



Ars amicitiae

Introduction

Joanna Woodall, Bart Ramakers & Ann-Sophie Lehmann

This seventieth anniversary edition of the *Netherlands Yearbook for History of Art* / *Nederlands Kunsthistorisch Jaarboek* – or NKJ as it is called for short – is dedicated to the theme of friendship in the art and visual and material culture of the Low Countries and their diaspora. The image we have chosen for the dust cover is a detail from the *Allegory of Joris Hoefnagel's friendship with Johannes Radermacher* completed by Hoefnagel (1542-1601) in 1589 (fig. 1). A small oil painting on panel (22.5 x 34.5 cm), it depicts two male-female couples whose *all'antica* dress implies their allegorical character. On the left, a standing young man wreathed in laurel gazes at a seated young woman whose head is garlanded in roses. He leans against a hand-plough whose projecting beam and ploughshare connect with the young woman's open lap and he holds out what seems to be a measuring rod, which she grasps. She has an open music book on her lap, supported by another bulky

Detail fig. 1

1

Joris Hoefnagel, *Allegory on the friendship between the artist and Johannes Radermacher* (1538-1617), oil on panel,

22.5 x 34.5 cm, Museum Boijmans Van Beuningen, Rotterdam, 1308 (OK) (photo: Studio Tromp)



volume – perhaps a Bible – and another music book and instruments at her side. A picture is propped on her knee, extending into the space between the two figures. The young woman in turn gazes at this image, in which are visible a large stag beetle and a comely pear. They flank a bright blue vase that contains a soft-pink, open bloom and supports a butterfly. In the cartouche directly beneath the couple, a Latin text in Roman script can be translated as follows:

Take heed, beholder, lest you think that the replica – not simulation – of love is deceptive, and what its origin and end are. In mutual solace for their absence, Joris Hoefnagel and Johannes Radermacher, in the year of Christ 1589.¹

An odd couple, at right, comprises an adolescent boy in vivid red and a tall, older woman whom Thea Vignau-Wilberg has identified as an “antique” priestess.² Her standing pose echoes that of the young man in the couple to the left. Subtle resonances between the adolescent boy and the young woman opposite include his lower position in the composition, exposed flesh, and his feathered helmet, which is visually reminiscent of the woman’s flower headdress. Yet unlike the young man and woman, in this right-hand couple there is no physical contact between the two partners. Instead, they are connected indirectly by the light that is depicted streaming from the tetragrammaton above and by the oil that supplies the lamp on the altar. The boy gazes towards the light’s divine origin and the woman points upwards; she holds the jug from which a gleam of oil trickles whilst he holds the burning lamp. The Latin text in the cartouche beneath is written in italic and reads as follows:

If it is to be of use to mortals, love, the legitimate offspring of honorableness and joy, takes from piety its immortal nourishment for its fire, dedicated to God.³

As the Latin inscription on the left suggests, this enigmatic work was the product of an interaction between the Antwerp artist and merchant Joris Hoefnagel and his longstanding friend and fellow Calvinist, the humanist and international merchant Johannes Radermacher (1538-1617), whose wide circle of friends among artists and poets, humanists and merchants can still be traced through his *album amicorum*.⁴ It is possible that the allegory was Radermacher’s invention, since his daughter reported having inherited a little painting whose subject corresponded with the picture and which was ‘a copy [*copie*] of one which our blessed father invented to honour one of his friends to whom he was bound in affection by pious conversation’.⁵ In an instance of the interchange of gifts and the rich intermediality characteristic of humanist friendship in this period, Hoefnagel may have translated the invention dedicated to him by Radermacher into an image of which a copy or replica was returned to his friend.⁶ Their mutual, interlocking interchange was extended by the picture-within-the picture, which replicates and commemorates a gift of a miniature on vellum from Hoefnagel to Radermacher in the same year.⁷ As the primary ‘beholder’ of

both works, Radermacher would have known that there was a Latin text inscribed at the lower edge of the original miniature that is depicted within the larger picture (fig. 2). This recorded that 'Joris Hoefnagel gave this to Johannes Radermacher as a pledge of his love in the year 1589'. He would also have known that the central motif of the little picture was a bouquet comprising an Apothecary's Rose, a white Columbine, and a single Pink, and that at the top of the miniature there was another Latin inscription in gold letters advising that 'One should not treat friendships as one does flowers, which are appreciated only when they are fresh'.⁸

