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One of the most beloved of Netherlandish artists, Pieter Bruegel the Elder is best known today for his paintings of peasants and proverbs. He is now less commonly recognized as the inventive and influential draftsman who brought a new naturalism to the rendering of landscape and who created a body of print designs that pointedly dissect the imperfections of human nature. Yet it was above all through this exceptional graphic work that Bruegel's art achieved widespread fame during the sixteenth century. Bruegel's accepted drawings are relatively few in number, and thus our exhibition would not be possible without the generous participation of both private collectors and public institutions willing to part with their very rare possessions. We are, therefore, most grateful to these lenders. A particular note of appreciation must be extended to the three museums with the largest holdings of Bruegel's drawings, the Staatliche Museen zu Berlin, Kupferstichkabinett; The British Museum in London; and the Graphische Sammlung Albertina in Vienna, whose directors and curators made the exceptional gesture of lending all their drawings by Bruegel for this occasion.

The exhibition was organized by Nadine M. Orenstein, Associate Curator in the Department of Drawings and Prints at the Metropolitan Museum, and Manfred Sellink, Director of the Stedelijk Museum Brugge and formerly Chief Curator of Drawings and Prints in the Museum Boijmans Van Beuningen. We are indeed grateful to Manfred Sellink, who had considered holding an exhibition of Bruegel's drawings and prints some time before a collaboration with the Metropolitan Museum was envisioned. Our thanks are also extended to all of our colleagues at the Museum Boijmans Van Beuningen who helped to organize the exhibition as well as to the members of the staff of the Metropolitan Museum who have contributed their efforts toward coordinating the show and producing the catalogue.

The Museum extends its sincere thanks to The Andrew W. Mellon Foundation for its support of the exhibition. We are also indebted to the generosity of Karen B. Cohen and The Drue E. Heinz Fund for making this publication possible.
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Director
The Metropolitan Museum of Art
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Note to the Reader

The catalogue entries are arranged by artist in the following order: Pieter Bruegel the Elder; uncertain attributions to Pieter Bruegel the Elder; Master of the Mountain Landscapes; Jacob Savery; Roelandt Savery; and Master of the Small Landscapes. Bruegel's work appears in chronological order. The prints after Bruegel's drawings are paired with the corresponding design when one exists. Such pairs are ordered according to the date of the drawing.

Dimensions are given with height preceding width. Paper is white unless otherwise indicated. The translations of the inscriptions on the prints are taken from Tokyo 1989 unless otherwise stated. Watermarks have not been recorded consistently but are included if they were accessible to the authors or have been published previously.

The literature section of each entry includes only references to the major oeuvre catalogues and texts that specifically discuss the work in question. Attributions made by previous scholars, listed in parentheses, are given only if they differ from those of the authors of the present catalogue.

Citations are abbreviated in the literature sections of the entries and in the notes. Full references are provided in the bibliography, which includes references not cited in the text.
Pieter Bruegel the Elder

Drawings and Prints
The Elusive Life of Pieter Bruegel the Elder

NADINE M. ORENSTEIN

Who was Pieter Bruegel the Elder? An engraved portrait of him published about three years after his death (fig. 1) is our best surviving record of his appearance. But this stiff profile view reveals little; he does not even hold a paintbrush or palette, traditional symbols of the painter’s craft. Biographers since the sixteenth century have sought to describe the life of this Netherlandish artist whose works so captivate us but whose own story is still largely a mystery. Bruegel himself seems as elusive as his Beekeepers (cat. no. 107): men with palpable presence, whose identities we cannot penetrate, for their encased heads and covered bodies offer few clues to who they are, where they have come from, or what they are thinking. Like them Bruegel remains an intangible figure, although his remarkable paintings and drawings leave us with enduring impressions.

While such panels as The Wedding Banquet, ca. 1567 (fig. 2), and The Harvesters, 1565 (fig. 3), present the viewer with vivid images of peasant life, we know that their creator was not the “Peasant Bruegel” that so many of his early biographers imagined him to be but rather a city dweller who associated with the learned intellectuals of his day. However, during the past four and a half centuries, little more than these meager facts have been revealed about Bruegel’s background, and there is even less information about his beliefs and opinions. As a result, we can in the main only make educated guesses about what ideas he might have intended to convey in his extraordinary paintings of peasants and in the landscapes and allegorical print designs featured in the present catalogue.

Tracing Bruegel’s biography is problematic because documentary evidence relating to his life is exceptionally sparse. Indeed, we can track the history of his paintings over the last four and a half centuries more easily than we can reconstruct his life. Archival records provide us only with glimpses of disparate moments—his inscription into the artists’ guild, a painting commission, his marriage. We can extrapolate information from these glimpses and piece them together with other contemporary evidence and with what we know about the period in which he lived, his family, and his friends. The two-and-a-half-page biography published by Karel van Mander in his Schilder-boeck of 1604 has served as an important source for details about

Fig. 1. Attributed to Johannes Wierix. Portrait of Pieter Bruegel the Elder. Engraving from Dominicus Lampsonius, Pictorum aliquot celebrium Germaniae Inferiores effigies, 1573

Detail, cat. no. 107. The Beekeepers
Fig. 2. Pieter Bruegel the Elder. *The Wedding Banquet*, ca. 1567. Oil on panel. Kunsthistorisches Museum, Vienna

Fig. 3. Pieter Bruegel the Elder. *The Harvesters*, 1565. Oil on panel. The Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York, Rogers Fund, 1919 19.164
Bruegel’s life, but it cannot be taken entirely at face value, while the author must have based his account partly on information from people who knew Bruegel, his narrative is interwoven with the sort of topoi and invented anecdotes meant to clarify the painter’s work that were standard features of artists’ biographies of the time. Van Mander asserts, for instance, that Bruegel and his friend Hans Franckert went to country fairs and weddings dressed like peasants and gave “presents just like the others, pretending to be family or acquaintances of the bride or bridegroom.” Bruegel may well have been friends with Franckert, a merchant and jeweler in Antwerp, but the rest of the story seems likely to be a fantasy inspired by the imagery in the artist’s depictions of peasant festivities, several of which the author had seen in local Amsterdam private collections.

It is usual to begin a biography with the date and place of its subject’s birth, but here this cannot be done, for in Bruegel’s case both of these facts are open to question. The main source of evidence for his birth date is one of the earliest documents we have relating to Bruegel: the record of his inscription into the Antwerp artists’ guild, the guild of Saint Luke. This document, which reads Peeter Brueghels, schilder (Peeter Brueghels, painter), is dated 1551. And because artists normally joined the guild between the ages of twenty-one and twenty-five, most scholars calculate that Bruegel was born sometime between 1525 and 1530. The place of Bruegel’s birth has been a matter of even more speculation. It is possible that he was born in either of two towns named Breughel or Brogel—one in the Northern Netherlands the other in the Southern Netherlands. According to Van Mander, he came from a village called Bruegel, not far from Breda, but the place described in this way could be the northern or the southern town. One theory, based on the form of the artist’s name as it appears in the register of the guild of Saint Luke—which is Brueghels—points in an altogether different direction. Proponents of this view believe that because the final s in a name often indicated a patronymic, it may well be that he did not come from a town called Bruegel but rather that he was the son of a man named Brueghel.

Not much is known about Bruegel’s early training. Van Mander writes that he studied in Brussels with Pieter Coecke van Aelst, who was one of the most important painters in the Netherlands during the early sixteenth century and whose daughter we know he eventually married. It is difficult to confirm Van Mander’s statement, although details of Bruegel’s life do coincide with aspects of the history of Coecke or rather that of Coecke’s wife, the watercolorist Mayken Verhulst. As has often been noted, Bruegel’s work bears little resemblance to Coecke’s, which is marked by friezelike compositions as well as ornamentation and muscular figures that both show Italian influence. Indeed, Bruegel’s art, with its expansive, naturalistic landscapes, distinctly Flemish scenes, and stocky peasants, can be viewed as having developed in reaction to the production of Coecke and the artists of his generation. Nevertheless, it may be that Bruegel was Coecke’s pupil, absorbing from him certain general compositional principles and an appreciation for Italian art rather than a legacy of specific stylistic formulas.

We have concrete evidence that in 1550 and 1551 Bruegel was in Mechelen, where he was in the employ of the artist and art dealer Claude Dorizi, painting the outer wings of an altarpiece for the glove makers’ guild in the cathedral of Saint Rombout. The records for this altarpiece, Bruegel’s earliest documented work, show that Peeter Baltens carried out the main panel and that the outer wings were to represent Saint Gommaire and Saint Rombout in grisaille. The date of Bruegel’s work in Mechelen accords well with the theory that he studied with Coecke, who died in 1550; it is reasonable to suppose that the death of Coecke, if he had been Bruegel’s master, would have prompted his pupil’s move from Antwerp at this moment. Moreover, Coecke’s wife was originally from Mechelen, and it may have been through her that Bruegel came into contact with Dorizi. It was soon after he finished work on the altarpiece, which unfortunately no longer exists, that Bruegel joined the guild of Saint Luke. Not long after that he began a journey to France and then to Italy, which Van Mander describes.

There is only scant proof that Bruegel traveled in France, whereas Van Mander’s account of the artist’s stay in Italy between 1552 and 1554 is complemented and supported by both documentary evidence and works by the artist. (This is the first of very few instances in which that author’s assertions about Bruegel are confirmed by tangible proof.) Bruegel probably traveled to Italy via Lyons, making his way south to Sicily and then turning back north toward Rome, where he remained for some time. It has often been proposed that he went to Italy in the company of two
Antwerp artists, the painter and prolific print designer Maarten de Vos and the sculptor Jacob Jongelinck, both of whom have been documented as present in Italy in 1552. A few surviving works can be associated with this period in Bruegel’s life. One of these is the drawing *Southern Cloister in a Valley* (cat. no. 1), which is dated 1552 and depicts an Italian landscape that was probably sketched on site. His print *Navel Battle in the Strait of Messina* (cat. no. 85), although dated 1561, must have been based on sketches made on site as well and indicates that he traveled as far south as Sicily. Two other sheets attest to Bruegel’s stay in Rome: the drawing *Ripa Grande in Rome*, ca. 1552–54 (cat. no. 8), and the engraving *Prospectus Tyburninu* (View of Tivoli), ca. 1555–56 (cat. no. 24).

That the Roman sojourn probably took place about 1553 is suggested by two etchings published near the end of the sixteenth century that purport to reproduce drawings Bruegel made in Rome and are inscribed *Petrus Bruegel fecit Romae A 1553* (made by Pieter Bruegel in Rome in the year 1553) (see fig. 4). Moreover, it is likely that in 1553 Bruegel met and collaborated with the Croatian miniaturist Giulio Clovio, who returned to Rome in that year after a two-year absence from the city. Their acquaintance and work together are attested by Clovio’s estate inventory of 1577 recording five works, now lost, that Bruegel would have made during his trip. These include a *Tower of Babel* painted on ivory, a gouache view of Lyons—which testifies to the truth of Van Mander’s statement that Bruegel traveled
in France on his way to Italy—and a gouache of a tree. The most intriguing of them, however, is a miniature, of which half was painted by Clovio and half by Bruegel. Although scholars have not succeeded in identifying Bruegel’s hand in any of Clovio’s works, we can surmise that it is this miniaturist’s influence we see in such paintings by Bruegel as The Tower of Babel (fig. 5), which teems with minute figures.

When he went back to the Netherlands, probably by 1554 and presumably settling in Antwerp, Bruegel began to work for the Antwerp print publisher Hieronymus Cock. That year he drew the Landscape with Bears (cat. no. 15), which Cock elaborated and etched as The Temptation of Christ (cat. no. 16), and in 1555–56 he made the designs for The Large Landscapes group of prints (cat. nos. 22–34). These works marked the beginning of Bruegel’s most prolific period of activity as a designer of prints, which lasted until 1561. During this time he carried out more than forty drawings for prints, including The Seven Deadly Sins series, 1556–57 (cat. nos. 42–54), Everyman, 1558 (cat. nos. 58, 59), The Alchemist, 1558? (cat. nos. 60, 61), and The Seven Virtues sequence, 1559–60 (cat. nos. 64–77). We must remember that these engravings and etchings not only were fascinating projects for Bruegel but also offered him a steady source of income at a time when he seems to have had few major painting commissions. Indeed, only a handful of his surviving paintings bear a date earlier than 1562: The Parable of the Sower, 1557 (Timken Museum of Art, San Diego), The Netherlandish Proverbs, 1559 (Staatliche Museen zu Berlin, Gemäldegalerie), The Battle between Carnival and Lent, 1559 (fig. 6), and The Children’s Games, 1560 (Kunsthistorisches Museum, Vienna). From about 1562, however, his commissions for paintings became more numerous, and his production as a designer of prints declined dramatically. Yet his few late drawings for prints are no less significant than the many early ones, for among them are Spring, 1565 (cat. no. 105), and Summer, 1568 (cat. no. 109), as well as the two woodcut designs The Wild Man or The Masquerade of Orson and Valentine, 1566 (cat. no. 108), and The Dirty Bride or The Wedding of Mopsus and Nisa, 1569 (cat. no. 111).

Bruegel’s painting Two Monkeys (Staatliche Museen zu Berlin, Gemäldegalerie) offers a background view of Antwerp, which has been considered an indication that the artist was still living in that city in 1562, the date borne on the panel. He was certainly in Brussels in 1563, marrying Mayken, Coecke’s daughter. According to Van Mander, about the time of the marriage, Mayken’s mother convinced Bruegel to move from Antwerp to Brussels in order to distance him from a former girlfriend. The veracity of this story will likely never be confirmed, but it seems clear that by the time of his wedding, Bruegel was in Brussels, the city where he had at least one significant patron and ultimately was buried.

While Antwerp was the prosperous commercial center of the Netherlands, Brussels was the seat of the government,
and it may be that Bruegel moved there seeking court commissions. This is conjecture, but we know for certain that he became increasingly active as a painter beginning in 1562. In fact, most of his forty or so surviving paintings date to the last seven years of his life—the period that saw the creation of such important works as *The Fall of the Rebel Angels*, 1562 (Musées Royaux des Beaux-Arts de Belgique, Brussels), *Dulle Griet*, 1562 or 1563 (Museum Mayer van den Bergh, Antwerp), *The Wedding Dance*, 1566 (fig. 104), and *The Sermon of Saint John the Baptist*, 1566 (Szépművészeti Múzeum, Budapest).

The great majority of these paintings are large panels, cabinet pieces that Bruegel produced for wealthy, well-educated private collectors in Antwerp and Brussels. Among Bruegel’s most notable and devoted patrons can be counted Cardinal Antoine Perrenot de Granvelle, archbishop of Mechelen and counselor to Margaret, duchess of Parma and regent of the Netherlands. Granvelle owned several of Bruegel’s pictures, but we can identify only one, the *Flight into Egypt*, 1563 (Courtauld Institute Galleries, London). The prominent Antwerp merchant and royal official Nicolaes Jongelinck was the most avid contemporary collector of Bruegel’s work. He owned sixteen of his pictures, including the *Tower of Babel*, 1563 (Kunsthistorisches Museum, Vienna), and the *Road to Calvary (The Carrying of the Cross)*, 1564 (Kunsthistorisches Museum,
Vienna), as well as the great series The Months, 1565, which appears to have decorated a single room in his country villa, Ter Becken. How Bruegel might have come into contact with such wealthy and powerful patrons is unclear. Granvelle he may have met through his presumed traveling companion in Italy Jacob Jongelinck, who was one of the archbishop’s favorite artists—or the link here was perhaps Cock, who dedicated several prints to Granvelle. And he could well have been introduced to Nicolaes Jongelinck by Jacob, who was his brother. We know that another important patron was Bruegel’s friend: the renowned cartographer Abraham Ortelius, who owned the grisaille Death of the Virgin, 1564 (fig. 109; see entry for cat. no. 117).

In 1567, two years before Bruegel’s death, the duke of Alva arrived in Brussels. From there he unleashed a reign of terror, the culmination of campaigns of oppression and censorship that had been waged for many years by the Inquisition and the Catholic Spanish governors of the Netherlands against Protestants and others they deemed heretics and subversives. Bruegel’s production from his last years, such as the paintings The Blind Leading the Blind, 1568 (Capodimonte, Naples), and The Magpie on the Gallows, 1568 (fig. 7), are pervaded by a tone of sorrow and bitterness that seems to reflect the artist’s feelings about contemporary events. Specific details and themes treated in many of the works of these years offer tantalizing clues to these feelings. Thus the magpie in The Magpie on the Gallows, Van Mander tells us, refers to gossiping tongues that Bruegel consigned to the gallows—and we wonder if the gossip might stand for informers. Ambiguous too, for example, are the many knives featured in the drawing and the print Summer, 1568, which seem not to relate merely to the theme of the harvest but to something more ominous as well.

While it is difficult to imagine that Bruegel was unmoved by the climate of terror that surrounded him, we cannot say what he thought about it. Unfortunately, there is no information about his religious or political beliefs, and his imagery, although suggestive, is too enigmatic to give us any clear evidence of his intended meanings. We can examine what we know about Bruegel’s circle of friends, acquaintances, and patrons for what this might tell us about him, but this exercise yields no real answers. His friend Ortelius, for example, belonged to a clandestine religious sect, the Family of Love, that rejected all ceremony and hierarchy, but there is no proof that Bruegel was also a member. Moreover, the faith of the Family of Love stood in radical opposition to the ideologies of Bruegel’s major patrons. Cardinal Granvelle was an envoy of the Spanish court who took a harsh stand against heretics, and Nicolaes Jongelinck was a staunch Catholic. Perhaps it is reasonable to propose, as one scholar has done, that Bruegel did not side with one particular group but that his sympathy and allegiance shifted over time. Yet the conclusion to Van Mander’s biography of the artist encourages us to think that Bruegel had strong, even subversive, opinions: “One sees many unusual inventions of symbolic subjects of his witty work in print; but he had still many more, neatly and carefully drawn with some captions on them, some of which he got his wife to burn when he was on his deathbed because they were too caustic or derisory, either because he was sorry or that he was afraid that on their account she would get into trouble or she might have to answer for them.”

What might these drawings have been like, if they did indeed exist? Were there many with the sort of captions that Van Mander mentioned and did they resemble The Beekeepers, with its handwritten inscription? Were many destroyed, and, if so, is this the reason so few survive from this period? As with so many aspects of Bruegel’s life, we can only wonder.

Pieter Bruegel died in Brussels in 1569; we know this from a memorial erected many years later by his son the painter Jan Brueghel in honor of his parents in the church of Notre-Dame de la Chapelle in Brussels. Bruegel’s wife, Mayken, outlived him by nine years. Jan, the younger of Bruegel’s two sons, and Pieter the Younger, the older child, were about one and five years old, respectively, when their father died. They must hardly have known him, but even so both eventually became successful painters in their own right. Pieter the Younger, in fact, ran a prolific workshop that produced variations on his father’s compositions.

Although Bruegel’s story for the most part remains a mystery, we can state with confidence that he achieved some fame during his lifetime and that this fame grew exponentially soon after his death. Not long after he died, his paintings were eagerly sought after and had become quite costly. Cardinal Granvelle, who had been forced out
of the Netherlands in 1564 and had left his collection behind, tried to replace his Bruegels in 1572 and found this to be a difficult and expensive undertaking. By the end of the century Rudolf II, the Holy Roman Emperor in Prague, owned a large and notable group of Bruegel pictures—some of which he had inherited from his brother Archduke Ernest, who had collected them when he was governor of the Netherlands between 1593 and 1595. Bruegel became widely known through his prints, which circulated as far as France and Italy during his lifetime and were published and republished in the decades after his death. Among the Italians who saw his prints was Lodovico Guicciardini, whose description of him as the second Hieronymus Bosch in his 1567 Descrittione di . . . tutti i Paesi Bassi would have been based, at least in part, on such prints as The Seven Deadly Sins, compositions overrun by Boschian creatures. Another was Giorgio Vasari, who listed Bruegel among the noteworthy Netherlandish painters in his 1568 Le vite de’ più eccellenti pittori, scultori et architettori and also related his vision to that of Bosch. The perceptions of these Italian authors appear to have been encouraged by information sent to them by Dominicus Lampsonius when he was compiling a series of prints showing famous Netherlandish painters. In the verses that accompanied Bruegel’s portrait, the stiff engraved profile image that appears at the beginning of this essay, Lampsonius praised his compatriot:

Who is this new Hieronymus Bosch, appeared again in the world?
Who through his great artistry is able to imitate the spirited dreams of the master with his brush and pen, so as now and then even to surpass him?
May you, Pieter, grow in your spirit as you have in art, for in your and your old master’s comical genre of design you earn everywhere and from everyone the outstanding rewards of praise, by no means less than any other artist.

About the same time Lampsonius’s poem was published, Ortelius wrote a tribute in memory of his friend on a page in his Album Amicorum, which in even more lavish terms reveals the contemporary view of Bruegel: “That Pieter Bruegel was the most perfect painter of his age, no one—unless jealous or envious or ignorant of his art—could ever deny. But that he was snatched away from us in the flower of his age—I cannot say whether I should attribute it to Death, who thought Bruegel was more advanced in age when he observed the distinguished skill of his art, or whether I should attribute it to Nature who feared that she would be held up in contempt because of his artistic and talented skills at imitation.”
Perhaps the strongest testimony to Bruegel’s posthumous fame is provided by the many copies of his paintings and drawings as well as the numerous works imitating his style that were produced during the late sixteenth and early seventeenth century. Drawings such as those by Jacob Savery and the Master of the Mountain Landscapes included in this catalogue (cat. nos. 120–129) stand as proof of the admiration his art commanded; they are unequivocal evidence that his style was already identifiable soon after his death and that it quickly became a model to be emulated and sometimes even forged. We may never learn with certainty when or where Bruegel was born, or who his teachers might have been, or what precisely he intended to express in his pictures, but the strong impact of his work on later generations and the timelessness of his contribution make these gaps in our knowledge seem insignificant.

1. The portrait, which is unsigned, is now given to Johannes Wierix by Zuzanna van Royven, who is compiling the Wierix volume for the New Hollstein series. As the engraving was published in Dominicus Lampsonius’s Pictorum aliquot celebrium Germaniae Inferioris effigies, by Volckken Dietrich—the widow of Bruegel’s longtime publisher Hieronymus Cock—only a few years after Bruegel’s death, it is likely that the bearded profile bears some resemblance to the artist.

2. Glück (1910, p. 6) put an end to the idea of the Peasant Bruegel.

3. Grossmann 1977 and Gibson 1977 remain excellent basic texts on the artist’s life and art, as do Freedberg’s several essays (in Tokyo 1979) on Bruegel and his time. Marijnissen et al. 1988 transcribes all the documents relating to Bruegel and summarizes the content of the most important published works on the artist’s life.

4. All of these documents are transcribed and listed in chronological order in Marijnissen et al. 1988, pp. 11–16.


6. Van Mander must have based his text on word-of-mouth information from Gillis van Coninxloo, whose mother was the stepsister of Pieter Coecke van Aelst, who was the father of Bruegel’s wife and may have been Bruegel’s teacher; see Miedema in ibid., vol. 3, p. 325.

7. On Franckert, see ibid., p. 239.

8. Van Mander (ibid., pp. 263–64) mentions The Battle between Carnival and Lent (probably the painting now in the Kunsthistorisches Museum, Vienna) and a Peasant Wedding in the collection of Herman Pilgrims, an Amsterdam merchant, as well as a Peasants’ Fair and a Peasants’ Wedding, both of which he describes as watercolor canvases and neither of which can be traced.


10. Bedaux and Van Gool 1974 place his birth more precisely, dating it to 1527/28. For a summary of the arguments regarding Bruegel’s birth date, see Briels 1980, p. 207, n. 3.

11. See Van Bastelaer and Hulin de Loo 1907, pp. 43, 45.


13. According to Grossmann (ibid., p. 52, n. 32), A. Vorenkamp suggested in a lecture held in 1949 that it may have been Mayken who was Bruegel’s teacher.


18. There is no proof for this theory. The evidence that the three men traveled together at this time is circumstantial: many years later an Italian doctor wrote to Abraham Ortelius asking him to pass on greetings to Maarten de Vos and Pieter Bruegel, whom the doctor would most likely have met when the two artists were in Italy; see Popham 1931, p. 188. Jacob Jongelinck was the brother of Nicolaas Jongelinck, who would become Bruegel’s patron.

19. These etchings, Landscape with Mercury Abducting Psyche and Landscape with the Fall of Icarus, were attributed to Simon Novellanus by Mielle (1579, pp. 69–71). A discussion of the dating of these works to 1595 can be found in Rotterdam 1994, pp. 137–46, nos. 49–52.

20. These were listed in the inventory as "Una torre de Babilonia de avolio de mano de M° Pietro Brugole . . . Un quadro di Leon de Francia a guazzo di mano M° Pietro Brugole . . . Un quadro di un albero a guazzo di M° Pietro Brugole"; Tolnay 1935, p. 61, n. 11.

21. This was cited in the inventory as "Un quadretto di miniatura la metà fatto per mano sua l' altra di M° Pietro Brugole"; ibid., pp. 9, 61, nn. 10, 11. Based on this evidence, Tolnay (in 1965, 1978, and 1980) attributed several miniatures to Bruegel.


23. There is no concrete evidence that Bruegel lived in Antwerp while he was working for Cock; he never became a burgher of the city, and no documents that record his presence there have been found; see Van der Stock 1998, p. 276.

24. Buchanan 1990. The Months probably originally comprised six panels, five of which survive; three are in the Kunsthistorisches Museum, Vienna, one is in the Národní Galerie, Prague, and one is in The Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York.


27. Freedberg in Tokyo 1979, p. 55.


29. The memorial was inscribed OBITU ILLE ANNO MDLXIX; see Marijnissen et al. 1988, p. 12.


32. This group of paintings became the basis for the collection now in the Kunsthistorisches Museum, Vienna. On later collectors of Bruegel’s paintings, see Briels 1980, pp. 194–201.


34. Vasari 1568, pp. 858–89.

35. Lampsonius 1572, pl. 19; translated by Martin Royalton-Kisch and Antony Griffiths.

36. A. Ortelius, Album Amicorum, Pembroke College, Cambridge, fols. 12v–13r. The translation is by Freedberg (in Tokyo 1979, p. 65); see also Ortelius 1690, pp. 21–22.
Hans Mielke in memoriam

Pieter Bruegel as a Draftsman:
The Changing Image

MARTIN ROYALTON-KISCH

The epithet “Peasant Bruegel” still clings tenaciously to Pieter Bruegel the Elder. Yet he won the admiration of his contemporaries not for painting rustics but as a disciple of “nature” and of Hieronymus Bosch.

His early reputation was based primarily on his engraved designs, for which more than half of his surviving drawings are preparations. The drawings could not have given rise to the “peasant” epithet, for far from illustrating the rustic life of Flanders, almost all of them are either landscapes or fantastic allegories in the manner of Bosch. Likewise, Bruegel’s oil paintings represent religious subjects more often than the peasantry, despite the exceptional focus on it in compositions like the celebrated Wedding Banquet (fig. 2).

The first published notice of Bruegel appeared in 1567, in a book by Lodovico Guicciardini entitled Descrizione di . . . tutti i Paesi Bassi (Description of All the Low Countries). He described the artist as a “great imitator” of Bosch who had become known as the “second Hieronymus Bosch.” A year later Giorgio Vasari also paired Bruegel with Bosch and called Bruegel an “excellent master.” Vasari, although garbling the chronology of the two painters, described their works as “landscapes in oil, fantasies, bizarre things, dreams, and imaginations” and was thus the first to categorize Bruegel’s art into landscapes on the one hand and fantasies on the other.

Vasari revealed that his information came from Dominicus Lampsonius of Liège, who in 1572, three years after Bruegel’s death, published a brief tribute to Bruegel on a portrait engraving of his late friend (fig. 1). This again paired him with Bosch:

*Who is this new Hieronymus Bosch, appeared again in the world? Who through his great artistry is able to imitate the spirited dreams of the master with his brush and pen, so as now and then even to surpass him?*

May you, Pieter, grow in your spirit as you have in art, for in your and your old master’s comical genre of design you earn everywhere and from everyone the outstanding rewards of praise, by no means less than any other artist.

Two aspects of Lampsonius’s text are worth stressing. Despite heading his poem “Pieter Bruegel, Painter [Pictor],” Lampsonius highlighted Bruegel’s skill with the pen and in design (graphicus), giving an unusual emphasis to his works on paper rather than to his paintings. Lampsonius also considered Bruegel’s achievements as an artist to be of the highest order, despite the “comical genre” of his art, a genre that normally would have condemned its practitioners to the ranks of the second-rate.

At about the same time another friend, the cartographer and humanist Abraham Ortelius, wrote (without mentioning Bosch) that Bruegel was an imaginative artist who, as Pliny the Elder had said of Apelles, “painted many things that could not be painted.” Ortelius also emphasized Bruegel’s naturalism, comparing him with Eupompas, the Greek master of the fifth century B.C. “who followed nature, not other artists.” This aspect of Bruegel’s art was similarly praised by Karel van Mander in his biography of him published in 1604. But like Guicciardini, Vasari, and Lampsonius, Van Mander also described Bruegel as a Bosch imitator, revealing that, early on, “he had practiced a lot after the manner [handelinge] of Jeroen van den Bosch.”

Bruegel’s drawings reveal with particular clarity that although he initiated neither the fantastic nor the naturalistic in art, he occupies a significant place in the history of both genres. Yet just sixty-one drawings by Bruegel are known—which makes them rare, even though this is a wealth in comparison with those of earlier Flemish painters such as Jan van Eyck, Rogier van der Weyden, and Bosch. Only one drawing is generally accepted as by Van Eyck: the
**Portrait of Cardinal Albergati** now in Dresden. However, Van Eyck’s painting of Saint Barbara of 1437 takes the form of an elaborate finished drawing on a prepared panel (fig. 8), and the background landscape announces, in an extraordinary way, Bruegel’s pen drawings of more than a century later. We encounter in Bruegel the same distant hills, dotted with trees and capped by an unreal city—a Heavenly Jerusalem—with a broad river below (compare cat. nos. 9, 10, 12, 20). We also observe builders at work, cutting and transporting newly quarried stones and preparing mortar, much as Bruegel portrayed them in his two paintings of the Tower of Babel (see fig. 5). Such connections between Bruegel and fifteenth-century art will detain us again later.

Drawings ascribed to Rogier van der Weyden are also extremely rare, and only a few more are known by Bosch (see figs. 9, 34). However, the catalogue of the sixty-one drawings by Bruegel published in 1996 by Hans Mielke has so radically revised our conception of Bruegel the draftsman that we need to return to first principles. Iconography and cultural history, which have long been the chief concern of writers about Bruegel’s art, are treated at greater length elsewhere in this catalogue. Here we will concentrate on Bruegel’s drawings in the context of those by his predecessors and contemporaries, both in Flanders and in Italy.

**Bruegel in Italy: The Mastering of Landscape**

The earliest dated drawings by Bruegel are five landscapes of 1552 (fig. 10; cat. nos. 1–4). In this year, like so many Flemish artists before him, he set off from Antwerp for Italy to complete his education as a painter. Having in all probability trained with Pieter Coecke van Aelst, who died in 1550, Bruegel had worked in Mechelen (Malines) alongside Peeter Baltens (of whom more below) for the art entrepreneur
Claude Dorizi. Bruegel had enrolled in the Antwerp painters' guild for the 1551–52 "guild year." One may imagine that as a pupil of the recently deceased Coecke, a highly successful painter who had been to Italy himself and had translated into Dutch the architectural treatise of Sebastiano Serlio, Bruegel ventured south in 1552 in anticipation of studying a wide range of material and, as Vasari stated of Bruegel's compatriots, in order "to learn the Italian manner." 

Before examining the drawings that Bruegel made during his travels, we should pause to consider a characteristic design by his master (fig. 11). It has become a commonplace to state that Bruegel's works reveal no trace of Coecke's influence. Although this is largely true, Coecke did produce paintings with Bosch-like characteristics, and his well-ordered and inventive compositions would have been instructive to Bruegel. Reminiscent of the works of Giulio Romano and of the Fontainebleau school, Coecke's designs often teem with figures in complex arrangements and exaggerated postures—raw materials that emerge transformed in Bruegel's explosive fantasies. The tree to the left in The Capture of the City of Ai (fig. 11), rising in a spiral to frame the design, also reveals something of Coecke's abilities in landscape, a genre taken up by his pupil with enthusiasm.

Besides studying the ruins of ancient Rome, northern European artists visited Italy to marvel at the paintings, sculpture, and architecture that had been produced there during the previous sixty years, above all by Leonardo, Raphael, Michelangelo, and Titian. We should remember that Michelangelo and Titian were still active, the two most celebrated artists in the world, when Bruegel traveled south in 1552. Michelangelo, who had completed The Last Judgment in the Sistine Chapel more than ten years before, had recently finished the frescoes The Conversion of Saint Paul and The Crucifixion of Saint Peter in Pope Paul III's private chapel in the Vatican. However foreign to Bruegel's artistic ambitions Michelangelo's aims might appear—and Michelangelo could be dismissive of Netherlandish painting—it is unimaginable that Bruegel would have ignored the Sistine Chapel and the other sights of Rome. Indeed, the festive rustics in his paintings must partly have derived their weighty plasticity from the figures of the Italian sculptor, and these types reappear in Bruegel's late drawing of The Beekeepers (fig. 12; cat. no. 107), which quotes from The Sacrifice of Noah on the Sistine Chapel ceiling (fig. 13).

Titian had for twenty years been court painter to the Holy Roman Emperor Charles V, the most powerful sovereign in the hemisphere and, ultimately, the ruler of Flanders. Besides completing numerous portraits and historical paintings, Titian had reinvigorated the art of

Fig. 10. Pieter Bruegel the Elder. River Landscape, 1552. Pen and brown ink on blue paper. Département des Arts Graphiques du Musée du Louvre, Paris.
landscape, though he based his vision on Flemish models. Knowledge of his works had spread through prints (see fig. 14), and these influenced Bruegel, whose cotton-wool foliage in Wooded Landscape with Mills (cat. no. 3) is remarkably like that in a woodcut after Titian's Two Goats at the Foot of a Tree (fig. 79). Thus Bruegel's art, like that of most of his countrymen, was tempered by his experience of Italian art.  

Bruegel's earliest drawings reveal that he was already a consummate landscapist when he embarked on his travels, just as Dürer had been on setting out for Italy in 1494. River Landscape of 1552 (fig. 10) has been eloquently described by Mielke: “a winding, slow-moving river between gentle mountains; a boat on the left, walkers and riders on the slope masterfully incorporated into the movement of the landscape; on the right bank, a cart and two riders. The young artist portrays the most unpretentious view and yet attains the greatest heights of his art.” Mielke stresses the everyday character of the view, which lacks a dominant motif—a departure from most earlier drawings. He notes the extraordinary variety of Bruegel's touch in both this work and in Southern Cloister in a Valley (cat. no. 1), ranging from the lively calligraphy of the foreground scrub to the stenography of minuscule ticks and hooks that describe the trees near the summits of the distant mountains. River Landscape is also remarkable for its
reticence, for the broad, empty expanses of river and open sky. The detail in the trees at the center left is extraordinary, their minutely stippled outlines admitting the light, with a few longer but still brittle strokes providing shadow and mass. The anatomy of the rocky slopes is perceptible beneath their coats of vegetation, and the whole view is unified in a relentless movement, curving toward distances that our eyes strain to fathom.

Such drawings must have been executed directly from nature (in contemporary Dutch, naer het leven), and it was through such diligent study that Bruegel became equipped to conjure up from his own imagination (uit den gheest) visionary landscapes such as *Wooded Landscape with Mills* and *Landscape with Fortified City* (cat. no. 10). Both were produced during his Italian journey and are summations of his experience of nature, now transformed and distilled by his imagination, by his creative spirit—or by his ingenium, to use a term employed at the time. The large tree in *Wooded Landscape with Mills*, 1552, seems to buckle under its own weight. Rising from straggling roots, it spirals skyward like the funnel of a tornado, twisting and spreading out into arterial branches that snake across much of the page. Below, shielded by the tree’s foliage, is a more commonplace woodland scene of the type Bruegel could have known from such predecessors as Cornelis Massys (see fig. 15), or compiled from motifs extracted from his own drawings from nature: the woodland with two hunters and a dog to the left, the house and church glimpsed on either side of the main trunk, and the row of trees marching into the distance toward the right. The determined viewer will discern more rooftops to the right of the windmill and, immediately to its left, so small as to escape attention, a loaded horse-drawn wagon, a cousin of the vehicle on the right of *River Landscape*. Bruegel’s finished drawings never lack details of this sort, and they provide long and rewarding lessons in looking.

In *Landscape with Fortified City*, 1533 (cat. no. 10), Bruegel created an almost limitless urban view, encircled by seemingly unending walls. The view stretches to a distant coastline on the left, with a ship in an estuary. Among the multiplicity of churches, towers, fortresses, and rooftops nestled around the citadel in the center, a bridge with nine arches, each reflected in the water, spans the river. Yet the imposing metropolis appears threatened by its vast natural environment: the buildings peter out beyond the walls, the wind has picked up in the trees to the right, and dark clouds loom above the inhospitable mountains. The detail is extraordinary: toward the left a rider passes a gruesome gibbet; near the right foreground a church tower with a belfry and a raised choir rises above some light-struck trees; on the hill to the right of the city are two figures and some
Fig. 15. Cornelis Massys, *Landscape with a Castle*, 1541. Pen and brown ink. Staatliche Museen zu Berlin, Kupferstichkabinett

Fig. 16. Joachim Patinir. *Landscape with Cliffs*, ca. 1530–25. Pen and brown ink. Museum Boijmans Van Beuningen, Rotterdam
grazing animals represented by rectangles on stilts, an abbreviation encountered time and again in Bruegel's landscapes. Compositions like these, informed by studies of nature, are more immediate and realistic than those by Bruegel's most influential predecessors Jan van Amstel, Herri met de Bles, Cornelis Massys, and Joachim Patinir (see figs. 15, 16). \(^8\) Theirs was the tradition into which Bruegel was born and by which he was shaped, but his most tangible grasp of nature was a new development. His drawings bear out the assessment of Van Mander, who in 1604 famously stated: "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." \(^9\) These works clearly dumbfounded Bruegel's fellow artists, even in the country that prided itself on being the home of landscape. Elsewhere, Van Mander praised Bruegel as "one of the great masters who bear the palm of honor in landscape," \(^9\) in works "that look so natural... he teaches us to represent, without much effort, the angular, rocky Alps, the dizzying views down into a deep valley, steep cliffs, pine trees that kiss the clouds, far distances, and rushing streams." \(^10\)

How did Bruegel formulate such a vision of nature? For part of the answer we must turn, as he did, to Italy. Contrary to widely held belief, Bruegel had much to learn south of the Alps. From the time of Van Eyck until the death of Raphael in 1520, the tide of influence in landscape had swept largely from Flanders to Italy, but from the mid-sixteenth century there were currents moving in the opposite direction. \(^11\) Bruegel was among the first Northerners to absorb the lessons in compositional presentation, variety of texture, and atmospheric perspective that had been so successfully developed by Italian painters since Leonardo. For the poetic plausibility of his designs, the breadth and reach of his lines, and the balance of his compositions, he was indebted to Titian and to the Venetian painter's acolyte Domenico Campagnola (1500–1564). In 1554 Bruegel even drew a free version of a composition by Campagnola (fig. 17, cat. no. 13), \(^12\) rethinking Campagnola's distant vistas, adding in his own style a river between cliffs at the left (with one of his insect-like animals grazing in the middle
distance) and a church approached by travelers on the right, and enriching the foreground with vegetation and everyday figures; some of the figures are walking, while two others—a man and a woman—take a rest and choose fruit from a basket. This reinterpretation speaks volumes about Bruegel’s reaction to his Italian model. A full-fledged master, he felt secure enough to resist mere imitation, selecting from Campagnola only the general compositional plan. The Italian’s method of hatching in broad parallel curves is seen in Bruegel’s drawing below the central copse of trees and in the lower left foreground, by the river. This was an element that Bruegel had already made his own, however (see cat. nos. 2, 10).  

The verso of the copy after Campagnola bears the beginnings of a sketch, which afford a rare glimpse of Bruegel initiating a new design. The sketch is related stylistically to another Italianate drawing of 1554, the recently discovered _Wooded Landscape with a Distant View toward the Sea_ (cat. no. 14). Here, on blue, probably Venetian, paper Bruegel produced a landscape comparable to the rare examples by his contemporary Federico Barocci (see fig. 18). The medium of the two drawings is identical, the scale similar, and the style surprisingly close—from the flowing lines in the tree trunks to the white stippling in the foliage.
That this is no isolated case is shown by a comparison of Bruegel’s drawing Bears in a Wood (fig. 19) with Barocci’s Landscape with the Stigmatization of Saint Francis (fig. 20). Here, again, Bruegel employs ink and white heightening on blue paper in a composition that has strong links with Barocci’s scheme.

When a few more contemporary landscapes are added to our survey, Bruegel falls into context. A drawing by Campagnola of about 1516 (fig. 21) depicts a mountain town and an approaching storm, much like Bruegel’s 1553 Landscape with Fortified City; an autograph sketch by Titian evinces analogies with Bruegel’s penmanship (fig. 22). As the eighteenth-century connoisseur of drawings Pierre-Jean Mariette stated, “some of these landscapes drawn with the pen [by Bruegel] . . . would not be disavowed by Titian.” Thus, despite Bruegel’s reputation for robust independence, his landscapes harmonize with the traditions of his day.

Art history has been so compartmentalized into the study of different national schools that similarities between them can seem surprising. Yet such transnational features confirm that Bruegel’s Italian journey led to an enthusiastic artistic exchange with his Southern colleagues, at least in the field of landscape. Whether Bruegel influenced Barocci, or Barocci Bruegel, is not the point. Rather, it is clear that the enriched textures of Bruegel’s landscape drawings evolved in Italy and that they conform to international stylistic norms. This is equally true of their iconography: the landscape is transformed into an idealized arena within which figures and animals are pitted against nature, and the transitory, insubstantial works of man against God’s durable creation. Thus was landscape conceived and interpreted throughout Europe.

Peculiar to Bruegel within this tradition, however, are his awe-inspiring details: horsemen and carts, rooftops and belfries, and even fruit in baskets, to recall but a few of those mentioned above. Neither the Venetians nor Bruegel’s Northern masters had paid such heed to the particular, preferring to emphasize the unifying flow of their
compositions. In this attention to detail Bruegel's work is related to traditions of manuscript illumination and miniature painting, arts in which he was certainly versed. Bruegel not only married, in 1563, the daughter of the miniature painter Mayken Verhulst, who was described in 1567 by Gucciardi as one of the four principal female artists living in the Low Countries;44 but while in Rome Bruegel also collaborated with the miniaturist Giulio Clovio (1498–1578), who collected Bruegel's work. The inventory of Clovio's possessions drawn up at his death lists "a small miniature painted half by himself and half by Pieter Bruegel," a small "Tower of Babel" painted by Bruegel on ivory, a "View of Lyons" (Leon di Francia) in gouache, two other landscapes, and a gouache study of trees.45 Sadly, all these works are lost. Yet there are still conclusions to be drawn from this documentation. Vasari's life of Clovio opens

Fig. 22. Titian. *Landscape with a Fortified Castle*, ca. 1545–50. Pen and brown ink. Musée Bonnat, Bayonne

with the statement: "For many centuries, and perhaps for yet other centuries, there has been no more excellent illuminator or painter of small things than Giulio Clovio, who has far surpassed all others in this exercise." Clovio’s reputation was barely inferior to Titian’s or Michelangelo’s and was already secure a full decade before Bruegel’s arrival in Italy. That the young Fleming should collaborate with the prince of illuminators even on a small miniature is revealing in the context of the detailed execution of Bruegel’s finished drawings. The lost gouaches may also have been miniatures or illuminated leaves, and it is logical to suppose that Bruegel had received some training in this art. Scholars have attempted to identify Bruegel’s hand among the landscapes in Clovio’s masterpieces of illumination, but the attributions are unlikely, given the similarity of the peripheral views in much earlier manuscripts by Clovio himself (see fig. 23). Yet this investigation into Bruegel’s role indicates once more how his landscapes meld with those by his Italian contemporaries.

Bruegel’s subsequent landscape drawings rarely deviate from the patterns set in Italy. The two surviving Large Landscapes from among those published by Cock in 1555 (one of which is cat. no. 22), the sketchier Rabbit Hunt for Bruegel’s only autograph etching, of 1560 (cat. nos. 81, 82), and even the late compositions Spring (cat. no. 105), The Beekeepers (cat. no. 107), and Summer (cat. no. 109) retain Italian links, despite Bruegel’s evolution (in the last-named three drawings) of a less panoramic setting. In the late works the forms and atmosphere dissolve into a range of dots, with a “grainy, frothy characterization of ground and trees,” producing optical effects that were taken up by the so-called Master of the Mountain Landscapes and by Roelandt and Jacob Savery (cat. nos. 120–34) and by Dutch landscape painters in the seventeenth century.

Bruegel’s drawings from nature appear so fresh and skillful that they have been taken as evidence of his originality (fig. 10, cat. no. 1). Here we need to be cautious. Few such sketches survive from before his time, and it has recently been argued that they were especially vulnerable to loss. Made for practice and as mere records of landscape rather than as developed “works of art,” and often slight, they were of no value either to collectors or to other artists, who could make such drawings themselves. As a rule, only the most elaborate might be preserved and, as with Bruegel’s drawings, prized enough by the artist for him to sign them. Both north and south of the Alps, the practice of drawing from nature was widespread throughout the sixteenth century, and a vast number of landscape sketches, by hundreds or even thousands of artists, must have been destroyed. The extant groups of landscape drawings by the so-called Anonymous Fabricz (an artist close to Bruegel in style), by the Master of the Errera Sketchbook, and, even earlier, by Fra Bartolommeo (see fig. 24) are exceptional. Moreover, Bruegel’s, and even Fra Bartolommeo’s drawings are not widely separated in style or composition from landscape sketches made in the seventeenth century, or even later.

Although our modern enthusiasm for them would have seemed almost ridiculous in Bruegel’s time, we continue to admire these informal drawings, with their suggestions of light and distance, both as works of art in their own right and as precursors of seventeenth-century Dutch landscape

---

Fig. 24. Fra Bartolommeo. Farm Buildings on the Crest of a Hill and a View of a Fortified Town in a Valley, ca. 1500. Pen and brown ink. Kongelige Kobberstiksamling, Statens Museum for Kunst, Copenhagen
sketches. Because of the immense losses in this branch of art, we cannot easily claim that Bruegel was a pioneer in the genre, a landscape sketcher who altered the course of the history of art. Such assertions have been made but result partly from a concern to bolster the uniqueness of an artist whose chief claims to originality, however, lie elsewhere. But compared with the few other works of the kind known from his time—in particular, with those associated with the Master of the Small Landscapes (cat. nos. 135–144) and those by the Master of the Errera Sketchbook, which employ the same media (see figs. 25, 26)—Bruegel’s sketches are of remarkable quality. Nevertheless, like his composed landscapes, they conform to the styles practiced by many artists of his period. The miracle is that some, if only a few, have survived; and as rare examples of their type, their claims to “originality” have seemed all the more plausible.

Finally, there are four landscapes by Bruegel that stand apart from those described thus far. Three (including cat. nos. 4, 5) are datable to about 1552, the year in which Pastoral Landscape, now in the Nasjonalgalleriet, Oslo (cat. no. 3), is dated, and one (cat. no. 19) is thought to be from about 1554. Both compositionally and stylistically, they fall between Bruegel’s precise drawings from nature (see fig. 10, cat. no. 1) and such richly textured and highly finished compositions as Wooded Landscape with Mills (cat. no. 2) and Landscape with Fortified City (cat. no. 10). Despite some freedom and fluency, they surprise the viewer with their even line, their thin textures in the foliage (where, as Mielke has observed, Bruegel was wont to draw flourishes that resemble the number 3, written many times over), and their flatter modeling. Equally divergent from the norm is Landscape with a Group of Trees and a Mule (cat. no. 17), which transmits, as do few drawings by any artist, a sense of the speed, purposefulness, and energy with which it was set down. In this case, however, although the composition appears more or less fixed, the style is that of a preliminary sketch for a more finished work. Thus this drawing does not entirely belong with the four mentioned above.

Of critical importance is the stylistic relationship between these four drawings and those by Peeter Baltens (1527–1584). In Baltens’s Landscape with Rider and Shepherd (fig. 27) we again encounter the traits that we have described: the even, fluid, and somewhat incoherent lines and flatter modeling. Bruegel is first documented in 1551.

Fig. 27. Peeter Baltens, Landscape with Rider and Shepherd. Pen and brown ink. Staatsgalerie Stuttgart, Graphische Sammlung
as Baltens’s collaborator on the altarpiece for the glove makers’ guild in the cathedral of Saint Rombout in Mechelen. Could Bruegel have been working as Baltens’s assistant following his training with Coecke?

Van Mander praises Baltens as “a very good landscape painter, who followed very closely the manner of Pieter Brueghel and also handled the pen very cleverly.” Van Mander’s chronology is unreliable, however. He states that Baltens joined the Antwerp painters’ guild only in 1579, when in fact he was enrolled as a youth in 1540. In the Mechelen project he was charged with painting the central, colored parts of the altarpiece, and Bruegel with the grisaille wings, assignments that imply that Baltens was the more established figure. Thus he may well have influenced Bruegel’s first landscape drawings, which would necessitate redating the Pastoral Landscape group. This would make them Bruegel’s earliest surviving works, and it would mean that Wooded Landscape with Mills (cat. no. 2), was Bruegel’s first landscape to respond clearly to Italian models, a response that becomes more evident in 1553 and 1554 (see fig. 19; cat. nos. 10, 11). It appears unlikely that Bruegel made his most Baltens-like drawings only after he had begun to develop his style in this Italianate direction.

