¹⁶ See note 71 above.

space among them.¹¹⁷ He magnified the dramatic effect of light and shade by using more theatrical spotlighting and by overlapping his great variety of species. As a result, his blossoms were no longer evenly lit. Moreover, by including a number of animals caught in moments of life and death, as in a cockatoo eating a frog and lizards and a kingfisher catching insects, this flower still life dramatically conveys the meaning of vanitas. Savery's significantly looser brushwork and effective use of tonality made a considerable impact on the younger generation of flower painters, including Balthasar van der Ast (1593-1657) and the sons of Ambrosius Bosschaert the Elder—Ambrosius the Younger (1609-1645), Johannes (c. 1610-c. 1650), and Abraham (c. 1612-1643)—with whom he maintained close relationships during his years in Utrecht between 1618 and 1639.¹¹⁸

Ambrosius Bosschaert the Elder

While De Gheyn, Savery, and Jan Brueghel the Elder also worked in other genres, the painting dealer and flower painter Ambrosius Bosschaert the Elder devoted himself exclusively to the independent genre of flower still lifes. He spent most of his life in Middelburg, the capital of Zeeland, which was renowned as a center for the importation of exotic goods as well as for its botanical gardens.¹¹⁹ Bosschaert, who lived in Middelburg from c.1587 to 1613, maintained close connections with its local gardeners

¹¹⁷ Signed and dated *ROELADT SAVERU FE 1624*. This large (130 x 80 cm) painting is in the Centraal Museum (inv. no. 2310) in Utrecht. For the identification of each flower and animal, see Segal, "The Flower," 315-319.

¹¹⁸ Savery was best man of Ambrosius Bosschaert the Younger at his wedding in Utrecht on January 6, 1634. See Abraham Bredius, "De Bloemschilders Bosschaert," *Oud Holland* 31 (1913): 140.

¹¹⁹ One of two largest regional offices of the Dutch East India Company was located in Middelburg, while the other was in Amsterdam.

and botanists there, among them Matthias Lobelius.¹²⁰ As town doctor in Middelburg from 1584 through 1596, Lobelius had a broad network of relationships with amateur gardeners as well as with internationally well-known botanists, including Dodoens and Clusius. Bosschaert could have had connects with these botanists through Lobelius, or through other local botanists and gardeners.

Bosschaert's interactions with gardeners and botanists, which were similar to those of De Gheyn, allowed him to create the realistic appearance of the blossoms in his flower still lifes. As in *Flowers in a Glass* of 1606 (fig. 178), one of his earliest bouquet depictions, Bosschaert painted in his flower still lifes with crisp edges, which he achieved by painting completely in glazes, his brushwork almost invisible. Such a fine style immediately calls to mind De Gheyn's floral images. Much like De Gheyn, Bosschaert also arranged flowers in an almost symmetrical composition, in which each individual bloom is evenly spotlit. He placed dark greenery behind the blossoms to make them stand out.

Given the fact that De Gheyn and Bosschaert apparently never met and made their careers in flower painting independently from one another, the shared characteristics of their flower pieces must have derived from their similar involvement with botanists and gardeners. Given their extensive networks, it seems probable that De Gheyn and Bosschaert worked for the same gardeners or botanists, including Clusius. Indeed, when the Middelburg gardener Johan Somer enclosed a statement to Clusius about "the counterfeit of the yellow fritillary" in his letter of May 8, 1597, the gardener must have

¹²⁰ For more study on Bosschaert's production of floral still lifes, responding to the Middelburg art market, and his social and professional networks of amateur collectors, botanists, merchants, and art dealers, see Meghan S. W. Pennisi, "The Flower Still-Life Painting of Ambrosius Bosschaert the Elder in Middelburg ca. 1600-1620," Ph.D. diss. (Northwestern University, 2007), especially chapters 3 and 4.

commissioned a local artist to portray this rare species from his garden.¹²¹ Although Somer did not identify the artist, it could very well have been Bosschaert: a yellow fritillary (*Fritillaria latifolia*) is found in Bosschaert's flower still lifes, including *Bouquet in a Glass Beaker* of 1618 (Copenhagen: State Museum of Art), *Bouquet in an Arched Window* of c. 1618 (The Hague: Mauritshuis, fig. 179), and *Bouquet at the Window* of 1619 (Stockholm: Prof. Einar Perman).¹²²

Despite the many similarities in their style of painting, significant differences exist as well. Bosschaert's work is much lighter in tonality than is that of De Gheyn. Moreover, the compositional variety of De Gheyn's later works—for example, the Kimbell painting—is not found in Bosschaert's more modestly scaled flower still lifes.

In 1615, Bosschaert left for Utrecht and stayed there until 1619, when he went to Breda. During the years he spent in Utrecht, Bosschaert and his sons maintained close connections with Savery, who was in the city from 1618 to the time of his death. Bosschaert must also have known the De Passe family, who settled down in Utrecht in 1611, and their most famous *florilegium*, *Hortus Floridus*, which was published in the city in 1614. In his interactions with these flower artists, Bosschaert's flower-still life painting became more naturalistic during his years in Utrecht. As in his copper painting *Roses in an Arched Window* (1618-1619, fig. 180), Bosschaert arranged his flowers more informally, often overlapping individual blossoms. Moreover, he depicted flower still lifes before an open stone niche, through which an imaginary landscape is visible, a type

¹²¹ "I send Your Honour the counterfeit of the yellow fritillary that has thus blossomed in my garden this year"; quoted in Bol, *The Bosschaert Dynasty*, 18.

¹²² The observation was first made by Laurens Bol. See *Ibid.* For more information about these three still lifes, see *Ibid.*, 64-65, cat. 33; 65, cat. 37; 67, cat.46, respectively.

of composition never found in Savery's oeuvre. By depicting shadows of flowers along the inner edges of the niche, Bosschaert was able to enhance a sense of illusionism.

Besides their naturalistic character, Bosschaert's flower pieces were deeply imbued with religious symbolism, in which even the smallest blossom serves as a reminder of the greatness of God's creation. In his last known work, *Bouquet of Flowers in a Glass Vase* (1621, fig. 181), which is in the National Gallery of Art in Washington, D.C., Bosschaert composed a symmetrical bouquet surmounted by two large flowers—a yellow iris and a red-and-white striped tulip, combining a range of flowers, such as lily of the valley, roses, a blue-and-white columbine, fritillary, in a round glass. In this painting, Bosschaert not only created a sense of joy with the diverse colors and shapes of each blossom, but also spirituality by including certain flowers associated with the religious symbolism, such as the rose, iris, columbine and pansy, species most frequently appeared in the border decorations of books of hours. Bosschaert's choice of flowers is also found in Le Moyne's *florilegia*, among others, a pansy in his Dumbarton Oaks manuscript (fig. 49). Bosschaert situated the same plant over the ledge, seemingly extending into the viewer's space.¹²³ In Christian traditions, the pansy is a symbol of the Holy Trinity due to its three colors—its old Dutch name is “*drievuldigheidsbloem*” (“Trinity flower”).¹²⁴ It was also known as “*Jesus oog*h” (“Jesus's eye”), a symbol of humility.¹²⁵ In this respect, the two dewdrops, which are clearly visible on the leaves, may have symbolized Jesus's tears in his humility. This religious interpretation is further reinforced by a butterfly, a

¹²³ I would like to thank my advisor Arthur Wheelock, curator of National Gallery of Art in Washington, D.C, for bringing my attention to the symbolism of this flower.

¹²⁴ Segal, “The Flower,” 325.

¹²⁵ *Ibid.*

symbol of resurrection. Although we do not know the extent to what Bosschaert intended such flower symbolism in his still lifes, he clearly shared the contemporary belief that God's presence is found in all of creation.

As evident in his daughter Maria's notes in 1621, Bosschaert was among the most successful artists in the independent genre of flower still lifes in his time: he was to be paid one thousand guilders for "a flower pot" he had painted for the Prince of Orange's steward.¹²⁶ The inscription in the Washington painting also commemorates Bosschaert's enormous reputation as a flower painter: "*C'est l'Angelicq main du grād Peindre de Flore AMBROSE, renommé jusqu'au Riuage Mort*" ("It is the angelic hand of the great painter of flora, Ambrosius, renowned even to the banks of more").¹²⁷

Jan Brueghel the Elder

The flower painter and landscape artist Jan Brueghel the Elder was born in Brussels and lived most of his life in Antwerp. In the second half of the sixteenth century, this city became the leading center of botany in Europe.¹²⁸ The Plantin press published a

¹²⁶ "[Bosschaert] resident within Breda, had left for the Hague to deliver a flower pot he had made for the butler of His Highness [Prince Maurice] for which he had charged as much as thousand guilders"; quoted in Bol, *The Bosschaert Dynasty*, 33.

¹²⁷ For more study on this inscription, see Wheelock, *From Botany*, 43, note 78.

¹²⁸ Mathias Lobelius praises the city as the center of horticulture in the preface to his *Plantarum seu Stirpium Historia* (Antwerp, 1576): "This entire, considerable and prominent region of Belgium (long ago known to the world as Flanders or Low Germany) is indeed the most famous warehouse in the whole of Europe. The most extraordinary and desirable of goods from across the globe are imported here in abundance over land and sea, and all the treasures of Europe, Asia and Africa are brought together here. The land is rich in brilliant talents, excellent in every art and science. Although the Northern climate is less suited to cultivating many plants because of its harsh cold, long winters, persistent lashing storms and other (additional) ravages, the zest for work, the precision and persistent care with which the inhabitants preserve the fragile plants from these conditions is nevertheless so great, that nowhere in the world can a plant be found which is not grown here under new techniques, and outstandingly cultivated by the unremitting labour and unflagging toil of an outstanding and distinguished people who spare no expense to this end. For this very reason, and not mistakenly, I would offer the first prize for developments in botany, the most important science befitting the greatest scholars, to the Belgians. For in this area alone one

great number of botanical studies by major botanists, including Dodoens, Lobelius and Clusius,¹²⁹ and exotic plants were cultivated in a number of important gardens in the city.¹³⁰ Of these, the most famous garden was that of the pharmacist Pieter van Coudenberghe (1517-c. 1594). In 1548, he laid out his garden—the first private botanical garden in Europe—in which he would over time cultivate hundreds of exotic plants. By 1568, the number of species of exotic plants reached almost six hundreds due to his active exchange of plants with other botanists, among them, Carolus Clusius.¹³¹

Brueghel's flower paintings were avidly commissioned by Flemish patrons but also by Cardinal Federico Borromeo, whom he met in Milan during his travels in Italy in 1589.¹³² In 1606, Brueghel painted his first flower still life for Borromeo shortly after spending some time in Prague in 1604 and having seen flower still lifes by Savery and De

encounters more species and varieties of plants, shrubs and trees than can be found in ancient Greece, wide Spain, Germany, England, France and refined Italy, or any other neighbouring country of region"; quoted in De Nave and Imhof, *Botany*, 13.

¹²⁹ Rembert Dodoens's first herbal book, *Cruijdeboeck*, was published by the Antwerp printer and bookseller Jan vander Loe in 1554. After Vander Loe's death in 1563, most of the botanical publications in Antwerp were printed by Christopher Plantin (c. 1520-1589). Beginning with Dodoens's 1566 publication *Frumentorum, leguminum, palustrium et aquatiliium herbarum ac eorum quae eo pertinent historia*, a number of botanical treatises were printed by the Plantin family. There were several botanical illustrators working for the publications, including Peeter vander Borcht, Arnold Nicolaï, Gerard Janssen van Kampen and Anton van Leest. Christopher Plantin had his own botanical garden in Berchem. See *Ibid.*, 14.

¹³⁰ For example, the Prince of Chimay; Karel van Bossu, Viscount of Brussels; Gilbert d'Oignies, Bishop of Tournai; and Cornelius Gemma and Jan Viringius, professors at the University of Louvain, owned the most exotic gardens in Antwerp. Lobelius also introduced the most important botanical gardens of Antwerp in his *Kruydtboeck* (Antwerp, 1581), which include the gardens of Jan van Hoboken, town registrar, and Marie de Brimeu, Princess of Chimay and Duchess of Aarschot. In particular, Marie de Brimeu's garden was designed by Carolus Clusius. See *Ibid.*, 13-14.

¹³¹ "Now after much work and heavy expenses I can admire around 600 exotic plants in my garden every day and although this has cost me many financial offers and a lot of time, I derive the greatest of pleasure from it"; quoted in *Ibid.*, 31, note 2.

¹³² For more study on Borromeo as an art patron, see Arlene J. Diamond, *Cardinal Federico Borromeo as a Patron and a Critic of the Arts and his Musaeum of 1625*, Ph.D. diss. (University of California Los Angeles, 1974); Pamela M. Jones, "Federico Borromeo as a Patron of Landscapes and Still Lifes: Christian Optimism in Italy ca. 1600," *The Art Bulletin* 70 (1988): 261-272; and Pamela M. Jones, *Federico Borromeo and the Ambrosiana: Art Patronage and Reform in Seventeenth-Century Milan* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1993).

Gheyn in the court. While their independent approaches to flowers inspired Brueghel to pursue his career in the emerging genre of flower still lifes, however, his style was quite different from those two, by using different types of models for his blossoms.

In July 6 of the following year, Brueghel sent Borromeo a letter along with a copper painting, which has been identified as a small (8 x 10 cm) painting in the Pinacoteca Ambrosiana in Milan (fig. 182). A number of elements in this painting—rosebuds, a mouse, a caterpillar, and a butterfly—were most likely based on images made by Joris Hoefnagel, including Jacob Hoefnagel's *Archetypa* after his father's design.¹³³ Brueghel referred to this painting in his 1605 letter to Borromeo, saying that “no one has ever seen the like in oils, painted so painstakingly and in such detail.” Each creature depicted in this work is rendered with the subtle delicacy of a manuscript illumination.¹³⁴

The first flower still life Borromeo commissioned, *Flowers in an Earthenware Jar* (Milan: Pinacoteca Ambrosiana, fig. 183), was completed in August 1606.¹³⁵ In this painting on copper, Brueghel depicted more than one hundred plants, including rare and exotic species such as tulips, fritillaries, anemones, and hyacinths. The great variety of flowers found in this work—eight different species of tulip, five types of iris, and nine forms of narcissus that appear in the work—became typical for Brueghel. The golden

¹³³ Brenninkmeijer-de Rooij, *Roots*, 49; and Vignau-Wilberg, *Archetypa*, 51.