It is not our ambition, or within our power, to decipher this complex double allegory, which was probably developed in conversation or correspondence between the two men involved and personal to them.⁹ Rather, we would like to use it to draw out some of the themes that illuminate the question of friendship in the art and visual and material culture of the Low Countries and their diaspora in the early modern period. For example, in contrast to present day western Europe and north America, where friendship is equally associated with women, friendship in the early modern Low Countries was normatively identified with men. Humanists were inspired in part by antique models of one-to-one friendship which were based on shared virtue, a quality intrinsically and etymologically connected with masculinity. Personal connections, embodied in the overlapping networks

2

Joris Hoefnagel, *Still-life with insects and flowers*, 1589, watercolour on paper on panel, 11.8 x 16.3 cm, Middelburg, Zeeuws Museum (photo: Ivo Wennekes)



of kinship (*bloedvriendschap*), friendship, fraternity, and clientage, also had overwhelming importance for activities formally dominated by men at this period. These included political and economic interactions and advancement, travel and knowledge exchange, and welfare and security, particularly in troubled times.¹⁰ Ideals and practices of friendship were, furthermore, in some measure culturally specific. In China, for instance, friendship was one of the ‘five cardinal human relationships’ that had to bolster the social order laid out by Confucius. Among these five, however, friendship was the only bond that was freely chosen. As the friendly exchange of artworks with European visitors sometimes testifies, friendship could transcend social hierarchies and, apparently, also bridge cultural distances.

A number of contributions to this volume are concerned with this lived experience of what has been termed strategic friendship, although it certainly did not preclude honour and affection.¹¹ Some authors show how friendship, both among artists and between artists and different sorts of men, including a Jesuit missionary to China, played an important part in the cross-cultural experience of painters in Amsterdam, London, Paris and Changsu.¹² Another article explores the significance of friendship in the acquisition of a prestigious work by Caravaggio by a group comprising an art-loving merchant and three leading Antwerp artists, including Rubens and Jan Brueghel the Elder.¹³ Other contributions enter the space of the studio, to explore humanist friendship as a social ideal and model for artistic practice, education, and collaboration, and to re-examine the familiar relationship between Rembrandt and Jan Lievens through the lens of friendship as a spur to competitive – even rivalrous – co-creativity.¹⁴

Interestingly, the image produced jointly by Hoefnagel and Radermacher imagined friendship allegorically through differently gendered couples. Whereas antique models of masculine friendship were concerned with shared virtue and described friends as ‘second selves’, this picture acknowledges difference within friendship in the form of a ‘feminine side’.¹⁵ Indeed, in both couples, the love that is at the heart of friendship is conceived as the offspring of a heterosexual connection or marriage. In the couple on the right, love is said to be the legitimate child of the disparate figures of honourableness and joy. Piety keeps this love eternally aflame and turned towards God. In the more ‘worldly’ couple on the left, who are physically linked, the imagery is of the masculine plough’s cultivation or engendering of natural and human fertility in the flora, fauna and artifacts that adorn and frame the young woman, and the varied products of nature which form the content of the work of art on her knee. While the inscription acknowledges that all this is a replica of (divine) love, it asks the beholder not to consider this replica to be in any respect a deceptive counterfeit. Thus, under the aegis of friendship/love, the sensory realms of nature and art on the left are only apparently separate from the intangible divine light and eternal flame on the right.