Antwerp and Brussels: The Allegorical Drawings
After returning from Italy to Flanders in 1554 or 1555, Bruegel was initially still preoccupied with landscape, and the set of twelve Large Landscapes engraved after his designs was published in Antwerp by Cock in 1555 (cat. nos. 22–34). But he soon concentrated on allegorical designs, many of them in the style of Bosch.

Bosch’s popularity had not diminished since his death in 1516. Collectors of his works included Mencio de Mendoza, marquesa de Cenete, in Guadalajara (she was the third wife of Count Hendrick III of Nassau, who probably commissioned The Garden of Earthly Delights); Domenico and Marino Grimani in Venice; the Portuguese humanist and traveler Damião de Goes; and, later, Philip II of Spain, Cardinal Antoine Perrenot de Granvelle (Bruegel’s patron, too), and Emperor Rudolf II in Prague. In sixteenth-century art literature, Bosch is mentioned by Marcantonio Michiel, by Vasari in both the first (1550) and the second (1568) editions of his Lives of the Artists, and by Felipe de Guevara and Giovanni Paolo Lomazzo, as well as by the authors who wrote about Bruegel—Guicciardini, Lampsonius, and Van Mander. This enthusiasm must have sparked Cock into perceiving a market for prints after Bosch’s designs and into commissioning Bruegel to produce new ones in the same vein.
Bosch was the first of four old masters who have always been celebrated for “fantasies, bizarre things, dreams, and imaginations,” to quote Vasari again. The others are Bruegel and, in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, Blake and Goya. Bosch and Bruegel, however, left no drawings that catch them in the very throes of inventing their visions. We must largely content ourselves with the two earlier artists’ final compositions, and they make Bruegel’s dependence on Bosch abundantly clear. As we turn from Bruegel’s landscapes to his allegorical drawings, the change in style, even in passages depicting nature, is as marked as the change in iconography. It is as if we are faced by another artist. The trees in Desidia (Sloth) (cat. no. 52), far from bearing the “airyly stroked roofs of foliage” that characterize even Bruegel’s most finished landscape drawings, jetison their leaves, and their branches turn to coral. These subaqueous qualities mark even the tree on the left of the most naturalistic scene, Ice Skating before the Gate of Saint George (cat. no. 62). Abandoning the lessons he had learned in Italy, Bruegel transmogrifies everything into symbols and ciphers from an allegorical world.

Bosch’s influence is strongest in Bruegel’s Seven Deadly Sins (cat. nos. 42–54), the drawings for which are dated 1536–57, while the prints came out in 1558. It echoes through Bruegel’s later designs, less in The Seven Virtues of 1559–60 (cat. nos. 64–77) than in The Last Judgment of 1558 (cat. no. 56), The Descent of Christ into Limbo of 1561 (cat. no. 87), The Fall of the Magician Hermogenes of 1564 (cat. no. 102), and several other designs now known only through prints (for example, cat. nos. 95, 113–115). The Calumny of Apelles (cat. no. 104), despite its relationship to a wide Renaissance tradition of representing this subject, also nods to Bosch in its configuration. Bruegel’s mastery of his predecessor’s idiom is complete, and his emulation frequently runs to direct quotation: the prostrate reptile at the lower right of Luxuria (Lust) (fig. 28, cat. no. 48) and the upside-down

Fig. 30. Alart Du Hameel after Hieronymus Bosch. The Last Judgment, late 15th century. Engraving. The British Museum, London
frog on the background mountain of Superbia (Pride) (fig. 29, cat. no. 46) are both from Bosch's Last Judgment, which was engraved in Bosch's time by Alart Du Hameel (fig. 30) and republished in the mid-sixteenth century. Such borrowings are numerous; but not for Bruegel the slavish imitation or self-conscious inclusion of isolated motifs that we find in works by earlier imitators of Bosch, such as Jan Wellens de Cock (Hieronymus Cock's father), and Jan Mandijn (ca. 1500–ca. 1560), and Peter Huys (ca. 1519–1584). Bruegel, rather, along the lines of Van Mander's description of his treatment of the Alps, swallowed Bosch whole and regurgitated his spirit with the freedom of a maestro.

Yet however much The Seven Deadly Sins were the product of Bruegel's own imagination, and even though Bosch's depictions of the seven sins are less fantastical, Bruegel's debt to Bosch is unsettling. Modern writers have sought to stress Bruegel's uniqueness (a quality necessary to every hero) and to excuse his indebtedness by citing concepts of emulation that were current in the art theory of his time. But as we have seen, Bruegel's dependence was immediately recognized—he was the "second Hieronymus Bosch," as Guicciardini named him. Bruegel, as we must acknowledge, was playing the tunes that his audience wanted to hear. His resurrection of Bosch was a strategy, perhaps initiated by Cock, for reaping the financial rewards of commercial success.

Fantastic as many of Bruegel's creations are, the very fact that Bosch had paved the way creates a sense almost of familiarity, like approaching Brahms after Beethoven or Schiller after Shakespeare. To be sure, Bruegel refreshed his inheritance, from the reptilian monsters to the precarious rocks and organic architecture. Yet his vision is less outlandish, less outré, than Bosch's. Perhaps this increases the power of Bruegel's images: the perspectives and human elements are plausible enough to induce powerful projections in the viewer. They reflect scrutiny not only of Bosch but also of mankind, incorporating incisive observations of expression, gesture, and movement. From Anger to Sloth, from Envy to Pride, Bruegel commands every gradation.

The allegorical drawings lack the stylistic variety of Bruegel's landscapes. The outlines are solid, the details are less suggestive, and textures are differentiated only rudimentarily. The sense of chance is diminished. These characteristics remind us that the drawings were merely a means to an end, serving as cartoons or templates for engravers who could wrest only a limited range of effects from their copperplates. Their uniform qualities were dictated by their role in the technology of printmaking and were subsequently increased by the printmakers who had to indent the outlines with a stylus in order to transfer them to the copperplates, a process that leaves its mark on the sheets.

Among Bruegel's first efforts in this vein was Big Fish Eat Little Fish (cat. no. 39). Its publication in 1557 with the legend Hieronymus Bos inuentor—though Bruegel signed the preparatory drawing for the print and dated it 1566 (cat. no. 38)—has led some to suggest that Cock simply exploited Bosch's name and suppressed Bruegel's for commercial reasons. Yet Mielke considers this unlikely, not least because Cock had already credited Bruegel with the designs for The Large Landscapes published in the previous year (cat. nos. 22–34). In addition, several motifs in Big Fish Eat Little Fish, such as the pointing man in the boat and the structure atop the rock in the distance, seem more typical of Bosch than of Bruegel. Thus the print may well depend on a lost prototype by Bosch, with Bruegel merely providing the engraver, Pieter van der Heyden, with a template.

This of course he had already done, not only for The Large Landscapes but also in 1556 for The Temptation of Saint Anthony (cat. no. 37). This first print by Bruegel in the Bosch mode credits only its publisher, Cock, and the design is ascribed to neither artist. The drawing (cat. no. 36) is manifestly by Bruegel, though, again, an invention by Bosch may have lain behind it. Uniquely among Bruegel's drawings for prints, the composition is not reversed in the printing, and its outlines are not indented, indicating that the engraver resorted to another method to transfer it to the plate. Perhaps dissatisfied with the print, Bruegel thereafter always provided directly transferable drawings in reverse.

In 1557 came not only Big Fish Eat Little Fish but also prints of Patientia (Patience) (cat. no. 55) and The Ass at School (cat. no. 41). For the latter the drawing survives in good condition (cat. no. 40). It employs the mature style that characterizes all Bruegel's designs for the engraver. There is an element of pedantry in the detail, in the uninterrupted outlines and fastidious cross-hatching. Nothing
is left to chance, from the carpentry of the four-legged stool to the bars in the basket-weave enclosure shielding the woman, and the engraver (in this case, Pieter van der Heyden once again) had only to replicate each line. His fidelity is extreme: the idiot expressions, the bees and alphabets, the cracks in the plaster are all impeccably duplicated. The print even enhances the wood graining and the legibility of the letters prepared for the teacher’s inspection. But as with all copies, the prints are harsher and less subtle, making us return, time and again, to the original drawings. Here we sense ourselves closer to Bruegel’s spirit, a circumstance of which the earliest collectors and the artist himself must also have been conscious, as the sheets are inscribed in unrevulsed letters in acknowledgment of their status as independent works of art.

The drawings detain us with a plethora of details and demand patient, reflective viewing. They could hardly be further removed from our age of the quick sound bite and the instant gratification, but the rewards are almost endless. **Desidia (Sloth)** may serve as an example. There are many distinct areas to absorb, arranged around the key central figure of Sloth herself. She has three snails around her and reclines on her symbol, the ass (also asleep). Her head is doubly supported: on her hand in the traditional gesture of Melancholy, husband of mental sloth, and on a pillow held by a devil, for “Sloth is the Devil’s pillow.” Moving clockwise from the lower left, the viewer encounters a man in bed fed by a bear and perambulated listlessly by a skeletal being; lethargic pupils in a schoolroom attended by three demons who offer another comforting pillow; a vacuously cawing bird near an idle boot that fails to rouse either a night owl or a couple in bed; and the movement of a clock. Above the clock a prostrate man redundantly hammers a bell that has its own clapper, an act of folly itself, but his action stirs no one; strings are attached to additional bells in the branches of a tree rising through the roof of a neglected and dilapidated edifice. In the ruined rafters are a nest and an ax, and gaming dice lie unused on a table. In the far distance two animals stand stranded on barren terrain, with a rider on a slug beneath them. Below this, a miller—a yawning, somnolent giant—defecates only after prompting (he is “too lazy to shit,” as a Dutch saying goes); his waste is collected in a boat within his mill, and his urine fills a bottle suspended nearby. At the upper right, the slow hand of time, its housing in flames, points to the “eleventh hour” while a group of idlers looks on. Below them a figure in a grotesque chariot is helped by devils to the river (the Lethe?), watched by a couple kneeling on a dead, multi-clawed fish, above an empty boat drawn up on a lifeless shore. A demonic carpenter yawns and saws into the turf (producing, one imagines, a snoring sound). A fat, immobile bird squats on a tree; in an opening in the trunk, an obese, slothful pig feeds on a thistle, too lazy to search for superior provender (another plant grows in the center); and a monstrous biped, its knife stashed in its hat, drags along its rooted body. The inscription below tells us that sloth makes the sinews dry and powerless, so that man becomes fit for nothing.

Many hours are required to absorb the prolixity of Bruegel’s imaginative details in The Seven Deadly Sins. In the series’s counterpart, The Seven Virtues of 1559–60 (cat. nos. 64–77), Bruegel produced a more naturalistic vision, for virtue has its place on earth. Only **Fortitudo (Fortitude)** (cat. no. 74) retains its Hieronymosities, as the armies of sin are driven into the pit. The central allegorical
figures with their symbols also possess a clear relationship to their counterypes in The Seven Deadly Sins. Although the drawings of the Virtues remain diagrammatic, their increased naturalism provides glimpses of Bruegel's abilities as a landscapist, notably in the backgrounds of Caritas (Charity) (cat. no. 66), Prudentia (Prudence) (cat. no. 68), Spes (Hope) (cat. no. 70), and Fortitudo (Fortitude) (cat. no. 74). The individual vignettes are bound together in more unified spaces. In Fides (Faith) (cat. no. 64), for example, the hoods flow like a tide through the worshipers, balanced by a diagonal thrust that unites the marriage ceremony with the celebration of Holy Communion to the right. After being turned upside down, the world regains an even keel, and virtue resides even in such everyday activities as the salting and pickling of meat (in Prudentia [fig. 31, cat. no. 68]).

In other drawings the realism increases, as in Ice Skating before the Gate of Saint George (cat. no. 62), Kermis at Hoboken of 1559 (see cat. no. 80; fig. 55), View of the River Scheldt near Antwerp (fig. 95), Spring (cat. no. 105), and Summer (cat. no. 109), and The Beekeepers (cat. no. 107). For all their allegorical implications, and despite the Michelangelesque monumentality of the figures in The Beekeepers, Bruegel returns to depicting a world we can enter.

The Corpus as Fragment

Mielke's catalogue raisonée of Bruegel's drawings describes sixty-one autograph sheets and six more known through copies. Of these sixty-seven items, thirty-five are finished designs for engravers. Eighty-four prints were published (not counting those after paintings or produced posthumously), so forty-nine design drawings are missing. They would have resembled the highly elaborated templates we have seen, works of the type that were most likely to appeal to early collectors of drawings and therefore to survive. This preference is articulated in a well-known letter of February 12, 1579, from Joris Hoefnagel to Niccolò Gaddi in Florence, stressing the desirability of an album containing "beautiful, finished, perfect drawings...drawings of importance and finished." For these, at least, there was a market.

Given the complexity of Bruegel's designs, he must have rehearsed them in rougher sketches. But among drawings of this character only The Rabbit Hunt (cat. no. 81) can be related to a finished work; the drawing is preparatory to the one print that Bruegel etched himself (cat. no. 82), so that a more detailed cartoon was probably never made. None of Bruegel's few outdoor sketches was referred to directly in a completed composition, though, as we have seen, Van Mander wrote that "he made many drawings from nature." We would like to know how many, as at most only six of those known appear even remotely to belong in this category. We can assume that there were many more, as Van Mander stresses Bruegel's commitment to this type of work, stating that "he used to make fine and pure sketches of landscapes from nature in pen." Bruegel's study of the Alps must have been thorough, and he probably filled several sketchbooks with Alpine views. Now we have none, as both River Landscape (fig. 10) and the Southern Cloister in a Valley of 1552 (cat. no. 1) are thought to have been made in Italy. Yet the degree of naturalism in Bruegel's prints inspired by Alpine scenery lends credibility to Van Mander's assertion. For his figures, Bruegel also presumably studied individual models from life, but we have only The Bagpipe Player (cat. no. 98), The Gozzard (Staatliche Kunstsammlungen Dresden), and the group of figures together on a single sheet in the Louvre. Surely Bruegel made many more such drawings. Most depressing of all is the lack of a single sketch for any of his paintings. Yet writers have hinted that they are based on drawings, and the recent revelation (through infrared reflectography) of firm drawn outlines under the paint surface has prompted the suggestion that Bruegel made full-size cartoons as well as preliminary drawings. His paintings and other compositions abound in details that an artist would have sketched before attempting to incorporate them in a finished work—fishing nets, toys, musical instruments, church towers, city gates, carts, hoists and scaffolding (for The Tower of Babel), rocks, mules, chickens, and owls. And where are the drawings of seagoing galleons, of which Bruegel made a series of ten prints (cat. nos. 89–94) and which he depicted in the paintings The Fall of Icarus (Musées Royaux des Beaux-Arts de Belgique, Brussels) and The Bay of Naples (Galleria Doria Pamphilj, Rome) and the print Naval Battle in the Strait of Messina (cat. no. 85)?

Another statement by Van Mander gives cause for concern. Having correctly pointed out that many of Bruegel's
“strange, comical, and fantastic compositions” were published in the form of engravings, he relates that the artist “had still many more, neatly and carefully drawn with some captions on them, some of which he got his wife to burn when he was on his deathbed because they were too caustic or derisory, either because he was sorry or that he was afraid that on their account she would get into trouble or she might have to answer for them.” Thus the artist himself, like Michelangelo before him, initiated the destruction of his own work.

The sixty-one surviving drawings (and the six copies of lost ones) can be only a pitiful fragment of a much larger corpus, yet it is impossible to know precisely how many drawings Bruegel made. Van Mander offers few clues; like all early artist-writers, he was anxious to elevate the status of his profession, concentrating on finished works and their reception by powerful patrons and referring to drawings only occasionally. With rare exceptions, drawings had little intrinsic or financial value until well into the seventeenth century. As Edward Norgate noted, a drawing “conduces to make profitable things, but is none it self.” That Van Mander should dwell at all on Bruegel’s drawings suggests that they were known and that their quality was recognized.

Drawing was the fundamental activity of the sixteenth-century artist in almost every part of Europe, from the commencement of his training until the end of his career; from trials of different media—pen, chalk (we know of no drawings by Bruegel in chalk), wash, colored papers—to copies after other artists’ prints, drawings, and paintings; from sketches from nature and the figure to ideas for compositions and the provision of designs for execution by others—engravers, woodcutters, craftsmen, tapestry weavers, and goldsmiths, as well as other painters. Only in Venice, from the time of Giorgione, was the preparatory role of the drawing sometimes abandoned, as Vasari and other commentators relate. For most artists drawing was the central, inescapable activity—in Vasari’s words, “the father of our three arts, Architecture, Sculpture, and Painting.”

Bruegel’s surviving works may represent less than 1 percent of his original corpus of drawings. Even paintings by Bruegel have disappeared. Forty are known, but they all date from a twelve-year span; around thirty of them are from his last six years in Brussels. This seems an odd imbalance. Several mentioned by Van Mander no longer exist.

One of Bruegel’s set The Seasons, painted for Nicolaes Jongelinck but subsequently in the collection of Archduke Ernest in Brussels, is missing, as are all the paintings listed in Giulio Clovio’s inventory. Antonio Tronarelli, also in Italy, owned a landscape in oils by Bruegel that was set into the binding of a luxurious album of drawings by famous, mostly Italian, masters. A Crucifixion and other lost paintings are also recorded in documents, and most of the twelve paintings by Bruegel that were owned by Rubens in the seventeenth century have also disappeared. Van Mander cites paintings in distemper as well as in oil paints, “for he was most outstanding in the handling of both techniques,” but only three are known: The Adoration of the Magi (Musées Royaux des Beaux Arts de Belgique, Brussels) (the attribution of which is uncertain), The Blind Leading the Blind, 1568, and The Misanthrope, 1568 (both Capodimonte, Naples). What chance had drawings when paintings and
even prints recorded in documents of the period can no longer be traced.  

That Bruegel made many hundreds of drawings can be taken as certain; and he probably made thousands. The vast majority of the sixty-one we know are highly finished and may not have been at all typical. Van Mander speaks of Bruegel’s extraordinary facility as a figure draftsman, apparently referring to individual figure sketches, but as we have seen, these have almost all disappeared as well. There are more facts to worry us—for example, the statistic that while eighteen copies are known after the surviving sixty-one original drawings, there are as many as ten after the six that are known only through copies. Many drawings by Bruegel have come down to us in appalling condition. Could it be that a large group of drawings was irreparably damaged, a disaster from which only a few sheets were salvaged? Or that, like The Resurrection of Christ (cat. no. 96), they were framed and treated as independent works, which disintegrated as they were exposed to light? The versos of three of Bruegel’s drawings are inscribed in an early hand, in red chalk, with the numbers 406, 407, and 937. What were the other items in this sequence? And how could Jacob and Roelandt Savery have produced such persuasive imitations of Bruegel’s landscapes (see cat. nos. 126–134) unless they had access to numerous drawings? Perhaps significantly Roelandt Savery had connections with Prague, where many of Bruegel’s paintings were in the collection of Rudolf II and whence several made their way to Vienna.  

To assert that losses have occurred is not new; nor are such losses unusual. No work by Bruegel’s mother-in-law, Mayken Verhulst, is now known—a frequent occurrence among sixteenth- and even seventeenth-century painters. As we have seen, drawings by Van Eyck and other fifteenth-century artists are rare. Van Mander informs us that there were 150 factories producing decorative landscapes (probably mostly watercolors on canvas) in Mechelen alone in the late sixteenth century; their products have not survived. Art was an industry, and in this hive of activity, drawings formed the commonest creative activity in every studio. But 432 years after Bruegel’s death we are left to “gather up the fragments that remain, that nothing be lost” (John 6:12). His few surviving drawings peer at us tantalizingly out of the darkness, and in order to regain a sense of his range as a draftsman we are forced to enlist our imaginations—to conceive of a lake on the basis of a small pond. This may be one reason why, after several previous attempts to define Bruegel’s corpus of drawings, a consensus has begun to emerge only in the last decade around Mielke’s clear-sighted catalogue.  

When the study of Bruegel began in earnest during the early twentieth century, many drawings were assigned to
him that have lately been attributed to other artists: the nineteen that are now given to the so-called Master of the Small Landscapes (cat. nos. 135–144), which are informal sketches of villages in Flanders; other landscapes, mostly with greater compositional pretension than the village views, are now ascribed with good reason to Jacob Savery (cat. nos. 126–129);\(^{105}\) and some of the most ambitious landscapes have now been assigned to Roelant Savery or, in this publication, to the Master of the Mountain Landscapes (cat. nos. 120–125).\(^{106}\) A large group of figure studies made from life has also been convincingly reattributed to Roelant Savery (cat. nos. 130–134).\(^{107}\)

These drawings nonetheless retain a place in the discussion of Bruegel as a draftsman, as they are precisely the sorts of drawings that Bruegel must have made. Some of his sketches from nature must have been produced in Flanders and would have resembled those by the Master of the Small Landscapes; the backgrounds of Bruegel’s paintings clearly depend on drawings of this type.\(^{108}\) Bruegel’s views are replete with the architecture of his homeland, and few of his landscape drawings can have been as highly finished as the majority of those that survive. On his Italian journey he must have filled sketchbooks with topographical and landscape views of various kinds, like those by Sebastiaan Vranckx that survive from the end of the sixteenth century.\(^{109}\)
There are sheets of this type, mostly by anonymous hands, from Bruegel's own time that would not look out of place beside his *Ripa Grande in Rome* (cat. no. 8)—his sole surviving topographical view of the city.

Figure and costume studies of the kind made by Roelant Savery must have been equally indispensable to Bruegel for his characterizations, whether finalized in paintings or prints. A number of rarely discussed drawings traditionally assigned to Bruegel's circle, including *A Woman Carrying a Pail* (fig. 32), are informal studies entirely in the same manner. *Five Standing Men* (fig. 33) includes, in the center, three figures that were employed by Pieter Brueghel the Younger, and it may depend on a lost drawing by the Elder.\footnote{There are also no known sheets in which Bruegel practiced ideas for his demons, let alone for the compositions that contain them. A few of this type by Bosch survive (see fig. 34),\footnote{And we may assume that Bruegel's were comparable and that he made copies after Bosch's works. *The Painter and the Connoisseur* (cat. no. 100) now seems unusual in Bruegel's oeuvre—and perhaps it was—but a rougher sketch, attributed to Bosch when last described in the 1960s, though perhaps from nearer Bruegel's own orbit, could well have preceded it (fig. 35). Minor sketches like these and other rough drafts must have formed a significant part of Bruegel's working practice. Studies of nature such as Fra Bartolommeo's (fig. 24) or Leonardo's (fig. 36) would have been necessary precursors to Bruegel's compositions. Sketches for his more elaborate designs, like the one for his etching *The Rabbit Hunt* (cat. no. 81), probably preceded most, if not all, of his paintings as well. The similar sheet *Journey to Emmaus* (cat. no. 83) is inseparable from *The Rabbit Hunt* in style, as has recently been argued.\footnote{Bruegel must also have made a drawing of *The Tower of Babel* like the one we know by Jan van Scorel (fig. 37).\footnote{Vicariously, then, we can begin to understand the extent and character of what is lost. Nonetheless, Bruegel's precise working methods and the full extent of his dedication to drawing will never fully be known.}}
Conclusion

The fragmentary nature of Bruegel’s surviving corpus of drawings does not prevent our reaching a few general conclusions. Most obviously, Bruegel returned Netherlandish craftsmanship to the level of skill seen in the years from Van Eyck to Gerard David. Although Bruegel’s humorous, incident-filled paintings still dominate the popular image of him, his drawings indicate that his interests ranged widely. Few artists have run the gamut from the miniaturist to the magnifier of human foibles, and from the pursuit of truth to nature in landscape to the humorous figurative fantasy—and all in a short life.115

Yet there is a troubling split. On the one hand Bruegel’s compositions explode with detail, as if the world were in terminal crisis—and we should remember that many of Bruegel’s contemporaries believed that it was. Apocalyptic imagery and prophecy had abounded in Bosch’s time—one has only to recall Dürer’s set of illustrations to the Book of Revelation—and continued to reverberate through much of the sixteenth century.116 But on the other hand there is the airy freedom of Bruegel’s landscapes. In the most finished of these, his focus on Alpine and Flemish scenery was novel in its naturalism and anticipates the particularization of the local landscape seen in Dutch art of the seventeenth century. This division in Bruegel’s interests between tradition and freedom, medieval and modern, requires explanation. How could he be so forward-looking in his landscapes and yet so archaic in his figurative and Bosch-inspired compositions—so much so that we remain uncertain whether some drawings are by Bruegel or by his fifteenth-century precursors?117

His friends and patrons, including Ortelius, Jongelinck, Lampsonius, Granvelle, and Plantin, for the most part remained in Flanders during the Roman Catholic Counter-Reformation, when vast numbers of their contemporaries fled to the Protestant Northern Netherlands in fear of persecution (though Ortelius and Plantin did come under suspicion, and Plantin spent the years from 1585 to 1588 in Leiden). Did they, and Bruegel, on the whole remain loyal to the authoritarian establishment? Were they supporters of the status quo? That an artist should reach back to pre-Reformation iconographies, as if sympathetic to the old order, might favor such a theory, despite Bruegel’s having commanded his wife to destroy drawings that could have been construed as subversive. Certainly, none of the latter appeared in print, and Bruegel’s work offers little to support the efforts that have been made to perceive him as a reformer.118 That is not to imply that he would have condemned the crimes perpetrated by the authorities against his fellow Flemings during his lifetime; but in the absence of other documentation, his art could suggest that he supported the Counter-Reformation. Perhaps he simply wanted to avoid running unnecessary risks while the bloodhounds of the Inquisition were in full cry. On July 15, 1561, writing from Lisbon, Johannes Terenmus told Bruegel’s friend Ortelius that the Inquisition examined all pictures and that he should not forward to him any prints that might offend the religious, or anything erotic, or any portraits of Erasmus, who was considered a heretic. Paolo Veronese’s 1573 trial before the Inquisition was only a few years away, when the Venetian painter was asked: “Do you not know that in Germany and other countries infested by heresy, it is habitual, by means of pictures full of absurdities, to vilify and turn to ridicule the things of the Holy Catholic Church, in order to teach false doctrine to ignorant people who have no common sense?”119 Bruegel appears never to have come under suspicion and even received an official commission shortly before his death. As Van Mander informs us, the councillors of Brussels requested that he “make some pieces of the digging of the Brussels canal to Antwerp.”120

Such an assessment of Bruegel—as an artist who exemplified conservative strains in his culture—would have undermined his reputation among the scholars who first championed him at the start of the twentieth century.121 Yet he may have simply pursued his profession, striving to win international acclaim in his own time. Increasingly, we have become aware of an old-fashioned trait: the exceptional degree to which he was inspired by much earlier art, from various sources, including Italian and antique ones.122 (In The Ass at School [cat. no. 40], the characters even wear medieval costume.) Bruegel’s corpus of drawings reveals the dichotomy particularly clearly through its partition into the landscapes on the one hand and the allegories on the other.

Perhaps Bruegel’s balancing act between the apparent “modernism” of his landscapes and the “archaism” of his other compositions, a dichotomy revealed especially clearly
by his drawings, can be explained. As Edward Norgate wrote, landscape was the art form "of all kinds of painting the most innocent, and which the Divill him selfe could never accuse of or infect with idolatry." This statement echoes Michelangelo's comment to Francisco de Hollanda in 1538: "In Flanders they paint only... things that gladden you and of which you cannot speak ill." Bruegel may have felt free to experiment in this iconographically uncontroversial sphere, but not in his religious and allegorical compositions.

The titles of many modern art-books also reflect this dichotomy: From Van Eyck to Bruegel suggests that he marks the end of a tradition, that what was nascent in Van Eyck remained operative in Bruegel; From Bruegel to Rubens that he looks forward to another era. Epilogue or prologue? Both, perhaps. But it is for other reasons that, 432 years after his death, we continue to celebrate his art: for the extraordinary power of his imagination, for his exceptional skill in representation, and for his unique place in the culture of sixteenth-century Europe. As the legend goes on a print published after Bruegel by Joris Hoefnagel in 1573 relates: "For art and the creative spirit there is fame without death."

I am grateful for the help and advice of Michael Bury, Antony Griffiths, and Stefaan Hautekeete. The coauthors of this catalogue, Nadine M. Orenstein, Michiel C. Plomp, and Manfred Sellink, all read a first draft of this essay and provided excellent suggestions and information. Jane Bobko made a thorough job of editing it. While writing I remained acutely aware of standing in the shadow of my late friend Hans Mielke, whose expertise on Bruegel's drawings was unrivaled. His untimely death on April 19, 1994, robbed us of a great connoisseur and an immensely kind and engaging personality. This essay is dedicated to his memory.

1. Peter C. Sutton, in his recent essay on landscape (in Madrid 1994–95, p. 24), still refers to "the great peasant painter, Pieter Bruegel." Even without undertaking detailed research, it seems that the epithet was common by 1770, when the artist was listed in the index to Hoet (1770, vol. 3, p. xiv) as "Bruegel, (Pieter, of den Boeren, of Ouden) [Bruegel, (Pieter, or the Peasant, or the Elder)]."

Descamps (1753, p. 101) declares that Bruegel was the son of a peasant ("fils d'un Paysan"), probably basing himself on Van Mander (1694–99, vol. 1, p. 190 [604, fol. 233]), who states that Bruegel came from an "obscure village amidst peasants"—which is not quite the same thing (much of Descamps's text is lifted from Van Mander's). Genaille (1983) looks into Bruegel's origins. Grossmann (in Brussels 1980) follows the development of our image of Bruegel.


3. Vasari 1568, pp. 87–89.

4. "paesi a olio, fantasticherie, bizzarrie, sogni & imaginazioni." Ibid.

5. Lampsonius 1573, pl. 19. Additional text on a drawn copy of the portrait (somewhat in the style of Jacob Hoefnagel) praises Bruegel for his conquest of nature (see Berlin 1975, no. 137). I thank Antony Griffiths for help with the translation from the Latin.

6. Writers and theorists consistently held history painting (the depiction of scenes from the Bible, history, or mythology) and allegory to be superior to the "lesser" genres of landscape, portraiture, and representations of subjects from everyday life.


10. For a recent discussion of the drawing, see Dittrich in Dresden–Vienna 1997–98, no. 1 (with additional literature).


13. Mielke 1996. The inadequacies of the previous corpus by Münz (1961), which had been left unfinished at his death, rapidly became apparent (see Haverkamp–Begemann 1964).


15. "per apprendere la maniera italiana" (Vasari 1568, vol. 3, p. 87). The documentation concerning Baltens is discussed in note 61 below.

16. See, for example, Oberhuber in Brussels 1980, p. 60. The drawing by Coecke is discussed by Boon (1992, no. 53).

17. Grossmann (1973, pp. 149–50) reproduces Coecke's Temptation of Saint Anthony to make this point.

18. Grossmann (ibid., p. 150, with additional literature) stresses the relationship between the landscape backgrounds in Coecke's paintings and Bruegel's views.


20. Michelangelo's influence has also been seen in the bulky figures of Jan van Hemessen (on whom, see Wallen 1983).


22. For the development of influences between Italy and the north, see Brussels–Rome 1995. For the situation in Venice, see Venice 1999–2000.

23. Mielke (1996, p. 7) rightly describes this woodcut as a "key experience" ("Schlüsselerlebnis") for Bruegel.

24. Most of the other major Flemish painters of Bruegel's generation, such as Frans Floris, Lambert Lombard, and Maarten de Vos, worked in an Italianate style. Titian later collaborated with Cornelis Cort, one of the engravers used by Bruegel's employer Hieronymus Cock. For Cort (who also engraved designs by Giulio Clovio, Federico Barocci, and Girolamo Musiano, all mentioned below), see Rotterdam 1994 and Sellink 2000. Cort's signed drawing Landscape with a Village in The Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York (inv. 50–72), is similar to the Titian drawing illustrated here (fig. 22).

25. But as Mielke (1996, p. 5) points out, Bruegel cannot have known Düer's sketches.
26. Ibid., p. 6.

27. In Italian literature, ingegno is used more often than ingenium. See Summers 1981, p. 38.

28. The role of these artists is described in Gibson 1989. The standard overview of Netherlandish landscape in the sixteenth century remains that by Franz 1969. Although the Dutch landscapes were fictitious, Italian viewers may have been deceived into thinking that they were real (Gombrich 1971, p. 146).


32. See note 22 above and Christiansen 1998.

33. First noted in Lugt 1927. The lithograph after the now-lost drawing was published by Denon (Duval 1829, vol. 2, pl. 1286v). Mielke (1996, pp. 42–43, no. 21) has persuasively argued for the authenticity of the drawing, which had been doubted by some earlier commentators, including Toltyn (1952, no. 86) and Arndt (1972, no. 7).

34. See also Mielke 1996, nos. 22 (here cat. no. 13), 23 (here cat. no. 22), and 24 (Large Landscape, Paris; here fig. 84).

35. The other rough sketches attributed to Bruegel are Eustavy with City in Background (cat. no. 15 verso), Landscape with a Group of Trees and a Mule (cat. no. 17), The Rabbit Hunt (cat. no. 81), Journey to Emmaus (cat. no. 83), and Mielke 1996, nos. 29 (Riverscape with Anglers, Paris) and 33 (Four Standing Men Conversing, Paris).

36. Mielke (1996, no. 7a) dates this Bruegel landscape to 1533 but places it among the drawings of 1532. Close inspection has revealed that Bruegel in fact dated it 1534. The Barocci was recently discussed by Schaar (in Hambincq 1997, no. 3). It was dated to the artist's early years by Pillsbury (in Cleveland–New Haven 1978, no. 10). Barocci's birth is placed as late as about 1535 by some writers, though Bellori (1672) states that he was born in 1538.


38. On the drawing by Campagnola, see Van Tuyll van Serooskerken 2000, no. 431. A comparable sketch by Campagnola in the Biblioteca Ambrosiana in Milan is there attributed to Bruegel (ref. N38; Gerrasche Photo 110528).

39. On the Titian, see Oberhuber (in Venice 1976, pp. 29–30, fig. 8).

40. Mariette 1741, p. 107. His spiritual heir Frits Lugt reestablished the importance of Italian influences on Bruegel's landscapes in an article (Lugt 1927) that was largely rejected for forty years. Disputed by Tolyn and others, Lugt's ideas were finally welcomed by Arndt in 1966 (see also note 41 below).

41. Lugt (1927, pp. 111–12) correctly argued that the Italianate landscapes were rejected from Bruegel's corpus because they suggested that Bruegel was not "original" as generally thought. Lugt's article was the first to illustrate Bears in a Wood (here fig. 19). Not until Mielke 1994 was this work fully reinstalled as an autograph drawing by Bruegel.

42. On Bruegel's interest in other Italian sources, including the frescoes by Andrea del Sarto and Franciabigio in the Scalzo in Florence, see Grossmann 1973. Lugt (1927, pp. 124–28) was the first to discern links between Bruegel and his contemporary the landscape specialist Girolamo Muziano (1533–1592), who was also in Rome in 1555; these links are mentioned again by a few later authors, including Winner (in Berlin 1975, p. 7) and Mori (1976, p. 17). Barocci may have been in Rome at the same time as Bruegel, or only a year or two later; his early chronology is uncertain.

43. The fundamental exposition of this concept of landscape is Müller Hufstede 1979; see also Bruyn 1987–88 and Bruyn 1994.

44. Genaille (1988, p. 138) suggested that Bruegel was initiated into miniature painting by Verhulst.

45. The inventory was published by Bertelotti 1881–82.


47. Tolnay (1965, 1978, and 1980) attributed to Bruegel various parts of Clivio's Towneley Lectionary (New York Public Library; MS 91), Farnese Hours (Pierpont Morgan Library, New York), and Comptes of Cardinal Marino Grimani (Sir John Soane's Museum, London). Only the first of these attributions is possible on chronological grounds, though Tolnay (1978) proposed that parts of the leaves in the Farnese Hours (ca. 1550–60) were blank and filled in by Bruegel only in the 1550s. Tolnay's attributions, though supported in the case of the Towneley Lectionary by Cioni-Visi (in Cioni-Visi and Gamulin 1980, p. 68), have not been generally accepted (see, for example, Gibson 1989, p. 63, and Alexander in London--New York 1994–95, p. 252). A date in the 1550s for the Towneley Lectionary was reaffirmed by Alexander (in ibid., pp. 248–52, no. 114). Links between Bruegel's work and manuscript illuminations have been suggested before, for example, by Buchanan (1900, pp. 247–50), who sees connections with both fifteenth-century manuscripts and the work of Simon Bening in the sixteenth century.


52. Compare Antwerp–London 1999, nos. 17, 18 (by Van Dyck), and, for example, sketches by Domenichino at Windsor Castle (ibid., no. 26, fig. 264; Pupe–Hennesey 1948, nos. 1677, 1678).

53. In nineteenth-century French art, Realism and Impressionism could still provoke ridicule for similar reasons.


55. For the Errera Sketchbook, see Berlin 1975, no. 181, and Wood 1998 (with previous literature).

56. For these landscapes, see also Mielke 1996, nos. 4, 6, 7, 8.

57. See, for example, ibid., under no. 7a.

58. Ibid., no. 9. Mielke places the drawing among those executed about 1552–53, but it may fall somewhat later, perhaps between Bears in a Wood of about 1554 (here fig. 19) and Landscape with Three Pilgrims of about 1554–55 (cat. no. 32).

59. See Jung 1985 and, for this particular drawing, also Stuttgart–Karlsruhe 1989–90, no. 63, and Kostyshyn 1994, no. 91. Kostyshyn distances Baltens' paintings from Bruegel's but refrains from comparing the artists' drawings, a project that was virtually impossible before the publication of Mielke's catalogue. I am grateful to Ger Luijtjen for helping me access to a copy of Kostyshyn's thesis. Baltens' printmaking is also discussed by Van der Stock 1998, pp. 158–72.

60. A comparable sheet dated 1544 (and therefore probably too early to be by Baltens) that was sold at Christie's, Amsterdam (November 15, 1993, no. 33), reveals that this style of drawing was not unusual before Bruegel. None of Baltens' drawings is dated, however, making any reconstruction of the connection between his and Bruegel's drawings precarious. Similar difficulties and a lack of visual and documentary material beset the study of the relationship between their paintings (see Kostyshyn 1994, esp. pp. 254–304), which rightly argues that Baltens' print of the Land of Cockaigne influenced Bruegel's version of this subject; for the print after Bruegel attributed to Pieter van der Heyden, see cat. no. 156.

61. The documents were published by Monballieu (1964) and are discussed at length by Kostyshyn (1994, pp. 86–87). Bruegel joined the Antwerp painters' guild in the 1551–52 "guild year" (October 18, 1551–October 18, 1552), thus after his collaboration with Baltens.

6. Miedema (in ibid., vol. 4, p. 160) believes that Van Mander’s 1579 date is a mistranscription of 1569. Baltens is listed in 1569, but almost certainly as a member of the guild’s council.

6. See Gibson 1992a (with additional literature).

6. Michiel 1514--47; Vasari 1550 and 1568; Guerra 1760--63; Guicciardini 1567; Lampsonius 1752; Lamomazzo 1784; Van Mander 1604.

6. The prints after Bosch previously produced by Du Hameel (fig. 30 herein, for example) may not have remained available for long. Cornelis Cort’s engraving of The Descent from the Cross after Rogier van der Weyden (Sellink 2000, no. 65) suggests that there was also an interest in even earlier images.

6. See note 4 above.


6. The Du Hameel is Hollstein 1949-- , vol. 6, no. 2; the later version is catalogued under Bosch’s name (ibid., vol. 3, p. 132).

6. See Jan Wellens de Cock’s Temptation of Saint Anthony (1522; ibid., vol. 4, no. 1) as well as versions of the same subject by Mandijn (Frans Halsmuseum, Haarlem) and by Huys (Museum Mayer van den Bergh, Antwerp).

7. Bosch’s famous tabletop with The Seven Deadly Sins in the Prado, Madrid.

7. Anzelewsky (in Berlin 1975, p. 8) interpreted the drawing The Painter and the Connoisseur (here cat. no. 100) as illustrating the saying “Kunst geht nach Brot” (Art follows bread).

7. As emphasized by Riggs (1979, p. 169): “With all our present admiration for Bruegel as a draughtsman and our disappointment in the results achieved by the engraver, we should not forget that basic fact” (that the preparatory drawings for the prints were “means to an end”).


7. This motif was perhaps taken from the image of Invidia in Bosch’s tabletop in the Prado, Madrid (fig. 86).

7. The Resurrection of Christ (cat. no. 96) may have been drawn: not for the engraver but as a finished work; the gestures drawn in reverse in the print are uncanonical (Riggs 1979, p. 169).

7. This aspect of Bruegel’s art, noted by Wied (1979, p. 7), has recently been stressed with regard to his paintings as well. Kavaler (1999, p. 257) writes that Bruegel’s paintings “seem to have encouraged prolonged visual inquiry.”

7. Kavaler (1999, p. 254) notes that Bruegel often uses a “radial” arrangement around a central figure, and that on other occasions he divides his composition into two opposing sides. The standard descriptions of Bruegel’s Seven Deadly Sins are those by Van Gelder and Borms 1939.

7. The drawing Prudentia was fully described by Hautekeete 1992. Nadine M. Orenstein has noted that figures in the later drawings for The Seven Virtues are more elongated than in some of the earlier designs for the series (see her essay “Images to Print” in this publication, p. 47).

8. See Vignau-Wilberg 1987, p. 207. The letter was first published by Bottari 1754--68. On this topic, see also Held 1963.

8. River Landscape (fig. 20), Southern Cloister in a Valley (cat. no. 1), Mountain Landscape with Ridge and Valley (cat. no. 4), Ripa Grande in Rome (cat. no. 8) (a topographical view done in Rome), Estuary with City in Background (cat. no. 15 verso) (probably a composition study), Riverscape near Baarode (cat. no. 21) (probably with staffage added later), and Mielke 1996, no. 28.

8. Ibid., no. 59.

8. The paintings do contain a few echoes from the drawings in The Suicide of Saul, 1563 (Kunsthistorisches Museum, Vienna), for example, the large rock surrounded by pines is reminiscent of the features in the drawing in Rotterdam (cat. no. 6); and mountains resembling those in Solitudine Rustica (cat. no. 28) recur in paintings like The Flight into Egypt, 1563 (Courtauld Institute Galleries, Seilern Collection, London) and Hunters in the Snow, 1565 (Kunsthistorisches Museum, Vienna). The Gloomy Day (February) (Kunsthistorisches Museum, Vienna) contains a citadel and town near mountains, not unlike those (in reverse) in Landscape with Fortified City (cat. no. 10).

8. Novotny (1948), for example, suggested that Bruegel’s landscapes were pieced together from real and imagined views.

8. Van Schouwete and Verwystaere (1995, p. 8) show that the painting Dulle Griet, 1562 or 1563, Museum Mayer van den Bergh, Antwerp, has only a rudimentary underdrawing and that it may have first been realized on another support—which may also have been employed to make the copies that are known. The same, they suggest, may be true of The Triumph of Death (Prado, Madrid). Urbach (1999, p. 113) is inclined to believe that cartoons were used in The Sermon of Saint John the Baptist (Szépmüvészeti Múzeum, Budapest), but notes that measurements of different versions of the same subject are required to establish this. In some paintings, however, the underdrawing is looser, and cartoons may not always have been necessary.

8. Both now often thought to be studio replicas of a lost original.


8. Vasari 1658, p. 43 (the opening sentence of his introductory section on painting begins: “Perche il Disegno, padre delle tre Arti nostri, Architettura, Scultura & Pittura . . . ”).

8. Van Mander 1994--99, vol. 1, pp. 193--94 (1604, fols. 233v--234r) cites more than one Christ Carrying the Cross (only the one in Vienna is now known); various “sorceries, hells,” a Temptation of Christ (perhaps related to the print by Cock, cat. no. 16 herein); one or two Peasant Wedding paintings that are not thought to include the one in Vienna; a Peasants’ Fair; and a painting entitled Truth Will Out, which has been linked to the drawing of The Calumny of Apelles (cat. no. 134).

8. The others are in Vienna, New York, and Prague. See Demus, Klauner, and Schütz 1981, p. 86, and Buchanan 1990. The missing painting represented Spring, Frans Floris painted a set of The Labors of Hercules for Jongelinck, of which only one survives (see Van de Velde 1973); the designs are known from a set of prints by Cornelis Cort of 1561 (Rotterdam 1994, nos. 21--22), mentioned by Vasari (1658, vol. 3, p. 311) five years later. Examples of losses of this kind are countless.

8. See Lafaconis 1998, p. 547. The album is described as “un libro di cento quintidi fogli di carta imperiale nel quale sono l’infiniti disegni con le cornici di penna, et la coperta di corame rosso turchese lineata d’oro dentro di una coperta di carta pecora” (a book of 115 imperial paper folios in which are the drawings stated below with frames in pen, and the cover of Turkish red leather lined in gold within a parchment cover); the landscape by Bruegel is first on the list and described as “un paesino a olio in una prospettiva de manio de Pietro Broghi nel incrustamento del libro” (a small landscape in oil in an illusionistic view [or frame?] by the hand of Pieter Bruegel on the surface of the album). It is not clear from the description exactly what this item was, or whether it was on paper or another support, but the landscape and the frame around it were probably both by Bruegel. I am grateful to Michael Bury for his help with the Italian.

8. On the basis of versions of the Crucifixion by Frans Francken the Younger and others, Harting (1991) postulates the existence of one or more prototypes by Bruegel that are now lost. See also note 91 above. For Rubens’s Bruegels, see Jaffé 1979.

pp. 172–88). Mielke (1979, p. 63), for example, also points out that only one impression of the *Kermis* etching of 1549 and only one drawing by Frans Hogenberg are known.

96. This statistic is gleaned from Mielke 1996.

97. For example, Mielke 1996, nos. 22 (here cat. no. 15), 24 (*Large Landscape*, Paris; here fig. 84), 58 (*Resurrection of Christ*, Rotterdam; here cat. no. 96), and 58 (*Beggars Player*, Washington, D.C.; here cat. no. 98).

98. On this drawing, see note 76 above.

99. *Mountain Landscape with River and Travelers* (cat. no. 9), *Landscape with Fortified City* (cat. no. 10), and *The Calumny of Apelles* (cat. no. 104).

100. Serebrennikov (1997, p. 233) compares the admiration of Bruegel by Rudolf II’s circle with the so-called Dürer renaissance of the same period. Friedländer (1921, p. 179) stresses how the Habsburg taste for Bruegel at the end of the sixteenth century coincided with Van Mander’s high praise of his work. Further drawings were probably owned by Bruegel’s sons, as noted, for example, by Arnolt (1972, p. 109). It was probably in 1608 that fifteen paintings attributed to Bruegel were acquired for the Gonzaga collections in Mantua; when they were inventoried in 1627, the values assigned to them were high—often much higher than those placed on each of Mantegna’s *Triumphs* (see Mattioli 1976).

101. See Mielke 1996, p. 8. He reiterates that the drawing *View of Reggio di Calabria* in Rotterdam, the autograph status of which he has questioned (see cat. no. 84 herein), must be based on lost sketches from Bruegel’s Italian sojourn (as first truly argued by Meij in Brussels 1980, under no. 13; Münz 1961, no. 26) and Haverkamp-Begemann (1964, p. 57) believed that the drawing was made after the Italian journey, in about 1599, or later). In Brussels–Rome 1995, no. 20, it is pointed out that the inscription on Josi Hoefnagel’s print *Reggio di Calabria* for Braun and Hogenberg’s topographical atlas *Civitates Orbis Terrarum* of 1572–1618 (vol. 6, 1607–18, fol. 58) states that it is based on *studia autographa* by Bruegel. In my view the Rotterdam drawing is likely to be based on a lost Bruegel drawing. Bruegel must also have sketched the Pentimele Fort at Reggio, which he included in *The Triumph of Death* (as discussed by Rutundo 1991), and made drawings of Naples for his painting of the city now in the Galleria Doria Pamphilj, Rome. Wied (1979, p. 43) believes that sketches for Bruegel’s paintings must have existed, while Bevers (in Tokyo 1995, p. 70) suggests that Bruegel did not make many drawings for his paintings.

102. Mayken Verhulst has been associated with the Brunswick Monogrammist (Bergmans 1965). That artist, however, is generally identified as Jan van Amstel.


104. Some dissent was voiced by Serebrennikov (1998), who rightly emphasizes the radical nature of the catalogue; however, in 1997 (p. 233), she described the draftsman emerging from Mielke’s catalogue as “a virtual stranger who demands recognition.” But her doubts about Mielke’s judgment of *Bears in a Wood* in the British Museum (Mielke 1996, no. 18; here fig. 19), *Stream with an Angler in Brussels* (ibid., no. 19; here cat. no. 18), and of the landscape after Campagnola, (ibid., no. 21; here cat. no. 13) seem unfounded, and her redating of the Prague sheet (ibid., no. 22; here cat. no. 15) is based on a misreading of the inscription on the drawing (a good reproduction of the date is given by Arnolt 1966).