¹³⁴ Giovanni Crivelli, *Giovanni Brueghel, Pittor Fiammingo, o Sue Lettere e Quadretti esistenti presso l'Ambrosiana* (Milan: Ditta Boniardi-Pogliani di E. Besozzi, 1868), 50: “Un rametto, fatto d' me con molto diligenzi, pregando vs. Ill.mo d' accettarle in bona parte. Credo cho non è piu visto con colori in oglio cosi miniato p piu diligente”; quoted in Brenninkmeijer-de Rooij, *Roots*, 49, note 11.

¹³⁵ The flower piece first appears in his letter of Jan. 27, 1606, to Borromeo. Crivelli, *Giovanni Brueghel*, 62: “Ma non avendo ancora potuto adempire la mia buona volontà per finire l'opera già cominciata, fra tanto nascono i belli fiori che Serrano in quantita in ditto quadro:” (“because I have not yet been able to fulfill my intention of completing the already commenced work, the first flowers have been born of which there will be an abundance in the said painting”); quoted in Brenninkmeyer-de Rooij, *Roots*, 49, note 14. Brenninkmeyer-de Rooij suggests that the “already commenced work” could be his landscape painting, which he had mentioned in his letter in August of 1605 to Borromeo.

coins, jewelry, and exotic shells placed on the ledge around the vase reinforce the value of these rare flowers.¹³⁶ He mentions the painting in his two letters of 1606 to Borromeo:

Believe me, Your Honour, that never before have I painted such a picture. I think the flowers will be lifesize, more than a hundred, most of them extremely rare and beautiful. The common blooms are lilies, roses, carnations and violets: the others are unfamiliar, some of them never seen before in this country. God willing, I hope to finish it within a month: animals, flies and other maggots, with four shells from the sea: it will be a pretty sight.¹³⁷

I painted these flowers completely after nature. I have invested all my skill in this picture. I do not believe that so many rare and different flowers have ever been painted before, nor rendered so painstakingly: it will be a fine sight in the winter. Some of the colours are very close to the real thing. Under the flowers I have painted a jewel with coins, [and] with rare objects from the sea. It is up to your honour to judge whether or not flowers surpass gold and jewels.¹³⁸

In these letters, Brueghel emphasizes the fact that he had depicted the flowers “completely after nature” (“*fatta tutti del naturel*”). For such realistic illusionism, Brueghel observed living plants that were grown in gardens, where he either made sketches for future use in his studio or painted directly at that time. It was always challenging for Brueghel to have rare and extremely expensive flowers for his painting:

¹³⁶ Indeed, Brueghel accompanied this painting with “*ho misso 12 coccilli delli piu belli et raro che vengono del India con li navi hollandesi*” (“12 of the finest and rarest shells brought from India on Dutch ships”) as a gift to Borromeo. See Crivelli, *Giovanni Brueghel*, 168; quoted in Brenninkmeijer-de Rooij, *Roots*, 57, note 44.

¹³⁷ Crivelli, *Giovanni Brueghel*, 64: “*vs Ill.mo credo per certo che io no habio mai fatto un quadro simili. Credo che Serrano di fiori fatta grando comme il natural, in nomre pieu d centi, il maigior parta tutti raro et belli. Fiori communo son lilia rosa garofli et violi: gli altri che non son piu visa in questa paisi. Si piatco nostro Sig.r, spera aver finite in un mese d tempo: gli animali, de musci et altri vermi’, con quatre coccilli del mare: farrane un bel vedere: detto quader mandera per via d Vergainni mercanto*”; quoted in Brenninkmeijer-de Rooij, *Roots*, 50, note 17.

¹³⁸ Letter of August 25, 1606. See Crivelli, *Giovanni Brueghel*, 74-75: “*Il quadro delli fiori fatta tutti del naturel: in ditto quadro ho fatto tanto quanto sapir farre. Credo che non sia mai fatto tanti raro et vario fiori, finite con simla diligensa: d’inversa farra un bel vederei: alcuni colori arriveno apresca poca il natural. Sotti I fiori ha fatta una Gioia con manefatura de medaigle, con rarita del maro. Metta poi vs Ill.mo per giudicare, se le fiori non passeno ori et Gioii*”; quoted in Brenninkmeijer-de Rooij, *Roots*, 50, note 18.

“they are flowers, which it was not easy for me to find in gardens; such flowers are too important to have in the house.”¹³⁹ When he could not find such rare species of flowers in his local gardens in Antwerp, he went to Brussels. In a letter of April 14, 1606, to Borromeo, Brueghel writes:

Not only because it is painted from life but also because of the beauty and rarity of various flowers which are unknown and have never been seen here before: I therefore went to Brussels to portray a few flowers from life which cannot be seen in Antwerp. Your Excellency will marvel at this work. God willing, I hope to finish it by June 1 and shall dispatch it forthwith: the flowers are lifesize.¹⁴⁰

However, not all of Brueghel’s flowers were made from life. As Sarah Murray and Karin Groen discovered in their examination of the *Bouquet with Mourning Iris in a Stoneware Jar* (Cambridge: Fitzwilliam Museum, fig. 184), Brueghel’s underdrawings of different flowers are found to be in varying degrees of completion.¹⁴¹ In this painting, Brueghel drew his tulips with only a few lines, while his roses had far more detailed underdrawings.¹⁴² These differences indicate that he had not only composed his works with flowers from different seasons but had also used different types of models. For instance, he copied the large mourning iris (*Iris Susiana*) from Pierre Vallet’s *Le Jardin*

¹³⁹ Crivelli, *Giovanni Brueghel*, 110: “*Un quadret de fiori, qualo io retrove con discomeda alli giardini: simili fiori son trop in e’ stimi per aver in casa: io spera che su Sig. Ill.mo a’ura gusto questa iverna*”; quoted in Brenninkmeijer-de Rooij, *Roots*, 51, note 21.

¹⁴⁰ Crivelli, *Giovanni Brueghel*, 63: “*tanto per la naturalleza come anco delle bellezza e rarita de vario fiori in questa parto alcuni inconita et non peiu visto: per quella io son stata a Brussella per ritrare alcuni fiori del natural, che non si trove in Anversa. Vs Ill.mo sarra marvaigliato in detta opera. Si piatce noster Sig.r io spera aver finite ditto quader al primo Giugno et subito mandera gli fiori son grande comme il natural*”; quoted in Brenninkmeijer-de Rooij, *Roots*, 49, note 11.

¹⁴¹ Sarah Murray and Karin Groen, “Four Early Dutch Flower Paintings Examined with Reference to Crispijn van de Passe’s ‘Den Blom-Hof,’” *Bulletin of the Hamilton Kerr Institute* 2 (1994), 14.

¹⁴² *Ibid.*, 17.

du Roy très Chrestien Henri IV (Paris, 1608, fig. 185).¹⁴³ The simplification of forms and lack of correction in Brueghel's floral still lifes indicate that he used prints by, among others, Adriaen Collaert and Jacob Hoefnagel as models for some of his blossoms.

While De Gheyn and Bosschaert concealed their brush marks with an extremely smooth manner of painting, Brueghel's brushwork was quite free and expressive. As in his 1606 flower piece, Brueghel's quick and sweeping brushstrokes are clearly visible along the soft contours of the flowers. His blossoms are impressionistically rendered with subtle tonal gradations. The delicacy of Brueghel's tonal contrasts was admired by his contemporaries, as is evident in a letter written to Sir Dudley Carleton in 1617. In this letter, the British ambassador George Gage praises Brueghel while criticizing De Gheyn's flower piece for being "cutting and sharpe" and "too much ordered:"

And howsoever yow esteeme there your Jacques de Ghein, yet wee preferred by much Brugel, because his things have neatnesse and force (*kracht*), and a *morbidezza* (softness or mellowness), which the other hath not, but is cutting and sharpe (*ghesneden en cantigh*) and his thinges are too much ordered.¹⁴⁴

Cardinal Borromeo was so delighted with Brueghel's flower pieces that he even expressed his pleasure in the "imagined odor" emanating from the flowers depicted in Brueghel's flower still life:

[When I am in my study and] it is hot, flowers are pleasing to me, and some fruit on the tables. And I have enjoyed most of all having the fruits of the spring, and the flowers of it, and still in the summer—according to the diversities of the weather—[I have enjoyed] having various vases in the room, and varying

¹⁴³ Brenninkmeyer-de Rooij, *Roots*, 66-67.

¹⁴⁴ C. Ruelens and Max Rooses, *Correspondence de Rubens et documents épistolaires concernant sa vie et ses œuvres*, 6 vols. (Antwerp: Veuve de Backer, 1887-1909), 2:119-120; quoted in Taylor, *Dutch Flower Painting*, 130, note 52.

those according to my pleasure. Then when winter encumbers and restricts everything with ice, I have enjoyed from sight—and even imagined odor, if not real—fake flowers [. . .] expressed in painting [. . .] and in these flowers I have wanted to see the variety of colors, not fleeting, as some of the flowers that are found [in nature], but stable and very enduring.¹⁴⁵

Brueghel's choice of various species of flowers satisfied Borromeo, who would have looked forward to the pleasure of seeing "the variety of colors" in his flower painting. As Karel van Mander wrote in *Den Grondt der Edel Vry Schilder-Const* (Haarlem, 1604), variety was the most essential element for connecting art to the attributes of nature:

Nature is beautiful through variety; this one can see when the earth, blooming with almost a thousand colours, stands showing its worth to the starry throne of Heaven, and one can discover this graceful pleasure in other things too: for no one cries when asked to enjoy themselves at a Table provided with many different kinds of food and drink. History too, and this is important, should display variety in its Figures.¹⁴⁶

To achieve such a variety, it became crucial for artists to be able to color "after nature." This is probably why De Gheyn began his painting career with flower painting. In his *Schilder-Boeck*, Van Mander notes the difficulty De Gheyn had when he changed his career from engraving to painting: "Now that he [De Gheyn] had planned to start using colors, and having further considered that it would be difficult for him to distinguish and know colors well in their variety straight away, he thought to gain time by this means."¹⁴⁷

¹⁴⁵ Federico Borromeo, *Pro suis studiis* (Milan: Bibliotheca Ambrosiana; MS G310inf, no. 8, 1628): fols. 254v-255r; quoted in Jones, "Federico Borromeo," 269.

¹⁴⁶ "Door verscheydenheit is Natuere schoone, dat sietmen, als schier met duysent coleuren het Aertrijck ghebloeyt om prijs state ten toone, teghen den sterrigen Hemelschen throone, als noch aen meer dinghen is te bespeuren bevallijck ghenoeghen: want sonder treuren, het volck verlusticht, aen Tafel van spijsen en dranck voorsien, op menigherley wijze. Oock d'History, daer veel aen is gheleghen, haer Beelden behoven te zijn verscheyden;" rpt. in Karel van Mander, *Den Grondt der Edel Vry Schilder-Const*, ed. Hessel Miedema, 2 vols. (Utrecht: Haentjens Dekker & Gumbert, 1973), 1:132-135, no. 20-21.

¹⁴⁷ See note 66 above.

For De Gheyn, who would have gained knowledge about different colors, flower painting was a great practice for using “a thousand colours.”

Early seventeenth-century flower painters such as Jacques de Gheyn, Roelandt Savery, Ambrosius Bosschaert and Jan Brueghel the Elder were able to put into action Van Mander’s thoughts about the importance of having variety by applying “a thousand colours” to a number of species of flowers. With some flowers bursting from the bud altogether and others in full bloom, and with each flower being depicted from an individual angle, these flower painters could capture the true beauty of nature. Paralleling their efforts to create floral images with such subtlety and delicacy of color, were Crispijn de Passe the Younger’s accurate descriptions about colors of the blossoms depicted in his *Hortus Floridus*. Underlying the approach of all these artists, were the pioneering efforts of Jacques le Moyne de Morgues, whose careful observation of flowers and their color, made in consultation with botanists and publishers, established the pictorial framework for early seventeenth-century flower still lifes. These early flower artists, who had learned Le Moyne’s innovation in flower painting through their extended networks involving botanists, publishers and collectors, transferred their knowledge of Le Moyne’s floral images to contemporary flower painters.

Conclusion

This study opened with a discussion of Jacques le Moyne de Morgues's contribution to the development of seventeenth-century Netherlandish flower still lifes. I questioned how Le Moyne's floral images were known to early flower artists, among others Crispijn de Passe the Elder and Jacques de Gheyn. How is it that stylistic connections found between them, even though they have never met during life? Le Moyne lived in France until he settled down in England in the early 1570s and stayed there until his death in 1588, and De Passe and De Gheyn never traveled to England.

Le Moyne was a botanical artist who gained his early training in the French manuscript tradition and continued to develop his career as flower painter in a world fascinated with collecting and recording plants. Le Moyne's career as a cartographer and official artist in the Florida expedition encouraged him to portray botanical specimens as living plants after his return to France. Moreover, Le Moyne's experience in Florida was of interest to English aristocrats such as Sir Philip Sidney and his circle, as well as to renowned gardeners and botanists such as Carolus Clusius.

Along with an interest in rare and exotic plants from the New World, a gift-exchange tradition existed in England that reinforced social, cultural and political relations between givers and receivers. While a variety of gifts circulated between donors and recipients, flower-motif books, such as those seen in William Smith's flower poem, Esther Inglis's flower-illustrated manuscripts, and Thomas Palmer's botanical emblem books, were favored gifts due to their aesthetic beauty and didactic functions. The important role of nature in spiritual meditation in contemporary arts and literatures is

evident in Le Moyne's emblematic *florilegia*, which were presented as gifts and placed in collectors' cabinets as independent works of art. Following this gift-exchange tradition, Le Moyne dedicated his emblematic *florilegia* to "Madame de Sidney."

