Aus den zahlreichen Einzelbeispielen, auf die hier nicht eingegangen werden kann, knüpft die Arbeit suggestiv überzeugende Bezugsketten, denen man im Detail allerdings nicht immer folgen muss. Das ändert jedoch nur wenig an der Qualität des vorgelegten Wurfs, dem man viele Leser wünscht. Es ist in einer Zeit, in der postmodern Deutungsmuster beliebig austauschbar erscheinen und sich das Fach im Bereich des Mittelalters wie eine Schere zwischen einer medial geprägten Bildlichkeitsdiskussion und einer Realienkunde auseinander zu entwickeln scheint, eine bemerkenswerte Bildungsleistung. Zudem ist diese Dissertation eine große Hommage an Günther Bandmann, die zeigt, wie stark die Impulse der kunsthistorischen Diskussion der Nachkriegszeit heute noch von Relevanz sein können.

Klaus Gereon Beuckers
Universität Kiel

Agnese Fantozzi (ed.): Roma 1536. Le Observationes di Johann Fichard; Libreria dello Stato, Istituto poligrafico e Zecca dello Stato; Roma 2011; 353 pp., 41 illustrations; ISBN 978-88-240-1059-7

In 1536 Johann Fichard, a 24 years old lawyer from Frankfurt, left for Italy. He described his sixteen-month excursion in a report called „Italia". This text is one of the first accounts of an educational journey, decades before the Grand Tour became an essential part of a good upbringing. Fichard's manuscript was not printed until 1815, by a later relative, Johann Carl von Fichard, alias Baur von Eyseneck.[1] Although this book is still available in a few libraries, it is not easily accessible. As the original manuscript was already reported lost in 1889, it is impossible to judge the accuracy of the 1815 transcription. In 1891 August Schmarsow published some excerpts, but a publication of the complete text, which comprises inter alia Rome, Naples and Bologna, is still awaited by scholars.[2] In 2011, however, Agnese Fantozzi produced the edition of sixty pages of Fichard's text, in which he describes Rome. This edition consists of an introduction of fifty-seven pages by Daniela Pagliai, the original Latin text with an Italian translation by Emanuele Liuti, seventy-four pages of annotations by Agnese Fantozzi, and a useful index on topics described by Fichard or discussed in the text and annotations. The book is nicely edited and illustrated with contemporary pictures.

Fichard's text is photocopied after the 1815 edition. The accurate translation that closely follows Fichard's text is published on pages opposite the original Latin. The translator has made occasional annotations when she noticed textual problems and added references to classical writers. The Latin text is preceded by an analytical introduction by Pagliai, who presents a description of the text and several topics related to

1 Johannes Fichard: Italia. In: *Frankfurtisches Archiv für ältere deutsche Litteratur und Geschichte*, hg. v. J. C. von Fichard, genannt Baur von Eyseneck, dritter Theil, Frankfurt Main 1815, p. 3–130.
2 August Schmarsow: Excerpte aus Joh. Fichard's *Italia* von 1536. In: *Repertorium für Kunstwissenschaft* 14/2, p. 130–139, and 14/5, p. 373–383.

it. She discusses the status of the text and Fichard's humanistic education in Freiburg and Basel. She also puts Fichard's motivation for the journey in a historical perspective, by describing other German humanists who travelled to Italy in the quattrocento, such as Konrad Peutinger and Konrad Celtis. Pagliai assumes that Fichard's travel plans were stimulated by Peutinger's collection of antiquities and his friendship with Andrea Alciati. Pagliai further discusses the writers on ancient Rome whom Fichard enumerates on page 14, especially Bartholomaeus Marlianus's *Antiquae Romae Topographia*. She analyzes Fichard's description of Rome and compares it with contemporary images, supplying some general background information on Rome at that time, as for instance the triumphal entry of Charles V in 1536. One chapter is dedicated to Fichard's personal interests. Pagliai observes a deep fascination for antique sculpture and an interest in music, but also an indifference to quattrocento painting. She concludes with a discussion of the last pages of this text, called „obiter observata Romae" (things incidentally seen in Rome), in which she observes a personal and anecdotic tone, with a critical attitude towards the court of Paul III, that does not match the atmosphere of the previous text. Pagliai therefore supposes that, if Fichard really is the author of these pages, he has used information from a different source.

