

The Golden Age by Joachim Wtewael

WALTER LIEDTKE

Curator, European Paintings, The Metropolitan Museum of Art

JOHN BREALEY'S YEARS at the Metropolitan Museum were a golden age for people who love paintings. It was a time when curators and collectors would visit the conservation studio to be brusquely greeted and enlightened by a man who suffered fools, or at least the ill-informed, with unexpected patience and generosity. "Let me refresh your memory," he would say of a picture that he had unobtrusively transformed, often by undoing past intrusions.

The extraordinary quality and nearly perfect condition of Joachim Wtewael's small painting on copper *The Golden Age* (Figure 1, Colorplate 6) would have been greatly admired by John. As a connoisseur of drawings he would also have appreciated the suave sketches in which Wtewael worked out the composition (Figures 2, 3), sketches made partly in response to examples by two of the most celebrated draftsmen of the day, Hendrick Goltzius and Abraham Bloemaert (see Figures 4, 5).

It has been two millennia since Ovid, Virgil, Lucretius, and other Roman poets, following the much earlier lead of Hesiod, described an early epoch in the history of mankind as a Golden Age, when men and women lived in an unregulated Garden of Eden. Already with Virgil, and routinely in the Renaissance, the idea of a Golden Age was politicized to denote a period of ideal rulership, although the need for government and law is dismissed in the most popular version of the mythological story, Ovid's bucolic account in *Metamorphoses* (bk. 1, lines 89–112). One sign of man's decline in the later ages that Ovid describes, those of silver, bronze, and iron, would appear to be the misuse of the classical metaphor, so that a "Golden Age" could be discerned in sixteenth-century Florence or seventeenth-century Amsterdam. If one expects to find not innocence but sophistication in a Golden Age, then the early 1600s was such a time in the lives of Dutch artists such as Wtewael, Goltzius, and Bloemaert,

and in the life—at least the aesthetic life—of the collector who (as discussed below) appears to have acquired *The Golden Age* shortly after it was painted in 1605, Emperor Rudolf II.

Neither Wtewael nor his exquisite painting on copper conforms to common notions of art and artists in the Golden Age of the Netherlands. Wtewael could be described as the most consistently Mannerist Dutch or Flemish painter of the period, although the naturalistic qualities found even in some of his most stylized compositions, including this one, lend the works a distinctive flavor. One often has the sense of seeing flesh and blood figures in bizarre circumstances rather than fantasies tinged by observations from life.

The time and care that went into a painting like *The Golden Age* could not have been afforded by most artists of the time, nor could they have been compensated sufficiently by the average patron. In 1604, the Vasari of the Netherlands, Karel van Mander, referred to some distinguished collectors who had "excellent and subtle" works by Wtewael, such as the "many small pieces of excellent precision and neatness" that were owned by "Joan Ycket" (Jan Nicquet) in Amsterdam.¹ However, Wtewael appears to have painted mainly for his own pleasure, and to have retained a large part of his oeuvre. In 1669, his granddaughter Aletta owned thirty paintings by the artist, most of which were probably passed down to her by his son Peter or his daughter Antonietta (Aletta's mother).² A little more than a hundred paintings by Wtewael are known today.³

Although good biographies are available elsewhere,⁴ it might be helpful to review some of the essential details of Wtewael's life. A near contemporary of Abraham Bloemaert (1564–1651), Wtewael was born in Utrecht in 1566 and died there in 1638. According to Van Mander, the teenaged artist trained to be a glass painter like his father, Anthonis Wtewael, but then studied oil painting for a couple of years with Joos de Beer (fl. 1575–d. 1591), a former pupil of the famous Antwerp master Frans Floris (1519/20–1570). (This would have been in the mid-1580s, a few years after Bloemaert's brief tuition with the same Utrecht

artist.) Wtewael then went to Italy, where he entered the service of Charles de Bourgneuf de Cucé, bishop of Saint Malo. Van Mander reports (probably on the basis of the artist's own account) that this arrangement lasted for two years in Italy and then two years in France, and that "during this time Wtenwael [*sic*] painted many things for the Bishop and all from his imagination, after his own invention."⁵

Most Dutch artists who went to Italy during this period came from families that had the means to cover the considerable expense and loss of income. The Wtewaels had been members of the educated middle classes for several generations. One of the artist's uncles earned a doctorate in law; another uncle and Joachim's older brother Johan were notaries. In May 1595, the humanist scholar Aernout van Buchell (1565–1641) noted in his diary Wtewael's recent marriage to Christina van Halen, the daughter of a shoemaker. Van Buchell was a distinguished antiquarian and amateur of the arts who in his journal, *Res Pictoriae*, records that in addition to painting, Wtewael "excels so much in sculpture that for it he has long since won the highest praise from the great and highest intellects."⁶ No sculpture by Wtewael is known to have survived, but Van Buchell's remark is relevant to what James Draper has described as the "Giambolognesque figural know-how" demonstrated in *The Golden Age*.⁷

In 1596, Wtewael and his wife bought a large house on the broad Oudegracht in Utrecht, and the couple's first child, the painter Peter Wtewael, was born. Joachim Wtewael was a dedicated businessman, to Van Mander's regret. The biographer wonders in the *Schilder-boeck* that "our Pictura is so well disposed [to Wtewael], given that she is held or exercised by him only in second place, whenever commerce, which comes first, tolerates it or allows him the time." Perhaps he will become completely tangled up in his flax business, Van Mander continues (in his redundant way), "just as Arachne became stuck and entangled in her web through the wrath of Minerva."⁸ During his lifetime Wtewael invested well over 25,000 guilders, at a time when a skilled craftsman might have earned five or six hundred guilders annually. When the Dutch East India Company (VOC) was formed in 1602, Wtewael and his brother each bought nine hundred guilders' worth of shares, which brought exceptional returns (25 percent per annum in the early 1620s).⁹ In 1614, the painter purchased five small houses behind his own, and in 1619 and 1625 he acquired, as investments, various other properties on the Oudegracht.¹⁰

Wtewael was a prominent figure in local society as well as in the world of art. In 1618, he was part of a

delegation that petitioned the Dutch stadtholder Prince Maurits to dissolve the Utrecht city council, which resulted in his own lifetime membership in the municipal government. He was also active in the Reformed Church and in charitable organizations. By contrast, he never held office in the painters' guild (which, however, he helped found in 1611), and as a teacher he had only a few minor pupils.