107. The reattribution was first proposed by Frans van Leeuwen in a lecture delivered in Amsterdam on April 13, 1967. A round-robin publication was circulated by him in 1969. Joaneath Spicer was approaching the same conclusion, buttressed with additional arguments, in the late 1960s as well, as is known from correspondence. Her ideas were first presented publicly in a lecture in Prague in 1969; an article followed (Spicer 1970b).

108. Liess (1979–80, 1981, 1982) made a detailed defense of the old attribution to Bruegel, but his arguments have not generally found favor; the most thorough rebuttal of it is by Mielke (1986, pp. 84–88). Haverkamp-Begemann (1979) proposed that the Master of the Small Landscapes was Joos van Lierre, which most commentators, including Mielke, accept as highly likely. See cat. nos. 135–144 here.


111. For an illustrated overview, see Marijnissen 1987, pp. 453–62.

112. In the Randall sale, Sotheby’s, London, May 10, 1961, no. 2 (with thanks to Greg Rubinstein for further information); now in a private collection.

113. Royalton-Kisch 2000. Both drawings have been retouched by another hand in a darker ink.

114. Boon 1992, no. 182. Sorel also painted a version of the subject, now in the Ca’ d’Oro in Venice (Friedländer 1967–76, vol. 12, no. 307, pl. 168). The Colosseum in Rome was a source of inspiration for both artists.

115. Bruegel’s date of birth is usually given as about 1525/30. This may be too early, however, since Ortelsius states that Bruegel was “taken from us in the flower of his age” (Red qud nobis medio acetis flore aubrepsit sit). See Puraye in Ortelsius 1669 (the passage on fol. 12v of Ortelsius’s *Alum Nicamur*).


118. Stridbeck (1954) already felt that the idea that Bruegel might have been anything other than Catholic was wrong.

119. The letter was published by Hessels (in Ortelsius 1887, no. 20). The transcript of Veronese’s trial is quoted from Crawford 1905, pp. 24–30. Kaveler (1999, p. 254) examines this question in depth and finds Bruegel “attached to the past, conservative and nostalgic, longing for an order that had been gradually dismantled and brought to symbolic closure at the twin flash points of iconoclasm and rebellion.” Sybesma (1994) interprets the *Beekeepers* (here cat. no. 107) as a highly negative representation of Protestantism, despite its containing a veiled criticism of the Inquisition.

120. Van Mander 1954–99, vol. 1, p. 193 (1604, fol. 23y). There is no record of Bruegel’s having started work on the project.

121. Ortelsius’s attitude has come under similar scrutiny. Although his parents were Protestant, he remained to all appearances a Catholic, “prompted by the desire to live quietly for his business and scientific activities” (Boumans 1954, p. 377; reiterated by Urbach 1978, p. 238).


125. This does not contradict the conclusion of Müller Hofstede (1979) that Bruegel’s landscapes present a more stoical worldview. The dichotomy, which affected many humanists of the age, is encapsulated in the subtitle of Wallen 1983: “between Reform and Counter-Reform.”

Images to Print: Pieter Bruegel’s Engagement with Printmaking

NADINE M. ORENSTEIN

Pieter Bruegel the Elder created only one print himself, The Rabbit Hunt (cat. no. 82). Here, on a hillside overlooking a vast, winding river valley, a hunter takes aim at some rabbits as he too appears to be stalked, by a soldier circling a tree. Bruegel executed on a copper printing plate this beautiful, albeit somewhat ominous, etching much as he would have carried out a drawing on paper: he delineated few forms with distinct outlines but instead defined the light-filled foliage and imposing mountains with fine speckling and loose, broad hatching. As with details in his earlier landscapes, the farm buildings, churches, and fortress on the hilltop seem to emerge organically out of the earth. Now that the drawings attributed to the Master of the Mountain Landscapes (cat. nos. 120–125) have been removed from Bruegel’s oeuvre, this etching, which is dated 1560, has taken on importance as one of the few remaining testaments to the master’s style of drawing landscapes after 1556.¹

Were it just for this one exceptional essay at etching, we would probably not discuss Bruegel’s involvement with printmaking at any length. Yet his engagement with prints goes far beyond this single example. Hardly any of his paintings were reproduced in engraving, but during a period of about fifteen years Bruegel created a relatively large body of original drawings, many with themes distinct from those he treated in painting, specifically meant to be employed by printmakers as designs for etchings, engravings, and woodcuts.² In the course of the six years between 1554, the date on the Landscape with Bears (cat. no. 13), his first drawing used as a design for a print, and 1560, when he executed The Rabbit Hunt, at least thirty-eight prints were produced after his design. Almost half of Bruegel’s surviving drawings, some thirty-two of about sixty-one works, served as direct models for prints, and it is likely that the artist produced at least another twenty-six that have not come down to us, for such sequences as The Large Landscapes (cat. nos. 22–34)³ and The Sailing Vessels (cat. nos. 89–94), as well as Patientia (Patience) (cat. no. 55) and other single prints.

Like The Rabbit Hunt, which displays the address H. cock excv[it], the majority of prints after Bruegel’s drawings were issued by a single individual, the master’s longtime publisher, Hieronymus Cock. But these prints differ from The Rabbit Hunt in many other ways; most notably, they were done after Bruegel’s designs by seasoned printmakers who used a precise vocabulary of lines intended to clearly translate the artist’s pen-and-ink works into a black-and-white medium.

The period between 1554 and 1569, when Bruegel was creating designs for prints, was a particularly interesting and exciting moment of change in the history of printmaking in the Netherlands. During this time Antwerp became the most important center for print production in northern Europe as a result of the efforts of Cock and other publishers who were able to produce many prints in large numbers and distribute them throughout Europe. Bruegel and other artists who were not themselves printmakers gained wide and enduring popularity through their designs for prints. Dutchish printmaking of the previous two decades had been characterized by intimate etchings and engravings made by such artists as Jan Gossaert, Dirk Vellert, Jan Vermeyen, Frans Crabbe, Cornelis Massys; often tiny and idiosyncratic, these works were produced in small numbers of impressions. But these peintres-graveurs, painters who made prints after their own designs, could no longer satisfy the growing demand for prints. By the time Bruegel made his own etching in 1560, essays in printmaking by painters were becoming more and more the

Detail, cat. no. 102. The Fall of the Magician Hermogenes
exception. Increasingly, the production of prints was divided among a number of individuals with specific expertise: a designer, an engraver, and a printer, in the service of a publisher who undertook financing and distribution, men whose distinct roles and interactions were being defined with every work that went onto a printing press. Cock began by making his own etchings, but by midcentury he was running a business that produced many prints, none of which he etched himself. Each print executed in mid-sixteenth-century Antwerp tells part of the tale of the gradual flourishing of the city’s print industry.

Unlike many of his contemporaries, Bruegel appears to have taken an intense interest in the prints made after his designs. The partially carved woodblock of The Dirty Bride or The Wedding of Mopsus and Nisa (cat. no. 111), which displays Bruegel’s own drawing on its surface, perhaps offers the most obvious evidence we have of his close interaction with the cutters and engravers who reproduced his work. Bruegel drew the humorous scene, taken from a Shrovetide play known as The Dirty Bride, in broadly traced pen and ink right on the block on top of a now-faded white ground that coats the surface. As the incisions in the upper left corner demonstrate, the anonymous block cutter worked directly from Bruegel’s design, translating the master’s brisk lines into intricate printable carvings. Bruegel must have made a similar drawing for the woodcut of The Wild Man or The Masquerade of Orson and Valentine (cat. no. 108), which would have disappeared as the block was cut.

Bruegel’s drawings on paper also reveal, albeit in less conspicuous ways than his drawing on the woodblock, his keen awareness of the work of the printmaker as well as his desire to influence the interpretations of his designs by others on the printing plate. In contrast to the rapidly executed drawing on The Dirty Bride woodblock, the majority of Bruegel’s drawings on paper for prints clearly look the part. In those drawings on paper he carefully delineated the outlines and indicated the fields of hatching with measured strokes of the pen intended to guide the printmaker. Such drawings as The Ass at School (cat. no. 40) and Ice Skating before the Gate of Saint George (cat. no. 62) show a high degree of specificity in the definition of details, down to the precise nature of the lines and dots meant to describe textures and shading. Another mark of the consideration Bruegel gave these designs is his frequently exercised practice of drawing an image lightly and then going over some of the sheet with darker ink once again, strengthening particular lines here and there, as though he were reiterating his intention. Bruegel did not just make drawings that would be engraved by another artist; he created drawings to be engraved.

The high level of Bruegel’s involvement with printmaking becomes most evident when his methods are compared with the practices of contemporaries who, like Bruegel, had their drawings reproduced by Cock. Frans Floris, for instance, seems to have had a much more distant relationship to the process than did Bruegel. Although he made one etching himself, Floris produced very few drawings
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Fig. 38. Frans Floris. The Sense of Touch, 1561. Pen and brown ink and brown wash heightened with white on blue paper. Szépművészeti Múzeum, Budapest

Fig. 40. Lambert Lombard. *The Raising of Lazarus*, 1544. Pen and brown ink. Kunstmuseum Düsseldorf

that were meant to be used directly for prints. Instead, he left such work to assistants or others who made drawings after his paintings and sketches that were intended for direct transfer to the printing plate.7 This is corroborated by the seventeenth-century biographer Karel van Mander, who wrote that Floris’s prints were “mostly engraved after drawings which his pupils or others had made after his paintings.”8 Moreover, Floris’s drawings used as direct models for prints do not appear to have been made with that specific intention. Thus, his freely executed brush drawing on blue paper of *The Sense of Touch* (fig. 38) for an engraving (fig. 39) is now identifiable as a print design only because the outlines are indented, indicating that they were traced with a sharp tool in order to transfer the image onto the printing plate. The drawing gave Cornelis Cort, the printmaker, a great deal of freedom in translating the washes and lively lines into the more restrained medium of engraving and, in fact, required him to invent most of the engraved lines on the printing plate. In this respect, this design and others made after Floris’s work resemble Bruegel’s very first drawings for prints.

Lambert Lombard, Floris’s teacher, produced many paintings that were reproduced in prints for which few drawings have survived. According to Dominicus Lampsonius, Lombard was the first Netherlander to have printmakers make engravings after other artists’ work.9 His drawings for prints, like Floris’s, left quite a lot of leeway to the engraver. Lombard’s designs for *The Raising of Lazarus* (figs. 40, 41), for example, are certainly more deliberate and finished than designs by Floris, but the foliage and many other details are drawn in sketchily. Moreover, the dark areas are indicated with wash instead of hatching. The idea was not that the engraver should copy the drawing line for line but that he should follow the outlines and fill in hatching in a freely invented manner here and there wherever wash appears. This, of course, is in marked contrast to Bruegel’s approach in his highly detailed drawings, which leave the engraver little or nothing to invent.10 Bruegel was clearly thinking about, if not trying to control, the final product and the engraver’s contribution to it.

In their specificity and language Bruegel’s drawings are close to those of Maarten van Heemskerck. Heemskerck, an even more prolific designer of prints than Bruegel, worked most often with the engraver Dirck Volckertsz. Coornhert, who may have brought Heemskerck and Cock together. The drawing *Man Protected by Shield of Faith* (fig. 42) for the print by Coornhert of about 1559 (fig. 43) shows how Heemskerck expressed his shading and textures in terms of the graphic vocabulary of the printmaker.11

The specific style of drawing Bruegel employed expressly for engravings is even more deliberate than Heemskerck’s. The careful pen work in Bruegel’s drawings for prints parallels the cuts engravers made to produce hatching and stippling on the copperplate. It contrasts sharply with the broad and spirited lines of his earlier landscapes, as is revealed by comparing the freely swirling sides of
Landscape with Fortified City (cat. no. 10) with, for instance, the controlled compositions of The Ass at School and Ice Skating before the Gate of Saint George.

Since they were intended to guide the printmakers, Bruegel’s drawings for prints were put to practical use. In general, they seem to have been executed about a year before the engravings based on them were published.13 The drawings were normally done in reverse of the intended prints14 and often bear markings and inscriptions that were not made by Bruegel. For example, the verses in the lower margins of the drawings that were included in the engraved versions were inscribed by hands other than Bruegel’s. These verses are always executed in a shade of ink different from that of the drawing they accompany. The inscription in the bottom margin of The Ass at School, for instance, is written in a reddish brown ink, while the drawing is composed in gray-black and gray-brown ink. And the inscription border in Bruegel’s drawing for Fortitude (Fortitude) (cat. no. 74), which contains unexplained symbols rather than letters, has an ornamental shape entirely unlike the inscription border in the print of it engraved by Philips Galle (cat. no. 75). The ornamental form in the drawing does, however, appear in another print engraved by Galle, The Parable of the Wise and Foolish Virgins (cat. no. 86), considered close in date to Fortitude and for which no drawing survives. Apparently, instructions for the ornamentation of the inscription margin on the Virgins were sent to Galle on the sheet of the Fortitude, which he was also about to engrave. The drawing Landscape with Three Pilgrims (cat. no. 22) bears many small details executed in gray ink—for example, the ships in the river—that were probably not executed by Bruegel. Since these details appear in the final print, we can surmise that they were probably drawn in by the engraver or the publisher in order to augment the image.

It is remarkable that Bruegel’s drawings for prints have come down to us in relatively large numbers and generally
in quite good condition; indeed, they are often in a much better state than his drawings created as independent works of art, a fact that prompts us to wonder what the history of these working drawings might have been once their original purpose came to an end. Who kept the drawings once the engravings were made is unclear. In the 1601 inventory of the shop of Cock’s widow, Volckxken Diericx, no drawings are listed but most of the printing plates are accounted for and many impressions of the prints are noted. The drawings may have been sold by the publisher at some point or held by someone else, possibly the engraver or the artist himself. In this context it is intriguing to consider that the designs for prints made by some engravers have survived in far larger numbers than those used by others: almost all the drawings for Pieter van der Heyden’s prints are known, for example, whereas we have hardly any for the sheets etched by the brothers Joannes and Lucas van Doetecum, and those that do survive are in poor condition.

Bruegel’s highly detailed style of drawing for prints is not in evidence in the three examples of his earliest print designs that are still extant, the Landscape with Bears (cat. no. 15), etched by Cock, and two drawings for The Large Landscapes, the Landscape with Three Pilgrims (cat. no. 22) and the Alpine Landscape (fig. 84), both etched by the Doetecums. The Landscape with Bears probably was not created expressly as a design for a print, while the others no doubt were, yet all three are characterized by vibrant line work with little specification of the nature of the hatching and textures. At this stage of his career as a print designer Bruegel worked in the same manner as Lombard, leaving a good deal of room for interpretation on the part of the engravers.

The master’s trusting relationship with printmakers came to an end in 1556, with his first religious and allegorical prints engraved by Pieter van der Heyden. Van der Heyden was not an inventive engraver, and his figures are stiff and angular; he was, however, highly skilled technically and his great strength was fidelity to the model he was copying. This is evident in a number of prints he engraved between 1551 and 1555 for Cock after Floris and Lombard, such as the latter’s The Crucifixion (fig. 44). Bruegel must have known some of these and would thus have been well aware of the quality of Van der Heyden’s engraving when the two started to work together. It seems likely, then, that out of concern for Van der Heyden’s limited powers, Bruegel began to make designs that did not require ingenuity in translating washes and free-flowing marks into hatching but could be followed line for line. The first such design was probably The Temptation of Saint Anthony (cat. no. 36), which was quickly followed by Big Fish Eat Little Fish (cat. no. 38) and The Ass at School (cat. no. 40). Van der Heyden would ultimately engrave more of Bruegel’s designs than any other printmaker, and it was probably his talent as

Fig. 44. Pieter van der Heyden after Lambert Lombard. The Crucifixion, 1555. Engraving. Bibliothèque Royale de Belgique, Cabinet des Estampes, Brussels
Fig. 45. Pieter Bruegel the Elder. Detail, cat. no. 64. Fides (Faith)

Fig. 46. Philips Galle after Pieter Bruegel the Elder. Detail, cat. no. 65. Fides (Faith)

Fig. 47. Pieter Bruegel the Elder. Detail, cat. no. 72. Justitia (Justice)

Fig. 48. Philips Galle after Pieter Bruegel the Elder. Detail, cat. no. 73. Justitia (Justice)
a faithful tracer that ensured the success of their collaboration over many years; Bruegel left no line to chance, and Van der Heyden happily followed his lead.

Other engravers interpreted Bruegel's designs in different ways. Philips Galle, for one, was much more skillful and individualistic than Van der Heyden. Although Galle followed Bruegel's designs, his prints never conform exactly to the originals in the same way that Van der Heyden's do. Doubtless this is a result of Galle's originality. But his residence in the northern city of Haarlem, far from the Antwerp of Bruegel and Van der Heyden, must also have changed the dynamic between designer and engraver, which in turn may have affected the appearance of the prints. The designs would have been sent to Galle as they were made, and his engraved printing plates would have been returned as they were finished. As a result, Bruegel must have lost some of the close control over the engravings that seems to be reflected in the prints made with Van der Heyden.

Galle's engravings for the Virtues series (cat. nos. 64–77), for example, are dominated by deeply cut parallel hatching that produces a dark, velvety mezzotint-like effect, especially strong in the early impressions, and tend to elongate and thin out Bruegel's characteristically earthy, slightly pudgy figure types. A comparison of the allegorical figures of Fides (Faith) in the drawing (fig. 45) and print (fig. 46) illustrates the difference. The printmaker's slight adjustments to the original designs appear to have had an influence in reverse of the usual one: oddly enough, by the time he composed Temperantia (Temperance), Justitia (Justice), and Fortitudo (Fortitude), the final drawings in the Virtues series, dated a year later than the first ones, Bruegel himself was executing slim, elongated figure types that had not previously appeared in his work. The figures of Justitia in the drawing and print (figs. 47, 48), for example, are much more similar to each other than are the allegorical representations in the earlier drawing and print of Fides. Bruegel seems to have changed his style in response to the dazzling proofs of Galle's first prints of the Virtues, which the master would likely have seen before he created the final three.

A consideration of the prints after Bruegel must include a discussion of Hieronymus Cock, the artist's first and longtime publisher. Cock ran the most important print publishing business north of the Alps between about 1548 and 1570. Based in Antwerp, his firm was known as Aux Quatre Vents (At the Four Winds). His publisher's address appears on the prints he issued as H. Cock excudit or in the abbreviated form Cock excv or some variation thereof. After Cock's death, in 1570, his widow continued the business for several more decades. Prints produced after Cock died show a later form of the address, Aux Quatre Vents, which he likely never used.

As a publisher, Cock secured designs for prints, hired printmakers to engrave or etch them, and employed printers to produce them. He also took care of the sale and distribution of his prints locally and internationally, sometimes by making agreements with others to sell his publications abroad. Bruegel's first engagement with printmaking was probably undertaken at the behest of his friend Cock, who would publish almost all of the prints after his drawings, producing sixty-four starting about 1554. Until 1563 Bruegel seems to have had an almost exclusive relationship with Cock, and one that was closer than that of any of the other designers who worked with the publisher. After 1563, possibly because Bruegel moved to Brussels or as a result of the demands posed by a growing number of painting commissions, his work for Cock became more sporadic.

Like Bruegel, certain printmakers—including the Doetecum brothers, who etched Bruegel's Large Landscapes (cat. nos. 22–34)—appear to have worked exclusively or almost exclusively for Cock. Others—such as Frans Huys, who engraved several prints after Bruegel, including the Nauel Battle in the Strait of Messina (cat. no. 85) and The Sailing Vessels (cat. nos. 89–94)—worked concurrently for several Antwerp publishers and even issued some of their own prints. And not only Galle but also Coornhert, Heemskerck, and Cort worked for Cock and carried out their craft at some distance from Antwerp. The Quatre Vents was probably not a workshop where designers and engravers actually sat composing prints, nor does it seem to have been a place where plates were printed. More likely it was a shop in which Cock pursued the myriad aspects of his business and sold prints. That the production of prints appears to have been pursued off-site, in an engraver's studio, was perhaps a factor that encouraged Bruegel's evidently close relationship with engravers, since Cock may not have supervised the work himself.

Bruegel's first designs made for Cock that were specifically intended for engraving, the group of twelve Large
Landscapes, must have made a startling impression when they were issued in print form. Although Cock had published even larger engravings in previous years, never before had he, or for that matter any other printmaker, given landscape such grand treatment. Probably just before he issued the landscapes, he had etched *The Temptation of Christ* (cat. no. 16), which was based on a drawing by Bruegel that does not appear to have been conceived for translation into print. Cock's admiration for Bruegel's prints would have been evidenced had he published even one of these large prints immediately after *The Temptation of Christ*. The extent of his appreciation and the success of the works can be gauged by the fact that he issued not one landscape engraving after Bruegel but twelve Large Landscapes and an additional print in a slightly different format, *The Large Alpine Landscape* (cat. no. 35), after the master.

The Large Landscapes must have stood out among the prints offered in Cock's shop. However, in some respects they fit in perfectly with them, for in the late 1540s and early 1550s Cock's main concern, and one of his most important contributions, was the publication of Italianate works and their dissemination in northern Europe. His stock included large prints after Raphael's Stanze frescoes, engraved by a printmaker of Italian origin, Giorgio Ghisi, and works by Netherlandish Romanists such as Lombard, Floris, and Heemskerck, as well as views of Italian sites, including Cock's own etchings of Roman ruins. Thus, *The Large Landscapes*—majestic Alpine views and a portrayal of the waterfall at Tivoli based on the scenes Bruegel encountered during his Italian journey—complemented the traditional strengths of the production of the Quatre Vents.

A new phase in Cock's production was heralded by Bruegel's designs for Bosch-inspired prints depicting allegories and proverbs, as well as scenes of Netherlandish peasant festivals, which took shape starting about 1556. Indeed, Bruegel's prints of this kind seem to have set the Quatre Vents on a path where Italian subjects, although still a major part of the business, began to play a lesser role, while themes of Netherlandish life and culture became more important. The return to Italy of Ghisi, Cock's most important Italian engraver, about 1555 should not be discounted as a factor in this change of emphasis, but the clear success of Bruegel's Boschian scenes made a deep impression on the publisher. (How deep this impression was is underscored by the fact that, not long after he began publishing Bruegel's proverb prints, Cock added to his stock several other engravings, supposedly after Bosch, on the same theme.) Cock issued additional prints on native subjects not only after Bruegel and possibly Bosch by Van der Heyden but also after and by Hans Bol and Jan Vredeman de Vries.

Cock's production was distinguished in the Netherlandish print market by the consistently high quality of the work, which was cut by the finest reproductive engravers active in the mid-sixteenth century. This excellence was assured in the case of Bruegel's prints by the governing role his drawings played in the printmaking process in providing explicit patterns that the engravers followed with extreme faithfulness. Rarely do even minor compositional alterations occur in the prints after Bruegel, as comparison of drawings and corresponding prints shows. However, one rare example of deviation appears in the print of *Ice Skating before the Gate of Saint George* (cat. no. 63), where the engraver removed one of the lower branches in the tree, presumably to unencumber the view into the background. Given the pattern set by other prints after Bruegel, it seems unlikely that even this insignificant change would have been made without the master's knowledge.

We need only look at the prints published by the Quatre Vents after Bruegel and Cock died to see how exceptional, in both quality and fidelity to the original models, are the works issued during their lifetimes. Thus, in *The Peasant Wedding Dance* (cat. no. 113), which was engraved after Bruegel by Van der Heyden following the master's death, hats and hair sit awkwardly on heads, and limbs attach equally awkwardly to bodies, particularly in the case of the figures in the background. It is difficult to imagine that Van der Heyden was following one of Bruegel's clearly defined drawings when he made this appealing print with its clumsy details. Another example of variation from Bruegel's model after his death is represented by *The Festival of Fools* (cat. no. 114), also engraved by Van der Heyden. In this instance, a comparison of the rare impressions of the first state with impressions of the second state shows that many details were added to the image after the print had reached a finished stage with all its inscriptions completed. Such major changes were never made late in the production process when Bruegel and Cock were active.
Several of Bruegel's prints were originally issued with blank bottom margins, a circumstance that can frustrate scholars searching for the meanings of his images. These margins may have been left blank for a practical reason related to the way they were marketed. Bruegel's prints were distributed abroad by Cock, who placed them with merchants whose international connections were broader than his own. Records from the shop of Christophe Plantin, an Antwerp book publisher, for example, show that on at least two occasions he sent Cock's prints to a Parisian bookseller named Martin Le Jeune. Plantin in turn brought Cock prints and books from France to sell in his shop. The list of Cock's products sent to Paris in 1558 includes many painted impressions, including six to eight colored ones of a number of Bruegel prints (few of which survive). The prints by Bruegel with blank margins reveal Cock's attempt to serve an international audience by incorporating inscriptions in various languages. The Everyman (cat. no. 59), which was probably published about 1558, was the first of Bruegel's prints to display verses in French as well as in Latin and Flemish. Two lines of Latin were engraved on the plate, but the verses in Flemish and French were printed in letterpress type at the bottom of the sheet. The sheet with the image that had been printed on one press was run through another apparatus, a letterpress that printed the verses composed in movable type.

This process may have been a bit clumsy because each impression of the image had to be printed a second time on a different kind of press. Cock solved the problem by leaving the bottom border blank to streamline the procedure. An impression in Rome of The Stone Operation (fig. 49) shows how the streamlining was accomplished, for it has Flemish text glued on the lower margin, indicating that this area was left empty so that letterpress verses printed on a separate piece of paper could be cut out and pasted on the sheet printed with the image. In this way individual impressions in Dutch, French, or Latin for Bruegel's very successful prints could be made without running each through two presses. This same treatment must have been intended for other prints after Bruegel that were originally produced with empty lower margins, among them Ice Skating before the Gate of Saint George (cat. no. 63) and The Merchant Robbed by Monkeys (cat. no. 95).
About the time he issued *The Stone Operation*, Cock published a number of prints by artists other than Bruegel with letterpress text either attached to the individual page or used as a series title page; *Christ on the Cross between the Two Thieves*, dated 1559, after Heemskerck (fig. 50), for example, has French letterpress text attached on both sides of the image to form the wings of a triptych. These were concentrated in the period about 1558–60, which suggests that at that time Cock had made an arrangement with a local printer to have letterpress text produced for a number of publications by various artists. The printer may have been Sander Jansens, who apparently printed many of Cock’s plates from at least 1569, or, more likely, Plantin, who was already working with Cock in 1559 on *The Funeral Procession of Charles V*, a project combining letterpress text and printmaking.

When we think of the audience for Bruegel’s prints, we must consider not only whether they were adapted to certain markets but also whether they may have had sensitive content that was altered to avoid offending local authorities. The frequently ambiguous imagery in Bruegel’s prints and Van Mander’s report that on his deathbed the artist directed his widow to burn certain of his drawings because of their subversive nature have prompted speculation that some political message does indeed appear in the work. It is not within the scope of this essay to address the long-standing debate about the presence or absence of this content. However, we can point to instances in which Bruegel’s prints were subject to censorship or, surprisingly, seem to have escaped it. Beginning in 1546 printers in Antwerp were required to obtain a permit from the central government allowing them to work, and to do this they had to obtain a certificate indicating good conduct and orthodox beliefs. (Cock obtained his permit in 1550.) It has been suggested, however, that regulation of artistic content usually did not result from directly imposed government censorship—although this existed during the period—but rather from government harassment and intimidation that led to self-censorship on the part of the publisher or someone working with him.

These regulations did not touch Bruegel directly since he was not a printer. They must have had some effect on his designs, however, as demonstrated by the one obvious instance of self-censorship that exists among his prints. This can be traced in the design and print of *Luxuria (Lust)* (figs. 51, 52, cat. nos. 48, 49) from the series of Seven Deadly Sins (cat. nos. 42–54). In both design and print an adulterous man sits with his hands tied behind his back on a robed creature; they are led by a man in a cowled robe who plays
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Fig. 49. Pieter van der Heyden after Pieter Bruegel the Elder. Detail, fig. 91, *The Stone Operation* or *The Witch of Mallegem*
a bagpipe and are followed by a mob of howling demons accompanying two women who also appear to have their hands bound. In Bruegel’s drawing the adulterer’s hat is quite clearly a bishop’s miter, an unmistakable allusion to the dissolute life of some ecclesiastics, but in the print the hat has been given a less recognizable character. This minor change, which was made during the engraving of the plate, dilutes a small detail in Bruegel’s design that might have been viewed as inflammatory. It is interesting to note that in the engraving of Patientia (cat. no. 55), dated one year earlier than Luxuria, allusions to clerical dissipations are much more overt and numerous: there are several derisive references to the papacy and clergy, including images of monks drinking and carousing in the tree at the right. A censored state of the plate exists in which the emphatic clerical references have been crossed over and the monks turned into fools (fig. 53).38 It is not clear when that censored plate was produced, and, oddly enough, the unadulterated impressions are much more common than the altered one, which, in fact, is rare. We must wonder whether the bishop’s miter in Luxuria was removed in response to criticisms leveled against the Patientia of the previous year.

Not only Cock’s marketing strategies and possible political considerations but also various other publishers influenced the content of Bruegel’s prints. Despite his more or less exclusive relationship with Cock, Bruegel on a few occasions worked with other publishers, for whom he altered the tone of his designs. Publishers must have been well aware of what was being produced by their fellow printmakers, especially since most of them were concentrated within a single square mile in the city of Antwerp.39
Competition was lively, but most publishers seem to have had individual specialties and to have directed their stock to particular audiences.⁴⁰ In this context, it is revealing to compare two kermis scenes Bruegel made, one, the *Kermis of Saint George* (cat. no. 79), for Cock; the other, the *Kermis at Hoboken* (cat. no. 80), for Cock’s Antwerp competitor Bartholomeus (or Bertolomeus) de Mompere.⁴¹ An important figure in the dissemination of Netherlandish peasant images, De Mompere presents an interesting contrast to Cock, as his output suggests that his audience was different from Cock’s educated clientele. A good portion of De Mompere’s publications features large-format depictions
of festivities of both peasants and elegant folk, often printed on two sheets of paper. All of their inscriptions are in Flemish rather than in Latin, a significant indication of the audience for which his stock was meant. Even more important in this respect is the general emphasis on the coarse side of the festivities portrayed in the peasant scenes he published. Pieter van der Borcht’s Peasant Kermis, for example, issued by De Mompere in 1599 (figs. 54, 92), presents wild dancers whose movements evoke the brusque actions of men fighting, while the accompanying inscription equates peasants with beasts.

It may be that De Mompere commissioned the Hoboken from Bruegel as a second version of the Cock Saint George, altered slightly to suit his own patrons. However, it seems more likely that the Saint George was done in response to the Van der Borcht, for the text on the banner in the Bruegel, “let the peasants have their kermis,” repeats the last line of the inscription on the Van der Borcht. Probably soon after that Bruegel made the Kermis at Hoboken for De Mompere.

Were it not for the existence of Bruegel’s design for the De Mompere engraving (fig. 55), this print might be discounted as a derivation by another hand of Bruegel’s Kermis of Saint George. But the drawing proves that the De Mompere example is after Bruegel, and the Hoboken, despite its similarity to the Saint George, offers a number of contrasts to the Cock print. The Hoboken is somewhat coarser and more aggressive in its characterization, depicting men urinating and defecating here and there throughout the scene, pigs placed prominently in the foreground, and a symbolically significant fool who walks with two children at the front and center of the picture. The inscription, probably added by De Mompere—“The peasants rejoice at such festivals in dancing, jumping, and drinking themselves drunk as beasts”—paraphrases the contemptuous inscription on Van der Borcht’s Peasant Kermis. In the generally more placid Saint George, Bruegel replaced the fool and the children with two laughing men who are discussing the activities, relegated the pigs to a part of the background where a group of men fighting appears, and showed no men relieving themselves. Bruegel must have created the two works with emphases tailored to the particular clienteles of the two publishers, the De Mompere direct and more critical, the Cock intended to elicit discussion and questions.
The prints after Bruegel’s designs ensured the artist’s widespread popularity during his lifetime and long after his death. Yet they stand apart from other aspects of his work, notably the paintings and the landscape drawings, because their purpose and the process of their creation were so different. Contemporary scholars usually view the prints in one or the other of two almost contrary ways—as close keys to, or clarifiers of, Bruegel’s frequently ambiguous intent or as distant relations to his artistry. But neither assessment is entirely accurate. Bruegel’s prints were collaborative efforts whose final appearance was shaped by the contributions of many individuals. Moreover, writers other than Bruegel sometimes added inscriptions to the plates long after they had left the publisher’s shop. Thus, the conclusions we draw about Bruegel’s meanings in the prints must take into account what we know of their production. What influence might the engravers, inscription writers, and publishers have had on their content? Did Bruegel even anticipate the contributions of these other individuals as he was designing them? Could the same motif in a painting and a print carry dissimilar meanings because of the intervention of many hands in the print?

However, despite these interventions, Bruegel appears to have been much more closely involved than any of his contemporaries in the execution of prints after their original designs. Our good fortune in still having a great many of Bruegel’s drawings for prints allows us to piece together an image of him as a print designer, carefully guiding the engravers and making sure that their work stayed true to his conception. It is the interplay and fusion of the opposing poles of Bruegel’s individual genius and the inventions of engravers, inscription writers, and publishers that remain especially intriguing in the prints after the master’s design. And it is the exceptional role of these prints in Bruegel’s work that makes them such interesting objects of study within the context of his oeuvre and the context of his time.
1. The other drawings of this period that are still generally given to Bruegel are *Storm-tossed Scheidt before Antwerp* (Courtauld Institute Galleries, London; The Rabbit Hunt (cat. no. 81); and *Viento di Calabria* (cat. no. 84), the attribution of the last of which has been doubted; see Mielke 1996, nos. 53–54.

2. A few of the paintings reproduced as prints are *The Death of the Virgin* (cat. no. 217), engraved by Philips Galle, and the two woodcuts of *The Dirty Bride or The Wedding of Mopsus and Nisa* (cat. no. 211) and *The Wild Man or The Masquerade of Orson and Valentine* (cat. no. 108), the last two of which reproduce details from Bruegel’s painting *The Battle between Carnival and Lent* (fig. 6).

3. Two drawings related to *The Large Landscapes* have survived: *Landscape with Three Pilgrims* (cat. no. 22) and *Alpine Landscape* (fig. 84).

4. However, many of the designers who worked for Cock, among them Frans Floris, Lambert Lombard, and Maarten van Heemskerck, appear to have made one or two prints themselves. For Floris, see Hollstein 1949–78, vol. 6, p. 2553, no. 4; for Lombard, see ibid., vol. 11, p. 93. There are a number of prints that may be by Heemskerck; see Veldman 1993–94, nos. 35–38, 199–206, 304, 349, 392.


6. This method appears to have been a traditional one followed by such earlier artists as Albrecht Dürer and Albrecht Altdorfer. Dürer’s blocks are in the Staatliche Museen zu Berlin, Kupferstichkabinett; see Basel–Berlin 1997–98, pp. 96–109, nos. 10.3, 10.4. An Altdorfer block is in the Staatliche Graphische Sammlung, Munich; see Winzinger 1950.

7. A drawing of *Temperantia* (Temperance) in Berlin (Van de Velde 1975, p. 448, fig. 342) may be one of the intermediary drawings by a studio assistant for an engraving.


9. Lampsonius 1665, p. 34; translation in Hubaux and Purye 1949, p. 76.

10. Tolnay (1952, p. 47) remarked on the differences between Bruegel’s very detailed designs and the designs of the Romanists Floris, Lombard, and others.

11. Veldman 1993–94, no. 434. There is one major difference between the drawing and the print: the face of God in the corner of Heemskerck’s drawing is replaced by Hebrew letters in the print, a change made for religious reasons rather than as an invention on the part of the engraver.

12. A Bruegel drawing often bears a date of a year earlier than that of the corresponding print.

13. One exception is the drawing for *The Temptation of Saint Anthony*, 1556 (cat. no. 36), executed in the same direction as the print.


16. On Van der Heyden’s engraving style, see Riggs 1977, pp. 95–100; on his treatment of Bruegel’s designs, see Tolnay 1952, p. 47.


18. On Galle’s treatment of Bruegel’s drawings, see Tolnay 1952, p. 47; on Galle’s work as a publisher, see Sellink 1997.

19. More drawings exist for prints engraved after Bruegel by Van der Heyden and Galle than for any of the other printmakers who worked with him; for this reason it is easier to judge his interaction with them than with Frans Huys or the Doetecum brothers.


24. Van der Stock (1998, p. 145) has suggested that Cock’s printing was probably done by Sander Jansens, a local printer.


30. The inscription was added to the plate in the state that precedes the one in which Theodoor Galle’s publisher’s address was inserted.

31. Delen 1934–35, vol. 2, part 2, pp. 155–56; Riggs 1977, pp. 64–65. Among the prints sent to Paris in 1538 were Bruegel’s *Patientia, The Temptation of Saint Anthony, The As at School, Big Fish Eat Little Fish, and The Seven Deadly Sins*. Plantin also sent Cock’s prints to Frankfurt, although the records do not mention Bruegel prints among them.

32. The probable dating can be determined on the evidence of Bruegel’s drawing, which is inscribed 1558.

33. Impressions of Bruegel’s *Everyman* print with letterpress text are not uncommon. Such impressions are found in the Bibliothèque Royale de Belgique, Brussels (two); British Museum, London; Metropolitan Museum (two); Ashmolean Museum, Oxford (two); Bibliothèque Nationale, Paris; and Museum Boijmans Van Beuningen, Rotterdam.

34. Veldman 1993–94, no. 383. Other Cock publications from this period with letterpress text include *Scenographiae sive perspectivae* by the Doetecum brothers after Jan Vredeman de Vries, published in 1560 with a letterpress title page (*Naliss 1998, nos. 163–82*), and the Triumph of Patience series (*Veldman 1993–94, nos. 436–43*), the drawings for which are all dated 1559. In their early states the sheets in this series were printed with empty margins and have separately printed letterpress text in Latin pasted on them. It is interesting that in the following states the text was engraved on the lower margin.


38. This state was first recognized by Boon (1982).


40. On Cock’s competitors, see Landau and Parshall 1994, pp. 220–23 (Liefnick), and Mielke 1975 (De Jode).


42. Most of his prints were etchings, and it should be noted that the only etching the engraver Frans Huys appears to have made—the large *Army of the Turks* (*Ramaix 1968–69, p. 46, no. 54*)—was also the only one of his prints published by De Mompere.

43. The attribution of the drawing for the *Kermis at Hoboken* has been questioned many times, but Mielke accepts the drawing without reservation (1996, no. 44, with further references).
"The very lively and whimsical Pieter Brueghel": Thoughts on His Iconography and Context

MANFRED SELLINK

Perceptions of Pieter Bruegel the Elder have evolved and proliferated since he first came to be the subject of serious art-historical study at the beginning of the twentieth century. He was first seen as Boeren Bruegel (Peasant Bruegel), an artist from a humble rural background who made the peasants from his immediate surroundings the subject of his work. This was a Bruegel whose shrewd psychological insights into the character of the inhabitants of the Flemish countryside were in particular widely praised. But later he was considered to be a typical bourgeois townsman who poked a little fun at the slightly backward countryfolk he portrayed. In many recent studies he is presented as an intellectual, a scholarly humanist whose inventions were meant to be moral examples and incentives for introspection. Several scholars have lately emphasized Bruegel’s indebtedness to the world of literature and theater and have shown how closely his images correspond to the moralizing plays written by the redderijkers (rhetoricians) who were his contemporaries. Opinions on his religious views differ widely. For some he was a staunch Catholic, while others suspect him of having secretly sympathized with such critics of the Catholic Church as Dirck Volckertsz. Coornhert. Still others have placed him firmly within a mysterious and forbidden circle of spiritualist Christians in Antwerp. (Certain writers have speculated that fantastic details in his pictures that appear obscure to us today are, in fact, symbolic references to alchemy and heretical sects, in the best tradition of Hieronymus Bosch.) Observers are equally divided regarding Bruegel’s politics and social views. To one scholar he was as clearly pro-Spanish as he was anti-Spanish to another in an era of burgeoning revolt against the Habsburg rule of the Netherlands. Authors influenced by a twentieth-century generation deeply sympathetic to the poor and the outcast interpreted his work as outright condemnations of the newly wealthy merchants of his pre-capitalist society. Yet recent studies have suggested that the same images do not criticize but simply show awareness of the prosperity of Flanders and the concerns of its community of merchants. And, finally, Bruegel’s position within the northern European artistic tradition is at issue: he is seen to be at the end of a long series of artists starting with Jan van Eyck and at the beginning of a new line that culminated in Rubens.

In short, each generation of scholars, and perhaps each individual authority, has a different view of the life and work of Pieter Bruegel the Elder. The primary reasons are quite simple: the life is an enigma and the work that remains is a mere fraction of the original oeuvre. We do not know when or where Bruegel was born, what his social background was, where or how he was educated and trained as an artist. We have no documentation about his opinions on art, religion, or society. We know next to nothing about his family life or social environment and can only attempt to reconstruct his intellectual milieu in Antwerp and Brussels from a few bits and pieces of evidence. Thus, what we would like to know about Bruegel we must largely intuit from his extant oeuvre, which is as astonishingly diverse as it is sadly fragmentary: some forty paintings, a mere sixty drawings, and, in part overlapping those drawings, about eighty prints made after his designs during his lifetime. This exercise will always leave room for speculation and doubt. However, in recent decades scholarship has provided valuable new insights regarding the authentication of works by Bruegel and his followers, reducing the size of the master’s corpus and refining its parameters; this

Detail, cat. no. 87: The Descent of Christ into Limbo
scholarship has focused as well on the iconography of Bruegel's inventions, illuminating his choice of subjects, their interpretation, and the sources of his motifs. It is the aim of the present essay to briefly survey Bruegel's iconography in the light of this fresh research, concentrating on prints and drawings and placing them in the context of what is known about the social, intellectual, and artistic environment in which the master lived and worked—a long-neglected field that has also benefited from recent studies.

Following a traditional order of classifying works of art, this survey begins with the religious drawings and prints, in particular the illustrations of biblical texts. Leaving aside biblical subjects that function essentially as staffage in some of The Large Landscapes (cat. nos. 22, 23, 25, 26), there are only a handful of examples in this category. Here it should be noted that the only works with Old Testament subjects by Bruegel now known or known to have existed are three paintings: the two versions of The Tower of Babel, one in the Kunsthistorisches Museum, Vienna, and the other one in the Museum Boijmans Van Beuningen, Rotterdam (fig. 5)—which, in fact, are more allegories of human pride than representations of the story in Genesis—and The Suicide of Saul (Kunsthistorisches Museum, Vienna). The great stories of the Creation, the lives of the patriarchs, the history of the Jewish people—despite what would seem to be their ideal dramatic content—clearly did not appeal to Bruegel. This is remarkable, given that printmakers and publishers in Antwerp and Haarlem, the two main centers of print production in the Netherlands in the second half of the sixteenth century, were particularly fond of such themes.

Bruegel’s choices of New Testament themes in his graphic oeuvre were unusual as well. Although he painted such popular and traditional subjects as the Adoration of the Kings, the Carrying of the Cross, and the Crucifixion, in his designs for prints he showed little interest in depicting the events of Christ’s life as reported in the Gospels. Instead, in these drawings, in keeping with his predilection for representing allegories, he favored the parables related by Christ. In such works as The Parable of the Wise and Foolish Virgins, 1560–63 (cat. no. 86), and The Parable of the Good Shepherd, 1565 (fig. 56), Bruegel searched for ways to give expression both to Christ’s puzzling words and to the symbolic intent of those words. This he did with consummate success in the Wise and Foolish Virgins by dividing his composition into halves, each of which he subdivided into two compartments. In the two sections of the lower half we see what Christ tells us about how the virgins occupy themselves as they wait his arrival as bridegroom. The upper half, which shows the wise maidens ushered into Christ’s house and the foolish ones barred from entrance, reveals the meaning of his words: only those who are prepared for the Second Coming will enter heaven at the Last Judgment. Very cleverly, in accord with the traditional hierarchy of the iconography of the Last Judgment, Bruegel also distinguished between the left and right sides of the image, placing the damned to the left of Christ and the saved to his right. His solution is less effective in The Parable of the Good Shepherd, in which he used a single, unified image, the type of composition he preferred—as study of his other allegories, both religious and secular, indicates. Here he attempted to present the several elements of the parable related in the Gospel of John in a rather confusing spatial continuum: at the lower left the thieves who enter the stable through its wall and roof and try to steal the unwilling sheep (10:1–5); at the center Christ shown as the gate to the stable, the embodiment of his metaphor “I am the door” (10:9); at the upper left the expression of his famous description of himself as the good shepherd who gives his life for his flock and, unlike the shepherd at the upper right, does not flee the wolves (10:11–14).

Although Bruegel’s compositional strategies differ in these two designs, in both the mise-en-scène is contemporary and stagelike, as it is in The Death of the Virgin, 1574 (cat. no. 117), where a biblical subject unfolds in a sixteenth-century Flemish interior. These choices lead us to speculate that the master invented such settings, rather than attempting historical reconstructions, in order to bring his religious subjects close to his audience and suggest the theatrical experience of viewing the popular moralizing plays of the rhetoricians.

A very different side of Pieter Bruegel’s artistic persona, his vision of the fantastical in the tradition of Hieronymus Bosch, is indulged in many religious drawings and prints, including The Temptation of Saint Anthony, 1556 (cat. nos. 36, 37), The Fall of the Magician Hermogenes, 1564 (cat. nos. 102, 103), and Saint James and the Magician Hermogenes,
1565 (cat. no. 101). In his own time and thereafter Bruegel was recognized as the successor to Bosch par excellence, and works of this kind clearly reveal why this was so. Indeed, in 1572 the Liège painter and humanist scholar Dominicus Lampsonius eulogized Bruegel as “Hieronymus Bosch, appeared again in the world . . . able to imitate . . . [and] now and then even to surpass him”; and in his 1604 history of painters in the Netherlands Karel van Mander wrote: “he had practised a lot after the works of Jeroon van den Bosch and he also made many spectres and burlesques in his manner, so that he was called by many Pier den Drol [Pieter the joker].”

Van Mander also maintained that “one sees few pictures by [Bruegel] which a spectator can contemplate seriously and without laughing, and however straightfaced and stately he may be, he has at least to twitch his mouth or smile.” Certainly it is true that Bruegel’s compositions, on religious as well as secular themes, swarm with demons, monsters, and witches who assume impossible acrobatic stances, grotesques that betray the artist’s exquisitely lively imagination and wicked sense of humor. That the master’s combining of comical and religious subject matter presented no problem for contemporary viewers is revealed by Van Mander, who tells us about “two pieces [by Bruegel] with the Carrying of the Cross, very natural to look at, in which there were always some burlesque details.” We see more than a few such burlesque details in the teeming imagery of The Temptation of Saint Anthony, The Fall of the Magician Hermogenes, and Saint James and the Magician Hermogenes, for example. And who would not laugh, or at least twitch his mouth and smile, at the drolleries in The Fall of the Magician Hermogenes, among them the two-legged face in the foreground with a lock threaded through its mouth that prevents it from speaking; or the bizarre creature with two arms at the other side of the composition whose tongue is pierced by some kind of object, or the acrobats in the background who are performing in front of a banner bearing a fused porcupine and unicorn. Clearly, Bruegel wished us to laugh at these inventions—as is no doubt indicated by the three smiling faces looking down on the scene from a window in the upper corner.

Yet he also intended to convey serious meaning in these images and maintained a balance between humor and religious content. This is a balance he preserved in two illustrations of basic tenets of Christian belief: The Last Judgment, 1558 (cat. nos. 56, 57), in which we see Christ passing his final judgment on doomsday, and The Descent of Christ into Limbo, 1561 (cat. nos. 87, 88), showing the Savior’s visit to the underworld to save the Old Testament prophets and patriarchs in the days between his death and resurrection. Both are subjects of the utmost gravity leavened by the appearance of fantastic and grotesque figures.
Each drawing and print of The Seven Deadly Sins (cat. nos. 42–54), a series Bruegel began in 1556, shows a female personification of a sin in the center of its composition, accompanied by an animal that traditionally symbolizes that vice. In Avaritia (Greed) (fig. 57, cat. nos. 42, 43), for example, the seated woman representing Greed appears with a toad, a reptile that from the Middle Ages onward stood for both the Devil and the sin of avarice. Around the woman we see a dehumanized and devastated world: people rob and are being robbed, are tormented by demons, and have lost all control over their surroundings to devilish creatures and monstrous contraptions, motifs that in many instances constitute witty embodiments of Netherlandish proverbs. Bruegel’s frightening, diabolical images offer evidence of the hellish everlasting life awaiting us after the Last Judgment and at the same time confront us with the monstrous consequences of our sins during life on earth, namely the loss of dignity and spiritual purity. Thus we can see that in Avaritia and in the other prints of the series the artist’s iconography, derived in part from fifteenth- and sixteenth-century traditions, is singularly appropriate to his serious moral message.