In this study I have argued that Mary Sidney Herbert, the Countess of Pembroke, was the "Madame de Sidney" of Le Moyne's dedication. Once belonging to her cabinet, Le Moyne's *florilegia* were circulated among botanists and publishers in her circle. They admired Le Moyne's efforts in the combination of art, science and emblematic, and encouraged a younger generation of Netherlandish flower still-life artists to expand upon Le Moyne's poetic, emblematic and naturalistic floral images.

At the core of this study is the conclusion that the collaboration between botanists, artists and publishers was a crucial component in the development of independent flower paintings. Botanists and publishers were at the center of a network of flower collectors, gardeners and artists, focusing on collecting and exchanging rare and exotic plants as well as illustrations of them. This study has carefully examined the role of the botanist Carolus Clusius and the publisher Hans Woutneel in involving a young generation of flower painters with projects that incorporated floral illustrations. In circulating botanical illustrations, Clusius and Woutneel supplied precisely colored drawings by Le Moyne to early Netherlandish flower artists, including Jacques de Gheyn and Crispijn de Passe the Elder, encouraging them to expand on Le Moyne's approach in their own floral images.

I have pursued a new approach to the subject of the origins of flower still lifes in an effort to establish Le Moyne's contributions to early Netherlandish flower painting. The results of this study suggest that Le Moyne's *florilegia* were known to early flower painters through their extended networks involving botanists, publishers and collectors.

Furthermore, the close relationships of these flower painters and botanists established ways of working “*naer het leven* (from life),” as evident in De Gheyn’s *Lugt album*, “a little book [. . .] drawn some little flowers from life (*nae t’leven*)” that was inspired by Le Moyne’s *florilegia*.¹

¹ Van Mander, *Het Schilder-Boeck*, folio 208r: “*een cleen Boecxken daer de Geyn metter tijdt eenige bloemkens van Verlichterije nae ’t leven in hadde ghemaect met oock veel cleene beestkens*”; rpt. in Miedema 1994, 1:437.

Appendix 1

Selected *Florilegia* Printed in 1586-1620

- 1586 Jacques le Moyne de Morgues, *La Clef des Champs* (Blackfriars, 1586).
- 1592 Jacob Hoefnagel, *Archetypa Studiaque Patris Georgii Hoefnagelii Iacobus F. genio duce ab ipso scalpta, omnibus philmuisis amice D: ac perbenigne communicat* (Frankfurt, 1592).
- c. 1600 Adriaen Collaert, series engravings of flowers without text on the title page followed by twelve engravings ; [after Collaert], *Florae Deae inter patros & exoticos flores sedentis artificiosa delineatio variorum florum subsequente effigie*, Justus Sadler excudit (Antwerp, c. 1600).
- [n.d.] Adriaen Collaert, *Florilegium Ab Hadriano Collaert caelatum, et à Philip. Galleo editum, illustriss. Eccelestissimque Dno D. Ioanni Medici. Omnis generis elegantiarum admiratori et patron, Philip. Gallaeus DD* (Antwerp, n.d.).
- c. 1604 Crispijn de Passe the Elder, *Cognoscite lilia agri quomodo crescant [...] gloria sua sic amictum fuisse ut unum ex his* (Cologne[?], c. 1604), later published in the second part of the *Hortus Floridus* (Utrecht and Arnhem, 1614).
- 1608 Pierre Valet, *Le Jardin du Roy Très Chrétien Henri IV* (Paris, 1608)
- 1609 Anselmus B. de Boodt, *Florum, Herbarum et Fruticum Selectiorum Icones et Vires, pleraeque hactenus ignotae [. . .]* (Frankfurt, 1609).
- 1611 Johann Theodoor de Bry, *Florilegium novum, hoc est: Variorum maxime-que Rariorum Florum ac Plantarum Singularium una cum suis Radicibus et Cepis Eicones, diligenter aere sculptae et ad vivum ut plurimum expressae – New Blumenbuch, darinnen allerhand schöne Blumen und frembde Gewächs mit ihren Wurtzeln und Zwiebeln mehrer theils dem Leben nach in Kupffer fleissig gestochen zu sehen sind* (Oppenheim, 1612.)
- 1612 Emanuel Sweerts, *Florilegium. Tractans de variis floribus et aliis indicis plantis, ad vivum delineatum in duabus partibus et quator linguis concinnatum* (Frankfurt, 1612).
- 1613 Basilius Besler, *Hortus Eystettensis, sive Diligens et Accurata omnium Plantarum, Florum, Stirpium, ex variis orbis terrae portibus, quae in celeberrimis viridariis arcem episcopalem ibidem cingentibus, hoc tempore conspiciuntus delineato et ad vivum repraesentatio* (Eichstätt & Nürnberg, 1613).

- 1614 - 1617 Crispijn de Passe the Younger, *Hortus floridus in quo rariorum & minus vulgarium florum Icones ad vivam veram[ue] formam [...] Et secundum quatuor anni tempora divisae exhibentur* (Utrecht and Arnhem, 1614), with extensions of the Spring section until 1617; Dutch edition: *Den Blom-hof inhoudende de rare oft ongemeene blommen die op den tegenwoordighen tijdt bij de Liefhebbers in estimatie ghehouden warden. Ghedeelt near de vier deelen des Iaers, ende door Crispian vande Pas de Ionghe in ordre gebrocht, ende met groote moete naer het leven gheconterfeyt. Ghedruckt tot Utrecht voor Crispijn vande Pas 1614* (Utrecht, 1614); French edition: *Jardin de Fleurs, contenant en soy les plus rares et plus excellent fleurs [. . .]* (Utrecht, 1614-1616); English edition: *A Garden of Flowers, wherein very lively is contained a true and perfect Discription of all the Flowers contained in these foure followinge bookes. As also the perfect true manner of coloringe the same with their naturall colores [. . .]* (Utrecht, 1615).
- 1616 Jean Franeau, *Jardin D'Hyver ov Cabinet des Fleurs contenant en XXVI elegies, Les plus rares et singulez Fleurons des plus fleurissans parterres – Illustré d'excellentes figures representantes au naturel les plus belles fleurs des Jardins domestiques* (Paris, 1616).
- 1616 Ulrich Völler von Gellhausen, *Florilegium, Das ist: ein Blumenbuch / darinnen allerhand Blümlein gantz artig mit lebhaftten Farben / sampt ihrer Wirckung und Eygenschafften vorgemahlet und beschrieben sindt. Auch Beneben dem die vornehmsten Früchte / so man in den Lustgärten zu pflantzen und aufzuzielen pflaget. Alles nach dem Leben und eygentlicher Beschreibung in Teutsche reimen verfasset* (Frankfurt, 1616).
- 1620 François Langlois, *Livre de fleurs, ou son representes toutes sortes de tulippes, narcisses, iris, et plusieurs autres fleurs avec diversites d'oiseaux, mouches, et papillons, le tous fait après le naturel [. . .]* (Paris, 1620)
- 1620 John Payne, *Flora: flowers fruicts beastes brids and flies exactly drawne, With their true colours lively described* (London, c. 1620).
- 1620s Francis Delaram, *A booke of flowers fruicts beastes brids and flies exactly drawn* (London, early 1620).

Appendix 2

Joris Hoefnagel's Poem Dedicated to Albrecht Dürer

*In ALBERTVM DVRERVVM. in gratiam
Georgij Hoefnagel.*

*DVRERI ingenio, qui nil molitur inepte
(Quem graphide aequavit nullus, paucique colore)
Consummasse artes pacis non sat fuit: idem
Aggressus bellique actus, sic Pallada utramque
Percolit, ut duplicem referat capite inde coronam.
Germanos bellare docet Germanus, et artem
Anormem prius, et diffusam ad certa reducit
Principia, ut pulcro praecepta hinc ordine pandat.
Consessu in magno, Megarà admirante Mathesin
A puncto in tantum tractando assurgere limen.
Saepe idem patriae Dürerus certa dedisse
Consilia in rebus dubijs memoratur. In uno
Norica Gens Ciue ut possideret omnia quae sunt
Singula sat praeclara alijs insignia* laudum. *vel: encomia
In Melanthonis effigiem.
Qui volet in claro pietatem effingere vultu,
Omne feret punctum hic, unum pingendo Philippum.*

(On Albrecht Dürer. To Show Honor
By Georg Hoefnagel)

To the genius of Dürer, who never made a foolish effort
(Whom none has equaled in drawing, and few in coloring)
It was not enough to have consummated the arts of peace,
But having attacked the affairs of war
He so perfected each Pallas
That from them he bore on his head a double crown.
As a German he taught the Germans how to wage war,
And an art that had previously been without norms and diffuse,
he reduced to certain
Principles, to unfold its precepts hereupon in beautiful order.
You might believe that you were watching Socratic Euclid teaching
In a great assembly, while Megara admired his Mathematics
Discussing how from a point it swelled into such a great boundary-line
Often likewise Dürer is said to have given the fatherland sure

Counsels in doubtful matters. So that
In one citizen the people of Nuremberg possess all things
Which, while they pertain to an individual, are outstanding
enough signs for praise* to others.

*encomia

On the Image of Melanchthon
Whoever wishes to depict piety in a famous face
He will gain all approval, in painting one Philip.)¹

¹ Written in the album of Johannes Radermacher, *Album Amicorum Joanni Rotarii (sic)*, fol. 55r (Ghent: Rijksuniversiteit, MS. 2465); quoted in Kaufmann, *The Mastery of Nature*, 81-82.

Appendix 3

A List of the Plants Illustrated in Sotheby New York 2005 Watercolors

The letters following the identification of the plants indicate Le Moyne's other *florilegia* where the same species illustrated. (VA=Victoria and Albert Museum watercolors; BM=British Museum watercolors; DO=Dumbarton Oaks manuscript)

- Fol. 1: Double daisy and painted lady butterfly (VA, BM, DO)
- Fol. 2: Sweet violet and butterfly (VA, BM, DO)
- Fol. 3: Common Mallow and Damselfly (VA, BM)
- Fol. 4: Dog rose and caterpillar (VA, BM)
- Fol. 5: Wild daffodil and insect (VA, BM)
- Fol. 6: Foxglove (VA)
- Fol. 7: Lily of the valley with butterfly and grasshopper (VA)
- Fol. 8: German iris and insect (VA)
- Fol. 9: White iris and dragonfly
- Fol. 10: Wild gladiolus and stag beetle
- Fol. 11: Lesser periwinkle
- Fol. 12: Peony (VA)
- Fol. 13: Species rose with snail (VA, DO)
- Fol. 14: Cyclamen (VA)
- Fol. 15: Opium poppy (VA)
- Fol. 16: Common vetch and black-veined butterfly (VA)
- Fol. 17: Common borage (VA, BM)
- Fol. 18: Corn Cockle (VA)
- Fol. 19: Corm Poppy (VA)
- Fol. 20: Cornflower (VA)
- Fol. 21: Love-in-a-mist (VA)
- Fol. 22: Staversacre, Delphinium staphisagria (VA)
- Fol. 23: Gilliflower, Matthiola incana (VA)
- Fol. 24: Draon arum and tortoiseshell butterfly (VA)
- Fol. 25: Bugloss (VA)
- Fol. 26: Cranesbill
- Fol. 27: Sweet-scented Chamomile (VA)
- Fol. 28: Red clove (VA)
- Fol. 29: Honesty
- Fol. 30: Heartsease (VA, BM, DO)
- Fol. 31: Clove pinks (VA, BM, DO)
- Fol. 32: Clove pinks (VA, BM)
- Fol. 33: Pot marigolds (VA, BM)
- Fol. 34: French marigolds (VA, BM)
- Fol. 35: Plume pink (VA)
- Fol. 36: Clove pinks (VA, BM, DO)

Fol. 37:	Rue (VA)
Fol. 38:	Millet and moth (VA)
Fol. 39:	Amaranthus
Fol. 40:	Comfrey
Fol. 41:	Larkspur (VA)
Fol. 42:	Dame's violet, <i>Hesperis Matronalis</i>
Fol. 43:	Gilliflower, <i>Matthiola incana</i> (VA, BM)
Fol. 44:	Wild columbine
Fol. 45:	Columbine (VA, BM)
Fol. 46:	Columbine with butterfly (VA, BM)
Fol. 47:	Orange lily and dragonfly
Fol. 48:	Gilliflower, <i>Matthiola incana</i> (VA, BM)
Fol. 49:	Hollyhock (BM)
Fol. 50:	Solomon seal
Fol. 51:	Bittersweet (Woody nightshade)
Fol. 52:	Wild sage and butterfly
Fol. 53:	Fern
Fol. 54:	Wild clary
Fol. 55:	Lavender (VA)
Fol. 56:	Spanish broom and butterfly
Fol. 57:	Gooseberry and butterfly
Fol. 58:	Peach (VA, BM)
Fol. 59:	Pomegranate (BM)
Fol. 60:	Bullace (VA, BM)
Fol. 61:	Redcurrant
Fol. 62:	Cob-nut (VA, BM)
Fol. 63:	Wild cherry (VA, BM)
Fol. 64:	Wild strawberry (BM, DO)
Fol. 65:	Almond (VA, BM)
Fol. 66:	Nectarine (VA)
Fol. 67:	Walnut (VA, BM)
Fol. 68:	Wild cherry (VA, BM)
Fol. 69:	Medlar (VA, BM)
Fol. 70:	Pear (VA, BM)
Fol. 71:	Cucumber (VA, BM)
Fol. 72:	Melon (VA)
Fol. 73:	Grape-vine (VA, BM)
Fol. 74:	Globe artichoke (VA, BM)
Fol. 75:	Apple (VA, BM)
Fol. 76:	Common fig (VA, BM)
Fol. 77:	Mulberry (VA)
Fol. 78:	Seville orange (VA, BM)
Fol. 79:	Lemon (VA, BM)
Fol. 80:	Quince (VA, BM)