A taste for classical literature is suggested by the numerous mythological subjects Wtewael depicted and by his clever interpretations, which must have benefited in most instances from consulting the proper source. The theme of the Golden Age (*Aetas aurea*) was adopted from the opening pages of Ovid's *Metamorphoses*, which was the primary source for mythological stories in Netherlandish art from the late sixteenth century onward. Illustrated editions in translation or with vernacular paraphrases of the poem were widely available, beginning with a small book published in Lyons in 1577. This influential volume features woodcuts by Bernard Salomon illustrating 178 episodes from Ovid's fifteen books (or chapters), each of which is accompanied by French or Dutch verses concisely summarizing the specific tale. The second edition of a Dutch translation by Johannes Florianus, published in Antwerp in 1566, is illustrated with 178 woodcuts after Virgil Solis, who had freely copied Salomon's illustrations (thus reversing them) for use in two German editions of 1563. Various editions and series of engravings followed, including fifty-two prints after Hendrick Goltzius (see Figure 4; the first forty engravings were published in 1589 and 1590), and a series of 132 prints by Crispijn de Passe (published in 1602, and as a book in 1607).¹¹

The relevant passage from *Metamorphoses* follows the first eighty-eight lines, which describe the creation of heaven and earth, water and air, animals and mankind, and reads in full (bk. 1, lines 89–112):

In the beginning was the Golden Age, when men of their own accord, without threat of punishment, without laws, maintained good faith and did what was right. There were no penalties to be afraid of, no bronze tablets were erected, carrying threats of legal action, no crowd of wrong-doers, anxious for mercy, trembled before the face of their judge: indeed, there were no judges, men lived securely without them. Never yet had any pine tree, cut down from its home on the mountains, been launched on ocean's waves, to visit foreign lands: men knew only their own shores. Their cities were not yet surrounded by sheer moats, they had no straight brass trumpets, no coiling brass horns,



Figure 1. Joachim Wtewael (Dutch, 1566–1638). *The Golden Age*, 1605. Oil on copper, 22.5 x 30.5 cm. The Metropolitan Museum of Art, Purchase, The Edward Joseph Gallagher III Memorial Collection, Edward J. Gallagher Jr. Bequest; Lila Acheson Wallace Gift; special funds; and Gift of George Blumenthal, Bequest of Lillian S. Timken, The Collection of Giovanni P. Morosini, presented by his daughter Giulia, Gift of Mr. and Mrs. Nathaniel Spear Jr., Gift of Mr. and Mrs. William M. Haupt, from the collection of Mrs. James B. Haggin, special funds, gifts, and bequests, by exchange, 1993 (1993.333). See also Colorplate 6

no helmets and no swords. The peoples of the world, untroubled by any fears, enjoyed a leisurely and peaceful existence, and had no use for soldiers. The earth itself, without compulsion, untouched by the hoe, unfurrowed by any share, produced all things spontaneously, and men were content with foods that grew without cultivation. They gathered arbuté berries and mountain strawberries, wild cherries and blackberries that cling to thorny bramble bushes: or acorns, fallen from Jupiter's spreading oak. It was a season of everlasting spring, when peaceful zephyrs, with their warm breath, caressed the flowers that sprang up without having been planted. In time the earth, though untilled, produced corn too, and fields that never lay

fallow whitened with heavy ears of grain. Then there flowed rivers of milk and rivers of nectar, and golden honey dripped from the green holm-oak.¹²

Two drawings by Wtewael appear to represent initial and nearly final stages in his development of the composition. The earlier drawing, now in Munich (Figure 2), usually described as unfinished, is mainly concerned with a scheme for framing the view, with naked couples, gnarled tree trunks, and Cupid-like children sinuously bracketing the sides of the design, and in the center the entertaining motif of one boy helping another to mount an agreeable goat. The lovers at the right, the posturing pair farther back, the figure of Saturn overhead and, to a lesser extent, the goat



Figure 2. Joachim Wtewael. *The Golden Age*, probably ca. 1604–5. Pen, brown ink, and gray wash on paper, 19.4 x 30.8 cm. Munich, Staatliche Graphische Sammlung



Figure 3. Joachim Wtewael. *The Golden Age*, ca. 1604–5. Pen and brown ink with gray wash on paper, 23 x 30 cm. Dresden, Kupferstich-Kabinett, Staatliche Kunstsammlungen

and the triangular group of figures at the left are elements partly inspired by the engraving after Goltzius of the same subject, which dates from about 1588–89 (Figure 4).¹³

Wtewael's second drawing, in Dresden (Figure 3), is quite dissimilar and very close in design to the painting. There are, however, reminiscences of the earlier sketch in the overall plan and in individual motifs. An infant holding fruit aloft again fills the lower right corner. The bearded man plucking grapes at the right takes the place of a passionate woman in the earlier drawing, who with her companions anticipates the grape-picking beauty and buttressing bodies beneath the arbor in the Dresden design. Below her, the woman reclining at the stone table and nuzzling a child, and perhaps also the pose of her male partner, seem to have developed from the female figure at the lower left in the Munich drawing. The climbing youth at the left in that composition and of course the boys with a goat

have echoes in the later study (the youth in reverse). This occurs also in the disposition of masses and voids in the first design, where the pair of shadowy trees at the left and the washed-in ground plane show how Wtewael intended the left foreground to dominate. In the Dresden drawing this scheme is more extensively realized, with help from a dog and children drinking from a spring, the addition of the arbor and trees, and the pyramidal reconfiguration of the nude ensemble. An older man bearing fruit serves not only as a waiter but also as the formal equivalent of the boy mounting a goat. A similar kind of metamorphosis occurs in the middle ground, where the striding lovers in the Munich drawing anticipate the intertwined trunks and feminine limbs of the trees in the Dresden study (which continue to attract the attentions of a male figure). Even Saturn on his cloud is given equal measure in foliage, which in the painting surrounds the sky-high figure of a man picking berries in the treetops.