The message of The Seven Virtues (cat. nos. 64–77), executed in 1559–60, is no less serious, and the concepts those works express are equally abstract. Yet Bruegel chose to present them in his naturalistic style and everyday settings, a choice dictated by particular meanings and their context in society. Important elements remain, however: throughout there is the same sense of humor, and in the center of each composition we see a woman personifying an abstraction, here a virtue, surrounded by traditional attributes. In Caritas (Charity) (fig. 58, cat. nos. 66, 67), for instance, there is a woman holding a burning heart, a symbol of God’s love. Standing on her head is a pelican, a bird that tears its breast to provide blood with which to feed its offspring and thus an exemplification of Christ’s sacrifice and unselfish love for humankind. Two little boys at her side allude to the love of a mother for her children. All of these images provide models of behavior for us, the viewers, to follow, as do the seven acts of mercy that are shown around Caritas, clockwise from top left: visiting prisoners, giving drink to the thirsty, burying the dead, lodging strangers (symbolized by a pilgrim), visiting the sick, clothing the naked, and, finally, in the lower left corner, feeding

Bruegel’s prints and drawings presenting moral allegories are closely related to his treatments of religious themes, and like them they are of two expressive types: naturalistic renderings in stagelike contemporary settings, on the one hand, and Boschian fantasies, on the other. Although it is often suggested that there is a development from early works with phantasmagoric iconography to compositions in a mature, humanist-oriented, and naturalistic allegorical style, an analysis of the dated prints and drawings does not confirm this theory. In fact, throughout his career Bruegel used both modes simultaneously for religious subjects, for allegories, and for more straightforward peasant themes. It seems that he selected one or the other of these two basic manners, depending on the nature of the theme he was portraying and the meaning he wished to convey, as illustrated by his choices in the series The Seven Deadly Sins, or Vices, and The Seven Virtues, two of his greatest achievements in the field of graphic arts.
the hungry. These details are not only depicted in a naturalistic manner but are also incorporated in a realistic contemporary setting with no hint of the fantasy that informs The Seven Deadly Sins. This is in keeping with Bruegel’s intended meaning, for by combining the abstract concept of Caritas and symbolic allusions to Christian love and sacrifice with representations of practical good works and placing them in familiar surroundings, he expressed the notion that virtuous behavior could benefit society. By following the same pattern of juxtaposition throughout The Seven Virtues, the profoundly Christian values embodied in the series are situated in a secular context that directly relates to the world in which the master lived and worked.

Another group of allegorical drawings and prints we must examine shows a further engagement with social, economic, and religious issues. Like other sixteenth-century print designers, Bruegel was clearly very much aware of social and economic concerns of the day, several of which he alluded to in his compositions: the booming economy of Antwerp and other cities in the Netherlands, the rapidly increasing wealth and power of merchants, practical problems of urban poverty, the greed of entrepreneurs, and the moral value of labor and industriousness as opposed to the sin of idleness.9

Greed and its disastrous effects on human life and the soul, for example, he explored not only in the aforementioned Avaritia but also in such works as Everyman, 1558 (cat. nos. 58, 59), and The Battle about Money, after 1570 (cat. no. 115). Some observers have interpreted these images as outright criticisms of the growing importance of trade and commerce in Flemish society. It seems far more likely, however, that they reflect Bruegel’s concern with greed, self-enrichment, and poverty as moral rather than as economic or political problems—the point of view of theologians and humanist scholars as well as the urban middle class, to which he himself belonged. Thus, The Battle about Money shows avarice as leading to moral corruption and as the source of war, reflecting a long-standing Christian tradition of opposition to the accumulation of wealth. And it is also in the light of the Christian tradition that praises labor and industriousness that Bruegel portrayed Desidia (Sloth) (cat. nos. 52, 53) as a vice in his Seven Deadly Sins and ridiculed it together with gluttony in The Land of Cockaigne, after 1570? (cat. no. 116). That Bruegel did not intend to make social statements in images of this kind is borne out by his Thin Kitchen and Fat Kitchen (figs. 59, 60), a pair of prints published in 1563. Although some modern viewers might like to see these two pictures as an attack on the problem of poverty, this is certainly not the case: while the fat people in their kitchen are distorted grotesques who are mocked for their lack of restraint in eating, the poor thin people are also caricatured without compassion.10

The types in The Fat Kitchen and The Thin Kitchen lead us to yet another category of the master’s oeuvre, the peasant themes that gave rise to the epithet Boeren Bruegel. The

Fig. 58. Philips Galle after Pieter Bruegel the Elder. Detail, cat. no. 67. Caritas (Charity)
Fig. 59. Pieter van der Heyden after Pieter Bruegel the Elder. *The Thin Kitchen*, 1563. Engraving. Museum Boijmans Van Beuningen, Rotterdam

Fig. 60. Pieter van der Heyden after Pieter Bruegel the Elder. *The Fat Kitchen*, 1563. Engraving. Museum Boijmans Van Beuningen, Rotterdam
paintings, drawings, and prints of this kind have been studied extensively and subjected to a wide variety of interpretations over the years. By now, however, the once-fierce debate about whether or not Bruegel was sympathetic to the peasants and peasant life he portrayed has subsided. Scholars now agree that while remnants of the long tradition of satirizing peasants in German and Netherlandish art live on in the master's work, the old view that the city-dweller Bruegel was merely poking fun at the lowest class of countryfolk is no longer tenable. Indeed, it is clear that such prints as the Kermis of Saint George, ca. 1559 (cat. no. 79), the Kermis at Hoboken, ca. 1559 (cat. no. 80), and The Peasant Wedding Dance, after 1570 (fig. 61, cat. no. 113), are not satires that show an entirely negative attitude toward the peasantry. Rather, they are more complex and nuanced, revealing a sense of humor and pleasure taken in witnessing a display of vital behavior; in addition, in the words of Walter Gibson, they "convey a sense of amused detachment of an observer watching, even participating in the dance, while maintaining a certain distance." Here Bruegel is convincingly shown as a burgher who regards his compatriots in the countryside with a mixture of admiration, pleasure, and just a touch of superiority.

However mixed his feelings regarding the peasants may have been, Bruegel expressed his wholehearted and profound love of the countryside in numerous graphic works, in which he presented a vision of landscape that is always beautiful and sometimes idealized. We see this idealization in, for instance, the pastoral atmosphere of Spring, 1565 (cat. nos. 105, 106), and Summer, 1568 (fig. 62, cat. nos. 109, 110), completed just before his death as part of an unfinished series of The Seasons. Although some authors have argued that even in Summer Bruegel's intent was to ridicule the peasantry, surely the more important feature here, and in other works of the kind, is the celebration of nature's beauty. This is a recurrent theme in Bruegel's landscapes, visible in his earliest known graphic works, from the years 1552 to 1554. Indeed, it appears in prints and drawings as various and early as the delicate Southern Cloister in a Valley, 1552 (cat. no. 1); the Cow Pasture before a Farmhouse, ca. 1554 (cat. no. 19), a boldly executed scene in Titianesque style; and the broad, grand mountain views of The Large Landscapes group, ca. 1555–56 (cat. nos. 22–34). Their differences and sometimes idealized elements notwithstanding, all of Bruegel's landscapes are in essence naturalistic and in this respect represent a major step in the development of Dutch and Flemish landscape art.

The works touched on above give shape to Bruegel's own concerns as well as to themes that reflect broad general interests and the cultural climate of his time—religious subjects, moral allegories, certain social issues, the plays of contemporary rhetoricians, love of landscape. Two unique drawings, however, seem possibly to reflect more deeply personal feelings about his life as an artist. These are The Painter and the Connoisseur, mid-1560s (fig. 63, cat. no. 100), and The Calumny of Apelles, ca. mid-1560s (cat. no. 104), both of which have as their subject the stupidity and shortsightedness of a patron who does not understand an artist. In the first, the more original composition, we see a visionary, prophetlike painter together with an obviously nearsighted, foolish critic or "connoisseur." The second is an image based on a famous lost painting by Apelles, an illustrious Greek artist of the fourth century B.C. That Calumny, which was known through a description by the classical writer Lucian, was a popular subject in sixteenth-century humanist circles. According to Lucian, it showed how a
successful court painter is discredited by an envious rival and almost condemned because of the stupidity and ignorance of his patron. In the end, however, the naked Truth, seen at the very left of Bruegel’s drawing, prevails over Ignorance and Suspicion, shown at the right advising the king.

As The Painter and the Connoisseur and the Calumny were not drawn to be engraved and because they seem so personal, it may well be that Bruegel intended them to be enjoyed in private with friends and fellow artists. But this is not certain, and much else remains unclear about these two sheets. Some writers have surmised but not proved, for example, that they relate to specific painting commissions and that Bruegel portrayed himself in them. We do know that The Painter and the Connoisseur was popular, for at least four copies of it were made. And we can speculate that both drawings were among the works to which Van Mander referred when he wrote: “One sees many unusual inventions of symbolic subjects of his witty work in print; but he had still many more, neatly and carefully drawn with some captions on them, some of which he got his wife to burn when he was on his deathbed because they were too caustic or derisory, either because he was sorry or that he was afraid that on their account she would get into trouble or she might have to answer for them.”

The works briefly discussed here and elaborated upon, together with other drawings and prints in the catalogue entries in this volume, provide several clues about Pieter Bruegel and his milieu. They clearly tell us, for instance, that he was a member of the rising urban middle class, probably in the prosperous city of Antwerp, from which he at some point moved to Brussels, the seat of the Habsburg court and governmental power in Flanders. And we can deduce from some of these works that he was certainly not the learned scholar and erudite humanist that several art historians have made of him, for they reveal that he had not mastered Latin, the lingua franca of the scholarly world: the few short Latin captions by his hand on preparatory drawings, such as the designs for The Seven Virtues, show strange spellings, and the lengthier inscriptions (in Dutch as well as in Latin) were clearly written by someone else.

That is not to say that Bruegel did not move in learned circles or had no access to Latin sources or books in other languages. In Antwerp in the third quarter of the sixteenth century there were numerous humanist scholars with connections throughout Europe. Among them were men in the orbit of the press of Christophe Plantin who were Bruegel's friends or acquaintances, including the famous and erudite geographer Abraham Ortelius, the scholarly printmaker and publisher Philips Galle, and the scholar, printmaker, playwright, and notary Dirck Volckertsz. Coornhert (see entry for cat. no. 17). Such individuals could have provided Bruegel with specific literary and iconographic sources and, indeed, publications of all kinds; in addition, they may well have helped him work out his intricate allegories, and they probably wrote verses for inscription on his prints.

Whatever the role of the contributions of others and of tradition in his oeuvre, Bruegel was uniquely inventive. Never content to repeat or merely modify iconographic models that had come down to him, whether religious or secular images, he always searched for new pictorial solutions for existing subjects. Out of his love and understanding of Boschian fantasies and popular culture—which he plumbed by illustrating folk sayings and proverbs—and the inspiration of the moralizing allegorical plays of contemporary rhetoricians, he invented a new and personal vision in such great works as The Seven Deadly Sins, The Seven Virtues, Everyman, and The Beekeepers. His powerful feeling for the beauty of nature and his sharp eye for the details of bucolic life in the Italian and Flemish countryside led him to conceive innovative masterpieces of landscape drawing and prints, including the Cow Pasture before a Farmhouse, The Large Landscapes, and Summer. And in
addition to his other fabulous talents there is also his great wit, a gift we can recognize today as clearly as Van Mander did four hundred years ago, when he wrote: “Nature found and struck lucky wonderfully well . . . our lasting fame of the Netherlands, the very lively and whimsical Pieter Brueghel.”6

1. The first historiographic study of Bruegel and the evolution of his reputation is Michel 1938. To date the best survey of Bruegel’s fortuna critica is Van der Stock 1989. For other recent comments on changing perceptions of Bruegel in the twentieth century, see Gibson 1989 and Meadow 1996. For an overview of the master’s life, work, and iconography, with further references, see Müller 1996 and Wied 1996. A fairly complete bibliography of Bruegel studies up to 1996 is provided in Müller 1997.

2. My discussion makes use of several such studies on printmaking, publishing, humanist scholarship, and redrijker literature in the Antwerp of Bruegel’s time, which are cited here. The humanist milieu around the illustrious Officina Plantiniana in Antwerp has been well documented in Léon Voet’s monumental studies, especially Voet 1675–76 and Voet and Voet-Grissolle 1972–74, and in the series of excellent exhibition catalogues published by the Museum Plantin-Moretus, Antwerp, over the last fifteen years. The study of sixteenth-century Netherlands literature as an intrinsic element of popular culture, including the visual arts, and its relevance in the culture of burgeoning cities was enriched by the work of Herman Pleij (notably 1979 and 1988). Guido Marnef (1996) has provided an excellent history of Antwerp in the third quarter of the sixteenth century, and Alfonso Thijs (1990) has written a valuable study of the development of the Counter-Reformation in the period. A new line of research on Antwerp print publishing was initiated in 1971 by Timothy Riggs’s fundamental study of the workshop of Hieronymus Cock and followed up by surveys of the printshops of Peeter Balins (Kostjashyn 1994) and of Philips Galle (Sellink 1997) and by Jan van der Stock’s 1998 overview of Antwerp print publishing up to 1835. A more superficial survey of Antwerp printmaking in the second half of the sixteenth century was offered in the exhibition “Graven Images: The Rise of Professional Printmakers in Antwerp and Haarlem, 1540–1600,” at the Mary and Leigh Block Gallery, Northwestern University, Evanston, Illinois, and in essays by Larry Silver, Walter Melion, and Timothy Riggs in its accompanying catalogue. In the field of iconographic studies the use of anthropological and sociological methodology has recently led to new insights, to which the innovative texts of Paul Vandendorpe (1977 and 1991) testify. These new approaches are applied to the study of art in Antwerp in the period of Bruegel’s activity in the numerous essays in Brussels 1992 and Antwerp 1993.


4. On The Parable of the Good Shepherd, see Van Bastelaer and Hulin de Loo, 1907, no. 124; Brussels 1969, no. 59; and Tokyo 1989, no. 59.


10. Van Bastelaer and Hulin de Loo, 1907, nos. 154, 159; Brussels 1969, nos. 55, 56; Tokyo 1989, nos. 55, 56.

11. An excellent summary of these interpretations, as well as a thoughtful and convincing reconsideration of the evidence in question, is provided in Gibson 1993, pp. 11–52.

12. Ibid., p. 37.

13. The Seasons sheets are related to Bruegel’s Months, his famous painting cycle. In this connection I would like to draw attention to Michael Eyres’s exquisite novel Headlong (1990), which focuses on the quest for a lost painting from the cycle. The novel shows profound knowledge and understanding of Bruegel and his work and provides as well a hilarious insight into the profession of art history and the vanity and frustrated ambitions of its practitioners.

14. Catherine Levesque (1994, pp. 17–31) has attempted to show that Bruegel’s landscapes, especially The Large Landscapes etchings, convey knowledge and humanist views on moral matters within a “journey framework.” Also see the harsh but just criticism of her highly debatable interpretation by Huizinga Leeflang (1995, esp. pp. 274–76).


16. Ibid., p. 190 (1604, fol. 233r).

Fig. 63. Pieter Brueghel the Elder. Detail, cat. no. 100. The Painter and the Connoisseur
The Importance of Being Bruegel: The Posthumous Survival of the Art of Pieter Bruegel the Elder

LARRY SILVER

Only recently has the importance of the Bruegel tradition for the art of the Northern Netherlands, what we call Dutch art, been fully acknowledged. This is largely because of scholarship’s anachronistic separation of Flemish and Dutch art traditions along the modern national borders of Belgium and the Netherlands. Attending simultaneously to artists on both sides of the river Scheldt—including in particular those Flemish artists who migrated northward after 1585—however, actually underscores the pervasiveness of Bruegel’s extended influence, at the same time it shows the decisive evolution of his own pictorial ideas into new but related concepts of landscape and figure groups. This essay will attempt to chart in the realm of prints and drawings both the forms and the content of the influence that reached into the generation after the master’s death—which should be termed a Bruegel survival rather than a Bruegel revival.

We can begin to see the influence of Bruegel and the conditions for his popularity by examining one of his most admired drawings, The Painter and the Connoisseur, mid-1560s (cat. no. 100). This image provides a wry commentary on the emerging dependence of painters on buyers within the nexus of an emerging art market, which was especially intense in Bruegel’s Antwerp. The scruffy yet eagle-eyed artist and his complementary shortsighted and bespectacled but well-heeled client are witty caricatures that reveal how each type regarded the other. But what is striking about this image in the context of our discussion is that it generated no fewer than four careful copies, even though it was a work intended for private delectation, rather than one of his paintings, which would have been displayed more publicly and were often copied. (One of the drawings after The Painter and the Connoisseur [British Museum, London] has even been attributed to no less an artist than Rubens.)

Such literal copies of Bruegel’s work constitute one kind of extended afterlife of his art; indeed, a number of Bruegel drawings survive only through their copies. Below we shall examine various copies in this category, such as the several nearly identical drawings of thick forest settings populated by wild animals. Another large group of drawings has only recently been unmasked as a set of outright forgeries of Bruegel’s work, with imitations of his technique and form and false signatures and dates, possibly in the main (but perhaps not entirely) by an imitator of the next generation, Jacob Savery (see cat. nos. 126–129). Jacob’s younger brother, Roelandt Savery, also imitated Bruegel figure types and techniques—so successfully that his group of drawings of one or more figures after life (naer het leven) (see cat. nos. 130–134) was taken from Bruegel and reattributed to him only a generation ago. Forgeries and imitations of this sort provide another type of afterlife, albeit a spurious one.

Ultimately, however, the real legacy of Pieter Bruegel the Elder is his distinctive combination of techniques and subjects and his concept of drawings (and their less expensive and more readily available replications in the form of reproductive prints) as independent works of art and collector’s items in their own right. This was a model for art making, both in drawings and prints, that would be extended from Bruegel’s native Flanders by a generation of epigones, including the Savery brothers and others, who moved north to the province of Holland in a time of religious and political, but not necessarily artistic, separation between the regions.

In Flanders itself, particularly within the continuing artistic tradition in Antwerp, Bruegel still served as a model, not least because of the ongoing production, especially of paintings, by his two sons: Pieter Brueghel the
Younger (1564–1637/38), who most often made literal copies after his father’s compositions; and Jan Brueghel (1568–1625), the more inventive spirit and sometime collaborator with Rubens and other artists. As we shall see, Jan Brueghel’s numerous drawings on related themes are instructive in showing how his father’s example was modified and developed into new directions at the same time it was followed in its essentials. Perhaps more surprising than the sons’ inspiration by the father, Rubens himself occasionally took Bruegel as a model—not only for oddities such as his presumed copy of *The Painter and the Connoisseur* but especially when he painted “in Flemish”: both for scenes of peasant festivities (such as his *Kermis* in the Louvre) and for panoramic landscapes with peasant labors. In this respect it is worth recalling that at his death in 1640 Rubens owned no fewer than eight works by Bruegel, including a lost Alpine landscape drawing (listed as “the Hill of St. Gotthard by old Bruegel” in Rubens’s own inventory) and a *Flight into Egypt* (now identified as the work dated 1563 in the Courtauld Institute Galleries, London).

But while we note the continuity of Flemish dependence on Bruegel’s ideas, we must also stress the little-acknowledged importance of his imagery for later Dutch art, particularly in the formative period of the early seventeenth century. That influence was embodied in many ways. Perhaps most notable was the adoption of some of Bruegel’s formulas of landscape painting; here, however, the response to what had been a minor emphasis in his graphic works, his thick forest wildernesses, was rather more significant than the inspiration of the panoramic vistas that had dominated sixteenth-century imagery. In addition, Bruegel’s distinctive representation of winter with scenes of ice skaters took on its own extended after-life well into the seventeenth century. And finally, Bruegel’s unending fascination with themes of peasant life, both festivities and labors in the countryside, provided continuing inspiration for later Dutch artists, who also imitated his celebrated scenes of peasants acting out folk sayings and proverbs.

The principal and direct link between Bruegel’s Flemish art and the Dutch art that subsequently developed his ideas was provided by a generation of the master’s successors, Flemish artists who fled to the Northern Netherlands for religious reasons during the turbulent early years of the Dutch Revolt, chiefly after the fall of Antwerp in 1585, and settled in Amsterdam: Hans Bol, Gillis van Coninxloo, Jacob and Roelant Savery, and, in particular, David Vinckboons. We shall see the significance for the continuity and development of the Bruegel legacy of these émigré artists. Here we should point out that political and religious circumstances impelled them to become “Dutch” rather than remain in Catholic Flanders and that views of either wilderness settings or an arable, peasant-filled local countryside would take on an altered meaning during the traumatic disruptions of the Dutch Revolt.
Landscape Legacies

Some portion of the Flemish world-landscape tradition was transmitted from its early-sixteenth-century founders, led by Joachim Patinir (d. 1524), to Pieter the Elder and on to the generations active in the new century, including Rubens.7 Karel van Mander’s justified praise for Bruegel in his 1604 Schilder-boeck focused on the new naturalism of Alpine mountain settings as a great improvement over Patinir’s entirely conventional and imagined crags.8 Yet experts have not often attended to the interest in mountain scenes displayed by Dutch painters who followed Bruegel. The same shortsightedness that has generally divided nationalistic scholarship between studies of Belgium and Holland has kept the influence of Bruegel’s mountains out of those accounts, which seek to identify “progressive” landscape trends with the depiction of flat Dutch countryside (in contrast to the fascination with mountains manifested by generations of Flemish artists, such as the De Momperes).9

A case in point is Hendrick Goltzius (1558–1616), usually invoked as the breakthrough draftsman of Holland in terms of establishing an independent Dutch style because of his drawings of panoramic views from the top of dunes in the vicinity of Haarlem (see fig. 64). However, his dot-and-stipple technique for rendering light and atmosphere in the landscape, even in this quintessentially Dutch scene, derives from Bruegel.10 Moreover, for all his vaunted realism, which, like Bruegel’s, was based on direct experience of the Alps during a trip to Italy (in his case in 1592), Goltzius produced drawings of mountains that are astoundingly conventional, indeed Bruegelian, in their forms. His drawing in the Morgan Library (fig. 65) not only includes a distant and arbitrary structure of mountains that step back into space but also assembles a nonnatural world-landscape juxtaposition of mountain with coastline of the sort seen in compositions by both Patinir and Bruegel. Far from being an isolated image confined to a single sheet in a private collection, this drawing was etched for wider distribution by the printmaker Simon Frisius and published in The Hague by Hendrick Hondius (fig. 66).11

Evidence that the importance of Bruegel’s formulas for mountain views endured for the generation of Flemish and

Fig. 65. Hendrick Goltzius, Mountainous Coastal Landscape, ca. 1596–97. Pen and brown ink. The Pierpont Morgan Library, New York
Flemish émigré artists who succeeded him emerges most vividly from the cluster of drawings that modern scholarship has assigned to Jacob Savery. Jacob Savery (ca. 1565–1603) trained in Flanders with Bol, who was Bruegel’s contemporary, and like his teacher became a citizen of Amsterdam in 1591;5 the works in question are drawn in the characteristic Bruegelian broad pen strokes with stipple technique that evokes atmosphere and usually feature a dominant cliff in one half of the landscape and a deep river view in the other half. Virtually all of these drawings are signed BRUEGEL in block capital letters and dated in the early 1560s.

Thus at the very moment that Goltzius was carrying out his own emulations of Bruegel’s mountain landscapes, Jacob Savery was producing “Bruegel” landscape drawings—in some recently unmasked cases, outright forgeries, each complete with a false signature and date. This permutation of the sincerest form of flattery underscores the demand for authentic Bruegel landscape drawings at the beginning of the seventeenth century and also shows the degree to which artists trained in Flanders in the Bruegel idiom felt competent to pass their works off as the master’s. Indeed, Jacob Savery surely was not the only skilled imitator of Bruegel; a cluster of drawings smaller than the Savery group with much finer stipple technique and a different set of sepia tones of ink, such as the Morgan Library Mountain Landscape with a River, Village, and Castle (cat. no. 120) and the Bowdoin College Alpine Landscape (cat. no. 121), points to an even more accomplished yet still anonymous imitator, whose works are so successful that they were long esteemed as examples of Pieter the Elder’s landscape masterpieces.

By the end of the sixteenth century the mountain view in the old idiom of the world landscape was a relatively stale pictorial construct (the Jacob Savery forgeries were taken to be Bruegel originals for so long in part because of their old-fashioned appearance). By contrast, the principal alternative landscape type, the forest landscape, was developed in more progressive ways and became the turn-of-the-century’s favorite formula (in both Flanders and Holland) for a remote wilderness site.6 Like the world-landscape model, it came under the formative influence of

---

Fig. 66. Simon Frisius after Hendrik Goltzius. Mountainous Landscape, 1608. Etching. The British Museum, London
Pieter Bruegel. In fact, a prime work that established Bruegel’s forest vision stands at the very outset of his career: the *Landscape with Bears* (cat. no. 15), a drawing without human figures that was later enhanced and transformed into an etching, *The Temptation of Christ* (cat. no. 16), published by Hieronymus Cock. Jan Brueghel made his own variant copy after the Cock etching in a drawing signed and dated 1595 that is now in the Collection Frits Lugt, Paris.4

The same basic compositional strategy is apparent in a number of copies, for example, the *Wooded Landscape with a Family of Bears, Deer, and Other Wild Animals*, ca. 1600 (fig. 113), and variants that attest to a lost, early original ascribed to the period of Bruegel’s trip to Italy of 1552 to 1554 and also in an authentic sheet in Milan, *Wooded Landscape with Mills*, 1552 (cat. no. 2; see entry for that work). What is striking about the Milan original as well as the copies is the emphasis on foreground trees, seen close-up and looking conspicuously artificial with their sinuous S curves and evocative sketchy hatchings and stipplings. In all of these images the viewpoint and horizon are low, and the contrasts of near and deep space remain strong.5 The concept of the forest scene as articulated in the *Landscape with Bears* also helped to shape Pieter’s own later print issued by Cock, *Pagus Nemorosus (Wooded Region)*, ca. 1555–56 (cat. no. 32), where the village clearing appears to have been carved out of the wild growth of the thick trees, which occupy fully half of the surface of the image. Here we can see that this influential formula offers a kind of flatland version of the world landscape, moving as it does from the wilderness of the forest, through the country hamlet, to a distant view of a major metropolis at the left horizon across the river.

The copies of Bruegel’s forest landscapes we have mentioned are not marked simulations or forgeries of the kind made by either Roelandt or Jacob Savery. Moreover, several of these wooded scenes with wild animals, such as bears or goats (and even exotic animals in the instance of a fine but problematic drawing in Cambridge, Massachusetts [cat. no. 119]), are now attributed to Jan Brueghel; thus they suggest that a number of originals by Pieter remained as part of the artistic patrimony of the Bruegel family and influenced the powerful and personal contribution made by his son to the forest landscape tradition in both paintings and drawings. A splendid example of the form as evolved at the hands of Jan Brueghel is the *Swamp Landscape*, 1593 (fig. 67), which does not closely copy drawings by his father, such as *Stream with an Angler*, ca. 1554 (cat. no. 18), but instead offers an emulation and variation of the prototype of the forest landscape.6 The pattern visible here was followed as well in other areas of Bruegel’s influence: we shall see that
artists of the next generation not only copied and forged models on this and other themes but also refashioned those models into their own updated versions while they still drew substantially upon them.

Because the evolution of the forest landscape in painting has been well charted in the scholarship of recent years (and also because the subject of the present exhibition is graphic art), there is little reason to discuss it here, except to remark that this Bruegelian innovation was embraced with phenomenal enthusiasm by both Flemish and Dutch painters about 1600. Some of these artists treated the theme in drawings as well as paintings. One such was, of course, Jan Brueghel, who was occupied with forest landscapes with and without figures on either side of the year 1600 and from as early as 1594.17

Alongside Jan Brueghel, the painter usually credited, perhaps even overcredited, with making the greatest contribution to the development of images in forest settings is Gillis van Coninxloo (1544–1607), who was born in Antwerp and died in Amsterdam. Indeed, Van Mander said of Coninxloo that “his manner of working is beginning to be followed a great deal; the trees which stood here somewhat withered begin to grow like his.”18 A forest landscape painting in Vaduz dated 1598 is the first dated picture by Coninxloo that treats the formula and offers a point of departure for dating and discussion of his work in this realm; his influence was broadened, however, by means of his later designs for large-scale prints. These were engraved principally by another professional printmaker, the insufficiently studied Nicolaes de Bruyn (1571–1656), with the address of Frans van Beusecom, and also by Johannes van Londerseel (1578–1625), who published with Claes Jansz. Visscher.19 It should be noted here that some of Coninxloo’s earlier compositions engraved by De Bruyn show forest settings on foreground hilltops opposite more distant mountain peaks, a combination that is an extension and refinement of the Bruegel world-landscape formula. In most of these designs the crown of foliage of one of the near trees bends over to conform to the top of the image, creating a canopy, a typical example being The Finding of Moses, 1601 (fig. 68). Like so many details in the work of the new generation, this is a specific compositional strategy.
with roots in prototypes by Bruegel, here chiefly the *Wooded Landscape with Mills*, and Pieter’s own variants, such as the *Italian Landscape (after Domenico Campagnola)*, 1554 (cat. no. 13). 10

In terms of meaning the forest succeeds the mountains as the locality of wilderness experiences in the work of both Jan Brueghel and Coninxloo. The concentrated isolation of the wooded setting provides another kind of site for the same moral trials involving ethical decisions or even tests of physical strength undergone by hermit saints and biblical heroes in Bruegel’s mountainscapes. We can note the appearance of such trials in the forest in the roster of Old Testament subjects in prints designed by Coninxloo: *Jacob and Esau*, 1601; *The Finding of Moses*, 1601; *Elisha and the Children of Bethel*, 1602; *The Prophet Hosea Praying, Samson Fighting with the Lion*, 1603; and in the New Testament scenes *Christ and the Woman with an Issue of Blood*, and *The Way to Emmaus*, (the latter a theme Bruegel included among the group of The Large Landscapes [cat. no. 23] almost half a century earlier). And we see one in a scene he derived from Greek mythology that treats the ultimate moment of choice: the *Judgment of Paris*, 1600. All are linked in meaning, for the outcome of every story depends upon the right or wrong seeing of the figures involved (and by implication by the viewer as well). This is true whether that outcome is the result of the bad choice made by the children surrounding Elisha or the poor judgment of Paris or the actions taken by Abraham, the pilgrims on their way to Emmaus, or others who have been afforded divine revelations. 11

The forest, far from the mundane and familiar world of the city, provides the appropriate setting for exceptional figures, both holy and mythic. Here, as in the world landscapes, figures and setting are truly matched; and as Reindert Falkenburg and I have both argued, the remoteness and grand scale of the forest or the earlier mountain wilderness signal the sanctity or gravity of the human scene, however small in scale, which the discerning viewer must seek out and read as significant. The connection between the wilderness and the moral choices within it as presented in the small-figure religious scenes of the pictorial tradition of Pieter Bruegel was further emphasized when Jan Brueghel and Coninxloo refined and redefined that tradition, both in paintings and in graphics. 12

**Rustic Leisure and Danger**

In addition to the wooded landscapes with their exceptional figures from the Bible and mythology, another, more ordinary kind of setting for more commonplace characters passed from Bruegel to succeeding generations: the winter landscape with skaters. The artists we have mentioned, Bol, Coninxloo, the Savery brothers, and Vinckboons—the Flemish émigrés who settled in Amsterdam and practiced an extended and modified version of Bruegel’s artistic formulas—all transmitted this major contribution, as they did other pictorial forms, to a new generation in seventeenth-century Holland. 13

The key link, however, is Hans Bol (1534–1593), who began his career in Mechelen but went to work in nearby Antwerp after the Spanish sacked his hometown. From 1572 to 1584 he remained in Antwerp, where he took citizenship in 1573, and worked with Cock’s printing establishment. He became a citizen of his eventual refuge, Amsterdam, in 1591. 14

The models for the winter landscapes lay in both paintings and prints. Among them is Bruegel’s most often copied painting, *Winter Landscape with Skaters*, 1565 (Musées Royaux des Beaux-Arts de Belgique, Brussels), which became a veritable cash cow for Pieter the Younger, who made numerous reprises of it, usually on the same small scale as the original, if not exactly in the same dimensions. 15 A graphic image of winter activities that became a prototype is *Winter*, 1570, by Bol (fig. 69)—an engraving that completed the print series of The Seasons published by Cock in 1570, for which Bruegel had designed both *Spring*, 1565 (cat. nos. 105, 106), and *Summer*, 1568 (cat. nos. 109, 110). Thus the Bol engraving’s pedigree shows a once-removed relationship to Bruegel’s own designs, and like them it was copied often in paintings by Pieter the Younger (for example in a series of 1616 now in Bucharest). 16 Bol’s sheet features large-scale human figures as much as it does the ice and snow of the frigid season, and it is noteworthy for the way it mingles classes in the leveling activity of skating across the frozen river. In both respects Bol’s design is closely linked to a Bruegel drawing of 1558 published as an engraving by Cock: *Ice Skating before the Gate of Saint George* (cat. nos. 62, 63). Such scenes of everyday pleasures by Bruegel, and by extension the progeny of those scenes, may seem entirely different in intent from the wilderness landscapes; some authors, however, have interpreted these images
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as belonging to the same tradition of representing moral trials and choice, arguing that the winter scenes refer to the risks of skating and walking on ice and, in the instance of Pieter’s painting Winter Landscape with Bird Trap, 1365, in Brussels, to the menace of the bird trap.\textsuperscript{57}

That this winter subgenre became a staple of artistic production on both sides of the Scheldt after 1600 is attested both in paintings and graphic work. Clear proof of its popularity is provided in the career of Hendrick Avercamp (1585–1634), whose entire output, beginning about 1608–9, was devoted to such images of Dutch rural life, elaborated with many more figures than seen in the earlier models.\textsuperscript{58} Winter scenes were of course parts of suites showing The Four Seasons, and Bruegel’s prototypes continued to inspire many print series, among them village scenes of Jan van de Velde II (ca. 1593–1641), including a sheet of 1617 (fig. 70) in which the layout of the town amid trees and the distant view at the left horizon clearly depend upon Bruegel’s engraving Pagus Nemorusus (Wooded Region).\textsuperscript{59} Another notable example from the same moment is the etching with engraving by Frisius after David Vinckboons, Winter, 1618, a work filled with a dense crowd of elegant, well-dressed small figures.\textsuperscript{60} Skating on frozen ponds and especially canals remains a major national pastime in the Netherlands to this day, marked in exceptionally cold years by organized long-course races.

An important component of the Bruegel heritage related to the skating themes in its focus on rustic leisure are peasant subjects, usually festive scenes of village kermises. The kermis scenes have been studied so extensively over the past several decades that they might seem to be a cliché by now; however, as the many later emulations make clear, they are one of Bruegel’s most potent legacies.\textsuperscript{3} Bruegel’s own interpretations took the form of paintings executed during the last decade of his life and also were a critical element of his print output, including the Kermis of Saint George, published by Cock about 1559 (cat. no. 79), and the Kermis at Hoboken issued about 1559 by Bartholomeus de Mompere (cat. no. 80), as well as later sheets, such as The Peasant Wedding Dance or The Peasant Wedding, published after 1570 by Cock’s widow (cat. no. 113).

Of course, peasant subjects were not invented or exclusively offered by Bruegel. They were, however, certainly a crucial part of his contribution, generating numerous painted replicas by Pieter the Younger, who remained in Antwerp, and also inspiring versions that became a major staple of the émigré artist community. In that community they were taken up first by Bol and then by his pupils Vinckboons and Jacob Savery. Jacob Savery we have already met as an outright forger of Bruegel landscape drawings, but here we come back to him because his interest in the master extended beyond such deceptions to preoccupation with Bruegel’s peasant subjects, which he interpreted in both paintings and prints.\textsuperscript{3} For the most part in such scenes the followers, like Bruegel himself, presented small figures in great crowds, engaged in dancing, feasting, and other leisure activities, as well as fighting, usually within the open market space of a village center adjacent to a church front.
As Svetlana Alpers and other commentators have noted, these images often also include figures of visitors, well-dressed patricians who observe the celebrations: a motif that has inspired much scholarly debate about whether the gesture of a visit should be taken to represent social condescension or rather, as Alpers contends, an upper-class affiliation with the perceived freedom and license of the boisterous lower classes.\footnote{11} What is striking about these village scenes is their embrace of the local setting, in contrast to the utterly foreign topography of mountain or forest landscapes seen in the other genres discussed here. Notable also is their suggestion of considerable sympathy for the peasantry, even where boorish manners are emphasized, and the image of social cohesion and order, however much fantasized and nostalgic, they present at the precise moment the Dutch Revolt was most destabilizing that very social order.\footnote{12} Even if Bruegel himself did not feel acute nostalgia for the innocent merriment of the peasants when he first created his images about 1560, his successors surely felt its grip during the dislocation and strife of the later, worst years of the revolt as they yearned ever more intensely for the halcyon qualities of the village environment.

Another peasant theme, in this case an ominous one, that was inspired by a core idea in Bruegel’s art had particular resonance for the generation of successor artists during these violent times: the boerenverdriet, or “peasant distress,” as it is called in contemporary inventories.\footnote{30} The wellspring of this imagery lies in Bruegel’s painting The Attack, 1567 (Stockholm University)—or a picture close to it, adapted by a follower—in which a small cluster of peasants is beset by armed bandit soldiers on a road in open country.\footnote{36} However, this painting is by no means unique in Bruegel’s oeuvre, for we can trace the theme in several of his works. We see it, for instance, in the projection of contemporary soldiers harassing villagers in the guise of a biblical scene in the painting Massacre of the Innocents, ca. 1566 (original at Hampton Court),\footnote{37} and we also note the rather unsettling presence of soldiers in a number of earlier prints. For example, they loiter alongside a roadway as a pair of travelers pass by safely in Milites Requistesentes (Soldiers at Rest), ca. 1555–56 (cat. no. 31), one of The Large Landscapes prints issued by Cock; and a soldier, armed with a pike and wearing a helmet, stalks a hunter with a crossbow from behind a tree in the only etching Bruegel executed himself, The Rabbit Hunt, 1560 (cat. no. 82). The significance of the latter subject remains unclear, although the consensus is that it is a vision of a hunter hunted, and the overall sense of the menace of man hunting is undeniable, despite the attractive expanse of the open river landscape in the distance. (This is a juxtaposition of opposites akin to the contrast between the dancing peasants and the large gallows in Bruegel’s painting The Magpie on the Gallows, 1568 [fig. 7].)\footnote{38}

As Jane Fishman and Jan Briels point out, boerenverdriet was represented by both Vinckboons and Jacob Savery at the end of the sixteenth century.\footnote{39} Typical of their treatments is a sheet by Vinckboons in the Städelisches Kunstinstitut und Städtische Galerie, Frankfurt, and another by Savery in The British Museum, London. In his drawing Savery inserted his narrative of menace in an environment that recalls models by Bruegel: his open village square is like Pieter’s settings in the designs for the Kermis of Saint George and the Kermis at Hoboken, but he replaced his predecessor’s market scenes with a scene of plunder, in which wagons are used for the theft of peasant wares rather than for their sale. Similarly, Vinckboons and others carried out both prints and paintings in which scenes of attack take place along roadsides in landscapes based on Bruegel’s formulas: examples are an etching by Bol, a print designed by Vinckboons and engraved by Johannes van Londerseel (fig. 76),\footnote{10} and painted panels of 1607 by Jan Brueghel with figures by Sebastiaan Vranckx (Koninklijk Museum voor Schone Kunsten, Antwerp, and Alte Pinakothek, Munich).\footnote{41}

*Bruegel Epigones: Vinckboons’s Formulas*

The most comprehensive continuation of Bruegel’s formulas within the Northern Netherlands was carried out in the paintings, drawings, and prints of David Vinckboons (1576–1632/33). Indeed, in his life and in his art Vinckboons, is second only to Pieter the Elder’s two sons as the paradigmatic Bruegel follower.\footnote{44} Certainly his biography is a typical one among the first generation of Bruegel successors: born in Mechelen, the city of Bol, he moved with his painter father, Philip (1545–1601), first to Antwerp, where he remained from 1580 to 1586, then across the border to Middelburg, and finally to Amsterdam by 1591. In that same year Philip Vinckboons joined the rolls of Amsterdam
citizens alongside both Bol and Jacob Savery, providing his young son and apprentice with a link to the very mainstream of ongoing Bruegel influence in the north. David also had significant relationships with artists younger than himself, for he has been credited with training some of the leading lights of the next generation, particularly men sensitive to Bruegel themes and forms: Claes Jansz. Visscher, Gillis d’Hondecoeter, and Esaias van de Velde (all, like Vinckboons, producers of prints).

Of David Vinckboons’s connection to Coninxloo, a contemporary of his father, we have tangible evidence: documents reveal that Vinckboons purchased some of the older artist’s drawings at an auction of his estate in March 1607, and old inventories suggest that Vinckboons might have provided figures for forest landscapes by Coninxloo. Moreover, designs by both were engraved by De Bruyn on large-scale plates. Certainly the work of the two artists is related, as both produced biblical narratives with small figures that unfold in great, towering bosky wilds. And while Vinckboons’s biblical narrative paintings of this kind grew directly out of Bruegel’s crowded paintings with similar themes, such as The Preaching of John the Baptist, ca. 1610 (Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam), they can take on a new character: they are often virtuoso productions, executed on a miniature scale in the manner of Jan Brueghel or Coninxloo—the type of picture favored by liefhebbers, the connoisseur-collectors of the early seventeenth century.

More than most artists of his time, Vinckboons made use of a range of Bruegelian peasant themes, including festivities and various figure types such as beggars. Some of these images seem to have been made as pendants to religious pictures with subjects from the ministry or Passion of Christ—paired opposites meant to hang in contemporary collections. Indeed, Vinckboons sometimes contrasted peasant and religious subjects within a single composition, emulating the deceptive presentation of Pieter the Elder in such paintings as the Census at Bethlehem, 1566 (Musées Royaux des Beaux-Arts de Belgique, Brussels), and the Conversion of Paul, 1567 (Kunsthistorisches Museum, Vienna): here the secondary figures are large in scale and placed in great numbers in the near foreground, while the true subject of the image, the religious narrative, is hidden at the side or in the distance, to be discovered ultimately (often with the force of a revelation) by the attentive and persistent viewer. This is a kind of compositional structuring, especially evident in Vinckboons’s prints engraved by De Bruyn, that retains the essence of Bruegel’s pictorial purposes, even if at first glance we think they are set apart from their prototypes by their small size and their apparent subjects, which do not seem to be concerned with this moral universe of choice and right vision. In this respect Vinckboons is the proper heir of both Coninxloo and the continuing Bruegel tradition.
Vinckboons followed not only Bruegel's formal and thematic vision but also a model of his art production: like the master he made many designs for prints, most of them engravings. Of his eighty-four known drawings fifty-two are for prints. The first dated drawing for a print is a work of 1600, although a small number of undated sheets of the kind may be from a few years earlier, and the bulk of his designs for engravings originated in the first decade of the new century. It is in about a dozen of these sheets that Vinckboons focused on one of Bruegel's favorite peasant themes, the village kermis, which he set in the same kind of location used by the master: a central space backed by a church with a steeple and flanked by a country inn, before which groups of small figures celebrate. In some of Vinckboons's versions processions in front of the church in the background identify the moment recorded as a specific annual religious holiday, a kermis in honor of a local patron saint, as in Bruegel's engravings Kermis of Saint George and Kermis at Hoboken. The Village Kermis, 1603 (fig. 71), a drawing much indebted for its tree-lined spaces to Bruegel's engraving Pagus Nemorosus (Wooded Region), ca. 1555–56 (cat. no. 32), typifies Vinckboons's treatment of the genre (which often appears as well in Jacob Savery's independent drawings and designs for prints).

Bruegel's representations of beggars, like his peasant scenes, were a powerful source of influence for Vinckboons and other followers. Pieter often featured beggars within scenes showing other peasant types, and he singled them out as the focus of a pair of paintings from 1568, The Blind Leading the Blind (Capodimonte, Naples) and The Cripples (Louvre, Paris), the former an image that was loosely copied in the series Twelve Flemish Proverbs, engraved after the master's death by Hieronymus Wierix. Vinckboons in particular among Bruegel's followers was inspired by images of this kind, incorporating beggars, often blind ones, in broad scenes of village life in paintings such as Blind Hurdy-gurdy Player, 1609 (Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam). He also designed an etching produced by Claes Jansz. Visscher, Leper Procession, 1608 (fig. 72), which features a woman with distinctive face-obscuring conical...
headwear that closely resembles that of peasants in the Louvre Cripples as well as the stocky figures characteristic of Bruegel’s types. (This scene resembles Bruegel’s festive kermis or wedding dance imagery more closely than his beggar subjects.)

Here we should mention a forgery of an image of beggars by Bruegel, The Blind, ca. 1600 (fig. 73), attributed by Hans Mielke to Jacob Savery, which bears a false inscription and date of 1562. Like Bruegel’s canvas in Naples and a vignette in the background of his Netherlandish Proverbs, 1560 (Staatsliche Museen zu Berlin, Gemäldegalerie), it may illustrate the parable of The Blind Leading the Blind (Matt. 15:14), but in contrast to that painting it does not show beset travelers and focuses as much on a peasant woman with a basket as on the picturesque if scruffy vagabonds.

Vinckboons responded not only to Bruegel’s kermis scenes and beggar figures but also to his use of proverbs, which he illustrated or alluded to in a number of paintings and drawings, primarily on peasant themes. Models of this kind that inspired Vinckboons are Bruegel’s Netherlandish Proverbs, portraying a comprehensive catalogue of sayings, the painting Peasant and the Bird Nester, 1568 (Kunsthistorisches Museum, Vienna), and the drawing The Beekeepers, ca. 1567–68 (cat. no. 107). The last two works refer to the proverb “He who knows where the nest is has the knowledge; he who robs it has the nest” and also contrast reckless nest robbing with smug complacency as well as with the prudent activity of working with apiaries.

In his own drawing Boy Bird-Nester, ca. 1606 (fig. 74) and the etching made after it in 1606 (fig. 75) Vinckboons based elements of his image and his central theme directly on Bruegel’s prototypes: he shows the same stocky figure types and the same nest robbing and, as the inscription on the print makes clear, invokes precisely the same proverb. In Vinckboons’s images, underneath a thick forest canopy evocative of Coninxloo’s settings, two peasants gape and point to the bold nest robber an exemplum of the proverb; the evidently complacent older man appears to instruct the younger one while he ignores his own purse, only to have it stolen in broad daylight by a sly and anarchical who resembles a ragged robber in Bruegel’s painting The Misanthrope, 1568 (Capodimonte, Naples). In the drawing’s middle ground a farmer prudently leads a cow across a bridge and into a stable, a motif that offers a contrast to the danger-filled forest world of the foreground and recalls a georgic scene with horses in a clearing in the background of Pieter’s Peasant and the Bird Nester. And in the middle ground of Vinckboons’s etching anglers empty a fish trap, a detail that emulates the careful and productive beekeepers of the Bruegel drawing. The etching introduces a new detail, a group of a mother and children and dog, their ragged costumes suggesting their poverty, and their equipment, a large cage and long pole, indicating that they live marginally on the bounty of the forest by catching birds—the subject of yet another work by Bruegel, the Insidious Aueps (The Crafty Bird Catcher), ca. 1555–56 (cat. no. 27), from The Large Landscapes group of prints.
Another major preoccupation for Vinckboons was the theme of *boerenverdriet*, which, as we have seen, Bruegel inaugurated with his paintings *Massacre of the Innocents* at Hampton Court and *The Attack* in Stockholm. Vinckboons plumbed the subject in a number of paintings, such as the pendants *Peasants' Distress* and *Peasants' Revenge*, 1609 (Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam): one of the pair shows peasants humiliated in their home or an inn by well-dressed soldiers with harlots; the other depicts the same peasants exacting their revenge outside the house or inn with knives, axes, and flails. He interpreted *boerenverdriet* as well in prints, including *Landscape with Travelers Attacked by a Gang of Robbers*, ca. 1610 (fig. 76), engraved by Londerseel and published by Visscher. *Boerenverdriet* is also the focus of the designs Vinckboons made for a series of prints engraved by Boëthius à Bolswert, which presents an allegory on the 1609 truce in the Dutch Revolt. The series opens with a sheet that portrays an attack on the closed door of a cottage by soldiers with a writ for their billeting and provision; continues with two images akin to scenes presented in Vinckboons's pendants of 1609; and concludes with *Festive Peasants, Soldiers, and Harlots* (fig. 77). This final image shows soldiers, harlots, and amorous peasants drinking and dancing outside an inn and closely recalls Bruegel's comic vision of village life in his *Kermis*, ca. 1568 (Kunsthistorisches Museum, Vienna). Here the theme is reconciliation during the truce, as indicated by the print's inscription: *Siet nu hoe den trefues alles verkeeren gaet / Den moestwillige Soldaat, komt bij den Huysman banken...* (Behold how the Treaty turns all upside down: / The turbulent soldier sits down with the peasant). But there is trouble brewing even in this would-be paradise, where theft of beer, purses, and sweethearts promises almost certain conflict in the future.

Finally, in this discussion of Vinckboons's inheritance and adaptation of the Bruegel legacy, we address a new

---

Fig. 76. Johannes van Londerseel after David Vinckboons. *Landscape with Travelers Attacked by a Gang of Robbers*, ca. 1610. Engraving. The British Museum, London
subgenre that is an inversion of the peasant theme. Known as merry companies or merry companies in a garden, this imagery, which became a Vinckboons specialty, focuses on festivities populated by upper-class figures—fashionable soldiers and their well-dressed companions—situated in parklike gardens framed by trees in the lineage of the forest canopies of both Bruegel and Coninxloo. This subject plays only a small role in Bruegel’s art, where, in such works as his 

*Netherlandish Proverbs* in Berlin, patrician types are inserted by way of contrast with plebeian characters. The merry companies are often hybrids in which the pleasure worlds of aristocrats and biblical sinners—the Prodigal Son or Mary Magdalene, for instance—overlaps as they pursue their amusements or dramas in the same garden settings.