Although in Hoefnagel’s picture femininity ultimately remains subsumed within the performance of friendship between two men, its visibility prompts consideration of the recognition of women as friends in this period. It is notable that in 1518 Erasmus endorsed Saint Augustine’s

fourth-century understanding of Christian, heterosexual marriage as encompassing friendship.¹⁶ The Protestant Reformation, which rejected the medieval Church's belief that celibacy was a more perfect state than marriage, encouraged this view.¹⁷ An article in this volume explores how, in the very 'highest' Protestant circles, the relationships of Elizabeth Stuart with both her husband Frederick Count Palatine of the Rhine and her brother Charles I of England were conceived as friendships and expressed and negotiated through a portrait historié commissioned from Gerrit van Honthorst.¹⁸ Images and descriptions of *Amicitia* that appeared in hugely influential works such as Andrea Alciato's *Emblematum Liber* (1531) and Cesare Ripa's *Iconologia* (1593) can also be connected with ways in which actual women acted and were portrayed. For example, Frans Hals's portrait of Isaac Massa and his bride Beatrix van der Laen (1622), in which the couple lean against a tree with an encircling vine, was informed by emblems and personifications of eternal friendship in which a vine cannot be uncoupled from its supporting tree-trunk even by death (figs. 3, 4).¹⁹

Contributions to this volume explore how the elite women Maria Tesselshade and Titia Brongersma also became more visible on their own account as highly creative figures, working within networks and coteries of friends and through a wide variety of means, including archaeology and



3

Artist unknown, *Amicitia*, c. 1603, woodcut, from Cesare Ripa, *Iconologia* (...) (Rome 1603), Heidelberg, Universitätsbibliothek (photo: Universitätsbibliothek Heidelberg)



4

Frans Hals, *Portrait of a couple, probably Isaac Abrahamsz Massa and Beatrix van der Laen*, c. 1622, oil on canvas, 140 x 66.5 cm, Amsterdam, Rijksmuseum (photo: Rijksmuseum)

diamond-engraving on wine glasses.²⁰ Considerable agency is attributed to the feminine in the entry for 'Confirmation of Friendship' in Dirck Pietersz. Pers's lavishly illustrated Dutch translation of Ripa's *Iconologia* (1644), which shows a young woman proffering a glass of wine to another person, 'And by this are the spirits and minds of the friends stirred up to unite together, and to confirm themselves in friendship' (fig. 5).²¹ Contributions to this volume address such conviviality as a pleasurable and binding aspect of friendship in relation to a play of 1534 recording a banquet in honour of a Franciscan tertiary in Bruges and in early seventeenth-century cultural co-teries in England and the United Provinces, some of which included women.²² Although these gatherings took place a century apart and the gender, spirituality, and social status of the guests differed, they all involved food, drink, and conversation. Talk ranged from discussion of theology and natural philosophy to solving visual-verbal puzzles in the form of chronograms and emblems, engaging the mind as well as the spirit in the performativity of friendship.

While friendship is certainly fulfilled in the warm glow of shared company, it equally has the power to connect people who are separated. Like many solvent people in turbulent times, Hoefnagel and Radermacher moved around a great deal, combining their pursuit of safe havens as Calvinists with their mercantile activities and need to make a living. Their travels also fulfilled their quest for knowledge and, in Hoefnagel's case, for artistic freedom. In 1589, the year commemorated by the *Allegory*, Hoefnagel had attained a privileged position at the court of the Dukes of Bavaria in Munich, while Radermacher had just taken refuge in Middelburg as a result of the fall of Antwerp to the Catholic Habsburgs in 1585. The *Allegory* speaks explicitly, on one side, of providing a replica of embodied presence 'In mutual solace for their absence' and, on the other, of the usefulness to mortals of an immortal fire of love, nourished by piety. It speaks tacitly and more privately, through the inscriptions on the original of the 'replica' miniature, of the artist's pledge of love and of determination not to allow friendship to wither like fresh flowers. The *Allegory* and the miniature of the same year were thus entrusted with keeping Hoefnagel's and Radermacher's friendship alive. There is no evidence that the two men ever met again in person.