Figure 4. Anonymous engraver after Hendrick Goltzius (Dutch, 1558–1617). *The Golden Age*, ca. 1589. Engraving, 17.4 x 25 cm. The Metropolitan Museum of Art, The Elisha Whittelsey Collection, The Elisha Whittelsey Fund, 1949 (49.97.642)

In this complicated process of transformation, Wtewael appears to have crossed the threshold from one stylistic phase to another, or at least to have shifted his stance between the Mannerism of the preceding decades and the tentative Baroque tendencies of the early 1600s in Utrecht and Haarlem. Of course, the Dresden drawing and the Metropolitan's painting remain rooted in the late sixteenth century; the preparatory work is to some extent a reflection of Goltzius's design (to judge this properly requires looking at the print in a mirror, as Wtewael probably did, thus seeing what his famous predecessor had actually drawn).¹⁴ But there is a considerable gain in volumes and depth, consistent lighting and space, and the dramatic massing of figure groups in Wtewael's second study compared with his first drawing and with his source in Goltzius. One measure of this is the surprising resemblance in composition between the left side of Wtewael's drawing in Dresden and one of the great monuments of the Baroque age in the Netherlands, Rubens's *Raising of the Cross*, of 1610–11, in Antwerp Cathedral.¹⁵

Although some reservations concerning the authenticity of the Dresden drawing have been expressed in the past (it bears a false signature and the implausible date of 1595), there can be little doubt that it is indeed by Wtewael and is his preparatory study of about 1604–5 for *The Golden Age*.¹⁶ In the final work, a few motifs have been modified or newly introduced: two more young men pick fruit in and behind the tree at the left, and one of the youths at the upper left in the Dresden drawing has become an older man with a beard; the artist has added a parrot perched on a branch, the man at top center, a flying stork, and at the lower right a cat and a turkey; different figures animate the right background; the goat's rider is finally

mounted; and a second goat, which in the drawing is almost indistinguishable from the foliage at the upper right, is now more noticeable amid the twisting branches and dangling bunches of grapes.

In the painting, Wtewael departs from the Munich drawing not only in terms of design but also in his approach to the subject. The first composition, with three couples embracing and the other figures scrambling onto goats, trees, and clouds, suggests that the Golden Age was mostly an epoch of sex and exercise. The erotic element, which like the figure of Saturn went back to Goltzius, was toned down in the end, so that the subject is no longer a saturnalia but Ovid's vision of men and women pursuing healthy, idyllic lives in harmony with nature and with each other.

For the most part, Wtewael based this interpretation on Ovid's text, but he also must have admired his Utrecht colleague Abraham Bloemaert's treatment of the theme in a masterly drawing of 1603 (Städelsches Kunstinstitut, Frankfurt), and the superb print after it (Figure 5), dated 1604, by the Antwerp engraver Nicolaes de Bruyn (1571–1656). In fact, Bloemaert's composition, by far the most impressive version of the story by a Netherlandish artist up to that time, probably inspired Wtewael to turn to the subject in the first place. It has been noted that compared with earlier representations of the theme, "amorous activity is subdued" in Bloemaert's rendering and naturalistic details are emphasized, as seen in the handling of the figures, the overflowing flora and fauna, and the description of the landscape itself (for which Bloemaert presumably chose De Bruyn, a specialist in the engraving of forest scenes).¹⁷

Bloemaert's own reference to the engraving after Goltzius is obvious when one compares his drawing to the print, so that the dominant group of figures and



Figure 5. Nicolaes de Bruyn (Flemish, 1571–1656) after Abraham Bloemaert (Dutch, 1564–1651). *The Golden Age*, 1604. Engraving, 44.2 x 68.6 cm. The Metropolitan Museum of Art, The Elisha Whittelsey Collection, The Elisha Whittelsey Fund, 1966 (66.559.79)

trees is at the right in both compositions. The similarities include the motif of Saturn on a cloud, the inclusion of puffy-faced Zephyr (greatly diminished in the later work), and the use of two main allées into the background. However, Bloemaert also spared no effort to create an original work and to surpass the Haarlem master in ways that are more faithful to Ovid as well as to nature.¹⁸ The overall impression is distinctly Northern, in a tradition descending from Dürer's *Adam and Eve* engraving of 1504 to Goltzius's drawing of the same subject (engraved by Jan Saenredam in 1597) and to Roelant Savery's Paradise pictures of forests teeming with animals.¹⁹ Unclassical figures, ancient trees, and abundant plants and animals are also found in a set of six prints after Bloemaert, *The History of Adam and Eve*, engraved and published in 1604 by Jan Saenredam.²⁰ In the Temptation scene, where, of course, Adam and Eve take fruit from a tree, one corner of the foreground is filled with gourds and leafy branches, as in Bloemaert's *The Golden Age* and Wtewael's drawing in Dresden (Figures 3, 5), while the other corner is occupied by a cat and a turkey, the odd couple that replaced vegetation at the lower right in Wtewael's painting.²¹

Many of the figures in Wtewael's small masterpiece are reminiscent of nudes found in earlier works by Goltzius and the Haarlem artists in his circle, by Bloemaert, and by Wtewael himself.²² However, there are no conspicuous instances of borrowing, which is not surprising considering that the Dutch Mannerists shared an extensive stock of motifs and placed a premium on constant invention.²³ Within this single composition, certain poses are echoed, reversed, and modified, with a discriminating eye to silhouetting effects, rhythms over the surface, forms that counterbalance each other, and so on. The use of color is also remarkable, with flesh tones ranging from ivory to terracotta set against intense blues and greens. The spatial effect of contrasting warm and cool tones together with darks and lights has been enhanced by the actual low relief of the paint surface and by the subtlest suggestions of smoothness, hardness, softness, moisture, and other sensations.²⁴

While Wtewael found inspiration in the work of his like-minded colleagues in the Netherlands, he was also aware of the larger cultural realm in which they lived, that of Rome, Florence, Fontainebleau, Prague, and other capitals of Late Renaissance painting and



Figure 6. Bartholomeus Spranger (Flemish, 1546–1611). *Diana and Actaeon*, ca. 1590–95. Pen and brown ink, brush and brown and gray wash, and white heightening over traces of black chalk, on paper washed blue and pink, 41.3 x 32.1 cm. The Metropolitan Museum of Art, Purchase, Lila Acheson Wallace Gift, 1997 (1997.93)

sculpture. Indeed, compared with Bloemaert (Figure 5), Wtewael turned back from the woods to the studio, where displays of artistic erudition were at home. As in contemporary works by Rubens (especially *The Baptism of Christ* in the Koninklijk Museum voor Schone Kunsten, Antwerp), *The Golden Age* is rich in references to the great masters of the past and of Wtewael's time. For example, the group of figures on the left, crowned by the curvaceous woman reaching up to the arbor, recalls sculptural ensembles by the Flemish-born Giambologna (1529–1608) and by his Dutch follower Adriaen de Vries (ca. 1545–1626).²⁵ Here and elsewhere one would not speak of quotation, except perhaps in the case of the boy standing behind the fruit-laden table, whose pose is close to that of Apollino statuettes made in Giambologna's workshop.²⁶ The male figure at the far right brings to mind bronzes like Giambologna's *Bacchus* (before 1562; Borgo San Jacopo, Florence) and a free variation of the same type by Willem van Tetrode (ca. 1525–1580), who collaborated with Cellini in Florence and worked in Rome before returning to his native Delft in 1566–67.²⁷ Wtewael may also have known one or more of the many Hellenistic sculptures that represent satyrs holding