In fact, they evolved from sixteenth-century pictorial models by a variety of artists, among them Lucas van Leyden, that show biblical scenes of moral indulgence: The Pleasures of Mary Magdalene, Susanna and the Elders, David Spying Bathsheba, and the like. Their pleasure-garden imagery proceeds as well from an older manuscript and engraving tradition that treats the Garden of Love and from the elaboration of those sources by Bol after he moved from Antwerp to the Northern Netherlands, when he painted miniatures showing courtly life.

The subgenre of merry companies was developed and popularized by Vinckboons and his student Esaías van de Velde over the course of a decade, beginning with small painted panels such as Van de Velde’s *Garden Party*, ca. 1610 (Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam), as well as by a number of other Antwerp artists. Vinckboons had already provided a notable touchstone of hybrid imagery in his *Feast in the Glade*, 1601 (fig. 78), engraved by De Bruyn, with its château and garden and almost invisible scene of punishment on the distant hill in the right background—a crucifixion and a gallows.

**Conclusions: Varieties of Influences from Imitation to Emulation**

Of course, with the new theme of the merry companies, we have moved a considerable distance from the cues and subjects provided by Pieter Bruegel himself. The subjects of winter skating and kermis produced by his followers grew naturally out of his models, whereas the forest settings so richly developed by Coninxloo and the *boerenvoordriet* scenes by various successors were based upon a narrower but still tangible foundation in his work. In fact, even the image of the love garden appears in one of Bruegel’s prints—albeit in miniature: we see it in the left background of his *Spring*, 1570 (cat. no. 106).

The extension of Bruegel’s inventions by his successors in the next generation in important respects does not conform to the notions of influence and legacy traditionally emphasized in art history. What we discover, in addition to a mere reception of influence or a heritage, are creative...
developments growing out of Pieter Bruegel's prototypes—even his marginal imagery—that is, the flourishing of the potential inherent in variations upon both his motifs and themes. We see a new generation's attempt to surpass his model rather than to imitate it literally—in short we see emulation. And to clarify the meaning of "emulation" and all that it suggests we note here that the term "aemulatio" in classical rhetorical tradition signified imitation involving the highest level of independence of a follower from his model, spurred by competition and the sense of artistic rivalry between contemporaries or between later generations and their predecessors (with an implied notion of progress).

This same emulative striving had been associated with Bruegel himself, who was seen by contemporaries as a second Bosch and whose praiseworthiness was understood to lie precisely in his ability to work creatively with the forms and themes of his celebrated model and infuse his own sensibility into them. Significantly, emulation was an aesthetic ideal in the last quarter of the sixteenth century, codified in the writings of Van Mander and demonstrated by Goltzius, whose Master Prints simulate both the forms (handelingen) and themes of famous printmakers and designers from the north and south (Dürer, Lucas van Leyden, Federico Barocci, Titian). Indeed, the term "emulator" was included in the adulatory text inscribed around the engraved portrait of Bruegel made in Prague for Rudolf II by Aegidius Sadeler in 1606; there the artist is deemed the "rival and scion" to nature and also to the precedents and achievements of earlier art.

Bruegel himself, a founding father of the Northern tradition in the vision of Sadeler's print and in the works of his followers, as we have seen, became a source for imitation as well as a model for exploration in terms of variety and richness of detail, like nature itself. Traditionally (and mostly in the context of Italian art) scholars have considered this kind of extension from the touchstone model as mannerism; and, in fact, within this framework it is perfectly possible
to view the production of Jan Brueghel, Bol, Coninxloo, the Savery brothers, and especially Vinckboons as mannered variations on a Bruegel theme, an intentional reconciliation of art with nature, of creativity with preexisting models.

While the successors at their best can be described as emulators of Bruegel, the responses of the new generation in fact run the gamut of possibilities. As we have shown, there was a great deal of copying, which took many forms. Pieter the Younger literally replicated his father’s paintings, even when he worked from drawings to produce easel pictures, inevitably of diminished quality, for the art market. Some artists made drawings that reproduce component elements of images such as forest scenes, and others imitated celebrated compositions, for example, The Painter and the Connoisseur (cat. no. 100). Roelandt Savery practiced another kind of imitation, excerpting individual figures from Bruegel’s models and carrying out his own versions of them in his naer het leven figure drawings. And there were also his brother Jacob’s outright forgeries of Bruegel’s drawings as well as his relatively faithful reprises of the master’s favorite themes.

But, to reiterate a principal assertion of this study, the most meaningful aspects of Bruegel’s posthumous survival depended on the continuing and unbroken process of emulation, which extended his models in new directions or invented new forms or themes based on suggestions or marginal ideas in those models: the skating scenes, the forest settings for wilderness experiences, the images of boerenworpriet. Crucial here was Bol, the main conduit of Bruegel’s ideas to the new generation in the new century: his students, particularly Coninxloo and Jacob Savery (central for their landscapes), as well as Roelandt Savery and especially Vinckboons (whose peasant figures and scenes were significant contributions).

The major new theme derived from an element only implied in Bruegel’s oeuvre, the merry companies, emerged quickly and fully, shaped by the developing Dutch national culture. This culture was focused on youth and pleasure in a time of peace and prosperity during the Twelve Years’ Truce of 1609 to 1621 and was marked by a powerful sense that contemporary life and issues of national identity rather than morally challenging biblical stories were proper subjects for artists; understandably, its concerns encouraged the growth of this new thematic center as well as its antipode, the festive village scene with peasants—what we now call genre subjects.

Here we should note that not only Bruegel’s genuine production deeply affected the imagery of the peasant scenes and country views by his successors; for works mistakenly ascribed to him also contributed to the formulation of Dutch landscape art in the seventeenth century. An important case in point is a series of prints published under the heading “Some country farms and cottages of the Duchy of Brabant, drawn by P. Bruegel, and, to please painters, engraved and published by Claes Jansz. Visscher. At Amsterdam. 1612.” These are in fact copies of a set of landscape prints issued by Bruegel’s publisher Cock in 1559 and 1561 without attribution to a designer but known to have been made after drawings by the Master of the Small Landscapes. Intimate, informal, and focused on local topography like Bruegel’s own drawings, they offered an alternative to the calculated and mannered landscape imagery developed by Pieter’s early followers, particularly Coninxloo and Jan Brueghel in their dense forest scenes. The back-to-the-future strategy of picture making evident in the 1612 series was taken up again by Visscher in his set of prints treating Pleasant Places, issued about 1612–13, in which he reinstalled anglers, skaters, and travelers akin to Bruegel’s figures in the familiar world of country farms and cottages. Through these prints Visscher effected a revolution in the vision of Dutch landscape forms and themes that was pursued and even surpassed by Esaias van de Velde and Jan van de Velde II in prints produced before 1618 and embraced and extended by others in following decades. Ironically, it was through the evocation of Bruegel’s name that Visscher was able to exercise this decisive influence. Thus, even under such false pretenses Bruegel continued to shape the course of Netherlandish art, especially in the realm of landscape and in the disciplines of prints and drawings.
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Pieter Bruegel the Elder (1525/30–1569)

I. Southern Cloister in a Valley, 1552

Pen and brown ink with brown, pink, blue, and gray washes added by a later hand
18.5 x 32.6 cm (7 1/4 x 12 3/4 in.)
Signed and dated at lower left: bruegel 1552
Watermark: the letters dg (see Briquet 9378)
Staatsliche Museen zu Berlin, Kupferstichkabinett KdZ 5537
Provenance: Adolf von Beckerath (1834–1915) (Lugt 2504); gift, 1902.

Literature: Van Bastelaer and Hulin de Loo 1907, no. 2; Tolnai 1935, no. 1; Bock and Rosenberg 1930, p. 20; Tolnay 1952, no. 2;
Münz 1961, no. 2; Berlin 1975, no. 23; Marijnissen et al. 1988, p. 57;
Tokyo 1995, no. 82; Mielke 1996, pp. 5–6 and no. 2.

Beyond a bank of trees where a hunt is taking place lies a wide valley with a cloister at the foot of a hill. The squat cloister, with grounds extending on both sides, appears to be Italian.

Despite the washes—light on the hilltop, on the cloister, and in the foreground trees and heavy gray in the foreground—all added by a later hand, the attribution of this drawing to Bruegel has never been doubted. As in his other sheets of the same date, the original drawing was executed in pen and brown ink. Bruegel sketched the scene with quick strokes. The upward sweeps of lines defining the ground and the dashes of leaves that look like the number 3 tipped on its side are typical of the artist's technique for drawing landscapes, as are the brief loops and dashes that indicate trees on the hillside in the distance. Bruegel signed the work, as he often did, in a rectangular space at the bottom that he specifically reserved for this purpose. The watermark on this sheet, one of the few visible on Bruegel's drawings, indicates that the paper is of French manufacture and dates to the mid-1550s. It is remotely possible that Bruegel drew this scene when he stopped in France on his way down to Italy. More likely, however, given the Italian appearance of the architecture of the cloister and its simply shaped rectangular church, he brought the French paper with him to Italy and used it there or perhaps purchased it in Rome.

This is one of Bruegel's earliest preserved drawings and one of the few landscapes he may have drawn directly from nature; the only other sheet from 1552 thought to have been drawn in the open is the River Landscape in the Louvre (figs. 10, 81).
Now that the Alpine landscapes long thought to have been executed by Bruegel in nature have been taken away from his œuvre (cat. nos. 120–123), these two drawings occupy a special place in the master’s work as what may be his only two known studies made in nature. In their spontaneity and casual organization, both sheets differ from the other drawings he made the same year, such as the *Wooded Landscape with Mills* (cat. no. 2) and the *Pastoral Landscape* (cat. no. 3), which are rather strictly composed and follow a formula standard for the artist: a corner of land in the foreground gives way to a valley in the background in the opposite corner, leading the eye into the distance. However, in the informal and briefly sketched compositional arrangement of the *Southern Cloister*, a bank of swaying trees acts as a hurdle that the eye must leap over to reach the mountain valley beyond. The prominent signature and date inscribed on this landscape suggest that, despite its loose character, it was not meant as a personal record for later use in the studio but as a finished work.

It is in the unstudied approach of this early drawing that Bruegel began to separate himself from Northern landscape tradition.

1. Tolnay (1925 and 1952) and Münz (1961) believed the washes were also autograph.
2. Grossmann (1973, p. 148) suggested that in its composition this view resembles landscapes in the backgrounds of paintings by Pieter Coecke van Aelst that Bruegel might have seen in Coecke’s studio. The examples Grossmann cites, however, are not very convincing.

---

**Pieter Bruegel the Elder**

**2. Wooded Landscape with Mills, 1552**

Pen and brown ink  
21.3 x 28.1 cm (8 1/4 x 11 3/4 in.)  
Signed and dated in brown ink covered by diagonal hatching in red-brown ink at lower left below dog: h. g. 52  
Biblioteca Ambrosiana, Milan  
F. 245, INF. N.9  
**Literature:** Arndt 1965–66, p. 10, no. 7; Arndt 1972, p. 83, no. 1; Berlin 1975, no. 27; Oberhuber 1981, p. 157; Marijnissen et al. 1988, p. 60; Mielke 1996, pp. 6–7 and no. 3.

A large, broad-branched tree dominates a wooded landscape that opens up on the right to a scene with a windmill on a hill and grazing cows near a watermill by a river. Two men with a dog on a leash walk off to the left.

Bruegel composed this superb drawing while on his trip to Rome in 1552. The date 1552 is now barely visible in the lower left, having been hatched over along with Bruegel’s name—as happened so often with his drawings. As in the Berlin *Southern Cloister in a Valley* dated the same year (cat. no. 1), Bruegel defined the hills with small dots and flocks of the pen. The shallow spatial recession in the area on the right, where the hill blocks the view into the distance, also relates to the Berlin drawing. The treatment of the tree—with its mighty, twisting trunk and its foliage described with open loops and broad horizontal strokes—resembles that in the *Landscape with Bears* in Prague (cat. no. 15), drawn two years later. Yet the present drawing is distanced...
from that work of 1554 by its relatively confined spatial scheme, for in the Prague drawing the background opens into a deep vista.

The *Wooded Landscape with Mills* is not a nature study but rather an invented, finished landscape drawing inspired by Bruegel's own studies from life as well as by Venetian and Flemish sources. The long curved hatches he used show that he was influenced by drawings by Domenico Campagnola. The large tree derives from an Italian chiaroscuro woodcut, *Two Goats at the Foot of a Tree* from about 1530–35 (fig. 79), the design of which has been attributed to Titian and also to Campagnola. The lower half of Bruegel's tree twists and turns in the reverse direction of the tree in the woodcut, but the two trunks share a similar pattern of shading. Bruegel combined the Italian landscape in the foreground, however, with a typically Netherlandish scene in the right background, recognizable by the gabled house, the windmill on the hilltop, and the watermill. It is a composition he no doubt would have been able to draw from memory.

2. The fact that it is in reverse of the woodcut suggests that Bruegel would have been working from a model in reverse of the woodcut, possibly a now-unknown copy of the print or a design for the print, rather than from the woodcut itself.
Pieter Bruegel the Elder

3. Pastoral Landscape, 1552

Pen and brown ink
21.5 x 31 cm (8 1/4 x 12 1/4 in.)
Signed and dated at lower left: ...ruegbel 1552., crossed out by another hand
Watermark: shield with cross (see Piccard XI, 659, 666)
Nasjonalgalleriet, Oslo NG. K&H.B. 15647
Provenance: Johan Christian Clausen Dahl (1788–1857), Dresden; his heirs; acquired 1903.

A fresh understanding of Pieter Bruegel’s development as a draftsman of landscapes during the early years of his career—prior to 1554—as brought forward by the late Hans Mielke in his catalogue raisonné of 1996, has given rise to a radical change in our image of the artist. In proposing several new attributions, such as the present Pastoral Landscape, the Mountain Landscape with Ridge and Valley (cat. no. 4), the Leiden Path through a Village (cat. no. 5), and the Wooded Landscape with a Distant View toward the Sea (cat. no. 14), Mielke added a substantial group of drawings to Bruegel’s oeuvre. These sheets, along with the closely related Landscape with a Group of Trees and a Mule (cat. no. 17) and the Cow Pasture before a Farmhouse (cat. no. 19), first attributed to Bruegel about forty years ago by Karl Arndt, were described in a review of Mielke’s study as “the key group of drawings for the ‘new’ Bruegel, and . . . also the biggest stumbling block to accepting the artist’s new persona.” Of these six works, only the Oslo Pastoral Landscape and the Path through a Village from Leiden are signed. That both of these sheets were ignored in the literature before Mielke published them may well be due to the fact that the Netherlandish drawings in the print rooms of Oslo and Leiden have barely been studied.

The lively, loosely sketched Pastoral Landscape, dated 1552, is one of Bruegel’s earliest drawings. The foreground is dominated by a group of large trees around which cows and sheep are grazing, watched over by a few herdsmen. In the background of the hilly landscape rapidly drawn pen lines suggest a valley with a river and a city on its shore. The lack of precision in the background, so characteristic of most of Bruegel’s landscape drawings, is conspicuous, as are the not entirely convincing modeling of the figures and a certain lack of depth in the composition.

Martin Royalton-Kisch plausibly suggests that these stylistic features closely recall drawings by Peeter Baltens, a slightly older painter with whom Bruegel collaborated in Mechelen in 1551. In addition to revealing the possible influence of Baltens, the present sheet, like the far more finished Wooded Landscape with Mills (cat. no. 2), betrays a first response by Bruegel to Italian models in its loose handling of the pen, daring perspective, and emphatic parallel hatching. Bruegel was still searching for solutions when he drew the Pastoral Landscape, but only two years later he was capable of achieving brilliant results using the same style and technique seen here, as such fully realized works as the Landscape with a Group of Trees and a Mule and the Cow Pasture reveal.

1. Serebrennikov 1998, p. 178. Serebrennikov elaborately discusses this group—in which she oddly enough does not include Mountain Landscape with Ridge and Valley—and accepts Mielke’s attributions. In his “Pieter Bruegel as a Draftsman,” in this publication, pp. 24–26, Royalton-Kisch also discusses the group but leaves out the Wooded Landscape with a Distant View toward the Sea, which he relates to the Italianate drawings of 1552 to 1554 (ibid., p. 20).

2. The signature and date in the lower left corner, which are crossed out by another hand, are very similar to the signatures in the Wooded Landscape with Mills and the Path through a Village. The authors of this publication consider these signatures to be authentic. As Mielke indicated (1996, p. 50), the attribution not only of these drawings but also of many others becomes problematic if these signatures are not accepted.


Pieter Bruegel the Elder

4. Mountain Landscape with Ridge and Valley, ca. 1552

Pen and brown ink
20.4 x 29.5 cm (8 x 11 1/4 in.)
Inscribed in pencil on verso: P Brueghel
Herzog Anton Ulrich-Museum Braunschweig, Kupferstichkabinett Z. 381
(Exhibited in New York only)
Literature: Flechsig 1923, pl. 55; Tolnay 1925, p. 72 (as Bruegel imitator, ca. 1600); Tolnay 1922, no. 43 (as not by Bruegel); Münz 1961, no. A22 (as Jan Brueghel?); Berlin 1975, no. 31 (as after Bruegel); Mielke 1996, no. 6; Von Heusinger 1997, pl. 224 (as Bruegel imitator).

A bush on a ledge on the right overlooks a broad valley dotted with small trees, houses, people, and animals. While some drawings long thought to be by Bruegel are now considered to have been made by an artist active about 1600, this drawing has met the opposite fate: once given to an artist who worked about 1600, it is now convincingly attributed to Bruegel. The key to the current attribution
was the recent identification of Bruegel’s signature on the *Pastoral Landscape* in Oslo (cat. no. 3), a sheet that is stylistically almost identical to the present drawing. The confident and rapid horizontal hooked strokes constitute the most notable element shared by the two works: these appear here in the shrubs in the right foreground and in the foliage in the center tree in the Oslo drawing. The definition of the clouds with broken lines and the parallel striations suggesting the sky in both works are very similar as well. Finally, the same small loops that define the trees in the background hills of the *Mountain Landscape with Ridge and Valley* occur in the right background of the drawing in Oslo. The *Mountain Landscape* also shows affinities with other early drawings by Bruegel. For example, the small loops that make up the trees are found as well in the *Southern Cloister in a Valley* (cat. no. 1). The present sheet can be dated to the time of Bruegel’s Italian trip, and more specifically to 1552, on the basis of the date inscribed on the Oslo piece.

1. Flechsig (1923) was the first to publish the *Mountain Landscape with Ridge and Valley* as by Bruegel, but Tolnay (1935) did not accept it. Münz (1961) attributed it to Jan Brueghel, and Mielke (1996) connected it with the Oslo drawing.

---

**Pieter Bruegel the Elder**

5. *Path through a Village*, ca. 1552

Pen and brown ink, reworked in foreground and sky by a later hand, signature at bottom center reworked in red-brown ink by a later hand

20.7 x 33.1 cm (8¼ x 13 in.)

Signed at lower center: *brueghel*, crossed out by a later hand; inscribed by a later hand at bottom left: *P Bruegel*, on verso: collection stamp of Albertus Welcker (Lugt 2793c)

Watermark: the letters dg (see Briquet 9578)

Prentenkabinet der Rijksuniversiteit, Leiden A.W. 1173

**Provenance:** Nicolaas Beets (1878–1963), Amsterdam; his auction, Frederik Muller, Amsterdam, April 9–11, 1940, no. 21; Albertus Welcker (1884–1957), Amsterdam; acquired with Welcker collection, 1957.

**Literature:** Leiden 1966–67, no. 24 (as circle of Pieter Bruegel); Mielke 1996, no. 4.

The earliest dated drawings by Pieter Bruegel that survive are from 1552, a year in which the artist was experimenting in style and technique, carrying out such varied sheets as the subtly detailed *Southern Cloister in a Valley* (cat. no. 1), the more finished Italianate *Wooded Landscape with Mills* (cat. no. 2), and the freely sketched *Pastoral Landscape* (cat. no. 3).¹ It has been proposed that the more finished drawings and the sketchier ones served different functions and that Bruegel determined the manner of his execution according to the purpose he had in mind for a particular sheet.² Thus, drawings of the first type could have been intended as gifts for patrons, whereas those of the second category, to which the present work belongs, were perhaps made as gifts for fellow artists. As we have no sources or documents regarding the use of drawings—other than preparatory designs for prints—produced in Bruegel’s workshop, and no information about their owners before the eighteenth century, this suggestion cannot be confirmed.

The qualities of the *Path through a Village* are difficult to judge because its appearance has been very much altered by rather unsuccessful later additions. Major parts of the center foreground, including the entirely formless walking figures (pilgrims?), as well as large parts of the sky, were added by the hand of an unknown artist who apparently suffered from horror vacui. The middle ground, with the forest, the village, and the hills rising behind houses, is largely untouched. The loosely sketched cottages and trees and the slightly nervous parallel hatching in this area are closely related to elements in the *Pastoral Landscape* from Oslo. However, even with its later additions, the present village view shows more volume in the buildings and a better understanding of how to create a convincing atmospheric depth than the Oslo sheet. This suggests that Bruegel made the *Path through a Village* shortly after he executed the *Pastoral Landscape*, learning from his mistakes and searching for the most convincing solutions for his landscape drawings. Already visible here are some of the telling details that characterize his later sheets. Parts of the foliage of the large tree at the left, for instance, are made up of strokes that resemble the number 3 on its side, a hallmark
of his landscapes. And on the slope of the hill in the right background we can distinguish several prototypical Bruegel trees: a stem drawn in one or two straight lines with a crown that consists of a circle of short stripes made with the pen.

In addition to the stylistic evidence, the crossed-out but authentic signature at the lower center of this long-unnoticed drawing offers a compelling reason to accept Hans Mielke’s attribution to Bruegel and his dating of about 1552 or 1553 at the latest.¹ Further supporting his findings is the watermark, which indicates that the Path through a Village is drawn on the same paper as the Southern Cloister in a Valley, a sheet that also has been sadly reworked by a later (although different) hand.

3. The signature is comparable to those on the Wooded Landscape with Mills and the Pastoral Landscape.
Pieter Bruegel the Elder

6. Mule Caravan on Hillside, ca. 1552

Pen and black-brown ink
21.8 x 30.1 cm (8 3/4 x 11 3/4 in.)
Signed and dated at bottom left of center, barely readable and
hatched over in red-brown ink: K...helgen...[527]

Museum Boijmans Van Beuningen, Rotterdam 146

Provenance: Franz Koenigs (1881–1944) (Lugt Suppl. 1023a);
gift of Daniël George van Beuningen, 1941.

Literature: Tolnay 1952, no. 89 (as after Bruegel); Grossmann
1954, p. 52 (as after Bruegel); Münz 1961, no. 430 (as Jan Bruegel);
Berlin 1975, no. 55 (as after Bruegel); Mielke 1996, no. 5.

Anonymous after Pieter Bruegel the Elder

7. Mule Caravan on Hillside, 1603

Pen and brown ink, with green and blue wash
21.7 x 30.2 cm (8 3/4 x 11 3/4 in.)
Inscribed on boulder in center: BRUEGEL 1603 at bottom left of
center: brueghel

Staatliche Graphische Sammlung, Munich 1097

Literature: Münz 1961, no. 431 (as Jan Brueghel); Wegner 1973,
no. 24; Berlin 1975, no. 56; Mielke 1996, under no. 5 (copy).

In both these sheets a small caravan with pack mules heads
over a hill toward a town that lies in the center of a wide
mountain valley. Tall pines on the right overlook the
landscape.

While many works have been removed from Bruegel’s
oeuvre during the past few decades, the Rotterdam drawing
is, by contrast, one of the few long-doubted sheets that
have recently been accepted as from his hand. Previously
considered, like the Munich sheet, a copy after a lost
Bruegel, possibly by the artist’s son Jan, its stylistic similarity
to accepted sheets has become more evident as the
parameters of the master’s oeuvre have been revised. ‘The
drawing had been doubted because certain parts of it
seemed rather more mechanical than similar features in
the group no longer believed to be by Bruegel and now attributed
to the Master of the Mountain Landscapes (see cat.
nos. 120–125). However, more appropriate comparisons can
be made with other, clearly authentic landscapes. For
instance, the low-lying town nestled among trees in the
background and the city in Landscape with Fortified City
(cat. no. 10) were traced with the very same sort of horizontal
lines running through them. The animals in the foreground,
with their round rumps and tapered legs ending in points,
closely resemble the beasts in the Pastoral Landscape (cat.
no. 3). And the trees that line the middle ground have
dotted and dashed foliage similar to that in the Mountain
Landscape with River and Travelers (cat. no. 9).

A comparison of the Munich copy with the Rotterdam
sheet serves to point up the quality of the authentic work. 3
Many shapes in the copy are more generalized than those
in the genuine drawing, whose forms show subtle distinctions
and clear articulation. Thus in the Rotterdam composition
each slight shift in the outlines of the mountains in
the background serves to define a facet of undulating form.
In the Munich sheet, however, the corresponding outlines
are less intricately rendered and, as a result, produce moun
tainsides that resemble large mounds. In the Rotterdam
drawing the definition of each building in the town in the
distance is clear and believable, even on the minute scale of
the image, whereas in the Munich copy the same edifices
lack structure and have towers that do not convincingly
connect to them.

Despite its shortcomings, the Munich drawing is a credi
table copy that reveals how expert the art of simulating
Bruegel’s drawings had become by the time it was made in
the early seventeenth century. Clearly the artist responsible
for it studied the most minute strokes of the original so that
he could imitate not just the image but also the sequence of
lines that Bruegel employed to form tiny trees and suggest
broad, drooping foliage—all executed in a manner that
suggests some of the animation of the master’s line work.
This copyist rendered even Bruegel’s hatched-over signature
in the lower center, now barely visible in the original.
The fact that the date 1603—thirty years after Bruegel’s
depth—is so prominently displayed in the drawing sug
suggests that the author was not attempting to pass it off as a
genuine work from the master’s hand.

1. Mielke (1996) was the first to wholeheartedly accept the drawing; Gross
mann (1954) rather reluctantly deattributed it, noting that “the penwork
is much better than is apparent in the reproductions.”

2. A more loosely drawn copy is in the Collection Frits Lugt, Institut Néer
landais, Paris; Mielke 1996, under no. 5 (copy).
Pieter Bruegel the Elder

8. Ripa Grande in Rome, ca. 1552–54

Pen and red-brown and dark brown ink
20.7 x 28.3 cm (8 3/8 x 11 1/8 in.)
Inscribed in the artist’s hand at upper center: a rypar, possibly by the artist in dark brown ink at lower left: bruegel

The Duke of Devonshire and the Chatsworth Settlement Trustees, Chatsworth 841

Provenance: Second duke of Devonshire, 1723 (?).


Bruegel chose a view from across the Tiber to render a cluster of buildings on the Ripa Grande, or Great Bank, of the river, the main harbor for seagoing vessels in Rome during the sixteenth century. The steep stairway and the long ramp lead to the double-arched entrance of the marine customs house, the Dogana Vecchia, on the right; just behind it to the left rise the church and bell tower of Santa Maria in Turri.

Surprisingly, this sheet is Bruegel’s only known drawing of monuments he would have seen in Rome. During his stay in the city he undoubtedly made many more that have not survived or are unrecognized. This is certain, for the Prospectus Tyburtinus (View of Tivoli) (cat. no. 24), a print after Bruegel’s design, attests that he drew sites on the outskirts of Rome, and his two Tower of Babel paintings, one in Vienna and the other in Rotterdam (fig. 5)—the former dated 1563, some ten years after he was in the city—
incorporate vaulting from the Colosseum, which he must also have recorded in sketches.  

Like the Rest on the Flight into Egypt in Berlin (cat. no. 20), a sheet of similar size, this drawing is executed in inks of two different colors: the main cluster of buildings in the background in a reddish brown and the scene in the foreground, the inscription, the two birds at the top of the sheet, and small details and touches on the sides of the background section in a darker brown. Here, but not in the Berlin sheet, the division between two campaigns of drawing is quite distinct; the dark brown lines hardly overlap the reddish brown ones. This clear division suggests that Bruegel sketched the buildings on site in the lighter ink and used the darker ink later, to turn the study into a more finished composition. The touches of dark ink in the background section seem to be final thoughts, as well as tiny marks made to unite the drawing, rather than compositional additions.  

The precise draftsmanship for the most part differs from the schematic rendering in the Rest on the Flight, which is inspired by earlier Netherlandish drawing style, although the treatment of the rocks in the foreground here is comparable to that of the strongly outlined landscape elements in the Berlin sheet.  

The attribution to Pieter the Elder was first put forward in 1911, replacing an earlier assignment to the artist’s son Jan Brueghel. Although since that time certain scholars have again proposed Jan as author, the attribution to Pieter the Elder is now generally accepted. Doubts regarding the attribution to Bruegel are understandable, as the sheet is rendered with a fine line more commonly found in the work of the son than in that of his father. Yet, in the context of the recently revised parameters of Bruegel’s oeuvre, the drawing has clearer affinities with the father's art. Thus, the delicacy of line work seen here is visible in the vertical hatchings in the mountains of the Landscape with Saint Jerome (cat. no. 11) and in other drawings by Bruegel. And the methodical, minutely wavering lines of the horizontal striations on the buildings are also typical of the older artist. But it is perhaps in the more rapidly drawn passages, such as the bushes in the left, the distant city view on the right, and the tiny figures walking up the ramp, that the more recognizable aspects of Bruegel’s style are apparent. The inscription at the top, once thought to be by Jan, is now accepted as in Pieter the Elder’s hand, for it matches his writing in autograph drawings such as his design for The Alchemist (cat. no. 60).  

1. Egger 1911, p. 38; Winner in Berlin 1973, no. 26; Krausheimer 1980, p. 239.  
3. Mielke (1996, p. 21) suggests that Bruegel may have chosen the two colors for visual effect.  
5. The drawing was first given to Jan Brueghel by Münz (1961), who was seconded by Haverkamp-Begemann (1964) in his review of Münz’s book. However, Winner (in Berlin 1973, no. 26), Müller Hofstede (1979, p. 97), and Mielke (1996, no. 14) have since convincingly argued in favor of the attribution to Pieter Bruegel.

Pieter Bruegel the Elder  

9. Mountain Landscape with River and Travelers, 1553  

Pen and red-brown ink, with light wash  

22.8 x 33.8 cm (9 x 13½ in.)  

Dated at bottom left: 1553; inscribed in red chalk on verso: no. 406; in ink on verso: E.N.29, Paeste di bruegel  

The British Museum, London O.o. 9–9 (P.3)  

Provenance: Numbering on verso indicates that the drawing was in the same collection as Landscape with Fortified City (cat. no. 10) in the seventeenth century; Richard Payne Knight Bequest, 1824.  

Literature: Van Bastelaer and Hulin de Loo 1907, p. 174, under no. 17 (copy); Tolnay 1925, no. 6; Popham 1932, p. 142, no. 2; Tolnay 1952, no. 8; Münz 1961, no. 4; Tokyo 1995, no. 83; Mielke 1996, p. 8, and no. 10.  

Travelers with packs on horseback and others on foot with walking sticks make their way over a hill toward a river that winds its way through low mountains. Among the wanderers in the foreground are two monks, who are recognizable as such by the hoods on their robes. In 1553 Bruegel executed three drawings of relatively similar size, subject, and style: this mountainscape, the Landscape with Fortified City (cat. no. 10), and the Alpine Landscape (cat. no. 12). All are invented scenes with compositions featuring foreground elements that play only a minor role instead of the traditional landscape format that presents a large foreground area with large trees or boulders, as seen, for example, in the Wooded Landscape with Mills (cat. no. 2). In each of the three the landscape...
descends almost immediately into the background, where the dominant motif of the image is placed. In the present drawing this motif is a rocky protuberance and fortress on the hilltop in the background that immediately attracts the viewer’s attention. The consistent stylistic approach embodied in the three sheets testifies to Bruegel’s careful study and assimilation, during his first months in Italy, of the drawing technique of such Venetian artists as Titian and Domenico Campagnola. The lightly curved sweeps of parallel hatching that underscore the undulations of the uneven land and the swelling of the mountains in the present work, for example, derive from drawings by Venetian draftsmen, as does the lively energy that imbues every detail in the scene. And Bruegel’s lines, which are more fluid and ink laden than in the Southern Cloister in a Valley (cat. no. 1) and other earlier drawings, may also have been inspired by Titian’s rich pen lines. Yet Bruegel incorporated a reminder of his Netherlandish roots in the center of his composition: a double-pronged rock formation that recalls the imagery of Cornelis Massys and Joachim Patinir. There is a remarkably close copy in Paris, which until 1925 was considered to be the original.1

This work is by far the most populated of Bruegel’s landscape drawings; ten figures wander through the foreground and many more trace a trail along the right bank of the river well into the distance. A seated man on the left looks out at the viewer as he points to the right, indicating the path followed by these diligent travelers. The path is the road of life, which takes us from the wild, unkempt foreground through the commanding landscape where traces of human activity and industriousness dot the mountains.2

2. Mielke 1996, under no. 70. Tolnay recognized the Paris sheet as a copy in 1935. The copyist left blank the small areas of damage in the mountains in the right background and along the edge on the right of the Berlin drawing; a telling detail that reveals the latter work to be the original.
Pieter Bruegel the Elder

10. Landscape with Fortified City, 1553

Pen and brown ink
23.6 x 33.5 cm (9¼ x 13¼ in.)
Signed and dated at lower right: p. brueghel f.5.f.ets; inscribed in red chalk on verso at upper left, according to Popham 1932 (sheet now laid down): n° 407, J.B.R.; Genoa 1648

The British Museum, London 1909-6-3-1 (Pt)
(Exhibited in Rotterdam only)

Provenance: Numbering on verso indicates that the drawing was in the same collection as Mountain Landscape with River and Travelers (cat. no. 9) in the seventeenth century.

Literature: Tolnai 1925, no. 5; Popham 1926, p. 35, pl. 67; Popham 1932, p. 142, no. 1; Tolnay 1952, no. 7; Münz 1961, no. 3; Menzel 1966, p. 25; Berlin 1975, no. 32; Müller Hofstede 1979, p. 98; Marijnissen et al. 1988, p. 62; Mielke 1996, pp. 8–9, and no. 11.

A city sprawls over a hilly landscape. A fortress appears to grow out of a large mound in the center of the town, whose houses and churches are ringed by a wall punctuated with numerous round towers. The city extends beyond these walls over the river in the background, where its outskirts include fields with cattle, as well as houses and castles veiled by trees. Dramatic, dark, swirling clouds gather overhead.

Like the Mountain Landscape with River and Travelers (cat. no. 9), this impressive sheet shows the Venetian influence that became pronounced in Bruegel’s drawings of 1553. The two thin trees on the right were directly inspired by the work of Titian and Domenico Campagnola, as were the sweeps of curved parallel lines that denote the swelling of the earth. The animation of the entire landscape, which seems to rustle in the wind of an impending storm, also finds precedents in Titian’s drawing style. Bruegel meticulously described the city, showing churches and towers of various architectural styles, as well as a drawbridge over a bend in the river and in the distance a larger bridge with arches. The specificity of the depiction has led some scholars to attempt to identify this city, which must, however,
be a fantasy. The artist may have meant it to represent Jerusalem, a place that in early Netherlandish paintings was usually portrayed as a sprawling walled city, but he included no historical staffage to offer us a clue to his intention. Before Bruegel made this drawing, a cityscape without historical subject matter of some sort had rarely, if ever, been made the main focus of a finished work of art. Sprawling cities can be found in paintings by such Northern artists as Joachim Patinir and Herri met de Bles, but these are relegated to the background. The castle that seems to emerge from the ground in Bruegel’s city points to the influence of Titianesque landscapes, where such details also appear in the background. Indeed, in this drawing Bruegel appears to have merged the Northern and Italian landscape traditions, awarding them pride of place as his primary subject.

It has often been suggested that the present drawing and three other meticulous sheets of the same date, Mountain Landscape with River and Travelers, Landscape with Saint Jerome, and Alpine Landscape (cat. nos. 9, 11, 12), were intended as designs for prints that were never produced. But there is no evidence to suggest that they were meant to be print designs save for their careful rendering, which, in the context of our new understanding of the nature and extent of Bruegel’s oeuvre, does not seem unusual. Thus, it is probable that they were executed as finished drawings in their own right.

2. Mensel (1966) suggested that it is Avignon.
3. Mielke 1996, p. 9; see, for example, Franz 1969, figs. 82, 86.
4. Tolnay (1937, no. 7), considered that they were created as designs for a first series of landscape prints. Mielke (1996, no. 11) suggested that this theory is undermined by the presence of a pentimento showing a round tower added over other lines in the left middle ground of the present sheet, since Bruegel does not seem to have made changes of this nature to his print designs.

Pieter Bruegel the Elder

II. Landscape with Saint Jerome, 1553

Pen and brown ink
25.2 x 33.6 cm (9 3/4 x 13 1/2 in.)
Dated at lower left: 1553; signed near center at lower edge:
BRVEGHEL

National Gallery of Art, Washington, Ailsa Mellon Bruce Fund, 1972 1972-47:1

PROVENANCE: Prince Johann of Liechtenstein, Vienna; Dr. Felix Somary, Zurich; William S. Schab, New York.


Saint Jerome kneels before a large tree; nearby rests his attribute, a rather unthreatening lion. Behind these tiny figures a large castle surrounded by walls nestles in a hilly landscape.

This energetic sheet dated 1553, like the three other landscapes by Bruegel that are securely assigned to this year (cat. nos. 9, 10, 12), reminds us of the strong bond Venetian art had on the Netherlandish artist during his stay in Italy. In all four drawings Bruegel’s gently curving parallel hatching and the animation he brought to the description of his images are indebted to his study of the graphic work of Titian. However, his handling of the pen in this sheet is slightly looser than in his other landscapes of 1553. The lines that define the rounded foliage of the small trees on the right and the mountains in the distance are more open, more general, and more quickly applied than the pen strokes in the Alpine Landscape (cat. no. 12), for instance. Nevertheless, the present work, like the others, must have been meant as a finished presentation drawing.

Certain motifs in the Landscape with Saint Jerome also alert us to Bruegel’s great admiration for Italian art at the time he made the drawing. The large twisting tree with its broad foliage and the two spindly trees behind it are recognizably inspired by Venetian models. And his Jerome is a bare-chested penitent kneeling at the foot of a tree, in the tradition often followed by Italians, rather than the more typically Northern representation of the saint at work in his study. The Italianisms notwithstanding, Bruegel
included in this southern landscape—as in many others of the kind—architecture that would seem more at home in the northern countryside. The sprawling fortress, its small buildings, and a Gothic chapel with a pointed steeple call to mind northern Europe, and the distant city view with a large tower, visible just beyond the hill above the castle, could easily be taken for the Antwerp skyline.

Despite the natural appearance of the rolling hills, Bruegel no doubt created this landscape in the studio. The composition follows a formula that Bruegel had previously employed in the *Wooded Landscape with Mills* (cat. no. 2) and would often repeat in the future, wherein a corner of land in the foreground with a large tree and several figures gives way to an expansive landscape that reaches far into the distance. The minuscule saint is dwarfed by the mighty tree before him, anticipating Bruegel’s Large Landscapes group (cat. nos. 22–34). Probably created only a year or two after the *Landscape with Saint Jerome*, this group too presents religious or genre subject matter that serves almost as a footnote to the majestic natural world.

1. Mielke (1996, p. 13) notes that the description of the landscape in the present sheet has become more routine than that in the *Wooded Landscape with Mills* (cat. no. 2) of just a year earlier.
Pieter Bruegel the Elder

12. Alpine Landscape, ca. 1553

Pen and brown ink
23.6 x 34.3 cm (9 1/2 x 13 1/2 in.)
Inscribed at bottom center: 1553 BRVEGHEL
Département des Arts Graphiques du Musée du Louvre,
Paris 19.728

Provenance: Pierre Crozat; his auction, Paris, April 10–May 13, 1741, no. 904 or 908; P. J. Mariette, stamp at lower left (Lugt 1852); auction, F. Basan, Paris, November 15, 1775, no. 840; Louvre stamps at lower right and lower left (Lugt 1899, Lugt 2207).

Literature: Mariette 1831–33, vol. 1, p. 188; Tölner 1853, no. 8; Tölner 1852, no. 10; Münz 1961, no. 5; Lugt 1968, no. 329; Berlin 1975, no. 30; Marijnnissen et al. 1988, p. 63; Mielke 1996, no. 16.

A broad plain lies before a massive mountainside with rocky outcroppings. Pairs of miniature figures, dwarfed by the natural world around them, make their way along the cliffs in the foreground down a path that leads into the distance.

Although the artist's name and date were added by a later hand, the close stylistic resemblance of this drawing to the Mountain Landscape with River and Travelers of 1553 in London (cat. no. 9) assures us that it was also made by Bruegel and executed in the same year.1 Like the London drawing, this sheet was composed in the studio and represents a scene based on the artist's observation of the mountainscapes he passed on his journey down to Italy from Antwerp.2 The present work differs from many of Bruegel's other landscape drawings in the degree of its focus on the land, which is almost complete. The minute figures that walk down the single path into the distance, like the tiny wanderers in the Mountain Landscape with River and Travelers, may refer to man's journey on the path of life. But this possible subplot is even less noticeable here than in the London sheet, where many travelers are scattered throughout the scene. Any meaning of this kind is completely overwhelmed by the main subject.

Like a number of other sheets from 1553, this drawing bears witness to the strong influence on Bruegel of Venetian draftsmen, most importantly Titian and Domenico Campagnola. Their impact is most noticeable in the gently curving patterns of parallel lines that define the planes of the mountains and cliffs. The handling of the pen lines is slightly more restrained and meticulous than in the other sheets of similar size from 1553 (cat. nos. 9–11). This precision of style may support the often-voiced theory that the Alpine Landscape was created as a design for a print that was never carried out.3 In its lack of historical subject matter, the sheet is most closely related to the Alpine Landscape (cat. no. 29) from The Large Landscapes, the drawing for which is still extant (fig. 84), and The Large Alpine Landscape print (cat. no. 35). But this drawing is much smaller than the known designs for The Large Landscapes, so it clearly could not have been made for that group. It is more likely that the present drawing and the other sheets of 1553, which have also been considered to be designs for unexecuted prints, were meant as independent finished works of art. In fact, even the drawings used for The Large Landscapes may not have been intended as print designs when they were executed.

1. It has been suggested by Mielke (1996, p. 40) that the present signature may be a copy of an autograph one that had been trimmed away from the sheet.

2. Münz (1961) perceived differences between the two landscapes that led him to propose that parts of this drawing were made directly from nature.

Pieter Bruegel the Elder

13. Italian Landscape (after Domenico Campagnola), 1554, recto

Landscape with Castle, ca. 1554, verso

Pen and red-brown ink
33.3 x 46.6 cm (13 x 18 in.)
Dated in red-brown ink on recto at lower right: 1554; inscribed by another hand in brown ink at lower right: ...ruge; on recto: collection stamp of William Mayor (Lugt 2798); on verso: collection stamp of Henri Hamal (Lugt 1231)
Watermark: crossed arrows

Staatliche Museen zu Berlin, Kupferstichkabinett
KdZ 1202

Provenance: Henri Hamal (1744–1820), Liège; William Mayor (d. 1874), London; acquired 1879.

Literature: Van Bastelaer and Hulin de Loo 1907, no. 21; Friedländer 1921, fig. 19; Tolnai 1925, p. 72 (as copy after Bruegel); Lugt 1927, pp. 116–18; Tolnai 1929, pp. 196–97 (as Campagnola after Bruegel); Bock and Rosenzweig 1930, p. 21 (as Bruegel?); Lugt 1931, p. 38; Tolnai 1932, no. 66 (as not Bruegel); Münz 1961, nos. 23, 24; Arndt 1972, p. 177, no. 87 (as copy after Bruegel); Berlin 1975, no. 40 (as Bruegel?); Müller Hofstede 1976, p. 41 (recto as Bruegel, verso as not Bruegel); Oberhuber 1981, pp. 146, 153; Tokyo 1995, no. 84; Mielke 1996, no. 21.

Although certainly not one of the most inspiring of Pieter Bruegel’s works, the Italian Landscape is clearly one of the most fiercely debated drawings in the oeuvre. René van Bastelaer and Georges Hulin de Loo unhesitatingly included it in their pioneering study of Bruegel drawings published in 1907. Twenty years later the renowned collector and connoisseur Frits Lugt recognized the indebtedness of the drawing to a lost work by Domenico Campagnola, formerly in the illustrious Vivant-Denon collection and at that time known only through a nineteenth-century lithographic reproduction. The new idea that Bruegel had copied a drawing by an Italian artist who was considered to be slightly inferior was apparently disturbing to other scholars. Thus, the Bruegel specialist Charles de Tolnay reversed the order: it was, he declared, Campagnola who had copied a lost composition by Bruegel! Over the following fifty years, opinion was deeply divided. After the 1975 exhibition in Berlin—in the catalogue of which the Italian Landscape was cautiously classified as Bruegel?—Justus Müller Hofstede firmly reinstated the sheet in the oeuvre of the master. Müller Hofstede did, however, consider the vague sketch on the verso, the Landscape with Castle, to be by another hand. But in his catalogue of 1996, some ninety years after the first words on the drawing were published, Hans Mielke convincingly argued that both recto and verso are by one and the same artist, Pieter Bruegel the Elder.

Lugt’s observation of the strong influence of Italian and in particular Venetian landscape drawing in the Italian Landscape—a highly original perception in a period when most scholars clung to studying developments within national schools—is now generally recognized as entirely correct. Even before his departure for Italy, Bruegel could easily have been acquainted with the landscapes of such masters as Titian and Campagnola through prints after their works, which were distributed rapidly and widely throughout Europe. Or he might have seen copies after Italian drawings and paintings owned by fellow artists who, like his publisher-to-be Hieronymus Cock, had traveled to Italy before him.

The first signs of Italian influences are already discernible in Bruegel’s earliest surviving works, sheets of 1552 that were probably made prior to his journey to Italy—including the Wooded Landscape with Mills (cat. no. 2) and Pastoral Landscape (cat. no. 3). But it is in a group of Titianesque drawings from 1553 to 1554, carried out in the last period of his stay in Italy or directly after his return to Antwerp in the latter year, that the inspiration of the Venetian landscape tradition is most clear. Not only the Italian Landscape but also the Landscape with Saint Jerome (cat. no. 11), the Cow Pasture before a Farmhouse (cat. no. 19), and the recently discovered Wooded Landscape with a Distant View toward the Sea (cat. no. 14) belong to this group. Of these four drawings, the present free copy after Campagnola is the least accomplished work. Judging by the lithograph after the Italian prototype, Bruegel added to his copy the church at the right, the figures in the foreground, and the winding river in the background. It is precisely these additions that destroy the unity of the composition and make it look a little too much like an accumulation of motifs—a point noted by Van Bastelaer, who rightly described the sheet as a mixture of Flemish and Italian landscape elements.

Although these observations might add force to arguments against ascribing the drawing on the recto to Bruegel, there are many telling features that warrant an attribution to him. The date seems authentic and such details as the dotted outlines of trees, the geometrically shaped cow in the left background, the form of the birds in the sky, and the leaves made up of strokes that resemble the number 3 on its side—one of Bruegel’s highly characteristic treatments—
all match particulars of autograph landscape drawings by the master. The quick and confident lines with which the figures in the foreground and the horseman at the right are drawn, like so many other elements in this sheet, reveal that a great draftsman handled the pen. The lack of coherence in the composition, however, shows that Bruegel was far less at ease making a paste of a work by someone else than in creating his own images.

Pieter Bruegel the Elder

14. Wooded Landscape with a Distant View toward the Sea, 1554

Pen and brown ink with brown wash, white gouache, and black chalk on blue paper
26 x 34.4 cm (10 1/8 x 13 3/8 in.)
Signed and dated at lower left: 1554 brueghel
Literature: Mielke 1996, p. 29, n. 5 and no. 74; Robinson 1999, p. 15, fig. 2.

A pair of trees commands the foreground of a landscape characterized by low hills and traversed by several figures. In the left background a rabbit and the hunters who pursue it dart across a clearing. Beyond a church nestled among trees and fields where cows are grazing, the background opens to a sea with sailing ships and a distant port.

This recently discovered landscape on blue paper is the most surprising work that has been added to Bruegel’s oeuvre in the last few years. With only a few exceptions, the known drawings by the artist were executed in brown ink on white paper. This energetic drawing—in which the blue (presumably Venetian) paper is employed as a middle tone between the darks described in brown ink and the lights added in white gouache—is, therefore, highly unusual, but it bears hallmarks of Bruegel’s signature works. The thin, swaying Titianesque trees with their dynamic foliage composed of quick, bending horizontals and strokes that resemble the number 3 on its side can be found in the Cows Pasture before a Farmhouse in Washington (cat. no. 19) and any number of other drawings from the artist’s Italian period. The handling is broad and loose, and in this respect the drawing is akin to the Washington example as well. In the lower left corner is a clearly authentic signature that closely resembles that of the Southern Cloister in a Valley (cat. no. 1). It was recently discovered that Bruegel also inscribed the date in the lower left corner, as he typically did in other sheets; this date, 1554, is now best visible under strong light and magnification.