Here *Ars amicitiae* moves beyond the involvement of artists with ideals and strategic practices of friendship into an intimate relationship between friendship and the artwork itself. *On Painting and Statuary*, a treatise composed by the Florentine Leon Battista Alberti (1404-1472) in the early 1430s and published in Latin in Basle in 1540, makes a striking analogy between painting and friendship:

In fact, painting certainly has in itself a truly divine power, not only because, *as is said of friendship*, it lets the absent be present, but moreover because it causes the dead after many centuries to be almost alive, such that it is recognized with much admiration for the maker, and with much pleasure.²³

Thus, what would currently be described as the agency of the artwork, in particular its capacity to bring into living presence again people (or things) from which the beholder is separated by distance or death, was understood by Alberti in terms of the power of friendship. Although very few people in the Low Countries would have read Alberti's words, his ideas were widely disseminated in Christian Europe and resonate with an epistemological regime in which visual reference was conceived as a form of attraction, an expression of love or sympathy that was believed to suffuse, connect, and give meaning to God's universe.²⁴

Although Alberti is ultimately concerned with pictures that tell a story, he exemplifies this characterisation of painting with a portrait of King Alexander the Great. Apparently, one of the generals of Alexander 'trembled all through his body because he saw an image of Alexander, who was already dead, in which he recognized the great majesty of his king. (...) Therefore, the faces of the dead, thanks to painting, have in a certain way a very long life'.²⁵ Alberti proceeds to describe how the frightened general confuses the portrait of Alexander with Alexander himself, as if true *pictorial* friends are living replicas of their partner in nature. Aristotle charac-

5

Artist unknown, *Amicitia*, c. 1644, woodcut, from Dirck Pietersz. Pers, *Iconologia of Uytbeeldingen des Verstants van Cesare Ripa* (...) (Amsterdam 1644), London, British Library (photo: J. Woodall)

terized true friendship as 'one soul in two bodies'.²⁶ The 'shared soul' of the picture and its 'friend' in nature is expressed in and through their visual relationship to one another. Yet this relationship is for Alberti not ultimately a matter of mere physical resemblance, like a passport photo. Alexander's general trembled because he saw the *majesty* of his king in his likeness. This attributes to painting the power visually to communicate the *embodied presence* of its absent partner as a fully-fledged subject.

Moreover, the beholder played an important part in this process. The highly educated would certainly have known Cicero's dialogue *De Amicitia*, composed in Rome shortly before the birth of Christ, which contains a clear precedent for the passage in Alberti's *On Painting*:

He who looks upon a friend, looks, as it were, upon a sort of image of himself. Wherefore friends, though absent, are at hand; though in need, yet abound; though weak, are strong; and – harder saying still – though dead, are yet alive; so great is the esteem on the part of their friends, the tender recollection and the deep longing that still attends them.²⁷

Here resemblance as a form of attraction occurs between the beholder and the friend, as well as between the image of the friend and his or her embodied presence. In this account of friendship, the image thus refers to *both* the beholder and the depicted friend, making visible the connection that they share and thus linking them together, although they are physically different and even if they are physically separated. The power of the portrait image to mediate between the beholder and sitter, as if it is the soul shared between two different bodies in Aristotle's understanding of true friendship, is fuelled by esteem, tender recollection, and deep longing.

Portraiture, conceived in this way, occupies an important position in this volume, particularly in relation to images of artists themselves. One contribution argues convincingly that an engaging and informal, yet charismatic, portrait of Lambert Lombard was painted by a pupil and characterises him as a friend with whom a network of similarly affectionate 'disciples' could meaningfully engage.²⁸ Another article looks closely at Van Dyck's double portrait of himself and Endymion Porter in relation to discourses and practices of friendship among English virtuosi. The painting elicits intersubjectivity not only by means of attitude, gesture, and simulated speech, but also by 'reflecting the self in the other': it is a mirror-image that allows for counterpoint as well as direct resemblance.²⁹ Later in the seventeenth century, the power of friendship, in the form of intersubjectivity, intermediality and a deep longing for the presence of the whole person – mind and spirit as well as body – generates the passionate poetry that Titia Brongersma addressed to portraits of her absent female companions.