grapes in their upraised hands (Goltzius drew one of them in 1591 during his stay in Rome).²⁸ Finally, the female grape picker at the left is very similar in reverse to a figure in a large sketch by Bartholomeus Spranger (1546–1611), *Diana and Actaeon* (Figure 6), which is considered to date from the early 1590s. It was drawings by Spranger like this one that were brought to Haarlem in 1583 by Karel van Mander and that made a great impression on Goltzius and other artists.²⁹ In this fertile era of invention, the resemblance between figures dating some twenty years apart in the oeuvres of Spranger and of Wtewael may be considered simply as a sign of the Dutch painter's fluency in a stylistic language that spread from Florence and Rome to Prague, Vienna, and other court cities in Northern Europe, and then to Haarlem, Amsterdam, and Utrecht.

The Golden Age is a quintessential cabinet picture in its extraordinary refinement of execution (much of which requires magnification to appreciate),³⁰ its classical theme, its references to other works of art, and in its minute study of naturalistic details (see Figure 7), in particular the various shells—themselves collectors' items—which suggest (unlike the trees) that the mythological paradise was located somewhere in the East Indian Ocean.³¹ A parallel may be found in the Metropolitan's large panel by Rubens and Jan Brueghel the Elder, *The Feast of Achelöus* (Figure 8), which dates from about 1614–15. It too illustrates a story told by Ovid, recalls classical sculpture in a few of the nude figures, and describes with delightful delicacy an ancient landscape, with birds, shells, fruits, and other bounty.³²

There is no counterpart in Wtewael's painting to Jan Brueghel's description of exquisitely manufactured objects, such as silver-gilt tazzas and ewers, since these treasures and the heroes' weapons date from



Figure 7. Detail of Figure 1



Figure 8. Peter Paul Rubens (Flemish, 1577–1640) and Jan Brueghel the Elder (Flemish, 1568–1625). *The Feast of Achelöüs*, ca. 1614–15. Oil on wood, 108 x 163.8 cm. The Metropolitan Museum of Art, Gift of Alvin and Irwin Untermyer, in memory of their parents, 1945 (45.141)

later times—Ovid’s declining ages of silver, bronze, and iron. However, there does seem to be an allusion to the days of creation just prior to the Golden Age, so that when man arrived each region already had its “appropriate inhabitants,” water affording “a home to gleaming fishes” (two men use a net to catch them in the right background), while “earth harboured wild beasts, and the yielding air welcomed the birds.” Wtewael may even have had in mind Ovid’s notion that “whereas other animals hang their heads and look at the ground,” the Creator, “or else Prometheus . . . made man stand erect, bidding him look up to heaven,” no doubt sensing that he had been fashioned “into the image of the all-governing gods.”³³

Until 1988, when *The Golden Age* appeared at auction in France, no painting by Wtewael of this subject was known. There are, however, three references to such a picture, or to more than one, in early inventories. “Een taffel auf cupfer, Aurum seculum von Wtewael” (“a panel on copper, the Golden Age by Wtewael”) is cited in the 1619 inventory of the imperial Kunstkammer in Vienna.³⁴ The inventory was made after the death of Emperor Matthias (1557–1619), who was the younger brother and heir of Rudolf II (1552–1612). The nature of the inventory has been debated, but it appears that the most Rudolfine works listed in it—meaning the most Mannerist, refined, learned, or erotic—came from the imperial collection in Prague.³⁵ Matthias was a minor patron by comparison, with quite different tastes.³⁶

A painting of the same subject by Wtewael is also cited in an Amsterdam auction of June 27, 1752 (“No. 155. Een de gulde Eeuw, van Joghem Uytewaal,”

with no dimensions or other details), and in an Amsterdam auction of April 15, 1778.³⁷ It is very probable that the same picture appeared in both sales, considering that they were held in the same city about one generation apart. At the second sale the painting is said to be on copper, “hoog 6 duim, br. 8 duim,” or about fifteen by twenty centimeters. Assuming that this information (to say nothing of the attribution) is reliable, the painting sold in Amsterdam in 1778 was not the present picture, but a work less than half its size.³⁸ However, the proportions are the same, about three to four in a landscape format. Since Wtewael is known for repeating compositions in different sizes, it is possible that *The Golden Age* sold in Amsterdam was a replica of the New York picture.³⁹

Circumstantial evidence indicates that *The Golden Age* by Wtewael in the Habsburg imperial collection was painted between about 1604 and Rudolf II’s death in 1612. It was suggested above that Bloemaert’s drawing dated 1603 and De Bruyn’s engraving after it (Figure 5) inspired Wtewael to treat the subject as an independent work of art (nearly all earlier Netherlandish examples are related to a series of prints). Another indication that the emperor’s painting on copper, “Aurum seculum von Wtewael,” was not painted before about 1604 is found in the fact that no such work is mentioned by Van Mander in his book of that year. In the section of the *Schilder-boeck* titled “The Lives of Famous Netherlandish and High German Painters,” Van Mander rarely misses an opportunity to note when a picture by one of his compatriots could be found in the possession of a great prince or of any important collector. His biography of Wtewael mentions individual

paintings by him in private hands, including a small copper *Mars and Venus* “recently delivered to Sr. Joan van Weely.”⁴⁰ This fresh information and details of Wtewael’s early career were evidently obtained directly from the artist. Therefore, it seems very likely that a painting by Wtewael that had been acquired by Rudolf II before about 1603–4 (and which treats a theme that Van Mander examines elsewhere) would have been mentioned by him in his comparatively detailed discussion of the artist. In the foreword of the *Schilder-boeck*, Van Mander calls Rudolf II the greatest connoisseur of painting in the world,⁴¹ and in the various “Lives” specific works by Spranger, Goltzius, Bloemaert, Jacques de Gheyn II, and other living masters are mentioned as in the emperor’s collection.