In contrast to his procedure in other landscape drawings, here Bruegel made great use of the paintbrush. Sweeps of wash indicate shadows on land, and touches of the brush describe the bark of tree trunks in the foreground. Dabs of white brushwork suggest the light areas of foliage, and several trees on the left are almost entirely constituted of white strokes. Moreover, the speckling that Bruegel often added between tree trunks with his pen to represent distant foliage—in the Wooded Landscape with Mills (cat. no. 2), for instance—is here carried out in white dots with a brush. The white gouache used in this sheet is integral to the image and could not have been added later, as has been proposed; examination with a microscope reveals that a few pen lines run over the gouache and that in some areas gouache and ink have blended, which indicates that both media were wet when applied.

Bruegel would have known and been inspired by landscapes executed with dark ink and white gouache on colored paper in the early decades of the sixteenth century by Antwerp artists in the circles of Jan Wellens de Cock, Matthijs Cock, and Joachim Patinir. But here, as in all his landscape drawings, he combined the influence of his Netherlandish heritage with aspects of Italian sources (few of whom used this technique). And it is the Italian component of his style—the vivacious energy and loose handling derived from Venetian models—that sets this work apart from the drawings of his Netherlandish predecessors.

Before adding the ink and gouache to the drawing, Bruegel briefly set the scene in black chalk. He traced a few
light lines of the composition to block in the tree trunks and some of the staffage and then went over the whole sheet in greater detail, obscuring the chalk strokes. The underdrawing is almost invisible to the naked eye but can be seen clearly with infrared reflectography (fig. 80). This delicate sketch resembles the artist’s tracings on the verso of the *Italian Landscape (after Domenico Campagnola)* (cat. no. 13), which dates from the same year as this sheet. These two examples are doubtless not the only drawings in which Bruegel used this type of preliminary sketch. Nevertheless, this landscape is unique in his oeuvre and raises many questions, most notable among them: how many other atypical sheets by Bruegel remain unrecognized as works from his hand?

---

1. According to William Robinson, in 1994 Mielke recognized Bruegel’s hand in the drawing, which had entered the Abrams collection in 1993 as the work of an unidentified sixteenth-century Flemish artist. I thank William Robinson, who discussed this drawing with me and generously shared his entry for the forthcoming exhibition catalogue of drawings from the Abrams collection.

2. Mielke (1996) had dated the drawing to 1553; more recently Royalton-Kisch discovered the slightly later date on the drawing.
Pieter Bruegel the Elder

15. Landscape with Bears, 1554, recto

*Estuary with City in Background,*
ca. 1554, verso

Pen and brown ink
27.3 x 41 cm (10 5/8 x 16 1/8 in.)
dated at lower right: 1554
Národní Galerie, Prague K 4493
(Exhibited in Rotterdam only)

Provenance: F. Berovsky; Freiherr Adalbert von Lanna
(1836–1909), Prague; Engert collection; acquired 1925.

Literature: Kramar 1948, p. 33 (as unknown, Netherlands,
ca. 1600, copy after the etching); Arndt 1966, p. 107; Franz 1969,
pp. 160, 326; Arndt 1972, pp. 87–90; Brussels 1980, no. 11;
Marijnissen et al. 1988, p. 69; Mielke 1994, p. 13; Mielke 1996,
no. 22.

Hieronymus Cock (1510–1570)
after Pieter Bruegel the Elder

16. *The Temptation of Christ,* ca. 1554

Etching and engraving; only state
22.6 x 35.1 cm (8 3/5 x 13 3/4 in.)
Inscribed at lower left: *H. Cock fecit.* in lower margin: *NON IN SOLO BANE VICTVRIS EST HOMO / SED OMNI VERBO QVOD DIGREDITVR PER OS DEL MAR. 4. DEVT. 8.* (Man
shall not live by bread alone, but by every word that proceedeth
out of the mouth of God. Mark 4 [Matthew 4:4] Deut. 8:3)

Mr. and Mrs. Julian I. Edison

Literature: Lugt 1927, pp. 112, 115; Raczyński 1937, pp. 16–17;
Hollstein 1949– , vol. 4 (Cock), no. 2; Vienna 1967–68, no. 16;
Brussels 1970, no. 148; Riggs 1971, pp. 270–71, no. 36; Rotterdam
1988, no. 23; Tokyo 1989, no. 96; Saint Louis–Cambridge
(Mass.) 1995, no. 3.

The *Landscape with Bears,* dated 1554, which is badly dam-
aged and was not easily accessible due to its location behind
the Iron Curtain, was first recognized as an authentic draw-
ing by Pieter Bruegel in 1966 by Karl Arndt. It became
clear immediately thereafter that the impressive etching
*The Temptation of Christ* by Hieronymus Cock was made
after this design by Bruegel, for the two images are very
similar. In addition to making some minor alterations in
the landscape, Cock changed the composition in one
important respect: he replaced the five bears playing in the
right foreground of the drawing with the Temptation of
Christ in the Wilderness—which appears in the left fore-
ground of the etching due to the reversal that occurs when
a print is made. As told in the Gospels, Jesus was tempted
thrice by the Devil to reveal his power as the Son of God
and to adore Satan instead of his Father. Shown here is the
moment when the Devil, disguised as a hermit, meets Jesus
in the wilderness, where he has fasted for forty days. The
Devil holds up stones and tempts him to change them into
bread with which to satisfy his hunger. Christ answers, as
reported in Matthew (4:4), with an allusion to the Old Test-
ament Book of Deuteronomy: “It is written, Man shall not
live by bread alone, but by every word that proceedeth out
of the mouth of God.”

The *Landscape with Bears,* damaged as it may be, reveals
itself to be a skillfully executed composition of high quality
with all the characteristics of Bruegel’s landscape drawings
of about 1554. The right half shows close affinities to what
is known as the Lugt group, a series of vertical drawings
dominated by large twisted trees and often with animals in
the foreground—examples are *Stream with an Angler* (cat.
no. 18) and *Landscape with Exotic Animals* (cat. no. 119). Its
combination of a dense wooded landscape, strongly influ-
enced by Titian, in one half of the sheet and an open view to a river or sea with towns on the horizon in the other half is found in various drawings of this period, such as the Wooded Landscape with a Distant View toward the Sea, dated 1554 (cat. no. 14), and the Landscape with Three Pilgrims, 1555–56 (cat. no. 22). In countless details of the present drawing hallmarks of Bruegel’s style can be recognized: the shape of the birds in the sky, the semicircular, striped modeling of the trees in the left background, the strokes resembling the number 3 lying on its side that make up the foliage of the large trees, and the use of accentuated parallel hatching to create volumes, as in the tower in the left. On the verso is a quickly sketched composition in pen and brown ink, Estuary with City in Background, that relates to a small group of riverscapes by Bruegel, among them Riverscape near Bausrode (cat. no. 21).

The etching by Cock is no less important than the drawing it follows. Although undated, the print is generally considered to have been made shortly after 1554. Thus it is probably the earliest print executed after Bruegel and marks the beginning of a long-standing and fruitful collaboration between the master and his publisher Cock. Why the name of the designer was not added to the print is unknown. Perhaps Cock did not consider the authorship of Bruegel, who in 1554 was not yet a household name, to be a commercial asset. The Temptation of Christ is the only work after Bruegel etched by Cock himself, who from 1555 onward concentrated on running his printshop Aux Quatre Vents. This is certainly a pity, as the freely etched image of The Temptation of Christ shows a far better understanding of the Italian and in particular the Venetian landscape tradition that influenced Bruegel than do later prints after the master’s designs by the Doetecum brothers.

1. One bear, which is climbing a tree, is partially hidden. Boon (1992, p. 78) suggested that the bear licking another bear is a direct reference to the saying “Natura potenter artis” (Nature is more powerful than art). This Latin motto from Horapollo’s Hieroglyphica was illustrated in the sixteenth century by the popular emblem of a mother bear licking a small young cub into shape; see Henkel and Schöne 1978, p. 442. Although Boon’s idea is attractive, especially because the saying is sometimes associated with Titian, it is probably incorrect, for the bears in question are clearly fully grown and they are frolicking.

2. The generally accepted reading of the date as 1554 is contested by Serebrennikov (1998, p. 179), who believes it to be 1556.

3. Bruegel’s name was possibly left off the Prospectus Tybarinus (cat. no. 24), one of The Large Landscapes, for the same reason.

4. Cock may well have developed his sensitivity to the tradition because, like Bruegel himself, he traveled to Italy and had come under the spell of Italian art; see Rijks 1971, pp. 39–30, 56–79.
Pieter Bruegel the Elder

17. Landscape with a Group of Trees and a Mule, ca. 1554

Pen and brown ink
19.7 x 25.8 cm (7 1/2 x 10 1/4 in.)

Private collection

Literature: Arndt 1967, no. 3; Arndt 1972, no. 5; Berlin 1975, no. 39; Mielke 1996, no. 9.

A cluster of four trees divides a landscape into two parts. On the right a man leads a mule down a hill toward a valley with a church. On the left lies a village with a tall pointed tower.

Brisk sweeps of the pen describe foliage, clouds, and rough ground in this marvelous sheet. We can easily imagine Bruegel’s hand at work, passing over the page so quickly that his pen sometimes just skimmed the paper, leaving broken lines and uneven traces of ink. Certain unique drawings like this spirited one oblige us to recognize how much of Bruegel’s drawn oeuvre must have been lost over time! It is difficult to imagine that this accomplished whirlwind of a sketch is the only drawing of its kind that he ever made. And, indeed, the extremely loose draftsmanship of
this sheet is visible also in the brief tracings that remain on the versos of the Italian Landscape (after Domenico Campagnola) (cat. no. 13) and the Landscape with Bears (cat. no. 15), where a seascape shows broad pen work very similar to that seen here. The use of this exceptionally free style may have been determined by the function of particular sheets, which, in the case of this piece, is not known.\footnote{1}

Although unusually open, the style of this unsigned drawing in some respects relates to that of numerous other works by the master. With its lumpy back and tapered legs, the cow standing at the left resembles the cattle in the foreground of the Landscape with Fortified City (cat. no. 10). The broadly indicated foliage and patterns of sweeping parallel hatchings defining undulating earth that are derived from sheets by Titian and Domenico Campagnola occur in several other drawings, such as the Cow Pasture before a Farmhouse (cat. no. 19) and the somewhat earlier Wooded Landscape with Mill (cat. no. 2). The nervous loopings of the leaves of the tree at the left find parallels in the foliage of the trees in the River Landscape in the Louvre (fig. 81). And the rough sketching of the angular roofs is comparable to details in the Cow Pasture and the Path through a Village (cat. no. 5). It has been suggested that Bruegel would have employed the loose technique of the present sheet during his earliest, experimental years as an artist.\footnote{2} Indeed, the drawing can be placed during his Italian sojourn of 1532 to 1554 and perhaps, more precisely, toward the end of that period based on its stylistic similarities to dated works such as the Landscape with Fortified City, 1553, and the verso of the Landscape with Bears, 1554.\footnote{3}

\footnote{1} Another unique sheet is the Ripa Grande in Rome (cat. no. 8), Bruegel's only known depiction of a Roman monument.

\footnote{2} According to Winner (in Berlin 1975, no. 39), details that were drawn over hatching, such as the tower at the left, could indicate that the Landscape with a Group of Trees and a Mule was meant as a compositional sketch.

\footnote{3} By Mielke (1996, no. 9), who dates the drawing to 1553.

\footnote{4} Royleton-Kisch has suggested to me a possible dating of about 1554 based on the connection to the verso of the Landscape with Bears.

Pieter Bruegel the Elder

18. Stream with an Angler, ca. 1554

Pen and brown ink
34.5 x 23.5 cm (13 3/8 x 9 1/2 in.)
Inscribed in dark brown ink at lower left: Bruegel F. 1554
Bibliothèque Royale de Belgique, Cabinet des Estampes, Brussels S.II 134 folio C
Provenance: Auguste Coster, Brussels; auction, Galerie Fievez, Brussels, May 17, 18, 1907, no. 656.

Literature: Lugt 1927, pp. 121ff.; Tolnai 1959, p. 196 (as Bruegel follower); Münz 1961, no. 129 (as Jan Brueghel, dated 1555; Arndt 1972, pp. 126–8, no. 152 (as copy); Berlin 1975, no. 47 (as copy); Oberhuber 1881, p. 136, no. 40; Mielke 1994, pp. 17–18; Mielke 1996, no. 19.

A majestic tree rises beside a stream in a wooded landscape. To the left of the partially exposed roots of the tree a figure in a boat is busy with fishing baskets. In the right foreground, at the water’s edge, a seated man angles. Behind him, deeper in the wood, a water mill appears. Farther back, at the left, we see a dwelling, probably a farmhouse, in front of which a man sits astride a horse that is drinking from the stream.

Stream with an Angler is typical of the sheets Pieter Bruegel produced between 1552 and 1556, when he traveled to Italy and absorbed the influence of landscape drawings and prints by and after such Venetian artists as Titian and Girolamo Muziano.\footnote{5} The careful undulating hatchings that define the trunk of the central tree, the use of hatchings to create a variety of tones in the terrain bordering the water, and the motif of the water mill all derive from Italian prototypes. Yet the broad and daring execution of the outstretched branches of the large tree and the realization of the three tiny figures are characteristic of Bruegel’s own highly personal style. Together these features reveal that the sheet was probably carried out in 1554, just as the inauthentic inscription indicates.

The sheet is part of the Lugt group of landscapes, so-called after Frits Lugt, who was the first scholar to draw attention to them.\footnote{6} These drawings are by Bruegel or members of his circle; mostly vertical in format, they show lush wooded scenes populated by a variety of human figures and
animals and reveal the influence of Titian. Five different compositions are featured, with numerous replicas of each extant. Several bear inscriptions including the annotations *Bruegel, 1554, and in Roma*, suggesting that the original drawings in the group were made by the master during his Italian journey. Three of the five compositions were conceived by Bruegel himself, while two are variations on his designs by or attributed to his son Jan Brueghel, among them *Landscape with Exotic Animals* (cat. no. 119). Of the three compositions by Bruegel, two original drawings survive, the *Bears in a Wood* (fig. 19) in London and the present sheet. It is probable that for several decades after Bruegel’s death the original drawings remained in the hands of his sons, who used them as models for copies or as sources of inspiration, which would explain why so many replicas and derivations of them exist.
The composition of the *Stream with an Angler* is reiterated in a sheet that is now in the Louvre. Only after careful examination can we discern the differences between the two drawings: we see that the execution of the Paris example is uniform and polished, while the present work has a few rough areas—in the upper and lower right corners, for example—lapses that tell us it is the original sheet, in which Bruegel was inventing his solutions. A second copy, of lesser quality than the Louvre replica, is in the print room of the Kunsterstichkabinett, Berlin. Here it should be noted that the compositions of the Lught group were repeated in paintings as well as in works on paper, as attested by Jan Brueghel’s *Landscape with Tobias* in the State Hermitage Museum, Saint Petersburg: in this tondo on wood we see the entire foreground of the *Stream with an Angler*, complete with its two fishermen, massive tree with exposed roots, and horse drinking. It was for uses of this kind that drawings were kept within families of artists.

1. In 1927 Lught recognized that *Stream with an Angler* and other drawings in the group to which it belongs were made by Bruegel. In this he was well ahead of his time, for it would take his colleagues almost fifty years—and sometimes more—to accept his position.
4. For the Paris sheet, see Lught 1968, no. 333, and Mielke 1996, p. 42, under no. 19. Lught believed the Paris sheet was the original and the present work a copy.
5. Berlin 1975, no. 49.
6. As observed by Winner (1961, p. 199, n. 23); see also Arndt 1972, p. 109, Fig. 19.

**Pieter Bruegel the Elder**

19. *Cow Pasture before a Farmhouse*, ca. 1554

Pen and red-brown ink
23.6 x 34.2 cm (9¼ x 13⅜ in.)
Inscribed in brown ink on verso: Tiziano
National Gallery of Art, Washington, Ailsa Mellon Bruce Fund 1973.22.1

**Provenance:** Dealer Richard Day, London.

**Literature:** Arndt 1972, p. 73; Washington 1974, no. 40; Berlin 1975, no. 38; Mielke 1996, no. 8.

In 1972 this previously unknown sheet surfaced on the art market in London. Although unsigned and cautiously offered for sale as Workshop of Bruegel, it was from the beginning associated with Pieter Bruegel himself. Drawn in pen and brown ink in long, sweeping, and unhesitating lines, the *Cow Pasture before a Farmhouse* at first glance seems to be a rapid sketch done from nature. But closer inspection reveals that it is, in fact, a painstakingly composed and well-balanced drawing with many delightful and witty details, a work in which Bruegel with the utmost care combined an Italian landscape, a Flemish village view, and bucolic imagery.

In front of a farm or more probably a manor, in the left background, cattle are grazing amid tall trees. In the foreground is a group of peasants. The figure farthest to the left (a young maid?) sits on the ground and milks the cow that is emphatically presented from the rear. To the right of the cow, a peasant leaning on a staff gazes at a man and a woman who are passionately engaged with each other. However bold and free the drawing may be, if we look carefully, we can see tiny, amusing details: the right arm of the man in this pair reaches under the skirt of the woman, who, in turn, extends her left hand toward her partner to caress him or perhaps to pull off some of his clothes. Further to the right, a more restrained couple takes a romantic stroll up a slope. Beyond the meadows behind these two figures the outlines of a village or small country town are visible, along with a windmill that balances the composition on the far right. In front of the house on the left there is yet another inconspicuous yet tellingly characterized detail: two farmers talking as they rest their arms on either side of a wooden fence. It is in the sum of these images that Bruegel has presented us with an Arcadian vision of a sun-drenched countryside on a quiet day with ample time for leisure, love, and lust.
The sheet bears an old attribution to Titian on the verso. Although the very obviously Flemish landscape subject has nothing to do with the work of the illustrious Venetian painter, this annotation is understandable: the layout of the composition, the broad, sweeping strokes of the pen, the emphatic parallel hatching, the form and modeling of the trees and the foliage are all clearly indebted to the landscapes of both Titian and Domenico Campagnola. However, Bruegel combined this Venetian influence with the Netherlandish landscape tradition that began with Joachim Patinir—and far more successfully than in his 1554 pastiche of Campagnola’s work (cat. no. 13). Moreover, many of the hallmarks of Bruegel’s personal style, as they had developed in his drawings starting in 1552, are present here: the strokes that resemble the number 3 on its side that make up foliage, the dotted crowns of trees in the right background, and the twisted, bare trunks of large trees that leave the view open to the background.

Hans Mielke pointed out that the Cow Pasture before a Farmhouse is very close to the Wooded Landscape with a Distant View toward the Sea (cat. no. 14) in its conception of landscape, the style and audacity of its drawing, and the rendering of its figures. We can therefore assume that the present sheet was made about the same time as the Wooded Landscape, which is not only signed but also bears the recently discovered date of 1554. Works from about the same year, then, these two great drawings represent a worthy finale to Bruegel’s journey in Italy, from which he returned to Antwerp at an unknown moment in 1554. There he would go on to produce landscape drawings showing less explicit Venetian influence.

1. On Bruegel and Italian landscape art, see Lugt’s pioneering study of 1937 and Mielke’s lucid introduction (1996, pp. 5–15) treating the artist’s journey to Italy. For a broader survey of artistic relations between the Netherlands and Venice in the sixteenth century, see the various essays in Venice 1999–2000, with a discussion of Bruegel’s Landscape with Saint Jerome (cat. no. 12) on pp. 422–23.
Pieter Bruegel the Elder

20. Rest on the Flight into Egypt, ca. 1555–56

Pen and red-brown and dark brown ink
20.3 × 28.2 cm (8 x 11 ¼ in.)
Signed at lower right: bruegel F
Staatliche Museen zu Berlin, Kupferstichkabinett, KdZ 5730

Provenance: Adolf von Beckerath (1834–1915) (Lugt 2504); gift, 1902.

Literature: Van Bastelaer and Hulin de Loo 1907, p. 176, no. 23; Tolnai 1925, no. 4; Bock and Rosenberg 1930, p. 18; Tolnay 1937, no. 5; Münz 1961, no. 29; Berlin 1975, no. 33; Müller Hofstede 1976, pp. 40–41; Marijnissen et al. 1988, p. 65; Mielke 1996, pp. 10–11 and no. 12.

A cloister of Italian style perches on a mountaintop in the middle ground of an Alpine landscape inspired by early Netherlandish precedents. On a hill overlooking the river valley in the foreground sit the Virgin, who cuddles the infant Christ, and Joseph, who gazes out at the view. The juxtaposition of the Virgin and the cloister, the two dominant compositional elements, was meant as a reference to the Virgin as a symbol of Ecclesia, the Church.

Bruegel composed this drawing in two shades of brown ink: the cloister and part of the landscape on the horizon are executed in a reddish brown, while the surrounding landscape is rendered in a darker brown. Close inspection reveals that an underdrawing in reddish brown exists beneath most of the background section. No doubt the difference in coloration has become more pronounced with age, but it surely was present to some degree when the drawing was made. Thus it demonstrates to us now that Bruegel carried out this composition in the same way he executed many of his designs for prints, in several campaigns, carefully drawing over lines and strengthening parts here and there.

There has been controversy about the date of the present piece. Some scholars have argued for a dating about 1559–60, based on its stylistic relationship to sheets once given to Bruegel but now attributed to Jacob Savery and on the long-honored assumption that the master signed his name without an "h" only about 1560. (The signature here has no "h.") Others have proposed a dating of about 1553–54, citing affinities between the drawing and works of Bruegel’s Italian period such as the Ripa Grande in Rome (cat. no. 8), which are also executed in ink of two colors. Another piece of evidence used in support of the earlier dating is the composition’s similarity to River Landscape with Mercury and Psyche, a print published by Joris Hoefnagel, which also shows a broad valley with tiny figures in the foreground and which, according to its inscription, reproduces a drawing of 1553 by Bruegel.

Yet, despite its Italianate cloister, this invented scene is unlike any of Bruegel’s dated landscapes of the Italian period, in terms of both composition and drawing style. The figures are larger in relation to the landscape than in the Italian-period drawings and even in the Hoefnagel print. In fact, with its small corner of land in the foreground jutting out over a broad Alpine vista, it most closely resembles The Large Landscapes prints and the only known drawing for that group, the Landscape with Three Pilgrims (cat. no. 22), which are believed to have been produced about 1555–56, after the artist returned to the Netherlands. Features that also set this sheet apart from the drawings of the Italian sojourn are often-noted compositional and stylistic archaisms: the small islands with large pointed cliffs, which relate to the landscapes of the painter Joachim Patinir, and the description of the rocky outcroppings and the family group with strong outlines and short rectilinear modeling strokes, which recall drawings by Patinir and, even more closely, the drawing style of Hieronymus Bosch and his circle in such works as The Deposition (fig. 82).3

Although comparisons with Bruegel’s paintings have been brought to bear on the discussion of the dating of this

Fig. 82. Hieronymus Bosch or Circle. The Deposition, ca. 1490–1500?
Pen and brown ink. The British Museum, London
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drawing, the relevance of the sheet’s strong technical and stylistic affinities with his designs for prints has been overlooked. The most notable of the latter parallels are the strongly defined outlines and measured lines used for shading that occur here and in the print designs with figural subjects that Bruegel began to produce about 1556 (for example, cat. nos. 36, 38, 40). Moreover, a light underdrawing in ink of a second color, like that of the present drawing, is apparent in many of the print designs. And while this sheet displays a familiarity with Bosch’s technique, many of the earliest print designs reveal a thorough knowledge of Bosch’s imagery. This drawing, although unrelated to a print, seems to anticipate the technique that Bruegel would perfect in his designs for figural prints but had not yet employed in his Landscape with Three Pilgrims drawing. It would thus seem reasonable to date the Rest on the Flight into Egypt about 1555–56, when he was thought to be busy with these early print projects. One further conjecture might be made: perhaps this drawing was created as a design for a print that was never carried out.  

1. Among the authorities who argued for this dating were Friedländer (1937, p. 160), Bock and Rosenberg (1930), and Minz (1960).
2. Among those who argued for the earlier dating were Tolnay (1935 and 1952) and Mielke (1996).
4. For a summary of the arguments relating paintings to the drawing, see Anreiter in Berlin 1975, no. 13.
5. One piece of evidence to consider in this context is the suggestion proposed in this catalogue that two of the prints among The Large Landscapes were not designed by Bruegel (see entry for cat. no. 33), one of which is the etching of the Rest on the Flight into Egypt. Could the present drawing, although admittedly smaller than that etching, have originally been meant as a design for a print in The Large Landscapes group but never used, and could the print in the group have been brought in to replace it?
Pieter Bruegel the Elder

21. Riverscape near Baasrode, ca. 1555

Pen and gray-brown ink
24.9 x 42.1 cm (9 13/16 x 16 5/8 in.)
Inscribed in brown ink at lower right: asszassz; in same hand at upper center: basrode
Watermark: the letters dd entwined and topped by a crescent and crown (see Briquet 5315)

Staatliche Museen zu Berlin, Kupferstichkabinett KdZ 5763

Provenance: Adolf von Beckerath (1834–1915), Berlin; acquired with Beckerath collection, 1902.

Literature: Friedländer 1921, p. 150; Tolnai 1925, p. 73 (as not Bruegel); Bock and Rosenberg 1930, p. 21 (as not Bruegel); Popham 1935, pp. 179–80 (as copy after “original Bruegel” version in British Museum); Klauner 1949–50, p. 17 (as copy after Bruegel); Münz 1961, no. A26 (as Jan Brueghel); Tolnay 1969, p. 61 (as copy after Pieter Bruegel); Berlin 1975, no. 59 (as copy after Bruegel); Mielke 1996, no. 27.

Now part of the city of Dendermonde, Baasrode, on the south bank of the river Scheldt in Flanders, some twenty-five kilometers southwest of Antwerp, was a town in Bruegel’s time. On the surge of one high tide, larger ships coming from Antwerp could just reach the town, where they would have to wait for the next flood to continue on their way to such destinations as Ghent and Bruges. Thanks to its favorable location, Baasrode was a thriving center of the shipping industry in the Middle Ages. The town’s economy declined, however, in the second half of the sixteenth century partly because nearby Dendermonde won its right to collect tolls. It would also be raided and ravaged during the wars with the Spanish troops in the so-called
Dutch Revolt in the decades after Bruegel captured this peaceful riverscape with Baasrode in the background.

Bruegel drew this view of the Scheldt a little to the west of Baasrode. Judging by the position of the sailing dinghy shown navigating downstream, the artist sat in a boat near the south bank of the river as he sketched. He used the same composition as in the three other Flemish riverscape drawings that have come down to us from his hand: the *Estuary with City in Background* on the verso of the *Landscape with Bears* in Prague (cat. no. 15), the *Riverscape with Angler* in the Louvre, and the *Riverscape with Village* in the Rothschild Collection in the Louvre. All present a wide view of the river dominating the foreground, the water narrowing down so as to show both banks in the middle ground, a group of trees to the right, and the town in the background. Although they were executed in a looser and sketchier manner than the present work, the Prague example and the *Riverscape with Angler* provide clues to its dating: the Prague sheet is dated 1554, and a copy of the *Riverscape with Angler* is dated 1556. Given the strong compositional similarities among the four drawings, the *Riverscape near Baasrode* can be dated about 1555.

The *Riverscape near Baasrode* was first published in 1921 by Max Friedländer, who gave it to Bruegel. His attribution was vigorously contested by scholars, many of whom had long thought that the drawing, like a version of the composition by Jan Brueghel in the British Museum, was a copy after a lost original by Bruegel the Elder. However, Hans Mielke convincingly argued that the Berlin drawing is indeed by the master himself, based on the evidence of an early watermark on the sheet and on characteristics of style. Such distinctive features as the form of the bird in the sky, the crowns of the trees on the right bank, boats floating on calm water (in the same way they do in the *Ripa Grande in Rome* [cat. no. 8]), and the long, smooth parallel hatching leave little doubt that the attribution to Bruegel is correct.

---

1. For the *Riverscape with Angler* and *Riverscape with Village*, see Mielke 1956, nos. 29, 28. In its relatively precise handling of the pen, the latter work is stylistically closest to the *Riverscape near Baasrode*.
2. The copy is by Jan Brueghel and is also in the Louvre (19.730; see ibid., p. 47, under no. 29).
3. British Museum, 1946-7-13-148; ibid., p. 46, under no. 27.
Pieter Bruegel the Elder
Joannes and Lucas van Doetecum
(act. 1554–d. 1605; act. 1554–
d. before 1578) after Pieter
Bruegel the Elder

22–34. The Large Landscapes, ca. 1555–56

One drawing and twelve etchings

It was most likely shortly after his return to Antwerp from Italy that Bruegel drew the designs for the group of twelve etchings called The Large Landscapes and a thirteenth related print known as The Large Alpine Landscape (cat. no. 35). These prints, based on the mountain vistas that had deeply impressed the artist as he made his way through the Alps, rank among his most widely circulated and celebrated works. Through them a broad audience became acquainted with Bruegel’s naturalistic conception of the landscape, a vision embodied in works that diverge markedly from the fanciful world views of his Netherlandish predecessors, most notable among them Joachim Patinir and his followers. Although artists had featured landscape in prints before, rarely had it been portrayed in as grand a manner as in The Large Landscapes. One of The Large Landscapes is a view of the waterfall at Tivoli and another shows a wooded area outside a Flemish village, but the rest depict expansive mountain scenery. Whereas the works of his Netherlandish precursors are additive, marked by compilations of individual details, Bruegel’s vistas are broad, sweeping, and unified. Most of his spacious compositions are anchored with small pieces of land in the foreground that serve as scenic overlooks to middle grounds and backdrops that plunge precipitously into the distance. The paths through his forests and valleys begin in the foreground areas, inviting the viewer to follow the travelers shown there as they wander off into the deep space of the landscape. As Karel van Mander wrote of Bruegel’s landscape paintings and prints in his Gronde der edel vry schilder-const (Foundations of the Noble Free Art of Painting) of 1604: “he teaches us to represent, without much effort, the angular, rocky Alps, the dizzying views down into a deep valley, steep cliffs, pine trees that kiss the clouds, far distances, and rushing streams.”

While the central and unifying theme of The Large Landscapes is the beauty of the land, most are enhanced with a narrative subject of either biblical or secular character that is underscored by the title etched in the margin. Small figures illustrate the narrative themes, but, here as in much of Bruegel’s other work, they are faceless, their heads bowed or turned away from the viewer. Their usually minor role perhaps indicates that Bruegel may have initially conceived these landscapes without specific additional themes. In the print of Euntes in Emmaus (The Way to Emmaus) (cat. no. 23), for example, only the halo on one figure and the inscribed title identify the image as biblical, and neither of these features is present in Bruegel’s initial design.

The uniform size and similar format of the prints suggest that they were created as a group, but the common hallmarks of a unified series are lacking: there is no title page, the prints are not numbered, nor do they appear to be arranged in a particular order, although some scholars have tried to identify one. Moreover, one print has no title and three bear titles etched with small flourishes on either side, while the others do not. These inconsistencies and the size of the works, which is unusually large, lead us to surmise that customers may have been able to purchase the prints either singly or in groups.

Once attributed to their publisher, Hicronymus Cock, the unsigned prints are now recognized as the work of the brothers Joannes and Lucas van Doetecum, who were frequently employed by Cock between 1554 and about 1575. The brothers, who collaborated so often that it has not been possible to distinguish their individual hands, became renowned for their ability to imitate engraved lines with etching. The skill is visible in The Large Landscapes, which are carried out primarily in etched lines that have the sharp appearance of engraved lines. Although they bear
Bruegel's name, it is probable that two of The Large Landscapes, Fuga Deiparae in Aegyptum (The Rest on the Flight into Egypt) (cat. no. 33) and Nundinae Rustorum (The Rustic Market) (cat. no. 34), are the invention of one or both of the brothers, for they differ compositionally from the other prints in the group (see the entries for these works).

The date generally accepted for The Large Landscapes is 1555–56, a moment before Bruegel embarked on his first designs for the prints of proverbs (see cat. nos. 38–41). He most likely executed the designs for the landscapes group just after he completed the Landscape with Bears of 1554 (cat. no. 15), a drawing Hieronymus Cock etched, although it does not appear to have been created as a design for a print. None of The Large Landscapes prints is dated, but fortunately there is a date on the Alpine Landscape in Paris (fig. 84), one of the two surviving drawings for the group. Although the drawing in Paris is in very poor condition, the date [15]55 is just visible on the sheet above Bruegel's name. Much of the scholarly discussion about the dating of The Large Landscapes has revolved around a group of drawings that many no longer consider to be by Bruegel's hand (cat. nos. 120–123). Details used in the prints occur in these drawings, whose appearance indicates that they may have been made on site; thus they were used as evidence that some of The Large Landscapes were made after drawings created during Bruegel's trip through the Alps rather than after his return to Antwerp. Even though the basis for this argument has been called into question, it remains likely that when he was in the Alps Bruegel made many brief sketches of mountainscapes that he used as the basis for designs for The Large Landscapes. Unfortunately, it now appears that none of these sketches has survived.

NMO

2. See, for example, Levesque 1994, pp. 17–33.
3. It is interesting to note that the inventory taken in 1601 of the possessions of the widow of Hieronymus Cock listed, instead of the twelve landscapes of the group, "Veertien coperen plaeten van Lantschappen van Bruegel" (fourteen copperplates of landscapes by Bruegel) under the heading "de groote coperen plaeten" (the large copperplates); Duverger 1984, pp. 27–28. This suggests that—at this date at least—The Large Landscapes were not set apart as a discrete series (in contrast to other printing plates preserved in the printshop that were segregated as series), but were grouped together with similar plates, probably those for The Large Alpine Landscape (cat. no. 35) and probably Cock's slightly smaller Temptation of Christ (cat. no. 16).
4. Oberhuber (1981, pp. 48–49) distinguished them from Cock's work and was the first to recognize two hands in the group, which he suggested were those of the Doectcum brothers. He called one of the hands the Master of the Feast of Saint George, to whom he attributed the Fuga Deiparae in Aegyptum (cat. no. 33) and the Nundinae Rustorum (cat. no. 34); see also Nalis 1998, pp. xi–xix.
6. Amft summed up the state of the arguments regarding this dating in 1972 (pp. 81–83).
7. This group includes the Alpine Landscape dated 1556 (Mielke 1996, no. A.7), which had long served as evidence for the dating of The Large Landscapes. In the present catalogue the drawing of Solicitudo Rustica (Rustic Cares) in London (cat. no. 155), which Mielke accepted as a design for the print, has been grouped with the landscapes considered to be by a later hand.
Pieter Bruegel the Elder

22. Landscape with Three Pilgrims, ca. 1555–56

Pen and brown ink, with gray and brown wash; contours indented for transfer
26 x 41.5 cm (10¼ x 11⅞ in.)

Koninklijk Museum voor Schone Kunsten, Antwerp T.5098

Provenance: Jan van der Does, lord of Bergestein (1621–1706); Valerius Röver (1636–1739); Private collection, Germany; auction, Christie’s, London, November 29, 1977, no. 158.


Joannes and Lucas van Doetecum after Pieter Bruegel the Elder

23. Euntes in Emmaus (The Way to Emmaus), ca. 1555–56

Etching with engraving
32.3 x 42.3 cm (12¾ x 16¼ in.)
Inscribed at lower left: bruegel Invent; · H. · cock excud ·; in lower margin: Euntes in Emmaus (The Way to Emmaus)

Museum Boijmans Van Beuningen, Rotterdam BdH 8003

Provenance: Günther collection, mark on verso (not in Lugt); auction, C. G. Boerner, Leipzig, November 10, 1927; bought by Johann Catharinus Justus Bierens de Haan (1867–1951), Amsterdam; his bequest, 1951.

Literature: Van Bastelaer 1908, no. 14; Brussels 1969, no. 9; Tokyo 1989, no. 9; Nalis 1998, no. 18.

Three pilgrims make their way along a winding river lined with farms and a fortress. In the etching, but not in the drawing, a halo was given to the center figure, thus distinguishing him as the risen Christ who has encountered two travelers. The travelers have come from Jerusalem and are headed toward the fortress in the distance, a motif that stands for the town of Emmaus, which was often depicted as a castle. No effort was made to evoke a biblical setting in this typically European landscape.

The Landscape with Three Pilgrims is one of only two surviving drawings for The Large Landscapes prints. It is stylistically comparable to a number of landscape drawings by Bruegel dated about 1554–55, most particularly the Landscape with Bears (cat. no. 13), which is dated 1554 and also
served as the model for a print. But unlike the *Landscape with Bears*, this work is thought to have been made specifically as a preparatory drawing for an etching. Yet its vibrant and free pen work bears a closer resemblance to the technique of the earlier Italian-period landscapes (see cat. nos. 10, 11, 19) than to the more controlled drawing style Bruegel began to use for print designs (see cat. nos. 36, 38, 40) just a year or two after he completed the sheet. Bruegel took into account the reversal of image that occurs in transforming a drawing into a print when he did not follow the usual convention but showed each pilgrim holding a staff in the left rather than in the right hand. It remains unclear whether Bruegel’s original intention was to include a biblical narrative in his composition—for this does not appear in his drawing but only in the etching, where it is signaled only by the halo and the title, which were probably added to the plate by the publisher. Also most likely added to the plate at the same time are two boats on the river and the setting sun on the horizon. In the drawing gray ink was used to execute details throughout the distant landscape on the right—most noticeable are the two small boats at the dock in the river center—as well as small areas of hatching and touches here and there on the sheet. These elements were probably inserted in the drawing by the publisher or the engraver before the design was transferred to the printing plate for etching. The brown washes, however, are thought to have been contributed by a later hand.

While the etcher of this print never strayed from Bruegel’s design, he did have to reinterpret some of the spirited details, most notably the foliage, that were not easily translatable into printed lines. The print diverges most notably from the drawing in the foreground at and below the point at which the original ends, where the printmaker placed vegetation of entirely new invention. This addition suggests that the etcher had to lengthen the design a bit to fit the copperplate.

1. The *Alpine Landscape* in Paris (Mielke 1996, no. 24), which also served as a design for one of The Large Landscapes, also shows touches of gray wash, but these do not delineate specific details.
2. Arndt (1972, p. 92) believed the washes were added by Bruegel.
Joannes and Lucas van Doetecum after Pieter Bruegel the Elder

24. **Prospectus Tyburtinus (View of Tivoli), ca. 1555–56**

Engraving; first state of three
32 x 42 cm (12¼ x 16¾ in.)
Inscribed in brown ink at lower right: h. cox excude; in lower margin: PROSPETVS TYPURTINVS (View of Tivoli)
Watermark: small shield topped by a flower with a banderole with letters below it (similar to Briquet 1830)

Museum of Fine Arts, Boston, Helen and Alice Coburn Fund, 1934. 34.7

Provenance: Prince Waldburg-Wolfgang (Lugt 2543); auction, C. G. Boerner, Leipzig, November 14, 15, 1933, no. 116.

Literature: Van Bastelaer 1908, no. 3; Brussels 1969, no. 1; Tokyo 1989, no. 1; Nalos 1998, no. 10.

In the only one of The Large Landscapes that portrays a specific place, a small figure sketches. While many artists have chosen to depict the ruins of ancient Roman villas at Tivoli, Bruegel focused instead on the rushing water and rocky outcroppings of its landscape.

This impression is one of the rare proofs that have survived among Bruegel’s printed work. Proof impressions, pulled to check the progress of a work, must have been taken at many moments during the course of a print’s creation, but since they are part of the working process they were seldom kept. The engraved inscriptions and many small patches of parallel hatching on the cliffs and foliage, visible in the finished state, had not yet been added to the plate when this proof was pulled. The inscriptions that appear here are additions made in brown ink. Upon viewing the print in this first state, the engraver must have decided that the image needed more lines in some of the shaded areas in order to give it greater three-dimensionality, for later stages are enhanced in these places.

The title of the print, *Prospectus Tyburtinus*, is often translated as *View of the Tiber*. But the English title should read *View of Tivoli*, as the Latin name for Tivoli is Tibur and the river there is not the Tiber but the Aniene.

NMO
JOANNES AND LUCAS VAN DOETECUM
AFTER PIETER BRUEGEL THE ELDER

25. Hieronymus in Deserto (Saint Jerome in the Wilderness), ca. 1555–56

Etching with engraving; only state
32.2 x 42.2 cm (12 3/4 x 16 1/2 in.)
Inscribed at lower right: bruegel Inscr. b cock excu; in lower margin: S- HIERONYMUS IN DESERTO- (Saint Jerome in the Wilderness)

Museum Boijmans Van Beuningen, Rotterdam 1965/249

Literature: Van Bastelaer 1908, no. 7; Brussels 1969, no. 2; Tokyo 1989, no. 2; Nalis 1998, no. 10.

Saint Jerome prays under a tree, bent over a book as his lion lazes behind him. The saint has turned his back on a magnificent landscape—hardly a wilderness—occupied by many minute figures and details: travelers, people with carts, a ferry drawn by horses, ships, and such. A mountainside in the middle ground is crowned by a fortress; beyond that a riverscape leads off into the distance.

This is one of three prints in The Large Landscapes group with a biblical subject. Here, as with the other examples (cat. nos. 22, 26), it is not clear whether Bruegel’s original intention was to depict a religious theme. The saint seems almost an afterthought, and the figures and the title were no doubt added by the publisher.
Joannes and Lucas van Doetecum after Pieter Bruegel the Elder


Etching with engraving; first state of two
32 x 42.3 cm (12 ⅞ x 16½ in.)
Inscribed at bottom left: *brueghel inven. / h. cock excudeh*; in lower margin: *MAGDALENA POENITENS* (Penitent Magdalene)
The Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York, Harris Brisbane Dick Fund, 1926 26.72.14

**Literature:** Van Bastelaer 1908, no. 8; Brussels 1969, no. 3; Tokyo 1989, no. 3; Nalis 1998, no. 12.

Mary Magdalene reclines under a lean-to made of logs, oblivious to the Alpine valley behind her. In the sky above she is taken to heaven by angels, as happened seven times a day during her thirty years of penance.

This impression is the first state taken before diagonal hatching was added over the Magdalene’s face. The print is one of a number in The Large Landscapes that were used as evidence for deattributing certain drawings that had been given to Bruegel (see cat. nos. 120–125): some details from the prints had been worked into several suspect sheets, suggesting that these elements were copied by the artist responsible for the drawings rather than inspired by nature.

---

Joannes and Lucas van Doetecum after Pieter Bruegel the Elder

27. *Insidious Auceps (The Crafty Bird Catcher)*, ca. 1555–56

Etching with engraving; only state
32 x 42.4 cm (12 ⅞ x 16½ in.)
Inscribed at lower right: *BRVEGHEL INVÆ h. cock excudeh*; in lower margin: *INSIDIOSVS AUCEPS* (The Crafty Bird Catcher)
Watermark: small shield topped by a flower with a banderole with letters below (similar to Briquet 1830)

Museum of Fine Arts, Boston, Helen and Alice Coburn Fund, 1934 34.10

**Provenance:** Prince Waldenburg-Wolfgast (Lugt 2542); auction, C. G. Boerner, Leipzig, November 14, 15, 1933, no. 121.

**Literature:** Van Bastelaer 1908, no. 10; Brussels 1969, no. 5; Tokyo 1989, no. 5; Nalis 1998, no. 14.

Fig. 83. Master of the Mountain Landscapes. *Landscape with a Mule*, late 16th or early 17th century. Pen and brown ink. Courtauld Institute Galleries, London

A man carries birds tied to a frame as he walks on a path toward a village nestled in a broad mountain valley. Perhaps he is bringing the birds to market. The print’s title, *Insidious Auceps (The Crafty Bird Catcher)*, leads us to wonder if there is not more afoot, for in emblematic literature the bird catcher is associated with temptation and deception. However, whether any such meaning is intended here is unclear.

Like the Alpine Landscape (cat. no. 29) and a number of other prints from The Large Landscapes, *Insidious Auceps* was used several times as a source of details for a group of drawings whose attribution to Bruegel is now rejected (see cat. nos. 120–125). For example, the large cluster of rocks to the left of the town in the present example appears as well in the lower left of the Landscape with a Mule in London (fig. 83) and in a drawing of an Alpine landscape in a Swiss private collection.

1. Henkel and Schön 1967, cols. 1107–10; and for further references see Levesque 1994, p. 28 n. 72.
Joannes and Lucas van Doetecum
after Pieter Bruegel the Elder

28. Solicitude Rustica (Rustic Cares), ca. 1555–56

Etching with engraving; first state of two
32.2 x 42.1 cm (12 1/4 x 16 1/4 in.)
Inscribed at lower center: bruegel Iniis; H:cock excu; in lower margin: SOLICITUDE RUSTICA (Rustic Cares); in brown ink in lower right margin, collector's mark: F
Watermark: small shield topped by a flower with a bannerole with letters below (similar to Briquet 1830)

Museum of Fine Arts, Boston, Helen and Alice Coburn Fund, 1934 34.12

Provenance: Prince Walburg-Wolfegg (Lugt 2542); auction, C. G. Boerner, Leipzig, November 14, 15, 1933, no. 123.

Literature: Van Bastelaer 1908, no. 12; Brussels 1969, no. 7; Tokyo 1989, no. 7; Nalis 1998, no. 16.

An expansive vista reveals a river that winds into the distance through high mountains. In a corner of the foreground a seated man hammers the blade of his scythe as another man looks off into the valley.

This is the grandest and most successful of The Large Landscapes. Bruegel left very little space for the land in the foreground, instead devoting almost the entire image to the sprawling river valley that cuts through the Alpine landscape. A drawing in London that lacks the figures seen here (cat. no. 125) was considered to be the preparatory design for this print.¹ On the basis of that incomplete drawing it had been suggested that the figures are the invention of the etcher rather than of Bruegel.² The solid, faceless men are, however, characteristic of Bruegel's staffage and completely unlike the thin, weightless, and angular types of the Doetecums, recognizable, for example, in the Fuga Deiparae in Aegyptum (cat. no. 33) and the Nundinae Rusticorum (cat. no. 34).

1. White 1963, p. 360. The drawing has been deattributed in the present catalogue.
JOANNES AND LUCAS VAN DOEYECUM
AFTER PIETER BRUEGEL THE ELDER

29. Alpine Landscape, ca. 1555–56

Etching with engraving; only state
32.2 x 42.1 cm (12 3/8 x 16 3/8 in.)
Inscribed at lower left: brueghel Inuentor / h. cocc excede.; at lower
right: brue: ins; in brown ink, collector’s mark: 9
Watermark: small shield topped by a flower with a banderole with
letters below (similar to Briquet 1830)

Museum of Fine Arts, Boston, Helen and Alice Coburn Fund,
1934 349

Provenance: Prince Waldburg-Wolfgang (Lugt 2542); auction,
C. G. Boerner, Leipzig, November 14, 15, 1933, no. 220.

Literature: Van Bastelaer 1908, no. 9; Brussels 1969, no. 4;

A man leads his pack mules up a narrow path in a valley near
high mountains. This etching stands out from the other
Large Landscapes in a number of ways. It is the only one to
which no descriptive title was given—its lower margin, where
an inscription could have been placed, has been left blank.
It is also the only print of the group that displays Bruegel’s
name twice and in which the inscribed word Inventor (inven-
tor) is not abbreviated. All this leads us to puzzle over an
unanswerable question: did the publisher initially intend it to
be the title page to the group but drop the idea along the way?

The Alpine Landscape in Paris (fig. 84), the preparatory
drawing for this print, is one of two designs for The Large
Landscapes that are known to have survived. Although
in very poor condition, that drawing shows many still-
distinguishable details that clearly reveal that the etcher
followed Bruegel’s model quite closely. It is the only
work related to the entire group of Large Landscapes
that is dated.
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Joannes and Lucas van Doetecum after Pieter Bruegel the Elder

30. Plaestrum Belgicum (The Belgian Wagon), ca. 1555–56

Engraving; first state of two
32 × 42.3 cm (12 ½ × 16 ½ in.)
Inscribed at lower right: BRUEGHEL INVE / H: cok excude

National Gallery of Art, Washington, Rosenwald Collection 1964.8.412

Provenance: Mr. and Mrs. Jake Zeitlin, Los Angeles.

Literature: Van Bastelaer 1908, no. 12; Los Angeles 1961, no. 9; Brussels 1969, no. 6; Tokyo 1989, no. 6; Nalis 1998, no. 15.

A covered wagon moves down a hillside before a vista that combines disparate features. As various observers have remarked, the landscape is a curious hybrid of countryside and a townscape that is characteristically Flemish in the foreground and middle ground, with several farm buildings and a small church, set against a broad mountainous valley typical of the views Bruegel would have seen during his journey in Italy.

Proof states were pulled at various points in the production of a print to check the progress of the plate as it was etched, but they were kept infrequently. This impression is one of the rare surviving proof states of Bruegel’s prints. It was taken before the title Plaestrum Belgicum (The Belgian Wagon) was inscribed in the lower margin. Thus, the proof offers a glimpse of how the etching evolved. Traces of the working process also appear elsewhere in the print. The ruling lines, which were lightly engraved as a guide to the alignment of the letters in the artist’s and publisher’s names as they were inscribed, are still visible. These were not erased in the prints issued by Hieronymus Cock, Bruegel’s publisher, but were expected to wear down after repeated printings; thus their presence here is a good indication that the print is a relatively early impression. Some light diagonal scratches are apparent in the area of the ruling lines, suggesting that this spot was burnished clean before the inscription was added.
Joannes and Lucas van Doetecum after Pieter Bruegel the Elder

31. Milites Requiescentes (Soldiers at Rest), ca. 1555–56

Etching with engraving; only state
32.2 x 42.1 cm (12 3/8 x 16 3/4 in.)
Inscribed at lower left: Bruegel iniis; at lower right: h.cock excu; in lower margin: MILITES REQUIESCENTES (Soldiers at Rest)

Museum of Fine Arts, Boston, Special Print Fund, 1929. 29.1880

Provenance: Frederick August II (Lugt 971); auction, C. G. Boerner, Leipzig, November 15, 16, 1938, no. 133.