Appendix 4

Le Moyne's Dedication to "Madame de Sidney" in *La Clef des Champs*

To My Lady, Lady Sidney

My Lady, although human actions are dissimilar, yet they have this in common, that all tend to some goal. How fortunate and praiseworthy, therefore, are those actions whose authors, caring little for their private profit, have more regard for the public good, as we may see not only in the most illustrious houses, of which you are both spouse and daughter, but in your own person which, as we remember the past the hope for the future, seems predestined to throw down ignorance and to magnify commendable virtue. Now, it has pleased God to give us in this age (the gutter for the malice of those before) a happy resting place here, accompanied by the light of His Holy word, under the most fortunate reign of His most faithful and our most serene ELIZABETH, Queen of these lands in good right in the arts, and produced a number of noble minds who have joined together to communicate to others that which it has pleased Him to impart to them, in which so worthy design, willingly and to the extent of my small talent, I have striven to follow them, by composing this little number of the most remarkable birds and beasts, not only those which are borne on the arms of the nobility, but also those which are more pleasing to the eye and which Nature's admirable artificer has best painted and decked out; which animals are accompanied by as many of the most beautiful flowers and fruits which I judged most fitting, all taken from life, and which might serve those to prepare themselves for the arts of painting or engraving, those to be goldsmiths or sculptors, and others for embroidery, tapestry and also for all kinds of needlework, for all of which skills portraiture is the first step without which none can come to perfection. And thus (My Lady) since I know you favour the liberal arts, I have made bold to dedicate to you what I have prepared, for publication under the protection of your name, which will serve it as a shield against the inveterate enemies of virtue; not that I esteem it worthy of that which you merit, but since a work which is profitable to all seems, in itself, to be an offering to your greatness, I reassure myself that my good intention will be more acceptable than the actual work, which is only worthy to approach you from a distance; receive it, then, if it pleases you, with that customary goodness which makes you no less loved among lesser men than your learning makes you esteemed among the great, and since your Highness will not have disdained this labour of mine, I shall hold myself most happy and shall be the more encouraged to bring what remains to its completion. And so (My Lady) I pray to Him whose graces have been richly meted out to you, to desire the continued growth of your everlasting virtue and of your future happiness.

From London this 26th of March,
Your most devoted
Jacques Le Moyne, called de Morgues, Painter.¹

¹ Translated from the French by J. W. Joliffe; quoted in Hulton, *The Work*, 1:186-187.

TO THE SAME

Sonnet

Though pale and nervous, threatened by my fear,
Though in my breast my heart beats painfully,
I'm not quite stripped of hope: tongue-tied and shy,
I find a new importunate boldness here.

Down then, my knee, eyes lowered. Kneeling there
Upheld by confidence, beneath your eye,
Trembling with happiness, I hopefully
Offer my Book, the humble gift I bear.

My Lady, I have banished fear and shame
To offer now to your Exalted Name
My love, my humble duty, my vocation;

And since your Virtue, holy ornament,
Lifts you from earth to scale the firmament,
I pray that you accept this dedication.

I. L. M.²

² Translated from the French by R. N. Currey; quoted in Hulton, *The Work*, 1:187.

Appendix 5

Esther Inglis's Flower-Illustrated Manuscripts

**Most information from Tjan-Bakker, "Dame Flora's," 67-68.

1. *Octonaries upon the Vanitie and Inconstancie of the World. Writin by Esterh Inglis, the first of Ianuar 1600* (Washington, D.C.: The Folger Shakespeare Library, MS V.a.91).
2. *A New Yeers Guift for the Right Honorable and Vertuous Lord my Lord Sidnay of the hand writing and limning of mee Esther Inglis the first of Ianuar, 1606* (Austin: University of Texas at Austin, The Carl H. Pforzheimmer Library, MS 40).
3. *Une Estreine pour tresillustre et vertueuse Dame la Contesse de Bedford, escrit et illumine par moy Esther Inglis ce I de Janvier, 1606* (Private collection).
4. *A New Yeeres Guift for the Right Honorable and Vertuous Lady the Lady of Arskene of Dirltoun. Of the hand writing and limning of mee Esther Inglis, the I. of Iannuar, 1606.* (Chicago: Newberry Library, Wing MS-ZW645.K29)
5. *Tetrasticha selecta historiae Geneseos, Estherae Inglis manu exaratae, Londini 1606*, Dedicated to Christianus Frisen, 29 July 1606 (Berlin: Staatsbibliothek, MS Lat.oct.14).
6. *Argumenta in Librum Psalmorum Davidis Estherae Inglis manu Exarata Londini 1606.* Dedicated to Lord Chancelor Ellesmere (Cambridge: Harvard University, Houghton Library, MS Typ 212).
7. *Argumenta in Librum Geneseos Esthere Inglis manu exarata Londini 1606*, Dedicated to Thomas Wotton (Private collection).
8. *Cinquante Octonaires sur la va vanite [sic] et inconstance du monde. Dediez a monseigneur le Prince, pour ses estrennes, de l'an, 1607. Escrit et illumine par moy Esther Inglis* (London: Winsor Castle, Royal Library).
9. *Cinquant [sic] Octonaires sur la vanite et inconstance du monde, dediez a tresillustre seigneur le conte de Shrewsbury, pour ses estrennes l'an 1607* (Edinburgh: National Library of Scotland, MS 25240).
10. *Argumenta singulorum capitum Eccles: per tetrasticha manu Estherae Inglis exarata strenae nomine egregio et dignissimo adolescentulo, M. Thomae Pukering oblate 1607* (New York: Pierpont Morgan Library, MA2149).

11. *Cinquante Octonaires sur la vaite et inconstance du monde, dediez, a tresillustre et puissant seigneur Lodowic Duc de Lenox &c: pour ses estrennes Escrit et illumine par Esther Inglis 1607* (Edinburgh: Scottish Record Office, GD 18/4508).

12. *Les Quatrains du Sieur de Pybrac dediez a tresillustre et tresnoble Seigneur, monseigneur le Conte de Salisberrie, pour ses estrennes, de l'an 1607 Escrit et illumine par moi Esther Inglis* (Edinburgh: University of Edinburgh, MS La.III.439).

13. *Les Quatrains du Sr. De Pybrac dediez a tresnoble et treshonorable Seigneur, Monseigneur de Hayes, pour ses estrennes 1607 Escrit et illumine, par moy Esther Inglis* (Chicago, Newberry Library, Wing MS-ZW645.K292).

14. *Argumenta in singulorum, capitum Evangelii Matthaei Apostoli, per tetrasticha manu Estherae Inglis exarata Londini xxvi Iuanuarii, 1607*, Dedicated to William Douglas, Earl of Morton (Private collection).

15. *Octonaries upon the Vanitie and Inconstancie of the World, writin and limd be me, Esther Inglis the xxiii, Decemb: 1607*, Dedicated to William Jefferay (Washington, D.C.: The Folger Shakespeare Library, MS V.a.92).

16. *Octonaries upon the Vanitie and Inconstancie of the World. Writin and limd be Esther Inglis the first of Ianuar, 1609*, Dedicated to Lord Petre (New York: New York Public Library, Spencer Collection, French MS 14).

Appendix 6

The Lugt Album

**The identification of flowers is from Boon, *The Netherlandish and German*.

Fol. 1v: Three Moths and a Stag-Beetle (1604)

Fol. 2r: a Fritillary and three Tulips in a vase; a snail and four insects (1600)

Fol. 3r: Three Alpine Flowers: a Globeflower, a Lady's Slipper Orchid and a Double Columbine(1600)

Fol. 4r: Three Spring Flowers: a Poppy or Crown Anemone, a Tulip and an Alpine Squill (1600)

Fol. 5r: a Turban Buttercup or Scarlet Crowfoot, a Rose-feathered Tulip, a variegated Columbine and a Cloth of Gold Crocus (1601)

Fol. 6r: Double Carnation, a Flamed Bizarre Tulip and a Liverwort or Liver-leaf (1601)

Fol. 7r: a Double White Columbine, a rose Feathered Tulip, a Double Pink Columbine and a Double Oxblood Purple Columbine (1602)

Fol. 8v: a Love-in-a-Mist, a Double Columbine, a French Marigold, a Double Poet's Narcissus or Pheasant's Eye and a Double variegated Columbine (1602)

Fol. 9v: a Yellow Turk's Cap Lily (1602)

Fol. 10r: Double or Plush Anemone, a Spanish Iris and a Siberian Iris (1601)

Fol. 11r: a variety of insects and flower petals (1600)

Fol. 12v: Three Summer Flowers: a Rose, a French Marigold and a Spanish Iris (1602)

Fol. 13v: Early Summer Flowers: a Spanish Iris, an Austrian Briar, two Wild Pansies or Heartsease (1603)

Fol. 14r: a Dog Rose, a Pink Rose Bud, three wild Pansies, a Great Double White Rose and a "Maiden's Blush" Rose (1603)

Fol. 15r: an Austrian Briar, an Orange Lily and a Pink Rose (1603)

Fol. 16v: an Apothecary's Rose, a Pink Rose and a Double White Rose (1603)

Fol. 17v: a Madonna Lily and a Garden Pea (1600)

Fol. 18r: a Scarlet Turkscap Lily and a Peony (1603)

Fol. 19r: a Provence or Cabbage Rose seen from the side and from the front (1603)

Fol. 20v: Crimson and White Tulip, Rose-flamed (1603)

Fol. 21r: a Crab (1604)

Fol. 22r: a Field Mouse (1604)

Bibliography

Manuscripts

Bibliothèque de l'Arsenal, Paris:

Getty Epistles Master. *Hours of Claude de Guise*. Before 1550. Bibliothèque de l'Arsenal, MS. 654.

Master of Claude de France. *Heures à l'Usage de Rome*. c. 1510-1515.

Bibliothèque de l'Arsenal, Ms. 291.

Bibliothèque Nationale de France, Paris:

Antoine de Jussieu. *Catalogus Stirpium Elegantissime*. 1722. Bibliothèque de Nationale de France, no. 5052.

Jean Bourdichon. *Les Grandes Hours d'Anne de Bretagne*. 1500-1508.

Bibliothèque Nationale de France, Ms. lat. 9474.

Bodleian Library, Oxford:

Thomas Palmer. "Vegetable Emblem" Book. 1598. Bodleian library, Ashmole 767.

British Library, London:

Carolus Clusius. Letter to Sir Philip Sidney (Dec. 4, 1575). British Library, Add. MS 17520, 6-7.

Carolus Clusius. Letter to Sir Philip Sidney (May 28, 1576). British Library, Add. MS 15914, 29-30.

Carolus Clusius. Letter to Sir Philip Sidney (Jun. 8, 1576). British Library, Add. MS 15914, 31-32.

Master of Claude de France. *Book of Hours*. c. 1520. British Library, Add. Ms. 35214.

Thomas Palmer. *The Sprite of Trees and Herbes*. 1598/99. British Library. Add. MS. 18040.

William Smith. *A new yeares Guifte: made vpon certen Flowers*. Late Sixteenth Century. British Library, Add. Ms. 35186.

British Museum, London:

Jacques le Moyne de Morgues. Fifty Watercolor Drawings of Flowers and Insects. 1585. British Museum, 1962-7-14-1.

Dumbarton Oaks Garden Library, Washington, D.C.:

Jacques le Moyne de Morgues. Manuscript of Eight Miniatures of Flowers and Insects. Early 1560s. Dumbarton Oaks Garden Library, RBR C-3-1 LEM.

Folger Shakespeare Library, Washington, D.C.:

Esther Inglis. *Octonaries upon the Vanitie and Inconstancie of the World. Writin by Esterh Inglis, the first of Ianuar 1600*. The Folger Shakespeare Library, MS V.a.91.

Esther Inglis. *Octonaries upon the Vanitie and Inconstancie of the World, writin and limd be me, Esther Inglis the xxiii, Decemb: 1607*, Dedicated to William Jefferay. The Folger Shakespeare Library, MS V.a.92.

Institut Néerlandais, Paris:

Jacques de Gheyn II. Fifty-Nine Drawings of Flowers and Small Animals on Twenty-Two Vellum Sheets. 1600-1604. Institut Néerlandais, Collection Frits Lugt, Inv. No. 5655.

J. Paul Getty Museum, Los Angeles:

Georg Bocskay. *Mira Calligraphiae Monumenta*. J. Paul Getty Museum. Inv. 86 MV 527. Published in Lee Hendrix and Thea Vignau-Wilberg, ed. *Mira Calligraphiae Monumenta*. Los Angeles: The J. Paul Getty Museum, 1992.

Library of Congress, Washington, D.C.:

Warburg Hours. c. 1500. Library of Congress, Rare Book and Special Collections Division.

National Gallery of Art, Washington, D.C.:

Joris Hoefnagel. *The Four Elements*. National Gallery of Art. Gift of Mrs. Lessing J. Rosenwald, 1987. 20. 5-8.

Oak Spring Garden Library, Upperville:

Jacques le Moyne de Morgues (attributed). Sixty Watercolor Drawings of Flowers and Fruits. 1560s. Oak Spring Garden Library.

Pierpont Morgan Library, New York:

Book of Hours. c. 1500. Pierpont Morgan Library, M. 1051.

Jean Bourdichon, *Book of Hours*. c. 1515. Pierpont Morgan Library, M. 732.

Master of the Hours of Claude Gouffier. *Hours of Claude Gouffier*. c. 1555, Pierpont Morgan Library, M. 538.

Private Collection:

Charles Jourdain. *Blason des Fleurs, ou sont contenuz plusieurs secretz de Medecine, dédié à tres illustre et tres docte Princesse Madame Marguerite de France, sœur unique du tres puissant Roy Henti de Valois*. 1555. Private Collection

Jacques le Moyne de Morgues. Miniatures Formerly in the Collection of Rudolf II: Ten Miniatures of Plants, Insects and Birds. c. 1585-1588. Private Collection.