In every respect, *The Golden Age* seems the perfect Rudolfine image, given the emperor’s love of erotic mythologies, forest scenes, naturalia, and precious works of art.⁴² It is also probable that Rudolf II would have recognized in his own reign “The Golden Age Restor’d,” to quote the title of Ben Jonson’s masque of 1615 celebrating the Stuart era in England.⁴³ Another example one could cite is Giuseppe Arcimboldo’s symbolic portrait of about 1591, *Rudolf II as Vertumnus* (Skokloster Castle, Sweden), which combines a year’s cycle of fruits and vegetables to depict the emperor as god of the seasons, suggesting that “the eternal spring of the new Golden Age is to come with his rule.”⁴⁴ Wtewael would have been familiar with the political analogy, since Ovid’s description of the Golden Age was presented as a metaphor for beneficent rulership in Van Mander’s “Interpretation and Explanation of the Symbolism in Ovid’s *Metamorphoses*,” the section of the *Schilder-boeck* that immediately follows the “Lives.”⁴⁵

That a painting by Wtewael could be found in Rudolf II’s collection not long after it was made is not a cause for wonder. In addition to employing Netherlandish artists such as Savery in Prague, the emperor pursued works by recent and contemporary painters through diplomatic and other channels. In August 1595, for example, the imperial secretary wrote to Count Simon VI zur Lippe (1554–1613), Rudolf’s new ambassador to East Friesland, that he should try to acquire whatever “beautiful and artful” paintings he could, in particular in Amsterdam and Utrecht.⁴⁶ The Protestant count, called Graef van der Lip by Van Mander, became a prominent figure in the Dutch art market, buying or attempting to buy important works by masters ranging from Lucas van Leyden to Goltzius and Bloemaert. Lippe solicited the help of artists, collectors, merchants, city officials, court figures, and even the prince of Orange to obtain paintings that were especially desired by Rudolf II or suited to his taste. Like other diplomats, Lippe, whenever he trav-

eled to Bohemia (in 1601, 1603, and 1607), would bring pictures for his sovereign. However, there were many ways in which the count, whose seat was Schloss Brake (now the Weserrenaissance-Museum) in Lemgo, Westphalia, could have sent works of art to Prague.⁴⁷

One of Lippe’s main agents in Holland was the Haarlem engraver Jan Muller (1571–1628), who worked closely with Goltzius, made prints after Bloemaert as well as the Haarlem Mannerists, and maintained contacts with Spranger, Adriaen de Vries, and other artists at Rudolf II’s court.⁴⁸ Paintings by Wtewael would have come to Lippe’s attention in a variety of ways. At least two of the collections in which works by the artist could be found (as noted by Van Mander) were known to the count as possible or actual sources of acquisitions. In 1602, his fortifications engineer, Johan van Rijswijck of Middelburg, advised him about important paintings that might be obtained from the mintmaster, collector, and gentleman dealer Melchior Wyntgis.⁴⁹ And Lippe purchased four major pictures from the estate of the Amsterdam collector Jan Nicquet (1539–1608), who (as noted above) was said by Van Mander to own many small works by Wtewael.⁵⁰

As of 1605, the date inscribed on *The Golden Age*, Lippe also had at least one art agent in Utrecht, Andries van der Meulen (1549–1611). He and his brother, Daniel (d. 1600), came from a wealthy family of textile merchants in Antwerp, but as Calvinists they fled to Bremen in 1585. Both men were well connected politically; in 1584, Daniel served as Antwerp’s representative to the States General in The Hague. In May 1596, Lippe wrote to Andries van der Meulen in Bremen asking for his help in obtaining Dutch and Flemish paintings on behalf of Rudolf II, and eleven days later Van der Meulen wrote to his brother, who had moved to Leiden, with the same request. Lippe must have been in frequent contact with the Van der Meulens, since they were also an important source of political news. In 1605, Andries moved to Utrecht. He must have known in advance about the city’s leading artists, from the emperor himself, from Lippe, or from his own brother Daniel, a “very courtly and cultured man” according to Wtewael’s friend Van Buchell, in a diary entry of 1591.⁵¹

Further speculation would be inappropriate, since the first owner of *The Golden Age* may have learned of its availability as fortuitously as the present writer did. In 1988, the picture surfaced for the first time at an auction in Versailles and moved swiftly through the London art market to the prominent collector Jaime Ortiz Patiño. After five years, Ortiz Patiño quietly consigned the work for sale to an art dealer in New York.

The painting was brought to our attention by a friendly journalist, who was aware that the Metropolitan Museum was one of the last great public collections without a work by Wtewael. Within weeks, a treasure that had disappeared for nearly four hundred years was on our walls.

ABBREVIATIONS

Bolten 1984

J. Bolten. "Notes on Abraham Bloemaert's Drawing of the Golden Age." In *De Arte et Libris: Festschrift Erasmus, 1934-1984*, ed. Abraham Horodisch, pp. 23-41. Amsterdam, 1984.

Fusenig 2002

Thomas Fusenig. "'... wollen euch mit vlies erkundigen, ob ir derselbige kunststueck zu wege bringen vermöchte': Graf Simon VI. zur Lippe kauft niederländische Gemälde für Kaiser Rudolf II." In *Kunst und Repräsentation: Beiträge zur europäischen Hofkultur im 16. Jahrhundert*, ed. Heiner Borggreffe and Barbara Uppenkamp, pp. 109-56. Bamberg, 2002.

Lowenthal 1986

Anne W. Lowenthal. *Joachim Wtewael and Dutch Mannerism*. Doornspijk, 1986.

Lowenthal 1997

Anne W. Lowenthal. "The Golden Age by Joachim Wtewael at The Metropolitan Museum of Art." *Apollo* 145 (February 1997), pp. 49-52.

Van Mander, *Lives*, 1604 (1994-99 ed.)

Karel van Mander. *The Lives of the Illustrious Netherlandish and German Painters, from the First Edition of the "Schilder-boeck" (1603-1604); Preceded by The Lineage, Circumstances and Place of Birth, Life and Works of Karel van Mander, Painter and Poet and Likewise His Death and Burial, from the Second Edition of the "Schilder-boeck" (1616-1618)*. Ed. Hessel Miedema. Trans. Michael Hoyle, Jacqueline Pennial-Boer, and Charles Ford. 6 vols. Doornspijk, 1994-99.

Van Mander, *Het schilder-boeck*, 1604

Karel van Mander. *Het schilder-boeck*. . . Haarlem, 1604.

Roethlisberger 1993

Marcel G. Roethlisberger. *Abraham Bloemaert and His Sons: Paintings and Prints*. 2 vols. Doornspijk, 1993.

