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Foreword

As the proud custodian of a rich corpus of over eight million documents, KBR is Belgium’s largest repository. Our historical collections embody countless unique sources of information, including an extensive collection of Bruegel's graphic work. We could not let ‘Bruegel Year’ go by unmarked.

KBR’s graphic collection runs to no fewer than a million objects, all told. It is kept in the Print Room, making this the home to Belgium’s largest collection of engravings, etchings, woodcuts, drawings, photographs and posters.

The Low Countries played a leading role in the development of the graphic arts, and so it is not surprising that the Flemish and Dutch Schools are especially well represented in our collection. The Print Room has also been systematically collecting the work of Belgian artists since its inception. Masterpieces in the collection include drawings and prints by and after masters such as Pieter Bruegel the Elder, Peter Paul Rubens, Jacob Jordaens, James Ensor and Léon Spilliaert. The Print Room also holds smaller ensembles of prints and drawings from the French, German, Italian, British and Spanish Schools. Non-western schools are represented by an important body of Japanese prints and an exceptional collection of Congolese drawings from the first half of the twentieth century.

The KBR Print Room has a special connection with Bruegel’s work: it boasts a complete collection of prints after his designs and has also played a long-standing and pioneering role in the field of Bruegel research. Various curators and scholars have devoted themselves to the study of the artist’s life and work. We continue to pursue new insights into Bruegel and his art on paper through the FINGERPRINT project – an interdisciplinary research initiative that combines historical and technical research, digital imaging, image processing and conservation and restoration techniques to discover more about how Bruegel’s prints were created. Through this analysis, we hope to find answers to the questions and challenges that the prints and drawings in the corpus continue to raise in terms of their history, technique and conservation. The BELSPO-funded project is a collaboration between KBR and the University of Leuven.

You can discover the preliminary results of this research, together with the Bruegel print collection, in the exhibition The World of Bruegel in Black and White. Pieter Bruegel the Elder’s complete graphic oeuvre is on display in the magnificent rooms of the eighteenth-century palace of Charles of Lorraine, part of KBR. We also introduce you to the medium of print, the first visual mass medium. Prints allowed artists’ work – and hence their names and fame – to be disseminated among an international and socially diverse public. The sixteenth-century Low Countries were a centre for the production of and trade in prints, with Bruegel and his publisher Hieronymus Cock playing a key role. Their brilliant artisanship and business acumen are at the centre of the exhibition. We also explore the creative process, from drawing to print. The focus is on the originality of Bruegel’s graphic work, which is a fully fledged part of his oeuvre alongside his paintings. The prints are less well known, but no less fascinating.

With the support of the Baillet Latour Fund, all the prints have been treated and remounted by our conservators, to allow them to be displayed under the best possible circumstances and hence preserved in optimum condition for posterity.

The exhibition also inaugurates a new era for KBR. The world is changing and so is the Royal Library of Belgium, the evolution of which is based on three pillars: the collections, the location and the public. If there is a single word connecting all of these, it is ‘accessibility’. KBR’s mission is to preserve the traces of the past, but we are also eager to give you greater access than ever to that past and to the exceptional patrimony in our safekeeping. We are also hard at work opening up our collections digitally to the maximum extent possible, while simultaneously redesigning the museum space. The Bruegel exhibition will be followed by the inauguration of an entirely new museum devoted to the medieval manuscripts from the Librije of the dukes of Burgundy, which symbolize the origins of KBR.

I would like to take this opportunity to sincerely thank the Belgian Buildings Authority, Tourism Flanders and the National Lottery, who have funded the infrastructure works and the restoration of the exhibits, making it possible to stage this magnificent Bruegel exhibition.

I also want to express my sincere gratitude and respect to the staff of KBR for their immense hard work. I am exceptionally proud of the results we are able to present.

You can read more in this reference work about the relationship between Bruegel and KBR, the latest research and the production, publication and use of Bruegel’s graphic work, while also lingering over every detail of the Bruegel prints in detail.

I hope this book brings you immense reading and viewing pleasure.

SARA LAMMENS
Acting Director
KBR
Pieter Bruegel (1526/27–1569), draughtsman and painter in Antwerp

An attempt at reconstructing his network

By the time 'Peeter Brueghels' registered as a young, independent painter in the guild year of 1551/52 with the Antwerp Guild of St Luke, the city along the Scheldt had already grown into a thriving centre of culture and business with near endless possibilities. Starting in the last decades of the fifteenth century, and especially during the first half of the sixteenth century, the city had developed at breakneck speed into one of Europe's main financial hubs. This was due to the city's exceptional commercial prosperity and its favourable geopolitical circumstances. The port city exerted an irresistible attraction on merchants, artists, biscuit bakers and charlatans alike, whom it seemed to lure with the promise of profit.

The real name of the talented young man remains unknown, but for his registration at the guild he called himself 'Peeter Brueghels', after the village of his birth. Right at the start of the famous first biography of Pieter Bruegel of 1604, the consistently well-informed author Karel van Mander remarked: 'Pieter Brueghel, den welcken is geboren niet wijt van Breda, op een Dorp gheheeten Brueghel, welcks naem hy met hem ghedraghen heeft, en zijn naacomelinghen ghelaten.' ('Pieter Brueghel, who was born not far from Breda in a village called Brueghel, the name which he took himself and left to his successors.') In other words, Pieter Bruegel took the name of his village of birth and passed it on to his descendants. It was still common practice in the sixteenth century to change one's name in this way, but few sentences have caused as much art-historical commotion as this cursory remark from the early seventeenth century. Over the course of the past hundred years, Pieter Bruegel's exact place of birth has been the subject of heated debate. Was it Breugel (the present-day Son en Breugel) in the Dutch province of North Brabant, or was it Grote-Brogel or Kleine-Brogel, near Peer, or was it Bree, near Maaseik, in the Belgian province of Limburg? The discussions have become part of Flemish and Dutch folklore.

The records regarding Pieter Bruegel, who was born around 1526/27, give the impression that he suddenly turned up in Antwerp. No father, mother, brothers or sisters of his are known, and although the surnames 'Bruegel' and 'van Bruegel' are mentioned many times before 1551 in the Antwerp archives, and by extension those of Brabant, before that year there is not one Pieter Bruegel to be found, including in the citizens' register (poortersboeken). Considering that van Mander indicates that the artist was an apprentice to the painter and tapestry designer Pieter Coecke van Aelst, Pieter Bruegel was probably living in the city along the Scheldt in around 1545/46 or even earlier.

In 1567 the Florentine merchant and author Lodovico Guicciardini included the painter in his description of the Low Countries, in a summary of artists who were still alive in that year. 'Hor parliamo de viui,' he wrote, 'Pietro Breughel di Breda.' Guicciardini is the only author who is not only likely to have known Bruegel personally, but also mentioned him by name in a publication.

[fig. 1] Virgilius Bononiensis, Map of Antwerp, viewed from the east, 1565. Woodcut, 1415 x 2750 x 70 mm. Printed by Gillis Coppens van Diest. Antwerp, Museum Plantin-Moretus, inv. no. MPM.V.I.01.002.
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during his lifetime. The ‘van Breda’ family is well documented in Antwerp between 1542 and 1551. ‘Pieter van Breda’ even appears several times in the Antwerp records, but he ‘disappears’ completely after 1551. In my opinion, there are sufficient arguments for elaborating the hypothesis that Pieter van Breda was in fact the young Pieter Bruegel the Elder.

By 3 January 1550 (n.s.) the father of Pieter van Breda, Adriaen Janss. van Breda, had already been dead for some time. A painter, oudkleerkoper (trader in used clothes) and vettewarier (merchant of fatty wares), Adriaen was apparently a jack of all trades. Pieter’s mother, Petronella Rubbens – who, so far as I can verify, was not related to Peter Paul Rubens – had at that point already remarried Hendrik van Roye, a cloth dresser (lakenbereider). Measures were taken to arrange paternal inheritance for the still underage brothers Pieter and Dierick and their married sister Gertrude. The parental home in Sint-Jansstraat (present-day Aalmoezenierstraat) in Antwerp’s Sint-Andries quarter, was sold. Adriaen Janss. van Breda and his wife Petronella Rubbens had bought the building on 1 July 1541 and it is known with certainty that they were still living there in 1542, as shown by that year’s ‘hearth-count’ of the eighth quarter. The house, as transpires from that document (an early form of census), lay in the middle of a densely populated area that was inhabited by all manner of artists and craftsmen (fig. 1). In this lively, and no doubt stimulating environment, countless breadwinners earned their living as painters, goldsmiths, printers, bookbinders, satin weavers or potters. Father Adriaen was at that time a painter (‘Adriaene van Breda schildere’). He did not become a burgher of the city of Antwerp until 30 April 1544 and at that point he was an oudkleerkoper.

There is reliable evidence to support the fact that Pieter Bruegel was born around 1526/27 in Breugel, the present municipality of Son en Breugel in North Brabant, which lies on the northern edges of the De Kempen region (Campine; fig. 3). The family went to live in Breda – more specifically in the hamlet of Molengracht. The latter is supported by a document from 1551. The claim that his village of birth was situated in Belgian Limburg is therefore redundant. It is probable that Pieter moved from Breda to Antwerp around the year 1542, at the age of about sixteen, together with his father Adriaen, his mother Petronella, his sister Gertrude and his brother Dierick, who would later become a cloth-maker. He grew up in the eighth quarter and automatically became a poorter (burgher) of the city, his father having qualified for citizenship in 1544. Around 1545/46 Pieter began an apprenticeship with the painter, draughtsman and designer of tapestry cartoons Pieter Coecke van Aelst, who was active in Antwerp at the time. In early 1550 he must have been just under the age of majority, as two guardians arranged his father’s inheritance for him. However, he evidently came of age (twenty-five years old) in 1551/52, because that is when he became an independent master in the Guild of St Luke. He usually signed his work ‘Brueg(h)el’ (without his first name ‘Pieter’), after the village of his birth, of which he undoubtedly had fond memories. Whether he did this in emulation of Jeroen van Aken, who took on the alias ‘Jheronimus Bosch’, remains a matter of speculation. Of this Pieter van Breda I have been unable to find any trace in the archives of 1551, although

1. Sint-Jansstraat = Aalmoezenierstraat
2. Zirkstraat 19: De Wolf
there were at least two homonyms: a shipmaster who is mentioned multiple times, and a priest and chaplain of Antwerp’s Cathedral of Our Lady, both of whom do not come into consideration, however, because of their ages.\(^{16}\)

Given that the persona of Pieter Bruegel himself remains largely ungraspable, we shall have to rely on examining his Antwerp environment in greater detail: the complex and dynamic network that formed a fragmented mould, as it were, around the enigma of the person that was Bruegel. I shall not explore the presumed but as yet not entirely clarified Mechelen connection, with the Antwerp personage of Peeter Baltens in the leading role. I shall pay even less attention to the artist’s master Pieter Coecke van Aelst and his patrons and possible friends Jean Noirot, Abraham Ortelius, Jan Vleminck, Lambert Lombard, Cornelis van Dalem, Gaspar Schetz, Daniel de Bruyne and Nicolaes and Jacob Jonghelinck. For shorter or longer periods of time they all belonged to the close circle of Bruegel’s orbit. I shall chiefly focus instead on Bruegel’s earliest known patron. Starting in the mid-sixteenth century, Hieronymus Cock and his wife Volcxken Diericx ran the print publishing business *Aux Quatre Vents* (At the Sign of the Four Winds), which developed over the course of the following decades into one of the most important print publishers in Europe.\(^{17}\) I shall subsequently elaborate on the person who – according to van Mander’s description – was ‘Bruegel’s best friend’, the eternal bachelor Hans Franckaert, born in 1520, a lover of culture and a wealthy merchant in metals and jewellery. Many documents shed light on this fascinating figure. From 1554 onwards, the ambitious print publishers Hieronymus Cock (1518–1570) and his wife Volcxken Diericx (c. 1520–1600) published work by the promising young artist Pieter Bruegel, collaborating with him on a regular basis.\(^{18}\) Over a period of ten years, Bruegel supplied them with designs that would be engraved and etched onto copper plates by, primarily, Pieter van der Heyden, Frans Huys, Philips Galle and the brothers Joannes and Lucas van Doetecum.\(^{19}\) The precise working relationship between Bruegel and his publishers remains unclear. Whether he was employed by them as a member of staff, worked on commission or supplied drawings on his own initiative from time to time is not known. In his 1604 *Schilderboek*, van Mander signalled in passing that Bruegel was already working for the publishers before 1552, immediately after his apprenticeship to Coecke.\(^{20}\) That is to say, this was even before Bruegel undertook his study trip to France and Italy (‘Hy is van hier [bij Pieter Coecke van Aelst] gaen wercken by Ieroon Kock, en is voorts gereyst in Vranckrijck, en van daer in Italien’).\(^{21}\) Could it be that he was commissioned to make this journey by Cock and Diericx? What is certain is that on his return he brought back a treasure trove of landscape drawings that he had made during his travels. Several of these drawings served as the basis for the series of twelve *Large Landscapes* prints (cat. no. 2) that were partially engraved and partially etched by one or both of the van Doetecum brothers.

In the context of art in the Low Countries, these landscapes were a true revelation. In the art literature they were described as ‘cosmic’ and ‘universal’, and van Mander positioned them, justly, in his theoretical treatise about painting on the same footing (‘as if it were a contest’, according to van Mander) with the landscape prints of Titian. He praised them especially because of their vast panoramas and their natural, unaffected compositions, and held them up as examples to be followed.\(^{22}\)

The prints published by Cock and Diericx were distributed internationally through well-developed networks of dealers and trade fairs. This was necessary because the potential of the Antwerp clientele alone was insufficient for maintaining the cost-effectiveness of such ambitious, top-quality, graphic production. On 27 August 1561 the book publisher Christophe Plantin –
who in the early years of his De Gouden Passer (The Golden Compass) publishing house also traded in individual prints – received a set of the above-mentioned Large Landscapes. Here Plantin was acting as the middleman for the onward sale of the works. It was explicitly stated in Plantin’s account books that they were by Bruegel: ‘12 lantschap Bruegelvel (‘12 Bruegel landscapes’).’ This remarkably early mention of the artist can be explained by the fact that Aux Quatre Vents also offered landscapes by other artists, which could lead to confusion. After all, at that time it was highly unusual for an artist to be mentioned by name; prints (and works of art in general, with the exception of works by or after artists who were already international celebrities, such as Raphael and Albrecht Dürer) were identified by the subjects depicted. In other words, it wasn’t ‘Bruegels’ that were being sold, but prints that depicted a specific iconographic theme. Thus, already in 1558, Plantin had supplied the Parisian merchant Martin Le Jeune with eight copies of The Ass at School (cat. no. 15) and six copies of Big Fish Eat Little Fish (cat. no. 8). These copies carried the express annotation that they were coloured-in (‘paints’), which made them four to five times more expensive than the non-coloured copies. It seems improbable that Bruegel coloured them himself (as did the young Quinten Massys at the start of his career with certain woodcuts), but the possibility cannot be excluded completely. It is noteworthy, after all, that with one or two exceptions, the hand-coloured prints that Cock offered for wholesale were primarily those designed by Bruegel. The others were not coloured. The large variations in price indicate the high quality of colouring done by hand with a brush, at times highlighted with golden paint. This is certainly not the type of cheap colouring that was executed using a template. Thus, the price for a non-coloured copy of The Ass at School was 1 scelling 4 deniers (16 deniers), while the price for a coloured-in copy was 6 scellings (72 deniers), precisely 4.5 times more. On the open market the prices could obviously be higher as no fixed amount was established and the dealer was at liberty to decide the price himself. However, because so many factors contributed to determining the price, it is impossible to make far-reaching conclusions. A letter from Plantin to the brothers Gentili of Padua dated 19 July 1567 shows the differences in quality and price in relation to the printed works of Dürer: ‘ce qui advient par le jugement ou affection de peintres ou cognoisseurs de telles pourtraictures, qui present quelquesfois lune piece (bien que d’une meeme main, planche, jour et heure imprimee) 2, 3, ou 4 fois double plus que lautre, chose qui se trouveroit fort strange a ceux qui ne sont experimenter et qui par consequent pourroit faire esmerveiller ceux a qui on les pourrait envoyer sans preadvertissement.’ (‘It is not unusual’, he wrote, ‘for painters or connoisseurs to value a particular print at two, three or four times the price of another impression, even though it was printed by the same hand, from the same plate, on the same day and at the same time. Those not familiar with the matter consider it very strange.’)”

Coloured-in prints were often described as ‘printed paintings’ in sixteenth-century inventories. That of a certain Janne Marienborgh, of 22 March 1567 (n.s.), records in the best room of the ‘inden vloor’ (ground floor), ‘I [een] schilderij op pampier gedrukt / van [de] boerenkermisse’ (‘I [one] small painting printed on paper from the farmer’s fair’). Whether this concerns a design by Pieter Bruegel, or a print by Pieter van der Borcht, or a different print altogether, remains unclear. In these inventories the name of the artist is seldom mentioned, if at all. One exception stands out: the inventory of the collection of Jan van den Werve notes on 29 November 1560, ‘1 elevatie des Serpenten van Frans Floris gedrukt’ (‘1 elevation of the Serpent by Frans Floris, printed’). This is an early example of the crediting of a work in an administrative context, and undoubtedly indicates the print’s importance. The work can be identified as the burin intaglio engraving The Raising of the Brazen Serpent (fig. 2), which five years previously, in 1555, was engraved by Pieter van der Heyden after the lost painting by Frans Floris and was published by Cock.

In the above-mentioned batch of engravings and etchings that Plantin sent to Le Jeune, a number of prints were categorized as ‘drolleries’, describing the bizarre, comical figures depicted in the images. About forty copies of ‘Patientia’ (cat. no. 10), twelve of The Temptation of Saint Anthony (cat. no. 7), twelve of Big Fish Eat Little Fish (cat. no. 8) and four complete sets of The Seven Deadly Sins (cat. no. 11) were traded as drolleries. The Seven Deadly Sins series was printed in that same year, 1558, and was therefore conceived, from the outset, to carry this far from traditional epithet. This description, which instantly reveals something about the way the works were interpreted, was evidently applied by either Bruegel himself or if not by him certainly by Cock. Half a century later, van Mander even called the artist ‘Pier den Drol’. From the Plantin archives it is now clear that the prints were described in this way from the moment they were made.

Giorgio Vasari is the first author to nominally list engravings after Bruegel. In the second edition of Le vite de’ più eccellenti pittori, scultori e architetti (1568) he elaborately expands on Cock’s list of publications, which he appears to know quite well. Vasari concludes his section about Cock’s activities as a publisher and engraver with a list of some engravings he published after preparatory drawings by Bosch and Bruegel, without however mentioning the latter by name. He speaks of a particular engraving as being designed by a painter (‘la qual carte fu disegnata da un pitore’) and, implicitly, relates him to Bosch. Vasari was not the first to associate the work of Bruegel with that of Bosch, but he was the first to concentrate so elaborately on his oeuvre:

And [he created] an alchemist wasting his substance, and coming at length to the hospital with his wife and children: this was designed by a painter [Pieter Bruegel] who got him to engrave the seven capital sins with various demons, a fantastic and laughable thing, the Last Judgement, and an old man with a lantern seeking quiet amid the turmoil of the world and not finding it. He also did a large fish eating a small fish, and a Carnival rejoicing at table with others and driving away Lent, while in another Lent expels the Carnival, with many other fancies which it would be tiresome to recount.”

Vasari appears to be well-informed about how Aux Quatre Vents operated, because he included the subject of the print Big Fish Eat Little Fish (1557; cat. no. 8) in his list of Bruegel designs
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Pieter Bruegel (1526/27–1569) and did so entirely accurately. He does not, however, mention Bruegel by name, although this must be implied – if he had based his attribution on the engraving alone, he would no doubt have named Bosch as the designer. This indicates that Vasari received his information from Cock himself, whether directly or indirectly. Moreover, his contemporaries and later authors described Bruegel more often as a ‘second Bosch’. Already early on in his career Bruegel had made a few designs for prints that completely exuded the atmosphere of Bosch’s works (who had died as far back as 1516). It is likely that this approach was encouraged by Cock and Diericx as part of a conscious marketing strategy.

Until 1563, Cock and Diericx were the exclusive publishers of Bruegel’s prints (with two exceptions, about which much has been written). In 1563, this changed, when Bruegel married Mayken Coecke van Aelst, his master’s daughter, and moved to Brussels. The following year he sent two pendant drawings to Cock in Antwerp – namely, the designs for Saint James and the Magician Hermogenes (cat. no. 9a) and Saint James and the Fall of the Magician Hermogenes (cat. no. 9b) – but the intense collaboration between Bruegel and Cock had come to an end. What is remarkable is that Cock also moved the location of his publishing house at the end of 1563, from the Nieuwe Beurs district to the Tapierspand neighbourhood. Was that a coincidence, or part of an altered publishing strategy? This question remains unanswered. After that, it was apparently over. Countless engravings and etchings after his work or ‘in the manner of Bruegel’ were still published and this continued throughout the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, but the artist was clearly no longer directly involved in their production. After the artist’s death in 1569, Aux Quatre Vents brought five more prints after Bruegel onto the market. Some of them, such as the two engravings from the series The Four Seasons, which Bruegel did not complete, were nevertheless published in 1570 by Diericx, after drawings from the artist’s estate. Cock commissioned the Mechelen artist Hans Bol to complete Autumn and Winter (cat. nos. 33c and 33d). Other prints, such as the Peasant Wedding Dance (cat. no. 26), were published after Cock’s death in 1570 by Diericx, maybe after a lost painting, although this is not entirely certain.

**Hans Franckaert: Bruegel’s wealthy and art-loving friend**

Hans Franckaert (figs 4–6) was a dealer in metal and jewellery. Born in 1520, he was the business partner of Nicolaes Jonghelinck and Daniel de Bryune. Ever since his childhood he had lived in the imposing house called De Wolf in Zirkstraat in Antwerp (fig. 1). He inherited the building from his father, who had bought it in 1525. In the guild year 1546/47, Franckaert – who was at that time already a norenborger (metal merchant) – was admitted to the Violieren, the chamber of rhetoric that was related to the Guild of St Luke, which gave him access to Antwerp’s artistic scene at a young age. On 9 January 1571, at the age of fifty-one, two witnesses declared that he was still unmarried (‘jonggezelle’). Crucially, van Mander pointed out that Franckaert gave many commissions to Bruegel: ‘En [Bruegel] wrocht veel voor een Coop-man, geheeten Hans Franckaert.’ (‘And [Bruegel] worked a lot for a merchant, named Hans Franckaert.’) The pair became friends and, according to van Mander, visited farms in De Kempen, northeast of Antwerp (fig. 3), to attend fairs and weddings (‘Hans Franckaert, dat een edel goet borst was van een man die geern by Brueghel, en met hem daeglijcks seer gemeensam was. Met deze Franckaert gingh Brueghel dickwils buyte[n] by den boeren, ter kermis en ter bruyleef’). However, their trips to the countryside were not always only for reasons of leisure. The well-to-do Franckaert would go to De Kempen to collect rents from at least two large farmsteads.

[fig. 1] De Kempen (or the Campine) is a natural region characterized by its sandy heathlands, situated in northeastern Belgium and the southeastern part of the Dutch province of North Brabant (lying south of a line stretched between Tilburg and Eindhoven).
In 1567 the Antwerp silversmith Jan van der Borcht – unfortunately, I cannot confirm whether he was related (perhaps a brother?) to the draughtsman and etcher Pieter van der Borcht, Bruegel’s contemporary and kindred spirit – paid his debt to Franckaert with the Meybeemt farm in Loenhout. The farm, as is explicitly stated in the records, annually yielded 50 carolus guilders. This meant that Franckaert, as owner of the farm, regularly went to collect the rent of 50 guilders, as well as payments in kind (in the document there is some mention of rye). But there is more. Already in January 1552 the sugar merchant Peeter Franckaert, Hans’s elder brother, also owned a large farm in De Kempen, in the Bochterstraete in Rijkevorsel, a village barely 9 kilometres from Loenhout. Hans received a mandate from his brother to go and represent his business interests there, regarding a disagreement relating to that farm, between Peeter Franckaert and the Antwerp silversmith Nicolaes Huybrechts. This is a clear indication that Hans Franckaert was already visiting De Kempen regularly since at least 1552. Whether by 1554 he was already accompanied (now and then) by his friend Bruegel, when he had returned from his voyage to Italy, is of course still open to question. Hans Franckaert had himself depicted in the Peasant Wedding (figs 4 and 5) which is consistently dated c. 1567. The likeness of the man on the right of this painting when compared with the portrait on the medal Franckaert had commissioned in 1565 is indeed convincing (figs 6a and 6b). Depicting a patron within a composition was a long-standing tradition in Early Netherlandish painting, albeit usually in a religious context (see fig. 7).
In my opinion, based on the evidence set out above, it may be concluded that Franckaert not only commissioned the Peasant Wedding, but that he was also the co-owner of the place where the scene takes place – whether it was the farm in Loenhout, the one in Rijkevorsel, or another. It could even be a composite of the interiors of several barns, although, in the final analysis, it does not really matter.

The question arises as to whether Bruegel might perhaps be the designer of the medal (fig. 6). Unlike Frans Floris, he is not at all known as a portrait painter, but there is nevertheless an explicit indication that Bruegel did indeed make portraits. Both in the auction catalogue of 13 August 1668 for the collection of paintings from the Pieter Stevens estate, and in the copy of the Schilder-boeck by van Mander that Stevens annotated, it is mentioned that Pieter Bruegel the Elder (the document states: ‘Breugel le vieil’) made the portrait of his mother-in-law Mayken Verhulst in 1566: ‘Le Pourtraict de la Femme de Mr. Pierre van Aelst.’ It thus seems probable to me that Bruegel is also the author of a portrait of his friend and travel companion Franckaert, which served as the basis for the medal.

If Bruegel often worked for Franckaert (‘[…] wrocht veel voor […] Hans Franckaert’) and spent time with him on a daily basis (‘met hem daeghelijcks seer gemeensam was’), as van Mander writes in 1604, one can wonder whether Franckaert was also the person who commissioned and was the first owner of (a version of) the Peasant Dance and The Wedding Dance (figs 8 and 9) and even of the original painting Visit to the Farm (now lost; fig. 10).

What certainly also needs further attention is the question of where Bruegel’s studio was located. Van Mander signals that Bruegel had servants, but we do not know how many and we don’t know any names. Did Bruegel work exclusively in Brussels after his marriage in 1563? That seems highly improbable. If we examine the floorplan of the large De Wolf house in the Zirkstraat in Antwerp, where the unmarried, childless, art-loving and initially wealthy Franckaert lived until 1577, we can see that there is a large space at the back (fig. 11). Maybe it was here that a number of Bruegel’s masterpieces came into being.

The Plantin archive shows that, from the very start, there existed an international market for prints by Bruegel, which has indeed remained the case. On the other hand, his paintings, following his death in 1569, quickly became sought-after collectors’ items. Already in a letter of 9 December 1572, a mere three years after the artist’s death, the provost marshal Maximilian Morillon wrote to Cardinal Antoine Perrenot de Granvelle that Bruegel’s work had become very expensive after his death: ‘fort chèrement: car elles sont plus requisez depuis son trespas que par avant, et s’esti-
And on 6 March 1609, Jan Brueghel confirmed in a letter to Cardinal Federico Borromeo that his father’s paintings were no longer available for sale because the emperor had bought many of them (‘L’Imperator ha fatto gran spese per aver tuti sua opera’). The prints after his work, on the other hand, remained available on the market at affordable prices, which meant they were always much appreciated.

Pieter Bruegel the Elder did not live to an old age. He died aged forty-two or forty-three, leaving behind three small children. In a time span of less than two decades he singlehandedly created several new paradigms for western art history. His eldest son, Pieter Brueghel the Younger, who had hardly known him (he was barely four or five years old when his father died), spent his whole career as an artist in pursuit of his father’s creative power, but was never able to come close. For him, as for us today, Bruegel remained an enigma.
1. The main source of information remains Van der Wee 1963.
4. An apprenticeship of about five years, sometimes shorter, was the usual custom. Pieter Bruegel is not mentioned in the Liggeren as a pupil of Pieter Coecke van Aelst. On the one hand, the Liggeren were not filled in during 1548/49, and on the other, there are several examples of apprentices who were not registered, of whom we know for certain, thanks to other documents, that they learned the trade with a particular master.
5. Guicciardini 1567, p. 99.
6. Until 1576 the Easter calendar style was used in Antwerp, the new year beginning at Easter (namely on Easter Saturday or Good Friday). All dates here have been transposed into the ‘new style’ of the civil year that begins on 1 January; these are indicated by ‘(n.s.).
8. Petronella Rubbens is not mentioned in the study Hervé Douschamps devoted to Peter Paul Rubens, his ancestors and his descendants; see Douschamps 1977, pp. 43–86.
9. The house was sold on 3 January 1550 (n.s.) to Jan Braem. See Stadsarchief Antwerpen, Schepenregisters 235, fol. 173 (document dated 7 January 1550 [n.s.]).
10. Stadsarchief Antwerpen, Schepenregisters 202, fol. 164 (document of 30 April 1544): ‘Mercurij vultima ap[ri]lis anno XVIIII Adriaen de soone van Daniel Janss. oucleercoep.’ / ‘Adrian the son of Daniel Janss van Breda, purchaser of old clothing.’ There are many precedents of craftsmen who were members of the guild without being burghers, even if that was in principle a requirement. Moreover, as appears from the fireplace count of the eighth quarter, many craftsmen never became a member of a guild. This also wasn’t necessary, as long as one did not own an independent enterprise. Many accomplished painters, sculptors, potters, etc. worked in the studio of an independent master, but did not have the right to run a workshop themselves. That sometimes led to conflicts. The Antwerp jurisprudence in this regard will be included in its entirety in Jan Van der Stock, Between Norm and Practice: Two Centuries of Image Making in Antwerp (c. 1350–c. 1550). Assessing the Archival Evidence (forthcoming).
11. Stadsarchief Antwerpen, Tresorij T.1705 (unpaginated). The ‘hearth count’ of the eighth quarter will be included in its entirety and with commentary in Jan Van der Stock, Between Norm and Practice: Two Centuries of Image Making in Antwerp (c. 1350–c. 1550). Assessing the Archival Evidence (forthcoming).

[fig. 11] Ground floor plan of De Wolf, Zirkstraat, Antwerp. In 1894 the front part was rebuilt above ground, while the remaining rear parts were left intact: the old cellar, what remained of the open inner courtyard, the tiny preserved rear house (left) and the large rear house (to the right at the back, indicated by the frame in red), which was clearly a workshop or warehouse with a wooden internal structure (Stadsarchief Antwerpen, Modern Archief, Bouwdossiers, 1894 #1777).
Breda consisted of four ‘quarters’ or hamlets: Teteringen, Lovendeyck (Lovensdonck), Zamberen and Molengraacht. The fact that the family lived in the hamlet of Molengraacht (Breda) is documented in Stadsarchief Antwerpen, Schepenregisters 242, fol. 407 (document of 2 November 1551): ‘tander Molengraacht alias van Breda.’ This is confirmed by various other documents, including Stadsarchief Antwerpen, Schepenregisters 242, fol. 1687 (document of 6 August 1551).


His guardians were the oudkleerkoper Jan van Breda (perhaps an uncle who had also emigrated from the hamlet of Molengraacht to Antwerp) and the very well-to-do master carpenter and property broker Jan van Ghooorte. Regarding the latter, see Soly 1977, pp. 119–20.

In 1529/30, Coecke took on a certain ‘Willem van Breda’ as an apprentice; see Rombouts and Van Lerius 1864–76, vol. 1, p. 118.

The information in this paragraph is based on Van der Stock 1989, pp. 89–102.

The most recent and comprehensive biography of Hieronymus Cock and Volckken Diericx is Van der Stock 2013, pp. 14–21. See also Van der Stock 1998, p. 272.

Orenstein and Sellink 2001, passim.

The apprenticeship with Pieter Coecke van Aelst is mentioned only by Karel van Mander in his Schilder-boeck (1604). There is no trace to be found of the apprenticeship in the Lijgeren or elsewhere. In 1532/33, Coecke took on a certain ‘Luyck Corenmetere.’ This too is clearly a homonym. Rombouts and Van Lerius 1864–76, vol. 1, p. 118.

‘From here [at Pieter Coecke van Aelst’s] he went on to work with Hieronymus Cock, and he subsequently travelled to France, and from there to Italy.’ See Miedema 1994–99, vol. 1, pp. 190–91.


Delen 1932, pp. 3–4; Delen 1934–35, pp. 151.

For example, on 27 July 1568, Plantin received from Cock ‘Landscape Cock’ (‘Landschap Cock’); see Delen 1932, p. 5, and Delen 1935, p. 152. The designer was also occasionally identified for other prints where confusion was possible.


28 Stadsarchief Antwerpen, V. 258 (Gerechtelijke inventarissen 1556–67), fol. 121v.

29 Stadsarchief Antwerpen, V. 298 (Inventarissen van nagelaten goederen), unfoliated [fol. 27].
Karel van Mander, our only source for Pieter Bruegel’s formative years, names Pieter Coecke van Aelst as his teacher. At first sight, it is surprising to think of Bruegel training under such a distinctly Italianizing master, yet there are strong indications that van Mander was correctly informed. It is certainly the case at any rate that Bruegel went on to marry Mayken Coecke, Pieter Coecke van Aelst’s daughter, many years later. So it was most likely in Coecke’s studio that the foundations were laid of Bruegel’s thorough familiarity with the art of the Italian Renaissance, which would be intensified by his visit to Italy and is chiefly apparent in his later work in the form of compositional schemes and ingenious quotations from Italian masters (see, for example, cat. no. 33b). Bruegel undoubtedly had an Italianizing idiom at his command too, although he would only apply it extremely sparingly in the years that followed (see cat. nos. 61 and 36). Despite Bruegel’s training under Coecke, the overall impact of antique art and the Italian Renaissance on his oeuvre remained limited. Coecke died in Brussels on 6 December 1550, but Bruegel appears to have completed his apprenticeship before then. It can be inferred from a court document dating from 1608 that he collaborated with Peeter Baltens on an altar for the glogers’ guild in Mechelen between September 1550 and October 1551. The young painters were employed by Claude Dorisy, the art dealer who had accepted the commission. Baltens painted the scenes on the inside of the altarpiece, while Bruegel was responsible for the grisailles on the exterior. We can only guess as to the style, nature and extent of Bruegel’s work at that time, but what we do know for certain is that he enrolled as a master in the Antwerp Guild of St Luke in 1551. This means not only that his training was complete, but above all that he was able to take on work as an independent master. Bruegel appears to have departed for Italy shortly after this. Several dated drawings place him in Southern Europe in 1552 at any rate, and there is strong circumstantial evidence that he had arrived in Messina (Sicily) by the summer of that year (see cat. no. 5). It was fairly common around the mid-sixteenth century for artists from the Low Countries to make the journey to Italy, primarily to familiarize themselves with the art and culture of classical antiquity and the Italian Renaissance. The fact that he trained under Coecke, who almost certainly visited Italy too, makes Bruegel’s choice even less surprising. In the light of his later work, however, the long journey seems less obvious: aside from the landscapes, his surviving or otherwise known work shows little evidence of reflection on the remnants of antiquity or the achievements of the Italian Renaissance.

We might well ask, therefore, what it was precisely that prompted Bruegel to undertake the visit? Under what circumstances did he make the journey and what support could he call on to accomplish it? Once again, van Mander provides us with a clue: ‘From there [Pieter Coecke van Aelst’s] he went to work at Jeroon Kock’s, there-after travelling to France and thence to Italy.’ If we take the biographer at his word, Bruegel began working for Hieronymus Cock shortly after completing his apprenticeship under Coecke. Van Mander believed, at any rate, that he did so before setting off for Italy. It is indeed plausible for a variety of reasons that Cock should have encouraged Bruegel to make the journey or even provided him with active support. Hieronymus’ father was the painter Jan Wellens de Cock, who died at a young age. Hieronymus’ brother was the much older Matthijs Cock, from whom he too probably learned the trade. Van Mander describes Matthijs as an outstanding landscape painter, adding that he was ’the first who began to make landscapes in an improved manner with more variations in the new Italian or antique way, and he was amazingly ingenious and inventive in composition or putting the picture together’. Like Bruegel, Cock had trained as a painter and the two might also have shared a particular talent for and interest in landscape. In 1549,
Cock had carried out painting commissions relating to the celebrations to mark the Joyous Entry of Philip II in Antwerp. He was also, van Mander tells us, a dealer in paintings, and Cock and his wife Volckken were successful business-people too. The couple were already highly ambitious: Cock received his licence to publish prints on 11 January 1548 (Easter Style; 1549 New Style), and his first edition is dated 1548. It consisted of models for decorative tableware in an antique-inspired grotesque style, engraved by Jacob Bos after drawings by Cornelis Floris. There is also a view, dating from 1549 and etched by Cock himself, of the siege of Boulogne. Both are examples of genres that would later feature prominently in his publisher’s list.

From the outset, Cock’s newly founded company was organized along Italian lines. Even more rigorously than Cornelis Bos before him, he applied a division of labour between designer, engraver and publisher, in which everyone’s role was clearly stated in most cases on the print – a practice applied in particular by Roman print publishers such as Antonio Salamanca and Antonio Lafreri. Even though no concrete evidence has been found that Cock visited Italy, he was plainly well connected there and was deeply influenced by antique, Italian and Italianizing art. One of his very first publications – a series of views of antique ruins in Rome, for which he himself drew the definitive designs – suggests that he had visited the city in person.

In 1550, Cock also brought the famous engraver Giorgio Ghisi from Mantua to Antwerp to cut several monumental prints for him. The first result of their collaboration broke new ground: a faithful reproduction engraved on two large plates of the fresco *The School of Athens*, which Raphael had painted in the Vatican. In this way, a key work of the Italian Renaissance was made accessible to a broad European public.

It is clear from the dated prints that Cock published in the early 1550s that the building of his list focused in the first instance on the reproduction of antique and modern Italian art. Aside from the previously mentioned Roman Ruins and School of Athens, these consisted before 1554 of prints after Raphael, Andrea del Sarto, Giovanni Battista Bertani, Agnolo Bronzino and Francesco Primaticcio, as well as designs by Netherlandish Italianists such as Cornelis and Frans Floris, Lambert Lombard and Maarten van Heemskerck, who had spent prolonged periods in Italy. At this point, Bruegel – at least the Bruegel we know from his later work – had little in common with Cock’s usual output, either stylistically or thematically. The ambitious publisher might already have been looking to branch out, however, and is sure to have registered the young Bruegel’s talent. The *Landscape with Abraham’s Sacrifice* (fig. 1), which Cock published in 1551, possibly after a design by his late older brother Matthijs, looks forward in terms of its structure and technique to Bruegel’s work in the period 1552–55 (see cat. no. 1). This too suggests a connection between Cock and Bruegel before the latter departed for Italy. Certain innovative features of Bruegel’s early landscapes thus appear to have been drawn in part from the work of Matthijs and Hieronymus Cock.

Cock dedicated several prestigious editions to Antoine Perrenot de Granvelle, including Roman Ruins and The Dispute about the Holy Sacrament (fig. 2), a second monumental print by Ghisi after Raphael. Granvelle was Bishop of Arras when he succeeded his late father in 1550 as chancellor of Charles V, a position similar to that of prime minister. The later cardinal and Archbishop of Mechelen was thus effectively one of the most influential men in European politics,
not to mention a prominent art lover, patron and collector. It is highly likely that Granvelle supported Cock’s business from the beginning. He might have made things possible for Cock that would otherwise have been unattainable for either financial or organizational reasons. For a young painter and print publisher to have brought a leading engraver from Italy, register him with the local guild and have him cut several large printing plates would indeed seem unfeasible without such assistance. What little correspondence has so far come to light between Cock and Granvelle dates from much later, by which time Cock was already well established and Granvelle was no longer residing in the Low Countries. All the same, it clearly shows that the powerful Granvelle corresponded directly with the Antwerp publisher and provided him with generous support. The correspondence in question relates to a map of Franche-Comté, the publication of which was ultimately blocked for military reasons, as it was feared the print would provide too much topographical information to the enemy. Granvelle compensated Cock for the lost business and the printing plate was duly locked away at Cantecroy Castle (on the outskirts of Antwerp), one of the cardinal’s residences.

All this provides us with another lead. Maps, city views and illustrations of battles and sieges remain a somewhat underexamined aspect of
Cock’s output. The material in question has only survived sporadically, while the inventory of Cock’s widow, Volcxken Diericx, indicates that there were other maps and city views that have yet to be traced.21 Cock mainly published large wall maps, which were subject to considerable wear and tear and have thus only been preserved in small numbers. The prints of battles and sieges, meanwhile, reflected current events and lost much of their interest once they ceased to be topical.22

Images of military campaigns in the 1550s related primarily to the Italian War of 1551–59 and the associated conflicts between Charles V and Henry II and their respective allies in Italy and the Low Countries. But the maps too show the territories where this war was being fought or which were at stake. In 1551, for example, Cock published an illustration of Parma and the surrounding area, which falls somewhere between a map and a vista, with a perspective representation of cities and mountains.23 Nina Serebrennikov has noted the pictorial, almost landscape character of these hybrid ‘map-views’, which she interprets as evidence that Cock trained as a landscape painter.24 The following year, Cock published a similar view of Piedmont, of which he described himself as not only the engraver but also the author (fig. 3). It is clear, nevertheless, that Cock based all these editions on drawings and above all on printed models that had already been published elsewhere. The map-view of Piedmont actually derived from the work of Matteo Pagano, although Cock did adapt it to his own style.25

In addition to a map of Spain,26 he offered a map of Sicily for sale in 1553 (fig. 4), which Cock etched after a previously published map by Giacomo Gastaldi.27 He gave it an attractive frame and highly pictorial staffage, as he did

for the map of Spain. The triumphant figure of Charles V at the top, seated on an eagle, is highly apt, while warships engage in a naval battle at the bottom. This is plainly a reference to the conflict between the emperor and the Turks and their respective allies for hegemony over the southern Mediterranean. Bruegel, who had been in Italy for a year at that time, appears to have witnessed the battle in person. At any rate, he depicted a similar encounter between the two enemy fleets in the monumental sheet showing the Naval Battle in the Strait of Messina (see cat. no. 5). The print, which was undoubtedly based on sketches and drawings done in situ, was not published until 1561.

Cock responded adroitly to current events with his chorographic and topographic publications. It was also in the interests of the Habsburg authorities that the military successes of the emperor and his allies were presented in a positive light in the Low Countries. They exercised control, at any rate, over publications of this kind by issuing licenses and privileges, and Granvelle is likely to have had a substantial influence in such matters. The material published by Cock and others formed just part of the mass of topographic and chorographic information collected for military purposes, which was not made public. Although interesting from a propaganda point of view, these representations

of past military campaigns are frequently inaccurate and contain little in the way of strategically sensitive information. The documents were not sufficiently detailed or accurate to be useful when planning military operations.

In an era when military topography had yet to develop significantly, drawn views of landscapes and topographical elements were vitally important. Painters were called on to map out strategic locations such as mountain passes, river valleys, bridges, fords, fortifications and all sorts of defences and natural obstacles. The resulting drawings – combined in some cases in panoramic surveys – naturally remained top secret. Views such as the one of eastern France prepared for Charles V have been preserved (fig. 5) and, as Serebrennikov has noted, display remarkable similarities to Cock’s hybrid maps of Parma and Piedmont, and also, essentially, to the panoramic and very natural-looking landscapes we know from Bruegel. Serebrennikov has suggested that before he departed for Italy, Bruegel was already familiar with this topographic and chorographic approach to the landscape via Cock’s publications. This, she argues, combined with the clearly identifiable Venetian influence to shape the development of his landscape style.

On an entirely hypothetical basis, I would like to take this a step further. Could the young Bruegel have been sent to Italy on a multiple mission? In the first instance, he will have had personal motives for undertaking the journey: exploring foreign countries and landscapes, experiencing a different culture, the prospect of learning and discovering new things. For artists of his era, this chiefly meant the remains of classical antiquity and the achievements of the Italian Renaissance. At least one aspect of this broad artistic movement appears to have been fully incorporated into Bruegel’s style at a very early stage: there is every indication that he had long since made the acquaintance of the landscapes of Titian and Domenico Campagnola through prints and possibly even drawings and paintings. The lessons of Michelangelo and Raphael only show up in later work and it is not entirely clear whether he absorbed them directly or through the output of other artists. Their example has been so thoroughly assimilated and ingeniously quoted that it is often only visible to a highly trained eye. The figures from the Sistine Chapel are frequently mentioned as models for Bruegel’s somewhat heavier characters and robust poses, especially in his later period. But he might have worked from engravings in this case too or have had access to drawings made by artists such as Pieter Coecke van Aelst or Maarten van Heemskerck. As early as 1531, Dirck Volckertsz. Coornhert published engravings with these Ignudi, based on van Heemskerck’s drawings. We find virtually no trace of classical antique remains in Bruegel’s work. While in Rome, he seems entirely to have ignored the ruins and antique sculpture that feature so prominently in Cock’s prints and in the drawings of Lombard and van Heemskerck. Instead, he drew cargo boats moored on the Tiber at the Dogana Vecchia – the somewhat ramshackle medieval complex that served as the Eternal City’s customs office (fig. 11). The fact that he spent time in Rome in 1553 is also demonstrated by two prints that were later published by Joris Hoefnagel with the inscription: *Petrus Bruegel fecit Romae A° 1553*. If these inscriptions mean that the compositions really were made in Rome, it is striking...
once again that Bruegel chose to work up the impressions he had gathered elsewhere during his trip rather than drawing Rome itself. Hoefnagel might have come across these drawings in the possession of the miniature painter Giulio Clovio during his later visit to the city. Bruegel must have been on friendly terms with Clovio, who was based in Rome at the time and working for Cardinal Alessandro Farnese, as the inventory of the Italian artist’s estate in 1577 refers not only to a view of Lyon on canvas, a painting of a tree, a miniature with the tower of Babylon on ivory, and two landscapes by Bruegel, but also a miniature painted by the two of them together. It is noteworthy once again that none of these works is associated with typically Italian or antiquizing subject matter or genres.

At Tivoli, near Rome, it was the waterfall and the unusual, strangely shaped rocks that caught Bruegel’s attention, together with a few features of the town – elements that he combined in a composition after his return, which Cock published as a print in The Large Landscapes series (cat. no. 2a). So, while Bruegel was drawn to this exceptional natural monument, he literally turned his back on the fine, round antique Temple of Vesta. The Colosseum must have made a deep impression on him, as the form of the building influenced his later image of the Tower of Babel, but drawings and prints of that landmark were naturally available in the Low Countries too, and the artist will undoubtedly have been familiar with them before he left for Italy. It certainly cannot be ruled out that some of the lost sketches and drawings he presumably made during his trip featured antique monuments, but no evidence of this has been found to date.

While it has proved almost impossible to reconstruct the remainder of Bruegel’s journey, the network of the Habsburgs and Granvelle might prove instructive for future research in this respect too. It is not improbable that Bruegel visited Mantua on his way back: the Gonzagas were not only loyal allies of Emperor Charles V, but also important patrons. Pieter Coecke van Aelst was plainly influenced by the works of Giulio Romano and his school, which the Duke of Mantua, Federico II Gonzaga (1500–1540), had commissioned. Giorgio Ghisi came from Mantua too and Granvelle was in contact with the Scultori family of engravers as early as the end of the 1540s. The strong Venetian influence on the development of Bruegel’s landscapes suggests that he is likely to have visited that city as well, where contacts provided by Cock and Granvelle might have gained him access to artistic circles, as they will have elsewhere. It was only a few years earlier that Titian had painted portraits of the cardinal and his father, Nicolas Perrenot de Granvelle. A partial copy after a drawing by Campagnola (fig. 6) likewise suggests a renewed and closer acquaintance with the latter’s art. There might be plenty more material besides, not yet discovered, that could further modify this picture.

By contrast, there is an overwhelming amount of evidence that Bruegel was interested in other subjects. His presence in Southern Europe is demonstrated by the drawing Southern Cloister in a Valley (fig. 7), dated 1552, which shows an everyday building in a landscape of the type found anywhere between Provence and Calabria. Bruegel worked out the sheet to a highly detailed and refined degree, undoubtedly creating it in his studio based on sketches done in situ. He might have taken a similar approach to his painting with the magnificent view of the Bay of Naples and the monumental print Naval Battle in the Strait of Messina (cat. no. 5). These works were all completed years after his return from Italy. While there is no reference in the print to a recent historical event, the naval skirmish it shows and the fire in Reggio di Calabria can be situated historically: Bruegel might have witnessed an engagement there in 1552 between the Franco-Ottoman and imperial fleets. The battle and the fire were episodes in the struggle for hegemony over the southern Mediterranean, to which
Cock likewise referred in his map of Sicily. They formed part of the Italian War that was in full flow during Bruegel’s stay.

By the time Naval Battle in the Strait of Messina was published in 1561, the conflict was over, and so the representation of strategically important locations – the ports of Reggio di Calabria and Messina and above all the fortress on the steep cliffs of Scilla in the left foreground, which controlled access to the strait from the north – had lost its relevance. The distances and proportions in the print do not correspond with reality either: the natural situation has been condensed into an aesthetic image. This is also the case with the View of the Bay of Naples (fig. 8), which dates from the same period. Naples too was a key bastion of the Habsburg empire – the capital of a viceroyalty with an important, fortified port. Granvelle had maintained political and artistic contacts there since the 1540s and was later appointed viceroy himself. The holder of the post at the time, Pedro Álvarez de Toledo (1484–1553), radically rebuilt and fortified the city. Granvelle also corresponded with his son, García Álvarez de Toledo, commander of the Neapolitan fleet and the future viceroy of Catalonia. The naval battle off Ponza, an island in the Tyrrhenian Sea between Rome and Naples, took place on 5 August 1552. Bruegel might have been in the area on that occasion too.

The harbour infrastructure, fortifications and lighthouses can also be seen in the Sailing Vessels series (cat. no. 6) and are all done in such a lifelike manner that they must have been drawn from nature. Yet the locations are not recognizable: Bruegel took his meticulously recorded pieces of reality and composed them into something else, just as he did in his breathtaking Large Landscapes (cat. no. 2) or the vertiginous Large Alpine Landscape (cat. no. 3), in which valleys, rivers, mountain passes, castles, rocks and lakes are merged to form imaginary vistas. This was naturally in keeping with the customary artistic practice of the time: it was never the intention to depict specific landscapes.

Various elements nevertheless point in a particular direction. Bruegel’s journey
does not appear to have been prompted by an interest on his part in antiquity or the art of the Renaissance. If he made the trip in Cock’s service and if the latter funded it, fully or in part, it is likely that he had specific assignments to perform. Cock’s list was chiefly oriented at the time to disseminating the art of antiquity and Italy, so it would have made sense for Bruegel to have been tasked with making drawings of frescos, statues or ruins. Cock did indeed expand his offering in the years after Bruegel’s return with images of that kind. A second series of the highly successful Roman Ruins, for instance, was published in 1561, engraved in copper on this occasion by the van Doetecum brothers rather than Cock himself. However, despite their attractive compositions and their animated staffage, they are in no way reminiscent of Bruegel’s work. As is the case with the first series, related drawings can be found in the Berlin sketchbook of Maarten van Heemskerck – a source from which Cock appears to have drawn for his first series as well.

Given Cock’s background and the obvious market potential of landscapes, this is sure to have been a segment in which he would have been keen to expand his offering, but one in which variety was likewise very important. In 1558, Cock launched a fine series of landscapes with scenes from Ovid’s Metamorphoses based on his brother’s drawings. The series represented the more traditional Netherlandish landscape within his publisher’s list, while the so-called Small Landscapes responded to a demand for images of local lanes, villages and farms. Cock’s landscapes were intended in the first instance as a source of inspiration for painters, yet there was also a clear pursuit of variety within The Large Landscapes series after Bruegel. The print Pagus Nemorusus (cat. no. 21), for example, shows a complete Brabant landscape that would be closer in essence to the Small Landscapes were it not imbued with the grandeur of Bruegel’s inventions.

A two-year journey seems like a disproportionate investment for fewer than a dozen landscape prints, which only leaves Cock’s

[fig. 8] Pieter Bruegel the Elder, View of the Bay of Naples, c. 1563 (?). Oil on panel, 42.2 x 71.2 cm. Rome, Galleria Doria Pamphilj, inv. no. fc 546.
activities in the areas of topography and chorography. Bruegel is unlikely to have been much use as far as the former is concerned: he was by no means a scientifically trained cartographer, while Cock was clearly able to draw on practitioners in that field of the stature of Giacomo Gastaldi, Christiana Sgrooten or Gilles Boileau de Bouillon. The depictions of battles and sieges he published did not always live up to the same high quality. They included hastily executed copies or variations on scenes that, in their original form, might have been published nearer the illustrated location and were subsequently copied or adapted by Cock.48 As topical responses to recent events, a cursory rendering was evidently enough to satisfy customers. Most of these prints refer, moreover, to events that occurred before or after Bruegel’s journey.

In 1557, Cock published a beautiful and monumental view of Florence, etched on three plates by the van Doetecums, who had previously engraved Bruegel’s Large Landscapes.49 Bruegel is likely to have visited the city during his journey to Italy, of which it was the principal artistic centre, together with Rome. Giorgio Vasari had published the first edition of his famous Vite there in 1550 at the printing house of Lorenzo Torrentino, alias Laurens van der Beke49 – a printer with Brabant roots, who had been born in Gemert, near Son en Breugel. In the second edition in 1568, Vasari revealed his knowledge of prints by Cock, Bosch and Bruegel.50 Surviving correspondence shows that he was later in contact with Lambert Lombard and Dominicus Lampsonius as well.51 The Fleming Jan van der Straet from Bruges, also known as Johannes Stradanus, was already working in Florence at the Medici court and later became Vasari’s principal assistant.52 It is possible that Bruegel met him. Stradanus later designed prints for Cock and many more for Philips Galle.53 The Medici were, moreover, loyal allies of Charles V. The View of Florence (fig. 9) shows all the hallmarks of the van Doetecum brothers: the staffage is in their characteristic style, as is the vegetation and the clouds. The composition is nicely constructed, with an overgrown elevation with figures on the right, which leads the viewer’s eye over the city and towards the surrounding hills. Together with the impressive clouds, these elements lend the vista the kind of spatial grandeur we also find in Bruegel, who ought not to be ruled out as the possible author of this city view.

The inventory of Volcxken Diericx’s estate refers to several monumental city views that have yet to be traced, but the locations in question are neither in nor en route to Italy, and so are not considered here.54 The final possibility is a view of Rome listed in the same inventory which, to my knowledge, has yet to be identified.55 It was

only engraved on one plate, however, and might be a smaller representation – possibly even of the siege view type.

In conclusion, if Bruegel had travelled to Italy purely for his own personal development or to help expand Cock's list, the return on investment would not have been sufficient, either rationally or relatively. Cock later exploited many facets of Bruegel's talent, but the trip to Italy would have had barely any impact on them. Sources for his Bosch-inspired works, his peasant scenes, his religious and allegorical works and most of his biblical themes were all immediately to hand. Such Italian influences as they incorporated were also available locally in the form of prints and drawings and in the art collections and studios to which Bruegel certainly had access. Thanks to his training under Pieter Coecke van Aelst, he is sure to have come into contact with them at an early stage.

The true reason for Bruegel's journey might have been secret even at the time. Through Cock and Granvelle – not to mention his former mentor Pieter Coecke van Aelst, who was court painter to Charles V and Mary of Hungary – the young painter undoubtedly had connections at court. And Bruegel's talent as a draughtsman would certainly have been known to Granvelle. The Italian War, in which much was at stake for the emperor and his allies, had just begun, and French attacks on the Duchy of Milan seemed likely via the Alps, particularly on the Piedmont and Savoy side. The emperor also faced a further threat in the shape of the German Protestant princes led by Maurice of Saxony. In 1552, having been cornered in Innsbruck, Charles V narrowly escaped via the Brenner Pass. Meanwhile, the Franco-Ottoman fleet posed a danger to the coasts of Campania, Calabria and Sicily. It was vital strategically to have performed a secret mission, probably to the Holy Land in preparation for a planned crusade. Whatever the case, he produced a heavily guarded mappemonde for the duke. Bruegel and his contemporaries are unlikely to have been aware of this fact and Bruegel might even have felt somewhat overqualified for such an assignment. All the same, the prospect of broadening his horizons and partaking of everything Italy had to offer an artist might have provided an additional stimulus. As for Cock, there would have been the potential for turning at least some of the impressions, experiences and, above all, sketches and drawings that Bruegel brought back with him into successful prints.

Bruegel was definitely acquainted with Jan Cornelisz. Vermeyen, who had accompanied the emperor on his North African campaigns. Van Mander wrote of him: 'for the Emperor gave him many commissions to depict his wars, deeds and conquests, from which drawings beautiful tapestries were subsequently made; so that he drew much from life everywhere, among other things the siege and topography of the city of Tunis; in this as well as other aspects of art he had a very intelligent and subtle manner of working; he was neither inexperienced in geometry nor surveying nor other noble sciences.'