Because friendship is not a matter of physical resemblance but rather 'one soul in two bodies', the analogy between the power of friendship and the agency of the work of art is not limited to conventional portraiture. Another contribution to this volume suggests that Jan van Eyck transformed the *Arnolfini portrait* into 'an image that recognizes and responds to us as we are engaged in responding to it' through the dog at the centre of the com-

CONFIRMATIONE dell' AMICITIA.
Bevestinge van Vriendschap.



position.³⁰ The image of a faithful, friendly, beloved non-human creature becomes for the receptive beholder an avatar that transcends the limits of representation. With this in mind, we might think again about the meaning of the Latin inscription that asks the beholder to recognize a true replica of love, not a mere deception, in *Allegory of the friendship between Joris Hoefnagel and Johan Radermacher*. Radermacher could have appreciated the divine power of friendship that provides mutual solace for their absence not only in the entire allegorical invention that he may well have given to his friend but also in the 'replica', within the allegory, of the miniature given to him by Hoefnagel as a pledge of his love. This miniature was itself a microcosmic replica of nature's varied creation, an expression of God's love. Radermacher and Hoefnagel could perhaps even have experienced the longing and power of friendship in the unlikely pair of a stag-beetle and a pear eternally juxtaposed to an ever-fresh rose.

When we thought about a theme for this anniversary volume, friendship came to mind immediately. The first *Nederlands Kunsthistorisch Jaarboek* was edited by Jan van Gelder, professor of art history at Utrecht University, and Sturla Gudlaugsson, art historian and director of the RKD, Netherlands Institute for Art History, and the Mauritshuis in The Hague. Published in 1947, it was an *album amicorum*, offered to Wilhelm Martin (1876-1954), former director of the Mauritshuis and extraordinary professor of art history at Leiden University on occasion of his seventieth birthday. This volume celebrates the seventieth birthday of the *NKJ* itself, which merits a brief look at the history of the journal. Over its lifespan, the *NKJ* has changed considerably

Over its lifespan, the *NKJ* has changed considerably, but also less than one might expect. In fact, some of its current hallmarks, such as interdisciplinarity and inclusivity, rotating editorship across the board and the invitation of guest editors, were already present in its very beginnings. The *NKJ* started out written in Dutch by art historians based in the Netherlands, but was not restricted to Dutch art at all. Being a continuation of *Het Jaarboek van den Nederlandschen Oudheidkundigen Bond* (since 1899) it was conceived of as a platform for the field in general, including archaeology, visual arts, and the applied arts, and featuring a variety of contributions across all time periods; though modern and contemporary art was not represented. In the second volume, the editorial board had been expanded to include nine members, all eminent Dutch art historians, and one of them female: the Groningen professor of art history Elisabeth Neurdenberg (1882-1957), who was the first woman to hold a chair in art history (by special appointment) in the Netherlands.³¹ From the second volume onwards, English summaries were included, the fourth volume (1952-1953) features an article in German and from the fifth volume onward, English articles feature regularly, written by colleagues from outside the Netherlands. In the fifth volume, an *album amicorum* for the Leiden archaeologist Alexander Byvanck, the colophon presents the English translation of the title *Netherlands Yearbook for History of Art*. The brief introduction by J.H. de Gelder to the tenth volume, looks back at the first decennium and stresses in particular the 'interuniversity and intermuseum' nature of the editorial board as a hallmark of the yearbook.³²

Volume 25, published in 1974, announced that from now on volumes would be dedicated to a theme, the first one being the work of the Dutch modernist architect H.P. Berlage. Possibly reflecting the spirit of the seventies and the ambition to renew and expand the field to include contemporary issues and move beyond the early modern period as well as traditional art historical media, it is followed by volumes on technical art history, on nineteenth-century art, and on Dutch modernism of the inter-war period. But there is also a monographic volume on Lucas van Leyden, again featuring technical art history, an early trademark of Dutch art history.