NOTES

1. See Van Mander, *Lives*, 1604 (1994-99 ed.), vol. 1, pp. 445-46, and vol. 6, pp. 80-81. Nicquet is briefly discussed in Lowenthal 1986, pp. 22-23.
2. Lowenthal 1986, p. 32.
3. Ninety-eight authentic works and nine "problematical attributions" are catalogued in Lowenthal 1986. A number of previously unknown pictures have appeared in the past twenty years, including the one discussed here.
4. See *ibid.*, chap. 2, and Anne W. Lowenthal in *The Dictionary of Art*, ed. Jane Turner (New York, 1996), vol. 33, pp. 417-19.
5. Van Mander, *Lives*, 1604 (1994-99 ed.), vol. 1, p. 445. On the uncertain chronology of Wtewael's travels in Italy and France, see Van Mander, *Lives*, 1604 (1994-99 ed.), vol. 6, p. 79; Lowenthal 1986, pp. 27-28; and Marten Jan Bok in *Dawn of the Golden Age: Northern Netherlandish Art, 1580-1620*, ed. Ger Luijten and Ariane van Suchtelen, exh. cat., Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam (Amsterdam and Zwolle, 1993), p. 327 n. 5.
6. See Lowenthal 1986, p. 36. The Latin text is given in *Arnoldus Buchelius, "Res Pictoriae": Aanteekeningen over kunstenaars en kunstwerken voorkomende in zijn Diarium, Res Pictoriae, Notae Quotidanae, en Descriptio urbis Ultrajectinae (1583-1639)*, ed. G. J. Hoogewerff and J. Q. van Regteren Altena (The Hague, 1928), pp. 75-76. Van Buchell's antiquarian work is discussed in Sandra Langereis, *Geschiedenis als ambacht, oudheidkunde in de Gouden Eeuw: Arnoldus Buchelius en Petrus Scriverius* (Hilversum, 2001).
7. James Draper, Henry R. Kravis Curator in the Metropolitan Museum's Department of European Sculpture and Decorative Arts, in a memo to the writer (2004).
8. See Van Mander, *Lives*, 1604 (1994-99 ed.), vol. 1, p. 446 (fol. 297r), and vol. 6, p. 82.
9. See Lowenthal 1986, p. 31, and Marten Jan Bok in Joaneath A. Spicer, with Lynn Federle Orr, *Masters of Light: Dutch Painters in Utrecht during the Golden Age*, exh. cat., Fine Arts Museums of San Francisco, Walters Art Gallery, Baltimore, and The National Gallery, London (Baltimore and San Francisco, 1997), p. 326.
10. See Bok in Spicer, *Masters of Light*, pp. 326-27, where (in n. 12) Lowenthal 1986, p. 31, is wrongly corrected.
11. The details in this paragraph are drawn from Eric Jan Sluijter, *Seductress of Sight: Studies in Dutch Art of the Golden Age*, trans. Jennifer Kilian and Katy Kist (Zwolle, 2000), chap. 2, "Metamorphoses" in Prints by Hendrick Goltzius and His Circle," pp. 23-27. See also Eric Jan Sluijter, *De "heydensche fabulen" in de schilderkunst van de Gouden Eeuw: Schilderijen met verhalende onderwerpen uit de klassieke mythologie in de Noordelijke Nederlanden, circa 1590-1670* (Leiden, 2000), pp. 194-95, for an outline of the influence of the Salomon woodcuts on Netherlandish illustrations of *Metamorphoses* to about 1700 (p. 335, fig. 6, for De Passe's engraving of the Golden Age, which employs a "Banquet of the Gods" format).
12. *The Metamorphoses of Ovid*, trans. Mary M. Innes (Harmondsworth, 1955), pp. 31-32.
13. The connection with the engraving after Goltzius is noted in Bolten 1984, p. 39 (pp. 33-37 on Goltzius's illustrations to Ovid), and Lowenthal 1997, p. 51.
14. Goltzius's original drawing is lost, but a copy of it, perhaps by the young Jan Muller (1571-1628), is in the Victoria and Albert Museum, London (E. K. J. Reznicek, *Die Zeichnungen von Hendrick Goltzius* [Utrecht, 1961], p. 474, no. ZW 10, fig. 454).