Well known in this regard are the cartoons for the tapestry cycle on The Conquest of Tunis, which also incorporate a panoramic and topographical survey of the theatre of war: the entire western Mediterranean, with Spain and North Africa. The designs for the tapestries date from 1546–48, but Vermeyen received a privilege to publish the material in print form much earlier. The plates – impressions from which have not survived – later appear to have come into the possession of Cock. The cartoons for the Tunis series were made in collaboration with Pieter Coecke van Aelst. The cycle's influence on Bruegel's work was noted only recently and it has even been suggested that Bruegel had a hand in painting the cartoons. Interesting parallels can indeed be drawn between scenes such as The Landing Off the Cape of Carthage and in particular The Capture of Goleta on the one hand and works such as Bruegel's Naval Battle in the Strait of Messina on the other.

Although the purpose of Bruegel's journey is pure supposition, it is supported by a fair amount of circumstantial evidence. It provides an answer, moreover, to a number of difficult questions regarding his oeuvre. Why, for instance, have so few drawings and sketches from that particular journey survived? Bruegel would have been required to hand over the majority of them – if not the detailed sketches, then certainly the finished products. And what he was allowed to keep, the artist will have been prohibited from reusing in recognizable form without permission. The Ripa Grande in Rome (fig. 11) and Tivoli were certainly not strategically important locations, and so could be kept and even published immediately, while in the case of the Strait of Messina, it was a matter of waiting for hostilities to end.

The hypothesis also offers an explanation for why Bruegel – who built firmly on northern artistic traditions and showed relatively little interest in the art of antiquity or the Renaissance – undertook the journey. At the same time, it would explain why we have failed to identify a single drawing by him of antique monuments or contemporary Italian history paintings or sculpture. It seems all but impossible that he did not make any such drawings, yet for the most part his attention plainly lay elsewhere.

We might also wonder what role presumed travelling companions such as Maerten de Vos – very much an Italianist – and possibly Abraham Ortelius might have played in this hypothetical scenario. Ortelius later undertook similar journeys out of personal interest and for his own projects, accompanied by Joris Hoefnagel, another citizen of Antwerp, who would imitate Bruegel's 'chorographic' example (fig. 12). Their expeditions, by contrast, had a clearly commercial, scientific and exploratory purpose and the fruits were published – primarily in Georg Braun's and Frans Hogenberg's Civitates Orbis Terrarum.
Another possible travel companion of Bruegel was the sculptor and medallist Jacob Jonghelinck. Like Bruegel, he is known to have spent time in Italy in the years 1552–53 and it has been suggested on a number of occasions that they travelled together, at least for part of the time.71 Jacob was the brother of Nicolaes Jonghelinck, who owned and also possibly commissioned many of Bruegel’s later paintings.72 The young artist was supported by none other than Antoine Perrenot de Granvelle, in whose Brussels palace he was even allowed to install a bronze foundry.73

The Large Landscapes, Large Alpine Landscape, Naval Battle in the Strait of Messina and even, to some extent, the Sailing Vessels are products of Bruegel’s Italian journey that added a wholly different new dimension to Cock’s list. This too will have appealed to the erudite and art-loving cardinal. It is virtually certain that Granvelle later acquired works by Bruegel for his private collection or even commissioned them directly. The painting Landscape with the Flight into Egypt is probably one such work.74 Bruegel would further widen Cock’s list with works in the manner of Hieronymus Bosch. He even vied with Bosch artistically in a translatio-imitatio-aemulatio after the Italian model and this too is reflected in Granvelle’s collection. Tine Meganck has persuasively demon-

[fig. 10] Pieter Bruegel the Elder, The Fall of the Rebel Angels, 1562. Oil on panel, 117 × 162 cm. Brussels, Royal Museums of Fine Arts of Belgium, inv. no. 584.
Stratified that the cardinal might have commissioned *The Fall of the Rebel Angels* (fig. 10).\(^7\)

This iconographically and symbolically rich work is packed with references to Granvelle’s image of himself as a defender of the faith, but also to the wider interests and aspirations in the areas of natural history and art that likewise formed part of his personality. Like *The Seven Deadly Sins* (cat. no. 11), *The Last Judgement* (cat. no. 12) and *The Descent of Christ into Limbo* (cat. no. 14), the painting incorporates references to and quotations from the work of Bosch, of whom Granvelle too was an admirer.

Bruegel’s experience in the rendering of topographically accurate landscapes and views must also have come in useful, moreover, for his last known commission. Once again, van Mander is our only source in this regard: ‘Shortly before his death the councillors of Brussels commissioned him to make some pieces of the digging of the Brussels canal to Antwerp, but because of his death that was left undone.’\(^7\)\(^6\)

The unfinished assignment would probably have taken the form of a bird’s-eye view of the new waterway between Brussels and the river Rupel, 25 kilometres away. The ‘councillors of Brussels’ will undoubtedly have been well aware that Bruegel, like Vermeyen, ‘was neither inexperienced in geometry nor surveying nor other noble sciences’.

1 Van Mander 1604, fol. 233r: ‘He learned art with Pieter Koeck van Aelst whose daughter he later married – whom he, while she was still small, had often carried in his arms when he lived with Pieter.’ (‘Hy heeft de Const gheleert by Pieter Koeck van Aelst, wiens dochter hy later marries, en hadde dy so noch eene[n] was dicycle op den armen gedragen, doe by hy Pieter woonden.’) This is supported by archival evidence too. See, recently, Bastiaensen 2011, pp. 26–27. See also Jan Van der Stock’s essay in this volume, pp. 8–17.

2 Reference has rightly been made since Lutg to the influence of the Venetian School, especially the work of Titian and Campagnola, on the early landscapes. The later works also display a familiarity with the work of Raphael and Michelangelo. See, among others, Lutg 1927, pp. 111–129; Grossmann 1932, pp. 218–227; Grossmann 1961, pp. 153ff; Arndt 1972, pp. 69–121; Stridbeck 1977; Ten Brink Goldsmith 1993, pp. 205–314.

3 Mechelen, Stadsarchief, DD S, no. 52, fol. 64. Published by Adolf Monbailleu: see Monbailleu 1964, pp. 92–110, specifically pp. 109–110. See also Marijnissen et al. 1988, pp. 11–12. Regarding Peeter Baltens, see also Kostyshyn 1994.


6 ‘Hy is van hier gaen wercken by Ieroon Kock, en is voorts gheeryst in Vranckrijck, en van daer in Italien.’ Van Mander 1604, fol. 233r.

7 ‘de Landschaften op een betere manier benen te maken, dat meer veranderingen, op de nieuw Italiaensche oft Antijcksche wijze, en was wonder versiericht en voordgeh in’t ordeneren oft by een goeden’. Van Mander 1604, fol. 233r.


10 Hieronymus Cock, Map with the Siege of Boulogne in 1549, 1549, etching and engraving, 380 x 430 mm. See Pieter Martens in Van Grieken, Luijten and Van der Stock 2013, no. 104.

11 Luijten 2013.

12 There are several incongruities in Cock’s views, however, that suggest he was not actually familiar with the local topography and that he based his works on the drawings of other artists. For a discussion of this series, see Riggs 1977, nos. 1–25 and no. 16; see Peter Fabring in Van Grieken, Luijten and Van der Stock 2013, nos. 9–10.

13 Giorgio Ghisi after Raphael, The School of Athens, 1550, engraving, printed from two plates, 512 x 815 mm overall. See Riggs 1977, pp. 46–47 and no. 169; Ger Luijten in Van Grieken, Luijten and Van der Stock 2013, no. 20.

14 There might still have been some overlap in this early period between the many different activities – painting, etching and selling all these products. Analysis of the inventory of the copper plates belonging to the estate of Voukxken Dierickx following her death more than half a century later reveals that Cock also possessed printing plates for less prestigious graphic works. These might have been purchased at an early stage to pad out a then limited stocklist and make it economically viable. The prints in question certainly did not bear the publisher’s name, at any rate. Cock was evidently keen from the outset to be associated only with more prestigious printmaking. See Van Grieken 2013, pp. 22–29.

15 Virginie D’haene in Van Grieken, Luijten and Van der Stock 2013, no. 95.

16 Regarding Granvelle as a patron, see among others, Banz 2000a; Banz 2000b, pp. 389–409; Van Durme 1949, pp. 653–78. Granvelle’s interest in printmakers and publishers, especially Hieronymus Cock, is dealt with by Wouk 2015a, pp. 31–61 (with further bibliographical references).


18 Wouk 2015a, p. 44.

19 Van der Stock 2013, pp. 19 and 21, notes 61–63.

20 See also Bracke and Martens 2013, pp. 61. See also, regarding this map, Meurer 1991, p. 180 (with further bibliography); Karrow 1993, pp. 332–33.

21 See Bracke and Martens 2013, pp. 58–67; Serebrennikov 2001, pp. 186–215. Serebrennikov wrongly called this element of Cock’s output ‘abortive’, as she was not familiar with the publisher’s later editions in this field. See Bracke and Martens 2013, p. 67, note 26.

Hieronymus Cock after Vinko Paletin, Wall Map and Iberian Peninsula, 1555, etching and engraving on four plates, 768 × 950 mm overall; see Wouter Bracke in Van Grieken, Luijten and Van der Stock 2013, no. 91.

The only known impression is in Wolfenbüttel, Herzog August Bibliothek, inv. no. KF, 3–4. Copies of the reissue by Paul de la Houve in 1601 can be found in Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, inv. no. CP Rés. Ge D 12191, and in London, British Library, inv. no. K 84.5 (Riggs 1977, no. 284; Karrow 1993, p. 217). See Serebrennikov 2001, passim. This matter has been discussed at length by both Nils Büttrn and Boudewijn Bakker; see Büttrn 2000b, pp. 79–98, and Bakker 2004, pp. 170–83 (with extensive bibliographical references).

Anonymous, Panoramic Map of Eastern France Commissioned by Charles V, c. 1559, pen and ink, grey, blue and two shades of green washes, 660 × 110 mm, Madrid, Biblioteca Nacional de España, inv. no. Ms. MR/43/283; Serebrennikov 2001, p. 189, fig. 44.


The influence has been cited, for instance, of one of the Ignudi in Michelangelo’s Sistine Chapel on the figure of the foreground of Summer (see cat. no. 316), or a figure from Noah’s Sacrifice in the same chapel as a source of inspiration for one of the beekeepers in the drawing of the same name. See Orenstein and Sellink 2001, nos. 107 and 110; Royalton-Kisch 2001, pp. 15–16; regarding the influence of contemporary Italian art, see also note 2.


Woven in Brussels at Willem de Pannemaker’s workshop. The earliest known version of the tapestries can be found in Madrid, Patrimonio Nacional, inv. no. TA 11/1–10. The cartoons are located in the Kunsthistorisches Museum in Vienna, inv. no. GG 241. See Buchanan 2014, pp. 181–97.

In a letter to Abraham Ortelius dated 16 June 1561, Scipio Fabius, a physician from Bologna, enquires after ‘Martinus Vulpes’ (Maerten van Vos) and ‘Petrus Broucli’, while in a second letter of 14 April 1565, he asks Ortelius to give his regards to ‘Petrus Broucli’. Some have inferred from this that all three were in Italy together at the same time and that they made Fabius’ acquaintance there. It is improbable, however, that Ortelius too visited Italy at such an early date. He is more likely to have done so in 1560. He certainly travelled to Italy in 1578 with Hoefnagel. See Popham 1931, p. 188; Meganck 2017, pp. 5–9.


Regarding Hoefnagel’s contributions to the city atlas Civitates Orbis Terrarum, see Vignau-Wilberg 2017, p. 314–414.


Tourneur 1927, pp. 79–93.

Pieter Bruegel the Elder, Landscape with the Flight into Egypt, 1565, oil on panel, 371 × 55.6 cm, London, The Samuel Courtauld Trust, The Courtauld Collection, inv. no. P.1978.PG.47.

Pieter Bruegel the Elder, The Fall of the Rebel Angels, 1562, oil on panel, 171 × 162 cm, Brussels, Royal Museums of Fine Arts of Belgium, inv. no. 184.

Van Mander 1604, fol. 233v.
Bruegel in all his states

How small details in the printing plate can make a world of difference

As of 2019, the graphic oeuvre that may be attributed to Pieter Bruegel the Elder runs in its purest form to approximately seventy original print compositions. It comprises an outstanding artistic legacy, which Bruegel produced within the space of barely fifteen years. When René van Bastelaer published his substantial monograph on Bruegel in 1907, he counted a total of 279 engravings, etchings and woodcuts. The number of prints has thus been radically adjusted in the intervening years – something that did not always occur without a struggle. Even now, 450 years after the artist’s death, it is still possible to debate the precise number of works: after all, what precisely constitutes a finished ‘original’ in the art of printmaking?

Ever since the beginning of the twentieth century, when Bruegel became a subject of research in his own right, art historians have made repeated attempts to encapsulate his surviving graphic oeuvre in lists and overviews. Henri Hymans made some personal notes in preparation for a catalogue raisonné, but these remained unpublished. Research only got under way in earnest thanks to the efforts of scholars such as Axel L. Romdahl and Alfred von Würzbach, following which renewed attempts were made to pin down Bruegel’s printmaking, with varying degrees of success. Two curators of the Print Room at the Royal Library of Belgium played a pioneering role in this regard. For many years, the catalogues raisonnés of René van Bastelaer (1907) and Louis Lebeer (1969) were viewed as the definitive handbooks for the study of Bruegel’s graphic oeuvre. Research in this field was given a fresh impetus in 2006 with the publication of the New Hollstein volume on Pieter Bruegel the Elder by Nadine Orenstein and Manfred Sellink. All the prints attributed to Bruegel were thoroughly reviewed, consistently described and reordered.

It is not enough when compiling a catalogue of this kind simply to sum up the different compositions, be it as an original, a copy or an imitation: attention also has to be paid to ‘peculiar’ impressions – prints that differ because of deviating details or tiny changes. These deviations are stated and described for each print. The approach is most obvious in the description of different states. This is the case where deliberate adjustments are made to the printing plate between print runs. Extra lines are cut into the copper and unwanted elements removed. The new impression differs from the previous one and so a new ‘state’ has been created. It is hardly surprising, then, that the second state of The Temptation of Saint Anthony (fig. 1 and cat. no. 7) has been overlooked until now. The devil’s in the detail.

A new plate can stand over 1,200, 1,500 or in some cases even 2,000 impressions [...] Gerard Grammay, 1580

One or more new states have been added by the compiler of virtually every catalogue raisonné containing Bruegel’s graphic work. And that is likely to continue for the foreseeable future, as is witnessed by the newly discovered or rediscovered states featured in this exhibition catalogue. But what precisely is gained by homing in on these minute details? The relevance of the quest lies in the fresh understanding it can provide of the status and evolution of a print. When these details are set against the right sources, new light can be shed on these much-discussed engravings and etchings. The aspects in question do not relate to only Pieter Bruegel and his pictorial inventions or to the commercial strategies of Hieronymus Cock, but also to the unidentified assistants and their contributions to the printmaking process, to the nuances of visual interpretation and to the complex network of publishers who continued to print Bruegel’s art until long after his death – because new impressions were still being pulled from the original copper plates for almost two hundred years. Taking the differences between impressions as its basis, this chapter sets out to provide a more nuanced account of Bruegel’s
printmaking. This focus on small adjustments in what are generally rare impressions affords us a different view of the artist and his work. A number of critical caveats oblige us to look differently at the print compositions that have come down to us.

Commercial choices made by the publisher

The long-standing romantic image of the peintre-graveur — the idea that painters made their own prints — has been thoroughly modified in recent decades thanks to the research performed into large, historical print publishers. Anyone considering printmaking after designs by Pieter Bruegel, for instance, cannot avoid the figure of Hieronymus Cock. Together with his wife Volcxken Diericx, he founded a print publishing company in 1548, a stone’s throw from the Nieuwe Beurs in Antwerp. The couple named their business Aux Quatre Vents (At the Sign of the Four Winds), indicating how far its ambitions and influence would extend. In this way, Cock and Diericx played an important role in Antwerp’s development as one of the leading centres for the production of prints in sixteenth-century Europe. And their influence and significance persisted long afterwards, too. Cock and Diericx achieved commercial success through products that excelled in both their technical and artistic ingenuity. Within a carefully conceived publishing strategy, they commissioned engravings and etchings with a wide variety of subject matter. Existing traditions were continued, such as the printing of commemorative historical prints and portraits. There were series devoted to classical antiquity and ruins, architecture and ornament, landscapes and cartography. Attention was also paid to the work of great Italian masters and to that of their counterparts from the Low Countries. Young talents too — Pieter Bruegel the Elder, not least — were given the necessary space in which to develop.

The publisher was the hub of the business. He coordinated and financed the production process, commissioned preparatory drawings from the artist, had those designs cut in copper by experienced engravers, oversaw printing in the workshop of a specialized printer and organized the distribution, both in Antwerp and internationally. The artist played only a modest role within the overall project. All the same, Bruegel’s contribution ought not to be underestimated: he enjoyed a considerable amount of freedom when it came to composing his print designs.

[fig. 1a] First state of Bruegel’s Temptation of Saint Anthony (see cat. no. 7). Amsterdam, Rijksprentenkabinet.

[fig. 1b] Second state of Bruegel’s Temptation of Saint Anthony (cat. no. 7). Brussels, KBR, Print Room.
All the same, new themes could only be initiated in consultation with the publisher, for whom the financial return was the primary concern. Cock must therefore have challenged Bruegel’s artistic talents time and again, to famously successful effect. Replacing the bears in the drawn design *Landscape with Bears* with the figures of Christ and the Devil, for instance, resulted in a print that appealed not only to an admirer of landscapes, but also to the pious art lover (cat. no. 1).13

Although Bruegel enrolled as a painter in the Antwerp Guild of St Luke in 1551, it was primarily as a draughtsman and print designer that he made his name in this earliest part of his career.4 Between 1554 and 1568, he designed no fewer than sixty prints for Cock,5 for which just over half the original drawings have survived.6 The earliest designs display a somewhat looser style, which left more room for interpretation by the engraver. Content and composition sprouted from the master’s genius, but whether or not the drawing was transferred successfully to the plate depended first and foremost on the skill of the engraver. It was no easy venture, therefore. Print publishers usually called on skilled engravers who copied the design as meticulously as possible. Cock was an accomplished etcher himself, but he also frequently turned to the brothers Joannes and Lucas van Doetecum, Pieter van der Heyden, Philips Galle (before 1563), Frans Huys (until 1562) and Cornelis Cort (until 1565) to have his printing plates cut. The method they used to transpose Bruegel’s original design into print form began by coating a hot copper plate with white wax. A layer of coloured chalk or powder was then applied to the back of the drawing itself. When the printmaker traced the lines of the drawing with a metal stylus, the powder left an impression of the original design on the wax. This served as a guide for the engraver when cutting the composition into the copper using a burin.7

Bruegel became increasingly aware over time of the impact the engraving process had on the translation of his designs, and so he began to tighten their execution. He paid more and more attention to the refined rendering of the many details, going so far as to include lines and dots to achieve a sense of texture and depth in the final printed impression.8 Bruegel’s designs were like musical scores, which had to be executed almost verbatim by the engraver. This is not to say that adjustments could not be made during the production process: a frog in *Avarice* (cat. no. 11d) was moved, for instance, and the bishop in the design for *Lust* (cat. no. 11f and fig. 2a-b) lost his mitre in the final print.

Cock may undoubtedly be regarded as the first and most important publisher of Bruegel prints. All the same, other publishers too availed themselves of the opportunity during the artist’s life to produce original engraved compositions by the master. Following the example of *The
Kermis of St George (cat. no. 24), which Cock offered for sale in or before 1558, Bartholomeus de Mompere had no qualms about publishing The Kermis at Hoboken (cat. no. 25) a year later, based on a drawing by Bruegel. Philips Galle, who had worked as an engraver for Cock but then began to publish on his own account in Haarlem from 1563 onwards, also produced a print of The Parable of the Good Shepherd (cat. no. 28) in 1565. And Maarten Peeters commissioned Johannes Wierix to cut The Drunkard Pushed into the Pigsty (cat. no. 39a) around 1568. The latter engraving does not derive from a preparatory drawing, however, but from a Bruegel painting dating from 1557.

After the artist had died in 1569, Cock still saw an opportunity to have several of the late master's designs cut in copper. The final drawn compositions that Bruegel had produced for Aux Quatre Vents were Spring and Summer, which meant that The Four Seasons series was left unfinished on his death. Cock had it completed in 1570 by Hans Bol with Autumn and Winter (cat. nos. 33c and 33d). The creation of The Dirty Bride (cat. no. 22) that same year is more remarkable. Bruegel initially drew the composition on a wood block, with a view to having the work published as a woodcut. For an unknown reason, however, the project was halted halfway through the gouging process. The commercially minded Cock published the image posthumously as a copper engraving in 1570.

The Four Seasons and The Dirty Bride are among the last prints published with Cock’s address. The great Antwerp publisher died soon afterwards, although this by no means meant the end of Aux Quatre Vents as a publishing house. His widow Volcxken Diericx continued to run the firm for another thirty years. In doing so, she could rely on a rich collection of printing plates, including the ones after designs by Bruegel, which were already among the shop’s stock. Diericx had three more plates cut after Bruegel posthumously: Festival of Fools (cat. no. 34), The Peasant Wedding Dance (cat. no. 26) and The Battle about Money (cat. no. 35). The appearance of these prints suggests that they are more likely to have been based on surviving sketches or unfinished print models by the artist. Nevertheless, the engraver Pieter van der Heyden had enough experience of cutting Bruegel’s originals to fill in any gaps while finishing the printing plates. The prints were no longer published with Cock’s address, but simply with a reference to Aux Quatre Vents.19

Philips Galle moved from Haarlem to Antwerp after Cock’s death in 1570.20 Having set up his own print publishing business in the commercial metropolis, he was able to fill the gap in the market that had arisen. Galle, too, made or commissioned several printing plates based on designs by Bruegel after the latter’s death. He used a surviving figure study by Bruegel, for instance, as the basis for an engraved image of Christ and the Disciples on the Way to Emmaus (cat. no. 32). The Triumph of Time (cat. no. 36), meanwhile, is likely to have been inspired by another surviving sketch. For its part, The Death of the Virgin (cat. no. 31) was published in print form at the request of Abraham Ortelius.

Avant la lettre states

If we consider the publisher’s list of Aux Quatre Vents in its entirety, it is notable that Cock and Diericx consistently paid a great deal of attention to the quality and finish of the engravings and etchings. Designer and publisher alike must have kept close watch, as it were, over the engraver’s shoulder. Bruegel’s precise execution of the print designs certainly provided a solid guide for the person tasked with transposing it by burin, etching needle or gouge. Regular quality control must nevertheless have occurred during the production process. Genuine trial proofs that will have played a part in this context have not survived the passage of time. A few so-called avant la lettre prints have, however, been preserved. These are impressions for which the composition had already been cut entirely on the copper plate but where the lettering (or part of it) is still missing. For example, several impressions are known of The Large Landscapes before the titles were

![fig. 3] Bruegel’s Alchemist (see cat. no. 17) as avant la lettre state, as auctioned at Boerner’s in Leipzig on 14 November 1933.
added (cat. nos. 2a and 2f), some of the *Sailing Vessels* lack the privilege or publisher’s address (cat. nos. 6b, 6c and 6h) and several rare examples exist of *The Alchemist* (fig. 3 and cat. no. 17), *The Stone Operation* or *The Witch of Mallegem* (cat. no. 18) and *The Dirty Bride* (cat. no. 22), in which the signatures or the captions are missing. All these prints may be viewed as states created immediately before the final finishing of the plate.

**A privilege**

Creating a new printing plate was an expensive affair. To secure their investment, print publishers therefore sought in certain cases to obtain a ‘privilege’ from the ruler or another high-placed person before bringing the print to market. If this was granted, a small statement could be added to the image as a guarantee of originality. A *privilegio* was a form of copyright, in which the provider of the privilege granted the publisher the exclusive right to reproduce the print composition. This prevented rivals from selling cheaper copies of the original print, which were generally of inferior quality.²¹ Cock made grateful use of privileges on a number of occasions. His *School of Athens*, for example, cut by Giorgio Ghisi after Raphael, is marked ‘HIERONYMV’S COCK PICTOR EXCVDEBAT: 1550. CVM GRATIA ET PRIVILEGIO P. AN. 8.’ This meant that the print, which was published in 1550, could not be reproduced anywhere within the empire for a period of eight years. Cock secured a *privilegio* for many other engravings and etchings in the years that followed.²² Documents have been located in the archives for only a few of the privileges granted. It is known, for example, that Cock petitioned the Great Council in 1562 regarding two maps he intended to publish. A privilege was needed, he argued, ‘for protection and with a prohibition on all printers, booksellers and others for a period of eight years so that they may not print or have printed or imitate the maps, on pain of confiscation and a fine of twenty Carolus guilders.’²³ He was granted the privilege on 15 May of that year, albeit only for four years and with a fine of 10 guilders.
A privilege for artistic prints was usually requested for entirely new pictorial material. In the case of Bruegel’s graphic work, however, it is not possible to draw any general conclusions regarding the application for and granting of privileges, due in part to the lack of relevant source material. Such protection is not yet present at any rate on the first prints that Cock commissioned after designs by Bruegel. There is no trace of a privilege in either the landscapes or the earliest experiments with Bosch’s visual language. Things changed temporarily in the years 1558–59, when the words ‘Cum privilegio’ were systematically added to The Seven Deadly Sins (cat. no. 11), The Last Judgement (cat. no. 12), The Alchemist (cat. no. 17) and The Stone Operation or The Witch of Mallegem (cat. no. 18). After that, Cock again published prints without a privilege.

We are still largely in the dark when it comes to the creation of the Naval Battle in the Strait of Messina (cat. no. 5). A strip of typeset text has been added to some of the first states with the words ‘CORNELIVS A DALEM EXCVDEBAT; ANNO .M.D.LXI. CVM PRIVILEGIO’. Cornelis van Dalem probably acted only as financier, collaborating with Cock to see the work through to completion. Once the plates were in Cock’s possession, a cartouche was engraved on the copper plate and Cock took over the previous privilege, including the year, from the first state.24

In 1568, Cock sold the Sailing Vessels series (cat. no. 6 and fig. 4). We know that it ran to ten prints, but the series was not finished in a single process. Frans Huys cut eight of the printing plates, with Cornelis Cort probably completing the cycle after Huys died in 1562. The project seems to have taken until 1565. The eight plates cut by Huys incorporate the privilege, but it is absent from the two later plates.

We can only guess, therefore, as to what motivated Cock to protect some of Bruegel’s images with a privilegio and not others. Future studies, including archive research, might shed light on the matter.

Latin inscriptions for a humanist clientele

Louis Lebeer rightly noted in 1969 that some art historians have let their enthusiasm run away with them when interpreting Bruegel’s prints. This includes overanalysing the image, reading all sorts of philosophical musings into them and referring extensively to sixteenth-century literature. Their sometimes subjective analysis led these scholars more than once to lose all contact with Bruegel himself and hence to overshoot their objective.25 The image of the artist that prevails today has been shaped by a mass of observations, interpretations and ideas accumulated over centuries. Not only the pictorial elements but also the texts appended below the images have been scrutinized. By interpreting text and image, some scholars claimed to have laid bare Bruegel’s soul. In my view, however, it is highly doubtful that the added texts offer any insight into Bruegel as a person. While Bruegel did provide the design for the prints, an additional layer of meaning was often created by the addition of captions cut on the printing plate by the engraver. We know that Cock called on several humanist friends to assist in the composition of some of the title prints and dedicatory texts in the publisher’s list.26 This does not seem to have been the case, however, for the Latin phrases in the Bruegel prints. Although this cannot be substantiated, Cock himself appears to have inscribed these inscriptions with pen and brown ink below the preparatory drawings. The quotations were drawn from well-known classical and contemporary writings, either verbatim or paraphrased.

The development of digital techniques in recent decades means that we can now use several new research methods to interpret and contextualize Bruegel’s graphic oeuvre more easily. Where a thorough knowledge of classical literature was once required, it is now enough in certain cases to enter part of a Latin quotation in an online search engine to identify the original source.27 Although a little creativity is sometimes needed – especially when it comes to paraphrases – it has nevertheless been possible to trace the original source text for the majority of the Latin captions in Bruegel’s graphic oeuvre. The results of this work are reflected in the present catalogue. Further research will be needed to determine why these particular sentences were chosen.

It is interesting to note that errors were made on a number of occasions, in terms of both content and of form, attributable in the first case to Cock as author and in the second to engravers such as Pieter van der Heyden. When the Antwerp publisher adapted a passage from the Psalms, for instance, to place below Bruegel’s Descent of Christ into Limbo (cat. no. 14), he made several mistakes in his Latin. Cases and words were wrongly transcribed.28 The engraver, who is unlikely to have been familiar with the classical language, duly repeated the errors. It also happened that the engraver himself skipped a letter, with the result that the line of text had to be tinkered with afterwards.29 The only reason justice has a first and a second state is because the letter ‘A’ in ‘VIVA[N]T’ had to be finished off properly (cat. no. 13d). Errors of this kind did not only occur, incidentally, in the prints that Cock produced: the plate for The Triumph of Time, for instance, which Philips Galle published after Bruegel’s death, included the non-existent word ‘mucetum’, which had to be altered in a later state to ‘invectum’ (cat. no. 36).

Whether sixteenth-century humanist art lovers were bothered by mistakes like this remains an open question. Either way, it will not have had too great an impact on sales of Bruegel prints. After all, the owner of a print was always free to make the necessary corrections in pen and ink, as occurred for three of the Virtues held in the Print Room at the KBR (cat. nos. 13e, 13f and 13g).
[fig. 5a] Bruegel's preparatory drawing for Justice (Justicia) (see cat. no. 13d), with a Latin caption added by another hand. Brussels, KBR, Print Room.

[fig. 5b] First state of Bruegel’s Justice (Justicia) (detail, cat. no. 13d), in which the crossbar of the ‘A’ in ‘VIVA[N]T’ is missing. Brussels, KBR, Print Room.

[fig. 5c] Second state of Bruegel’s Justice (Justicia) (detail, cat. no. 13d), in which the ‘A’ has been completed. Brussels, KBR, Print Room.
Cock’s ABC

An empty text margin on a print does not always indicate an avant la lettre state. Cock probably felt it unnecessary to have an inscription engraved on the copper plate for *The Stone Operation* or *The Witch of Mallegem* (cat. no. 18). This was only done decades later, when the plate came into the possession of Theodoor Galle. And an explanatory text did not have to be engraved on the plate per se; it could also be added to a finished print using a printing press.30 This was a common practice, of which multiple examples from Aux Quatre Vents are known. A rare archive document sheds additional light on the importance attached to this type of added text.

On 2 August 1566, Cock wrote to Antoine Perrenot de Granvelle, who was in Rome at the time, regarding a map of Burgundy that the cardinal had commissioned. The publisher explained how he intended to approach the project and that he had some further questions for his client too. Granvelle was asked, for instance, to choose the dedication to be printed on the map.31 In addition to the text itself, the publisher was unsure about the typography and so he enclosed samples of several different typefaces with his letter.32 However, Granvelle did not provide an answer.

Roman letters are so widely used today in the western world that we now attach relatively little importance to the typography of texts. In the course of the sixteenth century, by contrast, an important evolution took place, in which Roman letters slowly but surely displaced Gothic ones. This had substantial implications for ordinary readers, who were not familiar with the ‘Romeynscher A.B.C.’ and often struggled to decipher it as a result. In the foreword to his 1549 *Reglen van Metselrijen* (Rules of Architecture), Bruegel’s future father-in-law Pieter Coecke van Aelst wrote that he had used ‘braabantsche lettere’ as the typeface for his publication so that the text would be accessible to the common man.33

In the 1560s, Cock published several prints with typeset text added to the engraved image. There were two ways of doing this: printing the text onto strips of paper and then gluing these to the bottom of the print – as is the case with *The Stone Operation* or *The Witch of Mallegem* – or running the same sheet through both an intaglio and a typographical printing press. In the latter case, the text was printed on the same sheet of paper as the copper plate. Cock was not equipped with a typographical printing press himself, let alone the materials and knowledge needed to set such texts, and so he was obliged to work with a specialist partner, the identity of whom remained unknown for a long time, although there were strong indications that it was Christophe Plantin.34

When the Proctor-Haebler system (a research method used primarily by book historians) was recently applied to Bruegel prints with typographical additions, it was possible to confirm the identification of the unknown text printer as Plantin.35 The method developed by Robert Proctor identifies the typefaces used based on their size. To this end, a fixed number of lines of text have to be measured.36 Konrad Haebler argued that the shape of the letters also needs to be taken into account. By testing the results of both observations against models in Hendrik Vervliet’s reference work on typography in sixteenth-century Antwerp, it became possible to identify the printer of the text.37

Various print compositions after Bruegel are currently known, to which a typographical text has been added with a letterpress. These are *Everyman* (cat. no. 16), *The Wild Man* or *The Masquerade of Orson and Valentine* (cat. no. 21), *The Stone Operation* or *The Witch of Mallegem* (cat. no. 18) and *The Alchemist* (cat. no. 17). The most interesting of these four is undoubtedly *Everyman*. It was only when the printing plate came into the possession of the Antwerp print publisher Joannes Galle in the middle of the seventeenth century that a second state was created by adding various inscriptions to the copper plate. Consequently, the composition remained unchanged for over half a century. An idea of the print runs can be obtained, however, by looking at the verses in French and Dutch, which were printed below the edge of the plate on the same sheet. Based on the combinations of typefaces used, we can distinguish four individual versions. On four separate occasions a text was formed by placing individual letters in a composing stick (fig. 6). Versions A1 and A2 (figs 6b–c), both set in Ameet Tavernier’s Pica Roman and Pica Italic, differ only in terms of punctuation.38 In version B (fig. 6d), the capitals at the beginning of the Dutch verses are set in Robert Granjon’s Civilité typeface.39 Version C (fig. 6e), lastly, combines the English Roman and English Italic typeface with Johann Neudorffer’s Fraktur typeface for the capital letters of the Dutch verses.40 All these typefaces were owned in the mid-sixteenth century by Plantin’s printing firm. He is therefore likely to have been responsible for printing the added typeset text. Precisely the same typefaces were used for the texts added below *The Wild Man* or *The Masquerade of Orson and Valentine* and *The Stone Operation* or *The Witch of Mallegem* as we find in version C of *Everyman*. Only in the case of the French poem below *The Alchemist* is it still unclear at this point in which typeface it is set and hence who it was that printed it.
[fig. 6a] Bruegel’s *Everyman* (cat. no. 16), with version C as typeset addition. Brussels, KBR, Print Room.

[fig. 6b] Typeset version A1 of Bruegel’s *Everyman*, Dutch verses (detail, cat. no. 16). Brussels, KBR, Print Room.


[fig. 6d] Typeset version B of Bruegel’s *Everyman*, Dutch verses (detail, cat. no. 16). Brussels, KBR, Print Room.

[fig. 6e] Typeset version C of Bruegel’s *Everyman*, Dutch verses (detail, cat. no. 16). Brussels, KBR, Print Room.
The trick with the counterproof

In autumn 1653 two members of the Antwerp Wildens family, the painters Jan Wildens and his son Jeremias, died within barely three months of one another. The notary Hendrik Fighe was duly requested in spring 1654 to draw up an estate inventory. Most of the items in this surviving document were left by Jeremias, but goods are also described that still remained in his late father’s study (‘op ’t comptoir van des overledene vader’). Among those goods were ‘two books of landscapes by the Elder Bruegel’, more specifically ‘de drucken ende wederdrucken’. The word wederdrucken refers to a particular variety of impression, probably so-called contre-épreuves (counterproofs).

The printing plates for these Bruegel landscapes had long since left Antwerp by the time Wildens senior and junior were laid to rest. They were already listed in the 1601 inventory of Volcxken Diericx’s estate as a set of ‘fourteen copper plates of Bruegel’s Landscapes’. The number was fourteen because the twelve-part series of Large Landscapes (cat. no. 2) was supplemented – more than likely – by the Landscape with the Temptation of Christ (cat. no. 1) and the Large Alpine Landscape (cat. no. 3). We then lose track of the plates for several decades before they re-emerge after 1633 in the Kalverstraat in Amsterdam. A publisher’s address added to the second state of Rustic Solicitude (cat. no. 2g) identifies Cornelis Danckerts as the interim owner. The set of plates then ended up at the shop of the print seller Clement de Jonghe, who had his address in Kalverstraat cut on the plate for Wooded Region (cat. no. 2i). The inventory of de Jonghe’s estate, drawn up on 11 February 1679, still refers to the complete set of ‘14 fol. Lantschappen Breugel’.

In my view, the counterproofs date from the first half of the seventeenth century, precisely when the plates arrived in Amsterdam.

At least one counterproof is known today for nine of the compositions in The Large Landscapes series (fig. 7). A single reversed impression of Landscape with the Temptation of Christ also survived. All it takes to create a counterproof is to lay a damp blank sheet on top of the freshly printed impression while the ink is still wet. The ink then leaves a reversed impression on the back of the new sheet. A single pass can therefore create two prints. Little attention has so far been paid in the literature regarding the phenomenon of counterproofs, and historical sources have little to say about how such sheets were used. It is generally assumed that counterproofs had a part to play when a publisher wanted to make adjustments to the copper...
plate, given that it was easier to make corrections, additions and retouches to the plate when these were worked out in advance on a counterproof. It meant that the engraver did not have to work in reverse when adjusting the copper. However, this seems unlikely in the case of the counterproofs of Bruegel’s landscapes: the differences between the states are so minimal that the engraver would have had no difficulty in making them straight off. In the light of the wederdrucken in the possession of Jan Wildens, it seems possible to me that a counterproof made it easier for the painter to integrate certain pictorial elements from Bruegel’s work into his own landscapes.

Old plates, new states

Around the year 1600 the Aux Quatre Vents list included approximately 1,600 copper plates, 65 of which were designed by Bruegel. Nowadays, the most common differences between states that we detect, based on surviving impressions, relate to a change in a publisher’s address. This would occur each time the plate changed ownership. The edition history of the Bruegel prints, which covers a period of almost two centuries, is a complex story of difficult-to-trace copper plates and obscure print dealers, who continued their efforts to sell these old Bruegel prints. When the story of a publisher in one place came to an end, the plate would later crop up again at another firm. A detailed inventory of the stock and resources at Aux Quatre Vents was drawn up in 1601 when Volckxken Diericx died, thirty years after her husband, Hieronymus Cock. The printing plates found new owners following a public auction at the Friday market in Antwerp. The fame of the publishing house sparked interest both locally and internationally. This is how the aforementioned series of fourteen landscapes after Bruegel came to be in Amsterdam, where the series remained in print for many more years, thanks to Cornelis Danckerts and then Clement de Jonghe. At least seven printing plates, including The Kermis of St George (cat. no. 24) and the Naval Battle in the Strait of Messina (cat. no. 5), were likewise purchased at the auction by the Parisian publisher Paul de la Houve. That same year, the Frenchman had Cock’s address altered to ‘Au Palais A Paris Paul de la Houve excud 1601’.

The printing plate for The Kermis of St George ended up in the possession of Pierre Bertrand, another Parisian publisher. He altered the publisher’s address once again, but also added – for so far unknown reasons – several inscriptions. An impression of this third state can be found in the Bibliothèque nationale de France, Paris. This print belonged to Michel Hennin, a nineteenth-century collector, who had pasted the work into an album devoted to the history of France. He interpreted the inscriptions ‘Gille le niay’ and ‘le fou’ as references to figures from the Commedia dell’arte, prompting him to date the Bruegel print to the year 1645, when an Italian theatre company was hosted by the court of a very young King Louis XIV. It remains an open question as to whether Bertrand did indeed intend the inscriptions to refer to developments in seventeenth-century Parisian theatre. Either way, this is a clear illustration of how Bruegel’s prints often came to be buried over the centuries beneath layers of disparate meaning and interpretations. Incidentally, the same impression in the Bibliothèque nationale de France also bears the different inscriptions, added in pen and brown ink, that were incorporated into the fourth state of the print.

Despite the ‘European wanderings’ of some prints and records, the majority of Volckxken
Diericx’s estate remained in Antwerp. Her godson Theodoor Galle acquired at least three hundred printing plates, including several for Bruegel prints. He was employed at the time in the family firm run by his father Philips Galle, located in De Witte Lelie in the Huiddevettersstraat in Antwerp. As Bruegel’s graphic work was still in strong demand during that period, Theodoor, who due to the auction had missed out on obtaining certain plates after the master’s designs, had copies of them made. This is how the ‘Galle versions’ of the copper plates for The Thin Kitchen and The Fat Kitchen (cat. no. 20) came to be created. Galle had his publisher’s address engraved on other original printing plates that he had managed to purchase. In addition, he added a few inscriptions to certain Bruegel compositions, including the Sleeping Pedlar Robbed by Monkeys (cat. no. 19) and The Stone Operation or The Witch of Mallegem (cat. no. 18). When it came to creating new states, Theodoor’s son, Joannes Galle, went considerably further.

As a member of the third generation active in the Galle family business, Joannes could rely during his active period on the substantial list bequeathed to him by his father and grandfather. Following the death of his father Theodoor on 8 December 1633, Joannes’s mother, Catharina Moerentorf, had continued to run the business for a while, before officially turning it over to her eldest son on 26 May 1636. The collection of copper plates ran to no fewer than 3,260 by that point. The majority of them were stored at the family house and shop on the Huiddevettersstraat. Joannes continued to run the print publishing business until his death in 1676.

A great many new states of Bruegel prints were created while the plates were in Joannes Galle’s possession. It is definitely worth comparing these states against Galle’s known publisher’s list (c. 1650) – helpfully edited and republished recently by Peter Fuhring – which was produced with a view to promoting the Antwerp publisher’s sales. The modifications Joannes had made to the plates can be interpreted as reference marks to help him order his large collection of printing plates, to create structure within a specific series of prints and/or to provide explanatory texts (in three languages) for particular compositions.

If we examine the list from the mid-sixteenth century, we can partially infer the order of the collection. The title plate of the series Discovery of the New World after Johannes Stradanus contains the letters ‘a.a.’ in the upper left corner. This is followed in the list by Stradanus’ Bombyx or Silkworm series, which is marked ‘b.b.’ in the same position. The publisher’s list continues with work by Maarten van Heemskerck, namely the four-part Three Ages of Man (‘c.c.’), the three-part The Nine Best (‘d.d.’) and the eight plates for The Triumph of Patience (‘e.e.’). Although the plate for Bruegel’s Triumph of Time (cat. no. 36) was not part of a series, the reference ‘f.f.’ was placed in the upper left corner, following the logic of the list.

Structure was also applied to the stand-alone print series. As had occurred with the set of eight printing plates for Bruegel’s Seven Deadly Sins (cat. no. 11), which ended up in the possession of the Parisian publisher Pierre Mariette II in the second half of the seventeenth century, Joannes Galle also numbered the plates within certain series. The initial set of ten copper plates for Bruegel’s Sailing Vessels (cat. no. 6) had been increased to twelve by his father Theodoor in the first half of the seventeenth century. When the plates came into Joannes’s hands, he reduced the number to eleven. He did not change the publisher’s address of his father, but he did insert a number in the lower right corner of each image to replace the privilege. Impressions of the prints numbered 1, 2, 3, 4 and 10 of this series have not survived,
and the question of which plate was added to the original set of ten also remains unanswered.

So as to be able to sell more prints to a client, rather than being able to offer only existing engravings, the commercially minded publisher reused old printing plates to create new series of his own. In each case, Joannes Galle had titles and inscriptions added in Latin, French and Dutch as clarification for the seventeenth-century collector. The plate with an allegorical representation of Temperance with Personified Sins (fig. 8a), previously published by Gerard de Jode, was reworked as the title plate of a series. In the lower left corner is stated in three languages that the new series consists of Comical and Entertaining Emblems Invented and Painted by Sundry Artful Old Masters (‘Cluchtighe en vermaeckelijcke Sinnebelden van verscheyde constighe oude Schilders geinventeert ende geschildert’). A small capital letter was placed in the text margin on the right to indicate the coherence between the prints. The title print bears the letter ‘A’ (fig. 8a). It is followed by several images after designs by Maerten de Vos labelled ‘B’ (The Vanity of Woman), ‘C’ (Women Fighting Over a Man’s Trousers) and ‘D’ (The Egg Dance). The series also included work by Bosch followers, such as The Dissolute Household (‘E’) and The Blue Boat (‘F’); and there was a Battle Between Peasants and Soldiers by Peeter Baltens and Money Laughs (‘O’) and The Chariot of War (‘T’) by Hendrick Goltzius. All the same, the majority of the prints included here are after Bruegel: namely, Saint James and the Fall of the Magician Hermogenes (‘H’) (cat. no. 9b), The Land of Cockaigne (‘T’) (fig. 8b and cat. no. 37),

[fig. 9] Fifth state of Bruegel’s Alchemist (see cat. no. 17), published by Jacobus de Man, late 17th–early 18th century. Brussels, private collection.
Ice Skating before the Gate of St George, Antwerp (‘K’) (cat. no. 23), the copied Thin Kitchen and The Fat Kitchen (‘L–M’) (cat. no. 20), Big Fish Eat Little Fish (‘N’) (cat. no. 8), Everyman (‘P’) (cat. no. 16), The Battle about Money (‘Q’) (cat. no. 35) and The Parable of the Good Shepherd (‘S’) (cat. no. 28). Some letters from the series are still missing, but will hopefully be located in the near future. Given the variety of subjects included in the series, it is quite possibly the one described in Galle’s list as ‘Plusieurs autres diverses farceries & choses recreatives’.  

The last generation of publishers

Following Joannes Galle’s death in 1676, his heirs decided to dispose of the publisher’s stock. A public sale was organized and received a lot of publicity, including a mention in the Amsterdamsche Courant. An advertisement published in this newspaper on 4 February 1677 stated the following:

In Antwerp, on 15 February 1677 and subsequent days, at De Witte Lelie, the home of the late Joannes Galle Esq. in the Huidevettersstraat, the following plates shall be sold, comprising a great quantity, including landscapes, histories, both religious and worldly, from the Old and the New Testaments, architecture, perspective, four-footed animals, birds, fish, hunting, battles, et cetera. With many particular plates of different sizes, small and large, the catalogue of which is available in Amsterdam from Nicolaas Vischer.  

The same newspaper announced on 18 February that, for an as yet unknown reason, the sale of the plates had been postponed.
until 8 March. The catalogue referred to in the announcement does not appear to exist. Fuhring has concluded from this that the auction probably never took place.\(^6\) The plates and the remaining prints appear to have been sold off privately to other publishers. The big question remains as to precisely how this occurred.

It has been possible to identify a later publisher for only a handful of original plates after designs by Bruegel. Thanks to a recently discovered state of Bruegel’s *Alchemist* (fig. 9 and cat. no. 17), we now know that the plate ended up with Jacobus de Man, who was about thirty-two years old when Joannes Galle died.\(^6\) This ‘dealer in images’ (‘negotiant in beeldens’) from Ypres settled in Antwerp when he was almost thirty. He was registered there in 1676 in the *Liggeren* of the Guild of St Luke. Buying plates from Galle’s old list was not a bad move when it came to expanding his print-selling business. In addition to the plate for *The Alchemist*, he acquired a second ‘Bruegel’ plate – consequently, the address on the copy of the *Festival of Fools* (cat. no. 34) that Joannes Galle had commissioned henceforth read *Ja. De Man*.\(^67\)

Until now, nothing was known about Jan Houwens, whose address appears in the frame of the third state of Bruegel’s *Resurrection of Christ* (cat. no. 29). Manfred Sellink stated in 2001 that Houwens could be linked only to this particular state but that otherwise no information about him existed.\(^68\) Fuhring subsequently added that Houwens was probably active in Antwerp.\(^69\) However, new archive research has shown that he worked in Rotterdam in Holland rather than Brabant, and that he ran a print shop on the Vissersdijk, under the name ‘*De Koning van Groot Brittanjen*’ (‘The King of Great Britain’).\(^70\) It is indeed the case that very little information is available regarding the precise content of Houwens’s list, which appears to have consisted in many cases of plates he had purchased and then had reprinted for his own profit. He also sold maps and books. In autumn 1723, the seventy-two-year-old Houwens began to think of retirement. An inventory of his stock drawn up on 20 January 1724 shows that he sold a ‘crate of copper printing plates’ to his son Isaac for 900 guilders.\(^71\) It cannot be determined from the surviving archive documents whether these plates included that of Bruegel’s *Resurrection of Christ*. Isaac died in 1733, a year before his father.\(^72\)

Susanna Verbruggen from Kruiibeke in East Flanders was the third and final eighteenth-century owner of a Bruegel plate. In 1710 she registered with the Guild of St Luke in Antwerp as a publisher and seller of prints. Verbruggen moved her shop to *De Herpe*, a house in Keizerstraat, Antwerp, in 1739. Her main focus was on the publication of religious prints and prayer cards.\(^73\) She also published *The Kermis at Hoboken* (fig. 10 and cat. no. 25), after first having her publisher’s address engraved on the plate. After Verbruggen died on 18 April 1752,\(^74\) her print shop remained in business, her heirs having sold it to Isabelle Hertens.\(^75\) It was probably during this period that the plate for *The Kermis at Hoboken* was lost. The copper was already in such poor condition that even the addition of fresh hatching was no longer sufficient to rescue it.

De Man, Houwens and Verbruggen belong to the last generation (thus far identified) of re-publishers of Bruegel prints. They were all active in the first half of the eighteenth century and continued to produce impressions from the original plates almost two centuries after the artist’s death. Further research is needed to determine the extent to which these ‘old’ but successful compositions remained in demand among art-loving print collectors. Indications are that Bruegel prints disappeared from the trade completely during the course of the eighteenth century, finally bringing an end to the long and successful edition history of Bruegel’s graphic oeuvre.

---

\(^{1}\) This essay is a first, concise presentation of some interim findings produced by my doctoral research. The results of this study will be explored at much greater length in my forthcoming thesis, the working title of which is ‘Branding Bruegel: An Inquiry into the Mechanisms of Bruegel’s Graphic Practices and Afterlife’.
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Bruegel’s drawing for *The Dirty Bride* (c. 1566)

*AFINGERPRINT* project case study

The unfinished woodblock with *The Wedding of Mopsus and Nisa*

In terms of his graphic oeuvre, Pieter Bruegel is best known as a designer of copper engravings. He was very fond of this technique, in which he produced brilliant, detailed designs commissioned by the publisher Hieronymus Cock (*Aux Quatre Vents*) after returning to Antwerp from Italy in 1554. By contrast, the body of work comprising Bruegel’s woodcuts is very limited: the only survivors are *The Wild Man*, also known as *The Masquerade of Orson and Valentine*, from 1566 (cat. no. 21), and the unfinished, cut woodblock for *The Dirty Bride* or *The Wedding of Mopsus and Nisa* (fig. 1 and cat. no. 22). The pen drawing on the block was likely intended as a counterpart of *The Wild Man*, done in the same year (fig. 2). The dimensions of the print of *The Wild Man* and the block for *The Dirty Bride* are virtually identical. An unknown publisher commissioned the set of woodcuts. Bruegel also used both scenes in his painting *The Battle between Carnival and Lent* (1559).

The cutting of the woodblock with the drawing of Mopsus and Nisa was almost certainly begun in an Antwerp woodcutter’s workshop following the design that Bruegel drew directly onto
the block. There are several possible reasons why the woodcut medium rather than that of a burin engraving was chosen for these popular subjects. First of all, there were talented woodcutters working in Antwerp. Moreover, woodcuts could be produced faster and more cheaply than copper engravings. The blocks were also less subject to wear and tear during the printing process, allowing larger editions to be produced. The activities of the many woodcutters in Antwerp focused, among others, on Christophe Plantin’s printing works, with which Bruegel’s patron probably had close contacts.

The woodcut for The Dirty Bride was never printed, however, as the woodcutter did not finish the block. It remains a mystery as to why the work was left incomplete. Was the quality of the woodblock inadequate or the result unsatisfactory? This essay subjects the block to closer study and comparison within the context of the FINGERPRINT project – a joint interdisciplinary project involving the Royal Library of Belgium and Leuven University that combines historical and technical research, digital imaging, image processing, conservation and restoration techniques and data management. The aim is to use advanced digital photographic techniques, statistical image processing and laboratory analyses to identify and evaluate the different phases in the creation of a print, from the unique preparatory drawing through to publication of the finished impression.

Bruegel’s drawing of The Dirty Bride on the unfinished woodblock

The woodblock, which has been in the Metropolitan Museum in New York since 1932, depicts the story of The Dirty Bride. The scene comes from a comic play that would be performed in the run-up to Shrovetide by travelling theatre companies. The dishevelled bride Nisa, wearing a sieve as her bridal crown, is led from the threadbare nuptial tent by her groom, Mopsus. The musician providing the accompaniment has a wicker basket on his head and ‘plays’ a coal shovel with a knife. The two bridesmaids wear white,
gauze veils over their barely visible faces. They are wrapped in blankets and have upturned bowls on their heads. Another figure collects money in a pot. Broken oyster and egg shells – left over from the wedding meal – lie on a tablecloth in the foreground (the details can be seen clearly in the engraved version, fig. 3).

The woodblock is fairly large and was sawn lengthwise from an apple tree, which was probably more than a century old when it was felled. The wooden substrate makes the drawing itself difficult to study, given that the contrast between ink and wood is less than it would be in the case of ink on white paper. The hard, dried applewood block is medium brown in colour and measures approximately 264 × 416 mm and is 29 mm thick. The side with the drawing is smooth. Three techniques were commonly used to transfer the drawing to the block. The first was to paste the paper with the design onto the block face down. A layer of oil was then applied to make the paper transparent and to heighten the contrast of the inked lines. For the second technique, a white ground layer was applied to the wood and the drawing made onto that. The third method was a transfer technique in which a coloured, powdery medium was applied to the back of the sheet of paper. The drawing on the front of the sheet was then traced with a stylus to transfer it to the block. Bruegel opted for the second technique and drew his design directly onto the block. The thin white preparatory layer has largely disappeared, probably while the block was being cut or shortly afterwards.

Bruegel drew the design onto the whitened wood in brown and black-brown ink. He worked with a fairly thick quill pen combined with smaller, finer pens for the hatching and details, and a paintbrush to finish off the
The artist set the complex figures and compositions down onto the smooth wooden surface quickly and accurately. The central part of the scene – with Mopsus and Nisa, the wedding tent, the musician and the bridesmaids – is worked out in exceptional detail. Trees and village houses are set out in the background using fine lines (detail, fig. 4). The use of a lighter ink (or localized fading of the ink) makes the foreground less distinct.

The thickness of the lines indicates which gouge or chisel the woodcutter is supposed to use to carry out the woodcut. Lighter lines of ink for the contours of the figures alternate with darker ones. The woodcutter would carefully follow the lines of the drawing. There are traces on the back of the block that indicate trial cuts using gouges and chisels, as well as a black scorch mark in the middle. The burned area is a result of the way the woodblock was fixed to the woodcutter’s table, which had to absorb the force of his hand and the chisel on the block. The block was temporarily glued in place and the bone glue was later burned off, causing the patch of black (fig. 5).

Why the cutting of the large woodblock ceased after such a small amount of work (only the top left corner was cut, which might have taken about a day to complete) remains an open question. Did the publisher get cold feet because he thought the image might be interpreted as criticizing the marriage of Alessandro Farnese, Duke of Parma, to Maria of Portugal in Brussels in 1565, as Margaret Sullivan suggested in 1994? Or was the quality of the woodblock inferior?

As is usual, there are several knots in the longitudinal wood, as the fruit-bearing branches were not sawn off while the tree was growing. These natural irregularities were concealed on the picture side of the block by inserting two separate small blocks of the same type of wood. Bruegel’s drawing clearly runs across those inserted pieces.
According to William M. Ivins Jr., writing in *Metropolitan Museum Studies* in 1934, this unfinished woodblock is unique. Although other completed sixteenth-century woodblocks have survived, including ones by Dürer and Altdorfer, this one for Bruegel’s *Dirty Bride* was not finished. It therefore offers a perfect case study in which to investigate the relationship between drawing and woodcut. In his short article, the former Met curator refers to three photographs of Bruegel’s drawing on the block – reduced size and poor-quality images. The block had been rather clumsily restored and varnished while in the Albert Figdor collection in Vienna, making it more difficult to take successful photographs. Ivins himself published the first complete, full-sized black and white images in this 1934 essay. In his 1943 publication...
How Prints Look, he included a detail in black and white of the finished part of the woodcut. By contrast, the high-resolution images on the Metropolitan Museum’s current website are of excellent quality: every detail can be seen in crisp focus.

To document the woodblock as meticulously as possible, its drawing underwent digital imaging in 2018 as part of the FINGERPRINT project, which studies Bruegel's graphic oeuvre. This allowed the relief to be examined in detail and a simulation to be created of how the finished part might look if printed (fig. 6).