While Elisabeth Neurdenburg was the first woman on the board, she never published in the *NKJ*. Female authors appear in the mid-fifties, but it is only in the mid-seventies that a woman co-edits a volume: Marjan Boot, curator of applied arts at the Gemeentemuseum (since 2019 Kunstmuseum) The Hague and later at the Stedelijk Museum Amsterdam (volume 28, 1977), followed by Ilja Veldman (volume 29, 1978). In the early nineties, the *NKJ* opened its disciplinary focus to include historians and literary scholars, adding 'interdisciplinary' to 'interuniversity' and 'intermuseum'. The next decade saw scholars who had no institutional ties in the Netherlands but represented research into the history of Netherlandish art in other countries, entering the board, true to the international ambitions of the yearbook from its very beginnings.

The fiftieth volume (1999), on the art market, refrained from any references to the jubilee. In fact, none of the volumes marking a decade, except for the first, is concerned with the journal's anniversary. It may be a sign of the times that the current board felt the urge to take the opportunity of the seventieth *NKJ* to reflect the yearbook's purpose, intentions, and ideals with a volume on the art of friendship. Its history provides ample food for thought about future directions.

Earlier, we used the allegory by Joris Hoefnagel to draw out some of the themes that illuminate the question of friendship in the art and visual and material culture of the Low Countries and their diaspora in the early modern period. We have also asked ourselves lightheartedly how these themes might play out today, in relation to the *NKJ* itself.

The *NKJ*'s editorial board conceives of each volume or yearbook – and of the editorial process leading to it – as ideally an expression of friendly academic and personal relations among its members, and with our authors, enacted in collaborative work. Some things are still recognizable from Hoefnagel's allegory, others obviously have changed. In antiquity, a friend was seen as another self. Hoefnagel's allegory acknowledges difference within friendship, that friends can be dissimilar in character, that friendship has to be maintained in absentia, over long distances, among people who would sometimes or constantly move around. Nevertheless, friendship could not function in Hoefnagel's day without its participants staying in touch through letter writing and works of art, and without trusting that they will eventually meet again in person and enjoy each other's company. It is no different among the *NKJ*'s editorial board today. Its members are of various nationalities and live and work on different continents. We cherish the difference in disciplinary background among ourselves, as we appreciate the difference in topical interests and approaches. As the historical

overview above has made clear, the *NKJ* started as a male enterprise, only gradually expanding the number of female contributors and editors. Today we aim for gender parity among our ranks and maintain an ideal of friendship that no longer is exclusively masculine as it was in Hoefnagel's days. In the future, we look forward to increasing renewal and diversity.

As a matter of principle the board meets in person twice a year for a Winter and Summer meeting, lasting one day or more, to discuss paper proposals, draft and final paper submissions, peer review reports, as well as themes and calls for proposals for future volumes. Of course, we additionally make use of various means of online communication (and are currently forced to do so exclusively because of the ongoing coronavirus pandemic), but we consider our physical meetings as integral to our editorial philosophy. It is our conviction that the collective exchange of views and ideas within a friendly and convivial atmosphere eventually leads to better volumes. Meeting in person, seeing and talking to each other both on a professional and a personal level, enhances trust and keeps us motivated to keep on doing – and actually enjoying – our editorial work. In turbulent times such as those we are currently experiencing, the amicable relations we maintain among ourselves form an indispensable basis for continuing our voluntary endeavor.

This seventieth volume of the *NKJ* is intended by its editors as a *liber amicorum*, a monument to and expression of friendship for all those who have contributed to it since its founding, past and present: authors, former editors, advisory board members, designers, copy editors, translators, managing editors, and, of course, all its readers. In recognition of the dialogue at the heart of friendship, the volume interweaves full-length essays by participating authors with shorter contributions by members of the Editorial Board. Its appearance coincides with the departure for pastures new of two of our longstanding members, Dulcia Meijers and H. Perry Chapman. We dedicate this volume particularly to them, expressing our heartfelt gratitude for their many years of editorial service and, indeed, for their friendship.