15. It is doubtful that Rubens ever saw the drawing or Wtewael's painting, although it could have made its way to Prague through Antwerp or Brussels (where Rudolf II's brother Archduke Albert of Austria was regent of the Spanish Netherlands).
16. Lowenthal (1997, p. 51) concludes that the Dresden drawing "seems to be a well-developed preparatory study" for the painting in New York, and a comparison is made with a preparatory drawing in Oslo for Wtewael's painting, *The Judgment of Paris*, dated 1602, in the Cleveland Museum of Art. See Lowenthal 1986, pls. 32, 34, for the Oslo drawing and the Cleveland painting, and pls. 5, 6, for the drawing in Berlin that was made in preparation for Wtewael's *Wedding of Peleus and Thetis* of the 1590s or about 1600 (Alte Pinakothek, Bayerische Staatsgemäldesammlungen, Munich). See also Lowenthal 1997, p. 52 n. 13, on a copy after the Dresden drawing, in Düsseldorf. The authenticity of the Dresden drawing was convincingly defended before the corresponding picture was discovered, in Christian Dittrich, with Veronika Birke, *Die Albertina und das Dresdner Kupferstich-Kabinett: Meisterzeichnungen aus zwei alten Sammlungen*, exh. cat., Staatliche Graphische Sammlung Albertina, Vienna, and Kupferstich-Kabinett, Staatliche Kunstsammlungen, Dresden (Dresden, 1978), no. 82 (entry by Christian Dittrich).
17. The quote is from Roethlisberger 1993, vol. 1, p. 116, under no. 70 (catalogue entry for the engraving), where this point about De Bruyn is also made. The author convincingly overrules the suggestion made in Bolten 1984, p. 38, that Bloemaert's drawing may not have been made expressly to be engraved, which is contradicted by the inclusion of the cartouche with putti in the drawing, and by all the evidence of the artist's career as a designer and the art market in the Netherlands at the time.
18. As noted in Bolten 1984, pp. 37–38, where too much is made of the fact that the engraving after Bloemaert bears the same anonymous lines of Latin verse as the print after Goltzius. Such borrowings were common among print publishers.
19. Spicer (in *Masters of Light*, p. 334) says of Savery's Paradise paintings that "these fantasies can best be thought of as avian equivalents of Wtewael's *Golden Age*," and reminds the reader (without knowing that the emperor may have owned the present picture) of Rudolf II's famous menageries. For Goltzius's drawing of Adam and Eve, with a goat, cat, and dog in the foreground, see Reznicek, *Die Zeichnungen von Hendrick Goltzius*, pp. 238–39, no. 10, fig. 288.
20. Roethlisberger 1993, nos. 72–77, figs. 127–32.
21. That Wtewael referred to Bloemaert's *History of Adam and Eve* is also suggested by the strong resemblance between the couple in the background in the Munich drawing (Figure 2) and Adam and Eve in *The Tree of Knowledge*, the second print in the series.
22. The three reclining figures in the foreground of *The Golden Age* have immediate antecedents in Wtewael's *Wedding of Peleus and Thetis* (Herzog Anton Ulrich-Museum, Brunswick) and his *Judgment of Paris* (Cleveland Museum of Art), both of 1602 (Lowenthal 1986, figs. 31, 32). The Brunswick painting also features children riding goats and a man pouring wine (in the lower right corner) who is very similar in reverse to the figure at the upper left in the Dresden drawing (Figure 3). The Cleveland picture includes a crouching dog as well as reclining male figures that look forward to *The Golden Age*. The seated woman at the lower right recalls a repoussoir figure in Jan Saenredam's engraving after Goltzius, *The Discovery of Callisto's Pregnancy*, dated 1599 (see Sluijter, *Seductress of Sight*, fig. 51, and the detail of this figure on p. 22), and another in Cornelis Cornelisz van Haarlem's drawing of about 1588, *Olympic Games* (Pieter J. J. van Thiel, *Cornelis Cornelisz van Haarlem, 1562–1638: A Monograph and Catalogue Raisonné* [Doornspijk, 1999], fig. 29), while the reclining woman in the left foreground of Wtewael's painting is similar to the woman on the left in Cornelisz van Haarlem's panel of about 1597, *Depravity of Mankind before the Flood* (location unknown; Van Thiel, *Cornelis Cornelisz van Haarlem*, fig. 135). These comparisons do not reveal sources but parallels, of which there are many others.
23. A good sense of this can be gained from reviewing Sluijter, *De "heydensche fabulen,"* figs. 3–60.
24. Lowenthal 1997, p. 50, offers a fine description of these effects, and makes the point about the relieflike application of paint.
25. For De Vries, see Frits Scholten et al., *Adriaen de Vries, 1556–1626*, exh. cat., Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam, Nationalmuseum, Stockholm, and J. Paul Getty Museum, Los Angeles (Amsterdam, Stockholm, and Los Angeles, 1998).
26. See Charles Avery and Anthony Radcliffe, *Giambologna, 1529–1608: Sculptor to the Medici*, exh. cat., Royal Scottish Museum, Edinburgh, Victoria and Albert Museum, London, and Kunsthistorisches Museum, Vienna (London, 1978), nos. 37, 38. James Draper kindly noted this connection.
27. See Frits Scholten et al., *Willem van Tetrode, Sculptor (c. 1525–1580): Guglielmo Fiammingo scultore*, exh. cat., Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam, and The Frick Collection, New York (Amsterdam and New York, 2003), p. 119, no. 14 (the version in the Museum für Kunst und Gewerbe, Hamburg), where the bronze statuette of 1562–65 is called "a free variation on a familiar Florentine theme," in which Van Tetrode was "preceded by major artists such as Michelangelo, Sansovino and Giambologna." The latter's *Bacchus* is illustrated in the same catalogue, p. 32, fig. 28.
28. See Reznicek, *Die Zeichnungen von Hendrick Goltzius*, nos. 245, 246, figs. 182, 183, after the Satyr in the Villa Albani, which is seen in a later state in Margarete Bieber, *The Sculpture of the Hellenistic Age* (New York, 1961), fig. 568 (see also fig. 573 for another marble sculpture of a satyr holding grapes over his head, in the Vatican Museum). Carlos A. Picón, Curator in Charge of the Metropolitan Museum's Department of Greek and Roman Art, kindly brought this category of works to my attention. He also mentioned the numerous examples of children with goats in Greek sculpture, but it does not appear that Wtewael had a specific example in mind.
29. See Huigen Lceflang and Ger Luijten, *Hendrick Goltzius (1558–1617): Drawings, Prints and Paintings*, exh. cat., Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam, The Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York, and Toledo Museum of Art, Toledo, Ohio (Zwolle, 2003), chap. 4.
30. For example, the cat, viewed under a microscope, is shown to be rendered in countless threadlike lines of paint, many of which are red, thus lending warmth to the gray tabby coat of fur.
31. Compare the display of shells, birds, and sea creatures in Ferrante Imperato's illustration of his own collection of naturalia, in *Dell'Historia Naturale . . . Libri XXVIII* (Naples, 1599), which is discussed in Joy Kenseth, ed., *The Age of the Marvelous*, exh. cat., Hood Museum of Art, Dartmouth College, Hanover, New Hampshire, and other institutions (Hanover, 1991), pp. 234–35, no. 14 (detail on p. 12).
32. See Walter Liedtke, *Flemish Paintings in The Metropolitan Museum of Art* (New York, 1984), vol. 1, pp. 194–98, and vol. 2, colorpl. XIV. Also discussed in Guy Bauman and Walter Liedtke, *Flemish Paintings in America* (Antwerp, 1992), pp. 190–92, under no. 58.
33. The quotes are from *The Metamorphoses of Ovid* (p. 31), in the two paragraphs immediately preceding the description of the