The work of the woodcutter, which began with the trees and the musician with the big nose in the upper left of the woodblock (fig. 7a), can be visualized using the photometric stereo imaging technique, which captures the relief of a surface and renders it three-dimensionally. After processing, it is possible to display the computer images in various ways. Viewed in infrared light (IR), the lines in carbon ink become visible (fig. 7b). The sketch filter can be used to convert the cuts made with the gouge into a black and white image that resembles a print on paper (fig. 7c).
Comparison of the drawing on the c. 1566 woodblock with the 1570 copper engraving

After Bruegel’s death, his friend and publisher Hieronymus Cock returned to *The Dirty Bride*. Cock might have seen or come into possession of the woodblock in 1570 and, wishing to finish the project, commissioned the engraver Pieter van der Heyden to use the drawing as a model for an engraving (fig. 3). The publisher added a Latin inscription in the margin as a kind of poetic reflection on the burlesque image of the bridal couple. It reads ‘MOPSÔ NISA DATVR, QVID NON SPEREMVS AMANTES’ (‘Nisa to Mopsus given! What may not then we lovers look for?’). Cock’s inscription refers to the story of this marriage, based on a poem (*Eclogue* VIII, line 26) by the Roman poet Virgil. It appeared in various Latin, French and German fifteenth and sixteenth-century sources, where it was used to symbolize the ‘world turned upside down’ in popular theatre performances during Shrovetide.¹¹

There are clear differences between the drawing (c. 1566) and the engraving (1570): the woodcutter of *The Dirty Bride* provided very detailed work and used various gouges and chisels to transpose the foliage of the trees, the branches and the beginnings of the figure in Bruegel’s drawing. The small, finished section (fig. 8a) is certainly comparable in terms of quality to that of *The Wild Man*. Too little of the woodblock has
been cut, however, for it to be securely attributed to the same woodcutter.

The 1570 engraving by Pieter van der Heyden (fig. 8b) is more refined, as one would expect from this technique, and certain details are worked out differently. The treatment of the trees is not the same. Mopsus has a slightly modified hat and the background of the print has been worked out in more detail. Van der Heyden had a great deal of experience with the transposition of Bruegel’s drawings and might have taken the liberty of adding a few details: a crucifix on the pennant on the tent, a broken shutter on the gable of the building and several birds, for instance.

It is equally plausible, though, that a detailed preparatory drawing by Bruegel existed on paper. However, the engraving is considerably smaller in size than the original drawing for the woodcut. An intermediate transfer technique will certainly have been needed to reduce the drawing made on the woodblock for *The Dirty Bride* and to apply it to the copper plate.

### Conclusion

The year 1566, in which Bruegel created the drawing for the woodcut, was an extremely productive one for him. He completed three paintings referring to Shrove tide: *The Wedding Dance* (Detroit), *The Census at Bethlehem* (Brussels) and *The Sermon of John the Baptist* (Budapest). It was also around that year that he produced preparatory drawings for two woodcuts with scenes referring to Shrovetide: *The Wild Man* or *The Masquerade of Orson and Valentine* and *The Dirty Bride* or *The Wedding of Mopsus and Nisa*. One or possibly several experienced woodcutters were involved in their execution. However, the unidentified publisher halted *The Dirty Bride* project for an unknown reason and only *The Wild Man* was actually printed, leaving the other woodblock unfinished.

Following Bruegel’s death, in 1570, the publisher Hieronymus Cock and the engraver Pieter van der Heyden produced a print after the drawing for *The Dirty Bride*. Cock added a caption taken from Virgil. The woodblock might have served as the model, but a drawing (now lost) could also have been used. In the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries the unfinished woodblock was passed down through collectors in Vienna. It has recently been documented, as described here, using a new imaging technique carried out at the Metropolitan Museum of Art, where this exceptional drawing has been kept since 1932.

---

3. The print of *The Wild Man* measures 272 × 410 mm, the drawn surface of the block for *The Dirty Bride* 264 × 416 mm. Pieter Bruegel the Elder, *The Battle between Carnival and Lent*, 1559, oil on panel, 118 × 164.2 cm, Vienna, Kunsthistorisches Museum, inv. no. 1016.
5. Woodcutters who worked for Plantin during this period (cutting blocks for botanical publications) included Gerard van Kampen, Cornelius Muller and Arnold Nicolaë. See Moran 2017, p. 400.
7. Wood cut lengthwise contains traces of the knots where branches sprouted from the trunk, resulting in irregularities in the surface. The knots were masked by inserting small blocks of wood. This was common practice in the case of woodblocks used in woodcutters’ workshops. The small, inserted blocks are often visible as fine white fissures in later impressions of the woodcut, due to wear and tear or shrinkage. Thanks in this regard to Jean-Albert Glatigny, wood restorer, Brussels.
8. Applewood has a high density and is very hard. It was used to make woodcuts but also for small decorative objects turned on a lathe. Pearwood was another common material for woodcuts.
11. There is a heavily faded inscription in cursive script on the back of the woodblock in the upper right corner, probably reading ‘Bruegel’.
13. The unfinished woodblock is damaged: the edges have crumbled due to tunnels bored by insects, and the surface as a whole is dotted with flight holes. At the beginning of the twentieth century, the damaged corners were restored using wooden boards, which are clearly visible as they do not contain any drawing or flight holes. Part of the drawing might have been lost on the right. The numerous flight holes left by wood-boring insects were sealed using a white emulsion and the entire surface was then varnished. According to William Ivins (Ivins 1934), this occurred when the block was in the Albert Figdor collection, but it could also have been earlier.
15. Two woodblocks by Albrecht Dürer (1471–1528) are in the Staatliche Museen zu Berlin; one block by Albrecht Altdorfer (1480–1538) can be found in the Staatliche Graphische Sammlung, Munich.
16. Von Frimmel 1895–1905, vol. II, p. 78, no. 41; Romdahl 1905, vol. XXV, p. 135, fig. 30; Van Bastelaer 1908, fig. 217; Ivins 1934, p. 116, see notes 1, 2 and 3.
17. Ivins 1943, p. 16.
19. We are grateful to Nadine M. Orenstein, Curator of the Department of Drawings and Prints, The Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York, for her collaboration and interest. The images were made through the auspices of Maarten Bassens (KBR and Illuminare, KU Leuven) and were carried out by Hendrik Hameeuw (KU Leuven), both of whom belong to the FINGERPRINT project team. See Hendrik Hameeuw, *Advanced Imaging: Report 4*. KU Leuven Libraries, Demo & Imaging Sessions with the MS PLD at the Metropolitan Museum of Art, 21–23 October 2018, KU Leuven Libraries (unpublished report). The author’s findings are based on the study of these detailed images produced using the Portable Light Dome (software and viewer).
20. The Portable Light Dome (PLD) is an important tool used in this investigation. A single, downward-pointing camera is positioned on top of a dome-shaped structure, the inside of which is fitted with 128 evenly distributed LEDs. An image is shot with one of these lights shining at a time, so that the object is photographed with light falling from 128 different angles. Once all the shots have been processed, a 2D+ file of an otherwise seemingly flat surface is obtained. This file allows a virtual exposure, so that, in combination with the use of various filters, the object can be examined and investigated in an interactive manner and in high resolution. For more information about the PLD, see Watteeuw et al. 2016 and Van der Perre et al. 2016, pp. 163–92.
Bruegel rediscovered

A research tradition at the Brussels Print Room

His greatness, it is sometimes thought, has been discovered only in the twentieth century. This seems, however, too pretentious a claim. We could say in fairness that certain aspects of his art have only been revealed to our time, but otherwise we should rather speak of a rediscovery, after an admittedly long interval of neglect and misunderstanding.

Fritz Grossmann

It remains an odd fact that an artist known today as one of the most important figures in the history of Netherlandish art once risked being buried beneath the dust of oblivion. Although Bruegel enjoyed success during his lifetime and the afterglow of his fame persisted well after his death, the complexity of his work, shifting tastes and a host of other factors meant that the master gradually faded from the minds and hearts of art-lovers in the course of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. What scarce literature was devoted to the artist continuously recycled a handful of anecdotal details about Bruegel drawn from Karel van Mander’s Schilder-boeck (1604). This same paucity of biographical data meant in turn that it was not possible to place his paintings, drawings and prints in context, let alone explain them. Charles Baudelaire, for instance, was led to comment: ‘What artist could have composed such monstrously paradoxical works, were he not driven from the outset by some unknown force?’

Baudelaire’s lament was accompanied by another pressing problem: Bruegel’s artistic legacy was swamped for centuries by the work of his descendants, followers and copyists. Over time, incorrect attributions had gradually reduced his oeuvre to an indigestible mass of artworks of sharply varying quality. Art historians in previous centuries were acutely aware of the difficulty of seeking out original works by the master, and Belgian scholars even believed they would have to look abroad for his masterpieces. As Frans Jozef Van den Branden wrote in 1883, ‘with the exception of the museum in Brussels, which boasts a Massacre of the Innocents in a snowy Flemish village, signed “P. Brveghel”, the museums of the Low Countries are bereft of panels by the wittiest of our painters.’ It is hardly surprising that he failed to notice The Fall of the Rebel Angels, which had nevertheless been in the collection of the Royal Museums of Fine Arts of Belgium since 1846, given that the painting had been purchased as a work by Pieter Brueghel the Younger. It was subsequently attributed to Hieronymus Bosch and was not ascribed to Bruegel the Elder until 1897 – no coincidence, as this essay will make clear.

In contrast to the supposed absence of Bruegel’s paintings in our museums, his graphic work featured in the collections of quite a number of Belgian print connoisseurs towards the end of the nineteenth century. While it tends to be the paintings that create the greatest international furore nowadays, it was initially these black and white gems on paper that put the master back on the art-historical map. Bruegel was gradually rediscovered in the Print Room of the Royal Library of Belgium, a stone’s throw from his former home on Rue Haute in Brussels. Little by little, the constant study and commitment of successive curators – albeit within a steadily widening international network of researchers and collectors – uncovered the master’s life and work once again.

Interest in Bruegel’s graphic oeuvre meant that slowly but surely the complex tangle of paintings and drawings could also be unravelled. This essay recounts the saga of Bruegel’s rediscovery within the Royal Library’s Print Room. It draws on both the established literature and on previously unexamined archive documents to sketch a picture of the cautious
steps taken over the years to restore the artist to the canon. It is the story of a forgotten master, passionate curators, a network of Bruegel admirers and researchers, and a highly varied body of drawings, prints and paintings. The surprising history, in short, of an acclaimed twentieth-century research tradition.

A library for a young nation-state

As befits a newly founded nation, the young Belgian state took steps in the 1830s to safeguard its history. A number of public institutions were created with the task of collecting and preserving traces of the past and making them accessible to the public. A Royal Decree of 19 June 1837 duly established the Royal Library – the Bibliothèque royale de Belgique. The institution served initially as a general repository for books, prints, maps and manuscripts belonging to the nation and was housed in a wing of the Palais de l’Industrie on the Rue du Musée. Following extensive renovation, the library was opened to readers and scholars in 1839. The first few years did not go smoothly for the institution. The Royal Library’s first curator, Baron de Reiffenberg, had fallen into disfavour after a career at the University of Liège due to accusations of academic plagiarism. Unemployed, but not without merit, he was put in charge of the library on 25 July 1837. The baron viewed his appointment as anything but a promotion and he displayed little motivation when it came to performing his official duties. Rather than plotting out a course for the brand-new institution, he spent most of his time abroad visiting other national libraries and print rooms. De Reiffenberg was well aware of how to run a library in theory, but failed to take the necessary steps in practice.

There was one important development, however, that ought to be mentioned: the Royal Library’s holdings grew unexpectedly rapidly during its early years. The territory that was now Belgium had chiefly been administered before 1830 by foreign rulers – Philip II of Spain, Leopold Wilhelm of Austria and Albert of Saxony-Teschen, to name just a few – which meant that large volumes of high-quality documents, important to the state, had wound up irretrievably abroad. To make good this loss, the Belgian state made attempts to secure several important collections over the years, some of which were purchased in their entirety. As far as the future Print Room was concerned, the acquisition of Charles Van Hulthem’s collection in 1837 and that of the Library of the City of Brussels in 1843 would prove especially important. The city library’s collection had come about primarily through the confiscation of monastic property under Emperor Joseph II and seizures during the period of French rule. It might already have included several Bruegel prints, although this is difficult to determine at our present remove.

Following the death of Baron de Reiffenberg in 1850, Louis-Joseph Alvin was appointed head of the Royal Library, providing the institution with a much-needed fresh start. Alvin, a naturalized Belgian of French origin, remained at the library’s helm for thirty-seven years. At the time of his appointment, the Royal Library had an acute need for space, structure and vitality. Alvin changed all that: adjoining buildings were purchased and a spacious new reading room was added. Over time, the original collections were divided into specialist departments, a reorganization that actually owed something to a chance occurrence. Shortly after Alvin was appointed, the library’s staff were looking for a particular print in the collection. At that stage, every item had a sequential inventory number, regardless of its nature. The search for one simple engraving thus turned out to be like looking for a needle in a haystack.

A new system for indexing the collection was needed and Alvin opted for one based on item descriptions in accession registers. From 1851 onwards, every item entering the collection was documented by hand in large ledgers. A unique number was generally assigned to each object, accompanied by an indication of its origin and price. Works that had been in the Print Room collection since before 1851 were given an inventory number beginning ‘S.I’ to show that they belonged to ‘Series I’. Items added after 1851 had numbers prefixed with ‘S.II’. The S.III series commenced in November 1914, followed in January 1932 by S.IV and in January 1944 by S.V. Several unfortunate decisions subsequently had a severely detrimental impact on the management of the Print Room’s collection. Large numbers of prints and drawings were taken from storage, often without the accompanying inventory number, with the result that they were wrongly categorized as hitherto uncatalogued items from the original, pre-1851 collection. The deputy curator Marie Mauquoy-Hendrickx therefore took the initiative in July 1956 – a hundred years after the old S.I series had been concluded – to create an extensive new S.I inventory. This explains why multiple items now have a double inventory number, as a result of which it remains difficult to determine the precise scale of the collection. According to one rough estimate, the Brussels Print Room houses approximately one million objects in 2019. Due to lack of staff and other resources, digitization of the analogue indexes is proving to be a drawn-out process.

The preliminary cataloguing of the various collections in the mid-nineteenth century was not, of course, carried out by the then chief curator alone: he was assisted in this mammoth task by a small army of enthusiastic assistants. When it came to describing the collection of prints and drawings, one volunteer in particular stands out: Henri Hymans (1836–1912; fig. 1) from Antwerp, who was instilled with a love of the fine arts from an early age by his artistically minded mother. Hymans began work at the Royal Library of Belgium in 1857, having trained as an artist at the Antwerp Academy and in the studio of the Brussels lithographer François Stroobant (1819–1916). His first task was to draw up a list of the names of all the artists present in the collection. The Print Room became a department in its own right in 1875, with Hymans as its head. Despite his artistic training and talent, he opted firmly for...
art-historical research. In 1877, during the commemoration of the 300th anniversary of the birth of Peter Paul Rubens, the newly appointed curator collaborated closely with Max Rooses on the organization of a major Rubens exhibition and the accompanying catalogue. Hymans then immersed himself in other Southern Netherlandish artists, which resulted in a series of noteworthy discoveries.13

The curator and the art collector

For many art historians, the Schilder-boeck by Karel van Mander (1548–1606) is a highly important source that offers a unique insight into the lives of numerous fifteenth and sixteenth-century artists from the Low Countries. It is littered with anecdotes and frequently paints a picture of Southern Netherlandish painters that cannot be corroborated using archive sources. Van Mander was born in Meulebeke in West Flanders, but moved to Haarlem in the Northern Netherlands in 1583. It was there that he collected the information and dates – drawn from his own observations and the testimony of others – that he later used to write his artists’ biographies. In the centuries after van Mander’s publication, various new editions were published of the original source text, along with a few minor additions and the occasional erroneous clarification or interpretation.

In 1884, Hymans also decided to publish an edition of van Mander’s Schilder-boeck.14 Although it consists of a French translation of the original text, the publication is nevertheless one of Hymans’s greatest achievements. Unlike his predecessors, the curator annotated the text with information drawn from recent research. For the biography of Pieter Bruegel the Elder, for example, he stressed the successive generations of artists making up the Brueghel family. In doing so, he indirectly laid the foundations for the burgeoning corpus of work on both Bruegel himself and his many followers and copyists. The seeds were also planted for several of Hymans’s later publications, which would focus specifically on the dynasty’s artistic founder.

In 1890 and 1891, Hymans contributed three articles to the Gazette des Beaux-Arts, in which he blew the dust off Bruegel’s legacy for the first time after decades of silence.16 The tone was now set: the master had to be given back the status he deserved. Because, Hymans wrote, ‘Pierre Breughel ought to be considered an artistic personality far superior to the simple preoccupation with the comical or even the unexpected’.17 For Hymans, Bruegel was an artist with a distinctly national character, an exceptional painter and print designer who successfully warded off Italian influences on Netherlandish art in the sixteenth century. To support his argument, the curator cited several of Bruegel’s paintings and prints. The only challenge with which Bruegel research had to contend was, according to Hymans, ‘the absence of his works in most of the large European collections’.18

This revival of interest in Bruegel swiftly began to bear fruit. The Antwerp art collector Fritz Mayer van den Bergh managed to get his hands on several prints after designs by Pieter Bruegel the Elder in 1890 and 1893.19 This was not the extent, however, of the chevalier’s passion for collecting: fascinated by the unusual graphic
visual language and struck by the commonly held belief that paintings by the artist were not to be found in the Low Countries, Mayer van den Bergh took it upon himself to track down original paintings by Bruegel and, if possible, to acquire them for himself. The Antwerp collector was corresponding with Hymans about the possible attributions of certain panels as early as 1893, and in 1894 he had an incredible stroke of luck. On 5 October 1894 a public sale was held at an auction house in Cologne, featuring items that the art expert Max J. Friedländer dismissed as ‘poor average quality’ (‘miserablen Durchschnittsqualität’). Because of this, many collectors chose to ignore the auction and Mayer van den Bergh was able to buy Bruegel's *Dulle Griet* (*Mad Meg*) for a relatively low price. In the panel, he found the same world of images that he had previously encountered in his Bruegel prints.

Following the purchase in 1894, Hymans and Mayer van den Bergh continued to correspond regularly (fig. 2). The collector made a thorough study of his panel, but was unable to arrive at a satisfactory interpretation of the composition. It is clear from a letter dated 16 October 1894 that Mayer van den Bergh was not even entirely sure whether the work was indeed Bruegel's 'dulle Griet carrying away plunder in the face of hell' as van Mander put it in his *Schilder-boeck*. A great deal of amicable discussion must have followed, because Hymans eventually wrote to Mayer van den Bergh on 27 September 1897: ‘I've done an article on your Bruegel.’ The text in question was once again published in the *Gazette des Beaux-Arts*. In addition to a detailed description of the panel, the Brussels curator explored the painting's provenance. What's more, Hymans's article also settled the question surrounding the attribution of the previously mentioned *Fall of the Rebel Angels*, which was viewed in the late nineteenth century as the work of Hieronymus Bosch. This attribution became untenable, however, when the date *M. D. LXII* was found on the panel in 1894. Based on this finding and on the stylistic similarities with the recently discovered *Dulle Griet*, Hymans ascribed the enigmatic panel in Brussels to Pieter Bruegel the Elder.

Hymans apparently intended to publish a preliminary survey of prints after designs by Bruegel, given a number of zealous attempts found in his surviving archive. Although he did not succeed in this, for reasons that are not yet clear, other art historians wasted no time in delivering their indispensable contributions. In 1905 the Swede Axel L. Romdahl published an article titled 'Pieter Brueghel der Ältere und sein Kunstschaffen,' which drew on his doctoral research. The accompanying catalogue contains 36 original paintings and 111 prints. There is no separate list of drawings, although quite a few drawn works are mentioned in Romdahl's article. The following year, Alfred von Wurzbach appended a preliminary catalogue raisonné to the biographical entry on Bruegel in his *Niederländisches Künstler-Lexikon*. It is evident from both Romdahl's and Wurzbach's work that Hymans had succeeded in arousing interest in the relatively unknown master. All the same, the most important advance in the wake of Hymans's initiatives was yet to come.
A milestone monograph

In March 1888 a photographer recorded the interior of the Print Room of the Royal Library (fig. 3). The reading room of the department, which was still located at the time in the apartments of Charles of Lorraine, was lined with polished wooden racks containing elegant storage boxes. Several low cabinets were used to store larger items. Reading tables were arranged against the wall with the windows. To illustrate the enthusiasm and interest generated by Belgian graphic art, a number of employees posed for the photographer, playing the part of readers engaged in research. Even the odd-job man was roped in.

The curator’s office was located in the rearmost room, behind the tall, white doors. Sat at his desk, half hidden by stacks of books, a flamboyantly moustachioed Henri Hymans looks straight at the camera. Further away still, a member of staff bends over a large drawer, assiduously searching for a print. This young man is none other than René van Bastelaer (1865–1940, fig. 4).

Van Bastelaer, who came from Marcinelle in Hainaut, enrolled in the Faculty of Philosophy and Letters at the University of Leuven in 1883. Unusually, he did not make it beyond the second year; he abandoned his studies in 1885 and trained briefly under the artist Antoine Van Hammée (1836–1903). His particular interest in printmaking swiftly earned him a traineeship at the Print Room in Brussels, marking the beginning of a long and fruitful career at the institution. He was given a permanent position in February 1886, and went on to become deputy curator under Hymans in 1899. In the meantime, he had written a promising essay on the rivalry between engraving and photography, which was a highly topical issue at the time. Van Bastelaer’s potential was clear from the fact that his text won a prize and was published.

When Hymans succeeded the elderly Édouard Fétis as chief curator of the Royal Library in 1904, van Bastelaer was promoted too. He remained the head of the Print Room until his retirement in 1930. The interest in Pieter Bruegel the Elder that he inherited from Hymans translated in 1907 into van Bastelaer’s magnum opus. In collaboration with Professor Georges Hulin de Loo of Ghent University, he published Pieter Bruegel l’Ancien, son œuvre et son temps – the first monograph on the artist. The voluminous work combined years of shared research, which had been published in several instalments since 1904. Van Bastelaer provided an updated biography and a highly detailed description of Bruegel’s drawings and prints.

Hulin de Loo, meanwhile, studied the master’s painted oeuvre, comparing and differentiating the original paintings and works attributed to associated artists. He carried out a preliminary investigation too into the copies and pastiches produced by the ‘school’ of Bruegel.

It is also noteworthy that several extremely important works by Bruegel the Elder were added to the Belgian state collections around this time. The Bruegel collection of the Brussels Print Room was considerably enriched in
the first half of 1910, with the preparatory drawings for *Lucuria* (cat. no. 11f) and *Justicia* (cat. no. 13d) purchased on 3 January and 11 May respectively.32 What’s more, an important print sale took place on 11 April 1910 at the auctioneers Frederik Muller & Co. in Amsterdam, with a very large number of etchings and engravings divided into a limited number of lots. When the hammer came down at 120 guilders for lot 78, the Royal Library of Belgium suddenly found itself twenty-seven Bruegel prints richer. In total, van Bastelaer managed to secure thirty-six original prints by the artist at the sale.33

The Royal Museums of Fine Arts in Brussels also did some excellent business at the time. In November 1909 the institution acquired Bruegel’s *Adoration of the Magi* at the auction of Edouard Fétis’s estate34 and, three years later, *The Fall of Icarus* was purchased at the Sackville Gallery in London.35 While the authenticity of the latter painting is still contested, its design can be securely ascribed to the master.

This shifting pattern of attributions remains fascinating: what is it, after all, that determines whether or not a work is ascribed to a particular artist? In April 1907, for example, a drawing of an angler by a river was acquired at the auction in Brussels of the Auguste Coster collection.36 The sheet was entered in the Print Room’s inventory in van Bastelaer’s own hand as an authentic work by ‘Pierre Bruegel le Vieux.’37 Oddly enough, the curator subsequently ignored the piece: no trace of it is found in either his 1907 standard work or in his 1924 publication *Les dessins de Pierre Bruegel l’Ancien appartenant au Cabinet des Estampes de la Bibliothèque royale de Belgique.*38 Not until the research of scholars such as Frits Lugt,39 Karl Arndt,40 Konrad Oberhuber41 and Hans Mielke42 would the sheet be identified once again as an original work by Pieter Bruegel the Elder.43

Although van Bastelaer never published another study on the scale of his 1907 book, he evidently suffered from a certain intellectual wanderlust. Following his death on 11 April 1940, ten years after his retirement, the Royal Library came into possession of the Bruegel expert’s paper archives, the vast majority of which still belongs to the Print Room’s collection. The bound volumes contain a profusion of clippings and notes on specific artists, including Rogier van der Weyden, while a cupboard full of wooden boxes holds the former curator’s collection of iconographic documents. Lastly, there is a body of personal notes, corrected proofs and the odd stray letter relating to van Bastelaer’s research on Bruegel.44

A growing interest in Bruegel

Louis Lebeer (fig. 5) grew up in Mechelen in the shadow of the tower of St Rumbold’s Cathedral, where his neighbours included the artist Rik Wouters. He moved to Leuven in 1913 to study medicine at the university. On the outbreak of the First World War, Lebeer fled to Britain and enlisted in the Allied forces. The young corporal then returned to Leuven following the Armistice of 11 November 1918. Rather than completing his medical training, however, he decided to study Germanic philology instead. Thanks in part to René van Bastelaer’s influence, Lebeer became increasingly interested in graphic art, and when he graduated in 1922 he was immediately taken on at the Royal Library of Belgium.45 As van Bastelaer had done, he began as a trainee in the Print Room before eventually taking charge himself. Lebeer succeeded van Bastelaer in 1930, and he too never lost his interest in Pieter Bruegel and his art, including his prints.

Lebeer was amazingly industrious throughout his career, producing a multitude of publications and articles on drawing and printmaking, and criss-crossing the country to present lectures on all kinds of art-historical subjects. He lectured at the universities of Ghent and Liège, while continuing steadfastly to head the Print Room, including the difficult period during the Second World War. On the eve of the conflict, Lebeer was still corresponding with the Amsterdam print collector Dr Bierens de Haan. In the summer of 1939 the latter had visited the *Musée municipal* in Chartres, where he had seen a painting showing the Kermis at Hoboken, corresponding with van Bastelaer.
print 208, and in the same direction." Bierens de Haan wondered how the painting related to the print made by Frans Hogenberg. Was the work in Chartres an original painting by Bruegel or a copy after the corresponding print? Lebeer responded that the matter could not be resolved ‘without a thorough investigation’ and he sent Bierens de Haan an offprint of his latest article on Hogenberg to help in his research. It is unclear whether the discovery in Chartres led any further, although F. W. H. Hollstein did write to Lebeer in 1950 at Bierens de Haan’s suggestion. Hollstein had begun work in 1949 on a prestigious series of books, in which he classified all known prints produced in the Low Countries between 1450 and 1700 according to the artist and/or printmaker. With his letter of 9 October 1950 to Lebeer, Hollstein sent the proofs of the third volume of his Dutch and Flemish Etchings, Engravings and Woodcuts. The Brussels curator was specifically requested to add any missing states and data concerning Pieter Bruegel the Elder. Unfortunately, Lebeer was unexpectedly out of the country on an official assignment and so did not have time to provide the necessary notes for the manuscript. The proofs were returned with a letter of apology from the assistant curator Marie Maquroy-Hendrickx.

The fact that efforts to re-evaluate Bruegel’s oeuvre did not always pay off is illustrated by the somewhat rocky progress of exhibitions at the Royal Library. Lebeer took the initiative to exhibit the Bruegel prints right from the beginning of his career, but his first attempt to show the artist’s drawings, etchings and engravings in 1939 got off to an unfortunate start. Since the German invasion of Poland, the European continent had been gripped by a ‘phony war’. Although no shots had yet been fired on Belgian territory, the tension could be cut with a knife. It was exactly during this period, from 5 November to 10 December 1939, that the Royal Library first tried to show its Bruegel collection to the public. The timing could hardly have been worse, prompting the newspaper L’Indépendance Belge to comment: ‘Given the circumstances, no personal invitations will be sent, nor will there be an official opening.

All the same, the public is invited to visit this artistic event, which will highlight the most interesting aspects of the talent of one of our great artists.’ A mere 2,455 visitors found their way to the Royal Library’s exhibition hall. The project did, however, provide a useful blueprint for subsequent Bruegel exhibitions. In the 1950s, the same works repeatedly left the seclusion of the Brussels Print Room to travel within Belgium and abroad. Exhibition-goers were able to see the Brussels prints in Hasselt, Mechelen and Verviers, as well as in Cologne, Luxembourg and Oslo.

Bruegel was steadily becoming a household name, prompting an increase in attention that was accompanied by occasionally naïve requests. In December 1965, for example, the curator of Gaasbeek Castle Museum wrote to the Print Room to enquire whether he would be able to organize an exhibition featuring original drawings by Bruegel. He reassured the library that ‘everything will be kept safely and insured, and a special guard will be employed.’ The chief curator of the Royal Library sent a curt response on 16 December 1965: Herman Liebaers had received the letter from Gaasbeek ‘with a degree of surprise’, given that ‘for some years now, the Print Room of the Royal Library has been seeking through painstaking international contacts to organize an exhibition of that kind, the difficulty of which seems to have eluded you.’ The curator in Gaasbeek was therefore advised to ‘abandon the idea, so as not to complicate the negotiations that have already taken place’.

Chief Curator Liebaers already had clear plans for the Bruegel anniversary in 1969. Four centuries after the artist’s death, his world was to be brought back to life on the Mont des Arts in Brussels. The exhibition Bruegel: The Painter and his World ran from 20 August to 16 November 1969 at the Royal Museums of Fine Arts (fig. 6). Only a handful of original paintings could be shown to the public: the fragility of the works meant that many others were unable to travel. The museum nevertheless managed to reunite all Bruegel’s known works for the first time, albeit ‘in an imaginary museum, in the form of black and white photographs the same size as the original works’. The event proved an unprecedented success, with around a thousand art-lovers visiting the museum each day.

Around the same time, an exhibition was held at the Royal Library with original drawings and prints by Bruegel. The Honorary Curator of the Print Room, Louis Lebeer, had been in retirement since 1960, but the exhibition provided a fitting conclusion to his career, due not least to the exhibition catalogue. Lebeer had decided at a very early stage to compile a catalogue raisonné of Bruegel’s graphic oeuvre, in collaboration with his mentor René van Bastelaer, and he kept personal notes to that end throughout his career. Combined with the notes left by van Bastelaer, these enabled him to produce the Catalogue raisonné des estampes de Pierre Bruegel l’ancien. The publication was a second milestone for research into Bruegel prints. Lebeer’s influence went even further, however: Bruegel’s work was exhibited again in 1970, this time in a broader narrative context. In an article published in the Revue belge d’archéologie et d’histoire de l’art in 1968, Lebeer had emphasized the importance of the study of print publishers; here the exhibition’s curator, Lydia De Pauw-De Veen, who had...
worked closely with Lebeer at the Print Room, developed the idea further. Rather than focusing on renowned artists such as Pieter Bruegel, Maarten van Heemskerck and Lambert Lombard themselves, her exhibition used their work primarily to illustrate the highly diverse output and ambitions of the Antwerp print publisher Hieronymus Cock.56

Interest in Pieter Bruegel the Elder at the Print Room slowly but surely declined after Lebeer’s departure. There was certainly no malice in this: it was simply that the curators’ focus had shifted towards other masters. At the end of the 1970s, Marie Mauquoy-Hendrickx published the catalogue raisonné of the Wierix family as well as material devoted to Anthony van Dyck’s Iconographia. Nicole Walch’s interest, meanwhile, lay in a number of nineteenth-century lithographers and in other sub-collections, such as the Japanese *ukiyo-e* prints and the posters. An ongoing search for new states of Bruegel’s etchings and engravings or the more precise dating of compositions thus ceased to be a priority. Van Bastelaer and Lebeer’s publications seemingly represented the highwater mark for research into Bruegel’s graphic output. Hence the importance that was attached to the revised editions of their catalogues raisonnés.57

The diminished attention paid to Bruegel by the Brussels Print Room also translated into several missed opportunities. During her working visits to compile the New Hollstein volume on Pieter Bruegel, Nadine Orenstein

---

evidently did not get to see all the Bruegel prints in the collection. Building on the catalogues raisonnés of van Bastelaer and Lebeer, Orenstein published her updated version in 2006. Even though a great deal of new information was added, several rare states and impressions proved untraceable.58

The decline in interest in Bruegel did not mean that the spirit of the artist faded entirely from the Mont des Arts. In 2006, for instance, the Print Room contributed to Bruegel 06 – a summer cultural festival organized in Brussels and in the green belt around the capital.59 The life and work of Pieter Bruegel the Elder served as inspiration for an extensive programme of exhibitions, concerts, lectures, historical evocations and cycling and walking routes. Two of the five exhibitions that formed the centrepiece of the project were held at the Royal Library of Belgium. The exhibition Bruegel Imagined was shown at the Houyoux Gallery, which featured full-scale reproductions of the artist’s paintings. Bruegel in Print in the Nassau Chapel, meanwhile, showed the collection of Bruegel prints in its entirety for the first time since 1969. Close contacts between Brussels and Japan meant that the Royal Library’s Bruegel prints were also able to travel to Tokyo in 1989 and again in 2010.60

**Bruegel 2019 and the FINGERPRINT project**

The Royal Library joined the twenty-first century somewhat belatedly. Although the institution had continued to perform the tasks initially entrusted to it in 1837 – collecting and preserving the nation’s heritage and making it accessible – the public’s needs and wishes had evolved substantially in the intervening period. The library’s holdings needed to be digitized, for example, while its public outreach was also in urgent need of modernization. Persuading all the relevant parties of this, taking long-term decisions and fully and judiciously addressing the backlog that had developed proved, however, to be a very slow process. The Royal Library of Belgium (Koninklijke Bibliotheek van België / Bibliothèque royale de Belgique) was renamed KBR in the course of 2019. There is considerably more to this new name – and the accompanying house style – than a fresh élan. The fact that it coincides with the 450th anniversary of Pieter Bruegel’s death provides a more than welcome opportunity.61

Meanwhile, in 2014, the ambitious exhibition project Hieronymus Cock: The Renaissance in Print was held extra muros.62 Rightly so, since the Royal Library’s infrastructure was totally outdated by that point. To respond to this, the idea emerged of creating a brand-new museum space of its own. The plan was enthusiastically received, and attracted the support of both the federal and Flemish governments. The KBR Museum opens in 2019 with The World of Bruegel in Black and White exhibition of Bruegel’s drawings and prints, of which this catalogue is the concrete result. A permanent exhibition devoted to the library of the dukes of Burgundy is also due to open in 2020, with the focus on the wonderful world of precious manuscripts and book illumination.

Both exhibitions are founded on thorough and new research. In 2016, for example, the Print Room of the Royal Library of Belgium joined forces with Leuven University (KU Leuven) to pick up the thread of a tradition of Bruegel research in Brussels that had fallen dormant. The FINGERPRINT project – supported financially by the Belgian Science Policy Office – has applied the latest technological advances in the field of imaging to study with fresh eyes the drawn and engraved oeuvre of Pieter Bruegel the Elder. Its aim is to use the latest digital photographic techniques, statistical data processing and laboratory analysis to identify and evaluate the different stages in the creation of a Bruegel print, the development of which we follow from drawing board to collector’s portfolio. The project studies how Bruegel produced his preparatory drawings, how engravers transferred those designs to the copper printing plate, and how publishers continued to pull prints from the original plates until long after Bruegel’s death. My own doctoral research, supervised by Professor Lieve Watteeuw and Professor Jan Van der Stock, ties into this work.63 The interim results of the FINGERPRINT project and my doctoral studies provided a vital scholarly basis for the exhibition The World of Bruegel in Black and White. In this way, following in the footsteps of Hymans, van Bastelaer and Lebeer, the Brussels Print Room hopes to achieve a better understanding of and – if possible – even greater renown for Pieter Bruegel the Elder.
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The working title of the doctoral thesis is ‘Branding Bruegel: An Inquiry into Bruegel’s Graphic Practices and Afterlife.’
CATALOGUE

Note to the reader

The catalogue entries are grouped by theme.

The following technical information is provided for each print: catalogue number, engraver’s name, artist’s name, title, date and technique. The stated measurements refer to the edges of the copper plate; dimensions are in millimetres, with height followed by width.

The whereabouts and inventory number are followed by the state of the respective impression in square brackets.

Where applicable, transcriptions are also provided of the signature, privilege, publisher’s address and inscriptions. A translation of the Latin, French and/or Dutch inscriptions provided by Wouter Bracke is included in the notes to the relevant entry. Information can also be found there regarding the original source texts, localized by Maarten Bassens.

Updated, detailed descriptions are provided of the different states, based on Maarten Bassens’s ongoing doctoral research. Additional information, such as whereabouts, provenance and watermarks will be presented in the course of that study.

Where possible, the ownership of the copper plates has been traced using archival references.

Literature references are selective: only the most important titles and the most recent reference works are cited.
SEA AND LANDSCAPES
AND THE CROSSING OF THE ALPS

Bruegel’s earliest preserved works are landscapes. The first – usually drawings in pen and brown ink – were made during his travels to Italy. The artist must have known the landscapes made by his predecessors in the Low Countries before he left – ranging from the largest ‘cosmic’ landscapes by Joachim Patinir and Herri met de Bles to the more recent developments represented by Cornelis Metsys and especially Matthijs Cock, the brother of the print publisher Hieronymus Cock. No doubt Bruegel had been able to become acquainted with the landscapes of Venetian masters such as Titian and Domenico Campagnola. The influence of their poetic landscapes, with large, vigorous trees placed in the foreground, clearly had an influence on Bruegel’s drawing landscapes of Venetian masters such as Titian and Domenico Campagnola. The influence of their poetic landscapes, with large, vigorous trees placed in the foreground, clearly had an influence on Bruegel’s drawing landscapes. The artist must have made during his travels to Italy. The artist must have made during his travels to Italy. The artist must have

This would soon change. Around 1555, the brothers Joannes and Lucas van Doetecum engraved no less than twelve landscapes in copper that were based on Bruegel’s drawings and on which, alongside the name of the publisher Hieronymus Cock, Bruegel’s name as ‘inventor’ appeared. These Large Landscapes (cat. no. 2) heralded a milestone in the development of the landscape genre. Although Bruegel is building on existing traditions, he achieves a new effect. Never before had landscapes been depicted in such a natural way. Bruegel registered the wide vistas and breathtaking depths during his travels in Italy in his sketchbooks and on sheets of drawing paper. Based on this study material (now lost), he later composed meticulously constructed panoramas in his studio. Karel van Mander attests to this working method: "In zijn reysen heeft hy veel ghesichten nae t’leven gheconterfeyit, soo datter gheseyt wort, dat hy in d’Alpes wesende, al die berghen en rotsen had in gheswolghen, en

t’huys ghecomen op doeken en Penneelen uytgespogen hadde, soo eyghenlijck con by te desen en ander deelren de Natuere nae volghen. (On his travels he drew many views from life so that it is said that when he was in the Alps he swallowed all those mountains and rocks which, upon returning home, he spat out again onto canvases and panels, so faithfully was he able, in this respect and others, to follow Nature.)"

A highlight in this genre is the Large Alpine Landscape (cat. no. 3). This print of a somewhat larger format than The Large Landscapes must have been published almost simultaneously at Cock’s. But Bruegel’s attention was not exclusively drawn towards alpine scenery. The print Pagus Nemorosus (cat. no. 21) from The Large Landscapes series depicts a village in a wood in Brabant. Other compositions in this series also have an expressly hybrid character, whereby Bruegel mixes elements of local landscapes with the impressions of river valleys, lakes and mountains that he had seen on his travels. Perhaps the intention was to offer a wide variety of types of landscapes in order to satisfy the expectations of as large a public as possible. Some Large Landscapes were augmented with a narrative staffage and a title. One plate depicts a topographically accurate representation of a special place: the large Tivoli waterfall near Rome (cat. no. 2a). Thus Bruegel moved into the terrain of ‘chorography’ (the systematic description of a particular place, in this case graphically), a relatively young visual genre that was also practised by Hieronymus Cock and his publishing house, and which clearly appealed to the topographic and cartographic interests of a cultured public.

In 1560, Bruegel himself experimented for the first and only time with the etching needle. The resulting Rabbit Hunt (cat. no. 4) is spontaneous in appearance and the manner of etching makes it look more like a drawing in pen and ink. The beautiful panorama over a broad river landscape is in contrast to the menacing hunting scene (which should be interpreted in an allegorical manner) that is taking place in the foreground.

With the publication of the monumental Naval Battle in the Strait of Messina (cat. no. 5), Bruegel once again adopted the genre of chorography. Just as for a large part of the material for The Large Landscapes, the sketches were made in situ during his visit to this place in around 1552. The design for this print was made in the studio almost a decade later. This image is also only topographically correct in its main lines. The principal goal was to render a beautiful and recognizable image of this specific place. The sea battle taking place in the foreground is in no way indicated historically in the inscriptions, but refers in general terms to the ongoing conflict with the Turks for dominance of the Mediterranean Sea. Just as was the case with The Large Landscapes, prints like these were also most suitable as models for painters and craftsmen. Not only could they gain inspiration for the representation of various types of landscapes, but also for sea views and even for sailing ships and galleons at war. Although mainly geared towards a new European traders’ elite with a broad interest in maritime pursuits, the Sailing Vessels series (cat. no. 6) would also most certainly have served as an example for artists and artisans. Here Bruegel is creating more than the traditional ‘naval portraits’ that had already been depicted in earlier prints. Unlike anyone before him, he observes the ships’ natural environment. They sail or are anchored in rough or decidedly placid waters. But it is especially the large portions of sky, with the searing sun, the menacing or dramatically opening clouds, that receive an attention not seen before. Through their wide dissemination, all of these prints – which were reprinted until late into the seventeenth century – had a decisive influence on the development of landscape painting and the marine genre.

JORIS VAN GRIEKEN
I.

Hieronymus Cock after Pieter Bruegel the Elder

Landscape with the Temptation of Christ

c. 1554, etching and engraving, 319 × 439 mm
Brussels, KBR, Print Room, inv. no. S.II 84231 [I/I]

The Temptation of Christ is set within a vast landscape with a variety of animals. A deer emerges from behind a gnarled trunk, while cattle graze freely on the edge of the water, the placid surface of which is ruffled only by a small group of ducks. A pair of flying geese bring a touch of animation to the cloudy sky. We see evidence of human activity in the distance: two peasants, a building flanked by a round tower and, further off still, several ships that have just set sail from the port on their way to the open sea.

The engraving was done after a 1554 drawing by Bruegel of a Landscape with Bears, which was only attributed to the artist by Karl Arndt in 1966. As in several other drawings that Bruegel made after his return from Italy, the landscape here is organized around a dense mass of trees. The composition is strongly inspired by Titian’s work, with one part of the sheet terminating in the middle ground and the other offering a view of an expansive, lower-lying plain.

Besides a number of minor adjustments to the landscape, Hieronymus Cock – who worked the copper plate himself – made one significant alteration: he replaced the bears playing at the edge of the forest in the Prague drawing with the figures of Christ and the Devil, thus turning the Landscape with Bears into a Landscape with the Temptation of Christ. Inserting a religious element into what was originally a worldly scene enabled Cock to present viewers with a ‘moralizing landscape’ that would encourage them to reflect on the fundamental dichotomy between earthly pleasures and the spiritual ideal. It was not the only semantic adjustment of this kind: Mountain Landscape with Three Pilgrims, for instance, became The Way to Emmaus in print form (cat. no. 2h).

Chapter 4 of Matthew’s Gospel (and not Mark as wrongly stated in the inscription) describes how Satan tried to tempt Christ, who had spent forty days fasting in the wilderness, to sate his hunger by turning stones into loaves of bread. Jesus answered with a quotation from Deuteronomy (8:3), which Cock added in Latin at the bottom of the sheet: ‘Man shall not live by bread alone, but by every word that proceedeth out of the mouth of God.’

Christ is shown in the lower left corner, in a subtle contrapposto stance. He turns towards the Devil, who appears in the form of a hermit, leaning on a stick from which hangs a rosary. The old man’s long claws leave us in no doubt, however, as to his true, demonic nature. Cock was following a tendency here from the first half of the sixteenth century, when the Devil began to be depicted in a more human form. The trend is already apparent in works on the same theme by Lucas van Leyden, Jacob Cornelisz. van Oostsanen and Dirck Vellert. Unlike the fifteenth-century images that represented the Devil as a monstrous hybrid creature, intended primarily to evoke fear and revulsion, this iconographic evolution was probably a response to a new realization that there was a genuine ideological debate underlying the biblical narrative, not dissimilar to a doctrinal discussion between two theologians.

The print does not include a date but is generally thought to have been created in or shortly after 1554. It may thus be considered one of Cock’s first engravings after a design by Bruegel, possibly explaining why the name of the inventor is not stated here as, barring the odd rare exception, occurred systematically after 1556. Perhaps Cock thought that the young Bruegel’s name was not yet a sufficient selling point in 1554. Whatever the case, Landscape with the Temptation of Christ marked the beginning of the fruitful collaboration between the artist and the Antwerp publisher. [GV]
NON IN SOLO PANE VICTVRS EST HOMO, SED OMNI VERBO QVOD DIGREDITVR PER OS DEI. MAR. 4. DEV'T 8.
2.

Joannes and Lucas van Doetecum after Pieter Bruegel the Elder

The Large Landscapes
c. 1555–56, twelve unnumbered etchings and engravings

2a Prospectus Tyburtinus

View of Tivoli
Etching and engraving, 320 × 420 mm
Brussels, KBR, Print Room, inv. no. S.I 9412 [II/II]

Inscriptions
Lower right: . h . Cock excude; in the margin: PROSPECTVS TYBVRTINVS

States and editions
I without text.
II as described. Extra hatching in the cliffs: to the left of the two figures, left of the waterfall, right of the tree above the waterfall, in the path between the trees bottom right, etc.
Counterproof of state II.

2b S. Hieronymus in Deserto

Saint Jerome in the Wilderness
Etching and engraving, 327 × 429 mm
Brussels, KBR, Print Room, inv. no. S.I 9411 [I/I]

Inscriptions
Lower right: brueghel Inuē / h . cock excud.; in the margin: S . HIERONŸMVS IN DESERTO

States and editions
Only state.
Counterproof.

2c Magdalena Poenitens

The Penitent Magdalene
Etching and engraving, 324 × 427 mm
Brussels, KBR, Print Room, inv. no. S.I 9409 [II/III]

Inscriptions
Lower left: brueghel Inuentor / . h . cock excud.; in the margin: MAGDALENA POENITENS

States and editions
I as described.
II extra hatching in Mary Magdalene’s face, upper body and left arm.
III the lower loop of the g in brueghel has been closed; the letters xxv in excud have been recut.
Counterproof of state II.

2d Alpine Landscape

with Deep Valley
Etching and engraving, 325 × 429 mm
Brussels, KBR, Print Room, inv. no. S.I 9407 [I/II]

Inscriptions
Lower left: brueghel Inuentor / . h . cock excud.; lower right: brue . inui

States and editions
I as described.
II extra hatching on the small rock on the path bottom right and a few dashes on the mule’s pack above it.

Preparatory drawing in pen and brown ink, grey wash in another hand, 1555, 290 × 450 mm, Paris, Musée du Louvre, Département des Arts graphiques, inv. no. 20.7203

2e Insidiosus Auceps

The Crafty Bird-Catcher
Etching and engraving, 329 × 423 mm
Brussels, KBR, Print Room, inv. no. S.I 1700 [I/I]

Inscriptions
Lower right: BRVEGHEL INVÆ / h . cock excudeb.; in the margin: INSIDIOSVS AVCEPS

States and editions
Only state.
Counterproof.

2f Plaustrum Belgicum

The Belgian Wagon
Etching and engraving, 324 × 428 mm
Brussels, KBR, Print Room, inv. no. S.I 9405 [II/II]

Inscriptions
Lower right: BRVEGHEL INVÆ / h . cock excud.; in the margin: PLAVSTRVM BELGICVM

States and editions
I untitled.
II as described.
Counterproof.

2g Solicitudo Rustica

Rustic Solicitude
Etching and engraving, 326 × 431 mm
Brussels, KBR, Print Room, inv. no. S.I 9404 [I/I]

Inscriptions
Bottom centre: brueghel Inui . / H. cock excud.; in the margin: SOLICITVDO RVSTICA

States and editions
I as described.
II right margin, the address C. Dankertz excudit.
Counterproof of state I.

Related drawing in pen and brown ink, undated, 244 × 352 mm, London, The British Museum, Department of Prints and Drawings, inv. no. 1965-10-12-1.1
[cat. no. 2a] Prospectus Tyurtinus
S. Hieronymus in Deserto

[cat. no. 2b] S. Hieronymus in Deserto
**2h**

**Euntes in Emmaus**

The Way to Emmaus

Etching and engraving, 316 × 429 mm

Brussels, KBR, Print Room, inv. no. S.I 9441 [I/1]

Inscriptions

Lower left: brueghel inuē . . H . coek excud.; in the margin:  EVNTE S IN EM A VS

States and editions

Only state.

Counterproof.

Preparatory drawing in pen and brown ink, with grey and brown washes, c. 1555–56, 260 × 415 mm, Antwerp, Koninklijk Museum voor Schone Kunsten, inv. no. T.5098

**2j**

**Milites Requiescentes**

Soldiers at Rest

Etching and engraving, 322 × 421 mm

Brussels, KBR, Print Room, inv. no. S.III 99203 [I/1]

Inscriptions

Lower left: brueghel inuē; lower right: h . coek excuia; in the margin: MILITES REQVIESCENTES

States and editions

Only state.

**2k**

**Nundinae Rusticorum**

Rustic Market

Etching and engraving, 30 × 414 mm

Brussels, KBR, Print Room, inv. no. S.I 9396 [I/II]

Inscriptions

Lower left: breugheil inuë; bottom, left of centre: h . coek excuia; in the margin: PAGVS NEMOROSVS

States and editions

I as described.

II in the right margin, the address Gedrukt bij Clemendt de Jonghe in de Calverstraat, In de / gebronne Const en Caart-winckel, Tot Amsterdam.

Counterproof of state I.

**2l**

**Fuga Deiparae in Aegyptum**

The Rest on the Flight into Egypt

Etching and engraving, 315 × 424 mm

Brussels, KBR, Print Room, inv. no. S.I 9398 [I/II]

Inscriptions

Lower right: brueghel inuē / H . coek excud.; in the margin: FVGA DEIPARAE IN AEGYPTVM.

States and editions

I without breugheil inuē above Cock’s address.

II as described.

Copper plates in the estate of Volckert Dierickx (1601): Veertien coperen plaeten van Lantschappen van Bruegel (Duverger 1984–2006: I, 28)

**Literature**

[cat. no. 2c] Magdalena Poenitens
[cat. no. 2d] Alpine Landscape with Deep Valley
The so-called *Large Landscapes* are indisputably one of the most interesting and influential series of prints produced in the sixteenth century. They owe their name, which was only applied at a much later date, to what at the time was their large format. Besides their size, the images stand out for their unprecedented naturalism. The prints were distributed on a relatively large scale and over a prolonged period, enabling their innovative form to exert a profound and lasting influence.

What’s more, they established Bruegel’s reputation overnight as an innovator in landscape art. His name appears on eleven of the twelve large copper plates that the van Doetecum brothers produced using a no less innovative combination of etching and engraving. It was the view of the famous Tivoli waterfall that was not signed, the reason for which is not known. Only two of the preliminary drawings have survived: the ones for *The Way to Emmaus* in Antwerp, and for the *Alpine Landscape with Deep Valley* in Paris. Sadly, both sheets are in poor condition, which somewhat complicates their assessment. The sheet in Paris still bears traces of the signature. The date is likewise hard to read, but is probably 1555, which would make the twelve landscapes some of the earliest prints that Bruegel designed for the publisher Hieronymus Cock. Together with the *Large Alpine Landscape*, which was created in the same period and is very closely related to this series (see cat. no. 3), *The Large Landscapes* can therefore be dated to just after Bruegel’s return from Italy.

We do not actually know anything about Bruegel’s work in the period before he travelled to Italy, as none of it has survived. All the same, we can assume that his landscape style evolved substantially in the course of that journey. He saw with his own eyes landscapes that were not familiar to people in the Low Countries: vast river valleys, deep gorges and steep cliffs in the Alps, and the southern valleys and coasts of France and Italy. Because of this, the following words of Karel van Mander have frequently been associated with *The Large Landscapes*: ‘On his travels he drew many views from life so that it is said that when he was in the Alps he swallowed all those mountains and rocks which, upon returning home, he spat out again onto canvases and panels, so faithfully was he able, in this respect and others, to follow Nature.

Bruegel must have produced hundreds of sketches from nature, which he then used as the basis for his drawings, print designs and paintings (see also cat. no. 5). It is nowadays assumed that more or less all his surviving drawings were done at a later date in the studio or were at least worked up there. In other words, these seemingly realistic landscapes never
actually existed as such but are scenes that were painstakingly composed in the studio. Every attempt to locate them or even parts of them geographically has therefore been unsuccessful, the only exception being the View of Tivoli as we will see in a moment.

Besides Bruegel’s direct impressions of spectacular landscapes, he was significantly influenced by the work of contemporary Italian masters such as Titian and Domenico Campagnola. These artists built up their landscapes in different but spatially connected planes, with a strong emphasis on large figures or topographical elements in the foreground, beyond which a panoramic view is glimpsed in the background. The extensive use of this repoussoir effect draws the viewer firmly into the scene. Bruegel must already have been familiar with these techniques from prints, but he will undoubtedly have had the opportunity in Italy to view more material. Evidence of how intensively he studied those examples is provided by a 1554 sheet in which he repeated part of a pen drawing by Campagnola (see p. 24, fig. 6).15

Bruegel would have been acquainted from an early age with the landscapes of artists active in Antwerp, such as Joachim Patinir (c. 1485–1524), Herri met de Bles (c. 1510–after 1555) and their followers. They painted distant panoramas observed from an elevated viewpoint – expansive vistas filled to the high horizon with a wide variety of landscape elements – with occasionally fanciful forms, and villages, towns and people. Together, these components invariably form the backdrop for a Christian or mythological story. A younger generation of painters, including Matthijs Cock, brother of the publisher Hieronymus Cock, continued the tradition, while also introducing elements of the charming pastoral landscape described in classical literature and depicted by Italian artists.16 Bruegel will no doubt have been well acquainted with Matthijs’s work and might also have met the man, who died between 1544 and 1547.17 Either way, Hieronymus Cock – whom Bruegel probably knew before he left for Italy – assumed responsibility for his late brother’s work, and even built on it further himself, as well as publishing it on various occasions in print form.18

Virginie D’haene has rightly noted that Landscape with Abraham’s Sacrifice (see p. 19, fig. 1), which Cock published under his own name in 1551, points firmly towards the structure of Bruegel’s landscapes. The etching shows a seemingly realistic landscape: there is a deep valley on one side, with a view into the distance beyond it, which contrasts with a rising road and groups of trees on the other side. What’s more, additional depth is created by means of a striking repoussoir in the foreground. This structure is found in a remarkably similar form in prints such as Saint Jerome
in the Wilderness and The Penitent Magdalene. It is also very striking that Cock himself etched Landscape with Abraham's Sacrifice using short, intermittent lines and dots for the elements located more in the background, which also, as D’haene notes, recalls Bruegel’s drawing style. While it would be going too far to suppose that Bruegel had a hand in the creation of this sheet, it does indicate that the roots of his development as a landscape artist need to be sought here too. It is plausible that Hieronymus Cock – who might have visited Italy himself and at the very least had contacts there – encouraged Bruegel to make the journey and offered his support.20

The series is less homogeneous than might appear at first sight, which is often taken to mean that it was produced gradually, with no clear plan at the outset. While it is entirely possible that Bruegel drew on older material that was already available, the notion that the series displays a clear stylistic evolution has been abandoned in recent studies. It has become increasingly clear instead that Bruegel applied different ‘modes’ or idioms to achieve a specific result. In other words, he used different stylistic and technical registers at the same time. Viewed in this light, the heterogeneity we detect in the series ought perhaps to be interpreted as a deliberate and well-thought-out choice. Not only does the series gain in variety this way – a quality that was rated highly in Renaissance art theory – it also serves as a showcase for Bruegel’s skills while simultaneously responding to the varying desires of a diverse target audience. We know from Cock’s own verses that it was important to him to offer variation in his products: ‘Let the cook [i.e. Cock] do the cooking for the sake of the people [and/or Volxken], for one wants roast and the other boiled…For what one likes not, another desires…’21

The series is also sure to have responded in broad terms to a heightened scientific interest in the landscape as part of a nature hitherto explained in chiefly theological and cosmological terms. Whether Bruegel’s landscapes are deliberate and specific expressions of a world view rooted in stoic philosophy, as Justus Müller Hofstede has argued, seems rather unlikely.22 Bruegel and his circle are said to have shared this Weltanschauung, which centred on thorough and inquisitive ‘looking’ and the resultant ‘seeing’ of the truth. When applied to The Large Landscapes, however, the question is moot, since the prints were conceived for as wide a public as possible and certainly not as an esoteric art product for a circle of initiates.