_____. The Sotheby's New York 2005 Watercolors: Eighty Watercolor Drawings of Flower, Fruits and Insects. 1560s-c. 1572. Private Collection.

Victoria and Albert Museum, London:

Jacques le Moyne de Morgues. Fifty-Nine Watercolor Drawings of Flowers and Insects on Thirty-Two Sheets. c. 1560s-1572. Victoria and Albert Museum, AM 3267^a-56 ~ 3267hh-56.

Primary Sources

Bry, Johann Theodor de. *America 1* (Frankfurt, 1590). Reprinted in *A Briefe and True Report of the New Found Land of Virginia*. New York: Dover Publications, 1972.

_____. *America 2*. Translated by Carolus Clusius (Frankfurt, 1591). Reprinted in *Voyages en Floride*. Nanterre: Editions de l'Espace Européen, 1990.

_____. *Des Ander Theyl der Newlich Erfundenen Landtschafft Americae* (Frankfurt, 1591). San Marino: Huntington Garden Library.

_____. *Florilegium* (Amsterdam, 1612). Washington, D.C.: The Folger Shakespeare Library.

Brunfels, Otto. *Herbarum Vivae Eicones* (Strasbourg, 1530-1536). Washington, D.C.: Dumbarton Oaks Garden Library.

Clusius, Carolus. *Rariorum Plantarum Historia* (Antwerp, 1601). Baltimore: University of Maryland.

Dodoens, Rembert. *Crujjdeboeck* (Antwerp, 1554). Washington D.C.: Dumbarton Oaks Garden Library.

_____. *Florum et Coronariarum Odoratarumque Nonnullarum Herbarum Historia* (Antwerp, 1568). Washington, D.C.: Dumbarton Oaks Garden Library.

_____. *Stirpium Historiae Pemptades Sex* (Antwerp, 1583). Washington, D.C.: The Folger Shakespeare Library.

Fuchs, Leonhart. *De Historia Stirpium Commentarii Insignes* (Basel, 1542). Washington, D.C.: Dumbarton Oaks Garden Library.

Gerard, John. *Catalogus arborum, fruticum ac plantarum tam indigenarum, quam exoticarum in horto Johannis Gerardi nascentium* (London, 1599). 2nd ed. Washington, D.C.: The Folger Shakespeare Library. Reprinted in Amsterdam and New York: Walter J. Johnson, 1974.

_____. *The Herball: or, Generall Historie of Plants* (London, 1597). Washington, D.C.: The Folger Shakespeare Library. Reprinted in 2 vols. Amsterdam: Walter J. Johnson, 1974.

Gesner, Conrad. *Epistolarum Medicinalium Conradi Gesneri [. . .] per Casparum Wuolphium* (Tiguri: Froschauer, 1577). Reprinted in Heinrich Zollner et al. *Conradi Gesneri Historia Plantarum*, 3 vols. Zurich: Urs Graf-Verlag, 1972-1974.

Harriot, Thomas. *A Briefe and True Report of the New Found Land of Virginia*. In *America* 1. Engraved and published by Johann Theodor de Bry. Frankfurt, 1590.

Laudonnière, René de. *L'Histoire Notable de la Floride [. . .] contenant les trois voyages faits en icelle par certains capitaines [. . .] françois* (Paris, 1586). Translated and published by Richard Hakluyt in *A Notable Historie Containing Foure Voyages Made by Certayne French Captaynes unto Florida*. London, 1587.

Mander, Karel van. *Het Schilder-Boeck* (Amsterdam, 1604). Reprinted in *Karel van Mander: The Lives of the Illustrious Netherlandish and German Painters, from the First Edition of the Schilder-Boeck (1603-1604)*. Edited by Hessel Miedema, 6 vols. Doornspijk: Davaco, 1994.

Moyne de Morgues, Jacques le. *Brevis Narratio Eorum Quae in Florida Americae Provincia Gallis Acciderunt*. In *America* 2. Engraved and published by Johann Theodor de Bry. Translated by Carolus Clusius (Frankfurt, 1591).

_____. *La Clef des Champs*. Forty-Eight Woodcuts of Animals, Birds, Flowers and Fruits (Blackfriars: 1586). Upperville: Oak Spring Garden Library.

Passe the Younger, Crispijn de. *Hortus floridus in quo rariorum & minus vulgarium florum icons ad vivam veramq formam accuratissime delineatae, et secundum quatuor anni tempora divisae exhibentur* (Utrecht and Arnhem, 1614). Upperville: Oak Spring Garden Library. Reprinted in Eleanor Sinclair Rohde, intro. *Hortus Floridus: The Four Books of Spring, Summer, Autumn, and Winter Flowers*. Translated by Spencer Savage. London: Minerva, 1974.

_____. *A Garden of Flowers* (Utrecht, 1615). Washington, D.C.: The Folger Shakespeare Library.

Secondary Sources

Adams, Simon. "Sidney, Mary, Lady Sidney (1530/35-1586)." *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*. <http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/69749> (accessed April 2, 2007).

Adams, Simon, Alan Bryson, and Michell Leimon. "Walsingham, Sir Francis (c. 1532-1590)." *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*. <http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/printable/28624> (accessed April 8, 2008).

Alpers, Svetlana. "Picturing Dutch Culture." In *Looking at Seventeenth-Century Dutch Art: Realism Reconsidered*. Edited by Wayne E. Franits (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1997), 57-67.

_____. *The Art of Describing: Dutch Art in the Seventeenth Century*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1983.

Arber, Agnes. "The Coloring of Sixteenth-Century Herbals." *Nature* 145 (May 1940): 803-804.

Aubrey, John. *Aubrey's Natural History of Wiltshire: A Reprint of The Natural History of Wiltshire*. New York: Augustus M. Kelley Pub., 1969.

_____. "Sir Walter Raleigh." In *Aubrey's Brief Lives*. Edited by Oliver Lawson Dick. Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press, 1957, 253-260.

Aumüller, Stephan A. *Carolus Clusius Fungorum in Pannoniis observatorum Brevis Historia et Codex Clusii. Mit beiträgen von einer internationalen Autorengemeinschaft. Herausgegeben von S. A. Aumüller und Jozsef Jeanplong*. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiado, 1983.

Avril, François, and Nicole Reynaud, *Les Manuscrits: À Peintures en France 1440-1520* exh. cat. Paris: Bibliothèque nationale de France, 1993.

Balis, Arnout, and Marjolein Leesberg, ed. *The New Hollstein Dutch & Flemish Etchings, Engravings and Woodcuts 1450-1700: The Collaert Dynasty*. 4 vols. Amsterdam: Ouderkerk aan den IJssel: Sound & Vision Publishers, 2005.

Backhouse, Janet. Book Review of "The Master of Claude, Queen of France: A Newly Defined Miniaturist." By Charles Sterling. *The Burlington Magazine* 118 (July, 1976): 524-526.

Bakker, Noortje, Ingvar Bergström, Guido Jansen, Simon H. Levie and Sam Segal, *Masters of Middelburg: Exhibition in the Honour of Laurens J. Bol* exh. cat. (Amsterdam: Kunsthandel K. & V. Waterman, 1984).

- Bartrum, Giulia. *German Renaissance Prints 1490-1550*. London: British Museum Press, 1995.
- Bath, Michael. *A Collection of Emblemes; George Wither*. Hants: Scolar Press, 1989.
- Bennett, Charles E. *Laudonniere & Fort Caroline: History and Documents*. Gainesville: University of Florida Press, 1964.
- Bergström, Ingvar. "De Gheyn as a *Vanitas* Painter." *Oud Holland* 85 (1970): 143-157.
- _____. "Disguised Symbolism in 'Madonna Pictures' and Still-life." *The Burlington Magazine* 97 (1955): 303-308, 342-349.
- _____. *Dutch Still-Life Painting in the Seventeenth Century*. Translated by Christina Hedström and Gerald Taylor. New York: T. Yoseloff, 1956. Reprinted in New York: Hacker Art Books, 1983.
- _____. "Flower Pieces of Radial Composition in European 16th and 17th Century Art." In *Album Amicorum J. C. van Gelder*. Edited J. Bruyn. The Hague: Nijhoff, 1973, 22-26.
- _____. "Studier i Holländskt Stillebenmåleri under 1600-talet," Ph.D. diss. University of Gothenburg, 1947.
- Biesboer, Pieter. "Judith Leyster: Painter of 'Modern Figures'." In James A. Welu, Pieter Biesboer, et al., *Judith Leyster: A Dutch Master and Her World* exh. cat. (Haarlem: Frans Halsmuseum, and Worcester: Worcester Art Museum, 1993).
- Bilimoff, Michèle. *Promenade dans des Jardins Disparus: Les Plantes au Moyen Age, d'Après les Grandes Heures d'Anne de Bretagne*. Rennes: Editions Ouest-France, 2001.
- Bleier, Everett F., ed. *Early Flower Engravings: All 110 Plates from the 1612 Florilegium by Emanuel Sweerts*. New York: Dover Publications, 1976.
- Blom, J. M. "A German Jesuit and His Anglican Readers: The Case of Jeremias Drexelius (1581-1638)." In *Studies in Seventeenth-Century English Literature, History and Bibliography: Festschrift for Professor T.A. Birrell on the Occasion of His Sixtieth Birthday*. Edited by G.A.M. Janssens and F.G.A.M. Aarts. Amsterdam: Rodopi, 1984, 41-51.
- Blunt, Wilfrid, and Sandra Raphael. *The Illustrated Herbal: The Art of Botanical Illustration*. London: Frances Lincoln Publishers, 1979. Reprinted in New York: Thames and Hudson, 1994.

- Bobory, Dóra. “‘Qui me unice amabat.’ Carolus Clusius and Boldizár Batthyány.” In *Carolus Clusius: Towards a Cultural History of a Renaissance Naturalist*. Edited by Florike Egmond, Paul Hoftijzer, and Robert Visser. Amsterdam: Koninklijke Nederlandse Akademie van Wetenschappen, 2007, 119-144.
- Bok, Marten Jan. “Art-Lovers and their Paintings: Van Mander’s *Schilder-boeck* as a Source for the History of the Art Market in the Northern Netherlands.” In Ger Luijten, Ariane van Suchtelen, Reinier Baarsen, Wouter Kloek, and Marijn Schapelhouman, ed., *Dawn of the Golden Age: Northern Netherlandish Art 1580-1620* exh. cat. (Amsterdam: Rijksmuseum, 1993), 136-166.
- Bol, Laurens J. “Een Middelburgse Brueghel-groep I.” *Oud Holland* 70 (1955):1-20; “Een Middelburgse Brueghel-groep II.” *Oud Holland* 70 (1955): 96-109; “Een Middelburgse Brueghel-groep III.” *Oud Holland* 70 (1955): 138-154; “Een Middelburgse Brueghel-groep IV.” *Oud Holland* 71 (1956): 132-182; “Een Middelburgse Brueghel-groep V.” *Oud Holland* 71 (1956): 183-203; “Een Middelburgse Brueghel-groep VI.” *Oud Holland* 72 (1957): 20-40; “Een Middelburgse Brueghel-groep VII.” *Oud Holland* 73 (1958):59-79; “Een Middelburgse Brueghel-groep VIII.” *Oud Holland* 73 (1958): 128-147; “Een Middelburgse Brueghel-groep IX.” *Oud Holland* 74 (1959): 1-19.
- _____. *Goede Onbekenden* exh. cat. (Dordrecht: Dordrecht Museum, 1959).
- _____. *‘Goede on Bekenden’: Hedendaagse Herkenning en Waardering van Verscholen, Voorbijgezien en Onderschat Talent*. Utrecht: Tableau B.V., 1982.
- _____. *Holländische Maler des 17. Jahrhunderts nahe den Grossen Meistern: Landschaften and Stilleben*. Braunschweig: Klinkhardt & Biermann, 1969. Reprinted in München: Klinkhardt & Bierman, 1982.
- _____. *The Bosschaert Dynasty: Painters of Flowers and Fruit*. Leigh-on-Sea: F. Lewis, 1960.
- Boon, Karel G. *Netherlandish Drawings of the Fifteenth and Sixteenth Centuries*. 2 vols. The Hague: Government K. Publishing Office, 1978.
- _____. *The Netherlandish and German Drawings of the XVth and XVIth Centuries of the Frits Lugt Collection*. 3 vols. Paris: Institut Néerlandais, 1992,
- Borne, Francois and Alan Wintermute. *Old Master Drawings and Paintings*. New York: Artemis-C. G. Boerner, 2004.
- Bredius, Abraham. “De Bloemschilders Bosschaert.” *Oud Holland* 31 (1913): 140.
- Brennan, Michael G. *The Sidneys of Penshurst and the Monarchy, 1500-1700*. Burlington; Ashgate Publishing Company, 2006.

- Brenninkmeyer-de Rooij, Beatrijs. *Mauritshuis in Bloei: Boeketten uit de Gouden Eeuw (The Mauritshuis in Bloom: Bouquets from the Golden Age)* exh. cat. (The Hague: Mauritshuis, 1992).
- _____. *Roots of Seventeenth-Century Flower Painting: Miniatures Plants Books Paintings*. Leiden: Primavera Pers, 1996.
- Briquet, C. M. *Les Filigranes: Dictionnaire Historique des Marques du Papier*. 2nd ed. New York: Hacker Art Books, 1966.
- Brugerolles, Emmanuelle, and David Guillet. *The Renaissance in France: Drawings from the Ecole des Beaux-Arts, Paris* exh. cat. (Paris: Ecole nationale supérieure des Beaux-Arts; Cambridge: Fogg Art Museum; and New York: Metropolitan Museum of Art, 1994).
- Brusati, Celeste. "Natural artifice and material values in Dutch still life." In *Looking at Seventeenth-Century Dutch Art: Realism Reconsidered*. Edited by Wayne E. Franits. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1997, 144-157.
- Chong, Alan, Wouter Kloek, Celeste Brusati, Julie Berger Hochstrasser, Guido Jansen, and John Loughman, and Betsy Wieseman. *Still-life Paintings from the Netherlands 1550-1720* exh. cat. (Amsterdam: Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam; and Cleveland: Cleveland Museum of Art, 1999).
- Christie's. *Important Natural-History Books including The Birds of America by John James Audubon*. New York: Christie's, 10 March 2000.
- _____. *The Hans van Leeuwen Collection: 16th and 17th Century Dutch and Flemish Master Drawings*. Amsterdam: Christie's, 24 November 1992.
- Clusius, Carolus. *Treatise on Tulips* (Antwerp, 1601). Translated by W. van Dijk. Haarlem: The Associated Bulb Growers in Holland, 1951.
- Crawford, Patricia. *Women and Religion in England 1500-1720*. New York; Routledge, 1993.
- Crivelli, Giovanni. *Giovanni Brueghel, Pittor Fiammingo, o Sue Lettere e Quadretti esistenti presso l'Ambrosiana*. Milan: Ditta Boniardi-Pogliani di E. Besozzi, 1868.
- Daly, Peter M. *The English Emblem and the Continental Tradition*. New York: AMS Press, 1988.
- Davenport, Cyril. *English Embroidered Bookbindings*. London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trübner and Company, 1899.