Soldiers with halberds and long staffs or lances appear to be patrolling a hilltop overlooking a magnificent Alpine river valley. Three soldiers are resting in the foreground—one of them is in the act of either standing up or sitting down—while two more stroll on the left and another one, who is wearing a cloak, walks by some trees on the right. The long stick carried at an angle by one of the two travelers who amble over the hill echoes the tilt of the soldiers’ weapons.

This etching has been placed as late as 1558 in the chronology of Bruegel’s work because it is the only print in The Large Landscapes in which Bruegel’s name is spelled without an “h,” sometimes considered the form of the artist’s name used after about 1560. But the form of Bruegel’s name is not a reliable criterion for dating his work, since the “h” appears in both early and late prints. There are, however, other factors that suggest this print might indeed have been one of the last in the group to have been designed by Bruegel. With an overlook placed in the center and a path that drops off abruptly, it is more complicated compositionally and thus arguably later than the others. In addition, figures are shown in more unusual and complex poses; they are also larger and weightier than the other staffage in The Large Landscapes and closer in scale to the characters in the allegorical prints.

Joannes and Lucas van Doetecum
after Pieter Bruegel the Elder

32. Pagus Nemorosus (Wooded Region), ca. 1555–56

Etching with engraving; first state of two
32.1 x 42.5 cm (12 1/8 x 16 3/4 in.)
Inscribed at lower left: *bruegel inalt. h:cock excav*; in lower margin: *PAGVS NEMOROSVS* (Wooded Region); in brown ink in lower right margin, collector’s mark: *F*
Watermark: small shield topped by a flower with a banderole with letters below (similar to Briquet 1836)

Museum of Fine Arts, Boston, Helen and Alice Coburn Fund, 1934 34.13

Provenance: Prince Waldenburg-Wolfegg (Lugt 2542); auction, C. G. Boerner, Leipzig, November 14, 15, 1933, no. 127.


Accompanied by two horsemen and followed by a soldier carrying a lance and a sword, a covered wagon transporting passengers crosses a pool of water before a Flemish village. A distant view of a city on the horizon emphasizes the rural character of the scene. In the lower right corner we see a grazing rabbit instead of the narrative figures related to the title of the print that appear in this spot in most of the other Large Landscapes.

Bruegel depicted no striking mountain vistas in *Pagus Nemorosus (Wooded Region)*, which, in fact, is the only one of the Large Landscapes that portrays a purely Flemish scene. Indeed, this is among the first Netherlandish prints to break with the tradition of representing exotic mountainscapes and instead focus entirely on the local countryside. In 1559, just a few years after *Pagus Nemorosus* was made, the Doetecums etched an extensive series of local landscapes after the so-called Master of the Small Landscapes (see cat. nos. 135–144), issued by Hieronymus Cock, the publisher of the Large Landscapes.
Joannes and Lucas van Doetecum after Pieter Bruegel the Elder?

33. *Fuga Deiparae in Aegyptum (The Rest on the Flight into Egypt)*, ca. 1555–56

Etching with engraving; first state of two

31.4 x 41.6 cm (12 7/8 x 16 1/2 in.)

Inscribed at lower right: *H. cock excud*; in lower margin: *FVGA DEIPARAE IN AEGYPTVM* (The Rest on the Flight into Egypt)

National Gallery of Art, Washington, Rosenwald Collection 1964.8.6

Provenance: Mr. and Mrs. Jake Zeitlin, Los Angeles.


The Holy Family rests in the midst of a broad mountain landscape. The sheet exhibited here is a unique impression of the early proof state of this print, taken before Bruegel’s name was added in the lower right over that of the publisher Hieronymus Cock.

*Fuga Deiparae in Aegyptum (The Rest on the Flight into Egypt)* and *Nundinae Rusticorum (The Rustic Market)* (cat. no. 34) diverge stylistically from the other Large Landscapes. It has often been remarked that their thin, insubstantial figures must have been invented by someone other than Bruegel, probably the etchers themselves, the Doetecum brothers.

Yet it is not only the staffage in these two prints that sets them apart from the others in the group, for the landscapes are equally uncharacteristic of Bruegel’s work. Both landscapes, with their small hills and narrow, meandering rivers, are composed in an additive rather than a unified way; the land starts and stops, rather than winding seamlessly
into the distance. Moreover, the trees in both prints are tall and spindly, as compared with the sturdy, powerful trees in Bruegel's landscape drawings and in the other Large Landscapes. This divergence from Bruegel's style has been explained as the contribution of an individualistic printmaker; 5 it is unlikely, however, that an etcher would have strayed so dramatically from a given design by the master. Even though both prints bear the master's name, it seems more probable that they were designed by someone other than Bruegel, quite possibly one of the Doetecums—an idea rejected in recent literature that should be revived. 3 It is likely as well that they were created to fill out the group.

A fact not previously noted may support the theory that Bruegel did not design these prints: the present example and a unique impression of the Nundinae Rusticorum in Vienna (fig. 85) are the only Large Landscapes with extant first states in which all the inscriptions except Bruegel's name have been added to the plate. 4 In both cases the artist's name was inserted in the following state just above that of Cock and in similar lettering, indicating that it was added soon after the original inscriptions were executed. We must therefore wonder whether these prints had reached a finished stage in the first state, at which point the decision was made to add Bruegel's name to make all the elements of the group consistent.

1. Riggs 1979, p. 167; Oberhuber (in Vienna 1966–67, p. 48) first attributed these prints to the Doetecums and suggested that the staffage may follow designs by Cock. Lebeuf (in Brussels 1969) gave the etching of the entire series to Cock.
3. Tolnay (1952, p. 40) proposed this theory, wondering whether the prints might not have been invented and engraved by Cock. Oberhuber (in Vienna 1966–67, p. 48) rejected Tolnay's idea, as did Lebeuf (in Brussels 1969, p. 33).
4. In the existing proof states for the other Large Landscapes the title appears to have been added last. The proof state exhibited here was published by Feinblatt in Los Angeles 1964, no. 13.

---

Joannes and Lucas van Doetecum after Pieter Bruegel the Elder?

34. Nundinae Rusticorum (The Rustic Market), ca. 1555–56

Etching with engraving; second state of two
29.6 x 42.7 cm (11⅜ x 16¾ in.)
Inscribed at lower left: bruegel iniit / H: cocx excude; in lower margin: NUNDINAE RUSTICORUM (The Rustic Market)
The Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York, Harris Brisbane Dick Fund, 1926 26.72.54

Literature: Van Bastelaer 1908, no. 13; Brussels 1969, no. 8; Tokyo 1989, no. 8; Nalis 1998, no. 17.

Tiny figures participate in a variety of activities at the edge of a Flemish town in the foreground. Beyond rows of trees lies a lake in front of tall mountains atypical of the native landscape. This etching, with its tiny, insubstantial figures, clumps of land, and spindly trees, is uncharacteristic of Bruegel's work and, like the stylistically related Fuga Deiparae in Aegyptum (cat. no. 33), was probably not designed by him—as is argued in the entry on the latter work. The two prints may have been added to fill out the group of Large Landscapes.

This is an impression of the second state, which includes Bruegel's name; a unique proof state printed before Bruegel's name was added to the plate exists in Vienna (fig. 85).
Fig. 85. Joannes and Lucas van Doetecum after Pieter Bruegel the Elder? *Nundinae Rusticorum* (*The Rustic Market*), ca. 1555–56. Etching; first state. Graphische Sammlung Albertina, Vienna
Joannes and Lucas van Doetecum after Pieter Bruegel the Elder

35. The Large Alpine Landscape, ca. 1555–56

Etching with engraving; only state
36.8 x 46.8 cm (14 3/8 x 18 3/8 in.)
Inscribed at lower right: BRUEGHEL INVE / H: cock excudeb.
Museum Boijmans Van Beuningen, Rotterdam BdH 23953

Provenance: Anton Wilhelmus Mari Mensing (1866–1936), Amsterdam; Mensing et Fils (Frederik Muller et Cie), Amsterdam, April 25–27, 1935, no. 93; bought by Johan Catharinus Justus Bierens de Haan (1867–1951), Amsterdam; his bequest, 1951.


A majestic Alpine landscape unfolds, dotted with towns, trees, animals, and a few travelers. On the right a man on horseback pauses to view the scene along with us. This etching is distinguished from the prints of The Large Landscapes group (cat. nos. 22–34) by its somewhat larger size and its lack of both a title and a lower margin in which one might have been added. Indeed, no narrative subject of the kind that might be described in such a title—and which appear in most of The Large Landscapes—has been added to the image: the overpowering beauty of nature is its only subject. Furthermore, the composition is structured in a rather different way here: Bruegel did not provide the viewer with a foreground ledge from which to contemplate the scene, a feature that is found consistently in The Large Landscapes. In The Large Alpine Landscape we are immediately confronted by the face of a steep ridge, the top of which serves as a path down the mountain. The powerful presence of the scene and its departure from traditional compositional formulas tell us that if any of Bruegel’s landscape prints were taken from drawings he made on his journey through the Alps, it would have to be this one.

Charles de Tolnay suggested that this etching and some of The Large Landscapes should be dated to about 1558.1 However, it seems more likely that the present work and all the other Alpine landscape prints etched by the Doetecums were executed at the same time—and that this time was the generally accepted date of 1555–56.

1. Tolnay 1952, p. 46.
Pieter Bruegel the Elder

36. *The Temptation of Saint Anthony*, ca. 1556

Pen and brush and brown and gray-brown ink
21.6 x 32.6 cm (8⅞ x 12¾ in.)
Inscribed at lower left: *Bruegel 1556*; in red chalk on backing: S.P.; in pencil on backing: *Bruegel Lord Bentinck. Copy*
Ashmolean Museum, Oxford, I 30

Provenance: Francis Douce; gift to Bodleian Library, Oxford, 1834 (Lugt 687); transferred to Ashmolean Museum, 1863.

Literature: Van Bastelaer and Hulin de Loo 1907, pp. 158–59 (as doubtful); Tolnay 1925, p. 17; Parker 1958, no. 30; Tolnay 1953, no. 46; Grossmann 1954, p. 35, no. 47; Münz 1961, no. 127; Berlin 1975, no. 62; Marijnissen et al. 1988, pp. 82–83; Mielke 1996, no. 30.

Pieter van der Heyden (ca. 1530–1576) after Pieter Bruegel the Elder

37. *The Temptation of Saint Anthony*, 1556

Engraving; only state
24.5 x 32 cm (9¾ x 12¾ in.)
Inscribed and dated at lower left: *cock. exaud. 1556*; inscribed in lower margin: *MVLTAE TRIBULATIONES ISTORVM, DE OMNIBVS IIS LIBERABIT EOS DOMINVS. PSAL. 35 [sic]*
(Many are the afflictions of the righteous: but the Lord delivereth him out of them all. Psalm 35 [34:9])

Mr. and Mrs. Julian I. Edison


Saint Anthony prays at the foot of a tree, his back turned to the wild scene behind him. The imagery is Boschian: a large, hollow, bandaged head with a window eye—a head that also appears in the print after Bruegel’s *Gula (Gluttony)* (cat. no. 45)—is mired at a bend in a river, awaiting the imminent invasion of boatloads of small armed figures; an enormous hollow fish sits atop the head; smoke billows from the mouth of the head, where friars appear to be bailing out water; demons cavort in the river and along its banks; a town burns in the background. This is the first of Bruegel’s compositions inspired by Bosch, whose imagery he revived in the production of the Quatre Vents publishing house. Bruegel’s Boschian borrowings and the work of Bosch himself, who had been active about fifty years earlier, are quite different in spirit: Bosch’s mystical imagery often turns into commentary on human folly when taken up by Bruegel.

Although it is not signed by either Bruegel or the engraver Pieter van der Heyden, the print of *The Temptation of Saint Anthony* was likely the first collaboration between the two men, who would work together often—Van der Heyden went on to produce some twenty-six prints after the master’s designs. The attribution of the drawing for this engraving was once questioned because its image, unlike the compositions of Bruegel’s other print designs, is oriented in the same direction as the final print, rather than in reverse, and the signature is not in the artist’s hand. But Charles de Tolnay, Fritz Grossmann, and Hans Mielke put to rest any doubt about the attribution of the drawing to the master himself. As they have argued, the quality of the line is perfectly in keeping with that of Bruegel’s other preparatory designs for prints. Indeed, in this drawing Bruegel first conceived a careful and deliberate style of draftsmanship that engravers could closely follow, one that characterized the print designs he produced thereafter. Bruegel’s drawings for prints lack the spontaneity of his landscape drawings, but this is so because they are the result of his adaptation of his drawing style to fit the specific purpose of providing printmakers with clear models. He delineated areas of shading with carefully executed patches of cross-hatching rather than the energetic and effusive parallel hatching of his earlier landscape drawings, and he also precisely defined the outlines of figures and shapes.

Bruegel carried out this design at an early point in his collaborations with printmakers, and it is likely that he was still working out his method vis-à-vis the engraver at the time. This would explain why the drawing was not made in reverse of the print and may also account for the only major compositional differences between the two works. These variations occur along the bottoms of the compositions, where the print shows certain details that do not appear in the drawing: from right to left, a bag with coins, a knife, four small birds, and a strip of grass in the water. It may be, as Mielke suggested, that the details are lacking in the drawing because they were cut off when the sheet was trimmed at the bottom. If that were the case, however, parts of the money bag, knife, and birds would still be visible. More probably, therefore, Bruegel’s drawing fell a bit short of the end of the copperplate and Cock or someone in
his shop added elements to fill in the bottom of the print.

No one has completely explained the scene behind Saint Anthony. Tolnay saw it as a vision of a corrupt Church, pointing to various details, including the flag in the shape of a papal bull that flies from the branch emanating from the fish's mouth. Mielke compared the imagery to hellish visions in paintings by Bosch and his followers.  

1. As noted by Tolnay 1952, p. 18.

2. See Combe 1948.

3. The drawing, which is trimmed at the bottom, originally may have borne Bruegel's signature in the now-lost portion of the sheet. Lebeer (in Brussels 1969) first attributed the print to Van der Heyden.

4. Van Bastelaer rejected the drawing; see Van Bastelaer and Hulin de Loo 1907, p. 198.

5. Tolnay 1931, pp. 19, 66, no. 46; Grossmann 1934, p. 35, n. 47; Mielke in Berlin 1975, p. 36.

6. It is clear that drawing was trimmed at top as well as at bottom.

7. Tolnay 1931, pp. 19, 66, no. 46.

Pieter Bruegel the Elder

38. Big Fish Eat Little Fish, 1556

Pen and brush and gray and black ink; contours indented for transfer
21.6 x 30.7 cm (8 1/4 x 12 1/4 in.)
Signed and dated at lower right: 1556 / brueghel
Graphische Sammlung Albertina, Vienna 7875

Provenance: Albert von Sachsen-Teschen (Lugt 174).

Literature: Romdahl 1905, p. 123; Van Bastelaer and Hulin de Loo 1907, no. 90; Tolnai 1935, no. 28; Benesch 1938, no. 76; Tolnay 1953, no. 144; Münz 1961, no. 128; Marijnissen et al. 1988, p. 81; Mielke 1996, no. 31.

Inscribed at lower left: Hieronymus Bus / inuentor // BAME [monogram]; at lower right: COCK / EXCV. 1557; at center: ECCE; in lower margin: GRANDIVBS EXIGIT SYNT PISCES PISCIBVS ESCA // Ziet sone dit hebben ik zeer langhe gheweten / dat die groote vissen de sleyne eten. (Little fish are the food of big fish. / Look son, I have long known that the big fish eat the small.)
Watermark: Gothic letter P

The Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York, Harris Brisbane Dick Fund, 1917 17.3.859

Literature: Van Bastelaer 1908, no. 139; Hollstein 1949–; vol. 9 (Van der Heyden), no. 46; Brussels 1969, no. 16; Tokyo 1989, no. 16.

Out of the mouth of a large beached fish tumble many smaller fish. A small, helmeted figure with an enormous knife slices open the big fish’s belly, revealing even more creatures. The land and water are overrun by fish: a two-legged fish walks off with another fish in its mouth, fish hang from a tree, and a fish-bird flies overhead. In the foreground a man in a boat points out the scene to his son. The

Pieter van der Heyden
after Pieter Bruegel the Elder

39. Big Fish Eat Little Fish, 1557

Engraving; first state of three
22.9 x 29.6 cm (9 x 11 1/4 in.)
inscription on the engraving puts his gesture into words: “Look son, I have long known that the big fish eat the small.”

Bruegel executed his design in fine, long, even pen lines sometimes broken up with light stippling, line work meant to communicate clearly his intentions to the engraver. In spite of the measured draftsmanship, in this marvelous drawing Bruegel achieved a remarkable range of tones, most notable on the skin of the large fish. As in many of his other designs for prints, he seems to have gone over the drawing, once finished, with quick strokes here and there, strengthening some of the outlines and the recessed areas. Such touches can be found, for example, along the back of the big fish and the edge of its mouth. Horizontal hatching slightly coarser than the original strokes was added in a lighter shade of brown ink below the foot of the tree at the right, perhaps by another hand. In his engraving Pieter van der Heyden, as in all his successful collaborations with Bruegel, faithfully followed the master’s careful, descriptive drawing, which left the printmaker little room for invention.

One of the best-known prints after a Bruegel design, the engraving of Big Fish Eat Little Fish is signed with the name Hieronymus Bosch. However, Bruegel’s authorship is attested to by the drawing, which he signed in the lower right. The print’s publisher, Hieronymus Cock, was probably responsible for replacing Bruegel’s name with that of the more famous and more salable Bosch, who had died in 1516. (Cock had omitted Bruegel’s name from the engraved version of The Temptation of Saint Anthony [cat. no. 37], published the previous year.) The substitution of Bosch’s name for that of Bruegel, who was called by early biographers a new Bosch and a second Bosch,’ was quite appropriate. In illustrating a proverb, Big Fish Eat Little Fish clearly reveals that Bruegel was inspired by Bosch, the first Netherlandish painter to portray proverbs in his work. Moreover, details in Bruegel’s design closely recall features in paintings by Bosch—for example, the two-legged fish that appears in the Haywain (Prado, Madrid) and even a big fish eating a smaller one in the background of the Temptation of Saint Anthony (Museo Nacional de Arte Antigua, Lisbon).
Big Fish Eat Little Fish is one of Bruegel’s earliest variations on the theme of the foolish world peopled by faceless types who go about their business, a subject that would become more prominent in his later works, such as Spring (cat. no. 105) and Summer (cat. no. 109). It is also among the first of Bruegel’s many treatments of proverbs in paintings and prints. These themes, far from being folk proverbs, were recognized and admired for their classical roots by the artist’s contemporaries. Books of proverbs by Erasmus and other classical authors were popular, particularly in humanist circles, and were regarded as sources of ancient philosophy that provided moral instruction. The pairing of the Latin and Flemish versions of the proverb depicted here and in Bruegel’s other designs echoes the pattern of linking Latin, Greek, and vernacular proverbs in Erasmus’s Adages, a text that was published repeatedly in the Netherlands during the sixteenth century. In the present work the motif of the father pointing out the large fish to his son, who in turn points to the man in the boat who extracts a small fish from a larger one, shows that the son has understood the moral lesson. Attempts have been made to connect the image to contemporary political events. Although later publishers did appropriate the image for various political causes, there is little reason to believe that Bruegel had similar intentions for the original version.

1. By Vasari as early as 1668 and by Van Mander in 1604.
4. The addition of inscriptions to the third state of the engraving, published by Johannes Galle in the mid-seventeenth century, gave the print a political theme, and several seventeenth-century copies of it appropriated the image for political purposes. See Unverfehrt 1984b, pp. 407–11.

Pieter Bruegel the Elder

40. The Ass at School, 1556

Pen and brush and gray-black and gray-brown ink; contours indented for transfer
23.2 x 30.2 cm (9½ x 11¾ in.)
Signed and dated at lower left: bruegel.1556.; in another hand in brown ink in lower margin: Al rejt den exile te scholen om leeren—
Is eenen exile. Hy en sal gheen port weder keeren (Although the ass goes to school in order to learn, if it is an ass, it will not return [as] a horse)

Staatliche Museen zu Berlin, Kupferstichkabinett InvZ 11 641


Literature: Tolnai 1925, no. 27; Bock and Rosenberg 1930, p. 18; Tolnai 1925, no. 45; Münz 1961, no. 129; Berlin 1975, no. 63; Marijnissen et al. 1988, p. 70; Mielke 1996, no. 32.

Pieter van der Heyden after Pieter Bruegel the Elder

41. The Ass at School, 1557

Engraving; only state
23.4 x 30.3 cm (9½ x 11¾ in.)
Inscribed at lower left: Bruegel: Inventor.; at lower right: COCK. EX 1557, in lower margin: PARISSIUS STOLIDUM SI QVIS TRANSMITTAT ASELVM. SI HIC EST ASINVS NON ERIT ILLIC EQVS./ Al rejt den exile ter scholen om leeren ist einem exile by en sal gheen port voetder keeren (If you send a stupid ass to Paris, if it is an ass here, it will not be a horse there. / Although the ass goes to school in order to learn, if it is an ass, it will not return [as] a horse)

Fig. 86. Hieronymus Bosch. Detail, The Seven Deadly Sins, ca. 1514–75. Oil on panel. Museo del Prado, Madrid

National Gallery of Art, Washington, Gift of Mrs. Jane C. Carey as an addition to the Addie Burr Clark Memorial Collection 1958.6.1

An ass leans over a counter through a window and looks at sheet of music. On one side of it is a candle and on the other a pair of glasses. Below the ass a schoolteacher prepares to spank a pupil. He is surrounded by an unruly mob of children equipped with a variety of books and writing tablets. As the inscription indicates, their nature, like that of an ass, will not be changed by the experience of school. Providing a counterpoint to the central activity, an outer ring around the teacher is formed by pupils who are engrossed in their lessons and appear to have little use for him. In the background a woman looks through a window at the scene.

As in most of Bruegel’s designs for prints, the drawing has been carefully conceived, with every line clearly delineated for the engraver. Here two shades of ink were used and Bruegel’s practice of going over lines, strengthening them here and there, is evident, probably more now than originally. In this case the artist reinforced many of the outlines, most noticeably on the seated student on the right who is reading a book. Bruegel seems to have begun in a light brown ink and picked up again in a stronger, darker shade.

The engraver Pieter van der Heyden was so faithful to Bruegel’s designs that it seems likely that the speckling on the floor in his print, which is absent in the drawing, was not an embellishment he used without reason or instruction. It may have been added to give more solidity to the floor or perhaps for a technical reason—to avoid leaving a large blank area that would clearly show the scratches that would inevitably mar the printing plate. Richly printed impressions of Bruegel’s frequently printed plates such as the present example are rare. The known impressions of this print, which display the date 1557, have traditionally been called the second state based on a reference to a state bearing the date 1556.1 This, however, is incorrect; there appears to be only one state.

The Ass at School resembles Bruegel’s contemporary proverb drawing and print Big Fish Eat Little Fish (cat. nos. 38, 39). As in the Big Fish, related sayings in Latin and the vernacular have been provided and a foreground figure points to the subject of the proverb in front of him; in the Big Fish it is a man in a boat, while here it is the boy who looks up from his reading. Whereas the print of the Big Fish was signed spuriously with the name Hieronymus Bosch, Bruegel is given full credit as designer in the present engraving. Although the general meaning of The Ass at School is clear, certain aspects of the image have puzzled scholars: why, for example, is the teacher in fifteenth-century dress, and who is the woman looking through the screened window? The old-fashioned costume may merely underscore the ancient nature of the adage illustrated,2 or perhaps it was used to lend a ridiculous scene an additional note of absurdity. In respect to both details a connection may be drawn to Bosch’s depiction of Invidia (Envy) in his circular painting The Seven Deadly Sins (fig. 86).3 There a woman looks through a window screen similar to the one shown here, and her head is covered and tilted in much the same manner as the woman’s in the drawing. Moreover, the man with the falcon in the painting sports dress that even in Bosch’s time must have been old-fashioned. N M O

---

1. The earlier impression was supposedly in the collection of S. van Gijn, Muller 1865–82, vol. 4, suppl., no. 4184q. However, the description of this impression was no doubt incorrect; the impression in the Museum Simon van Gijn, Dordrecht, is dated 1557. I thank J. Beijerman-Schools of the Dordrecht Museum for examining that impression for me.
2. See Sullivan 1911.
3. That work or a copy of it appears to have been in Antwerp when Bruegel designed this print, according to an inventory of 1574–75 taken in that city that lists a painting by Bosch showing the Seven Deadly Sins. Marijnissen and Ruysdael 1987, p. 329; Mees 1907, p. 54.

---

Pieter Bruegel the Elder
and Pieter van der Heyden after
Pieter Bruegel the elder
42–54. The Seven Deadly Sins, or The Vices, 1556–58

Six drawings and seven engravings

Pieter Bruegel’s two series of prints on The Seven Deadly Sins, or The Vices, and The Seven Virtues (cat. nos. 64–77) are nearly identical in format, yet there is no specific contextual connection between them. The series of Seven Deadly Sins, completed in 1558, is carried out entirely in the style of Hieronymus Bosch and filled with fantastic figures and landscapes. The Virtues, begun in the following year, by contrast, are all set in Bruegel’s own time and place, reproducing actual Flemish scenes of the second half of the sixteenth century.

Scholarly writing on the two series has always stressed these differences, but why Bruegel adopted Bosch’s manner in the earlier set has yet to be explained. Already in his 1557 engraving Big Fish Eat Little Fish (cat. no. 39), Bruegel had repressed his own identity, publishing the work with the inscription Hieronymus Bos Inventor. It has been assumed that Bruegel’s chief reason for imitating Bosch in his graphic work was a commercial one: Bosch was simply more popular than Bruegel, and therefore engravings in the Bosch manner were more marketable than his own prints.

With regard to The Vices, however, this does not strike me as a satisfying explanation. It seems more probable that Bruegel adopted Bosch’s style because viewers would instantly associate it with the world of sin and folly. Moreover, Bosch’s anticlassical manner represented a specifically Christian piling up of imagery as opposed to the serene order of antiquity. Bruegel’s densely packed pictures, at first glance so confusing that we can make little sense of them, represent the antithesis of the clarity and realism extolled, for example, in Vitruvius’s On Architecture. Indeed, they find their literary equivalent in the works of Rabelais. Thus Bruegel’s borrowings from the Bosch tradition are by no means to be thought of merely as a bow to the earlier artist but rather should be viewed as a statement of his own theoretical stance, a way of distancing himself from the Italianizing manner of such contemporary Netherlandish artists as Maarten van Heemskerck and Frans Floris. In this context, we should note that it would be instructive to attempt to determine just which of his compositions Bruegel produced in deliberate contrast to works by his contemporaries. And we should remember that the master’s stylistic choices constitute a definite rejection of the prevailing style of the Italian Renaissance, but this is not to say that they reveal a national character or a typically northern European sensibility.

All the engravings in the series of Seven Deadly Sins follow the same compositional scheme. In the center foreground of each there appears a personification of the sin portrayed, identified both by attributes and by a Latin inscription: Ira (Anger), Desidia (Sloth), Superbia (Pride), Avaritia (Greed), Gula (Gluttony), Invidia (Envy), and Luxuria (Lust). These personifications do not appear in isolation but in a scenic context; Gula, for example, sits drinking her fill at a table with other tipplers. The remainder of each scene is filled with figures representing particular aspects of the depravity in question. Luxuria is permitting a dragonlike demon to kiss her and fondle her breast. The hollow tree in the foreground, the fountain in the background on the left, and especially the mussel shell that encloses a pair of lovers and sits atop the tree trunk are pointed echoes of details in Bosch’s Garden of Earthly Delights (Prado, Madrid). In the other engravings the borrowings from Bosch are less specific. The personification of Ira calls to mind the subject in Bruegel’s own Dulle Griet (Museum Mayer van den Bergh, Antwerp), a painting that has been dated to 1561–62—a rare instance of a graphic motif finding later use in a painting.

In each of the engravings the personification of the vices is accompanied by a symbolic animal. The bear shown with Ira is gnawing the leg of a man who did not jump to safety quickly enough. Desidia is in the company of an ass, which serves her as a kind of bolster. Next to Superbia stands a showy peacock, while a poisonous toad crouches directly in front of Avaritia, and Gula is seated on the back of a pig. Invidia is pointing at the turkey standing to her right, and Luxuria is attended by a lecherous cock perched on the back of her partner’s chair.

Like Bosch before him, Bruegel managed to present the various permutations of each vice he portrayed in vivid detail. It is as though he shows us a world in which the sins are repeated eternally in an unbroken cycle. The people in his pictures, like those in Bosch’s phantasmasorias, appear mainly as victims, yet it is altogether probable that these numberless naked men and women are not so much real people as personifications of the soul. In his series of Seven Deadly Sins Bruegel delineated an imaginary world, as Bosch did in his panel paintings. Yet the real world is also in evidence in each of these engravings. Although the foreground is filled with an allegorical scene, we generally see on the horizon the silhouette of a city or ships at sea.

JM

Pieter Bruegel the Elder

42. Avaritia (Greed), 1556

Pen and gray-brown ink; contours indented for transfer
22.8 x 29.8 cm (9 x 11\% in.)
Inscribed in pen and gray-brown ink at lower right: brueghel 1556;
in another hand in red-brown ink at lower center: avaritia
(greed); by latter hand in red-brown ink in lower margin: Eere
beleefheyt schaerne noch godlyck vermaen / En siet die scrapende
gierichyt niet aan (Scraping Avarice sees neither honor nor
courtesy, shame nor divine admonition)³

The British Museum, London N 1920-2-76-4

Provenance: Baron Dominique Vivant-Denon (1747–1825),
London; his auction, M. Masson St. Maurice, Paris, May 1–19,
1826, no. 593 (lot with cat. nos. 44, 46, 50); Charles Fairfax
Murray (1849–1919), London; his auction, Christie’s, London,
January 30–February 2, 1920, no. 87? (lot with cat. nos. 44, 46,
bought by dealer Nicolaas Beets).

Literature: Tolnai 1925, no. 30; Popham 1932, p. 143; Van Gils
1940–42, vol. 2, p. 65; Tolnai 1952, no. 47; Münz 1961, no. 130;
Brussels 1980, no. 22; Marijnissen et al. 1988, p. 85; Mielke 1996,
no. 33.
Pieter van der Heyden
after Pieter Bruegel the Elder

43. Avaritia (Greed), 1558

En siet die scrapende gbierichbeyt niet aen (Scraping Avarice sees neither honor nor courtesy, shame nor divine admonition)

The Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York, Harris Brisbane Dick Fund, 1926 26.72.31

Literature: Van Bastelaer 1908, no. 128; Brussels 1969, no. 21; Tokyo 1989, no. 21; Van Bastelaer 1992, no. 128.
Pieter Bruegel the Elder

44. *Gula (Gluttony)*, 1557

Pen and gray-brown ink; contours indented for transfer
23 x 30 cm (9 x 11 3/4 in.)
Signed and dated at lower left: *brueghel 1557*; by another hand in red-brown ink at lower center: *Gula (Gluttony)*; by latter hand in red-brown ink in lower margin: *Schoude dronkenschap ende gulselyck eten / Want overdaet doet godt en hem selven vergeten* (Shun drunkenness and gluttony, for excess makes man forget God and himself)
Watermark: small eagle

Collection Frits Lugt, Institut Néerlandais, Paris 466

(Exhibited in New York only)


Pieter van der Heyden
after Pieter Bruegel the Elder

45. Gula (Gluttony), 1558

Engraving; only state
22.3 x 29.3 cm (8½ x 11¼ in.)
Inscribed on overturned washtub at lower center: brueghel/Inventor; -PAME [monogram]; GULA; at lower right: H. Cock. executum cum gratia et privilegio 1558; in lower margin: EBRITAS EST VITANDA, INGLVIESQE CIBORVM. (Drunkenness and Gluttony are to be shunned.) / Schout dromkenschap, en gulschlyck eten / Want overdaet doet gelt en hem selven vergheten.
(Shun drunkenness and gluttony, for excess makes man forget God and himself.)
The British Museum, London 1880-7-10-638

Literature: Van Bastelaer 1908, no. 129; Brussels 1969, no. 22; Tokyo 1989, no. 22; Van Bastelaer 1992, no. 129.
Pieter Bruegel the Elder

46. Superbia (Pride), 1557

Pen and gray-brown ink; contours indented for transfer
22.9 x 30 cm (9 x 11 3/4 in.)
Signed and dated at lower left: brueghel 1557; inscribed by another hand in red-brown ink at lower center: Superbia (Pride);
by a later hand in red-brown ink in lower margin: Hoewaerde wert van Godt boven al ghedaet / sghelyce wert godt weder van hoewerder wesmaet (Pride is hated by God above all, at the same time God is abused by Pride)
Watermark: eagle with shield with the letter F
Collection Frits Lugt, Institut Néerlandais, Paris 465


Pieter van der Heyden
after Pieter Bruegel the Elder

47. Superbia (Pride), 1558

Engraving, only state
22.5 x 29.2 cm (8 3/4 x 11 1/2 in.)
Inscribed in cartouche at lower right: P. • brueghel. Inuentor •;
at lower center: PMFE [monogram] and SUPERBIA; at lower left: Cocc excud am privileg 1558; in lower margin: NEMO SUPERBVS AMAT SUPEROS, NEC AMATVR AB ILLIS •
(Nobody who is proud loves the gods above, nor is he loved by them) / Houterdy weert van gout hoven al hhebaet / Ti zgelyk weert gout weder van houertye weertmaet

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

The Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York, Harris Brisbane Dick Fund, 1926 26.72.33

Pieter Bruegel the Elder

48. Luxuria (Lust), 1557

Pen and gray-brown ink
22.5 x 29.6 cm (8 3/4 x 11 1/4 in.); contours indented for transfer
Signed and dated at lower right: bruegbel 1557; inscribed by another hand in red-brown ink at lower center: luxuria (lust); by latter hand in red-brown ink in lower margin: Luxurye steenct sy is vol onsuverheden / Sy breeckt die crachten en sy swackt die leden (Lechery stinks, it is dirty. It breaks [man’s] powers and weakens limbs)
Watermark: eagle with shield with the letter F

Bibliothèque Royale de Belgique, Cabinet des Estampes, Brussels S. II 132 816 folio C

Provenance: François Empain.

Pieter van der Heyden
after Pieter Bruegel the Elder

49. Luxuria (Lust), ca. 1558

Engraving; only state
22.5 × 29.6 cm (8¾ × 11½ in.)
Inscribed in cartouche at lower left: brueghel - Inuentor - / H - Cock - excu - cu[m] prors; at lower center: IHME [monogram]; at right of center: LVXVRIA; in lower margin: LVXVRIA ENERVAT VIERE, EFFEOMINAT ARTVS. (Lust enervates the strength, weakens the limbs) / Luxure stinkt, sy is vol onsnuiwerden / Sy breeckt die Krachten, en sy swaakt die leden

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

The British Museum, London 1880-7-10-635

Pieter Bruegel the Elder

50. Invidia (Envy), 1557

Pen and gray-brown ink; contours indented for transfer
22 x 30 cm (8 3/4 x 11 3/4 in.)
Signed and dated at lower left: bruegel 1557; inscribed by another
hand in red-brown ink at lower center: invidia (envy); by latter
hand in red-brown ink in lower margin: Een onsterfelycke doot es
nyt en vreede peste / een boest die haer seluen eet met walshen moleste
(Envy is an eternal death and a terrible plague, a beast which
devours itself with false troubles); on recto: collection stamp of
Alfred Beurdeley (Lugt 421)

Private collection, Switzerland

Provenance: Baron Dominique Vivant-Denon (1747–1825),
London; his auction, M. Masson St. Maurice, Paris, May 1–19,
1826, no. 593; (lot with cat. nos. 42, 44, 46); Alfred Beurdeley
(1845–1919), Paris; his auction, Galerie Georges Petit, Paris,
June 8–10, 1920; Anton Wilhelmus Mari Mensing (1866–1936),
Amsterdam; his auction, Frederik Muller, Amsterdam, April 27–
29, 1937; Robert von Hirsch, Basel.

Pieter van der Heyden
after Pieter Bruegel the Elder

51. Invidia (Envy), ca. 1558

Engraving; only state
22.7 x 39.5 cm (9 x 15 1/2 in.)
Inscribed at lower left: brueghel. Inue[n]t[e]; Cock: excud. cum
privilegio; at lower center: PAME [monogram]; INVIDIA; in lower
margin: INVIDIA HORRENDEVM MONSTRVM, SÆVISSIMA
PESTIS. (Envy is a monster to be feared, and a most severe
plague) / Een onsterfelijke doot, en voorde peste / Een beest die
haar zelf voert, en valschen moeste (Envy is an eternal death and a
terrible plague, a beast which devours itself with false troubles)

The Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York, Harris Brisbane
Dick Fund, 1926 26.72.46

Literature: Van Bastelaer 1908, no. 130; Vienna 1967—68,
no. 48; Brussels 1969, no. 23; Tokyo 1989, no. 23; Van Bastelaer
1992, no. 130.
Pieter Bruegel the Elder

52. *Desidia (Sloth)*, 1557

Pen and gray-brown ink; contours indented for transfer
21.4 x 29.6 cm (8⅝ x 11⅝ in.)
Signed and dated at lower right: *brueghel f.557*; inscribed by another hand in yellow-brown ink at lower center: *desidia* (sloth); by latter hand in yellow-brown ink originally in lower margin but cut off and pasted on verso: *Trachteyt maacht machteloos en verdroecht / die senneuen dat de mensch nieuwers toe en doecht* (Sloth makes [man] powerless and dries out the nerves until man is good for nothing [transcription from Mielke 1996])

Graphische Sammlung Albertina, Vienna 7872

_Literature_: Romdahl 1903, p. 113; Van Bastelaer and Hulin de Loo 1907, no. 95; Tolnai 1925, no. 36; Benesch 1928, no. 77; Tolnay 1952, no. 53; Münz 1961, no. 156; Berlin 1975, no. 64; Brussels 1980, no. 27; Marijnissen et al. 1988, p. 88; Mielke 1996, no. 39.
Pieter van der Heyden
after Pieter Bruegel the Elder

53. Desidia (Sloth), 1558

Engraving; only state
22.5 x 29.2 cm (8⅛ x 11⅛ in.)
Inscribed at lower left: bruughel - Inventor; at lower center: PAME [monogram]; DESIDIA; at lower right: H. Cock · excud., Privileg. 1558; in lower margin: SEGNITRIES ROBVR FRANGIT, LONGA OCIA NERVOS. (Sluggishness breaks strength, long idleness [breaks] the nerves.) / Trubcheyt maect machtellos, en verdrocht / Die sensuwen dat de mensch nieuwers toe en doocht. (Sloth makes [man] powerless and dries out the nerves until man is good for nothing.)

The Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York, Harris Brisbane Dick Fund, 1926 26.72.34

Pieter van der Heyden
after Pieter Bruegel the Elder

54. Ira (Anger), 1558

Engraving; only state
22.5 x 29.2 cm (8 3/4 x 11 3/4 in.)
Inscribed at lower left: • P. bruegbel - Inuentor •; at lower center: PAME [monogram]; IRA; at lower right: • H. Cock - excudit •
Cum gratia et privilegio • 1558 •; in lower margin: ORA TVMENT IRA, NIGRESCVNT SANGVINE VENÆ. (Anger makes the face swell up, and the veins grow black with blood.) / Gramiscap doet den mont ssullen / en verhittert den most / Sy beroert den ghoest / en maect het swert den bloet (Anger makes the mouth swell, and embitters the nerves; it disturbsthe spirit, and blackens the blood)²

The British Museum, London 1880-7-10-641


In 1556 Bruegel started work on what would become his most elaborate achievement in the field of allegorical compositions, the present series of Seven Deadly Sins, completed between 1556 and 1558, and Seven Virtues, executed from 1559 to 1560 (cat. nos. 64–77). The two sequences were connected by The Last Judgment of 1558 (cat. nos. 56, 57) and possibly supplemented by The Descent of Christ into Limbo of 1561 (cat. nos. 87, 88).² Although the first group is traditionally known as The Vices to emphasize their linkage and contrast to The Virtues, a more precise title for them is The Seven Deadly Sins. The theological concept that underlies the theme, firmly embodied in Catholic doctrine since the early Middle Ages, considers the seven vices in question to be at the root of all other human vices and misconduct and consequently sets them apart as The Seven Deadly Sins. The Virtues and Vices were extremely popular subjects in Christian art and were usually presented as opposing pairs and often combined with an image of the Last Judgment, just as Bruegel did in his sequences.³

As Jürgen Müller discusses the concept of the series and its sources in his introductory text, this entry will concentrate on the making of the group and the relation between the drawings and the prints. It was in 1556, as far as we can judge from the remaining drawings, that Bruegel first tried his hand at allegories as subjects for prints after his design. His initial effort for The Seven Deadly Sins was the preparatory drawing for Avaritia (Greed) (cat. no. 42), which, like the design for Big Fish Eat Little Fish (cat. no. 38), is dated 1556 and is strongly influenced by the work of Hieronymus Bosch.⁴ All the other designs for the series are dated 1557, and all follow the pattern Avaritia set in Boschian style, composition, and imagery, as well as in size, drawing technique, and the calligraphy of inscriptions.

It is noteworthy that Bruegel began with Avaritia, for in the traditional order of theological exegesis the first sin is Ira (Anger), which is followed by Desidia (Sloth), Superbia (Pride), Avaritia, Gula (Gluttony), Invidia (Envy), and finally Luxuria (Lust).³ It has been suggested that Bruegel may have chosen to initiate his sequences with Avaritia because the subject of avarice and its related socioeconomic issues were of particular importance to him. And indeed several compositions that focus on the subject appear in his oeuvre, as Everyman (cat. nos. 58, 59) and The Battle about Money (cat. no. 115), among others, testify.

It was with The Seven Deadly Sins that Bruegel fully developed his characteristic manner of drawing preparatory designs for prints. Using a pen and ink that was probably originally dark black-brown, he drew the entire composition in fine lines. The result is intensely graphic, with tonal effects created entirely by means of various hatching techniques that are easily translatable into a purely linear engraving. In the last three drawings, Invidia (cat. no. 50), Ira (fig. 87), which unfortunately is not exhibited here, and Desidia (cat. no. 52), Bruegel reinforced outlines and

Fig. 87. Pieter Bruegel the Elder. Ira (Anger), 1557. Pen and brown ink. Gabinetto Disegni e Stampe degli Uffizi, Florence
emphasized certain parts of the composition with dark accents to show the engraver where the burin should cut most deeply into the copperplate. Pieter van der Heyden—the only engraver in the service of Aux Quatre Vents, Hieronymus Cock’s publishing establishment, who reproduced works by Bruegel between 1557 and 1560—cut all seven plates of the series, adding his monogram, PAME, at the lower center of each print. According to his unvarying habit, and unlike the far more gifted Frans Huys and Philips Galle, he faithfully copied Bruegel’s drawings line by line without making any remarkable contributions of his own. Whereas he often produced rather dryly engraved and dull prints, Van der Heyden surpassed his usual level of achievement in this series. His rendering of contrasts between light and dark is particularly striking and brings out a quality the drawings must have to some extent lost owing to the fading of their inks and wear and tear suffered through time. For this reason, especially in early, well-printed impressions, Van der Heyden’s engravings effectively convey the liveliness and vigor of Bruegel’s original compositions.

Although Bruegel signed and dated every drawing in the group and inscribed the Latin name of the personification represented at the center of each composition, he evidently did not write the Dutch verses that appear in the lower margins. These were all added in a hand that is clearly not his own and in red-brown or yellow-brown ink that is different from the shade used in the drawing. This raises the question of who was responsible for the verses, which were engraved on the copperplates in both Dutch versions that more or less accurately followed the inscriptions on the drawings and in Latin translations. Although no definitive answer can be proposed, it seems plausible that a humanist scholar was asked to compose appropriate verses after the drawings were completed. Verses written in this manner in general did not dwell on the composition or the details of the drawing they enhanced, as a modern viewer might
expect, but rather provided a general moral instruction relating to the subject. This is certainly true of the verses in the margins of The Seven Deadly Sins. Thus, *Ira* (cat. no. 54), for instance, is filled with fantastical details and allusions of all kinds, while its inscription speaks of the way anger affects physical appearance and state of mind.

Several scholars, in particular Carl Gustaf Stridbeck, have pointed out that the verses inscribed on the sheets of The Seven Deadly Sins show similarities to the writings of Dirck Volckertsz. Coornhert, a moralist, playwright, and engraver from Haarlem, who worked for Cock before 1559. Whether he was responsible for these texts is difficult to determine, however. Supporting arguments against Coornhert’s authorship is the fact that his ethical works that appear to relate to the Bruegel inscriptions, most notably his *Zedekunst, dat is Wellevenskunste* (Moral philosophy, that is the art of living virtuously), were all published many decades after the prints appeared. On the other hand, Coornhert’s prints from the period before 1560 reveal that he had a marked interest in virtues and vices and their relation to moral philosophy. Furthermore, in their spelling, style, and meter the Dutch verses on the sheets by and after Bruegel are comparable to inscriptions on prints by Coornhert, whom we know to have been well acquainted with Bruegel (see entry for cat. no. 117). In any event, we can assume that Bruegel, who seems to have controlled the production of prints after his designs rather closely, agreed with the tenor of the verses, whether or not they were written by Coornhert.

Clearly Bruegel’s preparatory drawings for prints have always been held in high regard as accomplished works of art, as the fate of the fourteen Deadly Sins and Virtues as well as the design for *The Last Judgment* testifies. All have been preserved (and constitute just a little less than one-quarter of the Bruegel drawings now known to exist), perhaps in part because ensembles of them were kept together in single collections at least until the early nineteenth century: the distinguished collectors Baron Dominique Vivant-Denon and Count Antoine-François Andréossy owned at least four drawings from *The Seven Deadly Sins* and *The Seven Virtues*, respectively. But the prints themselves fared less well. All the copperplates for them were still in the possession of Cock’s widow, Volckxten Dierix, at her death in 1601, along with the plates for most other engravings after Bruegel. Although nearly all of the other plates were reprinted in the seventeenth century by such publishers as Theodoor and Johannes Galle, *The Seven Virtues* and *The Seven Deadly Sins* were not. Whether the plates were too damaged to be used again or whether publishers did not expect to reap a profit from prints that could be reproduced cheaply will likely remain a mystery.

1. The translations of Latin and Dutch verses are based in part on those provided in Tokyo 1989.
2. The copperplates of *The Seven Deadly Sins* were listed in the 1601 inventory of the publisher Hieronymus Cock’s widow, Volckxten Dierix, as “Acht corperen platen van de 7 Dootonden” (eight copperplates of the seven mortal sins); Duverger 1984, p. 31. This suggests that the plates of the series were kept together with the plate of *The Last Judgment*. The citation of “Vieren-dertig Historieken van zeven plaetkens van de 7 Dootouden van achaten” (thirty-four histories of the seven images of the seven mortal sins in eight plates) may refer to the Bruegel series as well; ibid., 1984, p. 21.
3. The most elaborate study of Bruegel’s *Seven Deadly Sins* and *Seven Virtues* is Serébrennikov 1986. Of the older literature Van Gelder and Borns 1939 and Stridbeck 1936 are most noteworthy. On the tradition of the Virtues and Vices in medieval art, see O’Reilly 1988; Hourihan 2000 appeared too recently to be taken into account.
4. On the influence of Boschian imagery in the work of Bruegel, see Martin Royalton-Kisch, “Pieter Bruegel as a Draftsman,” in this publication, pp. 16–30, and Manfred Sellink, “The very lively and whimsical Pieter Bruegel!,” in this publication, pp. 59–60, 64. Regarding *The Seven Deadly Sins* and their indebtedness to Bosch, also see Bar 1940, pp. 97–100.
5. The sequence given here follows that proposed by Mielke (1996), which is based on stylistic analysis of the order in which the drawings were made. This order was first suggested by Van Gelder and Borns (1939, p. 9).
6. On Coornhert, his prints, and his ethical opinions, see Veldman 1990. For series with quite similar verses, see, for instance, *The Uncontrived World* and *The Vain Hope for Worldly Gain*, both from 1550; Veldman 1993–94, nos. 456–59, 460–63.
7. Compare the provenances of the individual drawings.
Pieter van der Heyden
after Pieter Bruegel the Elder

55. Patientia (Patience), 1557

Engraving; first state of two
34 x 44 cm (13 3/4 x 17 1/2 in.)
Inscribed under central figure: PATIENTIA; at bottom left: Hock exude 1557; at bottom right: BAME [monogram]
Bruegel-Invert; in lower margin: PATIENTIA EST MALORVM QVAE AVT INERVUNTVR, AVT ACCIDENT, CVM AQUANIMITATE PERLAT
Lactantius, Divinae Institutiones, Book 5)

Bibliothèque Royale de Belgique, Cabinet des Estampes, Brussels S II. 37216


Patience gazes upward, holding a cross; she sits chained to a block, much like a prisoner awaiting execution. The landscape around her is overrun with fantastic creatures. Out of a large hollow egg at the edge of a river emerges a figure, possibly meant to symbolize a papal envoy, as he wears a cardinal’s hat displaying the crossed keys of Saint Peter associated with the papal coat of arms, and a message or bull with dangling seals is inserted in his belt at the back. A man on horseback reads aloud what appears to be a papal bull, while a monk next to him holds a bundle of twigs over a blindfolded corpse in the river. A village with a church
range that is most apparent in strong early impressions. This collaboration with Bruegel seems to have brought out the best in Van der Heyden.