A large part of the book consists of an elaborate commentary on Fichard's text by Agnese Fantozzi, who focuses on art historical subjects and scrupulously annotates every topic described by Fichard: churches, palaces, arches, sculptures, routes and roads. If possible, she supplies the relevant reference to Marlianus's description of Rome. The information varies from a description of the monument under discussion anno 1536 to a concise history of the site, accompanied by references to recent research and –if available- images produced at Fichard's time. She draws on several contemporary sources, varying from Roman guidebooks that already existed and that Fichard might have used, to the diary of Marcello Alberini (1521–1536) about the route of Charles V on his triumphal entry in Rome, and to the map of L. Bufalini (1551) when the name of a partly subterranean river is concerned, to a letter dated 6 March, 1536, on the carnivalesque festivities on Monte Testaccio. (notes 132, 158, 166)

Though the book is the result of extensive research and thus offers a lot of information, some critical remarks are to be made. The subtitles of the introduction that derive from the Latin text, are – even for Latinists – not always instructive. In spite of many interesting topics with extensive footnotes, Pagliai's descriptive introduction gives a rather superficial analysis, and readers looking for a conclusion will be disappointed. Pagliai is convinced that Fichard wrote his text as a personal memento and that it was not meant for publication.(3,4) To prove this she refers to the feather-drawings in the original manuscript. Interesting but not taken into account by Paglai, are the various German words and parentheses in the Latin text, which give the impression of 'spontaneous' remarks or helpful translations of uncommon Latin words, rather meant for personal than public use. There was indeed a tradition of writing travel reports that were intended only for relatives and friends and not for publication. Accordingly, the initial epigram states that the report was written „only for me" and has not been re-read.[3] Of course, this might be interpreted rhetorically because

the epigram does address future readers. Yet I think that more research has to be done to clarify the purpose and influence of the text. In his *praefatio*, for instance, Fichard states, in a traditionally long Latin period, that he wants to write down the present state of Rome for his own memories, in the same way as others before him have described the topography of ancient Rome.(68) The way in which the purpose of his report is described and the fact that he compares it with other descriptions may be an indication of his ambitions. Also the fact that – according to Ludwig Schudt – the *Itinerarium totius Italiae* (1602) coincides with Fichard's initial list of highlights of Italy might prove that it has been used by others.[4] Unfortunately, Pagliai has ignored Schudt's *Italienreise*, which is still the most authoritative publication on the history of travels to Italy. Schudt's biographical information on Fichard is more extensive than Pagliai's and should have been taken into account.[5] Fichard's study in Freiburg, for instance, and his work in the army are not mentioned. Schudt emphasizes that Fichard was the first to describe not only which cities he visited but also which monuments were considered worth visiting. Thus, according to Schudt, Fichard set a standard for future travelers.[6] In other words, Schudt underscores the importance of Fichard in a way that Fantozzi and Pagliai should certainly have taken notice of.

Another topic of Pagliai's analysis deals with the sources Fichard used. She calls the list of 'writers on the ancient city' whom Fichard enumerates on page 66, a *tabula gratulatoria* and „a bibliography". (15) Fichard names Pomponius Laetus, Franciscus Albertinus, Antonius N., Andreas Fulvius, Fabius Calvus Ravennas, Flavius Blondus and Marlianus. According to Fichard, the latter has written „a very recent and diligent" *Topographia antiquae Romae*. Fichard refers to Marlianus quite often, mentioning even the exact folium on which the information is to be found. Thus it can be established with certainty – as Pagliai and Fantozzi rightly point out – that Fichard has used the 1534 edition. In Fantozzi's notes, the references to the 1534 edition of Marlianus can be easily found. Yet I do not agree that Fichard also used the other writers and that therefore we can consider the list as a bibliography. For instance, when Fichard considers the position of the Circus Flaminius, he states that Biondo positions it on the Campo Agonale, while Pomponius Laetus, Fulvius and Marlianus think *apud apothecas obscuras*, where the church of S. Catharina is.[7] Does this mean that Fichard

3 Fichard calls his epigram nugae as the ancient poets like Martialis and Catullus called their poems. The translation is: Anyone else who will read these travels of mine (frivolities) / that are notated by me with a swift hand. / Forgive me because (the Gods know) I didn't re-read them. (It's more than enough that time had been wasted once by this), / but while I want to remember different places / this was anyway written only for me.