- Davis, Natalie Zemon. "Beyond the Market: Books as Gifts in Sixteenth-Century France." *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society* 33 (1983): 69-88.
- _____. *The Gift in Sixteenth-Century France*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 2000.
- Day, Richard Day. *Master Drawings and Manuscripts 1480-1880* exh. cat. (London: Richard Day LTD, 1990).
- Delisle, Léopold. *Les Grandes Heures de la Reine Anne de Bretagne et l'Atelier de Jean Bourdichon*. Paris: Librairie Damascène Morgand, 1913.
- Depauw, C. "Peeter Vander Borcht (1535/40-1608): The Artist as *Inventor* or *Creator* of Botanical Illustrations?" In F. de Nave and D. Imhof, ed. *Botany in the Low Countries (end of the 15th Century - ca. 1650)* exh. cat. (Antwerp: Museum Plantin-Moretus and Stedelijk Prentenkabinet, 1993), 47-55.
- Diamond, Arlene J. *Cardinal Federico Borromeo as a Patron and a Critic of the Arts and his Mvsaevm of 1625*. Ph.D. diss. University of California Los Angeles, 1974.
- Dick, Oliver Lawson, ed. *Aubrey's Brief Lives*. Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press, 1957.
- Donawerth, Jane. "Women's Poetry and the Tudor-Stuart System of Gift Exchange." In *Women, Writing, and the Reproduction of Culture in Tudor and Stuart Britain*. Edited by Mary Burke, Jane Donawerth, Linda L. Dove, and Karen Nelson. Syracuse: Syracuse University Press, 2000, 3-18.
- Dreyer, P. "Zeichnungen von Hans Verhagen dem Stummen von Antwerpen, Ein Beitrag zu den Vorlagen der Tierminiaturen Hans Bols and Georg Hoefnagels'." *Jahrbuch der Kunsthistorischen Sammlungen in Wien* 82-83 (1986-87): 115-144.
- Dülberg, Angelica. *Privatporträts: Geschichte und Ikonologie einer Gattung im 15. Und 16. Jahrhundert*. Berlin: Gebr. Mann Verlag, 1990.
- Duncan-Jones, Katherine. *Sir Philip Sidney, Courtier Poet*. New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1991.
- Egmond, Florike. "Clusius and Friends: Cultures of Exchange in the Circles of European Naturalists." In *Carolus Clusius: Towards a Cultural History of a Renaissance Naturalist*. Edited by Florike Egmond, Paul Hoftijzer, and Robert Visser. Amsterdam: Koninklijke Nederlandse Akademie van Wetenschappen, 2007, 9-48.
- _____. "Clusius, Cluyt, Saint Omer: The Origins of the Sixteenth-Century Botanical and Zoological Watercolors in *Libri Picturati* A. 16-30." *Nuncius* 20 (2005): 11-67.

- Egmond, Florike, Paul Hoftijzer, and Robert Visser, ed. *Carolus Clusius: Towards a Cultural History of a Renaissance Naturalist*. Amsterdam: Koninklijke Nederlandse Akademie van Wetenschappen, 2007.
- Evans, Robert J. *Rudolf II and His World: A Study in Intellectual History 1576-1612*. Oxford; Oxford University Press, 1973.
- Farmer, Norman K. Jr. "Lady Drury's Oratory: The Painted Closet from Hawstead Hall." In *Poets and the Visual Arts in Renaissance England* (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1984), 77-105.
- Filedt Kok, J. P., and Marjolein Leesberg. *The De Gheyn Family. The New Hollstein Dutch & Flemish Etchings, Engravings and Woodcuts, 1450-1700*. 2 vols. Edited by Ger Luijten Kok. Rotterdam: Sound & Vision Publishers, 2000.
- Findlen, Paula. *Possessing Nature: Museums, Collecting, and Scientific Culture in Early Modern Italy*. Berkeley, University of California Press, 1994.
- Fisher, Celia M. "The Development of Flower Border in Ghent-Bruges Manuscripts 1470-1490." Ph.D. diss. University of London, 1996.
- Fouquet, Karl. *Hans Staden: Zwei Reisen nach Brasilien 1548-1555*. Marburg an der Lahn: Trautvetter & Fischer Nachf., 1963.
- Freedberg, David. "Iconography between the History of Art and the History of Science: Art, Science, and the case of the Urban Bee." In *Picturing Science Producing Art*. Edited by Caroline A. Jones. New York: Routledge, 1998, 272-296.
- _____. "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*. Edited by David Freedberg and Jan de Vries. Santa Monica: Getty Center for the History of Art and the Humanities, 1991, 377-428.
- Freeman, Rosemary. *English Emblem Books*. New York: Octagon Books, 1966.
- Frye, Susan. "Materializing Authorship in Esther Inglis's Books." *Journal of Medieval and Early Modern Studies* 32 (Fall 2002): 469-491.
- Frye, Susan, and Karen Robertson, ed. *Maids and Mistresses, Cousins and Queens: Women's Alliances in Early Modern Europe*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1999.
- Fumerton, Patricia. "'Secret' Arts: Elizabethan Miniatures and Sonnets." *Representations* (Summer, 1986): 57-97.

- Gelder, J. G. van. "Van Blompot en Blomglas." *Elsevier's Geïllustreerd Maandschrift* 46 (1936): 73-82, 155-166.
- Gerard, Robert A. "De Passe and Early English Natural History Printmaking." *Print Quarterly* 14 (June 1997): 174-179.
- _____. "Wouteneel, de Passe and the Anglo-Netherlandish Print Trade." *Print Quarterly* 13 (December 1996): 363-376.
- Gibbon, David Mac. *Jean Bourdichon: A Court Painter of the Fifteenth Century*. Glasgow: The University Press, 1933.
- Goldgar, Anne. *Tulipmania: Money, Honor, and Knowledge in the Dutch Golden Age*. Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press, 2007.
- Gomori, George. "Philip Sidney's to Charles L'Ecluse in 1577." *Notes and Queries* 44 (March 1997): 29-30.
- Gray, Madeleine. "Sidney, Barbara, countess of Leicester (c. 1559-1621)." *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*.
<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/printable/67993> (accessed April 28, 2008).
- Green, Henry, ed. *A Choice of Emblems by Geoffrey Whitney (1548-1603)*. New York: Benjamin Blom, 1967.
- Greene, Edward Lee. *Landmarks of Botanical History*. Edited by Frank N. Egerton. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1983.
- Grell, Ole Peter. "Cool, Jacob (1563-1628)." in *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*. Edited by H. C. G. Matthew and Brian Harrison. Oxford: OUP, 2004.
<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/20853> (accessed March 10, 2009).
- Griffiths, Anthony. *The Print in Stuart Britain 1603-1689*. London: The British Museum, 1998.
- Haig, Elizabeth. *Floral Symbolism of the Great Masters*. London: K. Paul, Trench, Trübner & CO., LTD, 1913.
- Halliwell, Mary, ed. *A Guide to the Hawstead Panels at Christchurch Mansion, Ipswich*. Ipswich: The Friends of the Ipswich Museum, 2006.
- Hamel, Christopher de. *A History of Illuminated Manuscripts*. London: Phaidon Press, 1994.

Hannay, Margaret P. "Herbert [née Sidney], Mary, countess of Pembroke (1561-1621)." *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*.
<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/printable/13040> (accessed April 9, 2007).

_____. *Philip's Phoenix: Mary Sidney, Countess of Pembroke*. New York and Oxford, Oxford University Press, 1990.

_____. "The Countess of Pembroke's Agency in Print and Scribal Culture." In *Women's Writing and the Circulation of Ideas: Manuscript Publication in England, 1550-1800*. Edited by George L. Justice and Nathan Tinker. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002, 17-49.

Hatton, Richard G. *The Craftsman's Plant-Book: Or Figures of Plants*. London: Chapman and Hall, 1909.

Harms, Wolfgang. "On Natural History and Emblematics in the 16th Century." In *The Natural Sciences and the Arts*. Stockholm: Acta Universitatis Upsaliensis, 1985, 67-83.

Harms, Wolfgang, and Ulla-Britta Kuechen, ed. *Joachim Camerarius, Symbola et Emblemata (Nürnberg 1590 bis 1604)*. 2 vols. Graz: Akademische Druck- u. Verlagsanstalt, 1986/1988.

Hasselt, Carlos van. *Le Héraut du Dix-Septième Siècle: Dessins et Gravures de Jacques de Gheyn II et III* exh. cat. (Paris: Institut Néerlandais, 1985).

Hecht, Peter. *De Hollandse Fijnschilders van Gerard Dou tot Adriaen van der Werff* exh. cat. (Amsterdam: Rijksmuseum, 1989-1990).

_____. "Dutch Seventeenth-Century Genre Painting: A Reassessment of Some Current Hypotheses." In *Looking at Seventeenth-Century Dutch Art*. Edited by Wayne E. Franits. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1997, 88-97.

Helinga, Lotte, Alastair Duke, Jacob Harskamp, and Theo Hermans, ed. *The Bookshop of the World: the Role of the Low Countries in the Booktrade 1473-1941*. 't Goy-Houten: HES & De Graaf, 2001.

Hendrix, Lee. "An Introduction to Hoefnagel and Bocskay's Model Book of Calligraphy in the J. Paul Getty Museum." in *Prag um 1600: Beiträge zur Kunst und Kultur am Hofe Rudolfs II*. Freren: Luca Varlag, 1988, 110-117.

_____. "Joris Hoefnagel and the 'Four Elements': A Study in Sixteenth-Century Nature Painting." Ph.D. diss. Princeton University, 1984.

- _____. "Natural History Illustration at the Court of Rudolf II." In *Rudolf II and Prague: The Court and the City*. Edited by Eliska Fucíková. London and New York: Thames & Hudson, 1997, 157-171
- Hind, A. M. *Engraving in England in the Sixteenth & Seventeenth Centuries*. 3 vols. Cambridge: University Press, 1952-1964.
- Hochstrasser, Julie Berger. "Life and Still Life: A Cultural Inquiry into Seventeenth Century Dutch Still Lifes Painting." Ph.D. diss. University of California Berkeley, 1995.
- _____. *Still life and Trade in the Dutch Golden Age*. New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2007.
- Hollstein, F. W. H. *Dutch and Flemish Etchings, Engravings and Woodcuts ca. 1450-1700* 4. Amsterdam: M. Hertzberger, 2004.
- Holt, Mack P. *The French Wars of Religion, 1562-1629*. 2nd ed. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2005.
- Honig, Elizabeth. "Making Sense of Things: On the Motives of Dutch Still Life." *Res* 34 (Autumn 1998): 168-183.
- Hopper, Florence. "A Munich Prayer Book and Jaques de Gheyn II, Translatio-Imitatio Aemulatio?" *Nederlands Kunsthistorisch Jaarboek* 38 (1987): 97-109.
- _____. "An Early Flower Piece by Jacques de Gheyn II." *Simiolus* 8 (1975/76): 195-198.
- _____. "Clusius' World: the Meeting of Science and Art." In *The Authentic Garden*. Edited by L.Tjon Sie Fat and E. de Jong. Leiden: Clusius Foundation, 1991, 13-36.
- _____. "Jacques de Gheyn II and Rudolf II's Collection of Nature Drawings." In *Prag um 1600: Beiträge zur Kunst und Kultur am Hofe Rudolfs II*. Freren: Luca Verlag, 1988, 124-131.
- _____. "Science and Art at Leiden: Carolus Clusius and Jacques De Gheyn II's Flower Drawings for Rudolf II." In *Rudolf II, Prague and the World*. Edited by Lubomír Konečný (Prague: Artefactum, 1998), 128-133.
- Hulton, Paul. *The Work of Jacques Le Moyne de Morgues: A Huguenot Artist in France Florida and England I*. 2 vols. London: British Museum Publications, 1977.
- _____. *America, 1585: The Complete Drawings of John White*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press; and London: British Museum Publications, 1984.

Hunger, F. W. T. *Archief Zeeuwsch Genootschap der Wetenschappen*. Middelburg: Altorffer, 1925.

_____. *Charles de l'Escluse: Nederlandisch kruidkundige, 1526-1609*. 2 vols. The Hague: M. Nijhoff, 1927-1943.

Huntley, Frank Livingstone. *Bishop Joseph Hall and Protestant Meditation in Seventeenth-Century England: A Study With the texts of The Art of Divine Meditation (1606) and Occasional Meditations (1633)*. Binghamton: Medieval & Renaissance Texts & Studies, 1981.

Huxley, Robert, ed. *The Great Naturalists*. London: Thames & Hudson, 2007.

Huygens, Constantijn. *De Jeugd van Constantijn Huygens*. Rotterdam: A Donker, 1946.

Impey, Oliver, and Arthur MacGregor, ed. *The Origins of Museums: The Cabinet of Curiosities in Sixteenth- and Seventeenth-Century Europe*. London: House of Stratus, 2001.