The addition of narrative staffage and an inscription to some of the prints might likewise be interpreted as Cock’s attempt to make the series attractive to as wide a public as possible. A landscape with pilgrims – a familiar sight on Europe’s roads at the time – was transformed into a representation of The Way to Emmaus by adding a halo and an inscription. The figures in Saint Jerome in the
Wilderness and The Penitent Magdalene, meanwhile, are totally overshadowed by the breathtaking landscape, which immediately demands the viewer’s attention: beautifully integrated though they are, it is unclear in this instance too whether or not these figures were present in the original design. With the exception of The Rest on the Flight into Egypt, no further narrative staffage was added to the series. The titles Insidiosus Auceps (The Crafty Bird-Catcher), Milites Requiescentes (Soldiers at Rest), Plaustrum Belgicum (The Belgian Wagon), Nundinae Rustiorum (Rustic Market) and also to a certain extent Solicitude Rustica (Rustic Solicitude) refer to figures and objects depicted in the foreground that are entirely at home there. There is no reference to any particular biblical, mythological, literary or even cosmological theme. The title Pagus Nemorosus (Wooded Region) merely describes the nature of the depicted landscape. The margin below Alpine Landscape with Deep Valley was left empty. The figures in the right foreground – travellers with a train of pack mules on a mountain road – are inconspicuous and perfectly integrated in their natural surroundings and the surviving drawing shows that the print was engraved precisely as the artist conceived it. As in the Large Alpine Landscape (see cat. no. 3), what Bruegel and Cock present here is the purest of landscapes – something that, while not perhaps an absolute first, was still highly exceptional for the time. The suggestion of terrifying heights and fathomless depths makes this a very special image, and it was this aspect that seems to have made a powerful impression on Bruegel’s contemporaries too. Van Mander, for instance, writing in his ‘Groundwork’, recommended Bruegel’s prints as an example for painters: ‘Besides I could proclaim proudly the fine colouring and artful disposition of the works and prints of the counterfeiter Bruegel, in which, as if we were in the horn-capped Alps, he shows us how without great toil we may fashion views deep into vertiginous dales [then up toward] steep cliffs and cloud-kissing pines, [then out toward] far distances, and along rushing streams.’

Besides this thematic variation, the landscapes also differ strongly from one another in morphological terms. Like the closely related Large Alpine Landscape (see cat. no. 3), which nevertheless falls outside this series because of its larger dimensions, Alpine Landscape with Deep Valley, The Penitent Magdalene and The Crafty Bird-Catcher are homogeneous and convincing representations of the high mountains. Even the architecture in the two latter prints is in keeping with the surroundings, which can also be said, in fact, of Saint Jerome in the Wilderness and Soldiers at Rest. The grand vistas with rocky peaks, combined with broad valleys and expanses of water in the foreground, are probably an echo of the large lakes and rivers at the foot of the mountains. Rustic Solicitude is in keeping with this, although the church and the houses in
[cat. no. 2h] Euntes in Emmaus
the foreground are distinctly Brabantine in style. In The Belgian Wagon, named for the characteristic covered wagon in the foreground, Bruegel combined a Brabant village with an Alpine panorama in the distance. The morphology of The Way to Emmaus – with a view of a broad river meandering between steep cliffs alternating with meadows and gently sloping hills – is most reminiscent of the valleys of the Meuse, the Rhine or the Rhône. Here too, however, the farms set amid the greenery look very Brabantine and Bruegel has the river flow into a sea or large lake on the horizon. Wooded Region, by contrast, shows a very different, more closed landscape. A wagon accompanied by mounted men and followed by a soldier makes its way along a flooded road past a Brabant village. The contours of a city by a wide river can be made out vaguely on the horizon on the left, while the right half of the sheet is given over entirely to trees and foliage. Unlike Landscape with the Temptation of Christ (see cat. no. 1), for instance, or most of Bruegel’s earlier drawings, the vegetation on the ground here is abundant and worked out in detail. The way this has been done – we even see a little rabbit – recalls the tapestry cartoons he knew so well from his apprenticeship under Pieter Coecke van Aelst.16

Connoisseurs generally view the prints Rustic Market and The Rest on the Flight into Egypt as less successful, with art historians such as Charles de Tolnay and Nadine Orenstein questioning their attribution to Bruegel.7 They rightly drew attention to the heterogeneous nature of the compositions:8 rather than the powerful spatial unity that characterizes the other landscapes, what we find here is rather an accumulation of landscape elements that lack coherence. The prints are more in keeping in this respect with the older Netherlandish landscape tradition – certainly in the case of The Rest on the Flight into Egypt, with its rather fragmented structure. The figures were almost certainly added by the engravers, or have at any rate been so heavily reworked that there is little of Bruegel left in them.

The objections are not sufficiently fundamental, however, for us to cease to view the prints as authentic works by Bruegel. The evident shortcomings oblige us to think about the relevance of concepts such as stylistic evolution, the use of different stylistic registers or ‘modes’, and above all the creative and technical process that led to their realization. Comparison of the preliminary drawing of The Way to Emmaus with the final engraving is extremely enlightening in this respect: besides the previously mentioned addition of a halo around the head of the pilgrim in the middle, the composition was extended somewhat on three sides, probably to make it fit the copper plate. For this to succeed graphically, the engravers also had to reinterpret Bruegel’s very loosely drawn foliage. The vegetation in the foreground is considerably less detailed in the drawing. Were the van Doetecum brothers given a free hand in this regard, or were Bruegel and Cock involved in the process? Bruegel’s preliminary drawings had clearly not yet reached the degree of detail and refinement we find in, say, the series The Seven Deadly Sins (see cat. no. 11) or The Seven Virtues (see cat. no. 13). This being the case, we might well ask whether this composition was conceived as a preparatory drawing. After all, a pre-existing drawing was plainly used for Landscape with the Temptation of Christ (see cat. no. 1). It is not improbable that Bruegel and Cock made a selection from drawings that were already available and adapted them where necessary or left this to the engravers.9 Unless the drawings are found, we will never know what the models seen by Joannes and Lucas van Doetecum looked like.

The series remained unnumbered, which means that the fixed order applied today is a much later convention. The View of Tivoli comes first in this sequence. Given that the composition depicts a specific location, this sheet differs in many respects from the rest of the series. It is firmly in keeping with the then still new visual genre of ‘chorography’ – the systematic description of a particular place, in this case graphically.10 The print shows the first stage of the large waterfall on the Aniene – a tributary of the Tiber – at Tivoli near Rome. Its inscription does not refer to the principal river but to Tibur, the city’s ancient Latin name. The beautiful view, the rural location near Rome and above all the cool river made ancient Tibur a favourite summer retreat for prominent Romans: the celebrated poet Gaius Maecenas had a beautiful country estate there and Emperor Hadrian later had his immense Villa Adriana built nearby. The spot grew popular again from the late Middle Ages onwards. In addition to its natural beauty, its antique remains now became an attraction too. Maarten van Heemskerck had visited the location two decades previously and, unlike Bruegel, showed an interest in the ancient Roman monuments.11

Because the depicted location can be identified and still exists, albeit in much altered form, we can roughly deduce how Bruegel must have gone about his work. The spectator looks from the south side of ancient Tibur’s Acropolis, probably somewhere near what is now the Piazza delle Mole, in a southerly direction towards the large waterfall, which tumbles between two rocky banks. Downstream, the water of the Aniene runs eastwards through a gorge with strange, doughy rocks. This ravine is spanned on the far left by a stone
bridge, the Ponte di San Rocco, which was damaged by flooding in 1826 and was not rebuilt. Countless artists, from Jan Brueghel to J. M. W. Turner, have drawn the distinctive bridge. Another, smaller waterfall can be seen between the rocks on the right. Although the river was diverted in the nineteenth century and the powerful waterfall has now been reduced to a small, canalized stream spanned by the new Ponte Gregoriana, all these elements are still easily identifiable today.

But that is about as far as the fidelity of this image goes: the town that Bruegel placed on the right bank of the Aniene is actually on the other side. Aside from the bell towers – from left to right, probably those of Santa Maria Maggiore, San Biagio and San Lorenzo Martire – the buildings he drew no longer exist. And those churches cannot actually be viewed from the spot in question, which means Bruegel must have sketched them from a different vantage point. The solid, round, crenellated building vaguely resembles one of the towers of Rocca Pia, but the castle in question is located on the southwest side of the town and cannot be seen from this point either. Numerous images of the old Tivoli have survived, none of which features a building like this in the same location. The shape is reminiscent, however, of the ancient Mausoleo dei Plauzi, which was fortified in the late Middle Ages.

This distinctive structure, which has also been frequently drawn by artists, is nevertheless situated further up the Aniene near the Ponte Lucano. The building with the little bell tower on the right is probably the small church of Santa Maria del Ponte or San Rocco, which actually stood on the other side at the end of the bridge of the same name. The rocky outcrop with the two cave-like openings on the right, behind which the tip of a tower is just visible, remains a mystery. Two similar hollows can be seen by the side of the road on the far left: the local karst topography has resulted in the creation of numerous caves that Bruegel might have seen. Meanwhile, the ‘doughy’ rocks that Nils Büttner and others have dismissed as products of Bruegel’s imagination are actually formed by the erosion of the calcium-rich travertine, their shape corresponding precisely with the water-carved rocks that can be seen in the lower-lying river gorge, with its countless grotte, which were a popular destination for tourists.

It is clear from all this that the Prospectus Tyburtinus is a much less faithful reflection of the true situation than the modern viewer might expect. Here too, Bruegel assembled a composition after returning to his studio, based on his memory and numerous sketches and drawings. While the topography has broadly been respected, elements have been
Pagus Nemorosus
[cat. no. 2] Milites Requiescentes
switched around, moved closer together or enlarged. It is unclear whether these were deliberate choices or the result of imperfect memory and examples. As in his constructed rendering of the Strait of Messina (see cat. no. 5), Bruegel's primary aim would have been to compose an appealing and recognizable picture of the location, in which distinctive and eloquent natural elements such as the waterfall and the unusual rock formations draw the viewer’s attention. Bruegel’s view of Tivoli was clearly seen as an exceptional achievement, as it was copied repeatedly and served for many years as the only printed representation of the place.

As an image of a striking natural phenomenon located in a region with a rich history, his ‘chorographic’ picture put the seal on an already highly varied series. Prints of this kind certainly appealed to the erudite European elite who not only formed Cock’s clientele, but with whom both Bruegel and his publisher also maintained friendly business and social contacts. So it was that Joris Hoefnagel, who visited Tivoli with Abraham Ortelius in 1578, came to quote Bruegel’s rendering of the waterfall in his own view of the town, published in Braun and Hogenberg’s Civitates Orbis Terrarum. This tells us something about the way Bruegel was viewed by contemporaries like Ortelius: as the artistic exponent of nature. So natural was his art, that every artist ought to take it as his example, along with nature herself.}

1 Both Ss in PROSPECTVS have been cut incorrectly.
2 A third state is generally described with the addition of the number 2 after excude. This is, however, a reworking in pen and ink of an edition of the second state.
4 Hans Mielke continued to regard this drawing as an authentic work by Bruegel. Nadine Orenstein and Manfred Sellink, by contrast, believe it to be a copy and that the sheet formed part of a group of drawings of mountain landscapes that were long considered originals by Bruegel, but are actually imitations produced in the late sixteenth or early seventeenth century by an unidentified artist. Regarding the issues surrounding this work, see Mielke 1996, no. 25; Orenstein and Sellink 2001, no. 125; Silver 2011, p. 120.
5 Mielke 1996, no. 25.
6 The word MILITES was originally cut as MILIES. The error was subsequently corrected by changing the second I to a T and adding an extra I.
7 A third state is generally described with the addition of the number 2 after excude. This is, however, a reworking in pen and ink of an edition of the second state.

8 The Large Landscapes differ in both scale and subject from the equally influential Small Landscapes, which Cock published in 1559 and 1561, and which depict local villages and hamlets. Those prints have long been attributed to Bruegel. See Van Bastelaer 1908, nos. 19–69; Van Grieken, Luijten and Van der Stock 2013, nos. 973 and 978; Onuf 2017.
9 This continued well into the seventeenth century with Herman Saftleven, for example; see Bakker 2004, pp. 143–45. The direct influence of the Large Landscapes in particular and the Large Alpine Landscape is strikingly visible in the work of Hercules Segers; see Leeflang and Roelofs 2016, especially no. HB 3–6. Some prints bear the addresses, in a later state, of Cornelis Danczek (1604–1616) and of Clement de Jonghe (1624–1677), both of whom were print publishers in Amsterdam.
10 This persuasive attribution by Konrad Oberhuber has never been seriously questioned; see Oberhuber 1967, pp. 48–49.
11 See note 4.
12 The Wooded Landscape with Bears, which Cock used as the basis for his Landscape with the Temptation of Christ, was definitely not conceived as a print, however; see cat. no. 1; arguments for this dating in Arndt 1972, pp. 81–83.
17 The latest dated drawing by Matthijs Cock was done in 1544 and an archival document shows that he had already died by 20 March 1547. See Van der Stock 2013, pp. 14–21, particularly pp. 17 and 21, note 31.
18 See Van Grieken, Luijten and Van der Stock 2013, nos. 94, 95, 96a, 96b, 97a, 97b. See also D’haene 2013, passim, and Sellink 2013, pp. 52–57.
19 Virginie D’haene in Van Grieken, Luijten and Van der Stock 2013, no. 95.
20 This is likewise implied by Van Mander: ‘From there he went to work at Jeroon Kock’s, thereafter travelling to France and thence to Italy.’ See Van Mander 1604, fol. 231r. See also the essay by Joris Van Grieken, pp. 18–33.
’Den Cock moet coken om ’t Völckx wil, van als / Wamt deen wilt gebraeck hebben en dander gehouden… manchdaigs niet sijacht ciste olde elders passeren / Wamt dat deen niet en mach wort van dander wel beheert ….’ Picture with rebus and verses from the series Strapwork Compartments by Battini, 1553, engraving, 170 × 118 mm. See Van Grieken, Luijten and Van der Stock 2013, cat. no. 4a.

22 Büttner 2000. For the broader cultural-historical and art-historical context, see also Bakker 2004.

23 Müller Hofstede 1979, pp. 73-142.


25 See Lebeer 1969, no. 9.

26 It is unclear, however, whether these details were worked out by Bruegel himself. This might have been left to the engravers. The quality and style of the vegetation nevertheless suggests the former. See also below.


28 A further argument that is always invoked is the absence of Bruegel’s name on the first state, but this objection can be downplayed or even refuted. The absence of a signature on a proof state naturally means nothing. And even the definitive version of prints that were plainly engraved after a design by Bruegel occasionally lack his name for unknown reasons (see cat. no. 23).

29 Although the majority of the surviving sheets are smaller (approx. 200 × 300 to 350 × 450 mm), examples such as Wooded Landscape with Bears, which Cock turned into Landscape with the Temptation of Christ (see cat. no. 1), and Italian Landscape (after Campagnola; see note 15 and p. 24, fig. 6) show that Bruegel was also producing drawings on the scale of The Large Landscapes in that period (approx. 300 × 400 mm).

30 Büttner 2000b, pp. 147-64.

31 Ibid., pp. 172-73.

32 Ibid., pp. 173 and 174, note 261.

33 These rocks can also be seen below the Ponte di San Rocco and the church of the same name in a drawing (The Ponte di San Rocco in Tivoli, c. 1605, pen and brush in brown ink, with blue and brown washes, over traces of black chalk, 381 × 276 mm, The Cleveland Museum of Art, inv. no. 1914.160) attributed to Guillaume van Nieulandt II (1584–1615). This artist worked with Jacob and Roelant Savery and, in Rome, with Paul Bril — all of whom were well acquainted with and imitated Bruegel’s work. The question can be asked whether he was strictly following nature or whether he was familiar with lost Bruegel study material, which he might have been able to access through Jan Brueghel.


35 See the encomium in the Album amicorum (Friendship Book) of Abraham Ortellius, c. 1573, Cambridge, Pembroke College. See Puraye 1969; Maylls 1981, pp. 119-77.
[cat. no. 2k] Nundinae Rusticorum

Sea and landscapes and the crossing of the Alps
[cat. no. 21] Fuga Deiparae in Aegyptum
Joannes and Lucas van Doetecum after Pieter Bruegel the Elder

Large Alpine Landscape

c. 1555–56, etching and engraving, 368 × 468 mm
Brussels, KBR, Print Room, inv. no. S.I 9394 [I/1]

Inscriptions
Lower right: BRVEGHEL INVE[N] / H. cock excudeb.

States and editions
Only state.1

Copper plates in the estate of Volekzen Diericx (1601): Yeertien coperen plaeten van Lantschappen van Bruegel (Duverger 1984–2006: 1, 18)
In the inventory of Clement de Jonghe’s estate (1679): 14 fol landschappen Bruegel (Laurentius van Grieken, Luijten and Van der Stock 2013, no. 159)

Literature

This print displays substantial similarities with several of the mountain views in Bruegel’s Large Landscapes series, particularly Alpine Landscape with Deep Valley (cat. no. 2d). It too was published by Hieronymus Cock. As in the case of The Large Landscapes, this is an etching with adjustments made by burin – a working method typical of Joannes and/or Lucas van Doetecum. The print itself does not include a date, but has traditionally been assigned to the same period as The Large Landscapes, around 1555–56. The preparatory drawing has not survived. The Large Landscapes cycle was the fruit of a project that was plainly adjusted in the course of the production process. It initially comprised a series of twelve compositions, but ultimately ran to fourteen plates, according at least to the relevant entry in the inventory of Volekzen Diericx’s estate. It is therefore possible that this print was included in the series at an earlier or later date, even though it was originally conceived as an autonomous work. The print is also larger, and no margin has been provided for an inscription. It differs further in that Bruegel’s signature is in capital letters, announcing the way the artist would sign his work in future.

Large Alpine Landscape is also distinguished by its lack of any narrative visual element, like Alpine Landscape with Deep Valley and Prospectus Tyburtinus (View of Tivoli). The landscape itself is the subject here. Albeit an overwhelming landscape: especially for a native of a flat country, such as Bruegel. It represents a vast mountain panorama, in which a river has carved out a deep and wide valley. The jagged rocks, capricious ridges, meandering paths, flowing river and meadows with clusters of trees hold the viewer’s attention. There is evidence of human activity too, albeit insignificant in the face of this majestic nature: we make out a village, a castle atop a protruding crag, a fortified town in the valley at the foot of a steep slope, a few isolated farms, a train of pack mules, but also a solitary gallows and executioner’s wheel. The viewer is invited, as it were, to meditate on the landscape, as if viewing it from an invisible mountaintop. This is what the horseman on the far right, shown from the rear, seems to be doing, as a shepherd walks down the steep mountain in front of him. On the slope below the spot where the rider and his mount have paused, several mountain goats perch on outcrops of rock, making the ravinette that surrounds them in the foreground all the more sombre and menacing. The print is marked – even more so than the other Alpine landscapes engraved after work by Bruegel – by a sense of excitement and insecurity, a dizziness in the face of the immensity of the world.

The dissemination of this masterpiece undoubtedly contributed to Bruegel’s fame as a painter of Alpine scenes. In a famous passage from his Schilder-boeck, published in Haarlem in 1604, Karel van Mander wrote that during his travels through the Alps, the artist had ‘swallowed all those mountains and rocks which, upon returning home, he spat out again onto canvases and panels’. What Bruegel actually did was breathe new life into the tradition inherited from Joachim Patinir, by imbuing his mountain landscapes with an unprecedented visual naturalism, based on his experiences travelling to Italy across the Alps. Fine examples of this can be found not only in his graphic output, but also in his paintings. In addition to the surviving works, we know that Peter Paul Rubens owned a View of the Gotthard Massif by Bruegel. All these works had a profound influence on landscape art in the late sixteenth century, in the work of artists such as Lucas and Marten van Valkenborch, Roelant Savery, Tobias Verhaecht and Joos de Momper. A great many drawings with similar mountain landscapes were produced around 1600, the style of which so closely resembled Bruegel’s that they were long attributed to him. They were only recognized and acknowledged as imitations around the end of the previous century.”

1 A crack developed over time in the lower right corner, where the signatures are located, providing us with information regarding the order in which the surviving impressions were printed.
2 It would nevertheless be useful to revise the chronology of Bruegel’s graphic output, and more specifically that of the landscapes, as Manfred Sellink (Sellink 2013, pp. 52–57) has already suggested.
3 In this connection Van Grieken, Luijten and Van der Stock 2013, no. 107, and also cat. no. 2.
4 The fourteenth print in that case would be Landscape with the Temptation of Christ (see cat. no. 1 and the essay by Maarten Bassens, p. 44).
5 Regarding the way this landscape invites the viewer to meditate, see Falkenburg and Weemans 2018.
6 These two figures might be intended to represent the contrast between the vita contemplativa and the vita activa (Müller et al. 2014, no. 14).
7 Nadine Orenstein has already made explicit reference to the power of this composition and the sense of dizziness it generates (Orenstein and Sellink 2001, no. 35).
9 Denœux 1912, no. 192. This work was previously owned by the Antwerp collector and merchant Pieter Stevens (Briels 1980, pp. 198, 206). Fritz Grossmann claimed that the painting resembled this engraving quite closely, but without offering any decisive arguments (Allart 2001, pp. 49–51, 57, note 47).
10 A summary of this issue is provided by Orenstein and Sellink 2001, pp. 266–67.
Autograph etching by Pieter Bruegel the Elder

The Rabbit Hunt

1560, etching, 223 × 292 mm
Brussels, KBR, Print Room, inv. no. S.II 48464 [I/I]

Inscriptions
Upper right: H. Cock excu; lower left: BRVEGHEL

States and editions
Only state.

Preparatory drawing, pen and grey-brown ink, brush in darker grey, 1560, signed, 213 × 296 mm, Paris, Fondation Custodia, Collection Frits Lugt, inv. no. 6959

Copper plate in the estate of Volcxken Diericx (1601): Een opereen plaatse van een Lantschap van Bruegel of Noch een ander opereen plaatse van een Lantschap van Bruegel (Duverger 1894–2006: I, 33)

Literature

This print holds a special place in Bruegel’s oeuvre, as it is the only etching that he executed himself. The artist made unusually free and skilful use of the possibilities offered by the medium. He modelled the sunny crowns of the trees in an almost pointillist manner and was able with a few dashes and dots to add relief to the orchard in front of the farmhouse lower left. The effect of depth is enhanced by the judicious use of fine and heavier lines and points. Bruegel also made a preparatory drawing for this etching. Because of its somewhat careless and sketchy execution, the sheet has only been accepted as an authentic work by Bruegel since the publication of Hans Mielke’s catalogue of his drawings. The work is in keeping, for instance, with the artist’s early landscape drawings, while its intended purpose explains the looser penwork and the limited elaboration and detail. It was Bruegel himself, after all, who was to work out the design directly on the copper plate. The preliminary drawing was done in two phases: in addition to the areas worked out in pen and grey-brown ink, shadows and details were emphasized in brush with darker ink at a later stage. Further research has shown that these adjusted areas largely correspond with the corrections made by burin to the etched plate. There are also numerous differences between the drawing and the etching, which indicate that Bruegel altered certain elements during the etching process.

The scene after which the print is named is located in the foreground, where a hunter accompanied by a dog aims his crossbow at two rabbits or hares. It has rightly been linked to a proverb in Erasmus’ Adagia: Duos insequens lepores neutrnum capit (‘He who chases two hares catches neither’). But there is something more going on here: the unsuspecting hunter is being stalked in turn by a man behind the tree, armed with a halberd. There is a sense of menace in the scene that contrasts sharply with the charming landscape. Margaret Sullivan has also linked the motif of the hunter as quarry with a Latin proverb quoted in the same source: Tute lepus es, & pulpamentum quarius (‘A hare yourself, you hunt for prey’). It is an allusion, she suggests, to the political and religious situation in Antwerp around 1560, when a climate of suspicion reigned after bounties were offered for denouncing alleged heretics. It is not possible at our present remove to determine whether the artist was indeed referring to this situation and whether this would have been understood by some of the print’s viewers. Yet an interpretation of this kind is not unduly implausible, given what Karel van Mander wrote about the ‘caustic’ or ‘derisory’ drawings that Bruegel supposedly ordered to be destroyed on his deathbed, although this claim too is impossible to verify.

Although the print is known only from impressions with the address of Hieronymus Cock, it is not clear whether it was commissioned by him. Numerous elements do, however, point in that direction. The horizontal format and dimensions (approximately 9 by 12 Antwerp inches) correspond with most of the prints that Bruegel designed for Cock, and space has clearly been left in the lower margin for a text to be inserted of the kind that was customary for Cock’s editions. The two proverbs would not have been out of place here, but an edition with the text never materialized. [JVG]
Frans Huys after Pieter Bruegel the Elder

Naval Battle in the Strait of Messina

1561, engraving and etching, printed from two plates, $428 \times 717 \text{ mm}$
Brussels, KBR, Print Room, inv. no. S. I 1666 [II/V]

Inscriptions
Lower left: F. HVIS . FECIT , lower right: BRVEGEL INVENTOR

States and editions
I the impressions generally have an attached letterpress text on separate strips of paper:
Trinacriæ insignes portumque vetustam / Messanam, veteres quam construxerè
Pelagi, // Parte vides dextra, & scopulos, sedesq[u]e Gigantum, // Qua micat horrendum
nocturnis ignibus Æthna. // Rhegius à læua est,
Calabrum trarctus : a illud / Inter vtrumque
fretum Scylla terribile monstro // Olim terra fuit,
quae pór quassata dehiscens / Ionium excepit
Pelagus, factumque barathrum. // CORNELIVS
ADALEM EXCVDEBAT, ANNO .M.D.LXI.
CVN PRIVILEGIO,

II addition of the place names REZO (left) and MESSINA (right). The text that was added to the first state as a letterpress strip is now engraved in a cartouche in the lower right corner. The final lines no longer refer to Cornelis van Dalem as publisher, but to Hieronymus Cock: Hieronymi
Cock pictor excudebat, M. D. LXi. / CVM Gratia et privilicio / Bruegel Inven.
Added in the upper margin: FRET I SICYLI SIVE MAMERTINI VULGO EL FARO DI
MESSINA OPTICA DELINEATI

III with the address Du Palais A Paris Paul de la
House excudat 1601.

IV the address has been changed to Harman
Adolff exc. Haerlem.

V the address has been changed to Impressa in
aedibus Nicolai Johannes Visscher A° 1632.

Related drawing in pen and brown ink, c. 1560,
later heavily reworked by another hand in grey and
brown washes, $156 \times 242 \text{ mm}$, Rotterdam, Museum

Copper plates in the estate of Volckken Diericx
(1601): Twee coperen plaatcs van der Storm der zee
van Messino (Duverger 1984–2006: I, 28)

Impressions in the estate of Volckken Diericx
(1601): Tweeendertig bladeren van de Stadt Rezo
(Duverger 1984–2006: I, 24)

Literature
Van Bastelaer 1908, no. 96; Oberhuber 1967, no. 41;
Lebeer 1969, no. 40; De Ramaix 1968–69, no. 40;
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This two-plate engraving, printed on the same number of sheets, is by far the largest that Bruegel ever designed. The image itself is an unusual one for the time. We look out from an elevated viewpoint across a sea strait, in which a naval skirmish is taking place in the foreground. Puffs of smoke indicate that the warships are firing their cannons. A sailing ship is being boarded by a galley in the middle. Several other galleys are clearly targeting the three-masted vessel on the left. Another three-master on the right flees under full sail, as a mass of galleys approaches the scene from the harbours in the background. Plumes of smoke rise up above the city on the left. The location of the action is identifiable not only from the topographically accurate depiction of the landscape but also from the inscriptions. Reggio di Calabria (Rezo) – the city in flames – is located on the Strait of Messina opposite the town of the same name (Messina), behind which rises a cloud-topped and smoke-belching Mount Etna.

Bruegel must have visited the spot during his travels in Italy. He might even have gone to Southern Italy by ship at the beginning of his journey1 and may have witnessed the hostilities in 1552–53 between the Franco-Ottoman and the imperial fleets. The bombardment caused a fire in the town of Reggio di Calabria. The Latin text describes the mythical origins of the location, but makes no mention, surprisingly, of these still recent events. The print was cut in copper by Frans Huys, as was the series of ships (see cat. no. 6) created in the same period. Bruegel’s preparatory material for this print has been lost, with the exception of a drawing in Rotterdam showing Reggio di Calabria in flames.2 The Rotterdam sheet does, however, give us an idea of how the artist approached the assignment. Having undoubtedly made copious sketches in situ, the master then developed detailed studies in his studio, which were later combined, possibly based on a composition sketch worked out in advance. Everything had to be rendered in reverse so that the topography would be correct in the finished prints. The drawing cannot therefore have been made on location, but probably served as a preparation for the preparatory drawing, now sadly lost.

This method resulted in more of an artistic interpretation than a realistic representation of the local situation. Bruegel clearly brought together various elements drawn from different viewpoints. The tip of the spit of land on which the port of Messina is located is actually oriented more towards the Sicilian coast. The artist probably drew this element of the harbour from the shore and combined it with a view of the town from a ship. Bruegel might have set down the general geographical situation from a hill on the neck of land called Punta del Faro, or simply Faro, to which the text in the upper margin refers.3 The various locations and reference points might be situated more or less accurately in topographical terms, but the distances between them are much smaller in the print than in reality. Etna, for instance, which stands almost 75 kilometres away, is barely visible from this vantage point. The cliffs at Scilla are another recognizable spot. They are shown in the print in the front left, just to the north of Reggio, whereas they are actually located much further away on the northern entrance to the strait. Scilla was the legendary home of the sea monster,
Scylla, referred to in the inscription. Like Etna, this mythical natural monument had to feature more prominently in the engraving. The cliff can also be seen in the Rotterdam drawing, but is hard to recognize due to the later reworking of the sheet. The proportions look much more natural in an old copy of a lost study sheet by Bruegel, acquired by the KBR in 2011 (fig. 1). All the same, and contrary to what was believed until recently, this composition cannot have been drawn from nature either. The differences compared to the actual location are simply too great. The lost original might have formed an intermediate stage in the design process. Bruegel compressed the vast panorama into a strong composition with greater relief and eloquence.

The combination of realistically rendered topographical information and interesting facts from mythology and history was clearly meant to elicit the interest of the erudite elite of Bruegel’s era. The size of the print alone means that the production costs – and hence the purchase price – must have been relatively high. This might explain why the extremely rare first state does not mention Hieronymus Cock as its publisher, but the landscape painter and nobleman Cornelis van Dalem, who might have acted as financier to enable this prestigious engraving to be produced. The second state was published by Cock that same year, now with the definitively engraved text. Although new impressions of the print continued to be produced until the seventeenth century, it is relatively rare today. It is evident from most of the well-preserved examples that they were kept folded up in albums for many years. The subject and the large size meant, however, that the print was also sought after as a wall decoration. Glued to linen or wood and possibly coloured in or framed, these impressions were far less able to survive the passage of time. [JVG]
6.
Frans Huys and Cornelis Cort (?) after Pieter Bruegel the Elder

Sailing Vessels
c. 1561–65, ten unnumbered engravings (with occasional etching)

6a
A Dutch Hulk and a Boeier
Engraving; 244 × 193 mm
Brussels, KBR, Print Room, inv. no. S.II 26928 [1/II]

Inscriptions
Bottom, left of centre: 1565; on the stern of the ship: DIT SCP 1564

States and editions
I: as described.
II: the date 1565 has been removed.

6b
Armed Four-Master
Sailing towards a Port
Engraving and etching, 291 × 219 mm
Brussels, KBR, Print Room, inv. no. S.I 7575 [1/IV]

Inscriptions
Bottom, right of centre: FH

States and editions
I: as described.
II: addition in the middle of the margin of the address Theodorus Galle excud.; on the right, the privilege has been removed and altered to the number 7.

6c
Armed Three-Master
on the Open Sea accompanied by a Galley
Engraving and etching, 314 × 246 mm
Brussels, KBR, Print Room, inv. no. S.II 26929 [II/III]

Inscriptions
Upper left: Cum privilegio; bottom left: BRVEGEL / FH.; lower right: H. Cock exc.

States and editions
I: as described.
II: plate trimmed at the top (302 × 240 mm), removing the privilege.
III privilege removed in the lower margin, right, and altered to the number 6.

6d
Armed Three-Master
with Daedalus and Icarus in the Sky
Engraving, 226 × 294 mm
Brussels, KBR, Print Room, inv. no. S.III 26114 [1/III]

Inscriptions
Lower left: F.H. bruegel.; in the margin, right: Cum privilegio

States and editions
I: as described.
II: addition in the middle of the margin of the address Theodorus Galle excud.

6e
Armed Four-Master
Putting out to Sea
Engraving and etching, 223 × 293 mm
Brussels, KBR, Print Room, inv. no. S.I 7581 [1/II]

Inscriptions
Lower left: F.H. bruegel.; in the margin, right: Cum privilegio

States and editions
I: as described.
II: privilege removed in the lower margin, right, and altered to the number 6.

6f
Armed Three-Master
Anchored near a City
Engraving and etching, 232 × 292 mm
Brussels, KBR, Print Room, inv. no. S.I 7580 [1/II]

Inscriptions
Lower right: F.H. bruegel.; in the margin, right: Cum privilegio

States and editions
I: as described.
II: addition in the middle of the margin of the address Theodorus Galle excud.

6g
Four-Master and Two Three-Masters Anchored near a Fortified Island with a Lighthouse
Engraving and etching, 226 × 294 mm
Brussels, KBR, Print Room, inv. no. S.I 7583 [I/III]

Inscriptions
Lower right: F.H. bruegel; lower right in the margin: Cum privilegio

States and editions
I: as described.
II: addition in the middle of the margin of the address Theodorus Galle excud.
III privilege removed in the margin, right, and altered to the number 11.
[cat. no. 6a] *A Dutch Hulk and a Boeier*
[cat. no. 6b] Armed Four-Master Sailing towards a Port
Three Caravels in a Rising Squall with Arion on a Dolphin

Engraving and etching, 218 × 286 mm
Brussels, KBR, Print Room, inv. no. S.I 59734

Inscriptions
Lower left: F.H. bruegel; lower right in the margin: Cum privileg

States and editions
I as described.
II addition on a cloud, upper right, of the address H. Cock ex.
III address on the cloud removed.
IV addition in the margin, left, of the number 4.
V the number 4 has been removed.
VI addition in the margin, centre, of the address Theodorus Galle excud. and addition right of the number 8.

Two Galleys Sailing behind an Armed Three-Master with Phaeton and Jupiter in the Sky

Engraving, 220 × 282 mm
Brussels, KBR, Print Room, inv. no. S.I 7589 [I/II]

Inscriptions
Lower left: F.H.; lower right: bruegel; in the margin, right: Cum privileg

States and editions
I as described.
II signed in a cartouche lower left: F.H. bruegel; addition in the margin, centre, of the address Theodorus Galle excud. and addition right of the number 9.

A Fleet of Galleys Escorted by a Caravel

Engraving and etching, 225 × 292 mm
Brussels, KBR, Print Room, inv. no. S.I 7589 [I/II]

Inscriptions
Lower left: F.H.; lower right: bruegel; in the margin, right: Cum privileg

States and editions
I as described.
II plate trimmed on the left (225 × 276 mm), removing the monogram F.H.; addition in the margin, centre, of the address Theodorus Galle excud.1

Copper plates in the inventory of Catharina Moerentorf, supplemented by two other plates (1636): De Schepen Bruegel twelff fflaten (Duverger 1984–2006: IV, 20)
In Joannes Galle’s catalogue (c. 1650): 2146–46
Naupégia. Bruegel inv. II. (Fuhring 2017: no. 123)

Literature
Armed Three-Master on the Open Sea accompanied by a Galley

[cat. no. 6c]
[cat. no. 6d] Armed Three-Master with Daedalus and Icarus in the Sky
The sailing vessels series testifies to the immense variety of themes found in Bruegel’s graphic work. Ships play a significant part in many of his drawings, paintings and prints, but here they are the absolute centre of attention. The series is highly varied: some of the vessels are presented individually, while others lie at anchor in groups near a lighthouse or sail in formation on waters both calm and stormy. A few of the scenes are set on the open sea, but in most cases the coast or a city is visible in the background.

In addition to large, frequently armed merchant vessels, we find manoeuvrable galleys, designed for warfare in the Mediterranean. One print even includes a boeier – a type of ship that was mainly employed on inland waterways.

The immense detail and accuracy of the depicted vessels suggest that a great deal of study went into producing the final designs, although the relevant sketches or nature studies have not survived, any more than the preliminary drawings. The series includes both Northern European and Mediterranean vessel types. Merchant ships from all over Europe put into Bruegel’s home city of Antwerp, but the artist must also have made detailed drawings during his visit to Italy. Mythological scenes were incorporated in three of the prints in the series: the fall of Icarus, the fall of Phaethon, and Arion on a dolphin. It has been suggested that these were later additions – a hypothesis resting on stylistic arguments, given the lack of surviving preparatory drawings. However, unlike *The Rest on the Flight into Egypt* (see cat. no. 21), say, where there are firmer grounds for doubting Bruegel’s authorship of the figures, the quality of these scenes is excellent and they are integrated successfully in the compositions. We ought not to forget that Bruegel’s training under Pieter Coecke van Aelst, as well as the time he spent in Italy, had familiarized him with the Italianizing idiom used in these instances (see also cat. no. 36). A few vague yet nonetheless striking similarities with works from Coecke’s studio might be an indication that Bruegel drew on material for his designs that had been assembled over a longer period of time.

The creation of the series appears to have been quite laborious and the dating of the prints has long been a matter of discussion. The obvious similarities to *Naval Battle in the Strait of Messina* (cat. no. 3) suggest that they were produced around 1560, yet one of the engravings shows a merchantman with the inscription *Dit scip 1564* (this ship 1564) on its stern, while the year 1565 appears on a wave in the foreground. This is one of two sheets, however, without the initials of the engraver Frans Huys, who died before 10 April 1562. The twice-dated engraving was left unfinished on his death, but was then completed by another hand, identified on stylistic grounds as that of Cornelis Cort. Was it Cort who put a date on the ship and took the liberty of engraving the arms of Amsterdam, Enkhuizen and his native town of Hoorn on it? Or were these already present in Bruegel’s drawing? We will never know for sure, but we can conclude from all this that Bruegel probably finished the drawings around 1560 and that the plates were completed, with two exceptions, by the spring of
1562. The series as a whole might not have found its way onto the market until 1565, the year in which Cort left the Low Countries to settle in Italy for good.

Isolated images of ships in print form were certainly not a novelty: Bruegel’s series had numerous precursors, the best known of which include engravings attributed to Venetian workshops, as well as a series of nine sheets by Master WA, who was active in the eastern Low Countries. All of these date from the final quarter of the fifteenth century and were evidently very popular as an example for artists and artisans. Bruegel and his publisher are likely to have been familiar with these or similar series. Perhaps they wanted to respond to the persistent popularity of such prints by creating a fresh edition. Compared with the almost archaic examples from the previous century, however, they opted for a new approach: not only are these vessels depicted with unprecedented naturalism, the way Bruegel placed his meticulously observed ships in larger, beautifully structured compositions is also innovative.

What most differentiates Bruegel’s series from its predecessors, however, is the attention that he paid to representing the sky and the atmospheric conditions. *Armed Three-Master with Daedalus and Icarus in the Sky* remains the most conventional in this respect. The searing heat of the sun also forms part of the story in this print. The elevated viewpoint means that an equal amount of space is given to both water and sky, linking it in this regard to the magisterial painting *View of the Bay of Naples* (see pp. 26–27, fig. 8) and the print of the *Naval Battle in the Strait of Messina* (cat. no. 5). In the other prints, Bruegel opted for a somewhat lower viewpoint. The beholder’s sense of involvement is heightened by a view of the scene as if from the quayside or out at sea among the ships. Since the horizon is also lowered, the sky takes up most of the composition – a space that Bruegel used gratefully. The clouds, which are rendered dramatically at times, feel very natural and are virtually unprecedented in art history with their overwhelming power. The focus on the ships almost makes us forget that we are looking here at fully fledged seascapes. These prints circulated on a relatively large scale and new impressions were still demonstrably being produced after the middle of the seventeenth century. It is no exaggeration to say that Bruegel’s series points the way towards the marine painting that would develop as a separate genre in the Dutch Golden Age.

Given that the series is incomplete in many collections and the original edition is not numbered, the extent of the series has been the subject of some debate. René van Bastelaer, for instance, included in the series an eleventh sheet with small ships at sea. The print in question might have originated in Hieronymus Cock’s circle, but it otherwise has little in common with Bruegel’s powerful ships’ portraits. The vessels in this instance are depicted in the distance, as in the pen drawing in the Courtauld Gallery in London, which has also been held out occasionally as an unexecuted preparatory drawing for a print from this series. Campbell Dodgson proposed the addition of two further prints to the series, but these are too far removed from the work of
Armed Four-Master Putting out to Sea

[cat. no. 6e]
[cat. no. 6f] Armed Three-Master Anchored near a City
Bruegel and Huys, both stylistically and in terms of engraving technique, for this to be plausible. While the inventory of Volcxken Diericx’s estate clearly mentions ‘Tien copperen platen van de Scheepkens van Bruegel’ (‘Ten copper plates with Bruegel’s ships’) and Christophe Plantin received ‘Alle de Schepen 10 f’ (‘All the ships, 10 f’) in 1568, it is possible that subsequent publishers occasionally added sheets to the series that have little or nothing to do with Bruegel’s initial concept.” Volcxken Diericx, for instance, had ‘Acht Historiën van Schepen van elf bladeren’ (‘Eight histories of ships of eleven sheets’) in stock, while the series was listed in the estate inventory of Catharina Moerentorf (1636), the widow of Theodoor Galle, as consisting of no fewer than twelve plates.18

The lack of inscriptions and a title page thus raises questions as to the intentions of the artist and the publisher. The somewhat heterogeneous nature of the series, in which neutral, objective depictions of ships occur alongside seascapes featuring mythological tales, suggests that we ought not to look for any specific deeper meanings. The prints are often interpreted as products of a particular period and milieu, in which mercantile capitalism, founded on international and transcontinental shipping, was responsible for major upheavals.19 Ships were not only a source of unprecedented wealth, but also the rise of a new urban elite. What’s more, shipping offered access to exotic locations and their new products. A connection is frequently drawn too with the interest in discoveries, travel and foreign cultures that is expressed so clearly in the science, chorography and cartography of the time. It is no coincidence, then, that these prints were created in Antwerp – a port city in which the developments in question played a central role. All these elements are pertinent, yet they still do no more than sketch the general social and cultural climate in which the series was produced. It is entirely possible that the engravings were to the taste of the new merchant elite in Antwerp, whose wealth derived from the flourishing maritime trade. And Bruegel may well have been fascinated by ships and with the journeys and discoveries associated with them, just like his friend, the erudite cartographer Abraham Ortelius. While it certainly cannot be ruled out that such an interest helped motivate him to create the series, it is the commercial character of these prints that will have been paramount from the publisher’s point of view and also, certainly, from that of the artist, whose living depended on them. In this instance too, Cock applied his tried and tested recipe of serving up a high-quality, varied product to an equally diverse clientele. Bruegel’s brilliant designs made these images of sailing vessels highly innovative; yet as the earlier examples cited above demonstrate, they also
belonged to a tradition that had proven itself both artistically and economically. The prints were no doubt to the liking of Cock’s core clientele: artists and artisans who could use the ships as models. But the series clearly had a wider potential as well, which might explain why he refrained from adding texts or commissioning a particular interpretation and target audience. Images of sailing vessels offered something for everyone and Cock always aimed, after all, to ‘do the cooking for the sake of the people,’ as his punning verse famously stated. [JVG]

1 In pen and black ink in the upper right corner of the Brussels print: **Cum privilegio**.
2 A crack developed on the rowing boat lower left, which expanded in the course of printing.
3 A crack developed in the upper left corner in the course of printing and the corner eventually broke off.
4 Bruegel’s proficiency in this period is expressed, for instance, in his View of the Ripa Grande in Rome, c. 1555–56, pen and reddish-brown and dark-brown ink, 207 × 283 mm, Chatsworth, The Trustees of the Chatsworth Settlement, inv. no. 84. The drawing shows boats moored at the Tiber quayside. See Mielke 1996, no. 14. It is currently assumed that the surviving drawings were worked up at a later date based on earlier sketch material. For that reason, the drawing of the Ripa Grande is usually given a later date. See, in this regard, Sellink 2013, pp. 295ff.
5 The galloping horses in Bruegel recall those in various tapestry cartoons from Coecke’s studio. See, for example, The Conversion of Saul. The figure of Saul falling from his horse is also vaguely reminiscent of Bruegel’s falling Phaethon. See Cleland et al. 2014, pp. 139–45, nos. 27–29. The gaping maw of the sea creature next to Arion reminds us in turn somewhat of the sea monster Cetus in the tapestry Andromeda Freed by Persers from the Poesia series. See Cleland et al. 2014, pp. 294–301, and especially p. 296, fig. 209.
7 Timothy Riggs was the first to suggest this attribution. See Riggs 1979, pp. 165–73.
8 For this identification, see De Groot and Vorstman 1980, no. 1. Based on the Enkhuizen arms, they also suggested that the ships are shown off that town on the Zuiderzee – a hypothesis that has since been generally adopted in the literature. The outline of the town is too vague, however, to sustain this identification. See Lichtert 2014, p. 111.
9 See Lebeer 1943.
11 The ships are depicted with such detail and accuracy that they serve as an objective source for the history of shipping. For the identification and description of the ships, see Buyssens 1954, pp. 159–91; Smekens 1961, pp. 5–57; De Groot and Vorstman 1980, pp. 9–10 and nos. 1–5.
12 By way of comparison, see the painting attributed to Bruegel on the same theme. The authorship of that work remains contested, however. It has been established in the meantime that all the known versions were created long after Bruegel’s death. See Sellink 2007, no. X5.
13 Pieter Bruegel the Elder, View of the Bay of Naples, c. 1563 (?), oil on panel, 42.2 × 71.2 cm, Rome, Galleria Doria Pamphilj, inv. no. fc 546; see Oberthaler et al. 2018, no. 14.
14 Van Bastelaer 1908, no. 108.
15 Pieter Bruegel the Elder, Storm with View of a City, c. 1559–63 (?), pen and brown ink, traces of black chalk, 202 × 299 mm, London, The Courtauld Institute of Art, Seilern Collection, inv. no. II. See Mielke 1996, no. 52; Sellink 2007, no. 79; Sellink 2013, pp. 296–97.
16 Dodgson 1931, pp. 81–82; see also Lebeer 1969, pp. 114–15, for the critical rejection of this addition.
18 A similar phenomenon occurred with The Large Landscapes (see cat. no. 2). See also the archival documents referred to above. For a survey of this issue, see Lebeer 1969, pp. 114–15, and Orenstein and Sellink 2001, pp. 217, 218, note 3.
19 See, among others, Silver 1996, pp. 124–53. See also Sellink 2015, pp. 53–74.
Four-Master and Two Three-Masters Anchored near a Fortified Island with a Lighthouse

(cat. no. 6g)
[cat. no. 6h] Three Caravels in a Rising Squall with Arion on a Dolphin
[cat. no. 61] Two Galleys Sailing behind an Armed Three-Master with Phaeton and Jupiter in the Sky
[cat. no. 6] *A Fleet of Galleys Escorted by a Caravel*
In 1567 Lodovico Guicciardini, an Antwerp citizen who originated from Florence, published a book that would become a popular source of information in the following century. In *Descrittione di tutti i Paesi Bassi*, his exhaustive description of the Low Countries, Guicciardini included a brief passage about Hieronymus Cock. At the beginning of a lengthy list of contemporary painters Guicciardini describes the seller of prints: ‘Girolamo Cock inuentore, & gran diuulgatore per via di stampa dell’opera di Girolamo Bosco, & d’altri eccellenti Pittori, onde è veramente bene merito dell’arte.’ (‘Hieronymus Cock, an original artist, who published many prints after the work of Hieronymus Bosch and other famous painters, and is therefore very much appreciated in the arts.’) Although this description relates to only a small group within Cock’s entire publisher’s list – which consisted of over 1,500 prints – the initiative to publish graphic images ‘after’ Bosch did not go unnoticed. Guicciardini here explicitly names Cock as the disseminator of prints after Bosch and other painters. What this passage shows is that Guicciardini considered Cock as someone who made the work of painters available to a wider audience. Guicciardini appears to plainly accept the prints after Bosch as a source of knowledge about the artist. Cock hereby becomes someone who is not only out for profit, but who also has an interest in the art of the past.

This is also evident from Cock’s decision to compile a *Schildersboeck* (book of painters), a collection of twenty-three portraits of artists, accompanied by inscriptions and a dedication by Dominicus Lampsonius in memory of the late Hieronymus Cock. The nineteenth portrait in the series is that of Pieter Bruegel. In the caption, Lampsonius establishes the tone by asking a question: ‘Quis novus hic Hieronymus Orbi Boschius?’ (‘Who is this new Hieronymus Bosch for the world?’) The *Pictorvm aliqvot celebrivm Germaniae inferioris effigies*, listed in the inventory of Volckxen Diericx as ‘a book of painters’, appeared in 1572, five years after Guicciardini first mentioned that Bruegel had been nicknamed the ‘second Bosch’ in his *Descrittione*. Bruegel is described as being accomplished in imitating the knowledge and ingenuity of Bosch: ‘Pietro Brueghel di Breda, grande imitatore della scienza et fantasie di Girolamo Bosco, onde n’ha anche acquistato il soprannome di “Secondo Girolamo Bosco”.’ Guicciardini explicitly mentions that he had already completed the research for his *Descrittione* in 1560. This means that Bruegel earned his sobriquet with the Bosch-like work that he made before that date. As well as *Big Fish Eat Little Fish* (1557, cat. no. 8), these were *The Temptation of Saint Anthony* (1556, cat. no. 9), *Patientia* (1557, cat. no. 10), *The Seven Deadly Sins* series (c. 1558, cat. no. 11), *The Last Judgement* (1558, cat. no. 12) and *The Stone Operation or The Witch of Mallegem* (1559, cat. no. 18). He had not yet painted works such as *Dulle Griet* (1563) and *The Fall of the Rebel Angels* (1562, see p. 30, fig. 10). As late as 1565, Bruegel produced the typically Boschian designs for *Saint James and the Magician Hermogenes* and *Saint James and the Fall of the Magician Hermogenes* (cat. no. 9), which were published by Cock.

Bruegel apparently earned his reputation as the ‘second Bosch’ first and foremost with prints that were published by Cock, but possibly paintings such as *The Battle between Carnival and Lent* and *The Proverbs* (both 1559) were associated with Bosch as well. Perhaps this also applies to the prints *Everyman* (c. 1558, cat. no. 16), *The Ass at School* (1557, cat. no. 15) and *The Alchemist* (c. 1558, cat. no. 17). The manner in which Giorgio Vasari refers to these prints in the second edition of his *Vite* (1568) suggests something of the sort. Thus the links between Bruegel, the notion of imitation (*imitatio*) and Bosch were established in the earliest writings about Bruegel.

**MATTHIJS ILSINK**
The Temptation of Saint Anthony

1556, engraving, 245 × 320 mm
Brussels, KBR, Print Room, inv. no. S.I 7602 [II/II]

Inscriptions
Lower left: Cock . excud . i556; lower margin: 
MVLTAE TRIBULATIONES ISYTORVM, DE OMNIBVS EX OMNIBVS: PSAL 33

States and editions
1 as described.
II various minimal reworkings in the plate, such as the addition of an extra coin above the money bag lower right, several feathers on the head of the bird at the top and a flight of birds on the far left; extra hatching beneath the jug-man, in the eye of the big fish and in the neckerchief worn by the smooching angler.

Preparatory drawing in pen and brush and brown and grey-brown ink, signed and dated i556, 216 × 326 mm, Oxford, Ashmolean Museum, inv. no. I 30a


Preparatory drawing in pen and brush and brown and grey-brown ink, signed and dated i556, 245 × 320 mm, Oxford, Ashmolean Museum, inv. no. I 30a

The Duchy of Brabant experienced a series of catastrophes in 1556. Besides failed harvests, the region was afflicted by plague, the first outbreak of which was detected on 30 May in Beveren, a hamlet on the opposite bank of the Scheldt to Antwerp. In an attempt to confine the epidemic to the other side of the river, sweeping regulations were announced within the city walls. That same year, Bruegel drew his design for The Temptation of Saint Anthony, who had been invoked since time immemorial for protection against the plague.

Bruegel places the hermit next to a large, dead tree, together with his traditional companions, a pig and a Bowman. Anthony kneels in deep contemplation, seemingly unaware of the infernal chaos unfolding behind him. The artist based his Temptation of Saint Anthony on the fantastical imagery of Hieronymus Bosch and his many followers active in Antwerp. The subject provided artists with a highly rewarding theme throughout the sixteenth century, enabling them to give free rein to their creativity.

A central place has been given in Bruegel’s design – one of his earliest experiments with the Boschian style – to a frightening, oversized human head with a fish on top. An ominous plume of smoke rises from the mouth, while one of the nostrils is pierced by a pince-nez. The composition as a whole is full of eye-catching elements that are as yet difficult to explain. As Louis Lebeer noted in 1969, it is best not to dig around for iconographic explanations in collections of Flemish or other proverbs. Some earlier authors, meanwhile, were convinced that Bruegel’s invention could be interpreted as a veiled attack on ecclesiastical corruption. Yet the scene appears more like a battle, in which the human figures on the left vainly resist the apocalyptic invasion of demonic monsters on the right. The way they are depicted, however, and the various attributes they have been given, alluding to human sins and frailties, suggest that they are going about the fight the wrong way. Anthony’s example offers a greater hope of salvation: he is able to resist these temptations by turning his back on worldly things.

Rene van Bastelaer was still unsure in 1907 as to whether the preparatory drawing in Oxford was an authentic work by Pieter Bruegel the Elder, but those doubts were firmly put to rest by authors such as Karl von Tölnai and Hans Mielke. In their view its bold lines are fully in keeping with the drawing style Bruegel had applied in other designs. Since the drawing is not reversed compared to the engraving, the sheet cannot have served directly as the basis for the printing plate. Perhaps it was easier for Bruegel to work out his initial design in this way, using the intended final orientation of the image.

The Brussels impression of Bruegel’s Temptation of Saint Anthony is the second state of two and has been consistently overlooked until now. All the same, the engraved composition displays a number of adjustments. Why and by whom these changes were made to the printing plate remain a mystery at this stage. [MB]
8.

Pieter van der Heyden after Pieter Bruegel the Elder

**Big Fish Eat Little Fish**

1557, engraving, 229 x 296 mm
Brussels, KBR, Print Room, inv. no. S.II 19175 [I/III]

Inscriptions
Lower left: *PAME* (monogram); above: *Hieronymus Bos. inuentor*; lower left of centre: *ECCE*; lower right: *COCK. EXCV. i557*; in the margin: *GRANDIBVS EXIGVI SVNT PISCES PISCIBVS ESCA.* 'Siet sone dit hebtte ik zeer langhe gheweten, dat die groote vissen de cleynen eten'

States and editions
I as described.
II Cock's address and the date have been removed.
III with the address *Ioan. Galle excudit* and a capital *N* in the lower right margin. Inscriptions in the sky upper right in Latin, French and Dutch. *OPPRESSIO PAVPERTVM / Divites per potentiam / Opprimunt vos. Iacob 2.6. // L'OPPRESSION DES PAUVRES / Les Riches vous maistrirent / Par leur puissance. // VERDRUKNINGE DER ARMEN // De rijke lieden verdrucken u door gewelt.*

Preparatory drawing in pen and brush, grey and black ink, 1556, signed, 216 x 307 mm, Vienna, Albertina, inv. no. 7875


Literature

A gigantic fish lies on the bank of a wide river, its mouth agape and its belly sliced open with a knife. Other fish, which have gobbled up still smaller ones, pour out from both openings. Some of them slip back into the water, where they are promptly devoured in turn by yet more fish. The same motif is repeated elsewhere: a half-human, half-fish creature strides inland on the left with a fish in its maw, while big fish eat the little ones in the river itself, too. The proverb is well known and was frequently used in Bruegel's time. It alludes to the way the rich grow steadily richer on the backs of the poor, as confirmed by the inscriptions added to the later states. A man and a child sit in the rowing boat in the foreground watching the goings-on from a distance. The word *ECCE* (look) is inscribed to the right of them. The text in the margin explains the wisdom the father is imparting to his boy: 'Look son, I have long known that the big fish eat the small.' 'Son' refers here to all children: we learn of our status as small fishes in this world from someone who has himself always been a small fish.

The knife with which the man in the helmet resolutely280 305
slits the belly of the biggest fish is stamped with a mark that clearly represents the world. A city can be made out on the horizon, highlighted by several towers, a crane and half a dozen ships. Is Bruegel alluding here to the business of the port and to his home city, as some authors have suggested? Greed was certainly an apt theme for the trading metropolis of Antwerp, also considered one of the cradles of capitalism.

Some historians have even interpreted the print as a political or religious pamphlet referring to specific contemporary events.4 Surely more relevant and more typical of Bruegel, however, is the universality of a theme like this and its allusion to human failings and sinful behaviour. The key to a proper understanding of the print is the fact that it is the largest and greediest fish that finds itself high and dry. The moral of the tale is that everything you accumulate through greed will one day be lost.