4 Ludwig Schudt: Italienreisen im 17. und 18. Jahrhundert; Wien, München 1959, p. 44. – Fichard, op.cit., p. 9–14.

5 Schudt, op.cit., p. 44.

6 Schudt, op.cit., p. 263–268.

7 The position of the Circus Flaminius has been under discussion until recently. We now know that it occupied the area between the Theater of Marcellus, Piazza Cairoli, Via del Portico di Ottavia and the Tiber (Filippo Coarelli: Rome and environs: An Archeological Guide; Berkeley, Los Angeles, London 2007, p.267). This information cannot be found in the notes. Fantozzi only gives a reference to Marlianus and repeats what can be read in Fichard.

has consulted all the sources he cites? I do not think so. Marlianus cites the three scholars as well, and Fichard has simply copied his references, including even literally his allusion to modern day-life: *funes torquentur* ([where] the ropes are twisted).[8] More examples of Fichard's dependence on Marlianus could easily be given. In her notes, however, Fantozzi repeats Fichard's references to the texts of Marlianus, Blondus, Pomponius Laetus and Fulvius, thus creating the wrong impression that Fichard really consulted them all. Fichard's list of books on page 66 is therefore to be considered as a suggestion for further reading or an homage to the authors of travel guides.

The publisher has chosen to provide photocopies of the text as it was printed in 1815. Ink spots now and then deprive the reader of parts of individual words. As these ink stains are identical (but regrettably less transparent) to those in the e-book with a stamp of the university of Michigan libraries, I suspect that the Michigan book has been utilized for the Fantozzi edition, even though this is, quite curiously, not acknowledged.[9] The text starts with a page without a number, because only the lower part of the page is printed. The second page is number 15 of the original text. The authors have limited themselves to the pages that describe Rome. As a result, the epigram on the front page – though printed in a note – lacks a translation. In a very short analysis of the Latin, Liuti observes that Fichard had a preference for the parenthetical construction. He frequently uses repetitive terms and superlatives to show his admiration. As Esther Sophia Sünderhauf has already observed in a comprehensive, earlier article, Fichard often used adjectives to express his esthetic impressions.[10] Characteristic is his description of a bathroom in Palazzo della Valle: „a small bathroom very richly adorned with very elegant and very playful paintings of naked girls who are washing etc." (176). There is much more to say about the Latin, but the authors have chosen to focus on the content.

As to the translation, only some minor remarks are to be made. The translation of the fifth *tabula* in the Della Valle hanging garden (*Sibi et Genio Posterisque Hilaritati*) should in my opinion be interpreted as *to the joy for oneself, the genius and the posterity*.[11] Sometimes a punctuation mark that was obviously wrong, has been interpreted differently. For instance, the publisher in 1815 has erroneously placed the semicolon af-

8 Fichard, op.cit., 55. – Marlianus: Antiquae Romae Topographia, 1534, p. 127r.

9 http://books.google.nl/ebooks/reader?id=hTMSAAAAMAAJ&hl=nl&printsec=frontcover&output=reader. The e-books with stamps of the Bayerische Staatsbibliothek and Harvard College Libraries have different ink stains. The university library of Heidelberg provides a spotless digital version of the entire text (http://diglit.ub.uni-heidelberg.de/diglit/fichard1815/0001).

10 Esther Sophia Sünderhauf: Von der Wahrnehmung zur Beschreibung. Johann Fichards Italia (1536/1537). In: Hartmut Böhme et al. (ed.): Übersetzung und Transformation; Berlin 2007, p. 439.

11 Fichard, op.cit., 69. – Liuti reads the version of the text as cited by M. van Waelscapple (Berlin, Staatsbibliothek Preuss. Kulturbesitz, *Mss. Lat., folio* 61 s.: *Sylloge epigraphica*, f. 63): *Sibi et Genio Posterorumque Hilaritati*. – Christian Hülsen, Hermann Egger (Die römischen Skizzenbücher von Marten van Heemskerck im Königlichen Kupferstichkabinett zu Berlin; Reprint, Soest 1975, II, 61) and Kathleen Wren Christian (Empire without an end: Antiquities Collections in Renaissance Rome, c. 1350–1527; New Haven, London 2010, p. 247) read the inscription in the same way as Liuti. Christoph Luitpold Frommel (Der römische Palastbau der Hochrenaissance; Tübingen 1973, II, p. 353) translates it as in Fichard's reading.

ter *redeundo ad principium templi*, probably interpreting the gerund *redeundo* as a finite form (126). Liuti has restored the original meaning of the text in her translation, but a note with an explanation might have been useful. Apart from these details, the text and translation will prove to be valuable for further research.