Notes

- 1 *Attende Spectator ne vanum putes/ Amoris simulacrum non simulati/quae origo quae finis/ Georgii Houfnaglei et Ioannis Radermacheri/ mutuum absentiae solatium/ Anno Christi. MDLXC.* The translation of refers to Vignau-Wilberg 2017, 141, the elegant translation in Bass 2019, 108, and the text itself.
- 2 Vignau-Wilberg 2017, 142.
- 3 *Honesto et lucundo legitimè natus Amor Utile/ mortalibus allaturus, igni suo Deo sacratio/ immortale à Pietate nutrimentum capit.* The translation is a slight modification of Vignau-Wilberg 2017, 141, with reference to the original text.
- 4 Bostoën 1999.
- 5 Bostoën 1998, 31, with reference to

- Rijksarchief Zeeland, Middelburg, Familie Archief Schorer 157, Dossier 491: *Mijn schilderijken dat mij gelegateert is (...), daerin getoont wort de eerlycke ocupacie, elck in sym beroep, ende de liefde die door godtsaelige conversacie van Godt gevoet wordt; dit synde een copie van een dat onsen saeligen vader geïnventeert hadde om te vereeren aen een syner vrinden die door sulcke conversacie malcanderen liefhadden.*
- 6 Vignau-Wilberg 2017, 143, suggests that Hoefnagel and Radermacher may have both owned an example of the image.
 - 7 The original work is now in the Zeeuws Museum, Middelburg: <https://www.zeeuwsmuseum.nl/en/collection/art/m98-072-01-stilleven-met-bloemen-en-insecten> (accessed 26/10/2020).

- 8 Segal & Alen 2020, 139.
- 9 For the meaning of the allegory, Wilberg Vignau-Schuurman 1969, vol. 2, 113; Bostoën 1998, 31; Vignau-Wilberg 2017, 141-143, no. B3; Bass 2019, 107-108. See also footnote 5.
- 10 Kooijmans 1997.
- 11 Kooijmans 1997, 14.
- 12 Kok, Weiler, Jonkman, Weststeijn in this volume.
- 13 Sammut in this volume.
- 14 Wouk, Zamboni, Chapman in this volume.
- 15 For antique concepts of friendship and virtue, see Weiler in this volume.
- 16 Leushuis 2004, 1290-1291.
- 17 Mobley 2015.
- 18 Frederick in this volume.
- 19 <https://www.rijksmuseum.nl/en/collec->