Pieter van der Heyden engraved the print after Bruegel's preliminary drawing, now in the Albertina in Vienna. Bruegel made van der Heyden's work easier by providing clear indications in his drawing, such as the precise modelling, with nuances of light and shade achieved through hatching, dots and dashes.5 It seems odd on the face of it that Bruegel should have signed the drawing, but that his name is not included in the print. It has been suggested in the past that the composition actually derived from a design by Hieronymus Bosch, but this is not the case. Hieronymus Cock's addition of the words *Hieronymus Bos inuentor* will have been prompted in part by marketing considerations and the Bosch revival that was underway at the time. Another pertinent reason for leaving out Bruegel's name and explicitly mentioning that of Bosch reflects the relationship between Bruegel's work and that of his illustrious predecessor. The context is that of artistic emulation, in which the imitator sought to outdo his example.6 Lodovico Guicciardini (1567) and Dominicus Lampsonius (1572) both dubbed Bruegel a 'second Bosch' – a nickname that he earned primarily through prints of the kind that Cock published in the second half of the 1550s.7

---

1 'Little fish are the food of big fish.'
2 'Look son, I have long known that the big fish eat the small.'
3 'Look and the fourth state were mentioned by Van Bastelaer 1908 (no. 119). It has not been possible, however, to locate a third state without additional inscriptions in the sky. What's more, Joannes Galle's editions share the appearance of the fourth state described in the literature. It makes sense, therefore, to abandon the distinction and to combine the relevant descriptions as referring to one and the same third state.
5 Mielke 1996, no. 31.
6 For an overview, see Marijnissen et al. 1988, pp. 80–82.
7 Oberthaler et al. 2018, p. 70.
8 Ilsink 2009, pp. 216, 222, 237, 231.
9 See also, for example, *The Temptation of Saint Anthony* (cat. no. 7) and the series *The Seven Deadly Sins* (cat. no. 11).
Pieter van der Heyden after Pieter Bruegel the Elder

The Story of the Magician Hermogenes

1565, two unnumbered engravings

9a
Saint James and the Magician Hermogenes
1565, engraving, 218 x 296 mm
Brussels, KBR, Print Room, inv. no. S.IV 2186 [1/III]

Inscriptions
Bottom, left of centre: Bruegel . inuent;
lower right: Cock . excudebat . i565;
lower margin: DIVVS IACOBVS DIABOLICIS PRAESTIGIIS ANTE MAGVM SISTITVR.

States and editions
I as described.
II the cross on the stole, lower right, has been turned into an eight-pointed star.
III the date 1565 has been removed.

9b
Saint James and the Fall of the Magician Hermogenes
1565, engraving, 224 x 292 mm
Brussels, KBR, Print Room, inv. no. S.IV 2187 [1/III]

Inscriptions
Lower left, on the table: .PAME. [monogram];
bottom, towards the middle: Cock . excudebat . i565.;
lower right: Bruegel . inuent;
lower margin: IDEM IMPETRAVIT A DEO VT MAGVS A DEMONIBVS DISCERPERETVR.

States and editions
I as described.
II Saint James’s face has been reworked: extra hair in the beard and the left eyebrow; more lines in the cheek.
III within the picture plane itself, Cock’s address has been replaced with three distichs with titles, in Latin, French and Dutch:

SIMONIS MAGI INTERITVS. / Attendebant eum quod multo tempore / Magicis suis artibus eos dementasset.


Pieter van der Heyden’s monogram has been removed; the word IDEM has been removed from the beginning of the inscription in the lower margin; on the right, the letter H and the phrase lo Galle excud. have been added.

Preparatory drawing in pen and brown to black-brown ink, 1564, signed, 233 x 296 mm,
Amsterdam, Rijksmuseum, inv. no. RP-T-00-5599

Copper plates in the estate of Volcxken Diericx (1601): Twee coperen plaeten van de Temptatie van Sint-Jacob (Duverger 1984–2006: I, 32)
In Joannes Galle’s catalogue (c. 1650): Plura alia variaq. Faceta & ludicra (Fuhring 2017: 337)

Literature

The story of the encounter between Saint James and the magician Hermogenes was inspired by Saint Peter’s victory over Simon Magus. It was handed down through the imposing anthology of saints’ lives, the Legenda aurea or Golden Legend, compiled by Jacobus de Voragine. This thematic connection explains why three verses in Latin, French and Dutch, alluding to the death of Simon Magus, were added to the third state of Saint James and the Fall of the Magician Hermogenes.

The Golden Legend tells how the magician Hermogenes, at the behest of the Pharisees, sends his demons to attack the apostle to prevent him from preaching and converting more heathens to Christianity. Thanks to his unwavering faith, however, Saint James is able to thwart Hermogenes’ plans. He wins the demons over, so that they turn on their master, who actually ends up being converted too. Bruegel chose to illustrate the episode in two drawings, which were then engraved on copper by Pieter van der Heyden. The design for the second engraving, signed and dated 1564, can be found today in Amsterdam. The other one, sadly, has not survived.

These two prints are the final examples of Bruegel’s use of a formal vocabulary developed several decades previously by Hieronymus Bosch. All the same, the many demons who populate the two compositions play a different role to their counterparts in The Temptation of Saint Anthony, for instance (see cat. no. 7).
[cat. no. 9a] Saint James and the Magician Hermogenes
[cat. no. 9b] Saint James and the Fall of the Magician Hermogenes
Rather than seeking to test the saint’s resolve, they have turned against their master. Bruegel’s rendering of the scene is much more chaotic than the story in the Golden Legend, which concludes peaceably with Hermogenes’ conversion. Saint James is shown outside the doorway of a church, where he makes the sign of blessing with his right hand as a scene brimming with violence unfolds before his eyes. The magician has been toppled from his chair, and is manhandled, upside down, by a pyramidal mob of demons. The horror of the scene is heightened by the man’s corpse on the table on the left, his severed head on a platter, next to a sword.

Besides these fantastical creatures, the visual space is filled with ventriloquists, contortionists and tightrope walkers – the artist drew inspiration from the fairs and kermises of his time – following the example of the farandole in the foreground. The arts of the juggler and the acrobat fell somewhere between conjuring, magic and street theatre, earning them a place in treatises on demonology alongside the traditional witch with her broomstick – like the one on the right of Saint James and the Magician Hermogenes, making good her escape via the chimney – and the demon-invoking magician. The tricks and stunts they performed were sufficient in the Middle Ages for them to be accused of mocking God and hence of being servants of the Devil. The artist is thus sketching a picture here of the demonic universe in its broadest sense.

These engravings focus significantly less on the episode from James’s hagiography than on the battle for supremacy between occult forces and orthodox belief. True faith ultimately triumphs over superstition and ungodliness, making the prints notable for their orthodox content. Renilde Vervoort notes a potential link between the theme of these works and the persecution of witches around 1560, Saint James featured prominently in that context as the patron saint of Spain and scourge of heretics, while as matamoros (Moor-slayer), he also played a leading role in the Spain and Low Countries of Charles V and Philip II.  

1. ‘Saint James, by devilish deception, is placed before the magician.’
2. ‘God heard his prayer upon which the magician was torn apart by demons.’
3. The New Hollstein lists five different states, but the final three of these are, in fact, one and the same state. From the third state onwards, the word IDEM and the monogram of Pieter van der Heyden have been removed, while in the Vienna impression – the so-called fifth state – the capital letter H was printed but subsequently scratched away.
5. Amsterdam, Rijksmuseum, inv. no. RP-T-00-559.
6. The figure of the cast-down magician was inspired by an anonymous Florentine engraving of Pride (Superbia), from around 1470–80. See Orenstein and Sellink 2001, p. 232, fig. 100.
7. The precise identity of the victim remains unclear. He might be Josiah, a scribe converted by Saint James on his way to be executed. Josiah was promptly condemned to death too, and the pair were beheaded together. Given the morphological differences, the corpse seems unlikely to be another image of the apostle himself. It was suggested at the time of the Chemnitz exhibition in 2014 that he might be a ‘decapitated swindler’. See Müller et al. 2014, p. 154.
10. Van Grieken, Luijten and Van der Stock 2013, nos. 68a and 68b.
Pieter van der Heyden after Pieter Bruegel the Elder

‘Patientia’

1557, engraving, 340 × 434 mm
Brussels, KBR, Print Room, inv. no. S.II 31216 [I/II]

Inscriptions

States and editions
I as described.
II the two monks in the dead tree have been turned into fools; the monk at the water’s edge on the left now has a hat; the large figure in the egg has a moustache and beard, the document with seals below his belt has been obscured by hatching, the crossed keys on his hat have been concealed, as have the various seals and pilgrim badges on and hanging from his hat.

Copper plate in the estate inventory of Volckxen Diericx (1601): Een coperen plaat van de Patientie van Bruegel (Duverger 1984–2006: I, 29)

Literature
Van Bastelaer 1908, no. 124; Lebeer 1969, no. 15; De Pauw-De Veen 1970, no. 91; Lari 1973, no. 119; Riggs 1977, no. 18; Marinissen et al. 1988, pp. 97–98; Freedberg 1977, no. 15; Müller et al. 2001, no. 13; Orenstein and Sellink 2001, no. 55; NHDO (Bruegel), no. 20; Mori 2010, no. 46; Sellink 2011, no. 60; Silver 2011, pp. 117, 177, 185; Sellink and Martens 2012, pp. 106–11; Müller et al. 2014, no. 20; Müller and Schauerte 2018, no. G62

A small and very solitary female figure sits chained to a stone, like a person condemned to death. With a crucifix between her clasped hands, she beseeches heaven to take her away from the chaos surrounding her. We find her in a desolate landscape full of dead trees, flames and smoke, and populated by disturbing creatures. Her calm and resigned attitude correspond with both the virtue of Patience, of which she is the personification according to the inscription at her feet, and Book 5 of Lactantius’ Divine Institutes, as quoted in the margin: ‘Patience is the bearing with equanimity of the evils which are either inflicted or happen to fall upon us.’ Her resignation in the face of tribulation will be rewarded in happier times, as Bruegel suggests with the rising sun and the tranquil-looking port in the background.

For the time being, however, the young woman will have to get by as best she can, surrounded by these fantastical creatures with their demonic antics, inspired by the imagery of Hieronymus Bosch. Besides the teeming details, Bruegel frequently refers to specific works by his predecessor, in particular the right panel of the Garden of Earthly Delights (Madrid, Museo Nacional del Prado): the broken eggshell, the knife blade, the cow’s skull and so on. He drew on this imagery for a whole series of prints between 1556 and 1558: The Temptation of Saint Anthony (cat. no. 7), Big Fish Eat Little Fish (cat. no. 8), on which Bosch’s name has been deceptively placed instead of Bruegel’s, The Seven Deadly Sins (cat. no. 11) and also The Last Judgement (cat. no. 12). This earned him the nickname ‘second Bosch.’ These reinterpretations of the Boschian repertoire were by no means coincidental: Bruegel’s publisher, Hieronymus Cock, whose name is stated at the bottom left of ‘Patientia’, evidently suggested it to the artist for commercial reasons – a conclusion supported by Cock’s publication of prints after a series of compositions that may be attributed to a greater and lesser extent to the artist from s-Hertogenbosch.4

‘Patientia’ or ‘Patience’ dates from the same period as The Temptation of Saint Anthony and The Seven Deadly Sins, and has also been conceived according to the same scheme. This is particularly clear in the case of Anger (cat. no. 11a), in which the small figure personifying the allegory is dominated by a large and fairly demonic figure at the centre. While the eight preparatory drawings for these prints are dated and have survived, this is not the case for ‘Patientia’. Since the preliminary drawing cannot be dated (the year 1557 at the bottom left of the print is not conclusive, as many years could elapse between the completion of a drawing and that of the engraving; see Avarice, cat. no. 11d) and since it is impossible to determine whether the orientation of the preliminary drawing was the same as that of the engraving, it is exceptionally difficult to situate the print within the chronology.

Does ‘Patientia’ come between The Temptation of Saint Anthony and The Seven Deadly Sins? Or rather from after the latter series, in which case it might be viewed as a pivot point, the subject of which announces The Seven Virtues series (cat. no. 13)?

The first state also includes numerous caricatures that take aim at abuses in the Church. These elements have been deftly concealed in the second state through a series of modifications to the printing plate. The St Peter’s keys on the cardinal’s hat worn by the large figure in the eggshell, for instance, have been blotted out. The seals hanging from it have been blurred, the hood of the monk next to the drowned man on the left has been replaced with a hat, while the monks in the dead tree on the right, who are getting drunk and visiting a prostitute, have been transformed into fools, with characteristic jester’s hats with little bells. In this way, a firmly anticlerical interpretation has been turned into a general expression of the diabolical in nature and of worldly folly. The date of this transformation is not known, but it probably occurred after the religious troubles that seized the Low Countries in the late 1560s – to which the burning church on the left seems to allude – and the harsh repression that followed. The plate was still in the possession of Volckxen Diericx, the widow of Cock, at the time of her death in 1601. [AB]

1 ‘Patience is the bearing with equanimity of the evils which are either inflicted or happen to fall upon us.’ (Lactantius, Divine Institutiones, Book 5.)
2 See Lucii Cæcilii Firmiani Lactantii Opera Omnia, Paris, 1836, p. 155. Cock used this reference for the prints Faith and Charity (see cat. nos. 13a and 19c), but without mentioning the source.
3 See in particular Dominicus Lampsonius and Lodovico Guicciardini, cited in Silver 2011, p. 159. See also Matthijs Ilink in Van Grieken, Luijten and Van der Stock 2013, p. 143.
Together with *The Large Landscapes* (cat. no. 2), the series *The Seven Deadly Sins* (cat. no. 11) and *The Seven Virtues* (cat. no. 13), represent a pinnacle in Bruegel’s graphic oeuvre. Unlike the *Landscapes*, all the preparatory drawings for the *Deadly Sins* and the *Virtues* have survived. Each piece is a detailed and meticulously created masterpiece, signed by Bruegel and dated between 1556 and 1560. These finely detailed pen drawings were cut into copper plates by two different engravers: the *Deadly Sins* was engraved by Pieter van der Heyden and the *Virtues* by Philips Galle. Given their iconographic and compositional complexity and the overarching unity between the contrasting series, we can assume that this project was prepared and elaborated very carefully. Bruegel shows that he is capable of creating complex narrative compositions with multiple figures and layers of meaning.

*The Last Judgement* (cat. no. 12), which in terms of style bears an affinity to the two series, was also engraved by van der Heyden. While it can be considered the crowning work of the *Deadly Sins* series, it can also be seen as a key work connecting both series. The Last Judgement is after all the culmination of Christian eschatology. Man, who has been living in a state of sin and has been, ever since the days of Adam and Eve, in the hands of the devil, is released from his sins through the Crucifixion and Resurrection of Christ – the son of God who became a man – and delivered from original sin. At the end of time, Jesus will return and definitively pass judgement on the living and dead who will have risen from their graves. Those who have accepted the mercy of God, recognized Jesus as their saviour and have diligently followed his example, will then live eternally under a new heaven on a new earth. Those who have trespassed God’s commandments and lived in sin, without having attained a state of forgiveness through their belief in Christ, shall be banished, together with the devils and the fallen angels, to eternal darkness.

In Bruegel’s time the fear of eternal damnation was deeply rooted. The end of the world could arrive at any moment. Leading a virtuous life and avoiding sin were therefore essential for salvation. Sins and Virtues were a simple guideline for the believer. Still, their nature, number and their order of importance were not a fixed matter. Bruegel depicted the sins of Pride, Avarice, Sloth, Gluttony, Lust, Envy and Anger. Opposing these were the four ‘cardinal’ virtues – Prudence, Justice, Temperance and Fortitude – which had been borrowed from the philosophers of antiquity. Three ‘divine’ or ‘theological’ virtues were added to this, which were considered even more significant: Faith, Hope and Charity.

In the Middle Ages this selection had already become established within the Catholic Church. But the matter remained food for theological discussions that arose during the Reformation. It was, in other words, still an ongoing debate.

Instead of drawing on the complicated allegories that were so typical of the imagery that emerged from the culture of the Renaissance and humanism, Bruegel based his works on late medieval traditions of representation. These were well-known and loved by broad sections of the population. The commercial insight of the publisher Hieronymus Cock no doubt played an important role in the making of these series. For the depiction of the Seven Deadly Sins, Bruegel and Cock consciously played on the popularity of the style and imagery of Hieronymus Bosch. The subject matter lent itself particularly well to the depiction of sinners trapped in hellfire, assisted or taunted by bizarre monsters and devils. Contrary to the deterrent example they wished to evoke, these prints were also amusing to look at. The fact that they differed from all other prints that were appearing on the market at the time must have been clear to everyone. When, in 1558, Christophe Plantin sold this series, along with other prints by Bruegel, to the bookseller Martin Le Jeune in Paris, they were categorized as ‘drolleries’, referring to their bizarre and even comical character.

Bruegel was able to make Bosch’s style completely his own, but rather than imitating his predecessor he aimed to surpass his example. The notion of *aemulatio* was highly rated among the art theorists of the Renaissance. The fact that Bruegel applied this to a late medieval master from his own country, and not a celebrated artist of the Italian Renaissance, makes Bruegel unique, and shows how aware and self-assured he was in his relationship with artistic traditions closer to home. The *Seven Virtues* have the same structure as *The Seven Deadly Sins* and are likewise built up around a central female personification. It relates how Christ – between the Crucifixion and the Resurrection – descends into limbo. The print of *The Descent of Christ into Limbo* (cat. no. 14) can, just like *The Last Judgement*, be brought into relation with the two series. Contrary to the Last Judgement that is described in the Book of Revelation, this text is not a part of official religious teaching. This scene is borrowed from apocryphal texts and also appears in Jacobus de Voragine’s *Legenda aurea* (*Golden Legend*). It relates how Christ – between the Crucifixion and the Resurrection – descends into limbo and there frees the virtuous souls who lived before the arrival of the saviour and therefore could not go to heaven, including the patriarchs and other figures from the Old Testament. Bruegel also executed this representation impressively in the Boschian style.

**Joris van Grieken and Agnes Kooijman**
Pieter van der Heyden after Pieter Bruegel the Elder

The Seven Deadly Sins

1558, seven unnumbered engravings

11a Anger (Ira)
1558, engraving, 225 x 294 mm
Brussels, KBR, Print Room, inv. no. S.IV 22001 [I/I]

Inscriptions

States and editions
Only state.

Preparatory drawing in pen and brown ink, 1557, signed, 229 x 291 mm, Florence, Le Gallerie degli Uffizi, Gabinetto dei Disegni e delle Stampe, inv. no. 1037E.

11b Sloth (Desidia)
1558, engraving, 230 x 291 mm
Brussels, KBR, Print Room, inv. no. S.II 135112 [I/I]

Inscriptions
Lower left: brueghel. Inventor.; bottom, left of centre: DESIDIA; lower centre: PAME [monogram]; lower right: H. Cock. excud. cum privileg. 1558.; in the margin: SEGNITIES ROBVR FRANGIT, LONGA OCIA NERVOS.

States and editions
Only state.

Preparatory drawing in pen and grey-brown ink, 1557, signed, 214 x 296 mm, Vienna, Albertina, inv. no. 7872.

11c Pride (Superbia)
1558, engraving, 229 x 296 mm
Brussels, KBR, Print Room, inv. no. S.II 22654 [I/I]

Inscriptions
Lower left: Cock excud. cum privileg. 1558.; lower centre: PAME [monogram]; bottom, left of centre: SVPERBIA.; lower right: p. brueghel. Inventor.; in the margin: NEMO SVPERBVS AMAT SVPEROS, NEC AMATVR AB ILLIS.

States and editions
Only state.

Preparatory drawing in pen and grey-brown ink, 1557, signed, 229 x 300 mm, Paris, Fondation Custodia, Collection Frits Lugt, inv. no. 465.

11d Avarice (Avaritia)
1558, engraving, 224 x 296 mm
Brussels, KBR, Print Room, inv. no. S.I 7606 [I/II]

Inscriptions
Lower left: p. brueghel. Inventor.; bottom, left of centre: Cock. excud. cum privileg. 1558.; lower centre: AVARITIA; below this: PAME [monogram]; in the margin: QVIS METVS, AVT PVDOR EST VNQV AM PROPERANTIS AVA?

States and editions
I as described.
II Cock. replaced with Mariette; in the left lower margin, the number 2.

[cat. no. 11a] Anger (Ira)
Sloth (Desidia)

(cat. no. 138) Sins and Virtues
11e Gluttony (Gula)
1558, engraving, 225 × 294 mm
Brussels, KBR, Print Room, inv. no. S.I 7607 [1/1]

Inscriptions
Bottom, left of centre: GVLA.; lower centre: . PAME. [monogram]; bottom, right of centre, on the lid of a barrel: brueghel / Inventor; lower right: H. Cock. excud cum gratia et privilege. 1558; in the margin: EBRRIETAS EST VITANDA, INGLVIESQE CIBORVM.” Schouder drenckenschap, en gulsichlÿck eten Want ouderdæt doet godt en hem seluen vergheten.”

States and editions
Only state.

Preparatory drawing in pen and grey-brown ink, 1557, signed, 230 × 300 mm, Paris, Fondation Custodia, Collection Frits Lugt, inv. no. 466

11f Lust (Luxuria)
c. 1558, engraving, 226 × 296 mm
Brussels, KBR, Print Room, inv. no. S.II 22656 [1/1]

Inscriptions
Lower left: brueghel. Inventor. / H. Cock. excud. cum priuili., lower right: H. Cock. excud. cum priuili.; lower centre: PAME. [monogram]; bottom, right of centre: LVXVRIA; in the margin: LVXVRIA ERNERAT VIBES, EFFOEMINAT ARTVS.”Luxurje stickt, sy is vol onsuuerheden Sy breeckt die Crachten, en sy swackt die leden”

States and editions
Only state.

Preparatory drawing in pen and grey-brown ink, 1557, signed, 225 × 296 mm, Brussels, KBR, Print Room, inv. no. S.II 132 816 folio C

11g Envy (Invidia)
c. 1558, engraving, 228 × 295 mm
Brussels, KBR, Print Room, inv. no. S.I 7608 [1/1]

Inscriptions
Lower left: brueghel. Inuentor.; further towards the centre: Cock. excud. cum priuili.; lower centre: INVIDIA.; bottom, right of centre: PAME [monogram]; in the margin: INVIDIA HORRENVDVM MONSTRVM, SÆVISSIMA PESTIS.” Een onsterfelijkke doot es nijt, en wreede peste Een beest die haer seluen eet, met valschen moleste”

States and editions
I as described.
II the address Cock. excud. cum has been replaced with p. Mariette excud.; in the lower left margin, the number 4.

Preparatory drawing in pen and grey-brown ink, 1557, signed, 220 × 300 mm, Basel, Kunstmuseum Basel, inv. no. 2012.50


Literature
[cat. no. 11d] Avarice (Avaritia)
In 1556, Bruegel began work on a number of drawings that would cement his reputation as a designer of prints. It might have been his experiments with the imagery of Hieronymus Bosch that led him in this direction. Or was it prompted by his commercially minded publisher, Hieronymus Cock? Whatever the case, Bruegel made the preliminary drawing that year for Avarice. In the course of 1557 he went on to deliver designs for the six other Deadly Sins (Anger, Sloth, Pride, Gluttony, Lust and Envy). Pieter van der Heyden engraved the compositions on copper plates in 1558, by which time Bruegel was probably already thinking about a follow-up series of seven prints, The Seven Virtues (cat. no. 13). With their appealing visual language and layers of iconographic meaning, the two series give the viewer plenty to think about.

In The Seven Deadly Sins, Bruegel draws on elements of the fantastic, the diabolical and the monstrous. Unlike the subsequent Seven Virtues series, his Deadly Sins are not shown in a realistic or current sixteenth-century setting, but one in which the spirit of Bosch clearly lives on. The notion of the Deadly Sins goes back many centuries and it was Pope Gregory I who fixed their number at seven sometime around 590 ce. A rich iconographic tradition gradually developed around them and it was this, combined with Boschian imagery, that formed the basis for Bruegel’s interpretation. He certainly lived up here to his nickname of the ‘second Bosch’, although rather than slavishly following his predecessor’s example (imitatio), he assimilated his influence in a personal and original way, enabling him actually to surpass Bosch’s work (aemulatio). Bruegel adopted an innovative approach towards the tradition in iconographic terms too, presenting each of the Seven Deadly Sins as an emblematic female figure – some with their traditional attributes, such as a mirror (Pride) or a handful of coins (Avarice). Each woman is depicted with an animal associated with the relevant sin: a peacock, a toad, a donkey, a boar, a turkey, a cock and a bear. The compositions also incorporate small groups of monsters and people whose actions refer to the depicted sin and show what punishment awaits in hell for any person guilty of it.

From the mid-twentieth century onwards, a number of authors sought to link Bruegel’s prints with the prevailing libertinism of his time – a philosophical movement that focused on individual freedom. Researchers meticulously analysed and interpreted the master’s compositions, leading some of them to connect the inscriptions on the engravings to the writings of Dirck Völcketz’s Coornhert: there was some logic to this, since the latter worked for Cock as an engraver and was an anti-catholic author who wrote Zedekunst dat is wellevenskunste (Ethics: The Art of Living Well), published in 1586. The Latin inscriptions can be traced verbatim to three source texts, making it difficult to sustain the claim that they are translations of the Middle Dutch captions in Bruegel’s drawings. The opposite is probably the case. No fewer than five inscriptions, for instance, are drawn from the Zodiacus Vitae by Marcellinus Palingenius – a work composed entirely in Latin hexameters and with an occasionally taxing abundance of spondees, which was written in the early sixteenth century in the circle around the Duke of Ferrara’s court. The first editions are undated, but the publication is thought to have first rolled off a Venetian book press around 1555. The Zodiacus Vitae is a didactic poem in twelve books – one for each star sign – in which the various conditions of human existence are combined with astrology, theology and metaphysical speculation. The author remains an elusive figure: Palingenius describes himself as a humble servant of the ‘Orthodox Church’, yet some see his satirical attacks on ecclesiastical and religious hypocrisy as evidence of Protestant sympathies. In 1559, shortly after Bruegel completed The Seven Deadly Sins, the Zodiacus Vitae was placed on the Catholic Church’s index of banned books. Palingenius’ nevertheless remained extremely popular.

A well-read humanist might well have connected the Bruegel prints with Palingenius’ censored texts, but it is highly doubtful that this would have influenced sales of the Deadly Sins cycle. The source for the Latin inscriptions accompanying Anger and Avarice has been traced to Ovid’s Ars Amatoria (The Art of Love) and Juvenal’s Satyricon (Satires) respectively.

Bruegel’s Seven Deadly Sins print series remained in demand for many years, although the precise fate of the printing plates has yet to be pinned down. They are mentioned in the 1601 inventory of Volckxen Dierickx’s estate, but we then lose track of them for a long time until they eventually resurface in late seventeenth-century Paris. We know this from a few unique impressions bearing the address of Pierre Mariette II. The set of eight printing plates – as also listed in the Dierickx inventory – further included the Last Judgement engraved by Pieter van der Heyden (cat. no. 12).
[cat. no. 11e] Gluttony (Gula)
LUXVRIA ENERVAT VIVES, EFFLOMINAT ARTVS.

Luxury stinks, is full of eruptions, breaks the crust, and wastes the body.

[cat. no. 11f] Lust (Luxuria)
[cat. no. 11g] Envy (Invidia)
1 'Rage puffs out the face, and the veins grow black with blood.' Source: Ovid, *Ars Amatoria*, Book III, verse 503.

2 'Rage puffs out the mouth and embitters the nerves; It disturbs the spirit and blackens the blood.'


4 'Sluggishness breaks strength, long idleness the nerves.' Source: Palingenius 1996, pp. 388–89, r. 139.

5 'Sloth makes powerless and dries out the nerves until man is good for nothing.'


7 'Nobody who is proud loves the gods above, nor is he loved by them.' Source: Palingenius 1996, pp. 368–69, r. 901.

8 'Pride is hated by God above all, at the same time God is abused by Pride.'

9 Mielke 1996, no. 35.

10 'Does the greedy miser ever possess fear or shame?' Source: Juvenal, *Satyrinae*, Book XIV, verse 178.

11 'Scraping Avarice sees neither honour nor courtesy, shame nor divine admonition.'

12 Mielke 1996, no. 35.

13 'Drunkenness and Gluttony are to be shunned.' Source: Palingenius 1996, pp. 388–89, r. 133.

14 'Shun drunkenness and gluttony, for excess makes man forget God and himself.'

15 Mielke 1996, no. 34.

16 'Lust enervates the strength, weakens the limbs.' Source (with *Ast nimia* rather than *Luxuria*): Palingenius 1996, pp. 118–19, r. 315.

17 'Lechery stinks, it is dirty. It breaks [man’s] powers and weakens limbs.'

18 Mielke 1996, no. 36.

19 'Envy is a monster to be feared, and a most severe plague.' Source: Palingenius 1996, pp. 122–23, r. 414.

20 'Envy is an eternal death and a terrible plague, a beast which devours itself with false troubles.'

21 Mielke 1996, no. 38.


23 Silver 2006, p. 147.
12a.
Pieter van der Heyden after Pieter Bruegel the Elder

The Last Judgement

1558, engraving, 226 × 296 mm
Brussels, KBR, Print Room, inv. no. S.I 7609 [I/II]

Inscriptions
Lower left: Brueghel. invéet // H. Cock. excude. cum. privilég. 1558.; lower right: PAME. [monogram]; lower left in the margin: VENITE . BENEDICTI . PATRIS . MEI . IN . REGNUM . AETERNVM . / ITE . MALEDICTI . PATRIS . MEI . IN . IGNEM . SEMITERNVM.; lower right in the margin: Compt ghy ghebenedyde myns vaders hier. / En ghæt ghy vermaledyde in dat eewighe vier.

States and editions
I as described.
II H. Cock. has been altered in the address to Mariette (the M has been placed over the H); in the left lower margin, the numeral 8.

Preparatory drawing in pen and black-brown ink, signed and dated 1558, 230 × 300 mm, Vienna, Albertina, inv. no. 7174

Copper plate in the estate of Volcxken Diericx (1601) as part of: Acht ooperen plaat en de 7 Dootsonden (Duverger 1984–2006: I, 36)

Literature
Van Bastelaer 1908, no. 121; Lebeer 1969, no. 25; Lari 1973, no. 115; Riggs 1977, no. 57; Gibson 1977, pp. 44–53; Serebrennikov 1986; Freedberg 1989, no. 25; Müller et al. 2001, no. 25; Orenstein and Sellink 2001, no. 57; NHD (Bruegel), no. 8; Mori 2010, no. 10; Sellink 2011, no. 65; Silver 2011, pp. 142, 143, 157; Sellink and Martens 2012, pp. 124–25; Van Grieken, Luijten and Van der Stock 2013, no. 53-8; Müller et al. 2014, no. 29; Michel et al. 2017, pp. 172–73; Müller and Schauerte 2018, no. G70; Oberthaler et al. 2018, no. 31

12b.
Anonymous after Pieter Bruegel the Elder

The Last Judgement

1558, etching and engraving, 223 × 295 mm
Brussels, KBR, Print Room, inv. no. F-2018-129 [I/II]

Inscriptions

States and editions
Only state.

Same preparatory drawing as 12a

Copper plate in the estate of Volcxken Diericx (1601): Een ooperen plaat en een Oordeel van Bruegel (Duverger 1984–2006: I, 33)


Literature
Van Bastelaer 1908, no. 121; Lebeer 1969, no. 25; Lari 1973, no. 115; Riggs 1977, no. 57; Gibson 1977, pp. 44–53; Serebrennikov 1986; Freedberg 1989, no. 25; Müller et al. 2001, no. 25; Orenstein and Sellink 2001, no. 57; NHD (Bruegel), no. 8; Mori 2010, no. 10; Sellink 2011, no. 65; Silver 2011, pp. 142, 143, 157; Sellink and Martens 2012, pp. 124–25; Van Grieken, Luijten and Van der Stock 2013, no. 53-8; Müller et al. 2014, no. 29; Michel et al. 2017, pp. 172–73; Müller and Schauerte 2018, no. G70; Oberthaler et al. 2018, no. 31
Although the Day of Judgement, when Christ returns to earth to judge humankind, is only mentioned briefly in the Bible (in the Book of Revelation), it was an extremely popular artistic theme in the fifteenth and sixteenth-century Low Countries. Bruegel’s treatment of the subject in his 1558 preparatory drawing for The Last Judgement is entirely in keeping with the established tradition. The composition displays the clear influence of a late fifteenth-century engraving by Alart du Hameel, who had based this in turn on a lost work by Hieronymus Bosch. In other words, various elements in Bruegel’s representation refer to Boschian motifs, without there being any question of a literal copy.

Bruegel’s design is extremely well balanced in terms of its composition. Christ is depicted upper centre in this harmonious arrangement, flanked by angels with long trumpets, saints and apostles. With a lily on one side and a sword on the other, he sits in judgement over the living and dead souls. Some of the latter are still emerging from their graves, while large groups of people stream towards their ultimate destinations. Angels lead the virtuous souls into paradise, while monstrous creatures drive sinners and heretics into the terrifying mouth of hell. Once the drawing had been converted into a print and hence reversed, heaven appeared at Christ’s right hand and hell at his left.

Bruegel’s Last Judgement offers us food for thought. It is the only drawn composition in the artist’s graphic oeuvre from which not one but two printing plates were made. Impressions exist on the one hand in which Pieter van der Heyden’s monogram appears in the lower right corner. These were printed from a plate that was engraved entirely by burin. On the other hand, there are impressions that also include Hieronymus Cock’s address, the year 1558 and Bruegel’s signature, but which lack the engraver’s monogram. These were printed from another plate, created using a combination of etching and engraving. Historically, the first plate has generally been viewed as the ‘original’, with the second classified for the sake of convenience as a ‘copy’. The situation is less clear-cut than this, however, and requires further explanation. It is not inconceivable that both plates were cut after the same composition and in the same period for Cock. A new plate might have been commissioned, for instance, when the old one began to wear out and the quality of the impressions deteriorated. This does not seem to have been the case here, though, as the number of surviving impressions from the first plate is no greater than it is for other plates. Research carried out into the origin of the two plates suggests another possible reason.

The one cut by van der Heyden is mentioned elsewhere in the inventory. Several authors have noted in the past that Bruegel’s Last Judgement is closely related in thematic terms to The Seven Deadly Sins series. The fact that the Diericx inventory refers to ‘eight copper plates of the 7 Deadly Sins’ (‘acht ooperen platen van de 7 Dootsonden’) is a compelling argument for adding the van der Heyden Last Judgement to the cycle of seven. Following the sale of Diericx’s estate, we lose track of the eight plates for a considerable time, until they reappear in the second half of the seventeenth century in the possession of Pierre Mariette II (1634–1716) in Paris. A unique impression of the second state of the van der Heyden engraved Last Judgement includes a number 8 in the lower left corner. The sheet belongs to a series that has only survived in fragmentary form and includes representations of the Deadly Sins Avaritia (with the number 2) and Invidia (number 4). [MB]

1 ‘Come, blessed of my father, into the eternal Kingdom. Go, cursed of my father, into everlasting fire.’
2 ‘Come this way, blessed of my father. And go, cursed of my father, into everlasting fire.’
4 Orenstein and Sellink 2001, p. 27.
5 The watermark in the Brussels impression – a double-headed eagle with a crown and a four-leaf clover above it – can be dated to around 1560. See <https://www.wasserzeichnen-online.de/wzi/detailansicht.php?id=36964> (accessed 25 April 2019).
6 The watermark of the impression of Invidia (now in the Musée du Dessin et de l’Estampe originale, Gravelines) comprises a jug with a single handle and a lid, a fleur-de-lis and the letters M/LP. Given the close resemblance of this to nos. 3689–93 in Heawood, the paper can be dated to the late seventeenth century. It has not been possible so far to ascertain whether Bruegel’s eight-part series of The Seven Deadly Sins was already in the possession of his father, Pierre Mariette I (c. 1603–1657). See Heawood 1950, nos. 3689–93; Rouir 1996, pp. 105–7.
The Last Judgement
[cat. no. 12b] The Last Judgement
The Seven Virtues

c. 1559–60, seven unnumbered engravings

Faith (Fides)

Engraving, 225 × 295 mm
Brussels, KBR, Print Room, inv. no. S.I 7592 [I/II]

Inscriptions
Lower left: Cock exc; lower centre: FIDES; bottom, right of centre: Brugel Ins; in the margin: FIDES MAXIMÉ Á NOBIS CONSERVANDA EST PRÆCIPVE IN RELIGIONEM, QVÌA DEVS PRIOR ET POTENTIOR EST QVÁM HOMO.

States and editions
I as described.
II Cock’s address replaced with ‘Paris chez Martel’.

Preparatory drawing in pen and brown ink, 1559, signed, 225 × 295 mm, Amsterdam, Rijksmuseum, inv. no. RP-T-1919-35

Hope (Spes)

Engraving, 225 × 296 mm
Brussels, KBR, Print Room, inv. no. F-2017-23 [I/]

Inscriptions
Lower left: BRVGEL. INV; bottom, left of centre: SPES; bottom, right of centre: H. cock excu.; in the margin: IVCVNDISSIMA EST SPEI PERSVASIO ET VITAE IMPRIMIS / NCESSARIA, INTER TOT AERVMMNAS PENEQUI [UE] INTOLERABLES.

States and editions
Only state.

Preparatory drawing in pen and dark brown ink, 1559, signed, 224 × 295 mm, Berlin, Staatliche Museen zu Berlin, Kupferstichkabinett, inv. no. KdZ 715

Charity (Charitas)

1559, engraving, 226 × 293 mm
Brussels, KBR, Print Room, inv. no. F-2017-25 [I/]

Inscriptions
Bottom, left of centre: H. cock excude.; bottom, left of centre: CHARITAS; bottom, right of centre: BRVEGEL. 1559; in the margin: SPERES TIBI ACCIDERE QVOD ALTERI ACCIDIT, ITA DEMVM EXCITABERIS AD OPEM FERENDAM / SI SYMPSERIS EIVS ANIMVM QV OPEM TYNCE IN MALIS CONSTITTVTVS IMPLOVAT.

States and editions
Only state.

Preparatory drawing in pen and dark brown ink, 1559, signed, 224 × 293 mm, Rotterdam, Museum Boijmans Van Beuningen, inv. no. N 18

Justice (Justicia)

Engraving, 225 × 293 mm
Brussels, KBR, Print Room, inv. no. F-2018-130 [I/II]

Inscriptions
Bottom centre: IVSTICIA; in the margin: SCOPVS LEGIS EST, AVT VT EV[M] QVE[M] PVNIT EMENDET, AVT POENA / EIVS CAETEROS MELIORES REDDET AVT SVBLATIS MALIS CAETERI SECVRIORES VIV A.

States and editions
I as described.

Preparatory drawing in pen and grey-brown ink, 1559, signed, 224 × 295 mm, Brussels, KBR, Print Room, inv. no. S.II 133 707 folio C
[cat. no. 13b] Hope (Spes)
13e

**Prudence (Prudentia)**

Engraving, 225 × 298 mm
Brussels, KBR, Print Room, inv. no. F-2018-131 [1/1]

*Inscriptions*

Bottom, left of centre: *H cock excu*; bottom, left of centre: *PRVDENTIA*; bottom, right of centre: *Bruegel Inventor*; upper right on the label around the jug: *VINVM*; in the margin: *SI PRVDENS ESSE CVPS, IN FVTVRVM OSTENDE, ET QVAE POSSVNT CONTINGERE, ANIMO TVO CVNCTA PROPONE*.

*States and editions*

Only state.

Preparatory drawing in pen and brown ink, 1559, signed, 225 × 298 mm, Brussels, Royal Museums of Fine Arts of Belgium, inv. no. 490.

13f

**Fortitude (Fortitudo)**

Engraving, 226 × 294 mm
Brussels, KBR, Print Room, inv. no. F-2017-26 [1/1]

*Inscriptions*

Lower left: *COCK EXC*; bottom, left of centre: *FORTITVDO*; bottom, right of centre: *BRVEGEL INVENTOR*; in the margin: *ANIMVM VINCERE, IRACVNDIAM COHIBERE, CAETERAQ VITIA ET AFFECTVS COHIBERE VERA FORTITVDO EST*.

*States and editions*

Only state.

Preparatory drawing in pen and brown ink, 1560, signed, 225 × 296 mm, Rotterdam, Museum Boijmans Van Beuningen, inv. no. 189.

13g

**Temperance (Temperantia)**

Engraving, 225 × 294 mm
Brussels, KBR, Print Room, inv. no. F-2017-24 [1/1]

*Inscriptions*

On the hem of the central figure’s dress: *TEMPERANTIA*; lower right on the sitting man’s tablet: *A B C D E / F G H I*; lower right: *BRVEGEL (VE in ligature); in the margin: *VIDENDVM, VT NEC VOLVPTATI DEDITI PRODIGI ET LVXVRIOSI APPAREAMVS, NEC AV ARA TENACITATI SORDIDI AVT OBSCVRI EXISTAMVS*.

*States and editions*

Only state.

Preparatory drawing in pen and brown ink, 1560, signed, 225 × 295 mm, Rotterdam, Museum Boijmans Van Beuningen, inv. no. MB 331.


Possible impressions in the estate of Volckken Diericx (1601): *Acht Historien van de 7 Dezechten van achtten of Vier Historien van de Seven Deuchden van sevenen* (*Duverger 1984–2006: I, 21*).

**Literature**

156 / SINS AND VIRTUES

[cat. no. 13c] Charity (Charitas)
[cat. no. 13d] Justice (Justicia)
In 1559–60, Bruegel supplied the designs for *The Seven Virtues*, the successful follow-up to his *Seven Deadly Sins* print cycle (cat. no. 11). Although the two series are inextricably linked, they differ in several obvious respects. Bruegel firmly opted, for instance, for a different stylistic programme, while his presentation of *The Seven Virtues* also shows how much he had developed in the interim as a designer of prints. There is greater structural cohesion in the compositions, while the engravings – now in a realistic setting – display a more mature, encyclopaedic character. The name of the engraver is not stated on the prints, but he can be identified on stylistical grounds as Philips Galle.

The Seven Virtues were officially categorized in the early Middle Ages. They consisted in the first place of the three ‘theological’ or ‘divine virtues’, Hope, Faith and Charity, which originated in the Song of Songs (see in particular 1 Corinthians 13:13). To these were added the four cardinal virtues – Justice, Temperance, Fortitude and Prudence – which date back to antiquity and already served as a guide for citizens of an ideal society in Plato’s *Politeia* (*Republic*). The Virtues had long been represented in the Middle Ages as female allegories battling the sin that constituted their opposite. One tradition, which seemingly culminated in late fifteenth-century French miniature art in particular, equipped each Virtue with her own arsenal of personal attributes. While Bruegel is unlikely to have been inspired directly by book illuminations, it is clear that he meticulously adopted the iconography of these personified Virtues.

For all their underlying moral messages, the images are relatively easy to interpret, as they can be linked to customary practices at the time. Faith, for instance, is depicted as a woman in a church, surrounded by the Instruments of Christ’s Passion. The sacraments of baptism, communion, marriage and confession are administered on the left, while a sermon is delivered on the right to a large group of worshippers. The Host is consecrated deep in the background. The figure of Hope, meanwhile, stands apparently impassively amid the swirling waves close to a small harbour town. Several ships are foundering, so that all the sailors can do is to hope for salvation. The same goes for the prisoners in the dungeon and the people in the background who struggle to douse the flames of a blazing house. Charity, the third and final theological virtue, is surrounded in turn by scenes illustrating the Seven Acts of Mercy.¹⁸

Prudence shows how wise it is to prepare for future needs and misfortunes. Firewood has been gathered in large bundles, preserved food is stored in barrels and men set aside a financial reserve in a large money chest. A cook swiftly extinguishes a fire with a bucket of water, a sick man waits for the final sacraments and efforts are made to shore up a rickety house. And even though the sky is clear, a dog has already taken shelter from coming showers in a hollow tree.¹⁹ The personification of Temperance
[cat. no. 13e] Prudence (Prudentia)
[cat. no. 13f] Fortitude (Fortitudo)
[cat. no. 13g] Temperance (Temperantia)
is accompanied by the Seven Liberal Arts, disciplines related to measure and measurement.20 Things are rather less seemly in the Justice print, in which Dame Justicia is shown amid all manner of torture techniques, executions and the dispensation of justice. Only once – for the seventh virtue – does Bruegel deviate a little from the general pattern of the series, which occurs not so much in the structure of the composition as in the formal execution. The demons and soldiers featured in Fortitude do battle in the vicinity of a woman clad in armour and with an anvil on her head. The Boschian imagery in this print is plain to see and the animals that had previously accompanied The Seven Deadly Sins are also present on the battlefield.

Unlike the sources of the Latin inscriptions on Bruegel’s Seven Deadly Sins, those for The Seven Virtues seem a little more straightforward in terms of theme. Bruegel’s Patience (cat. no. 10) of 1557 informs the viewer that the inscription in the margin comes from the Divinae Institutiones by Lactantius. The inscriptions accompanying Faith and Charity draw on the same third-century didactic poem with its ‘Divine Teachings’, as do the first four words of the inscription in the margin of Fortitude, although it is hard to describe this as a form of quotation. Three other captions for The Seven Virtues series were taken from works by Seneca. The one for Justice, for instance, is taken verbatim from De Clementia, and that for Prudence from De Prudentia. The inscription on Temperance is more problematic: it paraphrases a line from De Modo Temperantiae, part of Seneca’s commentary on the four ‘cardinal’ virtues. The word tenacitati refers to avara and should have the ablative case ending of ‘e’, instead of which it has been engraved with the dative ‘i’ ending. A supposed second state of this print is actually an impression in which a collector with a better command of Latin has corrected the text in pen. Another quotation, the Latin inscription accompanying Hope, occurs in a passage by the early sixteenth-century philosopher Juan Luis Vives, although it is possible that he borrowed it from another source.

The Seven Deadly Sins and The Seven Virtues are both mentioned in the estate inventory of Volckxen Dierickx, albeit as sets of eight printing plates in each instance. Although it was Philips Galle who engraved the Virtues series it has been suggested that Pieter van der Heyden completed the cycle with an eighth plate, The Descent of Christ into Limbo (cat. no. 14). It is an appealing idea that recalls the link between the Deadly Sins series (cat. no. 11) and the Last Judgement (cat. no. 12), both of which were engraved by van der Heyden. Firm evidence in this respect has yet to be found, however. [MB]
Above all we must keep faith, particularly in respect to religion, for God comes before all, and is mightier than man. Paraphrase of Fides quoque, magna iustitiae pars est; quae maxime a nobis, qui nomen fidei gerimus, conservanda est praeclara in religionem:quia Deus prior est & potentior, quam homo. See Lactantius 1994, pp. 97–98.

Mielke 1996, no. 45.

Very pleasant is the conviction of hope and most necessary for life, amid many and almost unbearable hardships. See Vives 1782, p. 508.


Expect what happens to others to happen to you; you will then and not till then be aroused to offer help only if you make your own the feelings of the man who appeals for help in the midst of adversity. Paraphrase of Spera et tibi accidere posse quod alteri nescias accidisse; ita demum excitaberis ad opem ferendam, si sumpseris eum animum, qui opem tuam in malis constituatis implorat. See Lactantius 1994, p. 96.

Mielke 1996, no. 46.

The aim of law is either to correct him who is punished, or to improve the others by his example, or to provide that the population live more securely by removing wrongdoers. Paraphrase of in quibus vindicandi haec tres lex secuta est, quae Princepto quoque rei quae debet: aut in eum, quem punis; emendet: aut ut poena eis ceteros meliores reddat; aut ut sublatis malis securos e veteri vivant. See Seneca 1832, p. 24.

If you wish to be prudent, think always of the future and keep in mind all that can occur. Paraphrase of Si prudens esse cupis, in futurum prospectum intende, et quae possint contingere animo tuo cuncta propone. See Seneca 1829, p. 450.

The New Hollstein mentions a second state, but this is an impression reworked in pen and brown ink (Brussels, KBR, Print Room, inv. no. S.II 135123).

Mielke 1996, no. 47.

To conquer one’s impulses, to restrain anger and the other vices and emotions: this is the true fortitude. The phrase Animum vincere, iracundiam cohibere is found in Lactantius’ Divinae Institutiones. See Lactantius 2005, p. 34.

The New Hollstein mentions a second state, but this is an impression reworked in pen and brown ink (Brussels, KBR, Print Room, inv. no. S.II 135123, and Dresden, Kupferstichkabinett, inv. no. A 30134).

Mielke 1996, no. 50.

We must look to it that, in the devotion to sensual pleasures, we do not become wasteful and luxuriant, but also that we do not, because of miserly greed, live in filth and ignorance. Paraphrase of Hac ergo mediocrissitatis linea continentiam observabitis, ut nec voluptatis deditis, prodigus & luxuriosus apparas, nec avara tenacitate nirdulis, nec obscuras exitias. See Seneca 1829, p. 457.

The Seven Acts of Mercy (feeding the hungry, giving drink to the thirsty, clothing the naked, lodging strangers, caring for the sick, visiting prisoners and burying the dead) derived from two Bible passages (Matthew 25:35–36 and Tobit 11:7).

The dog did not fare well, in technical terms at least: so many prints were pulled from the copper plate that a crack eventually developed near the animal.

The Seven Liberal Arts are grammar, rhetoric, dialectics, music, arithmetic, geometry and astronomy.
Pieter van der Heyden after Pieter Bruegel the Elder

The Descent of Christ into Limbo

c. 1561, engraving, 235 × 295 mm
Brussels, KBR, Print Room, inv. no. S.II 31214 [I/I]

Inscriptions
Bottom, left of centre: .PAME. [monogram];
lower right: H.cock excv.; further to the right:
Bruegel Incv.; in the margin: TOBLITE ë FORTE,
CAPITA VESTEA, ATTOLLIMINI FORES
SEMPITERNE, ET INGREDIETVR REX ILLE
GLORIOSV

States and editions
Only state.

Preparatory drawing in pen and brown ink, 1561,
signed, 225 × 295 mm, Vienna, Albertina,
inv. no. 78733

Copper plate possibly in the estate of Volckken
Diericx (1601): Een coperen plaeete van een
Helbrekinge (Duverger 1984–2006: I, 33) or
Acht coperen platten van de 7 Dootsonden

Literature
Van Bastelaer 1908, no. 115; Oberhuber 1967,
no. 47; Lebeer 1969, no. 38; Lari 1973, no. 110;
Riggs 1977, no. 14: Marijnissen et al. 1988,
p. 165; Freedberg 1989, no. 38; Müller et al. 2001,
no. 38; Orenstein and Sellink 2001, no. 88; NHD
(Baruel), no. 7; Morit 2010, no. 29; Sellink
2011, no. 102; Silver 2011, pp. 160, 169, 174, 177;
Sellink and Martens 2012, pp. 86–89; Müller et
al. 2014, no. 39; Michel et al. 2017, pp. 40–41;
Müller and Schauerte 2018, no. G8:

The idea of ‘limbo’ arose in the early years of
Christianity in response to the question of
what happened to Christ between
the Crucifixion and the Resurrection.
According to Jacobus de Voragine's well-
known medieval collection of saints' lives,
the Legenda aurea (Golden Legend),
and the apocryphal Gospel of Nicodemus,
Jesus descended into the underworld to
free the souls of virtuous Old Testament
figures from their 'temporary' imprisonment.
Everyone who died before Christ's
sacrifice on the cross – all the way back
to Adam and Eve – was burdened by
original sin and hence, according to the
theological views of the time, unable to go
to heaven. Through Jesus's grace, however,
they could be saved from their plight.

Bruegel made particularly grateful
use of Bosch-inspired imagery when it
came to depicting evil and the diabolical,
since it is not surprising that he resorted to
that rich, Boschian repertoire of hybrid
figures and monstrous creatures for this
1561 print design. An evident horror vacui
prompted him to cram the composition
with half-human, half-animal forms and
other acrobatic monstrosities. Limbo is
depicted as a desolate place, an absolute
dystopia, in the midst of which Christ
seems to hover in a bubble-shaped aureole,
which he shares with nine music-making
gods. The gateway to limbo appears on
the left of the engraving in the form of
a fearsome monster’s head. The opened
gates referred to in the Latin caption have
been lifted right off their hinges, allowing
a procession of Old Testament patriarchs
and prophets – Adam, Eve, Abel, Noah
and Moses at its head – to emerge to meet
the Saviour.

A minor blemish has previously been
noted in the inscription in the margin.
The engraver Pieter van der Heyden
made a tentative attempt to place the
inscription on the printing plate, but he
ran into problems due to a lack of space.
Consequently, the final ‘s’ of GLORIOSUS
had to be shifted above the line of text.4
This is not the only error to creep into
the Latin inscriptions below Bruegel’s
prints. They mostly resulted from absent-
minedness on the part of the engraver:
a letter was cut wrong or forgotten and
had to be inserted afterwards.5 In some
cases, however, the fault lay with an
unidentified third party who provided
inscriptions for the compositions. There is
a strong suspicion that it was Hieronymus
Cock in this case. A paraphrase of Psalm
24:9 in Latin was added in brown ink to
the preparatory drawing itself, now in
Vienna, of Bruegel's Descent of Christ into
Limbo. The sentence begins incorrectly
with the word TOBLITE rather than
TOLLITE, from the Latin verb meaning
‘to lift up’. What’s more, VESTEA should
actually be VESTRA – ‘you’ (plural).6
These errors were then repeated by the
engraver, who is unlikely to have been an
expert on Latin grammar, when cutting
the printing plate. While the addition of
Latin inscriptions was aimed at an erudite
international public, therefore, the words
more than likely flowed from the pen of
an enthusiastic author who had to draw
mainly on school-level Latin and a simple
dictionary.7 The same sentence cropped up
again later – albeit now spelled correctly –
that Cock issued with the signature of
Hieronymus Bosch (p. 166, fig. 1).

By analogy with The Seven Deadly
Sins (cat. no. 11), which is listed in the
inventory of Volckken Diericx’s estate as
Acht coperen platen van de 7 Dootsonden
('Eight copper plates of the Seven Deadly
Sins'), it might be asked whether The
Descent of Christ into Limbo also served
to complete the set of Acht coperen platen
van de 7 Dootsonden ('Eight copper plates
of the Seven Virtues'; cat. no. 13).8 It has
recently been possible, based on a study of
the editions produced using the printing
plates, to prove a connection between
the engraved Last Judgement (cat. no. 12)
and the Seven Deadly Sins series – a link
that had been assumed for some time.
Similar evidence for Bruegel's Descent of
Christ into Limbo cannot be assembled
for the time being, due to the lack of later
states of the print composition. What's
more, there are strong indications that
the printing plate is listed separately in
Diericx’s inventory as Een coperen plaete
van een Helbrekinge ('A copper plate of a
Harrowing of Hell'). [MB]
[fig. 1] Attributed to Cornelis Cort, after an anonymous follower of Hieronymus Bosch, Triptych with Judgement Day, Heaven and Hell, c. 1565. Engraving, 338 × 500 mm.
Brussels, KBR, Print Room, inv. no. S.IV 84981.
‘Lift up your heads, O you gates; Yes, lift them up, you eternal doors, that the King of Glory shall come in.’

1 Nadine Orenstein describes a second state of this print with added cross hatching in the upper right corner; see NHD (Bruegel), no. 7II. We have not been able to trace this and so the number of states has been reduced to one. In the earliest impressions, however, the guidelines and preparatory experiments with the inscription are visible.

2 Mielke 1996, no. 55.

3 Errors in inscriptions can be found, for example, in View of Tivoli (cat. no. 2a), Soldiers at Rest (cat. no. 3) and Saint James and the Magician Hermogenes (cat. no. 9a).

4 There is another error in the preparatory drawing, where Attollimini is written as Attollimine. See Michel et al. 2017, p. 47, note 51.

5 Bakker and Hoyle 2007, p. 56.

6 Orenstein and Sellink 2001, p. 212.
BRUEGEL AS A NARRATOR
AND A MORALIST

The Sins and Virtues offer a rule of conduct for human behaviour that is wholly in line with the Christian tradition. Around this same time Bruegel also began making print designs of a mainly worldly nature, which, through humour and derision, deliver moral lessons. These representations too had their roots in a centuries-old visual and literary culture that had previously been raised to a higher artistic level by Hieronymus Bosch. Bruegel rarely made literal copies of motifs by other artists, but by way of citation and accumulation of divergent influences created complex and multilayered images that make the viewer laugh and reflect, and often also arouse emotion.

In The Ass at School (cat. no. 15) the artist integrates various sayings and symbols into the setting of an old-fashioned and disorderly classroom. Bruegel’s satire criticizes ineradicable stupidity, failing education and child-rearing, as well as the inability or lack of motivation to gain knowledge and insight. His Everyman of around 1558 (cat. no. 16) is about the fruitless search every human being undertakes to find themselves and a higher goal in life. In Bruegel’s print it has become a very complex and ambivalent allegory, blending references to the Bible, classical literature and philosophy, and the plays and poetry of the rhetoricians. Sayings, proverbs, wordplays and the multiple meanings of words are typical of this rhetorician’s culture. A wordplay is also key to The Alchemist (cat. no. 17). Foolishness and greed lead to the material downfall of an alchemist and his family, who ‘all missed it’; and he invests his time and money in ‘misty’ pseudoscience. Deeply moving are the playing children who are looking for food, and the destitute family being received into the poorhouse. Through the juxtaposition of humour and mockery on the one hand, and compassion about the family’s fate on the other, Bruegel triggers a cathartic effect in the viewer. Apart from Everyman, The Alchemist is possibly Bruegel’s most narrative and in a certain sense most ‘theatrical’ print.

In The Stone Operation or The Witch of Mallegem (cat. no. 18) Bruegel pokes fun at quackery. This includes keisnijden – whereby the madness or foolishness in the form of a stone is surgically removed from the head – which had already been pictured earlier in the wake of Bosch. In Bruegel’s rendition it becomes a composition that is crammed with multiple references to sayings or allegories in relation to the incurable human folly. In Sleeping Pedlar Robbed by Monkeys (cat no. 19) Bruegel comically derides human (mis)behaviour in the form of thieving and playful little monkeys. Here too he embellishes a centuries-old visual tradition, but achieves an unprecedented effect through his incredible capacity to capture in images the beings of human and monkeys.