Jones, Pamela M. *Federico Borromeo and the Ambrosiana Art Patronage and Reform in Seventeenth-Century Milan*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1993.

_____. "Federico Borromeo as a Patron of Landscapes and Still Lifes: Christian Optimism in Italy ca. 1600." *The Art Bulletin* 70 (1988): 261-272.

Jongh, Eddy de. "Realism and Seeming Realism in Seventeenth-Century Dutch Painting." In *Looking at Seventeenth-Century Dutch Art: Realism Reconsidered*. Edited by Wayne E. Franits. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1997, 21-56. Originally published in "Realisme en Schijnrealism in de Hollandse Schilderkunst van de Zeventiende Eeuw." In *Rembrandt en Zijn Tijd* exh. cat. (Brussels: Paleis voor Schone Kunsten, 1971).

_____. *Still life in the Age of Rembrandt* exh. cat. (Auckland: Auckland City Art Gallery, 1982).

_____. *Tot Lering en Vermaalc: Betekenissen van Hollandse Genrevoorstellingen uit de Zeventiende Eeuw* exh. cat. (Amsterdam: Rijksmuseum, 1976).

_____. *Zinne- en Minnebeelden in de Schilderkunst van de Zeventiende Eeuw*. Amsterdam: Nederlandse Stichting Openbaar Kunstbezit, 1967.

Kaufmann, Thomas DaCosta. *The Mastery of Nature: Aspects of Art, Science, and Humanism in the Renaissance*. Princeton, Princeton University Press, 1993.

_____. *The School of Prague: Painting at the Court of Rudolf II*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1988.

Kaufmann, Thomas DaCosta, and Virginia Roehrig Kaufmann. "The Sanctification of Nature: Observations on the Origins of *Trompe l'Oeil* in Netherlandish Book Painting of the Fifteenth and Sixteenth Centuries." In Thomas DaCosta Kaufmann. *The Mastery of Nature: Aspects of Art, Science, and Humanism in the Renaissance*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1993, 3-48. Originally published in *The J. Paul Getty Museum Journal* 19 (1991): 43-64.

Kenseth, Joy, ed. *The Age of the Marvelous*. Hanover: Hood Museum of Art, 1991.

Klein, Lisa M. "Your Humble Handmaid: Elizabethan Gifts of Needlework." *Renaissance Quarterly* 50 (1997): 459-493.

Koch, Robert A. "Flower Symbolism in the Portinarty Altar." *The Art Bulletin* 46 (March 1964): 70-77.

Koning, Jan de, Gerda van Uffelen, Alicja Zemanek, and Bogdan Zemanek, ed. *Drawn after Nature: The Complete Botanical Watercolours of the 16th-Century Libri Picturati*. Zeist: KNNV, 2008.

Koreny, Fritz. *Albrecht Dürer and the Animal and Plants Studies of the Renaissance*. Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1988.

Krčálová, Jamila. "Die Gärten Rudolfs II." *Leids Kunsthistorisch Jaarboek* 1 (1982): 149-161.

Kuin, Roger. "Sir Philip Sidney and the New World." *Renaissance Quarterly* 51, no. 2 (Summer, 1998): 549-585.

Kusukawa, Sachiko. "Use of Pictures in Printed Books: The Case of Clusius's *Exoticorum libri decem*." In *Carolus Clusius: Towards a Cultural History of a Renaissance Naturalist*. Edited by Florike Egmond, Paul Hoftijzer, and Robert Visser. Amsterdam: Koninklijke Nederlandse Akademie van Wetenschappen, 2007, 221-246.

Lamb, Mary. "The Countess of Pembroke's Patronage." Ph.D. diss. Columbia University, 1976.

Landau David, and Peter Parshall. *The Renaissance Print 1470-1550*. New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1994.

- Langemeyer, Gerhard. "Die Nähe und die Ferne." In Gerhard Langemeyer and Hans-Albert Peters, ed. *Stilleben in Europa* exh. cat. (Münster: Landesmuseum für Kunst und Kulturgeschichte, and Baden-Baden: Staatliche Kunsthalle, 1979-1980), 20-45.
- Langemeyer, Gerhard, and Hans-Albert Peters, ed. *Stilleben in Europa* exh. cat. (Münster: Landesmuseum für Kunst und Kulturgeschichte, and Baden-Baden: Staatliche Kunsthalle, 1979-1980).
- Lawson, Sarah, and W. John Faupel, ed. *A Foothold in Florida: The Eye-Witness Account of Four Voyages made by the French to that Region and their Attempt at Colonisation 1562-1568*. London: Antique Atlas Publications, 1992.
- Leefflang, Huigen, Ger Luijten, Lawrence W. Nichols, Nadine M Orenstein, Michiel C. Plomp, and Marijn Schapelhouman. *Hendrick Goltzius (1558-1617): Drawings, Prints and Paintings* exh. cat. (Amsterdam: Rijksmuseum; New York: Metropolitan Museum of Art; and Toledo: Toledo Museum of Art, 2003).
- Letts, Malcolm, ed. *Hans Staden: The True History of his Captivity 1557*. New York: Robert M. McBride & Company, 1929.
- Levy, Charles S. "A Supplementary Inventory of Sir Philip Sidney's Correspondence." *Modern Philology* 67 (Nov. 1969): 177-181.
- Lorenz, Angelika, ed. *Die Maler tom Ring d. J.* exh. cat. (Münster: Westfälisches Landesmuseums für Kunst und Kulturgeschichte, 1996).
- Luther, Giesela. "Stilleben als Bilder der Sammelleidenschaft." In Gerhard Langemeyer and Hans-Albert Peters, ed. *Stilleben in Europa* exh. cat. (Münster: Landesmuseum für Kunst und Kulturgeschichte, and Baden-Baden: Staatliche Kunsthalle, 1979-1980), 88-128.
- MacCaffrey, Wallace T. "Sidney, Sir Henry (1529-1586)." *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*. <http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/printable/25520> (accessed April 9, 2007).
- Mâle, Emile. *Art & Artists of the Middle Ages*. 5th ed. Translated by Sylvia Stallings Lowe. Redding Ridge: Black Swan Books, 1986.
- Manning, John. "Continental Emblem Books in Sixteenth-Century England: The Evidence of Sloane MS. 3794." *Emblematica* 1 (Spring 1986): 1-11.
- _____, ed. *The Emblems of Thomas Palmer: Two Hundred Poosees, Sloane MS 3794*. New York: AMS Press, 1988.

- Mander, Karel van. *Den Grondt der Edel Vry Schilder-Const.* Edited by Hessel Miedema. 2 vols. Utrecht: Haentjens Dekker & Gumbert, 1973.
- Mantz, D.C., S.E. Gardner, and E.M. Ramsden. "The Benefit of an Image, Without the Offence': Anglo-Dutch Emblematics and Hall's Liberation of the Lyric Soul." In *Anglo-Dutch Relations in the Field of the Emblem*. Edited by Bart Westerweel. Leiden: Brill, 1997, 253-276.
- Mason, Peter. "Americana in the *Exoticorum libri decem* of Charles de l'Écluse." In *Carolus Clusius: Towards a Cultural History of a Renaissance Naturalist*. Edited by Florike Egmond, Paul Hoftijzer, and Robert Visser. Amsterdam: Koninklijke Nederlandse Akademie van Wetenschappen, 2007, 195-220.
- McLean, Teresa. *Medieval English Gardens*. New York: Viking, 1980.
- Meakin, Heather. "Lady Anne (Bacon) Drury, Photograph of her closet (c. 1612)." In *Reading Early Modern Women: An Anthology of Texts in Manuscript and Print, 1550-1700*. Edited by Helen Ostovich and Elizabeth Sauer. New York: Routledge, 2003, 480-481.
- Meij, A.W.F.M., ed. *Jacques de Gheyn II Drawings* exh. cat. (Rotterdam: Museum Boymans-van Beuningen; and Washington, D.C.: National Gallery of Art, 1986).
- Meyer, Frederick G. Meyer, Emily Emmart Trueblood, and John L. Heller. *The Great Herbal of Leonhart Fuchs*. 2 vols. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1999.
- Mitchell, Peter, and Paul Taylor. *Dutch Flower Painting 1600-1750* exh. cat. (London: Dulwich Picture Gallery, 1996).
- Miedema, Hessel, ed. *Karel van Mander: The Lives of the Illustrious Netherlandish and German Painters, from the First Edition of the Schilder-Boeck (1603-1604)*. 6 vols. Doornspijk: Davaco, 1994.
- Moffett, Thomas. *The Silkwormes and their Flies* (1599). Edited by Victor Houliston. Binghamton: Renaissance English Text Society, 1989.
- Murray, Sarah, and Karin Groen. "Four Early Dutch Flower Paintings Examined with Reference to Crispijn de Passe's 'Den Blom-Hof'." *Bulletin of the Hamilton Kerr Institute* 2 (1994): 7-20.
- Nave de, F. and Imhof, D. ed. *Botany in the Low Countries (end of the 15th Century - ca. 1650)* exh. cat. (Antwerp: Museum Plantin-Moretus and Stedelijk Prentenkabinet, 1993).

- Nicholls, Mark, and Penry Williams. "Raleigh, Sir Walter." *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, <http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/printable/23039> (accessed June 1, 2007)
- Ogilvie, Brian W. *The Science of Describing: Natural History in Renaissance Europe*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 2006.
- Orth, Myra D. "French Renaissance Manuscripts: The 1520s Hours Workshop and the Master of the Getty Epistles." *The J. Paul Getty Museum Journal* 16 (1988): 33-60.
- _____. "What Goes Around: Borders and Frames in French Manuscripts." *The Journal of the Walters Art Gallery* 54 (1996): 195-199.
- Oude Tekeningen: Een Keuze uit de Verzameling P. en N. de Boer*. Laren: Singer Museum, 1966.
- Pace, Claire. "'Delineated lives': Themes and Variations in Seventeenth-Century Poems about Portraits." *Word and Image* 2 (1986): 1-17.
- Panofsky, Ervin. *Early Netherlandish Painting: Its Origins and Character*. 2 vols. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1953. Reprinted in New York: Harper & Row, 1971.
- _____. "Iconography and Iconology: An Introduction to the Study of Renaissance Art." In *Meaning in the Visual Arts*. Garden City, New York: Doubleday, 1955. Reprinted in Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1982, 26-54.
- _____. *The Life and Art of Albrecht Dürer*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1955.
- Papy, Jan. "Joachim Camerarius's Symbolorum & Emblematum Centuria Quatuor: From Natural Sciences to Moral Contemplation." In *Mundus Emblematicus: Studies in Neo-Latin Emblem Books* 4. Edited by Karl A.E. Emenkel and Arnoud S.Q. Visser, Turnhout: Brepols, 2003, 201-234.
- Paris, Harris et al. "First Known Image of *Cucurbita* in Europe, 1503-1508" *Annals of Botany* 98 (2006): 41-47.
- Parry, Graham. "Van Dyck and the Caroline Court Poets." In *Van Dyck 350*. Edited by Susan J. Barnes and Arthur K. Wheelock. Washington, D.C.: National Gallery of Art, 1994, 247-260.
- Pennisi, Meghan S. W. "The Flower Still-Life Painting of Ambrosius Bosschaert the Elder in Middelburg ca. 1600-1620." Ph.D. diss. Northwestern University, 2007.

- Pieper, Paul. "Das Blumenbukett," In Gerhard Langemeyer and Hans-Albert Peters, ed. *Stilleben in Europa* exh. cat. (Münster: Westfälisches Landesmuseum; and Baden-Baden: Staatliche Kunsthalle, 1979-1980), 314-349.
- Pliny the Elder. *Natural History*. Translated by H. Rackham, W.H.S. Jones, and D.E. Eicholz, 10 vols. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, and London: Heinemann, 1938-1962.
- Pollard, A. W., and G. R. Redgrave. *A Short-Title Catalogue of Books Printed in England, Scotland, & Ireland and of English Books Printed Abroad 1475-1640* 3. London: The Bibliographical Society, 1991.
- Pörnbacher, Karl. *Jeremias Drexelius. Leben und Werken eines Barockpredigers*. München: F. X. Seitz, 1965.
- Ramón-Laca, Luis. "Charles de l'Écluse and *Libri picturati* A. 16-30." *Archives of Natural History* 28 (2001): 195-243.
- Randall, Lilian M.D. *Medieval and Renaissance Manuscripts in the Walters Art Gallery*. 3 vols. Baltimore: Walters Art Gallery, 1989; vol. II: France, 1420-1540.
- Raven, Charles E. *English Naturalists from Neckam to Ray*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1947.
- Reeds, Karen Meier. *Botany in Medieval and Renaissance Universities*. New York and London: Garland Publishing, 1991.
- _____. "Renaissance Humanism and Botany." *Annals of Science* 33 (1976): 519-542.
- Regteren Altena, I.Q. van. *Jacques de Gheyn: Three Generations*. 3 vols. The Hague, Boston and London: Martinus Nijhoff Publishers, 1983.
- Reznicek, E. K. J. *Die Zeichnungen von Hendrick Goltzius*. 2 vols. Utrecht: Haentjens Dekker & Gumbert, 1961.
- _____. *Hendrick Goltzius Drawings Rediscovered 1962-1992*. New York: Master Drawings Association, Inc., 1993.
- Riddle, John M. *Dioscorides on Pharmacy and Medicine*. Austin: University of Texas Press, 1985.
- Riley, H.T., B.A., ed. *Dictionary of Latin Quotations, Proverbs, Maxims, and Mottos, Classical and Medieval, including Law Terms and Phrases*. London: Bell & Daldy, 1866.