The introduction and notes are illustrated with contemporary images of monuments that Fichard describes. The fact that Maarten van Heemskerck, Francisco de Hollanda and Herman Posthumus were all in Rome at the same time, offers a unique opportunity to compare text and images. The authors, however, only give a short analysis in the introduction. Pagliai observes that the Rome of Fichard – unlike the Rome of van Heemskerck – is crowded with people and much more lively with shops and culture.(32) In a 2007 article, Sünderhauf has the impression that Heemskerck's *Römische Skizzenbücher* almost functions as an illustration of Fichard's observations and vice versa.[12] The intriguing painting of Herman Posthumus, *Landscape with Roman Ruins [Tempus edax rerum]*, 1536, is reproduced on the cover of the book and again in full-color on two pages. Readers wondering why this painting is so prominently present, will only find scant information in a note. Perhaps the authors just wanted to give an idea of the fascination for the antique anno 1536. The same is true for the other illustrations. Thus the authors leave it to others to study the relation between text and image.

Some 400 notes clarify the text. The references to Marlianus are very useful for those who have the 1534 edition at hand, and they are so frequent that it is obvious that Fichard had access to the book when he wrote his report; perhaps he even used it when he prepared his visit or during his journey. In fact, he often uses the same vocabulary and grammatical constructions as Marlianus does. Fantozzi provides abundant references to modern research, mainly of Italian scholars, but sometimes overlooks an important publication, as for instance Francis Haskell and Nicolas Penny's *Taste and the antique*. Fantozzi's note on what was possibly the first mention of the Belvedere torso could have been more explicit. According to Haskell and Penny, the great fame of the Torso Belvedere was a result of the admiration Michelangelo expressed for it.[13] This perhaps explains Fichard's remark, that one of the trunks lying in the Belvedere is especially praised by artists.(138)[14]

Fichard makes very interesting remarks on the monument of Innocent VIII in St Peter's (126). Fantozzi confines herself to noting that the monument was made by Antonio del Pollaiuolo but was soon moved to a different spot in St Peter's. A drawing by Maarten van Heemskerck shows how it stood on this new place. However, there is much more to say about Fichard's sensitive observations than Fanntozzi does.

12 Sünderhauf, op.cit., 430.

13 Francis Haskell, Nocholas Penny: Taste and the Antique. The Lure of Classical Sculpture, 1500–1900; New Haven 1981, p. 312.

14 Unfortunately, Haskell and Penny have totally overlooked Fichard as a source. When they declared that the misspelling of *Fidiae* on an inscription on the Dioscuri of the Quirinal was corrected into *Phidiae* during their restoration between 1589 and 1591, they were obviously not aware that in 1536 Fichard already reads *Phidiae*. They also missed Fichard's description of the group of *pedestrian statues in military clothing as on coins* on the corners of the basis. (p. 120; Fichard, op.cit., p. 41)

He tells us that „he (i. e. Innocent VIII) himself – though dead – is sitting. For it is the complete image of himself, his right hand raised, as though he is letting loose a thunderbolt, sitting on a throne, made of bronze". Fichard is intrigued by the fact that the dead pope is in a upright position, and fails to note that there is also a second, more conventional effigy of the dead pope lying on a bier, originally situated above the sitting statue. Did he not see the second effigy or was he so intrigued by the innovation of the first that he didn't feel the need of noting the second? Alison Wright writes that this is „the first portrait of the pope in majesty ever to be incorporated into a tomb", and emphasizes that Fichard gives the seated pope a Jovian aspect. „Whether or not this aspect was deliberately inscribed, or incidental on the use of a Jovian antique model for the seated figure […], Fichard apparently recognized an almost Michelangelesque terribilità in the figure".[15] I doubt that Fichard ever saw a Jupiter throwing his thunderbolt sitting on a throne. The open hand, moreover, is more apt to blessing believers than throwing a flash of lightning. But Fichard recognizes the anomaly of the image and tries to enliven the picture by association. He rightfully states that it is an image of the pope himself: *integra ipsius imago*. As Hannes Roser points out, the face of the sitting pope has, in comparison with that of the lying pope , the features of a portrait of an older man, who has not been idealized.[16] Fichard, furthermore, twice states that the monument is entirely made of bronze. All the other monuments he saw (the original tombs of Pius II and Pius III that were later removed, of Leo X and Clement VII, and of Nicolas V) were all made of marble. The only other bronze tomb in St. Peter's was that of Sixtus IV, which Fichard doesn't mention. Fichard turns out to be a scrupulous visitor, making his own observations. Regrettably, Fantozzi not only passes over this aspect, but she also does not consult recent studies on the subject.