In the diptych The Thin Kitchen and The Fat Kitchen (cat. no. 20) Bruegel thematizes, in an almost caricatural way, the contrast between lack and excess. If the misery of the hungry has to be considered as the consequence of the gluttony of the obese, then these pictures spur the viewer to moderation and to following the golden mean. This is also the theme of the painting The Battle between Carnival and Lent of a few years before. Two of the popular plays that can be seen in the background of that painting were later put into print. Just as in The Thin Kitchen and The Fat Kitchen, these theatre pieces reveal extreme contrasts. In The Dirty Bride or The Wedding of Mopsus and Nisa (cat. no. 22) an otherwise decent-looking young man, in a drunken, ill-considered moment, decided to take a slovenly and ‘bedraggled’ woman as a bride. It is not only a warning against the making of insufficiently considered choices, but also a variation on the beloved theme of unequal love. The woodcut The Wild Man (cat. no. 21) depicts the story of Orson and Valentine. This pair of brothers, whom fate dictated should grow up apart, represents the dual nature of man. Orson, the savage, stands for all that is animalistic and primitive; Valentine symbolizes the developed and cultivated man.

JORIS VAN GRIEKEN
Pieter van der Heyden after Pieter Bruegel the Elder

The Ass at School

1557, engraving, 236 × 303 mm
Brussels, KBR, Print Room, inv. no. S.I 7603 [I/I]

Inscriptions
Lower left: Bruegel. Inventor. on a box mounted on the wall to the left: PAME [monogram]; lower right: COCK. Ex. 1557; lower margin: PARISIOS STOLIDVM SI QVIS TRANSMITTAT ASELLVM. SI HIC EST ASINVS NON ERIT ILLIC EQVVS.' 
Al reÿst den esele ter scholen om leeren / ist eenen Schoelmeester 

States and editions
Preparatory drawing in pen and brush, grey-black and grey-brown ink, 1556, signed, 232 × 302 mm, Berlin, Staatliche Museen zu Berlin, Kupferstichkabinett, inv. no. KdZ II 641

The copper plate might have been in the estate of Lodovico Guicciardini (1521–1589) was astonished to discover that even the peasants there were able to read and write.1 Judging from the village school that Bruegel depicts in his print, the Italian writer’s account might have been a touch optimistic. The children are indeed receiving a basic education, but they do not seem very motivated. The rules and standards of behaviour in this chaotic classroom are not what we would expect to find in a school.

Most of the pupils have alphabet books in their hands or on their laps, but some are pulling faces and provoking each other. Others have not even bothered to dress completely, and sit semi-naked on the floor. An argument is going on in the foreground: possibly an intellectual one, but more likely over who has the biggest book.2 To the right of this little group, a classmate has climbed headfirst into a hive, with the bees still in residence. A teacher sits at the centre, surrounded by children. The situation has clearly got out of hand, and he is about to take action. The rod is at the ready, but a warning slap on the behind might be enough to restore discipline.

The donkey looking in from the upper left corner seems to have different ambitions to the noisy pack of children. It has all it needs to read the musical score lying on the shelf, but ‘what use are candle and spectacles, if the owl won’t look?’4 Asses were frequently associated with stubbornness and stupidity, as well as with sloth, as in Bruegel’s depiction of that deadly sin (cat. no. 11b). The donkey in this print can hardly be accused of laziness, however: the allusion here is to his unchangeable nature. As the Latin text at the bottom of the engraving states, you can send a donkey to study in Paris, but it will not return as a capable horse. The expression is probably German in origin and has been translated here into Latin.7 Variations exist in a variety of European languages. Depending on the particular country or region, the donkey’s pointless journey is to Rome, Oxford, Salamanca or some other intellectual centre.6 But Bruegel’s print still carries a clear message, even without this element of academic ambition and the engraved text: whichever method you choose, a recalcitrant child who resists its education will no more change than an ass will turn into a horse. For all its efforts, materials and eagerness to learn, this donkey is never going to achieve its goal.

Other proverbs and symbols are also hidden in the engraving. The two pupils huddled beneath the huge, feathered headpiece, for instance, are ‘playing under one hat’ (i.e. conspiring). The significance of the beehive, meanwhile, remains a matter of scholarly debate to this day. Hives generally symbolize order, while swarming bees are an emblem of self-confidence and immense perseverance.9 They can also be read as an allusion to the Church Father Ambrose of Milan, who was the patron saint in the Low Countries not only of beekeepers but also of teachers.9 His attribute is a beehive, so the hive here might be intended as a wry suggestion that the children will never emulate Ambrose’s erudition or ‘honeyed eloquence’ if they carry on like this. The pupils’ behaviour is being closely observed, incidentally, by a woman behind a wicker screen.

Bruegel's print primarily satirizes the lack of diligence and the bad behaviour that hold sway in this classroom. Folly and rampant egotism were themes that preoccupied sixteenth-century Europe and this moralizing engraving – various impressions of which were produced after its publication in 1557 – appeared on the market at just the right time. The children in this classroom might not live up to the intelligent rural folk that had so impressed Guicciardini, but they are perfect for a print that Hieronymus Cock knew would amuse the public. [AK]

1 ‘If you send a stupid ass to Paris, if it is an ass here, it will not be a horse there.’
2 ‘An ass might go to school to learn, yet if it is an ass, it will not return a horse.’
3 An earlier state with the date 1556 is occasionally mentioned in the literature, but this is based on an error.
4 Mielke 1996, no. 52.
5 Guicciardini 1567, p. 27.
6 This proverbial text was later added to a copy of the print published by Hendrik Hondius. See Van Bastelaer 1992, p. 196.
7 The proverb appears in various places, including Johannes Glandorpius’ Disticha ad bonus mores paraenctica, which was published between 1553 and 1558. His work consists largely of a translation of the book by the German Johannes Agricola, who wrote essays containing hundreds of proverbs. The reference to Paris rather than to Rome or another city might reflect the fact that the university in the French capital was one of the leading institutions in Northern Europe. See Gibson 2007-8, p. 35.
8 Ibid., p. 35, note 3.
9 Kaschek, Müller and Buskirk 2018, p. 41.
Bruegel as a narrator and a moralist

PARISIUS: STOLIDUM SI QVIS TRANSMITTAT ASELIUM. SI HIC EST ASINVS NON ERIIT ILIC EQUVS.

Al reijst den esele ter scholen om keeren, ist cenen esele bij en zal gheen peert veder keeren.
Everyman

c. 1558, engraving, 232 × 300 mm
Brussels, KBR, Print Room, inv. nos. S.II 80370 [I.A/II], S.II 32108 [I.B/II], F-2017-22 [I.C/II], S.II 80369 [II/II]

Inscriptions
Lower right: H. COCK. EXCVD. CVM. PRIVILEG.; upper left of centre, below a painting of a fool looking at himself in a mirror: NIEMA[N]TEN. KEN. HE[M]. SELVE[N]. (‘Nobody knows himself’); on a sack in the middle of the background: NEMO NON; on the hem of the cloaks of the figures in the foreground: ELCK; on the hem of the cloaks of the characters searching in the background: ELCK; below the figure by the church in the background: Elck; below the figure in the army camp in the upper right corner: ELCK; in the margin: Nemo non inquiet priuati undique lucris, / Hic trahit, ille trahit, cunctis amor unus habendi est.

States and editions
I as described.

The first state is accompanied in some cases by a separate typeset text printed on the same sheet below the edge of the plate. Four different versions can be distinguished based on the typefaces used. However, with a few minor adjustments, the same verses appear in each case:

Sur le monde vn chacun par tout recherche, / Et en toutes choses Soymesme veut trouuer. / Veu qu’vn chacun donques tousiours se cherche, / Pourroit quelqu'vn bien perdu demeurer? / Vn chacun pour le plus long tire aussy, / L ’vn par haut & l'autre par bas s'efforce: / Nul se cognoist Soymesme presque en ce monde icy: / Ce bien noté l'esmerueiller est force. / Elck soeckt hem seluen in alderley saken / Ouer al de werelt, al wort hy ghevloect, / Hoe can dan iemant verdoelt gheweken / Als elck hem seluen nu altijt soect. / Elck trect oock om dlancste soomen hier siet / Deen van bouen, dander van ondere. / Niemant en kent schier hem seluen niet / Diet wel aenmerct die siet groot wondere.

Preparatory drawing in pen and brown ink, 1558, signed, 208 × 241 mm, London, The British Museum, inv. no. N 28/06/1854-36°

Copper plate in the estate of Volckxen Diericx (1601): Een coperen plaete daer elckeen syn seiboen suet (Duverger 1984–2006: I. 31)

Literature
Sur le monde en chacun par tout recherche,
Et en toutes choses Soymême veut trouver.
Veu qu'en chacun dontques toujours se cherche.
Pourroit quelqu'un va bien perdu demeurer.

Vn chacun pour le plus long tire aussi,
L'en par haut & l'autre par bas s'efforce.
Nul ne conoist Soymême presque en ce monde icy:
Ce bien note s'elmerueiller est force.

Elk soet hem seluen in alleley schen
Ouer al de werelt, al wort hy ghesoet,
Hoe can dan iemant verdoolt ghesoeken
Als elk hem seluen nu alzigt soet.

Elk treft oock om dlanenste soomen hier siet
Deen van buren, dandez van andere.
Niemand en keert liës hem seluen niet
Diet wel aemeret die siet groet wondere.
Bruegel as a narrator and a moralist

[cat. no. 16] State I, version C
176 / BRUEGEL AS A NARRATOR AND A MORALIST
Bruegel drew his design for the print *Everyman* in the course of 1558 and the copper plate was engraved shortly afterwards by Pieter van der Heyden, whose monogram is not included here. A great deal has been written on the subject of Bruegel’s intentions and motives in depicting *Everyman*, with some authors resorting to complex philosophical reflections and lengthy quotations from sixteenth-century literature. This has resulted in a number of striking interpretations of the artist’s motives. Although a different view has been taken more recently, *Everyman* remains one of the most intriguing prints in Bruegel’s graphic oeuvre.

Just as the Greek philosopher Diogenes once carried a lamp through the streets in broad daylight in a vain quest to find an ‘honest man,’ *Everyman*, armed with a candle and spectacles, searches here for self-knowledge. His figure appears in eight different places in the composition: several times in the higgledy-piggledy mound of earthly goods in the middle, and even in a tug-of-war with himself. He seeks salvation in faith near the church in the background, and risks his life in the military camp in the upper right corner. All plainly to no avail. The painful truth is expressed in the painting of a fool looking at himself in the mirror: nobody knows himself. It is not so much his short-sightedness that prevents *Everyman* from finding himself, as greed and materialism. As he attempts to pick his way through the bales of merchandise, barrels, toys and other objects, *Everyman* is hindered by the large money bag under his arm. An orb with a jagged hole at the bottom, alluding to the uncertainty of earthly existence, lies between the legs of the most prominent *Everyman*. The tragedy of folly ultimately lies in the endlessly recurring selfishness of the seeker.

A second state of Bruegel’s *Everyman* did not appear until the middle of the seventeenth century, when the copper plate came into the hands of Joannes Galle. The Antwerp publisher emphasized the moralizing undertone of the engraving by adding the title *EYGHEN BAET* (personal gain). A reasonably educated viewer would already have got the message, however, from the existing Latin inscription in the margin, which combines several of the proverbs incorporated in Bruegel’s image. The same idioms are also referred to in the typeset Dutch and French texts added below some of the impressions.

More information regarding the successive editions of the first state can be gleaned from this letterpress addition. What is important here is not the meaning of the words but the form and use of the typefaces. Based on the different combinations of these, four individual versions can be distinguished. That is to say, on four separate occasions a text was formed by placing individual letters in a composing stick. Versions A1 and A2, both set in Ameet Tavernier’s Pica Roman and Pica Italic, differ only in terms of punctuation. In version B, the capitals at the beginning of the Dutch verses are set in Robert Granjon’s Civilité typeface. Version C, lastly, combines the English Roman and English Italic typeface with Johann Neudörffer’s Fraktur typeface for the capital letters of the Dutch verses. All these typefaces were owned in the mid-sixteenth century by the Antwerp book printer Christophe Plantin, which strongly suggests that he was responsible for printing the added typeset text. [MB]

---

1 ‘No one does not seek his own advantage everywhere, no one does not seek himself in all that he does, no one does not look everywhere for private gain. This one pulls, that one pulls, all have the same love of possession.’
3 Ibid.
6 Mielke 1996, no. 41; Oberthaler et al. 2018, no. 33.
7 One very early impression of *Everyman* (Brussels, KBR, Print Room, inv. no. S.II 80570) has a goat on a banderole as its watermark. The same filigree is found in *Vuyl Sauce* (Dirty Sauce) after a design by Jan Verbeek, which also has an added text (Brussels, KBR, Print Room, inv. no. S.IV 2224), and on the typeset title page of *Scenographiae sive Perspectivae* by Hans Vredeman de Vries (Brussels, KBR, Rare Books Department, inv. no. VB 5.074 E 1 [RP]). The latter bears the date 1560 and so the aforementioned impressions may be dated to around that period.
8 Jan Grauls has rightly noted the use of the Dutch expression ‘Elck soect hem selven, Elck trekkt om dianecte en Niemant en kent hem selve’ (‘Each is looking for himself, Each is out for himself’) literally, ‘Each is pulling for the longest (end)’, hence the tug-of-war, and Nobody knows himself’. See Grauls 1957, p. 178.
9 The same combination of typefaces as that in version C of *Everyman* is found in the typeset texts added below The Stone Operation or The Witch of Mallegem (cat. no. 18) and The Wild Man or The Masquerade of Orson and Valentine (cat. no. 21).
The Alchemist

c. 1558, engraving, 337 × 445 mm
Brussels, KBR, Print Room, inv. no. S.I 2368 [II/V]

Inscriptions
Upper left: Brueghel inue[n]; lower left:
H COCK EXCV'D CVM PRIVILEGIO; lower margin: DERN IGNARI RES FERRE ET
POST OPERARI / IVS LAPIDIS CARI VILIS
SED DENERDUE RARI / VINCA RES CERTA
VILIS SED YBIQ UE REPERTA / QVATVOR
INSERTA NAT'FRIS IN NVBE REPERTA / NVLLA
MINERALIS RES EST VRI PRINCIPALIS / SED
TALIS QVALIS REPERTIVR YBIQ [UE] LOCALIS;

on the bag to the left below the alchemist: Drogerie;
upper right over the doorway of the building:
lospital; in the books in front of the man sitting on
the right: 12 lonne marn / ALGHE MIST / ACED / OM;
on the two pots near the sitting man: keue / sulfer;
on the piece of paper over the fireplace:
ien / En la fumee est tout fondu pour l'heure /

Deep in concentration, the alchemist
uses his last coin in the hope that he
will be able to transform the metal into
precious gold. For all his efforts – and
those of his imbecilic assistant who tries
to fan the flames in the brazier with the
bellows – he is doomed to failure.
The chaotic laboratory is not a success.
The children – one of whom has an
empty, upturned cooking pot on his
head – are still naively foraging for food
in the larder. When the mother turns
her purse upside down, she finds that all
the money has been spent. The doleful
fate that awaits the family can be seen in
the background: they are received at the
door of the poorhouse where they will be
obliged to live.

The design of this engraving has
been worked out in detail. The figures,
with their subtle facial expressions, and
the space, equipped with all manner of
apparatus, chemicals and meticulous
formulae, represent an active alchemist's
laboratory. The word ALGHE MIST
even appears on the pages of the book
to which the 'scholar' is trying to
draw attention – a detail that has long
occupied linguists. Besides the obvious
reference to the title of the print, it seems
to be a play on words alluding to the
supposed scientist who has failed in every
regard (alles heeft geloost). The wordplay
can also be interpreted as ‘everything is
misty’ (alles is mistig), referring to the
plumes of smoke and ash that billow into
L'art Alchimiste sa fon nom bien à plain,
Le bien d'autruy & le noftr' f'y perr.
De fain meurons, n'ayant pirance ou pain
Tous defuiz allons comme il apper,
Malheureux est qui à tel art l'affert.

Voyez en haut en coni bien confus
Par Madame la bonne hospitaliere
Tous ceux qui font par ceft art cy deuez
Comme la chofe en est bien coufumiere,
Heureux font ceux qui s'en tirent arriere.

Cette fois cy encoi' veult je eprouver
De chercher l'art, ceft tout mon penfement
Si à ce coup je ne le puis trouver
Je brufleray mes liures, puis vrayement
A l'hospital men entray briefement.

T'entraie au vif voyant que noftr' bien
Par ce lot cy en la cendre demueur,
Cerdet perdons, en bourse n'ayons rien
En la fumee eft tout fondu pour l'heure
A l'hospital iron, ceft chofe feure.
the laboratory from the brazier and the hearth. Philips Galle, who transferred Bruegel’s design to the plate, used strong, straight parallel hatching to provide the figures with distinct contours and to accentuate the details of the laboratory at the height of the alchemical process.

Alchemy was an important phenomenon that was deeply rooted in sixteenth-century society. It basically concerned the search for the precise and vital composition of matter – for the so-called philosopher’s stone, which could convert base metals into gold. Another goal was the elixir of life, which supposedly granted a person immortality. For the most part, practising alchemists did not enjoy a very positive image; they were considered charlatans, driven purely by obsession and greed. Alchemy had a bad reputation among artists too. The emulation of nature was art’s central ambition, but alchemists went a step further, wishing to outdo nature herself. Because of this, they were widely viewed as the personification of greed.

Bruegel might have drawn for this image on a variety of early-modern literary and visual sources, in which the alchemist was held out as a target for mockery and a symbol of foolishness. The print no doubt contains many symbolic references. Although opinions differ as to Bruegel’s attitude towards alchemical practices, the work plainly has a moralizing undertone as well as a satirical edge: it shows what happens when obsession gets the better of common sense. The idea of obsession is also clearly evident in the French text, which did not form part of Cock’s original print and was only added later: even though the foolish alchemist has brought his ‘profession’ into disrepute, he still seems unable to resist one last go at making gold. [AK]
1 ‘The ignorant should suffer things and labour accordingly. The law of the precious, cheap but at the same time rare stone is the only certain, worthless but everywhere discovered thing. With four natures stuffed into the cloud it is no mineral that is unique somewhere but is of such a kind as to be found everywhere.’ An original source for this inscription has not been identified. The quality of the Latin is so poor, moreover, that it is near impossible to provide a literal translation.

2 It has so far not been possible to identify the typeface used here. Nor do we know what the origin is of the text.

3 ‘The name of the “Alchemist” art explains it. / Others’ wealth and our own are being lost. / We are dying of hunger, without money or bread. / Our eyes all opened, let us go as we are obliged. Unhappy is he who becomes a slave to this art. // Observe above, how well are received / By the good woman who runs the poorhouse, / All those who are disappointed by this art, / As this thing is quite usual. / Happy are they who stand back from it. // This time I want to experiment again. / To research this art is all that I am thinking. / If as it happens I cannot find it, / I will burn my books, then truly / I will go to the poorhouse briefly. // I am furious seeing that our money / Is resting in the ashes because of this fool here. / We are losing our credit, we have nothing in our purse. / For now, everything has gone up in smoke. // We will go to the poorhouse, that is a sure thing.’

4 ‘See how this foolish man distills in his vials / The blood of his children, his treasures and his senses; // See how, after searching uselessly / For mercury, he seeks bread with his children. // The alchemist has spent much on materials and time. / He had money, goods and treasure, but he lost it all. // Other than his ruin, not a jot is found by him in the fire. // In the end he must then die, as a poor man, in the almshouse.’

5 Mielke 1996, no. 42.

6 The design for this engraving – one of Bruegel’s largest drawings – has been preserved (Berlin, Kupferstichkabinett).

7 The role of the man behind the lectern can be interpreted in several ways. Is he a scholar who, from behind his treatise, is pointing out the failed alchemist to the viewer? Or is he the driving force behind all this activity? Is he a master alchemist who uses up other people’s money and labour, before disappearing in search of the next gullible and avaricious victim? See, for example, Gibson 2006 and Silver 2011.

8 Nummedal 2007, p. 40.

9 Orenstein and Sellink 2001, p. 172.


13 In 1494, Sebastian Brant published his Ship of Fools, which discusses and presents various types of fools and lunatics. The book also includes the figure of the alchemist, accompanied by an illustration that displays similarities to Bruegel’s engraving.

14 Marijnissen et al. 1988, p. 106.

15 Two characters are seemingly presented in the French text. The first two columns and the final one describe the catastrophic fate that awaits anyone who engages in alchemy. This part of the text might represent the voice of the alchemist’s wife, who sees how her family is suffering. The third column seems to be a plea on the part of the alchemist himself, who wants to give it one last try.
Pieter van der Heyden after Pieter Bruegel the Elder

The Stone Operation or The Witch of Mallegem

1559, engraving, \(355 \times 473\) mm
Brussels, KBR, Print Room, inv. no. S.II 117401 [III/V]

Inscriptions
On the side of the table: PAME [monogram]; lower centre: H. COCK. EXCVDT. CVM. PRIVILEGIO. 1559.; on a panel on the egg, lower right: p. brueghel / inventor.; on the otherwise illegible certificate in the background: [...] Jan kernakel; on the potts on the left: seuer and honich

States and editions
I no address, engraver's monogram or signature.
II address and engraver's monogram added.
III as described.

Accompanied in some cases by a letterpress text in Neudörffer Fraktur (Augustine text5 in the sky at the top, the French text:
Maistre Jean de la folie grand Operator et medicin borie dans la court estate et domines du Treshault et trespuissant monarque colyn par la disgrace / des cieule empererou souuerain de tout l’univers, Roy des enragez des creze, sotz et escervesz, S. d’Orleurs en France, de Lille en Flandre, de Ghele en / Brabantz, de Mauzbege en Haynault, grand maistre et commandeur general de los locus en Espagne, delli mati en Italie vande sotten des / Pais bas, der naren de Germanie etc. etc.); at the bottom of the print, the French verses:
Ceulx quÿ portent la pierre au front / Ou dans autrue lieu de la teste / Ie leur promet la guerison / Par la poincte de ma gantette / Les operatours d’Italie / Par leurs inventions nouuelles / souverent de l’homme la veuille / Pour le curer de la graelue. / Le merite bien mialx mon gain / Que non pas ces contouters de belles, / Ie ne geriesent que les reius / Et moy ie guery la ceruelle.

The copper plate in the estate of Volckens Dierickx (1601): Een coperen plaete van eenen Keysnyer van Keyaerts – people afflicted with the stone of folly – stream in on foot, on horseback and some on crutches, in the vain hope of a cure. They throng about Master Snottolf, the quack doctor who, for a price, will relieve this gullible crowd of the offending stones.4 Bax provided a brilliant analysis of this Boschian compendium of idiocy.5 Many of the motifs in the print are drawn from the standard late medieval iconographic repertoire of folly: the fake operation, the egg with the flowering sprig of beans, heads being wrapped in cloth, carrying a sack of grain to the watermill, and the large certificate with its garlands of gall, bladder and kidney stones. In an urban milieu in which people’s behaviour was subject to a growing number of rules, imagery of this kind was a gift to canny publishers, and scenes illustrating similar examples of unacceptable behaviour decorated many a parlour in Antwerp.6 Hieronymus Cock originally published this copper engraving – almost certainly catalogued as Keysnyer (Stonecutter) – without an inscription.7 The only ‘text’ in the first state is the scribble on the certificates. In the largest of these, we can just about make out the name Jan kernakel, which might refer to the term of abuse ‘karnakel’ (bag of bones).8 There is a unique impression in Rome, in which – probably for the first time – a text from Bruegel’s era has been pasted into the blank space at the bottom. The four verses refer explicitly to the engraved scene: the flood of keyaerts, the pain-relieving water, and the lantern to light up the operation.9 There is no reference as yet, however, to Mallegem – a name which does not appear until the fourth state, published by Theodoor Galle between 1610 and 1630.10 Galle was certainly not the first to use this fictitious name, which suggests a place where mad people live: another stone operation, after a design by Maerten de Vos dating from the last quarter of the sixteenth century, is similarly inscribed (fig. 1). The text in that instance reads: Ik meester blaeskake, doe nu mynen Intrey voor die van Malleghem, compt vry u lotert u den key, (‘I, Master Blaeskake, have come for the people of Mallegem, approach freely, one and all, whether you have a wasp in your head or a loose stone.’) In Galle’s version, the male quack in the Bruegel print has become a witch (Vrou Hexe). The ‘wasp’ mentioned in the Galle and de Vos prints was part of the tradition and refers to a negative object that needed removing from the fool’s head.11

V address changed to IOAN GALLE EXCVDT; Vrou Hexe replaced with meester Ian; in the sky at the top, the French text:
Maistre Iean de la folie grand Operator et medicin borie dans la court estate et domines du Treshault et trespuissant monarque colyn par la disgrace / des cieule empererou souuerain de tout l’univers, Roy des enragez des creze, sotz et escervesz, S. d’Orleurs en France, de Lille en Flandre, de Ghele en / Brabantz, de Mauzbege en Haynault, grand maistre et commandeur general de los locus en Espagne, delli mati en Italie vande sotten des / Pais bas, der naren de Germanie etc. etc. etc.; at the bottom of the print, the French verses: Ceulx qui portent la pierre au front / Ou dans autrue lieu de la teste / Ie leur promet la guerison / Par la poincte de ma gantette / Les operatours d’Italie / Par leurs inventions nouuelles / souverent de l’homme la veuille / Pour le curer de la graelue. / Le merite bien mialx mon gain / Que non pas ces contouters de belles, / Ie ne geriesent que les reius / Et moy ie guery la ceruelle.

Copper plate in the estate of Volckens Dierickx (1601): Een coperen plaete van eenen Keysnyer van Keyaerts – people afflicted with the stone of folly – stream in on foot, on horseback and some on crutches, in the vain hope of a cure. They throng about Master Snottolf, the quack doctor who, for a price, will relieve this gullible crowd of the offending stones.4 Bax provided a brilliant analysis of this Boschian compendium of idiocy.5 Many of the motifs in the print are drawn from the standard late medieval iconographic repertoire of folly: the fake operation, the egg with the flowering sprig of beans, heads being wrapped in cloth, carrying a sack of grain to the watermill, and the large certificate with its garlands of gall, bladder and kidney stones. In an urban milieu in which people’s behaviour was subject to a growing number of rules, imagery of this kind was a gift to canny publishers, and scenes illustrating similar examples of unacceptable behaviour decorated many a parlour in Antwerp.6 Hieronymus Cock originally published this copper engraving – almost certainly catalogued as Keysnyer (Stonecutter) – without an inscription.7 The only ‘text’ in the first state is the scribble on the certificates. In the largest of these, we can just about make out the name Jan kernakel, which might refer to the term of abuse ‘karnakel’ (bag of bones).8 There is a unique impression in Rome, in which – probably for the first time – a text from Bruegel’s era has been pasted into the blank space at the bottom. The four verses refer explicitly to the engraved scene: the flood of keyaerts, the pain-relieving water, and the lantern to light up the operation.9 There is no reference as yet, however, to Mallegem – a name which does not appear until the fourth state, published by Theodoor Galle between 1610 and 1630.10 Galle was certainly not the first to use this fictitious name, which suggests a place where mad people live: another stone operation, after a design by Maerten de Vos dating from the last quarter of the sixteenth century, is similarly inscribed (fig. 1). The text in that instance reads: Ik meester blaeskake, doe nu mynen Intrey voor die van Malleghem, compt vry u lotert u den key, (‘I, Master Blaeskake, have come for the people of Mallegem, approach freely, one and all, whether you have a wasp in your head or a loose stone.’) In Galle’s version, the male quack in the Bruegel print has become a witch (Vrou Hexe). The ‘wasp’ mentioned in the Galle and de Vos prints was part of the tradition and refers to a negative object that needed removing from the fool’s head.11

18. / BRUEGEL AS A NARRATOR AND A MORALIST
Theodoor Galle’s son Joannes changed the sex of the quack once again in the next state, where the witch becomes meester Ian. He also added two French inscriptions. The new text at the bottom states that ‘the surgeons of Italy use their new inventions to open up people’s bladders and cure them of kidney stones’. The quack notes dryly, however, that ‘they cure only the kidneys, I cure the brain’. This is an allusion to the blurred distinction between keisnijden (cutting out the stone of folly) and steensnijden (cutting out gall, bladder and kidney stones). There was a whole raft of literature in circulation regarding the latter, ranging from satirical farces to official edicts. Several motifs from the stone operation, including the untrustworthy quack and the warning about the dangerous operation, also crop up in those texts.” The French inscription at the top tells the story of Maistre Iean, the celebrated magician and quack, and emphasizes once again the worldwide phenomenon of folly: locos, mati, naren and sotten can, after all, be found in every corner of the globe. [WW]
Unlike the other prints with added letterpress after designs by Bruegel, the text for The Stone Operation was printed on two separate strips of paper and pasted on afterwards. Although the verses on the impression in Rome begin with ‘Nyet en was ick […]’, it would be much more logical in textual terms to start with ‘Compte alle keyaerts […].’

Vervliet 1968, pp. 54–55, no. 6, fig. 57.

Ibid., pp. 288–89, no. IT 3.

5 ‘You people of Mallegem, who wish to be healthy.

4 ‘I have never been anywhere that so many fools were

3 Ibid., pp. 166–67; Keeman 2003, pp. 2518–19; Wauters

2 Vervliet 1968, pp. 54–55, no. 6, fig. 57.

1 Unlike the other prints with added letterpress after

4 assistants. Approach freely, the best and the

I, Dame Witch, want to be loved here too. I have

this lantern. See how the stone sticks out and bulges. ‘

stone is rooted so deeply. I will light your sight with

my talent is known to fools. Oh, dear Master Snottolf,

Master Snottolf, will help you for a fee, for that is how

by stones, whether rich or poor, none is excluded. I,

regain your wits. Come, all fools who are tormented

reason, but must wait, even if you have yet to fully

the hair and the beard disappear. Now you have your

The water will soothe the pain and make the root,

fools, for it is impossible for him to treat them all.

One might think he would be frightened by all these

assembled as here, and yet there are more besides.

One might think he would be frightened by all these

fews who are tormented by stones, whether rich or poor, none is excluded. I, Master Snottolf, will help you for a fee, for that is how

my talent is known to fools. Oh, dear Master Snottolf,

this man is much troubled. Do help him, because his

stone is rooted so deeply. I will light your sight with

this lantern. See how the stone sticks out and bulges.

‘You people of Mallegem, who wish to be healthy.

I, Dame Witch, want to be loved here too. I have

come to cure you. I am at your service with my

four assistants. Approach freely, the best and the

worst, without tarrying. If you have a wasp in

your head or if the stones are rolling about in you.’

6 ‘Master John of Folly, great surgeon and sworn
doctor at court, the state and the domains of the
august and mighty prince Colyn, by the displeasure
of this sovereign emperor of the entire universe,
King of the mad, the insane and the emptyheaded,
Lord of Orleans in France, of Lille in Flanders,
of Geel in Brabant, of Maubeuge in Hainaut,
grandmaster and supreme commander of the locos
in Spain, the mati in Italy, the sotten in the Low
Counties, the naren in Germany, etc. etc.’

7 ‘Those who bear the stone in their forehead or

another place in the head. I promise to heal them

with the point of my redshank. The surgeons of Italy
use their new inventions to open up people’s bladders
and cure them of kidney stones. I do much better
than those prattlers: They cure only the kidneys,
I cure the brain.’

8 ‘Snottolf’ refers to a slippery species of fish and hence

a sly, untrustworthy person. Sellink and Martens

(both from the studio of Hendrick Goltzius, after a design by Karel

van Mander, 1590–94), in which the treatments

are unsuccessful due to the ubiquity of negative

character traits; Wauters 2017, pp. 36–37.

10 The ‘stone operation’ is the most common fake

surgical treatment in seventeenth-century art
inventories (Duverger has counted seventeen
scenes); see Duverger 1984–2006, vol. I, pp. 10, 18, 39, 98, 120, 250; vol. II, pp. 106, 210, 247, 403, 436; vol. IV, pp. 73, 291, 455; vol. VI, pp. 102, 248;
vol. XI, p. 169. At least one surviving panel painting
after this print has been identified: Vrou Hexe te
Mallegem (The Witch of Mallegem), c. 1559–1650,
1000 × 1550 mm, private collection.

11 ‘The inventory of Volcksen Dierick’s possessions
(1601) lists Een coperen plaete van eenen Keysnyer
van Bruegel and the consensus is that this refers to
The Witch of Mallegem. Malcolm Jones alone thinks
that it probably refers to The Dean of Renaix (Rome).
Orenstein and Sellink 2001, p. 193; Malcolm Jones,
‘The Stone of Folly [and the “Stone Operation”],’
see <https://tinyurl.com/yc7ulddq> (accessed
31 January 2019).

12 De Vries and Te Winkel 2007–18, entry ‘karnael’,
see <https://tinyurl.com/ybayue9m> (accessed
18 January 2019).

13 A thorough analysis of this text can be found

14 ‘Ohy lieden van Mallegem, wilt nu wel syn gezint /
Ik Vrouwe Hexe wil hier noch wel worden bemint / Om u
te genesen, ben ick gecomen hier / Tuwen dienste met
myn onder meesteressen fier / Compt vry den meesten
met den minsten, sonder verbeyen [wachten] / Hebdy
de wesp int hooft, oft loteren [loszitten] u de keyen.’

Lebeer 1969, p. 35; Dresen-Coenders 1983, p. 162;
Marijnissen et al. 1988, p. 110; Sellink and Martens
2012, p. 165.

15 These were not isolated cases: the wasp motif also
featured in the stone operations of Johannes Theodor
de Bry (1596) and Pieter Huys (1561?); Wauters
2018, pp. 20–21.

16 For the captions, see Lebeer 1969, p. 85.

19.

Pieter van der Heyden after Pieter Bruegel the Elder

Sleeping Pedlar Robbed by Monkeys

1562, engraving, 227 × 295 mm
Brussels, KBR, Print Room, inv. no. S.V. 70758 [I/IV]

Images of curious monkeys stealing a sleeping merchant’s wares were much-loved in fifteenth and sixteenth-century culture. The theme already appears in fourteenth-century bas-de-page miniatures, on early fifteenth-century silverware and in the form of a pantomime during the festivities to mark the marriage of Charles the Bold and Margaret of York in 1468. The iconography of the mischievous monkeys and the sleeping pedlar can also be found in the sixteenth century on painted tabletops, game boards and stained-glass windows. Above all, however, the subject was popular in Italian, German and Dutch printmaking. There is an anonymous late fifteenth-century German woodcut, for instance, that shows a very strong affinity with Bruegel’s engraving.¹

Although a drawn design for Bruegel’s print composition Sleeping Pedlar Robbed by Monkeys has not been identified, it is certain that Pieter van der Heyden engraved it on a copper plate in 1562. In structuring his scene, Bruegel did not venture far from the standard formula, in which a travelling merchant takes a snooze on the edge of a wood. As he reclines against his basket of wares he is oblivious to the fact that the curious monkeys are making off with his goods. So deep is his slumber that he does not even react as the little rascals’ teasing becomes bolder. They are fearless indeed: one monkey picks through the pedlar’s greasy hair for fleas, another relieves itself in his hat, while yet another leaves the man literally with his pants down. This is one of the artist’s few prints that is not filled with complex allegorical or moral allusions, but with visual fun instead. All the same, Bruegel would not be Bruegel if he did not add an additional layer of meaning to the traditional iconography. Some of the monkeys’ shenanigans can be linked, for instance, to the theme of the five senses (touch, sight, hearing, taste and smell), which was extremely popular in the sixteenth century.²

The lower margin of the print was left empty when the printing plate was in the possession of Hieronymus Cock and Volcxken Diericx. Only when it came into the hands of the publisher Theodoor Galle was an inscription in French added. The text in question was copied verbatim from a later copy after Bruegel’s print by Pieter van der Borcht, illustrating the complex pattern of borrowing that is found so often in the world of graphic art. Even though this visual tradition was already well known and widely disseminated, the importance of Bruegel’s print as a source of inspiration for European art history ought not therefore to be underestimated. A whole raft of copies and adaptations of the engraving are known, in both painted and print form. Bruegel’s Sleeping Pedlar Robbed by Monkeys thus gave a significant impulse to the genre of singeries – scenes in which monkeys use their antics and tricks to ‘ape’ human folly.³ Impressions also found their way to Southern Europe, where the print served as a model for murals, among other things.⁴ The composition even turns up on the other side of the world – probably by way of missionaries – in a number of seventeenth-century Chinese popular prints.⁵

---

¹ René van Bastelaer described an additional state with the address C.J. Visscher. This cannot be correct, however, as the printing plate was in the possession of the Galle family for most of the seventeenth century. The state described by van Bastelaer might therefore have been the adaptation of Bruegel’s composition by Pieter Feddes van Harlingen (c. 1586–1623) or the copy by Pieter van der Borcht; see NHD (Van der Borcht), no. 182.⁴
² ‘When the merchant wants his sweet repose, the monkeys will offer his goods for sale.’
³ Numerous printing plates after designs by Bruegel that ended up in Joannes Galle’s hands were given a capital letter in the lower right corner (see pp. 46–47). In this case, unusually, it is not a capital letter but a numeral in the lower left corner.
⁴ For a description of the various examples related to Bruegel as well as an extensive bibliography, see Schepers 2016, pp. 106–9.
⁵ Orenstein and Sellink 2001, p. 220, fig. 97.
⁷ NHd (Van der Borcht), no. 182.
⁸ Pieter van der Borcht copied Bruegel’s Sleeping Pedlar Robbed by Monkeys and incorporated it into a series of eighteen prints with monkey scenes that played a key role in the development of the singerie genre. See NHd (Van der Borcht), nos. 182–99.
⁹ Daan van Heesch recently studied a mural in grey tones after Bruegel’s Sleeping Pedlar Robbed by Monkeys in a Renaissance city palace in Segovia, Spain. The work is part of a cycle of six, along with The Thin Kitchen and The Fat Kitchen (cat. no. 20), two other paintings after prints by Bruegel. See Van Heesch (forthcoming).
¹⁰ Schepers 2016, p. 111.
The Thin Kitchen and The Fat Kitchen

1563, two unnumbered engravings

20a. The Thin Kitchen

Engraving, 224 × 291 mm
Brussels, KBR, Print Room, inv. no. S.IV 12746 [I/II]

Inscriptions
Lower right: /Bruegel insue[n] 1563; lower centre: .PAME. [monogram]; upper left: H. Cock ex.; lower margin: Ou Maigre-os Le pot mouue, est vu

States and editions
I as described and illustrated.
II the plate has been reworked. The man by the hearth has a beard, the dog has more hair, vertical cross-hatching has been added to the mantelpiece, horizontal cross-hatching to the cupboard and the upper shelves, cross-hatching in the shadows.

20b. The Fat Kitchen

Engraving, 224 × 295 mm
Brussels, KBR, Print Room, inv. no. S.I 7613 [II/II]

Inscriptions
Upper right: /pieter bruegel insue[n]; lower left of centre: 1563 and .PAME. [monogram]; lower left: H. Cock excudeb.; in the lower margin: Hors dici Maigre-

States and editions
I with two small boats to the right of the bagpipe player’s head.
II the plate has been reworked. The boats have worn away, the dogs have more hair, extra cross-hatching has been applied to the edge of the table, the floor lower right and the mantelpiece.


Literature

The Thin Kitchen and The Fat Kitchen are inextricably linked: each engraving shows the interior of a kitchen with numerous figures and features two lines of verse at the bottom, one in French, the other in Dutch. The prints are each other’s opposites in terms of both content and composition, encouraging the viewer to seek out the differences. Hardship rules in The Thin Kitchen, in which five emaciated men scramble in a bowl of mussels — a shellfish associated at the time with poverty.1 A half-starved dog chews on the mussel shells beneath the table. Other than a bit of dry bread and a few turnips, there is little food to be had in this kitchen. The woman in the cradle is too skinny to feed her own child, while the starveling (magherman) who sits by the fire stirs an unpromising little cooking pot. In the doorway, a fat man has wandered into the wrong room, as if in a scene from a farce. Realizing his mistake, the tubby character can’t get away fast enough. Ironically, the poverty-stricken company urge him to stay.

The Fat Kitchen, meanwhile, is a place of abundance. An obese gathering stuffs itself from the piled-up plates on the table and the many hams and sausages hung around the place. Three large pots simmer in the hearth, while a pig roasts on a spit. The cat and the dogs are so fat they can barely stand on their paws. A rotund woman suckles her hefty child. The scrawny bagpipe player is not welcome here and is forcibly ejected, much to his annoyance.

These prints have been interpreted in the past as an indictment of poverty and even as an illustration of the contrast between Catholics and Lutherans.6 However, since both the corpulent figures and their skinny counterparts are depicted without compassion, it is more likely that gluttony is being caricatured here, with hunger as its pendant.7 The engravings play with comical contrasts to call for self-control and moderation.8

No preparatory drawings have survived for these prints, but their attribution to Bruegel has never been questioned.9 Pieter van der Heyden’s monogram and Hieronymus Cock’s address place them firmly within Bruegel’s Antwerp circle, while the depicted themes and motifs are closely related to other works by the artist. We find a similar plea for moderation and admonition against gluttony in other engravings (cat. nos. 11e and 13g), and the contrast between a meagre and a rich repast features in the painting The Battle between Carnival and Lent too.10 The celebrated artist and art historian Giorgio Vasari also interpreted the two engravings in 1568 as an allegory of this kind.” What’s more, the man by the hearth in The Thin Kitchen closely resembles The Alchemist (cat. no. 17),11 while the playful motif of the child with an empty cooking pot on his head likewise reappears in that print.12

Although these compositions do not include any demonic hybrid
[cat. no. 20a] *The Thin Kitchen*
creatures, they nevertheless reveal a degree of influence by Boschian imagery. The workshop or a follower of Hieronymus Bosch (c. 1450–1516), for instance, had already used a scrawny and a corpulent man at a table to depict Gluttony in *The Seven Deadly Sins and the Four Last Things*. The skinny man in *The Fat Kitchen*, meanwhile, is strikingly similar to *The Wayfarer*, in his posture, clothing and the aggressive dog. Bruegel was probably not familiar with these original works, but will have known the motifs from drawings and paintings derived from them instead. He will undoubtedly have been inspired too by oral traditions, written sources and other prints.

These two engravings are not among Bruegel’s best known or most studied prints, but they must have been very popular in their day, given that more copies and pastiches have survived of *The Thin Kitchen* and *The Fat Kitchen* than of most of the artist’s other printed works. Jan Tiel’s variation on *Big Fish Eat Little Fish* (cat. no. 8) also contains numerous quotes from other prints, including the company around the table in *The Thin Kitchen*, who are depicted as fish (fig. 1). The prints also had something of an afterlife in drawings and paintings.  

1 ‘Where Skin-and-Bones stirs the pot, is a poor feast. Therefore, I will go to the fat kitchen, so that I can live.’
2 ‘Where Thinman stirs the pot is a poor meal. Therefore, I go to the fat kitchen with a light heart.’
3 ‘Out of here Thin-Back with the hideous face. You have nothing to do here since this is the fat kitchen.’
4 ‘Away from here, Thinman, however hungry you may be. This is the fat kitchen and you don’t belong here.’
5 Sullivan 2010, p. 188.
7 Orenstein and Sellink 2001, p. 61.
9 René van Bastelaer mentions two drawings (not reproduced) that might have served as a design, but the current whereabouts of these is not known. Van Bastelaer 1908, nos. 154, 159.
10 Oberthaler et al. 2018, no. 48.


11 ‘[…] ed un Carnovale, che godendosi con molti a tavola caccia via la Quaresima; ed in un’altra poi la Quaresima che caccia via il Carnovale […]’ (‘a figure of Carnival, who enjoys the pleasures of the table with many others, driving Lent away, and another of Lent driving away Carnival’). Vasari 1906, vol. V, p. 439.
12 Marijnissen et al. 1988, p. 207.
13 Silver 2011, p. 316.
16 The early provenance of *The Wayfarer Triptych* is not known. *The Seven Deadly Sins and the Four Last Things* was in the possession of Philip II of Spain as early as 1560. Ilsink et al. 2016, nos. 19 and 34.
18 NHD (Bruegel), nos. 36–37. For additional examples in print, see Hollstein et al. 1949–2010, vol. XLVI, nos. 128–89; NHD (Van der Borcht), nos. 198–97; NHD (Van Doetecum), nos. 832–53; Mori and Perin 2015, nos. 04-01, 04-02.
20 For a drawing of *The Combat between Meagre and Fat*, see Mori 2010, no. 128. For a Spanish mural of *The Thin Kitchen*, see Van Heesch 2020. See also Raupp 2002, pp. 246–55.
21.
Anonymous after Pieter Bruegel the Elder

The Wild Man or The Masquerade of Orson and Valentine

1566, woodcut, 272 × 410 mm
Brussels, KBR, Print Room, inv. no. S.II 24127 [I/I]

Bruegel put the finishing touches in 1559 to his painting The Battle between Carnival and Lent, now in the Kunsthistorisches Museum in Vienna, in which a confrontation has broken out between rowdy merrymakers and pious teetottlers on a large village square. This festive battle is accompanied by a whole raft of traditional rituals and folkloric elements. Bruegel also worked two Shrovetide plays into the painting: The Wedding of Mopsus and Nisa or The Dirty Bride is being performed outside The Blue Boat inn, and The Masquerade of Orson and Valentine outside The Dragon.

The artist returned to the same two popular plays seven years later in graphic form. With the exception of a few adjustments, he drew the compositions directly onto two blocks of applewood in pen and brown ink. All the same, The Masquerade of Orson and Valentine is the only composition in Bruegel’s oeuvre to have actually been executed as a woodcut: the woodcutter seems to have abandoned The Dirty Bride (cat. no. 22) halfway through finishing the block. The design resurfaced in 1570 as an engraving done by Pieter van der Heyden. Ironically, the unfinished woodblock with The Dirty Bride is the only surviving print medium associated with Bruegel’s graphic output.

The woodcut with Orson and Valentine incorporates the date 1566 and shows a fight between a wild man and a knight. The duo are accompanied by a regal figure and a masked woman offering a ring. The four characters are actors and are clearly wearing costumes. The fact that this is a Shrovetide play rather than a real duel is further emphasized by the women circulating in the background with collection boxes. The play itself is thought to derive from the French drama Lystoire des deux vaillants chevaliers Valentin et Ourson, which appeared in print towards the end of the fifteenth century. The book tells the story of twin princes who are abandoned in a forest. One of the boys is taken into the den of a female bear, who suckles him with her milk. The child grows up as a consequence with superhuman strength and sprouts hair all over his body. He becomes a wild man – variously named Orson, Nameless or Sansnom – who is the ruler of the forest and the terror of hunters. The other prince, Valentine, ends up at the court of his uncle King Pepin the Short, where he becomes a distinguished knight. After many years have passed, fate brings the two brothers back together. Valentine manages to tame his long-lost twin, who becomes his loyal companion. The two then set out on a journey, in the course of which they experience a series of extraordinary adventures.

It is doubtful whether Bruegel based his print on the original French edition of 1489. A Dutch translation, thought to have been published in 1557 by Jan II van Gheelen in Antwerp, is a more likely option, but the book is only known from an archival reference. What’s more, the hunt for the wild man was a common motif in Shrovetide plays. There are numerous versions of the story, but it mostly consists of the dramatized capture of a wild man, who is then ritually put to death. Performances of this kind often took place in February, linking them with the end of winter, the coming of spring and the associated fertility rites.

As is usually the case with xylographic work from this period, the identity of the person who cut the wood is not known. The impressions also lack the name of the publisher. Hieronymus Cock dealt exclusively in prints made from copper plates, so his role in this instance is not clear. Nevertheless, the typographic composition of the text added to the impression in Amsterdam and the fact that Cock published the print of Mopsus and Nisa as an engraving in 1570 suggest that he had some hand in the publication of this woodcut. [MB]

1 The added text runs to four lines, but is probably a truncated version that was followed by at least one more line.
2 Vervliet 1968, pp. 54–55, no. 6, fig. 57.
3 Ibid., pp. 288–89, no. IT 3.
4 ‘I, the Wild man, must now surrender myself, Because time banishes me from cities and villages. And yet I let many live with desires, Since my future shows a time of joyous peace.’
5 Vienna, Kunsthistorisches Museum, Gemäldegalerie, inv. no. 1016.
6 The two compositions appear to have been conceived as pendants. The surviving woodblock with The Wedding of Mopsus and Nisa in New York is related to the extant impressions of The Masquerade of Orson and Valentine not only thematically but also in terms of its dimensions.
7 Kuiper 2012, p. 92.
8 Timothy Husband firmly rejects the iconographic reading of the woodcut as a Masquerade of Orson and Valentine. See Husband 1980, p. 157, no. 42.
9 The letterpress inscription on the impression in Amsterdam (Rijksmuseum, inv. no. RP-P-BI-4955) is set in the same typefaces as Everyman version C (cat. no. 16).
[fig. 1] Typeset addition below Bruegel’s *Wild Man*. Amsterdam, Rijksprentenkabinet.

*Jeck Wildeman, moet my nu wel gheuangel, gheuen, Want den tijt die verhant, wt dorpen, en steden, my, Nochtans doen ickier vele met verlangen, leuen, Om dat mijn toecomst toont eenen tijt van vreden, bly.*
Pieter van der Heyden after Pieter Bruegel the Elder

The Dirty Bride or The Wedding of Mopsus and Nisa

1570, engraving, 223 × 289 mm
Brussels, KBR, Print Room, inv. no. S.II 135132 [II/V]

Inscriptions
Lower left: .PAME. [monogram]; bottom, right of centre: H. Cock. excud. 1570.; lower right: Bruegel. inventor.; in the margin: MOPSO NISA DATVR, QVID NON SPEREMVS AMANTES. 

States and editions
I without the inscription in the margin, the engraver’s monogram .PAME. or the address H. Cock. excud. 1570.
II as described.
III Cock’s address has been removed and replaced by C. van Tienen excud.
IV Cornelis van Tienen’s address has been removed and replaced by Martinus vanden Enden excudit.
V the address of Martinus van den Enden has been removed and replaced by CJVisscher excud.

Like The Wild Man or The Masquerade of Orson and Valentine (cat. no. 21), the Shrovetide play The Dirty Bride can be seen in Bruegel’s 1559 painting The Battle between Carnival and Lent.² Hieronymus Cock had Pieter van der Heyden engrave a copper plate with the scene in 1570. All the same, The Wedding of Mopsus and Nisa was not originally intended to be an engraving. There is a wooden block in the Metropolitan Museum in New York on which Bruegel himself drew an image of the farcical wedding.³ This work was probably created in the same period as the woodcut of The Masquerade of Orson and Valentine but for some reason the printing block with The Dirty Bride was not used. It was presumably only after Bruegel’s death in 1569, when demand for the artist’s work was running high, that Cock saw an opportunity to make money out of the unpublished design.

Sixteenth-century folk culture included an extensive repertoire of popular games and plays performed in the period around Shrove Tuesday. The subject matter often related to the ‘driving out’ or ‘fleeing’ of winter. For the most part, it is hard to work out nowadays precisely how these plays were performed, and we are equally ignorant as to their content, since a great many of the texts have failed to survive. The story of The Dirty Bride (Vuyl Bruyt) seems to hark back to an earlier variation, in which a ’vuyle druyt’ or ‘dirty vagrant’ personifying winter was driven out of a hedge to herald spring. Over time, the figure changed sex, until spring was announced by the first call of the cuckoo and the dirty bride leaving her ramshackle home.⁴
Cock added a literary touch to the posthumous edition. The story of Mopsus and Nisa is drawn from classical literature. In Virgil’s *Eclogues*, a spurned lover laments his former sweetheart Nisa, who has left him for the gullible Mopsus. Whether or not Bruegel had the quotation in mind when he designed the print will have to remain a mystery. It was more likely a joke on the part of Cock, who hoped it would appeal to an erudite audience. Virgil’s words offer food for thought: if even this unlikely wedding can occur, then anything is possible in love.

The print shows a group of street artists performing a comical popular play somewhere in the countryside. The slovenly bride Nisa is led by her misguided groom Mopsus out of the threadbare wedding tent. She is dressed in rags, while her groom wears the finest clothes. The farcical wedding is livened up by a figure with a large, fake nose, who ‘plays’ a coal shovel with a knife, an improvised musical instrument that can only have clanged horribly. The reference to popular plays is further emphasized by the young lad on the left who is doing the rounds with a collection box. [MB]

3 Mielke 1996, no. 65.
4 Vienna, Kunsthistorisches Museum, Gemäldegalerie, inv. no. 1016.
5 See also Lieve Watteeuw’s essay in this volume, pp. 50–57.
CITY AND COUNTRY LIFE

We spontaneously associate Bruegel with representations of peasants at work and particularly at leisure. His reputation as 'Peasant Bruegel' is longstanding. Already in Karel van Mander’s Schilder-boeck (1604) Bruegel emerges as an observer and portrayer of country life. The first lines of van Mander’s biography of Bruegel are revealing: “De Natuer heeft wonder wel haren Man ghevonden en ghetroffen, om weder van hem beerlijck ghetroffen te worden, doe sy in Brabant in een onbekent Dorp onder den Boeren, om Boeren met den Pinceel nae te bootsen, heeft uyt gaan picken, en tot de Schilder-const verwecken, [...] den seer gheestighen en bootsighen Pieter Brueghel, den welcken is geboren niet wijt van Breda, op een Dorp, gheeheeten Brueghel [...]”

Nature found and struck lucky wonderfully well with her man – only to be struck by him in turn in a grand way – when she went to pick him out in Brabant in an obscure village amid peasants, and stimulate him toward the art of painting so as to copy peasants with the brush [...] the very lively and whimsical Pieter Bruegel, who was born not far from Breda in a village called Brueghel [...] Are we to take these words literally? Or was van Mander merely borrowing a stylistic trope, whereby Bruegel, having been born in a peasant village, must have been predestined to excel in the peasant genre? The latest research does not exclude birth and rural origins in the Brabant countryside, but there are strong indications that the artist had already lived in an urban setting as a child, before arriving in Antwerp with his family as an adolescent (see the contribution by Jan Van der Stock in this volume, pp. 8–17). At the time, with the exception of Paris, Antwerp was the largest city north of the Alps. But urban culture ended not far beyond the city walls. Bruegel’s work expresses an ambivalent attitude towards peasants and country living. He seems to see it from the viewpoint of the city dweller, as an outsider; and it is clear that his work was made for a predominantly urban audience.

In The Large Landscapes (cat. no. 2), which Bruegel designed just after his return to Antwerp, we can already discern some villages and their inhabitants here and there. Farm labourers play the main role in Summer (cat. no. 3b), the last print that he ever conceived, which depicts the grain harvest. In all these images, the peasant is shown as being at one with nature. Working on the land was traditionally considered a useful occupation – humble, yet honourable – and the labourer lived and worked in rhythm with the seasons. In reaction to the increasing urbanization, and inspired by classical texts, the ideal emerged of the peaceful and authentic vita rustica. This was an idyll designed for the (rich) city dweller with properties in the countryside – from a ‘pleasure garden’, intended for brief sojourns just outside the city walls, to tenant farms, castles, hunting grounds and even whole manors, which came with accompanying income and seigneurial rights. Such investments not only generated wellbeing; they also stimulated profits and social prestige. Bruegel found inspiration (and clients) in this tension between the urban and rural worlds. The patrons and buyers of his art were sometimes, genuinely, lord and master of peasants and villages of the kind that he drew. According to van Mander’s account, Bruegel would venture into the countryside with his friend Hans Franckaert – himself an owner of at least two tenant farms – in order to observe ‘the peasant way of life’, how the rural folk ate, drank, danced and loved. They would go ‘for fairs and weddings, dressed up in peasants’ clothing’ (‘ter Kermis, en ter Bruyloft, verdeelde in boeren cleeren’).

It was not unusual in Bruegel’s time for peasants to be portrayed in a negative way, especially from the point of view of the city dweller. The Kermis of St George and The Kermis at Hoboken (cat. nos. 24 and 25) are similar-looking prints that were made in close succession to each other (c. 1558–59). Both feature the not so refined yet always infectious village festivities as well as their excesses. These images would have provoked not only laughter but also a degree of disdain in the city-based viewer. The ‘coarse’ behaviour of the countryfolk would have served as a negative exemplum; the crude peasant figured as the antithesis of the well-mannered city dweller. Bruegel elaborated further on this popular theme, not only in paintings but also in printed form. He was capable of maintaining a subtle balance between derision and entertainment. Despite his fascination for the peasants and his reputation as ‘Peasant Bruegel’, the motif is less richly represented in his prints than in his paintings. Only a short time after his death a print was made after (a version of) the painting Peasant Wedding Dance (cat. no. 26), possibly under the direction of Hieronymus Cock’s widow, Volcxken Diericx. Moreover, to expand on this theme further, in Ice Skating before the Gate of St George, Antwerp (cat. no. 25) Bruegel takes the citizens themselves to task: on the ice they also don’t move about so gracefully. But, here too, his derision never becomes bitter. Bruegel certainly does not wish to judge or moralize in any severe way. He allows us to look, think and especially laugh. As van Mander was already aware, humour is essential for ‘the very funny and absurdist Pieter Bruegel’ (‘den seer gheestighen en bootsighen Pieter Brueghel’) whose work one ‘cannot seriously view without laughing; yes, no matter how sober, tough and respectable the onlooker may be, he does at least have to titter or chortle’ (‘wiens werk men niet […] wijlsijck sonder lachen can aensien, ja boe stuer wijnbrouwegh en statigh by oock is, by moet ten minsten meese-muylen oft grinnicken’).