- Rohde, Eleanour Sinclair, intro. *Hortus Floridus: The Four Books of Spring, Summer, Autumn, and Winter Flowers*. Translated by Spencer Savage. London: Minerva, 1974.
- Runia, Epcó. *In the Mauritsshuis: Flowers*. Translated by Katy Kist and Jennifer Kilian. The Hague: Mauritsshuis; and Zwolle: Waanders, 2007.
- Rytz, Walther Rytz. *Pflanzenaquarelle des Hans Weiditz aus dem Jahre 1529; die Originale zu den Holzschnitten im Brunfels'schen Kräuterbuch*. Bern: Haupt, 1936.
- Sasek, Lawrence, ed. *The Poems of William Smith*. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1970.
- Savage, Spencer. "The Discovery of Some of Jacques Le Moyne's Botanical Drawings." *The Gardeners' Chronicle* 71 (1922): 44.
- _____. "Early Botanical Painters, no. 3, Jacques Le Moyne de Morgues." *The Gardeners' Chronicle* 63 (1923): 148-149.
- _____. "The Hortus Floridus of Crispijn vande Pas the Younger." *Transactions of the Bibliographical Society* 4 (Dec. 1923): 180-206.
- Savoia, Andrea Ubrizsy. "Some Aspects of Clusius's Hungarian and Italian Relations." In *Carolus Clusius: Towards a Cultural History of a Renaissance Naturalist*. Edited by Florike Egmond, Paul Hoftijzer, and Robert Visser. Amsterdam: Koninklijke Nederlandse Akademie van Wetenschappen, 2007, 267-292.
- Savoia, Andrea Ubrizsy, and J. Heniger. "Carolus Clusius and American Plants." *Taxon* 32 (Aug. 1983): 424-435.
- Schneider, Norbert. "Vom Klostergarten zur Tulpenmanie. Hinweise zur materiellen Vorgeschichte des Blumenstillebens." In Gerhard Langemeyer and Hans-Albert Peters, ed. *Stilleben in Europa* exh. cat. (Münster: Westfälisches Landesmuseum; and Baden-Baden: Staatliche Kunsthalle, 1979-1980), 294-312.
- Scott-Elliot, A. H. and Elspeth Yeo. "Calligraphic Manuscripts of Esther Inglis (1571-1624): A Catalogue." *The Papers of the Bibliographical Society of America* 84 (March 1990): 11-86.
- Seaton, Beverly. *The Language of Flowers: A History*. Charlottesville and London: University Press of Virginia, 1995.

- Segal, Sam. *A Prosperous Past: The Sumptuous Still Life in the Netherlands 1600-1700* exh. cat. (Delft: Stedelijk Museum 'Het Prinsenhof'; Cambridge: Fogg Art Museum; and Fort Worth, Texas: Kimbell Art Museum, 1988).
- _____. *Een Bloemrijk Verleden. Overzicht van de Noord- en Zuid-Nederlandse Bloemschilderkunst 1600-heden* exh. cat. (Amsterdam: Kunsthandel P. de Boer, and 's-Hertogenbosch: Noordbrabants Museum, 1982).
- _____. *Flowers and Nature; Netherlandish Flower Paintings of Four Centuries* exh. cat. (Osaka: Nabio Museum of Art; Tokyo: Tokyo Station Gallery; and Sydney: Art Gallery of New South Wales, 1990).
- _____. *Flowery Past: A Survey of Dutch and Flemish Flower Painting from 1600 until the Present* exh. cat. (Amsterdam: Gallery P. de Boer, 1982).
- _____. "Jacques de Gheyn's Plants." In A.W.F.M.Meij, ed. *Jacques de Gheyn II Drawings* exh. cat. (Rotterdam: Museum Boymans-van Beuningen; and Washington, D.C.: National Gallery of Art, 1986), 24-30.
- _____. "On Florilegia." In *A Double Celebration: Antiquariaat Junk 1899-1999; Junk's Rara Historico Naturalia 1900*. Amsterdam: Natural History Booksellers, 2000-2001, 9-47.
- _____. "Roelandt Savery als Blumemaler." In *Roelandt Savery in Seiner Zeit (1576-1639)* exh. cat. (Cologne: Wallraf-Richartz Museum; and Utrecht: Centraal Museum, 1985), 55-64.
- _____. "The Flower Pieces of Roelandt Savery." *Leids Kunsthistorisch Jaarboek* (1982): 309-337.
- Simpson, Percy. "Two Emblem Books: Thomas Palmer's Emblems in Ashmole MS. 767." *The Bodleian Quarterly Record* 6 (1930): 172-173.
- Sloan, Kim, *A New World: England's First View of America*. Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 2007.
- Sluijter, Eric Jan. "'Een Volmaekte Schilderij is al seen Spiegel van de Natuer': Spiegel en Spiegelbeeld in de Nederlandse Schilderkunst van de Zeventiende Eeuw." In *Oog in oog met de Spiegel*. Edited by N. Brederoo et al. Amsterdam: Aramith, 1988, 146-163. Reprinted in "Didactic and Disguised Meanings? Several Seventeenth-Century Texts on Painting and the Iconological Approach to Dutch Paintings of This Period." In *Looking at Seventeenth-Century Dutch Art*. Edited by Wayne E. Franits. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1997, 78-87.

- _____. “New Approaches in Art History and the Changing Image of Seventeenth-Century Dutch Art between 1960 and 1990.” In *The Golden Age of Dutch Painting in Historical Perspective*. Edited by Frans Grijzenhout and Henk van Veen. Translated by Andrew McCormick. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1999, 247-276.
- Sotheby’s. *Old Master Drawings*. New York: Sotheby, 26 January 2005.
- _____. *Old Master Drawings including an Important Set of Natural History Studies by Jacques le Moyne de Morgues*. New York: Sotheby’s, 21 January 2004.
- _____. *Six Guaches by Jacques Le Moyne de Morgues to be included in the Sale of Old Master Drawings*. New York: Sotheby’s, 29 January 1997.
- _____. *The Graham Arader Sale*. New York: Sotheby’s, 19 June 2009.
- Spicer, Joaneath A. “The Drawings of Roelandt Savery.” Ph.D. diss. Yale University, 1979.
- _____. “The Role of ‘Invention’ in Art and Science at the Court of Rudolf II.” *Studia Rudolphina: Bulletin of the Research Center for Visual Arts and Culture in the Age of Rudolf II* 5 (2005): 7-16.
- Sprengel, Kurt. *Geschichte der Botanik*. 2 vols. Altenburg and Leipzig: Brockhaus, 1817-1818.
- Sterling, Charles. *La Nature Morte de l’Antiquité à Nos Jours*. Paris: Éditions des Musées nationaux, 1952.
- _____. *The Master of Claude, Queen of France: Newly Defined Miniaturist*. New York: H. P. Kraus, 1975.
- Steuart, A. Francis, ed. *Memoirs of Sir James Melville of Halhill, 1535-1617*. New York: E. P. Dutton and Company, 1930.
- Swan, Claudia. *Art, Science, and Witchcraft in Early Modern Holland: Jacques de Gheyn II (1565-1629)*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2005.
- _____. “Collecting Naturalia in the Shadow of Early Modern Dutch Trade.” In *Colonial Botany: Science, Commerce, and Politics in the Early Modern World*. Edited by Londa L. Schiebinger and Claudia Swan. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2005.

- _____. "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*. Edited by Pamela H. Smith and Paula Findlen. New York and London: Routledge, 2001, 109-136.
- _____. "Jacques de Gheyn II and the Representation of the Natural World in the Netherlands ca. 1600." Ph.D. diss. Columbia University, 1997.
- Taylor, Paul. *Dutch Flower Painting 1600-1720*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1995.
- Theophrastus. *The Enquiry into Plants and Minor Works on Odours and Weather Signs*. Translated by Arthur Hort. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1999.
- Thevet, Andre. *André Thevet's North America: A 16th-Century View*. Kingston: McGill-Queens University Press, 1986.
- Thieme, Ulrich, Felix Becker, Fred C. Willis, and Hans Vollmer. *Allgemeines Lexikon der Bildenden Künstler von der Antike bis zur Gegenwart*. 37 vols. München: Deutscher Taschenbuch Verlag, 1992.
- Thomson, George, ed. *Insectorum Sive Minimorum Animalium Theatrum: The Butterflies and Moths*. Lochmaben: George Thomson, 2000.
- Tjan-Bakker, Anneke. "Dame Flora's Blossoms: Esther Inglis' Flower-Illustrated Manuscripts." *English Manuscript Studies 1100-1700* 9 (2000): 49-72.
- Tomasi, Lucia Tongiorgi. *An Oak Spring Flora: Flower Illustration from the Fifteenth Century to the Present Time*. Upperville, Virginia: Oak Spring Garden Library, 1997.
- Tung, Mason "From Natural History to Emblem: A Study of Peacham's Use of Camerius's *Symbola & Emblemata*." *Emblematica* 1 (Spring 1986): 53-76.
- Veldman, Ilja M. *Crispijn de Passe and his Progency (1564-1670): A Century of Print Production*. Studies in Prints and Printmaking 3. Translated by Michael Hoyle. Rotterdam: Sound & Vision Publ., 2001.
- _____. *Profit and Pleasure: Print Books by Crispijn de Passe*. Studies in Prints and Printmaking 4. Translated by Michael Hoyle. Rotterdam: Sound & Vision Publ., 2001.
- Vignau-Wilberg, Thea. *Archetypa Studiaque Patris Georgii Hoefnagelii 1592: Nature, Poetry and Science in Art around 1600*. Munich: Staatliche Graphische Sammlung, 1994.

- _____. "Die Emblematischen Elemente in Werke Joris Hoefnagels." Ph.D. diss. Leiden University, 1969.
- _____. "Naturemblematik am Ende des 16. Jahrhunderts." *Jahrbuch der Kunsthistorischen Sammlungen in Wien* 82/83 (1986/87): 145-156.
- _____. "Devotion and Observation of Nature in Art around 1600." *Natura-Cultura: L'Interpretazione del mondo fisico nei testi e nelle immagini*. Edited by Giuseppe Olmi et al. Firenze, Leo S. Olschki, 2000, 43-55.
- Voet, L. "Christopher Plantin as a Promoter of the Science of Botany." In F. de Nave and D. Imhof, ed. *Botany in the Low Countries (end of the 15th Century - ca. 1650)* exh. cat. (Antwerp: Museum Plantin-Moretus and Stedelijk Prentenkabinet, 1993), 39-46.
- Vorenkamp, A.P.A. "Bijdrage tot de Geschiedenis van het Hollandse Stilleven in de Zeventiende Eeuw." Ph.D. diss. Leiden: University of Leiden, 1933.
- Vos, Dirk De. *Hans Memling: The Complete Works*. Translated by Ted Alkins. Antwerp: Fonds Mercator Paribas & Ludion Press, 1994.
- Vroom, N.R.G. "De Schilders van het Monochrome Banketje." Ph.D. diss. University of Amsterdam, 1945. Reprinted in *A Modest Message as Intimated by the Painters of the Monochrome Banketje*. Translated by Peter Gidman, 3 vols. Schiedam: Interbook International, 1980.
- Warner, Ralph E. *Dutch and Flemish Flower and Fruit Painters of the XVIIth and XVIIIth Centuries*. London: Mills & Boon, 1928. Reprinted in Amsterdam: B.M. Israël, 1975.
- Wheeler, Elizabeth Darracott. *Ten Remarkable Women of the Tudor Courts and Their Influence in Founding the New World, 1530-1630*. Lewiston, Queenston, Lampeter: E. Mellon Press, 2002.
- Wheelock, Arthur K., Jr. *From Botany to Bouquets: Flowers in Northern Art* exh. cat. (Washington D.C.: National Gallery of Art, 1999).
- Whitney, Geoffrey. *A Choice of Emblemes and Other Devises; Leyden 1586*. New York: Da Capo Press, 1969.
- Wickert, Konrad. *Das Camerarius-Florilegium*. Erlangen: Kulturstiftung der Länder, 1993.

- _____. "Süddeutsche Gartenkultur in der Zweiten Hälfte des 16. Jahrhunderts und das 'Camerarius-Florilegium'." In *Natur im Bild: Anatomie und Botanik in der Sammlung des Nürnberger Arztes Christoph Jacob Trew* exh. cat. (Erlangen: Universitätsbibliothk Erlangen-Nürnberg, 1995).
- Wieck, Roger S. *Late Medieval and Renaissance Illuminated Manuscripts 1350-1525 in the Houghton Library*. Cambridge: Harvard College Library, 1983.
- _____. *Painted Prayers: The Book of Hours in Medieval and Renaissance Art* exh.cat. (New York: Pierpont Morgan Library, 1997).
- Wille, Helena. "The Discovery of the Scientific Heritage of Karel van Sint Omaars (1533-1569): *Libri picturati* A. 16-30 in the Jigiellon Library in Kraków." *Scientiarum Historia* 22 (1996): 67-80.
- Woudhuysen, H. R. "Sidney, Sir Philip (1554-1586)." *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*. <http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/printable/25522> (accessed April 8, 2008).
- _____. *Sir Philip Sidney and the Circulation of Manuscripts 1558-1640*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996.
- Wright, Gillian. "The Growth of an Emblem: Some Contexts for Bodleian Library MS Ashmole 767." In *Emblems and The Manuscript Tradition*. Edited by Laurence Grove. Glasgow: University of Glasgow, 1997, 81-99.
- Yeo, Elspeth. "Inglis, Esther (1570/71-1624)." *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*. Oxford University Press, 2004. <http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/15292> (accessed April 28, 2008).
- Young, Alan R. "Wenceslaus Hollar, The London Book Trade, and Two Unidentified English Emblem Books." In *The English Emblem and The Continental Tradition*. Edited by Peter M. Daly. New York: AMS Press, 1988, 151-202.
- Young, Frances B. *Mary Sidney, Countess of Pembroke*. London: David Nutt, 1912.
- Zandvoort, P. W. "Sidney in Austria." *Wiener Beiträge zur Englischen Philologie* 66 (1957): 227-245.
- Ziegler, Georgianna. "Hand-Ma[i]de Books: The Manuscripts of Esther Inglis, Early-Modern Precursors of the Artist's Book." *English Manuscript Studies 1100-1700* 9 (2000): 73-87.