A difficult question is that about Fantozzi's target public. For instance, her remark on the earlier depiction of the ceiling of the Sistine chapel may not be of interest to laymen, while her observation that Fichard is wrong in ascribing the decoration of the vault to Raphael will not come as a complete surprise to art historians. Yet the book provides ample information for both categories. Readers puzzled where the sarcophagi of the Santa Costanza are to be found, will not be disappointed, nor do scholars have to wonder if Fichard is the first to identify the Mausoleum of Costantina with the temple of Bacchus. However, as laymen can hardly be expected to read the commentary, it would have been better to target scholars, and substitute analyses for too obvious observations. For instance, when Fichard describes Castel Sant'Angelo even though 'it was guarded by some soldiers and was always closed, so that no one could enter without the captain's permission' (138), Fantozzi gives an overview of the Castel's history, but does not refer to Sünderhauf's conclusion that humanistic voyagers had their own international network and that Fichard had contacts in Rome who

15 Alison Wright: The Pollaiuolo Brothers. The Arts of Florence and Rome; New Haven 2005, p. 389 and 408.

16 Hannes Roser: „In innocentia mea ingressvs svm …". Das Grabmal Innozenz VIII. in St. Peter. In: Karsten Arne, Philipp Zitzlsperger (eds.): Tod und Verklärung. Grabmalskultur in der Frühen Neuzeit; Keulen 2004, p. 222.

granted him permission to enter even private places.[17] Fichard is one of the first to render the inscription that Paul III mounted on the Castel's wall. Fantozzi supposes that the inscription was located there at the occasion of Charles V's thriumphal entry in Rome in 1536, but the boastful text probably did not find its place on the castle until the emperor had turned his back.[18]

One of the last monuments in Rome that Fichard describes, is the Domus Cardinalis de la Valle, which is now known as the Palazzo Della Valle-de' Rustici. Deeply impressed by it, he calls it „the treasury of Rome's antiquities" (174). Elsewhere he writes that 'there has been a great deal collected, but nowhere as much as in the domus de la Valle'.(178) Behind the house of Della Valle was a garden with a cortile decorated with statues, a porticus and a hanging garden. Fichard describes the oblong form of the garden, the porticoes on the long sides and niches with the sculptures. Above the niches were eight *tabulae* with inscriptions, which he meticulously copied. Fantozzi provides important information on the hanging garden: a print issued by Hieronymus Cock in 1550, based on a drawing by Maarten van Heemskerck that was recently discovered by Arnold Nesselrath.[19] Very interesting is the drawing by Francisco de Hollanda, showing the inscriptions on the east wall on it. These inscriptions were also copied by Fichard, but not quite correctly, as Kathleen Wren Christian has proved in a short and stimulating article that Fantozzi has overlooked.[20] Christian observes that de Hollanda represented the inscriptions more or less faithfully and proves that he is the only one who reads the third inscription correctly. However, Hollanda rendered the fourth inscription of the east side *maiorum memoriae nepotumque emitationem* (*sic*), while Fichard noted it as the fourth of the west side.[21] In note 19, Christian justly observes that the inscriptions on the west side in the version of Fichard were written in the dative case and all those on the east in an accusative construction, which is good circumstantial evidence that here Fichard's reading is the right one. Fantozzi describes the history of the palazzo and the drawings comprehensively in note 360. She also refers to the Hollanda drawing, stating that it is a speculative iconographic recording of the inscriptions as reported by Fichard. In fact, Christian has shown that de Hollanda was at least in one respect more precise and less speculative than Fichard. The comparison of text and image proves to be fruitful.

17 Esther Sophia Sünderhauf: Wissenstransfer zwischen Deutschland und Italien am Beispiel des Frankfurter Italienreisenden Johann Fichard (1536/37). In: Kathrin Schade et al. (eds.): Zentren und Wirkungsräume der Antikerezeption; Münster 2007, p. 99–109.