JORIS VAN GRIEKEN AND MAARTEN BASSENS

[cat. no. 26] detail
Frans Huys after Pieter Bruegel the Elder

**Ice Skating before the Gate of St George, Antwerp**

c. 1558, engraving, 231 × 293 mm
Brussels, KBR, Print Room, inv. no. S.II 26930 [I/II]

Inscriptions
Upper left on the banderoles in the frieze of the gate building: PLVS / WL TR; lower left: H. cock excudeb; lower right: F.H.

States and editions
I as described.
II Cock's address and Huys's monogram have been removed. At the top of the print in Latin, French and Dutch: LVBRICITAS VITAE HYMANAE. DE SLIBBERACHTIGHEYT VAN 'S MENSCHEN LEVEN; on the Gate of St George: PORTA S. GEORGII ANTVERPIAE. 1553; on the Gate of St George: PORTA S. GEORGII ANTVERPIAE. 1553; in the left margin: p. Breugel delineauit et / pinxit ad viuum 1553; in the right margin, the address: Ioan Galle / excudit. and a capital K; addition of a six-line poem in Dutch: Soo rÿdtmen op het ÿs t' Antwerpen voor de stadt. / D'een herwaerts, d'ander gins, begaept van alle sÿen, / D'een stronckelt, genen valt, dien houdt hem recht en prat. / Aÿ leert hier aan dit beeldt, hoe wij ter wereldt rÿen, / En slibb'ren onsens wegh, d'een mal en d'ander wyls. / Op dees vergancklyckheyt veel brooser als het ÿs.

Preparatory drawing in pen and brown ink, with emphases in black ink, 1558, signed, 213 × 298 mm, New York, private collection

Copper plate in the estate of Volcxken Diericx (1601): Een copere plaete van een Ysbrugge (Duverger 1984–2006: I, 50)
In Joannes Galle's catalogue (c. 1650): Plura alia variaq. Faceta & ludicra. (Fuhring 2017: no. 337)

Literature
Van Bastelaer 1908, no. 205; Oberhuber 1967, no. 63; De Ramaix 1968–69, p. 28, no. 51; Lebeer 1969, no. 51; Lari 1973, no. 52; Riggs 1977, no. 52; Monballieu 1981; Marijnissen et al. 1988, pp. 66–67; Freedberg 1989, no. 51; De Jongh and Luijten 1997, no. 2; Müller et al. 2001, no. 51; Orenstein and Sellink 2001, no. 63; NHD (Bruegel), no. 41; Mori 2010, no. 112; Sellink 2011, no. 69; Silver 2011, pp. 56–57; Sellink and Martens 2012, pp. 176–81; Van Grieken, Luijten and Van der Stock 2013, no. 70; Müller et al. 2014, no. 52; Müller and Schauerte 2018, no. 29 (only State II described); Oberthaler et al. 2018, no. 46

Despite the freezing cold, a mass of people spend their time playing on the frozen city moat. Some of them shuffle gingerly across the glassy surface, but most are wearing skates or are busy tying them on. Far from everyone is equally adept or lucky. One skater holds out a helping hand to another who has fallen over, while in the background, a figure is hauled out of a hole in the ice. The unsteady man in the foreground has clearly not yet mastered the art of skating. A boy next to him propels himself across the ice on a little sledge made from a horse's jawbone. A man on the left hitches a ride by grabbing hold of his companion's cloak. In the upper right background, a figure plays an early form of ice hockey with a kolf stick.

A large number of spectators has gathered to watch from the bridge, the banks of the moat and the city walls. Some are clearly looking on with glee at the ineptitude of certain of the people who have ventured onto the slippery ice.

The print was engraved by Frans Huys and published by Hieronymus Cock, whose address is accompanied by the engraver's initials. Bruegel's name and the date have not been included and the margin at the bottom was left blank too. Consequently, there is no direct reference to an underlying moral for the image. Many contemporaries will probably have viewed the scene, based on everyday reality, simply as an entertaining image of winter games. Bruegel's beautiful preparatory drawing has survived and bears the date 1558 as well as the artist's signature, making this composition his earliest winter scene – a genre on which he would also make his mark through his paintings.

All the same, none of those works features winter games as centrally as *Ice Skating before the Gate of St George, Antwerp*. The engraving is, moreover, the only work set in an identifiable urban context. Although the print is reversed relative to both the preliminary drawing and the actual situation, any Antwerper who lived between 1545 and 1870 would have recognized the location of this winter fun immediately.
The long, arched bridge over the moat leads to the newly constructed St George’s Gate. The viewer’s eye is guided westwards along the frozen water towards the Kronenburg Gate and the river Scheldt. The contours of St George’s Church rise above the city walls. The new defences were more or less completed in the year Bruegel made this print, after fifteen years of construction.7 Besides security, the new and internationally groundbreaking fortifications lent the city even greater prestige. All that came at a high price, however. The work had cost more than a million gold crowns and special excise duties and taxes had to be levied for many years to offset the expense.8 Even these were not enough, and so all sorts of ingenious financial and fiscal constructions were dreamt up to raise additional funds, with the approval and collaboration of the city council.9 Civil servants and businessmen such as Michiel van der Heyden and Gilbert van Schoonbeke, as well as many of their associated subcontractors, took the opportunity to enrich themselves. In the end, however, these abuses came to light, saddling the heirs of van der Heyden, who died in 1552, and van Schoonbeke, who followed him in 1556, with colossal debts and writs for damages.10 It is not inconceivable, therefore, that Bruegel and Cock were alluding to those scandals and that the print can therefore be read as an image of the vicissitudes of fortune. Many of the figures are, after all, ‘skating over something’, ‘skating on thin ice’ or have ‘slipped up’. Because of the prominent place given to the controversial city defences, viewers of the print in Antwerp might have picked up such allusions very clearly at the time.

In a later state, bearing the address of Joannes Galle (1600–1676), the print was given the title De slibberachtigheyt van ‘s menschen leven (The Slipperiness of Human Life). Bruegel’s signature and the date 1553 are also incorporated for the first time, both of which were missing in the original edition.11 A text in Dutch explains that the picture symbolizes the uncertainty, fragility and transience of human existence, while explicitly stating once again precisely where the skaters are located. Although these words were added over three quarters of a century after the original publication, their form and content closely match the inscriptions that Cock customarily placed beneath his publications. Joannes Galle was a grandson of Philips Galle, who had known both Bruegel and Cock well. Might certain information about the original context and meaning of this print therefore have been passed down within the Galle family? Adolf Monballieu thought so, and he also interpreted the date 1553 as a specific allusion to the involvement of Cornelis Wellens de Cock, the publisher’s brother.12 Cornelis had been called to testify that year at a corruption trial, regarding work he had carried out as a contractor on precisely the section of the city defences shown in the print.13 It is entirely plausible that Bruegel and Cock intended the composition to allude to the ‘slip-ups’ of many of their illustrious fellow townsmen. But it seems less likely that they would have referred specifically to Cornelis Cock who, incidentally, was never formally indicted or convicted. [JVG]

---

1 ‘The Slipperiness of Human Life’.
2 ‘Thus the people skate the Antwerp city moat, one this way, another that, watched from all sides. One stumbles, another falls, that one keeps on straight and firm. Look at this picture and see how we pass through the world. We slither our way, the one foolishly, the other wisely, through this transience that is much more brittle than ice.’
3 Mielke 1996, no. 43.
4 The description of the print in the 1601 inventory of Volckesen Dierick’s estate as ‘Ibrugge’ (Ice Bridge) or ‘Ijsanck’ (On the Ice) does not suggest that a special meaning was associated with the print at that point. See Duverger 1984–2006, I, p. 30.
5 We find similar games on the ice in Bruegel’s Winter Landscape with Bird Trap (1565), Hunters in the Snow (1565) and The Census at Bethlehem (1566). See Meganck and Van Sprang 2018 for a thorough, interdisciplinary analysis of Bruegel’s winter scenes.
6 For the history of the city defences, from planning to construction and demolition, see Lombaerde 2009.
7 Ibid., pp. 24–31.
11 Bruegel was in Italy in the year in question, and so the inscription ‘P. Bruegel delineavit et / pinxit ad viuum 1553’ cannot be correct.
13 From the sworn witness statement of Cornelis Wellens de Cock, 4 June 1553 (Antwerp, Stadsarchief, T 1317, fols 98v–99v): ‘…segt dat hij van den jaeren xlv tott en jaer van xlvii gevrouwen heeft ende doen werken in de gravinge dezer stad van den Kronenhorpbroecke tot St-Jorispoorten’ ([‘Cornelis’] states that from 1545 to 1547, he worked on the excavations for the city’s fortifications between the Kronenburg Gate and St George’s Gate’); see Monballieu 1981, p. 30, doc. 1.
The Kermis of St George
c. 1558, etching and engraving, 332 x 523 mm
Brussels, KBR, Print Room, inv. no. S.II 80368 [I/IV]

Inscriptions
On the sign on the right: dit is in die kro[a]ne; on the banner: laat die boeren haer kermis bouwen; bottom centre: H. COCK EXCVDBAT; lower right: BRVEGEL INVENTOR

States and editions
I as described.
II Cock's address has been removed and changed to Au Palais a Paris / Paul de la Houve excud. 1601.
III de la Houve's address has been removed and changed to p. Bertrand ex.; inscriptions added in the sky: LA GRANDE FESTE DE NOTRE VILLAGE; above the two houses behind the stage: Maison de mon pere; on the side of the stage: Gille le niay; above the fool sticking his head through the basket: le fou.
IV different explanatory inscriptions have been added: by the ball game lower left: Ies de Cloosporte; by the figures right of centre who seem to be wrestling: La Pet an Gueule; by the dancers outside the inn: La Goufrerie Villageoise; by the round dance with swords: Dance a la Suisse; by the knight: La Pucele / St. George; by the archery contest at the windmill: Le Papegnoay.

Bruegel's design for the print of The Kermis at Hoboken (cat. no. 25), which for unknown reasons was published by Bartholomeus de Mompere, bears the date 1559, and so the artist's other kermis print, The Kermis of St George, has been dated to around the same period. No preparatory drawing has been identified, but we know that a consignment of Hieronymus Cock prints that Christophe Plantin sold to the Paris dealer Martin Le Jeune in the summer of 1558 included 3 Danses de villageois. It is entirely possible, therefore, that The Kermis of St George was produced before The Kermis at Hoboken.

Unlike the latter work, The Kermis of St George is set in an indefinable Brabant village with the skyline of the trading metropolis of Antwerp rising vaguely on the horizon. The print reads like an encyclopaedic presentation of sixteenth-century popular entertainments at fairs and feast days: people are drinking, laughing, dancing, playing and brawling. The banner of the crossbowmen's Guild of St George hangs outside the 'crown inn' (the sign reads 'dit is in die kro[a]ne'). Although the armour-clad patron saint is depicted with a bow, it really was a guild of crossbowmen, one of whose members is taking part in the procession arriving at the church. Many more of them can be seen, however, at the windmill in the background, which is being used as a vertical target for the guild's shooting contest. A mock joust is staged in the middle of the composition between a mounted Saint George and a do-it-yourself dragon on wheels. Bruegel also devotes a great deal of attention to children's games, such as the swing, a ball game, follow-my-leader and pet-en-gueule (literally, 'fart in the face'), which some adults are also playing. Besides the traditional dance with the long swords, a popular mystery play is being performed on an improvised stage, just behind the market stalls.

The slogan 'laet die boeren haer kermis bouwen' ('let the peasants have their kermis') on the crossbowmen's banner has been widely interpreted as a mild protest against new laws intended to rein in excessive behaviour at events of this kind. This would not have been particularly topical, however, as Charles V's order dated from 1531 and a constraining decree had been issued in 1550. Leaving aside the general tone of moral disapproval, is this not simply an image of what Karel van Mander in 1604 called 'the true behaviour of the peasants'?

The printing plate for The Kermis of St George turned up again in Paris in 1601, immediately after the sale of Volckxen Diericx's estate. Impressions were sold in Paul de la Houve's print shop there. Following the publisher's death, the copper plate found its way to Pierre Bertrand, who turned it into a third state by adding a number of inscriptions. A couple of characters from seventeenth-century French farce appear in this state in the form of captions – Gille le niay (Giles the Good-for-Nothing) and le fou (the fool). In the fourth state, descriptive captions were added to the activities depicted by Bruegel. Parisians did not have to try too hard, in other words, to work out what they were being shown. [MB]

1 Delen 1932, p. 9.
2 The coat of arms featured bottom left in the flag, with a chevron in the canton, has not been identified. The other shield, a silver cross on a gules (red) ground, is most likely that of the crossbowmen's Guild of St George, the Jonge Voetboog. See Génard 1883, pp. 174–76, pl. XXIX, no. 9. The old arms of Hoboken (near Antwerp) consisted of a silver cross on a sable (black) ground. See Kuyl 1866, p. 28, note 1.
3 The formal similarities should be noted between the woman on the swing in the barn and the two children on the hobby horse and their respective counterparts in Bruegel's 1560 painting Children's Games (Vienna, Kunsthistorisches Museum, Gemäldegalerie, inv. no. 1077).
Frans Hogenberg after Pieter Bruegel the Elder

The Kermis at Hoboken

c. 1559, etching and engraving, 298 x 408 mm
Brussels, KBR, Print Room, inv. no. S.II 31207 [I/IV]

Inscriptions
On a barrel, lower left: FHB [linked monogram];
on the banner right: Dit is de Gulde van hoboken;
lower right: Bruegel; in the margin: Die boeren verblÿen hun in sulken feesten / Te dansen springhen en dronkendrincken als beesten. // Sÿ moeten die kermissen onderhouwen / Al souwen sÿ vasten en steruen van kauwen; in the right margin: Bartolomeus / de mumpere. Excu.

States and editions
I as described.
II the pigs have been removed from upper right in front of the stage.
III signature changed to p. Bruegel / invecn.; de Mompere’s address replaced with Galle excudit; additional hatching added in the grass, the tarpaulins of the carts, the roof of the church, the pigs and various people in the foreground; crossed arrows added to the crossbowmen’s flags.
IV lower left: address Susanna verbruggen added.

Preparatory drawing in pen and brown ink, 1559, signed, 265 x 394 mm, London, The Samuel Courtauld Trust, The Courtauld Collection, inv. no. 45


Literature
Van Bastelaer 1908, no. 208; Lebeer 1969, no. 30; Lari 1973, no. 165; Marijnissen et al. 1988, pp. 115-18; Freedberg 1989, no. 30; Müller et al. 2001, no. 30; Orenstein and Sellink 2001, no. 80; NHD (Bruegel), no. 43; NHD (Hogenberg), no. 16; Mori 2010, no. 109; Sellink 2011, no. 75; Silver 2011, pp. 42, 311; Müller et al. 2014, no. 54; Michel et al. 2017, pp. 68-69; Müller and Schauerte 2018, no. G35

There was one respect at least in which rural folk enjoyed a privilege compared to townspeople in Bruegel’s time: villages such as Borgerhout, Deurne and Hoboken (all on the outskirts of Antwerp) lay beyond the banmijl that marked the limit for the collection of certain duties. This was good news not only for the local peasants, but also for townspeople who liked a drink or two. Local festivities such as kermises and saints’ days were often accompanied, therefore, by heavy drinking and the associated misbehaviour. The kermis at Hoboken had gained a certain notoriety in this respect. The village features here prominently, although it was far from the only place to celebrate ‘high days’ in such a manner.

Bruegel drew his design for The Kermis at Hoboken in 1559. The attribution of the drawing has been repeatedly challenged, based largely on the individuals who were responsible for producing the print: this is the only time that Bruegel is known to have collaborated with the printmaker Frans Hogenberg and the print publisher Bartholomeus de Mompere. To confuse matters further, the artist supplied a second print design showing another peasant fair – The Kermis of St George (cat. no. 24) – to Hieronymus Cock in the same period. The relationship between the two prints is so far unclear.

A flag with the Burgundian steel-and-flint emblem and two crossed arrows, below a banderole with the inscription ‘This is the Guild of Hoboken’, hangs in front of the inn. The reference to the local archery guild, the Oude Voetboog, could hardly be plainer. Besides the children at play, the fool, the pigs and the poultry, the foreground is mostly given over to a shooting range in which members of the guild hold their annual contest, an event held traditionally on Whit Monday. But there is more going on in Bruegel’s Kermis at Hoboken than a straightforward archery competition: the print presents itself as a faithful representation of village culture at the time. Kermises were held in the village of Hoboken twice a year – the Sunday after the Feast of the Cross (3 May) and the Sunday after the Birth of the Virgin Mary (8 September). Each included a procession with a miraculous cross, the ‘Black God of Hoboken’. In Bruegel’s print, the parade has just arrived at the village church. A procession of archers can also be seen, and a mystery play is being performed on an improvised stage. Everywhere you look, people are dancing, chatting and canoodling, although Bruegel keeps everything within respectable limits.
Bartholomeus de Mompere was the first owner of the printing plate. It then came into the possession of the Galle family of publishers: impressions of *The Kermis at Hoboken* were on sale at Joannes Galle’s print shop in the mid-seventeenth century. In the first half of the eighteenth century, the plate found its way into the hands of Susanna Verbruggen (died 1752), a print publisher based in Keizerstraat in Antwerp. It was well past its best by then (fig. 1 and p. 47, fig. 10). The outlines had become much fainter, while the clumsy addition of hatching led to impressions that were little more than faint echoes of Bruegel’s initial design. [MB]

1 ‘The peasants rejoice at such festivals in dancing, jumping, and drinking themselves drunk as beasts. They must observe church festivals even if they fast and die of cold.’
2 Mielke 1996, no. 44.
3 Peter Fuhring interpreted this as a reference to Bruegel’s Parable of the Good Shepherd. The Latin word ‘encaenium’ was applied both to fairs and the consecration of churches, justifying the identification as *The Kermis at Hoboken*. See Fuchs, Weijers and Gumbert-Hepp 1986, p. 1719.
4 This recalls a few lines from the *Pronstelcatie* of the satirical poet Malulf Knollebol, which was published in Antwerp in 1561: ‘Tsondaechs ende ‘s heylchdaechs ter eender uren / Na Borgerhout, na Berchem en Dueren / Na Marcxem, na Wulrijck en na ‘t Kiel mede, / Na de Plucke en na de koeketel te Hoboken in ‘t stede, / Ende al dees contreye door, sonder missen. / Dees partije comet weder metter ghissen / Na de stadt van Antwerpen snel; / Dit is te profijte van elck goet drinckghese.’ See Van Kampen 1980, p. 87.
5 Lebeer 1969, no. 30; Mielke 1996, no. 44.
6 A thorough study of Bartholomeus de Mompere and his publishing practices might provide fresh insights into *The Kermis at Hoboken*.

7 Génard 1883, p. 178, pl. XXIX, fig. 2.
8 Adolf Monballieu published an excellent study in which he compared Bruegel’s *Kermis at Hoboken* with archival information about the village. He rightly noted that Hoboken came into the possession of the landowner Melchior Schetz in the same year that Bruegel’s print was produced. However, since the sale of the estate did not occur until 14 November 1559, it is doubtful whether the two events were related. See Monballieu 1974, pp. 140–44.
Pieter van der Heyden after Pieter Bruegel the Elder

The Peasant Wedding Dance

After 1570, engraving, 375 × 423 mm
Brussels, KBR, Print Room, inv. no. S.II 85364 [I/III]

Inscriptions
Lower left: EBRVEGEL.INVENT; bottom centre: Aux quatre Vents; lowest right: [PAME, [monogram]; in the margin: Locht op speelman ende laten wel dueren. / Soe langh als de lul ghaet en den rommel vermach: / Doet lyse wel dapper haer billen rueren. / Want ten is erý met haer geen bruyloft ainden dach. // Nu hebbelijk hassen danst soomen plach, / Ick kijster na de pijp en ghy mist den soete: / Maer ouc bruyt naemt nu van dansen verdrach, / Trouwens, tis ook best, want sy ghaet vol en soete.'

States and editions
I as described.¹
II the address has been replaced by Ad. Coll. excud.
III the address Advraen Coll[err] has been removed; under the dancer’s foot on the far right, the address Gall ex.

Copper plate in the estate of Volckxen Diericx (1601): Een coperen plae te wesende een Boorenbruyloft (Duverger 1984–2006, I, 26)
In Joannes Galle’s catalogue (c. 1650): 299.

Literature

The address Aux quatre Vents, which Volckxen Diericx used to identify the publisher’s output following the death of his wife, Hieronymus Cock, tells us that this large print was produced after 1570. Bruegel too had died by the time the engraving was made. The print shows a peasant wedding – one of the subjects that contributed most strongly to the artist’s popularity. Couples dance to the music of a bagpiper, while the bride sits at the back, recognizable from the crown that hangs above her head against the cloth of honour. Guests throng around her bearing gifts: we make out all sorts of household items, including a chair, coal tongs and a spoon, but also a cradle. The latter might have been intended ironically, since the Dutch text accompanying the print (missing in this instance, as the impression has been trimmed at the bottom) tells us that the young bride is pregnant (sy ghaet vol/‘she is full’).

Bruegel’s biographer Karel van Mander claimed in his Schilder-boeck that the painter liked to sort of attend peasant weddings and that he mingled with the guests to study rural customs and mores.² Two paintings testify to the artist’s interest in this theme: The Peasant Wedding and The Wedding Dance, now in the Kunsthistorisches Museum in Vienna and the Detroit Institute of Arts respectively.³ We know from several sources, however, that Bruegel painted even more of these works. The inventory of the estate of Jean Noirtot, master of the Antwerp mint (1572), for instance, mentions several paintings by Bruegel, including two Peasant Weddings in oil paint, one on panel, the other on canvas.³

The popularity of peasant weddings among sixteenth-century art lovers is also apparent from the exceptionally large number of painted copies of a composition that is closely related to this engraving. The differences between these imitations and the engraving often lie in a number of anecdotal details: the guests crowding around the bride, for example, do not bear gifts. As many as a hundred or so versions of the composition are known from the studio of Pieter Brueghel the Younger – Pieter the Elder’s eldest son and devoted copyist. His youngest son, Jan Brueghel the Elder, also painted a magnificent, albeit reversed, version of it (now in Bordeaux, Musée des Beaux-Arts). Another copy still has been attributed to Marten van Cleve.⁴

The copies attributed to Bruegel’s two sons plainly derive from the same model:² not only are they closely related in terms of size – the positioning and outlines of the figures generally correspond too.⁵ This supports the conclusion that they are both based on an original composition by Bruegel, to which his sons had access, directly or otherwise. This will most likely have been a painting or a full-size preparatory drawing. Pieter Brueghel the Younger in particular

made extensive use of the materials his father had left behind, most notably his preparatory cartoons, which formed the basis for paintings of this type.⁶ When considering the design for this engraving, we ought to take into account that a lost painting by Bruegel – possibly a prototype – is more likely to have formed the basis for this successful composition, engraved by Pieter van der Heyden, than a drawn design. The use of a painted model would explain the more nuanced, soft treatment of the shadow areas that characterizes this print and which is noticeably different from the engraver’s normal way of working.⁷ [DA]

¹ ‘Play louder musician and make it last, so long as the flute and the drum play. Lyse will wiggle her behind, because it’s not every day she marries. Now Hans is dancing like old times, I’m listening to the fife and you’ve missed a step. Our bride has stopped dancing now, which might be for the best, because she is full and sweet.’
² The Brussels impression has been trimmed at the bottom, so that the poem in Dutch is not visible.
⁴ Several of the dancing couples in the engraving are related to the painting in Detroit.
⁷ A smaller version is also worth mentioning, painted in gouache on vellum and attributed to Jan Brueghel the Elder (Florence, Le Gallerie degli Uffizzi): Currie and Allart 2012, vol. 2, pp. 602–6, figs 412 and 413, note 54.
⁸ Currie and Allart 2012, pp. 395–98 and passim. We disagree with Nadine Orenstein, who notes a number of infelicities in this composition and therefore doubts whether Bruegel is its author; Orenstein and Sellink 2001, no. 113.
⁹ Timothy Riggs (Riggs 1977, p. 169) proposed this hypothesis based on the work’s unusual graphic technique.
BIBLICAL SCENES

The Christian faith had a defining impact on daily life in the sixteenth century. Although society was to an increasing extent dominated by fierce religious conflicts that influenced how Christian themes were depicted, scenes from the Old and New Testaments remained tremendously popular. Regardless of confessional preference, biblical graphic works lent themselves very well to individual devotion, as well as religious or moral instruction. A Christian undertone and references to the Bible, the lives of saints and other religious texts and customs are present in the majority of Bruegel’s works. On the other hand, purely biblical representations tend to be rare in his printed oeuvre. Scenes from the Old Testament – the particular speciality of Bruegel’s elder colleague Maarten van Heemskerck – do not appear in printed form at all. In some of Bruegel’s earliest etchings and engravings, such as Landscape with the Temptation of Christ, The Way to Emmaus and The Rest on the Flight into Egypt (cat. nos. 1, 2h and 2l), the biblical characterization was added (by another hand?), no doubt on request of the publisher who wished to give the prints an added commercial value. The same occurred with the popular saints such as James and Mary Magdalene (cat. nos. 9 and 2c). The earliest of his biblical scenes that Bruegel designed as prints – The Last Judgement and The Descent of Christ into Limbo (cat. nos. 12 and 14) – can be considered as final pieces of The Seven Virtues series and The Seven Deadly Sins series (cat. nos. 11 and 13).

In thematic and stylistic terms, The Parable of the Wise and Foolish Virgins (cat. no. 27) bears similarities to The Seven Virtues, The Seven Deadly Sins and The Last Judgement. Whereas the wise virgins, through their chastity, are well prepared for the Day of Judgement, the foolish virgins, with their sinful ways, remain in the dark. Bruegel depicts this parable in a composition that consists of four quadrants. This is wholly in line with tradition, although the artist allows himself certain liberties regarding the original biblical text. The preparatory drawing has been lost, but we can assume that the work was commissioned by Hieronymus Cock and that the composition was conceived as a print. This possibly was not the case for another image with an eschatological meaning – The Parable of the Good Shepherd (cat. no. 28) – which was published by Philips Galle in Haarlem in 1565. There are subtle indications that this work was based on a now lost grisaille, either an oil on panel or a pen and wash drawing on paper, which Galle was able to get his hands on. Not long before, Galle had engraved for Cock the monumental Resurrection of Christ (cat. no. 29), again an essential moment in the Christian story of the salvation. For this the engraver based his work on a pen and wash drawing by Bruegel that in all likelihood was not intended to serve as the design for a print. Bruegel apparently liked to use small-format grisailles to depict devout religious scenes. In these scenes the figures’ monumentality and expressive facial expressions, together with incredibly nuanced accents of light, all play an essential role. They trigger in the viewer an emotional, almost affective experience, which is possibly the special meaning they held for the artist and his entourage. The grisaille of Christ and the Woman Taken in Adultery – with its potent message of Christian mercy and the virtue of forgiveness – remained the cherished property of Bruegel’s descendants until well into the seventeenth century (and has survived to this day). A print that was directly based on the small painting (cat. no. 30) was published shortly after Bruegel’s death. The same happened with The Death of the Virgin (cat. no. 31), an apocryphal theme taken from the Legenda aurea, which, working on commission to Abraham Ortelius, Galle engraved after a grisaille that Ortelius owned. The correspondence that has been preserved between Ortelius and humanists such as Dirck Volckertsz. Coornhert and Benito Arias Montano suggests the print can be considered as a tribute to their deceased friend. This particular print circulated in a small, erudite circle, but no doubt most impressions soon found their way to a broader range of amateurs. Already, in 1571, Galle published Christ and the Disciples on the Way to Emmaus (cat. no. 32). He possibly based his engraving on a later drawing or a painting, now lost, by Bruegel. Here too, the subject of knowing and recognizing Christ as the Redeemer is the central theme.

JORIS VAN GRIEKEN AND AGNES KOOIJMAN
The Parable of the Wise and Foolish Virgins

c. 1560, engraving, 222 × 288 mm
Brussels, KBR, Print Room, inv. no. S.I 7601 [I/1]

The story of the wise and foolish virgins was an exceptionally popular theme in the Middle Ages. The parable, from the Gospel of Matthew, tells how ten young women visit the house of their husband-to-be. He will return that night, but the young brides do not know exactly when. Five of them are wise: they bring lamps and extra oil. The other five are less far-sighted and carry lamps but no spare fuel. Time goes by without the groom’s return, and the ten young women fall asleep. In the middle of the night, the call goes out: ‘Behold, the bridegroom cometh. Go ye out to meet him.’ Quick as a flash, the wise virgins rekindle their lamps, using the oil they have brought. But the foolish virgins’ lamps are empty, and they set off in vain to the market to buy fresh oil. On their return, they find the door closed: the foolish virgins are too late for their own wedding.

The parable’s message is intrinsically linked to that of the Last Judgement: no one knows the time of Christ’s Second Coming, and so every believer ought to be prepared. On the last day, when the dead are resurrected in the same way that the young women were awakened from their slumber, each person will receive their final judgement. Those who have prepared themselves well by living virtuously will get to enter heaven, represented by the bridegroom’s house, while fools and sinners will be left standing outside its closed gates.

It is clear from Bruegel’s treatment of the parable how the artist succeeded in giving fresh impetus to this traditional subject. The balanced composition consists of four quadrants. In the upper part of the print, Bruegel draws on older models, as reflected in the late Gothic character of the building, at which the wise and the foolish virgins stand before an open and a closed door respectively. It is not inconceivable that the artist drew inspiration for this from the work of his predecessors, including sculpted versions. The angel at the centre with the banderole, for instance, strongly resembles a design that can possibly be attributed to Hugo van der Goes. In the lower half of the print, Bruegel presents a carefully thought-out illustration of the parable’s allegorical meaning. The wise virgins are shown industriously carding wool, spinning yarn and sewing linen. The foolish virgins, by contrast, have chosen a very different way to live: they squander their precious time dancing to the tune of a bagpipe.

A dated preparatory drawing by Bruegel has not survived for this composition and the print does not include a date either. All the same, the printing plate is thought to have been cut around 1560 – a view supported by a few vague counterproof traces of a very early impression of Bruegel’s Justitia on the back. This seems to confirm the hypothesis that the print was engraved by Philips Galle, who was responsible at the time for producing the entire series depicting the seven virtues (cat. no. 13). In terms of technique, the engraving is entirely in keeping with other printing plates that Galle cut in this period after designs by Bruegel, such as The Alchemist (cat. no. 17) and The Resurrection of Christ (cat. no. 29). The engraver’s experiences with the final inscription are still visible in the lower margin of the earliest impressions of The Parable of the Wise and Foolish Virgins.

The fascinating pattern of reception and transmission of visual motifs through prints is highlighted by a visit to Burton Agnes Hall in Yorkshire, where a carved alabaster mantelpiece in the main hall has been borrowed almost verbatim (the Gothic architecture has been omitted) from Bruegel’s representation of the parable. [MB]
The Parable of the Good Shepherd

1565, engraving, 222 × 293 mm
Brussels, KBR, Print Room, inv. no. S.1 7616 [I/III]

Inscriptions
Lower left: BRVEGEL.INVEN.; bottom, left of centre: 1565; lower right, on the axe: PG.F [monogram]; above Christ’s head: IOHA. 10. / EGO SVM OSTIVM OVIVM; lower margin: HIC TVTO STABVLATE VIRI, SVCCEDITE TECTIS; / ME PASTORE OVIVM, IANVA LAXA PATET. // QVID LATERA, AVT CVLMEN PERRVMPITIS? ISTA LVPORVM, / ATQVE FVRVM LEX EST; QVOS MEA CAYLA FFGIT. HAD. IVN.*

States and editions
I as described.
II the address Th. Galle exc. has been added at the bottom, left of centre.
III upper left: the Latin line Bonus pastor animam suam dat pro ovis suis;* upper right: the Latin line Mala autem pastor oves suas desert;* Theodorus Galle’s address has been changed to Io. Galle exc.; the date 1565 has been removed; a grave accent has been placed over the O of TVTO in the margin; in the upper right corner of the margin, a capital S; a new line has been cut around the edge of the print, causing the already faded N of IVN to disappear.

Copper plate in Joannes Galle’s catalogue (c. 1650): Plura alia variaq. Faceta & ludicra. (Fuhring 2017: no. 317)
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‘Verily, verily, I say unto you, I am the door of the sheep. All that ever came before me are thieves and robbers; but the sheep did not hear them. I am the door; by me if any man enter in, he shall be saved, and shall go in and out, and find pasture. The thief cometh not, but for to steal, and to kill, and to destroy:...I am the good shepherd: the good shepherd giveth his life for the sheep. But he that is an hireling, and not the shepherd, whose own the sheep are not, seeth the wolf coming, and leaveth the sheep, and fleeth; and the wolf catcheth them, and scattereth the sheep. The hireling fleeth, because he is an hireling, and careth not for the sheep. I am the good shepherd, and know my sheep, and am known of mine. As the Father knoweth me, even so I know the Father: and I lay down my life for the sheep. And other sheep I have, which are not of this fold: them also I must bring, and they shall hear my voice; and there shall be one fold, and one shepherd’ (John 10:7–16).

This print offers an almost literal depiction of the Parable of the Good Shepherd. In that passage of John’s Gospel, Christ uses rich imagery to describe his role as a spiritual leader and saviour of his followers. The young shepherd carrying a wounded sheep on his shoulders was already a visual motif in the early Christian period. In this print, too, the shepherd – clearly represented here as Christ – is central. His beauty, serenity and dignity contrast sharply with the ugly faces and contorted poses of the figures attacking the sheepfold. The rustic building’s triangular form lends structure to the composition and is symbolically charged too. The door in the middle is the only regular entrance: it offers access to the path of salvation. By analogy with the text, the door and Christ also coincide here visually. The obedient sheep alongside and behind Jesus gaze up at him meekly, while the thieves or hirelings force their way into the shed to steal the sheep. It is plain from the armour and weaponry of some of them that these are false shepherds. Although the word ‘hireling’ (mercenarius) in the Gospel refers to a hired hand, it also has connotations of the soldier mercenaries who were notorious in Bruegel’s time for their predatory and violent behaviour. This is not to say, however, that the print alludes specifically to the political and religious situation at the time. Nor, contrary to what has frequently been claimed, ought we to search for Protestant sympathies on Bruegel’s part. Both the designer and the publisher maintained good relations, after all, with the Catholic authorities. What’s more, the publication of prints was a public matter subject to stringent controls. The popularity of the Good Shepherd theme is also apparent from prints on the same subject by contemporaries of Bruegel such as Maerten de Vos and Hans Bol, both of whom were later known as Protestants. There is nothing surprising about this in a period full of tension and uncertainty about religious choices and spiritual (and secular) leadership. Christendom was more divided than ever and the ideal of a single flock and a single shepherd seemed far away indeed. Yet Christians of every denomination ultimately sought salvation through Christ, which is the central theme of the parable depicted here.

The ingenious, compact composition with large figures in the foreground is typical of Bruegel’s final creative phase. All the same, the print is weakened visually by the scenes in the upper corners in the background. In the left background, we see a good shepherd defending his flock from a marauding wolf, while on the right a bad shepherd abandons his sheep and flees. No design or model for the engraving has survived, and so we can no longer determine whether these scenes formed part of Bruegel’s original conception. Perhaps they were added by the engraver and publisher. Both scenes narrate a passage from the parable almost verbatim, yet they add nothing of substance, either visually or in terms of content.
HICTVTO STABVLA TE VIRI, SVCCEDITE TECTIS; ME PASTORE OVIUM, IANVA LAXA PATET.

QVID LATERA, AVT CVLVM PERVMPITIS? ISTA LVPORVM, ATOVE TVRVM LEX EST, QVOS MEA CAVLA FVGIT.
The print was not published in the usual way by Hieronymus Cock in Antwerp but by Philips Galle, who had ceased to work for Cock in 1563 and was subsequently active as an independent print engraver and publisher in Haarlem. It is quite possible that Galle did not have a detailed preparatory drawing at his disposal, given that Bruegel continued to work with Cock during this period. Perhaps Galle himself was obliged to make certain additions and adjustments, which might explain the aforementioned weaknesses in the composition. Several of the figures on either edge, for instance, are cut off in a rather unsightly way. Perhaps the scene was truncated a little on the left and right to fit everything into the standard format for a print – roughly 9 by 12 Antwerp inches.

The inclusion of two lamps – one used by a robber on the left to shine a light into the shed and the other depicted lower right – might indicate that the model had more pronounced contrasts of light and shade or was even conceived as a nocturnal scene. These meagre, earthbound light sources have virtually no visual effect here, nor do they seem to have any other significance. Things would have been different if they had shone weakly compared to Christ’s intense, divine glow – the 'light of the world'. Lighting effects of this kind also play a role in two small grisailles: *The Death of the Virgin* (cat. no. 31) and *Christ and the Woman Taken in Adultery* (cat. no. 30), which were produced in the same period. The way the sheep’s heads merge into the darkness of the shed is also strikingly similar to the lighting effects in the background of those two works. For as long as there is no trace of Bruegel’s model, however, all this naturally remains mere speculation. [JVG]
1 'I am the door of the sheep' (John 10:7).
2 'You can stay here in all safety, people, shelter beneath these roofs, with me as shepherd, the door is wide open. Why do you break the walls, why the roof? That is what wolves and thieves do, from which my sheepfold offers salvation.' See also Junius 1598, p. 185.

3 Another state is generally mentioned in the literature between the second and third ones referred to here. We have not, however, located any impressions of it.

4 'I am the good shepherd: the good shepherd giveth his life for the sheep' (John 10:11).

5 'The bad shepherd abandons his sheep.'


7 The diptych with *Saint James and the Magician Hermogenes* and *Saint James and the Fall of the Magician Hermogenes* (cat. no. 9) dates from the same period. Bruegel was also working at that point on *Spring* (cat. no. 33a), which would only be published after his death.

The Resurrection of Christ

c. 1561, engraving, 454 × 320 mm
Brussels, KBR, Print Room, inv. no. S.II 135134 [I/III]

Inscriptions
Lower left: BRVEGEL . I NVEN . / COCK . EXCYDEBAT .

States and editions
I as described.
II the name COCK has been changed to GALLE.
III added in the frame in the lower right corner: Jan. Houbens: excudit.

Preparatory drawing in pen and brown ink, brush and grey ink, grey-blue wash, traces of opaque green paint (some of which probably added later), c. 1560–61, 431 × 307 mm, Rotterdam, Museum Boijmans Van Beuningen, inv. no. N 12t

Copper plate in the estate of Volckxen Diericx (1601): Een copper plante van de Verryssenisse Christi van Bruegel (Duverger 1984–2006: I, 29)
Also in Joannes Galle’s catalogue (c. 1650): 2949.
Verryssenisse Christi van Bruegel (Duverger 1984–2006: I, 29)

The day after the Sabbath, Mary Magdalene visits Christ’s tomb at dawn with a group of women. As the grieving company arrive, they and the soldiers standing guard are startled by an earthquake. An angel descends from heaven, rolls away the stone from the mouth of the cave and sits on it. The soldiers tremble with fear, while the angel tells the women that Jesus has risen from the dead. Although Christ’s Resurrection is described in several places in the Bible, the version recounted here and depicted by Bruegel is only found in Matthew’s Gospel (28:1–7). Bruegel’s monumental print shows the moment when the grave is found to be empty. The women listen to the angel’s message, while several soldiers, who have been woken from their sleep, look around dazed. High above this scene we see the radiant, risen Christ.

The day after the Sabbath, Mary Magdalene visits Christ’s tomb at dawn with a group of women. As the grieving company arrive, they and the soldiers standing guard are startled by an earthquake. An angel descends from heaven, rolls away the stone from the mouth of the cave and sits on it. The soldiers tremble with fear, while the angel tells the women that Jesus has risen from the dead. Although Christ’s Resurrection is described in several places in the Bible, the version recounted here and depicted by Bruegel is only found in Matthew’s Gospel (28:1–7). Bruegel’s monumental print shows the moment when the grave is found to be empty. The women listen to the angel’s message, while several soldiers, who have been woken from their sleep, look around dazed. High above this scene we see the radiant, risen Christ. Contrary to the customary iconographic tradition, he makes the sign of benediction with his left hand, while holding the banner with his right. An ‘incorrect’, reversed image like this results from the fact that the design on which the print was based was not originally intended to be converted in this way.

In 1907, René van Bastelaer and Georges Hulin de Loo suggested that a grisaille rather than a preparatory drawing might have been the model for this print composition. This would have been in keeping with other examples, such as Bruegel’s Christ and the Woman Taken in Adultery (cat. no. 30) and The Death of the Virgin (cat. no. 31). The fact that the engraved version of The Resurrection of Christ incorporates a frame (trimmed off in most of the surviving impressions) seemed to be additional evidence in support of this hypothesis. All the same, a drawing emerged in 1924 that had been used as the design for the creation of the printing plate. The outlines still show clear signs of having been traced onto the plate with a stylus. It was primarily the poor condition of the sheet that cast doubt for so long on the drawing’s authenticity. Nowadays, the work has been securely ascribed to Bruegel and is viewed as an autonomous work of art, which was subsequently used to engrave the printing plate.

The Resurrection of Christ was not the only version of the theme, incidentally, in Hieronymus Cock’s catalogue. In 1557, for example, he commissioned a two-plate Resurrection after a design by Frans Floris. Some authors view Bruegel’s Resurrection of Christ, which was produced a few years later, as an artistic response to Floris’s composition – a highly plausible hypothesis, although the moment when Bruegel’s print was created remains open to question.

The print has generally been dated to around 1562–63, but past arguments in support of this no longer hold up.

The Rotterdam drawing had probably been used as a model earlier than this, as Christophe Plantin received a large number of engravings from Hieronymus Cock on 27 August 1561, including ‘12 Verryssenissen’ (12 Resurrections).

Although the engraver’s name is missing from the print, the way the lines have been cut suggest that it was Philips Galle. It was probably also Galle who came into possession of the printing plate after Volckxen Diericx died in 1600. In the mid-seventeenth century, Bruegel’s Resurrection continued to feature in the catalogue of Philip’s grandson, Joannes Galle. Following the latter’s death in the final decade of the same century, the copper plate ended up in the shop of the print publisher Jan Houwens, which was located on the Vissersdijk in Rotterdam.
1 Mielke 1996, no. 56.
2 Van Bastelaer and Halin de Loo 1907, p. 364.
4 Fritz Grossmann cited a drawing in the Louvre in connection with the date (Grossmann 1952, p. 222). However, the sheet in question is no longer attributed to Bruegel but to Jacob Savery (Mielke 1996, no. A 33). What’s more, the reference to stylistic similarities with the Brussels Fall of the Rebel Angels (1562) does not seem to me to be conclusive.
5 The impressions of The Resurrection mentioned in 1561 were probably made after Bruegel’s design. Plantin’s account books refer as early as 1558 to slightly cheaper prints showing the Resurrection. These are likely to have been the ones based on a design by Floris. See Delen 1932, pp. 5 and 9.
6 A short article is being prepared on Jan Houwens and his publishing practices, based on surviving documents in the Rotterdam city archives.
30.

Pieter Perret after Pieter Bruegel the Elder

Christ and the Woman Taken in Adultery

1579, engraving, 266 × 339 mm
Brussels, KBR, Print Room, inv. no. S.V 87743 [I/II]

Inscriptions

Lower left: BRVEGEL. M. D. LXV. // p. Perret. Fe. 79.; lower right: Cum Privilegio; in the image on the ground in front of Christ: DVE SONDER SONDE IS / DIE; in the middle: QVI SINE PECCATO EST VESTRYM. PRIMVS IN ILLAM LAPIDEM MITTAT. Ioan. 8.; in the middle of the margin at the very bottom, the address Antverpiae apud Petrum de Jode.

States and editions

I as described.
II Pieter de Jode's address has been removed; the address CJF/Vischer excudit has been added to the composition to the right of the step; the word DVE on the ground in front of Christ has been corrected to DIE; a P has been added before the BRVEGEL signature.

Engraving after Pieter Bruegel the Elder, Christ and the Woman Taken in Adultery, 1565; oil on panel, 24.1 × 34.4 cm; London, The Samuel Courtauld Trust, The Courtauld Gallery, inv. no. P1978.PG.48
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In 1609, Cardinal Federico Borromeo (1564–1631) was actively looking for paintings by Pieter Bruegel the Elder, which had become rare by that time.\footnote{Müller et al. 2014, no. 48} Having failed to find anything on the art market, the Italian cleric was forced to turn to Bruegel's heirs. The painter's youngest son, Jan, still had a panel with Christ and the Woman Taken in Adultery (fig. 1), which his father had painted in grey tones in 1565 and had been copied repeatedly by his sons. Jan Brueghel wanted to keep the painting in the family, so an unconventional solution was found: he allowed the grisaille to travel to Italy, where a painter in the Cardinal's employ made a copy of it. The original was then returned to the family.\footnote{Müller et al. 2014, no. 48}

If Borromeo was primarily interested in the image, he could have saved himself a lot of trouble by making do with a print, as the engraver Pieter Perret (1555–c. 1639) had already cut a copper plate with Bruegel's grisaille. The commission most likely came from Gerard de Jode (c. 1516–1591), who acted as Perret's mentor from 1574 onwards. The engraving, which was first offered for sale in 1579, later bore the address of Pieter de Jode (1573–1634). The print offers a faithful reproduction of Bruegel's panel, unsurprisingly so, as careful examination of the painting reveals that tiny holes have been pricked around the edges of the painting. These were most likely caused by pinning tracing paper to it.\footnote{Müller et al. 2014, no. 48}

In this way, Perret was able to make an exact copy of the composition. It also implies that the engraving was made with the family's collaboration and even possibly on their initiative.

The engraving shows a kneeling Christ writing words on the ground: ‘He that is without sin among you, let him first cast a stone at her.’\footnote{Müller and Schauerte 2018, no. G88} The text is his response to an unusual encounter in the temple and to the question that has been put to him. A woman found guilty of adultery is presented to Jesus amid a restive crowd, with the demand that she be stoned to death – the punishment for infidelity prescribed under the Law of Moses. The Pharisees and scribes, two of whom are prominently represented in the foreground, spot their chance to put Jesus to the test in the hope that they can accuse him of breaking Jewish law. The thorny question is put to him: in his opinion, should this woman be stoned or not? Christ is faced with a dilemma: will he be guided by the requirements of the law or should he follow his conscience? Under the watchful eye of the hostile religious authorities, he is made to decide the woman's fate. Aware that an opportunity is being sought to condemn him, but supported by his apostles, he unexpectedly places the delicate question in the hands of those present.

The contrast between the light and dark zones makes the drama of the scene even clearer. The large figures arranged in an open circle around Jesus give the viewer the sense of being part of the assembly and of being drawn directly into the action.\footnote{Müller et al. 2014, no. 48} Like those bystanders, we are forced to examine our own conscience. Refined details, like the expressive faces and gestures, lend the scene an immense eloquence.

The subject matter and the skilful way in which it is represented can be read in the light of the religious conflicts in the Low Countries around the middle of the sixteenth century. Regardless of denomination, each Christian had to make moral choices in keeping with their own conscience and offer an individual accounting for those choices. Bruegel combines three different moments from the New Testament story in a single scene: the sly enquiry as to Christ's ethical stance, his moment of intrinsic reflection and the reactions of the contrite crowd. In doing so, the artist creates a sense of both religious and human compassion. The bystanders in the print have certainly got the message: even as Jesus continues to write, it is clear from the emotions expressed by the onlookers that some have already read enough to decide they will not act as executioner. They disappear into the darkness to resume their everyday business. The two stones that might have sealed the woman's fate lie on the ground untouched. The execution has been averted. Jesus will now raise his
QVI SINE PECCATO EST VESTRVM, PRIMVS IN ILLAM LAPIDEM MITTAT. Ioan. 8.
eyes from the ground to address her: ‘Woman, where are those nine accusers? hath no man condemned thee? She said, No man, Lord.’

Although Bruegel’s painting was copied with great care, the engraving cannot match it. The print certainly played a part, however, in disseminating Bruegel’s legacy. The fact that Perret might have been able to work directly from the original grisaille suggests that the family supported the making of the print and possibly benefited from it financially. After its publication by de Jode, the engraving appeared again in a revised state with the address of the print publisher Claes Jansz. Visscher (1587–1652), indicating that the print was distributed from Amsterdam as of the second quarter of the seventeenth century. [AK]

1 ‘He that is without sin among you, let him first cast a stone at her’ (John 8:7).
2 A small crack in the lower right edge is present from the first state.
4 Sellink 2011, p. 214.
5 Frits Grossmann has provided detailed information on the research into the grisaille and its relationship with the print; see Grossmann 1952, pp. 221–22.
6 The episode in full can be found in John 8:1–11.
7 The first impressions might have displayed an even stronger contrast between light and dark, which would have created a highly dramatic effect. The copper plate will, however, have suffered from being printed so many times, with the result that later engravings will have looked greyer.
8 ‘And Jesus said unto her, Neither do I condemn thee; go, and sin no more’ (John 8:10–11).
The Death of the Virgin

1574, engraving, 306 × 418 mm
Brussels, KBR, Print Room, inv. no. S.I 8724 [II/II]

Inscriptions

States and editions
I  as described.
II  regna in the first line has been replaced with certa; the year 1574 has been removed.

Engraving after Pieter Bruegel the Elder, The Death of the Virgin, c. 1562–65, oil on panel, 36.8 × 55.6 cm, Banbury, National Trust, Upton House, The Bearsted Collection, inv. no. 446749
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Three small grisailles stand out within Bruegel's oeuvre, which together form a rather enigmatic ensemble. At first sight, there is no obvious link between Christ and the Woman Taken in Adultery (see cat. no. 30), Three Soldiers and The Death of the Virgin (see fig. 1). Nor do we know the purpose for which the artist painted the three works.

The Death of the Virgin, which shows the moment of Mary's passing, surrounded by the apostles, clearly draws on German engravings, which probably influenced Bruegel's decision to work in tones of black and white. The way she holds the candle and, even more so, the diagonal arrangement of the bed and its rolled-up curtain, make it clear he was harking back to Martin Schongauer's version of the theme (c. 1470), which enjoyed remarkably wide distribution at the end of the fifteenth century. At the same time, Bruegel broke with the tradition of his German and his Flemish predecessors (Hugo van der Goes, Joos van Cleve): Mary is no longer idealized here, but is depicted as an old woman with a bent back and tired features. She is also surrounded by a large group of people, consisting not only of the twelve apostles. We can only guess at the significance of the young man asleep in the lower left corner. What's more, Bruegel shows himself in this work to be a master of chiaroscuro. He shrouds the room in darkness, with just a few sources of earthly light (the fire in the hearth and three candles), which contrast weakly with the intense, supernatural light that seems to emanate from the dying Virgin Mary. This unusual presentation was viewed as a sign of eccentricity on the artist's part – he also added a number of more prosaic, everyday elements, such as the cat by the fireplace and the remains of the meal on the table. Yet Bruegel actually remained very faithful to the episode as recounted in the Legenda aurea.² This very precise iconographic choice might have originated in the humanist circle around Abraham Ortelius (1527–1598). The Death of the Virgin entered Ortelius's collection quite quickly, although we do not know the precise details. Ortelius ordered an engraving of this atypical work by Philips Galle in 1574.

Galle had already cut various of Bruegel's compositions in copper (cat. nos. 13, 17, 27, 28, 29, 32). Although he reproduced the original work here very accurately, he nevertheless made a few minor changes. He used an ingenious system of hatching and areas left blank, such as the wide aureole around the Virgin, to convey the painting's light and dark contrasts in the engraving, which has the same orientation as the grisaille. All the same, in addition to adjusting the perspective of the chair in the foreground, Galle 'completed' certain elements that are not distinguishable in the painting, such as the Gothic panelling in the background and the candleholder on the mantelpiece.

This highly meticulous execution suggests that the engraver, too, wished to vie with the print after Schongauer and his famous ornate candlestick.³ Galle gave his composition an explanatory inscription. The cartouche on the left confirms the attribution to Bruegel – the signature on the panel seems to be a later addition. A prayer to Mary, possibly composed by Ortelius, is set out in three columns in the middle of the margin. The cartouche on the right contains an inscription stating that the engraving was done on commission for 'Abraham Ortelius himself and his friends', demonstrating that the print was initially disseminated within his circle of Antwerp humanists. This is confirmed, incidentally, in letters by Dirck Volckertsz. Coornhert and Benito Arias Montano praising both the original work and the engraved copy.⁴ Following this initial circulation, the engraving prompted a wider edition, as demonstrated that the print was initially disseminated within his circle of Antwerp humanists. This is confirmed, incidentally, in letters by Dirck Volckertsz. Coornhert and Benito Arias Montano praising both the original work and the engraved copy.⁴ Following this initial circulation, the engraving prompted a wider edition, as the plate remained in the hands of Galle's successors until after 1650.⁵ It also served as a model for five painted panels⁶ and a drawing.⁷ [AB]
‘Thus Philips Galle imitated Pieter Bruegel’s prototype.’

‘Abraham Ortelius had this made for himself and his friends.’

‘Virgin, when you sought the safe realm of your son, what great joy filled your breast! What would have been sweeter for you than to migrate from the prison of the earth to the lofty temples of the longed-for heavens! And when you left the sacred group of Christ’s followers, whose mentor you had been, what sadness sprang up in you. How sad yet also how joyful was that pious gathering of you and your son as they watched you go. What was a greater joy for them than for you to reign in heaven, what greater sadness than to miss your presence? This picture, created by a skilful hand, shows the happy bearing of sadness on the faces of the just.’ Translation adapted from Orenstein and Sellink 2001, p. 258.

Three Soldiers, 1568, oil on panel, 20.3 × 17.8 cm, New York, The Frick Collection, inv. no. 65.1.163.

For the various hypotheses regarding this character, see Melion 1996.


Crucifixion with Four Angels after Schongauer and executed under Cock, was long considered to be a work by Galle but is now longer attributed to him. See NHD (Galle), no. R8.


See Fuhring 2017, no. 322.

See Marlier 1969, p. 94.

Paris, Musée du Louvre, Département des Arts graphiques, inv. no. 19720, recto.
Philips Galle after Pieter Bruegel the Elder

Christ and the Disciples on the Way to Emmaus

1571, engraving, 248 × 193 mm
Brussels, KBR, Print Room, inv. no. S.1 15681 [I/II]

Luke’s Gospel recounts how two of Jesus’s disciples were travelling to the village of Emmaus on the evening of Easter Sunday. A man joins them on their way and they tell him about Christ’s death and miraculous resurrection. The stranger explains to them that these events had unfolded exactly as predicted by the prophets in the scriptures. At dusk, they invite the man to spend the evening with them at the inn. It is only during supper, when their guest blesses the bread, breaks it and hands it to them, that they recognize Jesus: ‘And their eyes were opened, and they knew him; and he vanished out of their sight. And they said one to another, “Did not our heart burn within us, while he talked with us by the way, and while he opened to us the scriptures?”’ (Luke 24:31–32).

This print depicts the first part of the story, with the monumental figures dressed as sixteenth-century pilgrims. We identify the central character as Christ from his halo, and from his characteristic appearance with the split beard and centrally parted hair. It is clear from his gestures and the attentive way the disciples are listening that he is explaining the scriptures to them: ‘O fools, and slow of heart to believe all that the prophets have spoken! Ought not Christ to have suffered these things, and to enter into his glory?’ (Luke 24:25–26). The disciple on Christ’s left hand holds his right hand to his chest to signify that his heart is burning.

Unusually, there are no references to the further course of the story. The landscape is empty apart from the setting sun in the background, which symbolically echoes Christ’s aureole. There is no trace of the road yet to be travelled, nor is a village or inn visible in the distance. The absence of any reference to the supper, which obviously symbolizes the Eucharist, means that greater emphasis is placed on Christ’s role as a teacher and of the difficulty of recognizing God.

In contrast to Bruegel’s other depiction of the same theme, in which the figures, viewed from the back, are almost unrecognizable as they blend into a vast landscape, we are presented here with a highly focused and rhetorically distilled reading. It seems unlikely, therefore, that the composition was drawn from a fragment of a larger image. Compositions with monumental figures in the foreground are found frequently in Bruegel’s oeuvre, chiefly from the mid-1560s onwards. The trio’s poses clearly resemble those, incidentally, of the three haymakers in the foreground of the 1565 painting The Hay Harvest. It is possible that both works were based on the same figure study. The cursory rendering of the landscape might also indicate that the model for the print was not a completed painting or detailed preparatory drawing, but a lost study from Bruegel’s repertoire.