- tion/SK-A-133 (accessed 26/20/2020); Alciato 1531, n.p. *Amicitia etiam post mortem durans*: https://www.emblems.arts.gla.ac.uk/alciato/facsimile.php?id=sm18_A6v (accessed 26/10/2020); and Pers 1644, 575, *Amicitia/Vriendschap*: https://www.dbnl.org/tekst/persooicesa01_01/persooicesa01_01_118.php (accessed 26/20/2020).
- 20 Woodall, Cook in this volume.
- 21 Pers 1644, 58: *En hier door worden de geesten of gemoederen der vrienden, opgeweckt om sich te vereenigen, en in de vriendschap te bevestigen*. See also Woodall in this volume.
- 22 Ramakers, Weiler, Woodall in this volume.
- 23 Our italics. *Della Pittura et della Statua* composed 1435-1436; *De Pictura* composed 1439-41; Alberti 1540; Sinisgalli 2011, 44-45.
- 24 Foucault 1970.
- 25 Sinisgalli 2011, 44.
- 26 For Aristotle's comment, see Mensch & Miller 2018, 221.
- 27 Cicero, *De Amitiae* 7:23.
- 28 Wouk in this volume.
- 29 Weiler in this volume.
- 30 Bass in this volume.
- 31 Marcus-de Groot 2003.
- 32 Van Gelder 1959.
- ### Bibliography
- Alciato 1531**
A. Alciato, *Emblematum liber*, Augsburg 1531.
- Alberti 1540**
L.B. Alberti, *De pictura praestantissima, et nunquam satis laudata arte libri tres*, Basle 1540.
- Bass 2019**
M. Bass, *Insect artifice. Nature and art in the Dutch Revolt*, Princeton 2019.
- Bostoen et al. 1998**
K. Bostoen, with contributions from C.A. Binnerts-Kluyter, C.J.E.J. Hattink & A.M. van Lynden-de Bruïne, *Bonis in bonum. Johan Radermacher de oude (1538-1617), humanist en Koopman*, Hilversum 1998.
- Bostoen et al. 1999**
K. Bostoen (ed.), with contributions from C.A. Binnerts-Kluyter, C.J.E.J. Hattink & A.M. van Lynden-de Bruïne, *Het album J. Rotarii. Tekstuitgave van het werk van Johan Radermacher de Oude (1538-1617) in het Album J. Rotarii, Handschrift 2465 van de Centrale Bibliotheek van de Rijksuniversiteit te Gent*, Hilversum 1999.
- Foucault 1970**
M. Foucault, *The order of things. An archaeology of the human sciences*, London 1970.
- Van Gelder 1959**
J.G. van Gelder, 'Bij het verschijnen van deel tien van het Nederlands Kunsthistorisch Jaarboek/ The Yearbook's tenth issue', *Nederlands Kunsthistorisch Jaarboek* 10 (1959), vii-xi.
- Kooijmans 1997**
L. Kooijmans, *Vriendschap en de kunst van het overleven in de zeventiende en achttiende eeuw*, Amsterdam 1997.
- Leushuis 2004**
R. Leushuis, 'The mimesis of marriage. Dialogue and intimacy in Erasmus's matrimonial writings', *Renaissance Quarterly* 57 (2004), no. 4, 1278-1307.
- Marcus-de Groot 2003**
Y. Marcus-de Groot, 'De eerste hooggeleerde vrouw in de kunstgeschiedenis'. In: Y. Marcus-de Groot, *Kunsthistorische vrouwen van weleer. De eerste generatie in Nederland vóór 1921*, Hilversum 2003, 299-322.
- Mensch & Miller 2018**
P. Mensch (trans.) & J. Miller (ed.), *Lives of the eminent philosophers. Diogenes Laërtius*, Oxford 2018.
- Mobley 2015**
S. Mobley, 'The Reformation and the reform of marriage. Historical views and background for today's disputes', *Issues in Christian education*, 48 (2015), no. 3 <https://issues.cune.edu/the-lgbt-disputes-teaching-and-practice-in-the-church-2/the-reformation-and-the-reform-of-marriage-historical-views-and-background-for-todays-disputes/> (accessed 26/10/2020)
- Pers 1644**
D. Pietersz. Pers (trans.), *C. Ripa Perugino, Iconologia of uytbeeldingen des verstands*, Amsterdam 1644. DBNL: https://www.dbnl.org/tekst/persooicesa01_01/persooicesa01_01.pdf.
- Segal & Alen 2020**
S. Segal & K. Alen, *Dutch and Flemish flower pieces. Paintings, drawings and prints up to the nineteenth century*, 2 vols., Leiden, 2020.
- Sinisgalli 2011**
R. Sinisgalli (ed. & transl.), *Leon Battista Alberti: On painting. A new translation and critical edition*, Cambridge 2011.
- Wilberg Vignau-Schuurman 1969**
T.A.G. Wilberg Vignau-Schuurman, *Die emblematischen Elemente im Werke Joris Hoefnagels*, 2 vols., Leiden 1969.
- Vignau-Wilberg 2017**
T. Vignau-Wilberg, *Joris and Jacob Hoefnagel. Art and Science around 1600*, Berlin 2017.