18 See Jan L. de Jong: [Rez.] Uta Barbara Ullrich: Der Kaiser im *giardino dell'Impero*. Zur Rezeption Karls V. in italienischen Bildprogrammen des 16. Jahrhunderts. In: *Journal für Kunstgeschichte* 12 (2008), p. 125.

19 Arnold Nesselrath: Drei Zeichnungen von Marten van Heemskerck. In: Ars naturam adiuvans. Festschrift für Matthias Winner. Hg. von V. v. Flemming, S. Schütze; Mainz 1996, p. 252–271. – Even though Fantozzi (n. 360) refers to Nesselrath's publication, the caption beneath figure 18 reads Hiëronymus Cock (da Maarten van Heemskerck?), while Pagliai on page 50 writes that the inventor of Cock's engraving is „probably" Heemskerck, without referring to Nesselrath.

20 Kathleen Wren Christian: The Della Valle Sculpture Court Rediscovered. In: *The Burlington Magazine* 145, no. 1209 (2003), p. 847–850.

21 Fichard, *op.cit*., 69: *Maiorum Memoriae Nepotumque Imitationi*. The last word is spelled correctly by Fichard.

To conclude, this book provides plenty and useful information, but lacks a thorough analysis, resulting from the choice to give an interpretative overview in the introduction and confine the annotations to facts without further investigation. Yet the book as a whole should be welcomed as a valuable enchiridion, especially because a part of Fichard's interesting text has finally been opened up for further research. The translation is definitely very helpful for those interested but not trained in Latin. Because Fichard was a receptive and critical observer who had access to places that others could not enter, he is a very precious source. I can only hope that the rest of the text about Naples, Pozzuoli, Florence and other places, will soon also be published.

Marieke J. Nugteren
University of Groningen

Christine Vogt (Hg.): Vanitas Vanitatum! Das Tödlein aus der Sammlung Ludwig: Todesdarstellungen in der frühen Neuzeit. Katalog zur gleichnamigen Ausstellung in der Ludwiggalerie, Schloss Oberhausen; Bielefeld: Kerber Verlag 2012; 144 S., zahlreiche Abb.; ISBN 978-3-86678-653-0; € 30,00

Der durch die Leiterin der Ludwiggalerie Schloss Oberhausen herausgegebene Band zur gleichnamigen Ausstellung, welche ebenso wie der Katalog in Zusammenarbeit mit der Graphiksammlung *Mensch und Tod* der Heinrich-Heine-Universität Düsseldorf entstand, widmet sich der Darstellungstradition von Tod und Vergänglichkeit in der bildenden Kunst der frühen Neuzeit.

Das Hauptobjekt der Ausstellung – die Memento Mori-Tumba aus der Sammlung Ludwig (um 1520) – wird im Kontext weiterer Exponate analysiert und durch detailliertes Bildmaterial ausführlich dokumentiert. Eine kulturhistorische Einordnung in die Vergänglichkeitsthematik, die für das Verständnis der Tumba von essentieller Bedeutung ist, erfolgt unter anderem durch einen Aufsatz zum sogenannten Zizenhausener Totentanz (um 1822/23) und einen Beitrag zur Vanitasdichtung von Andreas Gryphius. Beide Beiträge dienen exemplarisch zur Einordnung der Ikonographie der Tumba in eine über Jahrhunderte unverändert populäre Darstellungstradition aus dem Themenkreis Tod und Vergänglichkeit. Diese Darstellungstradition wird abschließend eindrucksvoll durch den eigentlichen Ausstellungskatalog veranschaulicht, welcher anhand zahlreicher Graphiken aus der Sammlung *Mensch und Tod* die enorme Bandbreite der frühneuzeitlichen Todesdarstellung illustriert und aufarbeitet.

Der Aufsatz über das Hauptexponat – „Die Memento Mori-Tumba aus der Sammlung Ludwig: Todesgedenken in der Frühen Neuzeit" von Jennifer Liß – fungiert gleichermaßen als Einleitung in die Thematik der Vanitasdarstellung und als Anknüpfungspunkt für viele der innerhalb des Katalogs aufgegriffenen Fragestellungen. Erstmalig wird hier das künstlerisch herausragende Kabinettstückchen aus dem