Although the print belongs to a small group of engravings published after Bruegel’s death, there is no doubt as to the composition’s authenticity. Philips Galle had previously engraved designs by Bruegel in copper on behalf of Hieronymus Cock (see cat. nos. 13, 17, 27, 29), and in 1565 he published The Parable of the Good Shepherd on his own account (see cat. no. 28). The engraver and the designer undoubtedly knew each other and might even have been friends. By the time he placed this print on the market, Galle had firmly established himself as an independent engraver and print publisher in Antwerp, where he filled the gap created by the death of Cock in 1570. The publisher and engraver was undoubtedly seeking in this instance to capitalize on the fame of the recently deceased Pieter Bruegel. [JVG]
1 ‘O Christ, you think it worthy to assume the appearance of a pilgrim in order to confirm our hearts in steadfast faith.’

2 This could be taken as an allusion to Jesus’s words: ‘I am the light of the world: he that followeth me shall not walk in darkness, but shall have the light of life’ (John 8:12). See Müller et al. 2014, no. 45.


4 See cat. no. 2h and a drawing attributed to Bruegel in Rotterdam, Museum Boijmans Van Beuningen, inv. no. N 86. See Orenstein and Sellink 2001, no. 83.

5 Grossmann 1960, p. 638; see also, for example, Sellink 2011, no. 174.

6 Closest in composition in this respect are the 1568 watercolours The Misanthrope and The Blind Leading the Blind (both in Naples, Museo Nazionale di Capodimonte, inv. nos. Q16 and 84-406). As in these compositions, the low vantage point almost makes the viewer part of the action.

7 Prague, Lobkowicz Palace, ‘The Lobkowicz Collections; see Klein 1963, p. 179. Although the similarity is striking, Louis Lebeer is keen to play it down; see Lebeer 1969, no. 85.

8 Nor is there any trace of a lost painting with this theme in the principal archive sources. See Allart 2001 for an overview.
Thanks to the widespread dissemination of his work in print form, Bruegel was an internationally celebrated artist by the time of his death. Already from the early 1560s onwards, however, the production of new print designs had clearly diminished. Bruegel did continue to collaborate with Hieronymus Cock, even though he had his hands full with other work. The preparatory drawings that survive for Spring and Summer (cat. nos. 33a and 33b of The Four Seasons) are dated 1565 and 1568; they show that the design process, compared to the feverish graphic activity of a decade earlier, progressed at a very slow pace. The Four Seasons stayed unfinished at the artist’s death. The series, which was completed by Hans Bol, appeared on the market in 1570. Shortly afterwards, Cock also passed away. Even during their lifetimes, other publishers and engravers had attempted to benefit from Bruegel’s and Cock’s success. Publishers, printmakers and art dealers such as Bartholomeus de Mompere, Frans Hogenberg, Maarten Peeters, Johannes Wierix and especially Philips Galle were so close to Bruegel that we can assume that the prints they published that bear Bruegel’s name are also genuinely based on his work. In some cases, paintings that survived served as models.

Following the deaths of both Bruegel and Cock, the demand for Bruegel’s work persisted. Cock’s widow, Volcxken Diericx, brought a few more significant prints onto the market that had been engraved by Pieter van der Heyden, just like before. Engravings such as Festival of Fools (cat. no. 34) and The Battle about Money (cat. no. 35) are so impressive, both visually and in terms of their content, that they must have been based on work by Bruegel that is now lost. However, the lack of detail in the elaboration of the prints – they do not show the same degree of refinement and finish we know from Bruegel’s documented print designs – suggests that they would have been based on sketches remaining in the master’s legacy. It is not known whether the artist’s heirs were involved in Diericx’s commercial undertakings. The Stone Operation or The Dean of Renaix (cat. no. 38) bears Bruegel’s name as well as the date ’1557’ but the execution is of poor quality and the engraving was clearly not made within Bruegel’s immediate circle. It is unclear what the composition is based on. Probably it came into being years later than the year indicated, and exploited the prestige of the artist’s name.

As a classical allegory, The Triumph of Time (cat. no. 36), which Galle engraved and published, stands out in Bruegel’s oeuvre, and is no doubt based on a lost sketch. Some of the roundels with proverbs (cat. no. 39) engraved by Johannes Wierix and an anonymous, somewhat less talented engraver, approach some of Bruegel’s last remaining paintings in terms of theme and composition. It is not clear by whom and when the prints were published, but the form and style suggest Antwerp around 1570. Were they intended to accompany The Drunkard Pushed into the Pigsty (cat. no. 39a)? This print was engraved by Wierix after a preserved panel painting and was apparently published by Maarten Peeters in 1568. The Land of Cockaigne (cat. no. 37) is clearly based on the painting of the same name. The traditional attribution to Pieter van der Heyden is not convincing, but the work bears signs typical of Antwerp print production. All these comic scenes with texts in the vernacular are bound to have appealed to a wide audience.

Joris van Grieken
Pieter van der Heyden after Pieter Bruegel the Elder and Hans Bol

The Four Seasons

1570, four unnumbered engravings

33a
Pieter van der Heyden after Pieter Bruegel the Elder
Spring
1570, engraving, 228 × 287 mm
Brussels, KBR, Print Room, inv. no. S.I 7619 [I/III]

Inscriptions
Lower left: Bruegel. inv[en]t.; lower right: H. Cock. excud. 1570. // PAME [monogram]; in the left margin: Martius, Aprilis, Maius, sunt tempora ueris ; in the central cartouche: VER / Pueriti e compar; in the right margin: Vere Venus gaudet florentibus aurea sertis .

States and editions
I as described.
II Cock’s address changed to CJVisscher excude; in the right margin 1.
III in the cartouche in the margin, addition of the address p. Schenk Iunior Exc. and N.34.

Preparatory drawing in pen and brown ink, 1568, signed, 220 × 290 mm, Vienna, Albertina, inv. no. 23.7504

33b
Pieter van der Heyden after Pieter Bruegel the Elder
Summer
1570, engraving, 223 × 284 mm
Brussels, KBR, Print Room, inv. no. S.II 148038 [I/II]

Inscriptions
Lower right: H Bol; lower right: Cock . excu; in the left margin: Iulius, Augustus, nec non et Iunius Aestas . in the central cartouche: AESTAS / Adolescenti e imago; in the right margin: Frugiferas aruis fert Aestas torrida meβeis .

States and editions
I as described.
II the second image has faded completely; Cock’s address has been removed; in the right margin 2.

33c
Pieter van der Heyden after Hans Bol
Autumn
1570, engraving, 227 × 289 mm
Brussels, KBR, Print Room, inv. no. S.I 7620 [I/II]

Inscriptions
Bottom centre: H . Cock . excud . i570; lower right: H . Bol .; in the left margin: Brumales Ianus, Februarius atq; in the central cartouche: HYEMS / Senectuti comparatur; in the right margin: Vis Hyemis glacie currentes alligat undas .

States and editions
I as described.
II Cock’s address has been removed causing a crack in the plate; in the right margin 4.


Literature
[cat. no. 33b] Summer
The depiction of allegories of the months or seasons arose from the tradition of medieval Books of Hours, in which the calendar was decorated with zodiac symbols, representing the passage of celestial time, and with the specific activities associated with each month. The latter symbolized the labouring of human beings on earth and hence the slipping away of earthly time. In *Spring*, for instance, Bruegel represents horticulture (March), sheep-shearing (April) and *fêtes galantes* (May). For *Summer*, meanwhile, he refers to the fruit harvest (June), the hay harvest (July) and grain harvest (August). The central Latin inscriptions at the bottom link each season with a stage in life. Spring is equated with youth, for example, which further heightens the *vanitas* character of the series, as the cyclical passage of the seasons was a long-established metaphor for the advance of time in anticipation of the Last Judgement. The only print to be signed is *Spring*, which includes the engraver’s monogram of Pieter van der Heyden, but he is nevertheless assumed to be the maker of all the prints. Bruegel’s preparatory drawings for *Spring* and *Summer* have survived. They date from 1565 and 1568 respectively, but were not published in print form until 1570.

Hieronymus Cock asked Hans Bol to complete the series, as Bruegel had died in the meantime. The choice of Bol no doubt indicates the prestige in which he was held in the eyes of Cock and his contemporaries. Although Cock offered many more prints for sale by other artists, Bol proved to be essential when it came to executing designs in Bruegel’s delicate pen technique. Although Bol often drew inspiration from a figure type deriving via Hans Vredeman de Vries from Frans Floris and also from the example of Pieter Coecke van Aelst, he structured the peasants and townspeople in these images of the months as solid figures, albeit with a greater sense of detail than Bruegel. He followed Bruegel’s concept of three seasonal activities per engraving. Bol depicts the characteristic activities for each month, such as the wine harvest in September, cutting wood in October, slaughtering animals in November, playing on the ice in December, celebrating in January and planting in February. Like Bruegel, he gives the landscape a fairly high horizon to create space for the many scenes. Bruegel views every scene from a nearby, slightly raised vantage point, and by tipping the surface of the ground towards the viewer, lending his figures an extraordinary monumentality that they lack in Bol, whose viewpoint is lower and further away. All the same, while the staging is less brilliant and the content simpler than Bruegel’s composition, a contemporary viewer of Bol’s *Autumn* and *Winter* is sure to have appreciated the variety (*varietas*) of nicely observed and very familiar details, such as the two children blowing up the bladder of a freshly slaughtered cow.
In an effort to ensure the visual unity of the series, Bol made an extra effort here to match Bruegel’s idiom. This is apparent in both the highly refined graphic execution and his attempt to emulate Bruegel’s visual humour. In Autumn, for instance, the butcher’s sturdy backside forms an amusing visual rhyme with the pig beneath him. He is cutting the animal’s throat, the blood from which is collected in a pan with a long handle held by a woman. Bol captured this action too in a few deft, rapid strokes (fig. 1). Comparison with the print shows that the woman is depicted there in a less functional, more posed stance. The butcher’s left leg has likewise been pushed back a little, resulting in a more artificial-looking pose, which might have been intended to echo the drinking peasant, whose right leg crosses over the edge of the image, parallel with his scythe, in Bruegel’s Summer. This expressive visual invention lends the print an exceptional dynamism. Bol, by contrast, opted for an appealing composition with a serene interaction between the figures. It is noteworthy that for Winter he evidently drew more inspiration from Pieter van der Borcht’s print Ice Skaters at Mechelen, published by Bartholomeus de Mompere in 1559, than from Bruegel’s Ice Skating before the Gate of St George, Antwerp (cat. no. 23). The kneeling man, viewed in profile as he ties on his skate, the sitting woman with the mantle, seen from the side, the smartly dressed gentleman who holds his lady by the waist in front of him as they skate, the reckless skater who falls through the ice with his arms raised and the one falling over backwards on the ice are all clearly borrowed from that source.

This series of prints, which linked Hans Bol’s name as an inventor to that of Pieter Bruegel the Elder, undoubtedly contributed to Bol’s image as Bruegel’s successor. This might have won him more commissions, as three series by him devoted to the seasons and the months are known from the decades that followed. In each of these, he reprised certain individual motifs from the 1570 series, which were also adopted with a few changes by Maerten de Vos later in the sixteenth century. It was a successful formula, therefore, which remained popular until well into the seventeenth century, as witnessed by the related cycles of the seasons painted by Abel Grimmer and Pieter Brueghel the Younger.
[cat. no. 33c] Autumn
Winter

[cat. no. 33d]
'March, April, and May are the months of spring.'
'Spring, similar to childhood.'
'In Spring golden Venus rejoices in garlands of blooming flowers.' Ilya M. Veldman identified the link between the Latin phrase and the Anthologia Latina. This collection of Latin poems was only published in 1573 and so cannot have been the direct inspiration for the inscription in the margin. See Veldman 1980, pp. 159–60.

14 'Winter’s power holds the rolling waves in her ice. ‘
13 ‘Winter, the semblance of old age. ‘
12 ‘Winter months are January, February and December. ‘
11 ‘Fruit-bearing Autumn gives grapes pregnant with young wine. ‘ See also Veldman 1980, pp. 159–60.
10 ‘Summer, image of youth. ‘
9 ‘July, August, and also June make Summer. ‘ Mielke 1996, no. 64; Orenstein and Sellink 2001, no. 105.
8 ‘Autumn, image of adulthood. ‘ See also Vel’dman 1980, pp. 159–60.
7 ‘Hot summer brings bounteous harvests to the fields. ‘ See also Veldman 1980, pp. 159–60.
6 ‘Autumn Landscape ‘
5 ‘Spring, similar to childhood. ‘
4 ‘March, April, and May are the months of spring. ‘

Two of Bol’s images of the months from the year 1570 are in Paris, but these do not correspond with the final prints: Summer (pen and brown ink, brown and mauve wash. Top, towards the right, signed in pen and brown ink: HBOL / 1570. 142 × 249 mm, École nationale supérieure des Beaux-Arts, inv. no. Masson 315) and Autumn (pen and brown ink, light-brown and grey wash, white highlights, on light-brown washed paper. Top centre, signed in pen and brown ink: H Bol / 1570. 138 × 245 mm, Musée du Louvre, Département des Arts graphiques, inv. no. 20908). Autumn is inscribed ‘September’ and ‘October’ and shows farm workers treading grapes in a barrel in what is a precise reproduction, although reversed, of the Autumn published by Cock. Are we dealing here with an initial scribbling down of ideas – in Bol’s customary sketching style for a first attempt of that kind – for what would ultimately become the lost preliminary drawing for Autumn or a ‘derived’ series of preliminary drawings for another, unpublished print cycle devoted to the seasons?

Bol was evidently also able to convey this style of drawing to Jacob Savery, whom Karel van Mander described as the best of Bol’s pupils (see Van Mander 1604, fol. 260v). Miedema 1994–99, vol. 1, pp. 300–1). He probably trained in Antwerp between 1580 and 1584 (see De Potter, De Jaegere and Kotková 2010, pp. 30–31). Savery was able, after all, to sell his imitations of Bruegel’s drawings as originals. Since 1986, a group of twenty-five landscape drawings, formerly ascribed to Bruegel, have been attributed to Savery. They had been wrongly dated to between 1559 and 1562. See De Potter, De Jaegere and Kotková 2010, p. 33. Orenstein and Sellink 2001, nos. 126–29.

More details in this regard can be found in the doctoral thesis the author is preparing at KU Leuven under Professor Jan Van der Stock, which includes an extensive biography and catalogue raisonné of all known works of Hans Bol (etchings, drawings and paintings).


On the reverse of Winter Landscape, pen and dark brown ink, 180 × 263 mm, Dresden, Kupferstich-Kabinett, inv. no. C 880. Given their high degree of realism, these sketches – which show the cutting of a pig’s throat and the turning of the animal on its back – were probably drawn from life or from memory shortly after observing the actions in question.

Etching, 294 × 481 mm. Signed in the lower right corner: FECIT PETRVS VANDER BORCHT 1559; address lower left: Bartholomeus de Momper. See NHD (Van der Borch): no. 169.

Because of the rarity of ice scenes in early sixteenth-century painting and printmaking, it is interesting here to mention Maarten van Heemskerck’s The Virtuous Wife serving her Family. Large figures in the foreground on the left alternate there with skaters in the lower-lying urban background, somewhat similar to the composition of Bol’s Winter. The print belongs to the series Praise of the Virtuous Wife, 1555, engraved and etched by Dirck Volkertsz. Coornhert and published by Cornelis Bos. See NHD (Van Heemskerck), nos. 468–73.
Festival of Fools

After 1570, engraving, 325 × 437 mm
Brussels, KBR, Print Room, inv. no. S.II 24900 [II/IV]

A festive crowd of fools streams into the scene through a pergola structure on the left. Their procession meanders all over the place as the figures jostle for the viewer's attention: from the bowling contest in the foreground to the throng dancing around the little stage in the background. The scene reads like a catalogue of derisive hand gestures—thumbsing one's nose, leading someone by the nose or holding up a hand with the thumb to the temple—or of animals and attributes associated with deception, such as the cat on the fool's back, spectacles and the fiddle.2 The fools enthusiastically make fools of one another. This 'iconography of folly' is heightened in a later state, in which individual fools have been given an explanatory number.3

The game in the foreground illustrates a play on the word 'sottebol', which refers both to a fool and to the balls used in the depicted bowling contest. This wordplay is heightened by the 'inaccurate' rendering of the balls, which ought to be flattened on either side. The former lines have confused some English-speaking scholars, who have detected a reference in them to Erasmus' Praise of Folly.4 There is no question in this text, however, of acknowledging the latter lines have confused some English-speaking scholars, who have detected a reference in them to Erasmus' Praise of Folly.4 There is no question in this text, however, of acknowledging the idea of folly triumphant was, moreover, firmly established in early-modern written and visual culture,6 hence the statement that the whole world is populated by idiots: 'Men vint Sottebols, onder elke nacie' ('Numbskulls are found in all nations'). The same message was frequently echoed in popular literature too.7 Nor would this ubiquitous idiocy disappear any time soon: the topos of the eternal regeneration of folly was equally widespread, if not more so.8 Several of the idiots from Festival of Fools can be found in an anonymous seventeenth-century painting of this idea: Hen hatching Fools (fig. 1).9

The bowling ball between the legs of the fool shown lower left has actually been transformed into a fool's head (identifiable by the ear): in this way, one fool gives birth to another. [WW]
‘You, Dumb-heads, who are plagued with frivolity, Come to the lanes, whoever desires to bowl, Although one will lose his honour and another his money. The world praises the greatest fools. One finds Dumb-heads in all nations, Even if they do not wear a fool’s cap on their heads, They have such grace in dancing, That their foolish heads spin like tops. The dirtiest Dumb-heads, squander their estates, Then there are those who take each other by the nose, Some sell Jew’s harps and others spectacles, With which they deceive many Dumb-heads by overvaluing. Yet there are even Dumb-heads, who carry themselves wisely, And understand the proper meaning from the Dumb-heads. Because they who have found folly themselves, Shall best hit the pin with their Fool’s ball.’

1 ‘You, Dumb-heads, who are plagued with frivolity, Come to the lanes, whoever desires to bowl, Although one will lose his honour and another his money. The world praises the greatest fools. One finds Dumb-heads in all nations, Even if they do not wear a fool’s cap on their heads, They have such grace in dancing, That their foolish heads spin like tops. The dirtiest Dumb-heads, squander their estates, Then there are those who take each other by the nose, Some sell Jew’s harps and others spectacles, With which they deceive many Dumb-heads by overvaluing. Yet there are even Dumb-heads, who carry themselves wisely, And understand the proper meaning from the Dumb-heads. Because they who have found folly themselves, Shall best hit the pin with their Fool’s ball.’

2 Moxey 1982, pp. 640, 643; Richardson 2007, pp. 160–61; Orenstein and Sellink 2001, p. 252. Dirk Bax linked these motifs to various events held in Antwerp, including the fool with a cat (Landjuweel 1561) and the spectacle-sellers as symbols of deceit (Landjuweel 1561 and Ommegeang procession 1565); see Bax 1949, pp. 73, 78 note 48, 175.

3 Information obtained from Maarten Basens as part of his doctoral research into the history of Bruegel print editions. As of the fourth state, the images are numbered (a total of 12 numbers, with 1–5 applied to the buildings), possibly to explain the actions. Unfortunately, the key with the text is missing.


5 The American scholar Todd Marlin Richardson misinterprets the Middle Dutch caption and argues at length that the engraving ought to be read as a plea for self-knowledge. He explains the play on words (head/bol) with reference to the iconographic ‘owl’s mirror’ motif; see Richardson 2007, pp. 174–77. A good example of a realistically depicted skittle game is the 1650 painting on a virginal by the Antwerp artist Joannes Couchet (Museum Vleeshuis, Antwerp).

6 The Bazoche or Basecho arose as a guild of clergymen at the Paris parlement, but evolved over time into a satirist’s society, which performed the Jeux de Farce or Jeux de Sotise. See Gaignebet and Tonneau-Ryckelynck 2004, no. 9; see also Lebeer 1969, no. 35.

7 Richardson 2007, pp. 157, 159, 162. Richardson notes that Moxey brings up this group from the Diest chamber of rhetoric but then dismisses it with little explanation. This might have been because Moxey assumed the print to be a purely allegorical depiction of folly, based on elements such as Bruegel’s choice of the traditional costume of court jesters; see Moxey 1982, p. 643.

8 Examples of misericords of this kind include: a character dropping his breeches and an acrobat (Onze-Lieve-Vrouwekerk, Aarschot); fools’ heads and mocking grimaces (Sint-Pieterskerk, Leuven); and the spectacles-seller (Sint-Katharinakerk, Hoogstraten). See Steppe, Smeyers and Lauwerys 1973, pp. 97–99, 185 (pl. 6, 9), 186 (pl. 14), 237 (pls 40–41).

9 Moxey 1982, p. 644; Orenstein and Sellink 2001, p. 252; Richardson 2007, pp. 167–69. Ger Luijten has rightly pointed out that it is precisely those who embrace their folly who emerge as winners; Luijten 2002, pp. 52–53. See also Sellink 2011, p. 264.


11 Among others: ‘Nu is den ooen effen vol met ’t hooft van eenen Sottebol […] Want ieder hooft heeft zijn gebreek.’ From the poem ‘Oven à la Mode’, Het masker van de Wereldt afgetrocken (1650) by Adriaen Poirters.

12 Vandebroek 1987, pp. 50–51; the author provides a substantial list of examples.

13 Stiennon and Brennet-Deckers 1983, p. 46; Vandebroek 1987, p. 50. See also De Gendt and Bals 2006, p. 8.
The Battle about Money

After 1570, engraving, 240 x 310 mm
Brussels, KBR, Print Room, inv. no. S.IV 2188 [II/III]

Bruegel's preparatory drawing for this undated print has not been identified. The engraving was made by Pieter van der Heyden and published by Volckken Diericx. Although the print has been dated in the past to between 1558 and 1567, we can tell from the inscription Auf quatre Vents that Diericx did not publish it until after the death of her husband, Hieronymus Cock, in 1570. Based on stylistic similarities with dated Bruegel prints, the design could be dated around 1562–63.

The print is often given titles that suggest its theme is a battle between money bags or piggy banks on the one hand and strongboxes on the other, with the former alluding to people of modest means and the latter to the rich and powerful. Yet this is actually a free-for-all, pitting piggy banks (or rather spaarpotjes – literally ‘saving pots’), strongboxes, money bags, purses and barrels of cash against each other. Some of these combatants have heads, while others do not; but they are all heavily armed and have limbs with which they lay about one another fiercely.

This remarkable and highly original composition is a representation of an ancient and universal theme that Bruegel presented on a number of occasions: an indictment of greed and, in particular, of personal enrichment. Rather than two rival factions doing battle, it is a chaotic skirmish in which it is every man for himself. Bruegel uses the tangle of spears and other weapons – horizontal, vertical and diagonal – to create an extraordinary rhythm, which recalls depictions of real battles done in the same period.

A theme such as greed – and above all the contrast between personal enrichment on the one hand and pursuit of the common good on the other – was particularly relevant in the metropolis of Antwerp, with its rapidly emerging mercantile elite. It resonated not only with the visual tradition of the time, but also with contemporary literature and plays. Some authors have interpreted the image as the artist’s declaration of solidarity with ordinary folk facing the greed of exploiters and speculators. However, rather than speculating about Bruegel’s personal views and social engagement, it is wiser to read the print as a satirical image tackling the universal themes of greed and sinful human behaviour in a highly original way. [KL]
A chilling triumphal procession traverses the landscape from left to right. A white and a black horse, decked out with the sun and the moon, symbolize day and night. They draw Time’s victory chariot, on which rests a globe with a tree growing from it and surrounded by the signs of the zodiac. The latter represent the passage of the months and the cycle of the seasons, as do the tree and the branches on the chariot, which sprout leaves on one side but are bare on the other. The scales dangling from one of the branches belong to the zodiac, while the mechanical clock symbolizes fleeting time. Behind the tree, in the centre of the composition, the landscape is changing. The thriving village set in lush countryside on the right gives way on the left to a barren landscape with a burning city in the distance. The central figure on the triumphal chariot is the god Saturn or Cronus, who devours his children and is hence associated with transience and the passing of time. He sits on an hourglass and holds in his left hand a snake biting its tail, an antique symbol of eternity. Time’s triumphal chariot is followed by Death mounted on an emaciated horse. Fame alone appears for the moment to have escaped the destructive power of Time. She is represented as a winged woman blowing a trumpet and riding an elephant. As it passes, the relentless procession tramples all of humanity’s accomplishments into the dirt, including the attributes of Bruegel’s own artistic profession – palette, paintbrush and maulstick.

Philips Galle published this engraving five years after the artist’s death. In terms of its form and content, the sheet has little in common at first sight with Bruegel’s known oeuvre. The allegorical representation draws on the Trionfi of Francesco Petrarca (Petrarch, 1304–1374) – a literary work that links the world of humanist thought with Christian doctrine through a series of six Triumphs. Cupid, symbolizing Desire, is conquered successively by Chastity, Death, Fame and Time, with God’s Eternity as the ultimate victor. The text was extremely well known and was frequently depicted by artists, mostly in the form of individual triumphal chariots carrying personifications. This iconographic tradition gradually accumulated numerous elements that were not mentioned by Petrarch. This engraving too deviates in numerous respects not only from the text but also from that visual tradition. Time’s chariot, for instance, is customarily drawn by stags and the personifications of Death and Time are not normally included.

For various reasons, it has frequently been doubted whether the design of this print ought to be ascribed to Bruegel. The genre of classical allegory might have prompted the artist to apply a somewhat Italianizing idiom that we would not normally associate with him. All the same, his training in Pieter Coecke van Aelst’s workshop and the time he spent in Italy suggest that he might well have mastered this visual idiom and have used it from time to time. Interesting parallels can also be drawn with a design for a stained-glass pane attributed to Coecke’s workshop, and with which Bruegel might have been familiar (p. 251, fig. 1).

We can only speculate as to the appearance of the model used by Galle. The composition certainly has its weaknesses: the triumphal chariot is rendered rather one-dimensionally, while the spatial positioning of the Saturn figure is unclear and it displays anatomical flaws, such as the unnaturally bent left forearm. The signs of the zodiac are not in the correct sequence either, nor is the working out of the landscape persuasively Bruegelian. Perhaps Galle only had a partially developed sketch of the composition to work from, forcing the engraver to interpret and make substantial additions of his own. Might the assumed model of this Triumph of Time have been a try-out for a complete series that was never executed? Whatever the case, Galle published a series of six Triumphs in 1565 based on designs by Maarten van Heemskerck.* It is tempting to think that the latter took over a commission that did not suit Bruegel or that circumstances prevented him from continuing, but no evidence has yet been found to back this up. [JVG]
'The horse of the sun and that of the moon rush
Time forward; who, borne by the four seasons
through the twelve signs of the rotating extensive
year, bears off all things with him as he goes on his
swift chariot, leaving what he has not seized to his
companion Death. Behind them follows Fame, sole
survivor of all things, borne on an elephant, filling
the world with her trumpet blasts.'

For an overview, see Masséna Essling and Müntz
1902. For examples from the sixteenth-century Low
Countries, see Bruyn 1987.

The sheet with The Triumph of Time (Paris, Académie
des beaux-arts) is part of a series of six triumphs
in medallion form, and is also known in the form
of several stained-glass medallions (Amsterdam,
Rijksmuseum, and Leuven, University Collections).
See Bruyn 1987.

NHD (Van Heemskerck), nos. 491–96; see also

[fig. 1] Anonymous, after a design attributed to the
circle of Pieter Coecke van Aelst, The Triumph of Time,
c. 1530–40. Stained-glass pane, 395 mm diameter.
Amsterdam, Rijksmuseum, inv. no. BK-1961-102.
Attributed to Pieter van der Heyden (?) after Pieter Bruegel the Elder

The Land of Cockaigne

After 1570, engraving, 209 x 277 mm
Brussels, KBR, Print Room, inv. no. S.I 8722 [I/IV]

As early as classical antiquity, people dreamed of a mythical place, a land of milk and honey, of plenty, where life was totally effortless. This unattainable location continued to inspire writers and artists in the centuries that followed. One of the ports of call of the ‘Ship of Fools’ in Sebastian Brant’s 1494 Narrenschiff, for instance, was Schlaraffenland (‘Land of Loafers’). The Nuremberg poet Hans Sachs (1494–1576) described the route to and appearance of this legendary place in several verses. Despite his detailed directions (‘Three miles beyond Christmas,’ ‘through hills of porridge’), Schlaraffenland remained out of the Meistersinger’s reach. One of Sachs’s poems, accompanied by a woodcut by Erhard Schön from around 1530, nevertheless provides a more concrete visualization. A Dutch translation of his poem, ‘Van dat Luye-lecker-lant’, was first published in Antwerp in 1600, but a prose version by an unknown author probably existed as early as 1546. Various artists were inspired by the highly detailed descriptions of the landscape, the buildings, the fauna and the flora. Peeter Baltens made an etching of The Land of Cockaigne around 1560, reflecting the text (p. 255, fig. 1). Bruegel seems to have been influenced in turn by Baltens.

Bruegel painted his version of The Land of Cockaigne – a panel now in Munich – in 1567. The engraving after this painting was more than likely made after Bruegel’s death. The image is reversed relative to the panel. The text added in the margin describes exactly what the scene shows. A scholar, a peasant and a soldier lie stretched out under a tree laden with delicacies. They have already eaten their way through the hills of porridge – note the figure in this regard in the left background. They will certainly not be condemned for their idleness in this Land of Plenty. Wine trickles from a jar straight into the scholar’s mouth, while a boiled egg on legs and an obliging suckling pig offer themselves to those feeling peckish. In the tart-covered hut in the right background, a roast chicken flies straight into the mouth of the knight in armour.

Images and descriptions of the Land of Cockaigne were not intended purely for entertainment, however: they usually had a firmly moralizing function too. Sloth and gluttony featured among Bruegel’s deadly sins for good reason. The anonymous prose text of 1546, for example, states: ‘Idleness, gorging and too many liberties are three things that are no good.’ Unsurprising, then, that the fanatical Protestant Paulus de Kempenaer wrote on his impression of Bruegel’s Land of Cockaigne in 1611 that life was not this easy and that people had to work for their bread.
The first state of the print does not include an engraver’s signature or a publisher’s address, so we are ignorant about the creation of the engraved *Land of Cockaigne*. Based on the style and technique, Pieter van der Heyden has traditionally been suggested as the plate’s engraver, although this is not unanimously accepted. Whatever the case, the plate does appear to have been cut in Antwerp. The name of Michael Snyders (1586–1672) has been added as publisher to the second state. The same printing plate later ended up with Joannes Galle (1600–1676) via a route that remains unclear. [MB]
"Those who are lazy and gluttonous, farmer, soldier or scholar, make their way here and taste all without working. The gardens are sausages, the houses have tarts. Capons and chickens fly by already roasted."

"The lazy person places his hand beneath his armpit, but is too tired to bring it to his mouth" (after Proverbs 26:15).

Sebastian Brant, *Das Narrenschiff*, 1494, cap. 108.

Sachs 1884, cap. 50, no. 4; Sachs 1893, pp. 8–11, no. 4, and pp. 321–23, no. 115.

'Van dat Luye-lecker-lant' was included in the publication *Veelderhande geneuchlijcke dichten, tafelpeelen ende refereynen* (Miscellany of Amusing Poems, Plays and Ballades), published by Jan van Ghelen.

'Luik en lecker en veel te meughen, Dat zijn drie dinghen die niet en deughen.'

This impression is now in Leiden University Library (inv. no. PK-P-121.500). The commentary reads as follows: 'Qui non laborat, non manducat / cat / 15 Jan: / 1611 // Ick en heb myn broot n[ier] ledich gegeten //

Neen, men geraect / soo gemackelyck / aend[den] / cost n[ier], men moet wat / voor de cost doe[n].'

The inscription has previously been discussed in Van der Stock 2001, pp. 27–28. Daan van Heesch subsequently identified a clear link between the Latin inscription (‘He who does not work shall not eat’) and the third volume of Rabelais’s *Pantagruel* (see Rabelais 1538, p. 156). Maarten Bassens and Daan van Heesch recently identified the author of the notes on the Bruegel print as Paulus de Kempenaer; see Van Heesch 2019a.
The Stone Operation or The Dean of Renaix

After 1570?, engraving, 355 x 473 mm
Brussels, KBR, Print Room, inv. no. S.I 23031 [I/III]

Inscriptions
Left, on the certificate on the wall: BRVGEL
INVEN 1557, on a banderole on a curtain in the background: THVIS VA NERI

States and editions
I as described.
II the monks in the doorway have been turned into peasants by the addition of hair and beards and the reworking of their clothes; extra shadow added to the banderole on the curtain.
III addition of a man (dressed as a dentist or quack doctor) with a dog in the middle of the print. Another small dog has been added lower left.

Literature
Van Bastelaer 1908, no. 192; Lebeer 1969, no. 83; Lari 1973, no. 156; Riggs 1977, no. o-14; Marijnissen et al. 1988, p. 389; Freedberg 1989, no. 83; Müller Lari 1973, no. 156; Riggs 1977, no.a-14; Marijnissen Van Bastelaer 1908, no. 192; Lebeer 1969, no. 83; Literature III addition of a man (dressed as a dentist or quack doctor) with a dog in the middle of the print. Another small dog has been added lower left.

Three ‘stone operations’ are being carried out at once in this chaotic ‘surgery’, where folly is expertly removed from the heads of the struggling patients using tongs or scalps. A previously treated man sits in the middle, gazing vacantly at the unfortunate person nearby who thrashes about wildly as a fresh group of idiots enters through the open door. The scene is packed with emblematic details: the owl on the back of the chair, the figure with the bellows, sitting in a basket, the patient with a blindfold into which a bunch of dead twigs has been inserted, the monk with the ladle, and much more besides. Together, all these allegorical elements confirm that it is human folly and gullibility that are being evoked here in a Bruegelian style.

The connection with Bruegel is, however, uncertain. Similar painted compositions circulated in the Southern Netherlands from the second half of the sixteenth century onwards. For the most part, these are naive works on panel, which generally include the date 1556 (the certificate on the wall is inscribed p. bruegel: 1556 in each case; fig. 1). They are stronger than their engraved counterparts both compositionally and stylistically, and are closer to Bruegel in iconographic terms as well. The little defecating figure, the neckless heads, the person behind a wicker screen, the red sign with the crescent moon and the man ‘armed to the teeth’, among others, are motifs that also feature in Bruegel’s repertoire. There are parallels too with the fake operations dating from around 1570/80 featuring the legendary ‘Baker of Eeklo’, who supposedly cut off his patients’ heads and then ‘rebaked’ them in an oven. The baker’s assistant placed a cabbage on their necks while they waited for their ‘new’ heads. One of the paintings depicting this ‘baker of heads’ uses the same elements as The Dean of Renaix, including the woman peeping in from behind the door/curtain and the large certificate next to the doorway (fig. 2). All this suggests that there were studios, most likely in Antwerp, in which works of this kind were produced on a large scale, based on the same models in each case, reflecting a renewed spike in demand for Boschian scenes in the period in question. The Dean of Renaix could therefore have been based on either as a phantom copy or a lost prototype by Bruegel himself.

The prints appear at any rate to have been produced after the paintings: the scene depicted here is reversed and the date 1557 is engraved on the copper plate. Unfortunately, both composition and execution have lost some of their power, while several noteworthy adjustments have been made to the content. The monks were turned into peasants and a banderole was added with the words THVIS VA NERI. This text has been variously interpreted as huis van Nemesis (‘house of Nemesis’, protectress of order and regularity in the universe), huis van naerhuyt (‘house of malice’) and huis van nering (‘guild house’). A secure explanation of the banderole inscription has yet to be found, therefore. The title Dean of Renaix, by contrast, comes from an annotation by the anti-Catholic agitator Paulus de Kempenaer (1544/64–1618). In 1591 he took his personal copy of the print and wrote in the hem of the robe ‘den deken van / Ronse in Vlae[n]dere(n)’ (the Dean of Renaix in Flanders; see fig. 3). This can be interpreted in two ways, whether or not complementary. On the one hand, it identifies the untrustworthy and duplicitous quack as the notorious inquisitor Pieter Titelmans (1501–1572), who was dean of Renaix (Ronse) until 1554. And on the other, it refers to the veneration of Saint Hermes, who was evoked in the town as a protector against insanity. Coincidentally or otherwise, de Kempenaer collaborated in 1615 with Jan Tiel, publisher of the print Cont mannen en vrouwen alle bey en laet u snyden vande key (Come men and women all, and have the stone cut out; after 1616). Not only does Tiel’s engraving feature the same motifs as The Dean of Renaix – they are located in precisely the same positions on the sheet – they are located in precisely the same positions on the sheet. [ww]
Afterlife of a success story

See Bax for a clear analysis of the various allusions. Van Gils inferred a range of proverbs in the print referring to theft, gluttony, debauchery, folly and alcohol abuse. Meige, by contrast, preferred a literal explanation for some of the elements. De Brouwere followed Van Gils’s example, while also (wrongly) detecting the depiction of the Seven Deadly Sins. More recently, Richardson made a somewhat forced attempt to interpret the round shape of the hat near the owl as the ‘owl mirror’ motif.


Pieter Bruegel the Elder (after), The Stone Operation, c. 1557, oil on panel, 72 × 104 cm. Whereabouts unknown.

Pieter Bruegel the Elder (probably after), The Stone Operation, 1556 or later, oil on panel, 72 × 104 cm, London, Sotheby’s, 9 May 1973, lot 104 as ‘P. Breughel’ (fig. 2); Marten van Cleve (circle of), The Stone Operation, 1556, oil on panel, 73 × 105 cm, London, Sotheby’s, 10 December 2009, lot 105. Piero Bianconi mentions a further painting in the Molken collection (Paris, 1907), which also features the apocryphal signature (Bianconi 1968, no. 16).

For example, The Ass at School (1557, cat. no. 15) and Pieter Bruegel the Elder, Flemish Proverbs, 1559, oil on panel, 117 × 163 cm, Berlin, Staatliche Museen zu Berlin, Gemäldegalerie, inv. no. 1720.


Wauters 2017, p. 46.

Hermens and Koppel 2012, pp. 89–90. There was a second Boschian revival within elite circles in Antwerp during the second half of the sixteenth century and the beginning of the seventeenth century.

Georges Hulin de Loo and René van Bastelaer assumed a lost prototype: see Van Bastelaer and Hulin de Loo 1907, C. 4; Van Bastelaer 1908, p. 9. This hypothesis was adopted in turn by Charles de Tolnay and E. Michel: see Bianconi 1968, no. 16. For the phantom copy, see Hans J. Van Miegroet, ‘Traces of Lost Pieter Bruegel Paintings Revealed Through Derivative Paintings, Phantom Copies, and Dealer Practices’, The Hand of the Master: Materials and Techniques of Pieter Bruegel the Elder, Symposium Kunsthistorisches Museum, 7 December 2018, Vienna. The second revival triggered a large number of forgeries to keep up with the high demand: see Hermens and Koppel 2012, pp. 87–88.

Full text: BRVEGEL INVEN 1557.

As of the second state, the monks have been turned into peasants.

By, respectively, Van Gils 1940, p. 1316; Van Bastelaer 1908, p. 59; and De Brouwere 1953, p. 266. See also Marijnissen et al. 1988, p. 389.

Daan van Heesch and Maarten Bassens recently identified his handwriting, which provides context for the underlying anti-Catholic intention: Van Heesch 2019a. See also Vandenbroeck 2015. Location of print: Universiteit Leiden, Prentenkabinet, inv. no. PK-P-121501.

Along with the annotation next to the sign: Inden / eynt / vogel / 29 Junij / 1591 / middel / borch (literally, ‘In the duck-bird, 29 June 1591’). Bax thought this was a pun, as ‘eyntvogel’ can be read as both ‘duck-bird’ and ‘end-bird’, making it a symbol of a person at the end of their reason and hence of folly: see Bax 1949, p. 73; Bax 1979 (English version), p. 93.

Louis Lebeer, however, thought that the link with Titelmans was far-fetched: see Lebeer 1969, p. 184.

Information provided by Daan van Heesch (ongoing research).

Ilsink 2009, figs 152 and 333.
[fig. 3] Anonymous, after a follower of Pieter Bruegel the Elder, *The Stone Operation or The Dean of Renaix* (detail). Leiden, Universiteit Leiden, Prentenkabinet, inv. no. PK-P-121501
Johannes Wierix and Pieter van der Heyden (?) after Pieter Bruegel the Elder

The Drunkard Pushed into the Pigsty
and the Flemish Proverbs

c. 1568, thirteen engravings

39a
Johannes Wierix after Pieter Bruegel the Elder
The Drunkard Pushed into the Pigsty
1568, engraving, 190 mm diameter
Brussels, KBR, Print Room, inv. no. S.II 31218 [II/IV]

Inscriptions
Lower left: p. Brueghel inue[n]t / martinus.petreiu. excude / IH.W. 1568
States and editions
I as described.
II Petri’s address has been removed; CJVisscher excudebat between the names of the designer and the engraver.
III Visscher’s name replaced with p. Goos.
IV three sentences in English added at the bottom: The injured women [...] but to eate.

39b
Johannes Wierix after Pieter Bruegel the Elder
The Scolding Woman and the Cackling Hen
c. 1568, engraving, 179 mm diameter
Brussels, KBR, Print Room, inv. no. F 7735 [I/I]

Inscriptions
Bottom centre: Femme qui tanse sans raison, / Ne fait guenuij a la maison.1 / IH.W.; border around circle:
Een leekende dack, / ende een rookende schouwe. Ja daer de simme aeuend heijzt sit en siet, Een craijende tinne / een kijfachtige vrouwe, Is ongheluck in huijs / ja quellinghe en verdriet.2

States and editions
Only state.

39c
Johannes Wierix after Pieter Bruegel the Elder
The Man with the Money-Bag and His Flatterers
c. 1568, engraving, 178 mm diameter
Brussels, KBR, Print Room, inv. no. S.I 7618 [I/I]

Inscriptions
Bottom centre: IH.W.; border around circle:
Die ghelt te gheuen heeft onder hooghe en slechte, En dat hij wat milt laet van sijnen schat, druijpen, Hy crijcht Offitien en comt t’ synen rechte. Want elck en weet niet hoe hem sal in ’t gat crijpen; on the giant’s back: On ne sait comme entrer on veut; / Au trou de cil qui donner pest.3

States and editions
Only state.

39d
Johannes Wierix after Pieter Bruegel the Elder
The Misanthrope Robbed by the World
1568, engraving, 178 mm diameter
Brussels, KBR, Print Room, inv. no. S.II 5714 [I/I]

Inscriptions
Lower left: IH.W.; border around circle: De sulck draecht rou= om dat de weerelt is onghetrou, Die meeste ghbruueckin minst recht en roden. Weijnich leefter nou= also hij leuen sou, Men rooft men treckt elk steeckt vol gheweijde seden; in the sky: Je porte dueuil voijant le monde, / Qui en tant de fraudes abonde.4

States and editions
Only state.

Related painting: The Misanthrope, 1568, tempera on canvas, 86 × 85 cm, 20 cm diameter, Naples, Museo Nazionale di Capodimonte, inv. no. q16

39e
Johannes Wierix after Pieter Bruegel the Elder
A Pedlar Sells Worthless Rubbish but the Customer is No Fool
1568, engraving, 180 mm diameter
Brussels, KBR, Print Room, inv. no. F. 7737 [I/I]

Inscriptions
Upper left: IH.W.; border around circle: A. Hier netten ende trompen ja oocht sochhe fluijten, Gheen beter ware men nu hier in ’t lasunt en vindt.5 B. Wech versiet o Crémere loopt elders stuijten, Daer t’ ulck noch is hoorende doof en siende blindt; in the foreground: A. Voicij des rets / tro[m]pes / et flutes: Telle denree onques vous neutes.6 / B. Va ten merrier va ten dicy: Veu ailleurs te denree aussic.7

States and editions
Only state.

39f
Johannes Wierix after Pieter Bruegel the Elder
The Rich Man Playing Violin on a Jawbone
1568, engraving, 178 mm diameter
Brussels, KBR, Print Room, inv. no. S.II 5715 [I/I]

Inscriptions
Lower left: IH.W.; border around circle: Tis goet Ontfangher sijn / inden Crijch principael, Hij vult den Aessack / en men laudeert sijn sake, Al is sijn gagie groot noch weet hij zijn w[er]blijd. Hij bouit hem heerlijk en speelt op die kake; on the jawbone: Qui de receuoir a moijen, / Sur la machoire il issue bien.8

States and editions
Only state.
[cat. no. 39a] The Drunkard Pushed into the Pigsty
The Scolding Woman and the Cackling Hen

[cat. no. 39b] The Scolding Woman and the Cackling Hen
39g

**Johannes Wierix after Pieter Bruegel the Elder**

**One Begs in Vain at the Door of the Deaf**

c. 1568, engraving, 178 mm diameter
Brussels, KBR, Print Room, inv. no. S.II 5716 [1/II]

**Inscriptions**

Lower right: .IH W.; border around circle: W andelt altijt in alle voorsichticheijt, Sijt ghetrou / betrout niemant / dan Godt in allen: W ant om dat den blinde dander leijt, / Sietmense beij tsamen inde gracht vallen.¹⁸

**States and editions**

Only state.

**Related painting:** The Parable of the Blind Leading the Blind, 1568, tempera on canvas, 86 x 156 cm, Naples, Museo Nazionale di Capodimonte, inv. no. 84-490

39i

**Pieter van der Heyden (?) after Pieter Bruegel the Elder**

**The Blind Leading the Blind**

(Matthew 15:14)

c. 1568, engraving, 177 mm diameter
Brussels, KBR, Print Room, inv. no. S.II 51835 [1/1]

**Inscriptions**

Border around circle: Wie met bedroch zijn craem stoffeert, En also meijnt te ghewinnen rijckdom groot: Voorwaer hij ten lesten met pouer logeert, Bij de bruijt sittende crant zijn boot.²²

**States and editions**

Only state.

**Related painting:** The Parable of the Blind Leading the Blind, 1568, tempera on canvas, 86 x 156 cm, Naples, Museo Nazionale di Capodimonte, inv. no. 84-490

39l

**Pieter van der Heyden (?) after Pieter Bruegel the Elder**

**The Hay Runs After the Horse**

c. 1568, engraving, 177 mm diameter
Liège, Université de Liège — Galerie Wittert, inv. no. 29455 [1/1]

**Inscriptions**

Border around circle: Daer t’hoij den peerde nae loopt is verkeert waert gheschiet, Merckt ghij dochters die selv aensoekt soo ombeschmaet: De Jongmans te vrijen tuwer eeren niet, Maer als t’peert / t’hoij / soeckt / uwer eeren betaemt.²¹

**States and editions**

Only state.

**Literature**


39k

**Pieter van der Heyden (?) after Pieter Bruegel the Elder**

**The Carefree Peddlar**

c. 1568, engraving, 177 mm diameter
Liège, Université de Liège — Galerie Wittert, inv. no. 10059 [1/1]

**Inscriptions**

Border around circle: Vrienden sijt sober, maer maeckt ghoede chier, Al vallet my suer ghebeden denct int ronde: Isser gheenen wijn daer sal wesen ghoet bier, En dat suckx ook goet is voor de ghesonde.¹⁵

**States and editions**

Only state.

39h

**Johannes Wierix after Pieter Bruegel the Elder**

**An Archer Wasting His Arrows**

c. 1568, engraving, 179 mm diameter
Brussels, KBR, Print Room, inv. no. S.II 5715 [1/1]

**Inscriptions**

On the wall, below the bolt in the crossbow: .IH W.; border around circle: Ja datmen veel gheeft en men siet hulp noch bate, Ten is gheen wonder dat dit meest elk verdriet, W aer toe ist nut men hout gheen oorden noch mate, Dan datmen den een [streep boven de ee] pijl naden anderen schiet.²⁷ in the foreground: Qui souvent donne et n’en a ioije, L’une fleche apres l’autre il ennuië.²⁷

**States and editions**

Only state.

39j

**Pieter van der Heyden (?) after Pieter Bruegel the Elder**

**A Fool Hatches a Big Egg**

c. 1568, engraving, 177 mm diameter
Liège, Université de Liège — Galerie Wittert, inv. no. 29453 [1/1]

**Inscriptions**

Border around circle: Foeij v verbuijckte dronckaerts sot, Altijt leckt en suijpt vol tot den croppe: Op u vuijl eij vindende als een marot, Ten lesten inden ijdelen doppe.²⁶

**States and editions**

Only state.

39m

**Pieter van der Heyden (?) after Pieter Bruegel the Elder**

**The Egotist Who Warms Himself by a Burning House**

c. 1568, engraving, 177 mm diameter
Liège, Université de Liège — Galerie Wittert, inv. no. 29451 [1/1]

**Inscriptions**

Border around circle: De sulck eijghenbaetghierich met onuerstant, Soeckt elcks bederffenis / sonder onterfem, Hem en ruchs wiens huisj date brant, Als hy hem mach by de colen wueren.²⁵

**States and editions**

Only state.

**Literature**

[cat. no. 39d] The Misanthrope Robbed by the World
The Rich Man Playing Violin on a Jawbone
[cat. no. 39f] A Pedlar Sells Worthless Rubbish but the Customer is No Fool
Proverbs and sayings had long been turned into visual images, but the phenomenon reached a peak of popularity in the sixteenth century. This heightened interest partially reflected the success of Erasmus’ *Adagia* (1500), with its literary examination of over eight hundred Greek and Latin adages from antiquity and the Bible. Publications such as *Seer schoone spreekwoorden [...]* (‘Very Fine Proverbs’, 1549) by Hans de Laet and *Les proverbes anciens flamengs et francois [...]* (1568) by François Goedthals provided that same knowledge in the vernacular, which is sure to have kindled further enthusiasm. Although these books were seized on primarily by authors, they proved equally useful for painters wishing to give visual form to proverbs in their work. They were an especially rewarding source for satirical and genre scenes. Frans Hogenberg from Mechelen, for example, is likely to have consulted a book of this kind when designing his 1558 etching *The Blue Cloak*. In a single composition, he combined forty-three sayings on the subject of human folly, complete with captions, to create an entertaining visual puzzle.

When it came to proverbs, however, no one surpassed Bruegel. It is very likely that he drew inspiration from Hogenberg, yet in his painting of *Flemish Proverbs*, Bruegel took the visualization of popular sayings to an unprecedented level. In a highly innovative manner, the famous panel groups as many as a hundred proverbs and sayings on the subject of human failings in, as it were, a single encyclopaedic framework. The bustling village scene – also known as *The Blue Cloak* – dates from 1559, making it one of his earliest paintings.

Before creating this proverbial landscape, however, Bruegel had already produced numerous compositions featuring similar examples of folk wisdom and foolish human behaviour. For instance, one year earlier, in 1558, he painted *Twelve Flemish Proverbs* – twelve plates decorated with foolish characters. The tondos in question are now mounted on a panel, but they once treated diners to comical conversation-starters and entertainment. A small, round painting with *The Drunkard Pushed into the Pigsty*, which Bruegel had done earlier in 1557 to poke fun at overindulgence, was rediscovered recently. The panel shows an angry crowd despatching the inebriate into his new quarters for the night, in the hope that the pigs’ company will sober him up and calm him down.

A wider audience soon had the opportunity to laugh at the drunken fool who has hoisted himself onto an egg. The emblematic with the pigs too, as the publisher Maarten Peeters offered the image as a print in 1568. The engraver Johannes Wierix cut the copper plate with the inscription: ‘P. Brueghel in[n]l’. *Flemish Proverbs*, a series of twelve round engravings, might also have been published shortly afterwards. Like the print with the drunken man, these use satirical sayings to reprimand misbehaviour in an imaginative way. Seven prints in the series once again feature Wierix’s signature. The five other, non-monogrammed engravings are often attributed to Pieter van der Heyden. The texts accompanying the tondos criticize human behaviour in a moralizing and enigmatic tone. The themes of the sayings vary. Puzzle-like images, such as *A Fool Hatches a Big Egg* (cat. no. 39j) and *The Man with the Money-Bag and His Flatterers* (cat. no. 39c) will have amused viewers primarily through their mockery of quacks and their gullible victims. Moralizing prints like *The Egotist Who Warms Himself by a Burning House* (cat. no. 39m) and *An Archer Wasting His Arrows* (cat. no. 39h), meanwhile, condemn laughter at other people’s misfortune and the futility of such behaviour. Then there is the commentary on gender relations, as in *The Scolding Woman and the Cackling Hen* (cat. no. 39b), where the moral concerns the misery caused by a shrewish woman and her position in the household.

Bruegel’s name features clearly in the engraving of *The Drunkard*, but the attribution is somewhat problematic in the case of the *Flemish Proverbs*. Some doubt remains as to whether Bruegel was involved in the creative process. The lack of signatures and preliminary drawings makes formal attribution difficult. All the same, there are grounds for accepting Bruegel’s artistic involvement in the *Flemish Proverbs*, when looking at the paintings of the *Twelve Flemish Proverbs*, which swiftly found their way into the medium of print. Besides *The Drunkard Pushed into the Pigsty*, the artist painted *The Misanthrope* and *The Parable of the Blind Leading the Blind*, the compositions of which correspond faithfully to similar images in the *Flemish Proverbs* (cat. nos. 39d and 39i). Both of these paintings date from 1568 and are very likely to have been completed by Bruegel before the corresponding compositions appeared in print.

In his proverbial compositions in paint and also in print, the artist was responding to a popular trend in his period. It did not take long, therefore, for copies to appear. Bruegel’s sons, Jan and Pieter, copied their father’s images of proverbs and sayings on an especially large scale, but other followers took inspiration from them too. One anonymous master, for instance, showed his immense admiration for *A Fool Hatches a Big Egg* (cat. no. 39j) by making a faithful study of it. His drawn copy dates from 1569 and is signed ‘P. Brugel’. Perhaps the somewhat dyslexic printmaker intended to refer in this way to the original designer of the print with the drunken fool who has hoisted himself onto an egg. The emblematic qualities of the *Flemish Proverbs* also
inspired Johann Theodor de Bry to make several copies of the series to publish in his Emblemata Saecularia in 1596. The many copies of images with comical and moralizing proverbs in both painting and printmaking highlight the sixteenth-century fascination with this popular phenomenon, which Bruegel had clearly studied. [AK]

1 'A woman who scolds without reason / Causes nothing but trouble in the house.'
2 'A leaking roof, / and a smoky fireplace, / Yes, where the ape sits at the hearth and looks, A crowing hen, a nagging wife, / Is misfortune at home, yes torments and sorrow.'
3 'Whoever has money to give to high and low, / And that he liberally lets drop from his treasure, He receives offices and comes into his rights, / Because not everyone knows how he shall crawl into the hole.'
4 'One does not know how he wants to enter / The hole of he who can give.'
5 'He wears a sackcloth because the world is unfaithful, / Most people act without right nor reason, Few now live as one should live, / One robs, one grabs, everyone is full of feigned morals.'
6 'I wear mourning, seeing the world / That abounds in so many frauds.'
7 'It is good to be the recipient of money due to a big war, / He fills his purse and one praises his business, Even if his pay is great, he knows his story, / He behaves unfaithful but still plays on the jawbone.'
8 'He who has means to receive / Plays well on a jawbone.'
9 A: 'Here are nets and trumpets, yes and fine flutes, / No better goods may be found in all the land.'
10 B: 'Get you away pedlar, praise your wares elsewhere, / Where people are deaf of hearing and blind of sight.'
11 A: 'Here are nets, trumpets, and flutes, Such goods you have never had.'
12 B: 'Go away, pedlar, go away from here; And sell your goods somewhere else.'
13 'Whatever I knock or beg, it is at a deaf man's door, / Our rations are poor, our cows are wearing out, Alas we have already eaten the best, / Thus I myself wish soon to abandon the beggar's sack.'
14 'Now we are begging in vain / Since we shout at the door of a deaf man.'
15 'Be sober, friends, but cut a dash / Although it's hard on me to go begging / If there's no wine, there'll be good beer / And that's good for the health too.'
16 'Yes, one gives much and sees neither help nor profit, / It is no wonder that this sorrows most everyone, what is the use men keep neither order nor measure, / But instead they shoot one arrow after the other.'
17 'He who gives often and without joy / Is sending one arrow after the other.'
18 'Travel always with caution, / Be true, trust nobody other than God in everything; Because when one blind man another leads, / One sees that they fall together in the ditch.'
19 'Fie, you excessive drunkard's fool, / Always liquored and sousted full to the head: Finding you on your filthy egg like a fool's bauble, / Finally ending in the empty eggshell.'
20 'Whoever stocks his booth with deceit, / And thus intends to attain great wealth: Verily he in the end lodges with the poor, / Sitting beside the bride, scratching his head.'
21 'Where the hay runs after the horse, it happens improperly, / Pay heed, you daughters, who woo so shamelessly:/ To court young men is not to your honour, But if the horse seeks the hay, [it is] to your honour beseeming.'
22 'One desirous of serving himself, with ignorance, / Seeks everybody's ruin without pity, He [is without] regard for whose house it is that burns, / So long as he can warm himself by the embers.'
23 Pieter Bruegel the Elder, Flemish Proverbs, 1559, oil on panel, 117 × 163 cm, Berlin, Staatliche Museen zu Berlin, Gemäldegalerie, inv. no. 1720.
24 The plates now belong to Museum Mayer van den Bergh in Antwerp. The texts of the proverbs were added to the images at a later date. Twelve Flemish Proverbs, oil on panel, 74.5 × 98.4 cm, Antwerp, Museum Mayer van den Bergh, inv. no. 339.
25 The painting The Misanthrope (with a verse at the bottom of the image) and The Parable of the Blind Leading the Blind (with no accompanying text) are in the Museo Nazionale di Capodimonte in Naples.
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