- Golden Age. Renaissance and Baroque artists would have approved of this passage because it supports the familiar argument in *paragone* debates that the most superior sense is that of sight. Thomas Aquinas wrote that human beings walk upright because their senses seek out knowledge and beauty, not just mere necessities. Animals face the ground, but man stands erect, "in order that by the senses, and chiefly by sight, which is more subtle and penetrates further into the differences of things, he may freely survey the sensible objects around him, both heavenly and earthly, so as to gather intelligible truth from all things" (David Summers, *The Judgment of Sense: Renaissance Naturalism and the Rise of Aesthetics* [Cambridge, 1987], p. 36, for this translation of a passage in the *Summa Theologiae*).
34. The document is listed in Lowenthal 1986, p. 212.
 35. This opinion was expressed by Thomas DaCosta Kaufmann, in a personal communication to the present writer, dated June 29, 2004. See Thomas DaCosta Kaufmann, *Art and Architecture in Central Europe, 1550–1620: An Annotated Bibliography* (Marburg, 2003), pp. 24–31, for a list of primary sources and studies of the various inventories of the imperial collections in Prague and Vienna, and pp. 90–95, for a list of publications on patronage and collecting in Rudolfiner Prague.
 36. See Thomas DaCosta Kaufmann, *The School of Prague: Painting at the Court of Rudolf II* (Chicago and London, 1988), pp. 100–101.
 37. Lowenthal 1986, p. 212.
 38. Here the writer draws a different conclusion than that implied in Lowenthal 1997, p. 50, where the Amsterdam painting is described as "slightly smaller than the Metropolitan Museum's example." With a surface area equal to 43.7 percent of the larger one, the smaller picture could be laid down twice on the New York painting, leaving an inch to spare across the top or bottom.
 39. For example, the two versions of Wtewael's *Battle between the Gods and the Titans*, of about 1600–1605 (Lowenthal 1986, nos. A-23, A-24, pls. 35, 36), are on coppers 21 x 28 cm (private collection) and 15.6 x 20.3 cm (Art Institute of Chicago), or about the same sizes as the two paintings under discussion. See also Lowenthal 1986, pls. 8–10, 32, 33, 37, 38, with dimensions given in the captions.
 40. Van Mander, *Lives*, 1604 (1994–99 ed.), vol. 1, p. 445.
 41. Van Mander, *Het schilder-boeck*, 1604, fol. 4v; see also Lowenthal 1986, p. 24.
 42. See Kaufmann, *School of Prague*, pp. 59–63, on "Rudolfine Mythological Painting: *Poesie* in Prague," and pp. 74–89, on "Nature Studies: Landscape, Still Life, and Animal Painting in Prague."
 43. This Jacobean masque is related to the iconography of Rubens's ceiling for the Banqueting House, Whitehall, in Fiona Donovan, "Rubens, England, and the Whitehall Ceiling" (Ph.D. diss., Columbia University, New York, 1994), pp. 153, 166–68.
 44. Kaufmann, *School of Prague*, p. 171, under no. 2.22. Patronage on this princely level might help to explain why Wtewael turned to the theme of the Golden Age, which "was relatively uncommon then, in comparison with feasts and amorous exploits of the gods" (Lowenthal 1997, p. 51). However, this remark must have been made specifically with Dutch paintings in mind; the earlier prints illustrating Ovid's passage may be counted among those supporting Sluijter's observation (in Sluijter, *De "heydensche fabulen"*, p. 23) that Dutch artists first demonstrated an interest in mythological subjects by treating "countless scenes that were never [or very rarely] represented in painting." Some sixteenth-century Italian painters who depicted the Golden Age are reviewed in Bolten 1984, pp. 26–27. Jacopo Zucchi's *The Golden Age*, one of three panels representing *The Ages of the World* (Uffizi, Florence), has been interpreted as a political allegory celebrating justice under Medici rule; see Bolten 1984, p. 27, figs. 6–8, citing Edmund Pillsbury, "Drawings by Jacopo Zucchi," *Master Drawings* 12 (1974), pp. 12–13, pl. 8, and Thomas Puttfarcken, "Golden Age and Justice in Sixteenth-Century Florentine Political Thought and Imagery: Observations on Three Pictures by Jacopo Zucchi," *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes* 43 (1980), pp. 130–49.
 45. Van Mander, *Schilder-boeck*, 1604, sect. 5, fol. 3v. A useful summary of the six sections of the *Schilder-boeck* is offered by E. K. J. Reznicek in his entry on Karel van Mander I in *Dictionary of Art*, vol. 20, pp. 245–46, where we are reminded that Goltzius worked on his illustrations to the *Metamorphoses* in close collaboration with Van Mander. Lowenthal 1997, pp. 51–52, connects Wtewael's picture with Van Mander's interpretation of the Golden Age, and observes that "such sentiments are more likely to represent the views of a patron than of Wtewael, in view of his later pro-Orange sympathies." Here, the author has in mind the possible "pacifist implications" of the subject, which assumes that the enlightened ruler in question would have been Dutch.
 46. Fusenig 2002, pp. 112, 126, doc. 1.
 47. See Van Mander, *Lives*, 1604 (1994–99 ed.), vol. 4, pp. 17–18, 63; Roethlisberger 1993, vol. 1, pp. 63–64; and especially Fusenig 2002, on Lippe and his Netherlandish agents.
 48. See Jan Piet Filedt Kok, "Jan Harmensz. Muller as Printmaker," *Print Quarterly* 11 (1994), pp. 244–45, 255–56, and E. K. J. Reznicek, "Jan (Harmensz.) Muller," in *Dictionary of Art*, vol. 22, pp. 272–73. Lippe tried to buy Lucas van Leyden's *Last Judgment* triptych (Stedelijk Museum De Lakenhal, Leiden) with the help of Prince Maurits, but (as Muller wrote to Lippe in November 1602) Goltzius and Van Mander had advised against the sale (see Van Mander, *Lives*, 1604 [1994–99 ed.], vol. 2, p. 83, and vol. 3, pp. 16, 20). In June 1603, the count bought Goltzius's painting on copper *Christ on the Cold Stone with Two Angels* (1602; Museum of Art, Rhode Island School of Design, Providence) from the master's stepson and collaborator, Jacob Matham (Van Mander, *Lives*, 1604 [1994–99 ed.], vol. 1, p. 402 [fol. 286r], and vol. 5, p. 218; Leeflang and Luijten, *Hendrick Goltzius*, no. 102). It was through Lippe that the emperor acquired a *Slaying of the Niobids* "made recently by Bloemaert," according to Van Mander in 1604. Rudolf II and Lippe each owned a *Banquet of the Gods* by the same artist (see Van Mander, *Lives*, 1604 [1994–99 ed.], vol. 1, p. 449 [fol. 297v], and vol. 6, pp. 95–96, and Roethlisberger 1993, nos. 12, 14, 15).
 49. Fusenig 2002, pp. 120, 132. On Wyntgis as collector, see Van Mander, *Lives*, 1604 (1994–99 ed.), vol. 1, p. 446 (owns a *Mars and Venus* by Wtewael) and the many pages cited in the indices of vol. 1, p. 499 (under Melchior Wyntjens), and vol. 6, p. 236 (under Wyntgis); Van Thiel, *Cornelis Cornelisz van Haarlem*, pp. 297–98; and Walter Liedtke, with Michiel C. Plomp and Axel Rüger, *Vermeer and the Delft School*, exh. cat., The Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York, and The National Gallery, London (New York, 2001), pp. 39, 571 nn. 90–93.
 50. See Van Mander, *Lives*, 1604 (1994–99 ed.), vol. 4, pp. 38 (Wyntgis) and 192 (Nicquet), and note 1 above. On the Middelburg collector and Lippe's contact there, see also Fusenig 2002, p. 120.
 51. For the details in this paragraph, see Fusenig 2002, pp. 112–15.