While there is debate about whether political content appears in the *Saint Anthony*, there can be no doubt regarding its presence in *Patientia*. It seems clear from the clerical imagery and the large size of this allegorical print that Bruegel intended to make a statement of some sort about contemporary religious conflicts in the Netherlands. The man on horseback reading what may be a papal bull near a monk and a floating corpse, as well as the figure emerging from the egg, may refer to the repressive authority of the ecclesiastic establishment, while the monks drinking and carousing in the tree certainly represent the dissolute life of some clerics. Bruegel’s own religious and political beliefs have long remained a puzzle, but in this print, at least, he revealed certain of his attitudes by making a plea for endurance and patience in the face of the extremely oppressive political climate of the day. After numerous impressions of *Patientia* had been pulled, someone, perhaps under pressure from new censorship laws, attempted to disguise the engraving’s disparaging portrayal of churchmen. In a later state the crossed keys and the message in the belt of the cleric in the egg were both covered over with cross-hatching, the monks in the tree were transformed into fools, and the monk at the riverbank was given a new hat (fig. 88). 1 It is difficult to determine who made the changes to the printing plate. Until 1601 the plate remained in the possession of the widow of Hieronymus Cock, who had taken over his publishing business after his death in 1570. 2

1. A possible source for this imagery of *Patientia* is a painting of the Temptation of Saint Anthony given to an artist in the circle of Jan Wellens de Cock (private collection, Belgium; illustrated in Tokyo 1994, p. 181) that contains a number of closely related motifs: a large tree with a hollow at the bottom, a tent at the top of its trunk, and objects hanging from its branches, as well as a burning church, a central praying figure, and a landscape overrun by Boschian creatures. The composition of the painting is in reverse of that of *Patientia*.

2. This state was first recognized by Boon (1982).

3. ‘*Een coperen plate van de Patientie van Bruegel*’ (a copperplate of Patientia by Bruegel) appears in the inventory taken of the possessions of Volckard Dierickx, Cock’s widow, in 1601; Duverger 1984, p. 29.
Pieter Bruegel the Elder

56. *The Last Judgment*, 1558

Pen and black-brown ink; contours indented for transfer. 23 x 30 cm (9 x 11 3/4 in.)
Signed and dated in cartouche at lower right: *brueghel 1558*;
inscribed by another hand in red-brown ink in lower margin:
*Compt ghy gebenede yd myns vандers hier / En gaet ghy vormaldeyde in dat eerweige vier* (Come you, blessed by my father here [unto the Eternal Kingdom], and you, the cursed, go into the everlasting fire)

Graphische Sammlung Albertina, Vienna 7873

Provenance: Albert von Sachsen-Teschen (1738–1822), Vienna.

Literature: Romdahl 1905, p. 111; Van Bastelaer and Hulin de Loo 1957, no. 89; Tolnai 1925, no. 37; Benesch 1928, no. 78; Tolnai 1952, no. 53; Stridbeck 1956, pp. 73–74; Münn 1961, no. 137; Berlin 1975, no. 66; Marijnissen et al. 1988, p. 99; Mielke 1996, no. 40.

Pieter van der Heyden

after Pieter Bruegel the Elder

57. *The Last Judgment*, 1558

Engraving; only state
22.5 x 29.5 cm (8 3/4 x 11 3/4 in.)
Inscribed in cartouche at lower left: *Brueghel. Inue[n]st[or]; at lower center: H. Cock. excud. Cam. privileg. 1558.; at lower right: PAME. [monogram]; in left portion of lower margin: *VENITE. BENEDICTI. PATRIS. MEI. IN. REGNUM. AETERNVM. ITE. MALEDICTI. PATRIS. MEI. IN. IGNEM. SEMPITERNVM. (Come you, blessed by my father, into the Eternal Kingdom, and you, cursed by my father, go into the everlasting fire.); in right portion of lower margin: *Compt ghy gebenede yd myns vандers hier / En gaet ghy vormaldeyde in dat eerweige vier. (Come you, blessed by my father, here, and you, the cursed, go into the everlasting fire.)

Museum Boijmans Van Beuningen, Rotterdam BdB 8736


Literature: Van Bastelaer 1908, no. 121; Hollstein 1949–, vol. 9 (Van der Heyden), no. 17; Brussels 1969, no. 25; Tokyo 1989, no. 25; Van Bastelaer 1992, no. 121.
Bruegel’s *Last Judgment* is closely connected to the series of Seven Deadly Sins (cat. nos. 42–54), engraved by Pieter van der Heyden and published by Hieronymus Cock in 1558, as well as to the slightly later group of Virtues (cat. nos. 64–77), engraved in 1559–60 by Philips Galle and also brought on the market by Cock. Conceptually the three themes are related, for in Christian ideology the Last Judgment is bound up with sin and virtue. The Bible tells us that after the Second Coming of the Savior each and every soul will arise in the flesh from the grave to be judged by the merits of the individual’s conduct during life. Vividly, the prophesies made in the Revelation of Saint John (20:12–14) declare: “And I saw the dead, small and great, stand before God; and the books were opened: and another book was opened, which is the book of life: and the dead were judged out of those things which were written in the books, according to their works. And the sea gave up the dead which were in it; and they were judged every man according to their works. And death and hell were cast into the lake of fire. This is the second death.” In accord with this imagery and with standard Christian portrayals, Bruegel’s depiction shows those who have sinned being sent by Christ to hell, on his left, while the virtuous souls on his blessed right are directed to heaven. Specifically, Bruegel’s vision of the entrance to hell as a hideous, gaping mouth stands in a medieval tradition and relates to the sea monster Leviathan, which is described in the Book of Job (chap. 41).

In style and technique the drawing of *The Last Judgment*, which is dated 1558, follows designs for The Seven Deadly Sins, begun two years earlier, in 1556. In that series and here, Bruegel carefully set out the composition with subtle lines of the pen and brown ink. By avoiding any use of wash and suggesting tones by means of various types of hatching, the master made a precise model that the engraver Pieter van der Heyden could easily reproduce line by line. The
Last Judgment sheets are also close to The Seven Deadly Sins in their imagery—especially the fantastic monsters driving the sinners to hell in the foreground—which reveals a strong echo of the manner of Hieronymus Bosch. This Boschian component would disappear and give way to allegorical imagery set in stagelike compositions in the later Virtues.

The theme of The Last Judgment was extremely popular as a subject of paintings, drawings, and prints in the Netherlands in the second half of the sixteenth century, especially in combination with portrayals of Vices and Virtues. This popularity was in part inspired by the ongoing fierce debates between Catholics and adherents of the Reformation concerning a tenet of Christian faith: would Christ judge whether individuals would go to heaven or hell according to their conduct on earth, as the Catholic Church maintained, or was that fate determined by God from the moment of the birth of humankind, as the Calvinists insisted. Certainly, Bruegel’s Last Judgment cannot be seen as a direct challenge to the Calvinist doctrine of predestination, but its production in relation to the series of Seven Virtues and Seven Deadly Sins must be considered in light of this theological debate, which aroused great public interest.


2. On the popularity and influence of Bosch during Bruegel’s time, see Unverferth 1980 and Gibson 1992. In his composition as well as some iconographical details here, Bruegel was certainly inspired by Alart Du Hamel’s Last Judgment engraved after a lost composition by Bosch; Hollstein 1949–56, vol. 6 (Du Hamel), no. 2. In fact, he had also derived several details in his series of Vices from this print; see Martin Royalton-Kisch, “Pieter Bruegel as a Draftsman,” in this publication, pp. 27–28.

Pieter Bruegel the Elder

58. *Everyman*, 1558

Pen and brown ink; contours indented for transfer 20.8 x 24.1 cm (8 3/8 x 9 5/8 in.)
Inscribed at lower left: *Brueghel 1558*; on picture at upper right: *Nymant en censyt sy selve* (Nobody knows himself); in reverse, *n e no* (not no one)


(Exhibited in New York only)

Provenance: Samuel Woodburn (1786–1833), London; his auction, Christie’s, London, June 16, 1854, no. 165.

Literature: Van Bastelaer and Hulin de Loo 1907, no. 96; Tolnai 1925, no. 38; Popham 1932, p. 143; Tolnay 1952, no. 55; Münz 1961, no. 138; Brussels 1980, no. 35; Marijnen et al. 1988, p. 100; Gibson 1992b, pp. 73–76; Mielke 1996, no. 41.

Attributed to Pieter van der Heyden after Pieter Bruegel the Elder

59. *Everyman*, ca. 1558

Engraving; first state of two
22.5 x 29.5 cm (8 7/8 x 11 3/4 in.)
Inscribed at lower right: *H·COCK·EXCLUD·CUM·PRIVILEG*; on hems of coats of five foreground figures and beneath men with lanterns at upper right: *ELCK (Everyman);* below picture at upper left: *NIEMA[N]T·EN·KENT·HE[M]·SELVE[N] (Nobody knows himself);* on bag at center: *NEMO NON* (not no one); in lower margin: *Nemo non querit passim suam commodam, Nemo/Non quaferit ses e cuntis in rebus agendis, // Nemo non inhiat privatis undique lucris, // Hic trabit, illa trabit, cuntis amor unus babendi est. (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

Ashmolean Museum, Oxford

Literature: Van Bastelaer 1908, no. 152; Hollstein 1949–, vol. 4 (Cock), no. 255; Stridbeck 1956, pp. 43–61; Grauls 1957,

166
Pieter Bruegel the Elder made his preparatory design for the *Everyman* print in 1538, shortly after he produced the drawings for The Seven Deadly Sins (cat. nos. 42–54)—a series closely related to the present works in both the subject matter and the moral issues treated. Although the engraving of *Everyman* is unsigned, there is no reason to doubt its traditional attribution to Pieter van der Heyden, who was responsible for The Seven Deadly Sins and, indeed, all prints made after Bruegel up to 1538. To be sure, the careful and meticulous, we might even say slightly dull, way the delicate pen lines of Bruegel’s drawing are reproduced here, in tandem with the lack of any real sense of depth, especially in the background, accords with the characteristics of Van der Heyden’s signed engravings. The *Everyman* engraving was issued by Hieronymus Cock; his address appears in a corner of the composition—its location in all the prints he published—and also wittily within the image, as Jürgen Müller points out below. Bruegel’s drawing, while reproduced almost exactly in the print, lacks the inscriptions that appear on the hems of the tunics of the men in the engraving. These inscriptions, which identify the figures as Everymen, must have been added by Cock or someone in his shop to clarify the subject of the picture.

The drawing and the engraving are among the most discussed works in Bruegel’s graphic oeuvre. Their intriguing image of old men with lanterns searching, rummaging through a chaotic pile of merchandise, and tussling to gain
possession of a cloth, as well as the equally fascinating inscriptions they bear, has elicited from countless art historians an astonishing diversity of opinion regarding the master’s intended meaning. Given the complexity of the allegory presented and its myriad allusions to both profane and religious themes, it is impossible to find a single interpretation that covers every detail of the composition. In keeping with the predilection of sixteenth-century humanists and rhetoricians for playing with several layers of meaning at once and for veiled and intricate references to the Bible, classical antiquity, and literature, we must recognize that there are multiple readings of *Everyman* that overlap and supplement one another.3

In sum, the central issue of Bruegel’s invention here is the dual but vain search of Everyman, or Ecl, for both worldly goods and self-knowledge; led by greed, his Everymen search everywhere for personal gain. Greed is a subject that Bruegel also plumbed in other works, such as *The Battle about Money* (cat. no. 115) and *Avaritia (Greed)* (cat. nos. 42, 43), and one he was certainly not alone in exploiting. It is tempting to speculate that the *Everyman* he drew in 1558 and the print Van der Heyden subsequently executed after it sparked the interest of his literary compatriots, for its theme reappeared in some of their material shortly thereafter: Ecl and his search for knowledge and goods was treated often in Antwerp’s 1561 Landjuweel, a festival in which rhetoricians performed plays they had written, and the city’s 1563 Ommegang, a procession whose features included moralizing tableaux vivants.4 Although the moral stance of the present image is that of a long-standing humanist tradition, and the theme itself is a familiar one, Bruegel’s iconographic elaboration of the subject and his extraordinary artistic ingenuity place *Everyman* among his most original compositions.

Translation adapted from Tokyo 1989, no. 26.

3. The literature listed above includes no more than a selection of the most noteworthy interpretations. Lebeer provides an excellent review of previous literature in Brussels 1969. Two scholarly studies of *Everyman* have been published recently: Kavaler 1999, which concentrates on socioeconomic issues in Antwerp in relation to the print, and Müller 1999, which relates the work to the Christian topos of the search for God. An abbreviated version of the latter appears in Jürgen Müller’s text for this entry.


### Interpretations of *Everyman*

Bruegel’s engraving *Everyman* is universally regarded as an especially complex allegory. As the drawing for it is signed and dated “[B]rugehel 1558,” that date serves as a terminus post quem for the undated engraving.1 The composition takes its name from its chief figure, identified by the word *Ecl* (*Everyman*) inscribed on the hem of his coat. The entire composition is built up around this Everyman, who stands bent over in the very center, staring at an open lantern with a burning candle inside it and apparently engaged in some sort of search.

The left half of the composition is presented against the backdrop of a wall. In a shadowy niche in that wall, in the center of the picture, we see an unlighted candle. To the left of the niche hangs the portrait of a man identified by his clothing as a fool. The inscription under the portrait reads: **NIEMA[N]T. EN. KENT. HE[M]. SELVE[N]** (Nobody knows himself). The right half of the picture provides a glimpse of an army camp in its background: tents, a small group of officers, standard-bearers, and a host of mercenaries whose upright lances block out the horizon. We also see a church and a leafless tree standing forlorn against the sky. In this part of the landscape there are two more Everymen, recognizable as such from their poses and lanterns. They too are bent forward, staring intently at their lanterns as they go about their own searches.

Art historians have taken the print to be an allegory of selfishness, pointing to the full purse of the Everyman in the foreground as an indication that he is as miserly as he is greedy.2 The inscription beneath the picture seems to support such a view, declaring “No one does not seek his own advantage everywhere, no one does not seek himself for 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. Yet the attribute of the lighted lantern immediately brings to mind Diogenes and his searching with a lantern in broad daylight for an honest man. Supporting this idea is the similar imagery of emblem 31 in the Morosophie of Guillaume de La Perrière from 1533, which shows the ancient philosopher in his search as evidence of his sagacity. Bruegel’s portrayal of another Everyman who has crawled into a barrel at the lower left edge of the picture may also be a link to Diogenes, who is said to have been so frugal that he lived in a tub. In the context of this interpretation, it would almost seem that we are to consider the Elck in a positive way, assuming that the Everyman is as modest in his needs as Diogenes. Franzsepp Würtenerberger has referred us to another iconographic tradition of importance to an understanding of Eeverym: the numerous Nobody depictions. He offers a Georg Pencz woodcut from 1535, Nobody (Der Niemand), as a specific precedent. But Pencz’s Nobody is surrounded by things that are broken or have fallen apart, whereas the objects in Bruegel’s image are all intact.

The central figure in Bruegel’s composition provides an important clue to the interpretation of the scene, for Everyman is clearly gazing at his lighted lantern in daylight. Apparently the lantern is not merely an aid in his search but the actual object of it. His spectacles are another key detail; he doubtless wears them in order to see his light clearly. But they must have additional significance, for glasses can have a negative meaning, supposedly symbolizing delusion, ignorance, or self-deception, as the literature on Bruegel’s engraving reminds us. In this connection we think of the well-known woodcut formerly attributed to Erhard Schoen, The Owl Has Light from 1540, a scene in some respects comparable to Bruegel’s allegory. There an owl, conspicuously brandishing a pair of spectacles, is perched next to a burning candle, and so that the viewer can see that the candle is burning in broad daylight, Schoen has included a sun in the upper left corner. The owl also refers to the sun in the inscription: *Was bildt mich sün(n) / licht oder prill, weyl ich doch selbs nicht seben will* (What help are sunlight or glasses if I don’t choose to see). A related image also appears as the illustration for chapter 28 of Sebastian Brant’s Narrenschiff (Ship of Fools) from 1494. Titled *Vom Wider-Gott-Reden* (On Blasphemy), this woodcut portrays a fool who has lit a fire in broad daylight, a daytime fire that is meant to show the obduracy of the man attached to the things of this world and how incapable he is of being saved.

Further clues to Bruegel’s meaning emerge from the jumble of objects at the bottom of his composition representing a wide variety of occupations, for the more we study it, the more suggestive it becomes. On the left we see an ax, a trowel, and a scale, and at the feet of the central Everyman a shoemaker’s last—all evoking specific trades. There are also barrels, baskets, and tied sacks. In the right half of the picture, in addition to still more objects that may refer to trades—a pot, shears and cloth, a book, and more tied boxes and bundles—are things used in various games: a checkerboard, dice, and playing cards. And at the very bottom edge of the image lie a mirror and a roll of paper. Markings on the sacks and boxes identify the trading companies to which the wares belong. Interestingly, some of the bundles have several different markings, which could mean that more than one person or company lays claim to them. Bruegel has included an inside joke in all of the disorder: on one of the visibly empty boxes in the left half of the composition is the firm mark of Hieronymus Cock, the publisher of his prints.

All the figures in Bruegel’s engraving are so deeply absorbed in their materialistic searching, so shortsighted in the intellectual sense, that eyeglasses would be of no use to them. What can happen when one Everyman encounters another is evident from the tussle two of them are engaged in over a length of cloth. Each is so determined that the other shall not have the cloth that he tugs on it with all his strength. If either of them were to give way they would both fall on their backs.

That Bruegel’s Everymen rule the world, even own it, is indicated by the presence of the orb between the central figure’s legs. At first glance we register this symbol of the world as just another tied sack, for it is easily overlooked because of the way Bruegel has positioned it. Once we spot the cross, projecting outward behind the figure’s right leg, we see that it corresponds to the traders’ marks; it is as if the world itself had become a mere commodity.

Here it is important to emphasize how much Bruegel’s way of building up meaning in a composition differs from traditional iconographic practice, how much he relies on the viewer’s ability to make the necessary connections. In the case of Everyman we must recognize the biblical images he alludes to. Seeing the bushel measure in front of Everyman’s left foot and noting the discrepancy between the lighted candle and the unlit one in the wall niche, we can only recall the New Testament admonition that we not hide our light beneath a bushel basket (Luke 11:33–35): “No man, when he hath lighted a candle, putteth it in a secret place, neither under a bushel, but on a candlestick, that they which come in may see the light. The light of the body is the eye: therefore when thine eye is single, thy whole
body also is full of light; but when thine eye is evil, thy body also is full of darkness."

Eick has misunderstood this image by taking it literally. He carries his lantern about with him, mistaking external light for the light within. He fails to comprehend that light is only a metaphor for Christian virtue. We, Bruegel’s viewers, in turn, are required to fully appreciate the image in order to recognize how it has been misunderstood, that this is an ironic perversion of the biblical metaphor for the search for God. In the Psalms, especially, we read of men searching for God with all their hearts. In the Gospel of Mark (1:37), Christ’s disciples find him and tell him: “All men seek for thee,” or “Every man is looking for you.”

Linked to the problem of man’s search for God is the theological issue of grace, for just as we cannot raise ourselves up into heaven alone, we cannot search for God and find him if he does not choose to be found. Finding God is always tantamount to being found by God. Bruegel’s Everyman commits the error of trusting that he can find God on his own.

---

**Pieter Bruegel the Elder**

**60. The Alchemist, 1558?**

Pen and brown ink; contours indented
30.8 x 45.3 cm (12.1/2 x 17 ¼ in.)
Inscribed in a different shade of brown ink at upper right, possibly by another hand: BRVEGHEL / 1558; on scholar’s book: ALGHE MIST; on canisters below book: KEYE (stones) and Salfer (sulphur); on bag in lower right corner: dreg[ej] (drugs); on paper under hourglass: ghetten (translation unclear); on page hanging from cover of fireplace: ...Een estracht... (an extra-t)
Staatliche Museen zu Berlin, Kupferstickkabinett KdZ 4999

Provenance: Pierre Crozet (Lugt 2931, 2952); P. J. Mariette (Lugt 1852); gift of Benoist Oppenheim, 1909.

Literature: Friedländer 1909; Tolnay 1925, no. 39; Tolnay 1952, no. 56; Münz 1961, no. 199; Berlin 1975, no. 57; Dreyer 1977; Marijnissen et al. 1988, pp. 103–8; Mielke 1996, no. 42.

**Philips Galle (1537–1612)**

**after Pieter Bruegel the Elder**

**61. The Alchemist, ca. 1558?**

Engraving; first state of three
32 x 44 cm (12 ¼ x 17¼ in.)
Inscribed at upper left: Bruegel Insae; at lower left: H COCK EXCVD CVM PRIVILEGIO; in lower margin: DEBENT IGNARI RES FERRE ET POST OPERARI / IVS LAPIDIS CARI VILIS SED DENIQ: RARI / VNICA RES CERTA VILIS SED VBIQ: REPERTA // QUATVOR INSERTA NATVIR IN NVBE REPERTA / NVILLA MINERALIS RES EST VBI PRINCIPALIS / SED TALIS QVAILIS REPERITVR VBIQ: LOCALIS. (The ignorant should suffer things and labor 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.)
Ashmolean Museum, Oxford

Literature: Van Bastelaer 1908, no. 197; Brussels 1969, no. 27; Winner 1979; Tokyo 1989, no. 27.

A scholar in old-fashioned dress seated at a lectern, a presence frequently found in depictions of alchemists, gestures toward the scene in front of him, explaining it as he points to a book inscribed Alche Mist, a play on the words al chemist, meaning something ruined or foul. Like figures in Bruegel’s proverb prints (see cat. nos. 39, 41), he is set apart from the scene by his placement and costume and draws the viewer’s attention to the foolish behavior unfolding before him. The alchemist, about to drop a coin into a vessel, sits by the
fireplace. The dilapidated setting shows us that he has foolishly squandered all in his quest for the philosopher's stone that will turn base metals into gold and silver. Indeed, the point is underscored by the activity around him: he is assisted by a fool who squeezes air from a bellows onto coals in a brazier; his wife displays her empty purse; the children, one with a cooking pot on his head, climb into the empty cupboard. Through the window we see the eventual outcome of the alchemist's folly: he and his family are welcomed at the poorhouse.

*The Alchemist* is one of Bruegel's largest designs for prints and one of his most outstanding drawings. Intricately described incidental details—among them the still life of a collapsed scale and assorted vessels set out on a table made from an old window shutter mounted on a barrel—reveal that, although the drawing was intended as a design for a print, Bruegel spared it none of the careful consideration and creative attention he gave to his independent landscape drawings and his paintings. He bestowed upon the large-scale figures subtle facial expressions—most notably the fool's purposeful squint as he works the bellows and the wife's reflective gaze—that he could not effect with the smaller figures of his earlier print designs. His delicate touch is evident in numerous details, such as the transparent billows of smoke that rise from the braziers and the fireplace. *The Alchemist* is one of Bruegel's few drawings with an evident *pentimento*: he shortened one leg of the alchemist's stool, the vague outline of which is still visible. Comparison with the print suggests that the drawing has been trimmed a little along the top and a bit more along the bottom.

Philips Galle engraved this print and several other unsigned works after Bruegel.¹ Unlike the other artists working after the master, Galle did not monogram any of his prints. If the date on the drawing, which some have suggested was written by a hand other than Bruegel's,² is correct, this large piece was probably Galle's first engraving after the master's design. His engraving technique is dominated by strong, straight parallel hatching and rather angular outlines that tend to thin out the figures and sharpen their contours. The sharp lines Galle used to create his hatching gave the darkest areas a velvety richness in impressions pulled early in the printing process. Unfortunately, however, much of the subtlety of Bruegel's comical characterizations was lost in Galle's often harsh translation via the engraver's burin. The fool's squint, for instance, was turned into a sort of demented facial twitch, and the wife's reflective gaze, which is off to the side in the drawing, confronts the viewer head-on in the print.

In satirizing the alchemist who squanders all his money in his relentless quest to transmute base metals into gold, Bruegel could have turned for inspiration to a number of literary and visual sources, most notably early-sixteenth-century editions of Petrarch, Sebastian Brant, and Cornelius Agrippa of Nettlesheim, himself an alchemist.³ For the composition of his design he certainly looked to a representation of another character who had frittered away his money, a woodcut of 1541 by Cornelis Anthonisz depicting the profligate Sorgheleus (Careless) reduced to poverty (fig. 89).¹ The woodcut's empty cupboard, the fireplace, and the view through the window revealing Sorgheleus being turned away at the home of a rich man have clear correspondences in Bruegel's *Alchemist*.

Scholars have differed about whether Bruegel regarded the alchemist in a positive or a negative light, and some have interpreted the image as a reference to the Fall and Redemption of humankind.⁶

---

1. For an interpretation of the scholar as an instigator of evil, see Dreyer 1977.
2. Lebeer in Brussels 1969, no. 27.
Pieter Bruegel the Elder

62. Ice Skating before the Gate of Saint George, 1558

Pen and brown ink, with touches in black ink; some lines indented for transfer
21.3 x 29.8 cm (8 3/4 x 11 1/2 in.)
Signed and dated at lower right: brueghel 1558; inscribed in brown ink on verso at lower left: 2254 (handwriting of Goll van Franckenstein I)

Private collection

Provenance: Johann Goll van Franckenstein I (1722–1783); Johan Goll van Franckenstein II (1756–1821); Pieter Hendrik Goll van Franckenstein (1787–1832); his auction, Amsterdam, July 1, 1833; album X, no. 11 (Boeven Bruegel); to Ernst Georg Harzen (1790–1883); Herbert Bier, London.

Literature: Glück 1931, no. 78; Auner 1936, p. 51; Grossmann 1939, p. 345; Münz 1961, no. 140; Marijnissen et al. 1988, p. 66; Mielke 1996, no. 43.

Frans Huys (1522–1562)

after Pieter Bruegel the Elder

63. Ice Skating before the Gate of Saint George, ca. 1558

Engraving; first state of two
23.2 x 29.9 cm (9 1/4 x 11 1/2 in.)
Inscribed at bottom left: H: eock excudeb; at bottom right: F:H


Skaters, muffled against the cold, make their way along the frozen moat situated just outside Antwerp’s city walls. Some attempt to steady themselves on the slippery surface to avoid the fate of the person who has fallen through the
ice in the left background, while people standing along the ramparts gaze down at the lively scene. In the right background there appear, one behind another, first the archway known as Saint George’s Gate, then the Church of Saint George, and finally the Kronenburg Tower, on the horizon.

The drawing’s distinct outlines and clearly delineated hatchings are typical of Bruegel’s designs for prints. Despite the meticulous nature of the execution, Bruegel imbued even such small details as the skaters in the left background with a lively animation. Frans Huys closely followed Bruegel’s model as he engraved, but much of the vibrancy of the figures was lost in the translation to the print. Despite his line-by-line reiteration of Bruegel’s drawing, Huys greatly simplified the outlines of the figures, as is particularly noticeable in the schematic appearance of the skaters in the engraving’s background. Huys’s work is not without a charm of its own, however, owing in part to the printmaker’s augmentation of Bruegel’s horizontal hatching, which emphasizes the slippery surface of the ice. Only one

Fig. 90. Frans Huys after Pieter Bruegel the Elder. Ice Skating before the Gate of Saint George, after 1601. Engraving; second state. Bibliothèque Royale de Belgique, Cabinet des Estampes, Brussels
significant change was made as the drawing was transferred to the printing plate: a small branch that emanates from the bottom of the left branch of the tree has been removed in the print, probably to clear the view to the background. In the drawing we find one of the rare *pentimenti* in Bruegel’s always carefully composed print designs, for traces of the column on the gate behind the cart on the bridge can be seen through the covering of the vehicle.

Bruegel may have intended this image to have meaning beyond the visualization of a simple winter scene of the kind popular in his day. However, as is often the case in Bruegel’s work, his intended meaning has not been spelled out. The image may have raised for contemporaries associations with life’s misfortunes and unpredictability and even called to mind the slipperiness of some people: in sixteenth-century proverbs skating and standing on cracked ice denoted things going wrong. As has sometimes happened with other similarly enhanced prints after Bruegel’s designs, an inscription added to this engraving several decades after its original publication has been used to interpret the meaning of the image. The inscription in question was added to the plate by the seventeenth-century publisher Johannes Galle (fig. 90) and alludes to skating as a reference to the uncertainty of life: “Oh learn from this scene how we pass through the world, Slithering as we go, one foolish, the other wise, On this impermanence, far brittle than ice.” This has led to a theory that connects the image to a municipal corruption scandal in Antwerp that came to light a few years before 1558, the date inscribed on the drawing. At that time Saint George’s Gate was a relatively recent addition to Antwerp’s new city walls, the construction of which had been exploited to line the pockets of many individuals, most notably the burgomaster, who embezzled money from the project and used municipal workers and materials to build his own country estate. The more than two hundred witnesses who provided testimony in the ensuing inquiry included Cornelis Wellens, the brother of Hieronymus Cock, publisher of *Ice Skating before the Gate of Saint George*. Wellens had been involved in the construction of the part of the fortifications depicted here, and thus Bruegel may have intended his design as a knowing poke at his longtime publisher, or Cock himself may have meant the print to be a jab at his brother.

1. See Beck 1981.
3. Amsterdam 1997, p. 51. A letterpress inscription was probably appended to the blank inscription margin that appeared on the print as originally published. Unfortunately, no impressions with the blank margin are known today.
Pieter Bruegel
and Philips Galle after Pieter
Bruegel the Elder

64–77. The Seven Virtues, 1559–60

Seven drawings and seven engravings

Literature for the entire series: Van Gelder and
Borms 1959; Barnouw 1947, pp. 24–38; Hollstein 1949–
(Cock), nos. 243–49, vol. 9 (Van der Heyden), nos. 37–43;
Stridbeck 1956, pp. 126–70; Klein 1961, pp. 179–244; Brussels
1969, pp. 93–106; Zupnick 1969; Ritts 1971, pp. 97–98; Zupnick
1971; Zupnick 1974; Gibson 1977, pp. 58–64; Brussels 1980,
pp. 91–96; Serebrennikov 1986; Tokyo 1989, pp. 136–43; Mielke
1996, nos. 45–51.

The series of Virtues from 1559, in contrast to Bruegel’s
group of Seven Deadly Sins (cat. nos. 42–54), which are
executed in the style of Hieronymus Bosch’s phantasmagories,
is characterized by historically accurate detail. Thus,
the engraving showing Spes (Hope) presents a Flemish
port city threatened by high water. Placed in the center of
the compositions, the personification of the virtue wears a
headdress that is a beehive and balances on an anchor,
brandishing a sickle and a rudder, her attributes. The image
develops a distinct paradox. Dying of thirst, the prisoners
in the upper left have lowered a pitcher from their window
in the hope of catching rainwater; meanwhile the sea has
risen so menacingly that it appears about to engulf the
entire city. In the one instance water saves life, in the sec-
ond it brings death. Other scenes in the series also present
similar contradictions.

Justitia (Justice), for example, is also based on a paradox.
The personification appears with her usual attributes, a
blindfold, a sword, and scales, yet all around her people are
tortured and killed. It is as if injustice rather than justice
were being addressed. The man stretched on a rack in the
left foreground, especially, reminds us that in Bruegel’s day
it was common judicial procedure to extract confessions by
torture. Although various scholars have correctly noted that
the Latin inscription on Justitia refers to the necessity of
punishment and have even cited legal treatises of Bruegel’s
time in support of their opinion to the contrary, it seems
entirely plausible that this image is a pointed criticism of
contemporary legal practice. The world depicted has been
reduced to an execution site. Nothing but wheels and gal-
lows appears on the horizon, and in front of them we see an
offender being burned at the stake. Bruegel shows us only
the accused and condemned; there is no sign of anyone
being favored by a decision of Justitia or protected by her
judgment from an unjust world. Justitia’s blindfold may be
intended to symbolize equality before the law, but we are
tempted to think that it prevents her from seeing the atroc-
ities committed in her name. Her determined impartiality
has turned into blindness.

For a final example of Bruegel’s ironic approach, look at
the Temperantia (Temperance). Once again a personification
of the virtue stands before us in the center of the picture
with her attributes, here a bridle, a clock, and eyeglasses.
Her right foot is resting on the vane of a windmill. Around
this central figure are various narrative groupings, some
representing the liberal arts. Two astronomers are trying to
measure the Earth and the distance between Earth and the
moon. However, they are thwarted because the planet is
turning on its own axis—indeed, the astronomer standing
on Earth and reaching toward the moon is close to falling
owing to the rotation. In this sheet Bruegel is declaring that
even though the virtue of temperance is the basis of all the
arts, none of them acknowledges its own limits. It is inter-
esting to note that he included both sculpture and painting
among the grouping of the liberal arts. At the left edge of
the composition we see a painter, furnished with palette
and maulstick and seated in front of a large easel. We are to
perceive this not only as a sign of the elevated status
Bruegel implicitly accorded to painting but also as an in-
dication of the high moral demands to which it is subjected.
In the secondary literature it has been suggested that the
men who are debating at the right are either theologians or
representatives of different creeds. The object of their
debate would thus be the book to their right, which has to
be the Bible.

In his presentation of Fides (Faith), Bruegel showed a
series of sacraments. In careful detail he depicted baptism,
confession, communion, and marriage, but the sermon, the
instruction to the faithful, is also given considerable atten-
tion. Fides herself is pointing to the Scriptures, upon which
the Dove of the Holy Ghost has settled. Bruegel empha-
sized the book and the dove by placing them at the inter-
section of diagonals—leading from the lower left to the
upper right and from the lower right to the upper left—
that draw the viewer’s attention to these details. This focus
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might suggest that Bruegel's message is that the Holy Ghost and the Scriptures inspired by him reveal to humanity the knowledge of God; they alone give us a true understanding of his salvation through Christ and the sacraments it imposes. However, we can also conclude from the emphasis on the Holy Ghost and the Scriptures that the artist was championing a spiritualist stance, one that values the reading of the Bible more highly than observance of the sacraments. In my view no definitive interpretation is possible.

In the allegory of Caritas (Charity) the focus is on compassionate works and active love for our fellow creatures, for perched atop the personification's head is the pelican, said to open its own breast to feed its offspring. The depiction of Prudentia (Prudence), here understood as judicious foresight, shows people preparing for the future in various ways. In the Fortitudo (Fortitude) men and women battle sins represented by the animals familiar from Bruegel's Seven Deadly Sins series. The engraving's inscription defines true strength as the ability to overcome our own weakness.

Bruegel's Virtues as well as his Seven Deadly Sins are more analytical than designs that treat these subjects by his contemporaries. His images not only tell us that we should emulate virtue and abhor vice, they also attempt to show us why.

**Pieter Bruegel the Elder**

64. *Fides* (*Faith*), 1559

Pen in brown ink; contours indented for transfer

22.5 x 29.5 cm (8 3/4 x 11 3/4 in.)

Signed and dated at lower right: *BRUEGEL 1559*; inscribed by the artist at lower center: *FIDES* (*Faith*); on cross at upper center, in reverse: *INRI*; by another hand in red-brown ink in lower margin: *fides maxime a nobis conservanda est praecipue in religionem, quia deus prior et potenter est quam homo* (Above all we must keep faith, particularly in respect to religion, for God comes before all, and is mightier than man)9

Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam  RP-T-1919-35
Provenance: Count Antoine-François Andréossy (1761–1828), Paris and Montauban; his heirs; their auction, Paris, April 13, 1864, no. 227 (lot with cat. nos. 70, 72, 74); Wilhelm Koller (d. 1871), Vienna (with cat. nos. 70, 71, 73); Pieter Langerhuizen Lzn (1839–1918), Crailoo and Amsterdam; his auction, Frederik Muller, Amsterdam, April 29, 1919, no. 118.


**Philips Galle**

**after Pieter Bruegel the Elder**

65. *Fides* (Faith), ca. 1559

Engraving; only state.

Inscribed at lower right: *Brugel Insu*; at lower center: *FIDES* (Faith); at lower left: *Cook ess*; on cross at upper center: *INRI*; in lower margin: *FIDES MAXIMAE A NOBIS CONSERVANDA EST PRAECIPUE IN RELIGIONEM. QVI DEVS PRIOR ET POTENTIOR QVI HUMAN HOMO.* (Above all we must keep faith, particularly in respect to religion, for God comes before all, and is mightier than man.)

Museum Boijmans Van Beuningen, Rotterdam Bdh 15038


Literature: Van Bastelaer 1908, no. 132; Brussels 1969, no. 31; Fehr 1970; Dolders 1987, no. 0701; Rotterdam 1988, no. 46; Tokyo 1989, no. 31; Van Bastelaer 1992, no. 132.
Pieter Bruegel the Elder

66. Caritas (Charity), 1559

Pen and dark brown ink; contours indented for transfer
22.4 x 29.9 cm (8 3/4 x 11 1/2 in.)
Signed and dated at lower left: BRÆGEL 1559; inscribed, possibly by another hand, at lower center: CAYRITAS (Charity); by another hand in red-brown ink in lower margin: Spe reris tibi accidere quod aliter accidit ita denuum excipiantur ad opem fremdam si sumpseris eius animus qui opem tunc in mali/constitutus implorat
(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); on verso: collection stamp of Franz Koenigs (Lugt 1023a)

On permanent loan to Museum Boijmans Van Beuningen, Rotterdam N 18

Provenance: Nicolaas Beets (1878–1963), Amsterdam; bought by Franz Koenigs (1881–1941), Haarlem, 1923; bought by Daniel George van Beuningen (1877–1955), Rotterdam, 1940; gift to Stichting Museum Boymans, Rotterdam, 1940.

Philips Galle
after Pieter Bruegel the Elder

67. Caritas (Charity), ca. 1559

Engraving; only state
22.2 x 28.9 cm (8 3/4 x 11 1/4 in.)
Inscribed at lower right: Bruegel. 1559; at lower center: CHARITAS
(Charity); H. cockesco.; in lower margin: SPERES TIBI
ACCIDERE QUOD ALTERI ACCIDIT. ITA DEMVM
EXCITABERIS AD OPEM FERENDAM/ SI SYMPSERIS
EIVS ANIMVM QVI OPEM TYNCE IN MALIS
CONSTITUTVS IMPLORAT. (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)

Museum Boijmans Van Beuningen, Rotterdam  BdH 15040

Provenance: Schloss-Museum, Gotha; their auction, C. G.
Boerner, Leipzig, May 21, 1933; bought by Johan Catharinus
Justus Bieren de Haan (1867–1951), Amsterdam; his bequest,
1951.

Literature: Van Bastelaer 1908, no. 134; Vienna 1967–68,
no. 55; Brussels 1969, no. 33; Dolders 1987, no. 070:3; Rotterdam
Pieter Bruegel the Elder

68. Prudentia (Prudence), 1559

Pen and dark brown ink; contours indented for transfer
22.5 x 29.8 cm (8 ½ x 11 ⅞ in.)
Signed and dated at lower left: BRUEGEL 1559; inscribed by the
artist at lower center: PRUDENCIAD (Prudence); by another hand
in red-brown ink in lower margin: Si prudens esse cupis in futurum
prospectum in ostende et quae possunt contingere animo tuo cuncta
propone (If you wish to be prudent, think always of the future and
keep everything in the forefront of your mind)

Musées Royaux des Beaux-Arts de Belgique–Koninklijke Musea
voor Schone Kunsten van België, Brussels Cat. de Grez 490

Provenance: Jean de Grez (d. 1910); given by his widow with
entire De Grez collection, 1911.

Literature: Tolnai 1935, no. 41; Van Gils 1940–42, vol. 3,
p. 69; Tolnay 1952, no. 59; Münz 1966, no. 144; Theuwissen 1968;
Berlin 1973, no. 72; Theuwissen 1979, pp. 176–77; Marijnissen et
al. 1988, p. 128; Mielke 1996, no. 47.
**Philips Galle**
**after Pieter Bruegel the Elder**

**69. Prudentia (Prudence), ca. 1559**

Engravings; first state of two
22.3 x 28.7 cm (8¾ x 11¾ in.)
Inscribed in cartouche at lower right: *Bruegel Inuentor*; at lower center: *PRUDENTIA*. (Prudence.); at lower left: *H. cock excu*; in lower margin: *SI PRVDENS ESSE CVPPIS, IN FVTVRVM PROSPECTVM IN OSTENDE, ET/ QVAE POSSYNT CONTINGERE, ANIMO TVO CVNCTA PROPONE. (If you wish to be prudent, think always of the future and keep everything in the forefront of your mind.)

Museum Boijmans Van Beuningen, Rotterdam BdH 15042

**Provenance:** Schloss-Museum, Gotha; their auction, C. G. Boerner, Leipzig, May 21, 1933; bought by Johan Catharinus Justus Bierens de Haan (1867–1951), Amsterdam; his bequest, 1951.

**Literature:** Van Bastelaer 1908, no. 136; Brussels 1969, no. 35; Dolders 1987, no. 07035; Rotterdam 1988, no. 49; Tokyo 1989, no. 35; Van Bastelaer 1992, no. 136.
Pieter Bruegel the Elder

70. Spes (Hope), 1559

Pen and dark brown ink; contours indented for transfer
22.4 x 29.5 cm (8 3/8 x 11 1/4 in.)
Signed and dated at lower right: BRUEGEL 1559; inscribed by the artist at lower center: SPES (Hope); by another hand in red-brown ink in lower margin: Eucundissima est spei persuasio et vite impermis Necessaria inter tot aerumnas penes[ue] intolerabili (Very pleasant is the conviction of hope and [it is] most necessary for life, amid many and almost unbearable hardships)

Staatliche Museen zu Berlin, Kupferstichkabinett KdZ 715

Provenance: Count Antoine-François Andréossy (1761–1828), Paris and Montauban; his heirs; their auction, Paris, April 13, 1864, no. 227 (lot with cat. nos. 64, 72, 74); Wilhelm Koller (d. 1872), Vienna (with cat. nos. 64, 72, 74).

Literature: Van Bastelaer and Hulin de Loo 1927, no. 94; Tolnai 1925, no. 42; Bock and Rosenberg 1930, p. 18; Van Gils 1940–42, vol. 3, p. 21; Tolnay 1952, no. 60; Bergström 1956; Winkler 1958, p. 102; Münz 1961, no. 145; Berlin 1975, no. 70; Brussels 1980, no. 29; Gibson 1981, p. 443; Marijnissen et al. 1988, p. 120; Tokyo 1995, no. 86; Mielke 1996, no. 48.
PHILIPS GALLE
AFTER PIETER BRUEGEL THE ELDER

71. *Spes* (Hope), ca. 1559

Engraving; only state
22.3 x 28.8 cm (8 3/4 x 11 in.)
Inscribed at lower left: *BRUGEL. INVS*; at lower center:
*SPES* (Hope); at lower right: *H. cock excu*; in lower margin:
*IVCVNDISSIMA EST SPEI PERSVASIO, ET VITAE IMPRIMIS NECESSARIA. INTER TOT AERVMNAS PENEOQUE INTOLERABILES.* (Very pleasant is the conviction of hope and [it is] most necessary for life, amid many and almost unbearable hardships.)

Museum Boijmans Van Beuningen, Rotterdam BdH 15039

PROVENANCE: Schloss Museum, Gotha; their auction, C. G. Boerner, Leipzig, May 21, 1933; bought by Johan Catharinus Justus Bierens de Haan (1867–1953), Amsterdam; his bequest, 1951.

LITERATURE: Van Bastelaer 1908, no. 133; Vienna 1967–68, no. 53; Brussels 1969, no. 32; Dolders 1987, no. 07012; Rotterdam 1988, no. 47; Tokyo 1989, no. 32; Van Bastelaer 1992, no. 133.
Pieter Bruegel the Elder

72. Justitia (Justice), 1559

Pen and gray-brown ink; contours indented for transfer
22.4 x 29.5 cm (8 3/4 x 11 3/4 in.)
Signed and dated at lower left: 1559 BREUDEL; inscribed by the artist at lower center: JUSTITIA (Justice); by another hand in red-brown ink in lower margin: Scopus legis est aut ut eum quem punit emendet aut poena eius caeteros meliores reddet aut sublatis malis ceteris secundiores ovant (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); on verso: collection stamp of Wilhelm Koller (Lugt 2632)

Bibliothèque Royale de Belgique, Cabinet des Estampes, Brussels S. II 133 707 folio C

Provenance: Count Antoine-François Andréossy (1761–1838), Paris and Montauban; his heirs; their auction, Paris, April 13, 1864, no. 237 (lot with cat. nos. 64, 70, 74); Wilhelm Koller (d. 1871), Vienna (with cat. nos. 64, 70, 74); Freiherr Adalbert von Lanna (1836–1909), Prague; his auction, H. G. Gutkunst, Stuttgart, May 6–11, 1910.

PHILIPS GALLE
AFTER PIETER BRUEGEL THE ELDER

73. Justitia (Justice), ca. 1559

Engraving; only state
22.3 x 28.7 cm (8 3/4 x 11 3/8 in.)
Inscribed at lower center: JUSTICIA (Justice); in lower margin: SCOPVS LEGIS EST AVT VT EV[M] QVE[M] PVNIT EMENDET AVT POENA EIVS CAETEROS MELIORES REDDET AVT SVBLATIS MALIS CAETERI SECVRIORES VIVA[N]T. (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.)

Museum Boijmans Van Beuningen, Rotterdam BdH 15041

PROVENANCE: Schloss-Museum, Gotha; their auction, C. G. Boerner, Leipzig, May 21, 1933; bought by Johan Catharinus Justus Bierens de Haan (1867–1951), Amsterdam; his bequest, 1951.

LITERATURE: Van Bastelaer 1908, no. 135; Vienna 1967–68, no. 52; Brussels 1969, no. 34; Brussels 1971, no. 90; Dolders 1987, no. 0704; Rotterdam 1988, no. 50; Tokyo 1989, no. 34; Van Bastelaer 1992, no. 135.
Pieter Bruegel the Elder

74. Fortitudo (Fortitude), 1560

Pen and brown ink; contours indented for transfer
22.5 x 29.5 cm (8 3/4 x 11 3/8 in.)
Signed at lower left: BRUEGEL; dated at lower right: 1560;
inscribed at lower center: FORTITUDO (Fortitude); in left
portion of lower margin: two lines of fantasy letters; on verso:
collection stamp of Wilhelm Koller (Lugt 2632) and of Franz
Koenigs (Lugt suppl. 1023a)

On permanent loan to Museum Boijmans Van Beuningen,
Rotterdam

Provenance: Count Antoine-François Andréossy (1761–
1838), Paris and Montauban; his heirs; their auction, Paris,
April 13, 1864, no. 237 (lot with cat. nos. 64, 70, 72); Wilhelm
Koller (d. 1871), Vienna (with cat. nos. 64, 70, 72); his auction,
Posonyi, Vienna, February 5, 1872, no. 61; M. Strauss; his auction,
Mietzke, Vienna, May 3, 1906, no. 19; Edwin Czechowicka,
Vienna; his auction, Paul Graupe and C. G. Boerner, Berlin,
May 12, 1910; bought by Franz Koenigs (1881–1944), Haarlem;
bought by Daniel George van Beuningen (1877–1953), Rotterdam,
1940; gift to Stichting Museum Boymans, Rotterdam, 1940.

Literature: Benesch 1927; Tolnay 1935, p. 102, no. 8; Van Gils
1940–42, vol. 3, p. 79; Tolnay 1952, no. 63; Münz 1961, no. 147;
Berlin 1975, no. 73; Brussels 1980, no. 33; Marijnissen et al. 1988,
p. 129; Mielske 1996, no. 50.
PHILIPS GALLE
AFTER PIETER BRUEGEL THE ELDER

75. Fortitudo (Fortitude), ca. 1560

Engraving; first state of two
22.3 x 28.7 cm (8⅞ x 11¾ in.)
Inscribed at lower right: BRUEGEL INVENTOR; at lower center: FORTITVDO: (Fortitude ·); at lower left: [Cock] exx; in lower margin: ANIMVM VINCERE, IRACVNDIAM COHIBERE, CAETERAQ(VE) VITIA ET, AFFECTVS/ COHIBERE, VERA FORTITVDO EST. (To conquer one’s impulses, to restrain anger and the other vices and emotions: this is the true fortitude.)

Museum Boijmans Van Beuningen, Rotterdam  BdH 15044

PROVENANCE: Schloss-Museum, Gotha; their auction, C. G. Boerner, Leipzig, May 21, 1933; bought by Johan Catharinus Justus Bieren de Haan (1867–1951), Amsterdam; his bequest, 1951.

LITERATURE: Van Bastelaer 1908, no. 137; Brussels 1969, no. 36; Dolders 1987, no. 070/6; Rotterdam 1988, no. 51; Tokyo 1989, no. 36; Van Bastelaer 1992, no. 137.
Pieter Bruegel the Elder

76. Temperantia (Temperance), 1560

Pen and brown ink; contours indented for transfer
22.5 x 29.5 cm (8¼ x 11¾ in.)
Signed at lower left: BRUEGEL; dated on board (?) at lower right: 1560; inscribed on hem of woman's dress at lower center, in reverse:
TEMORANCI (Temperance); by another hand in red-brown ink in lower margin: Videndum ut nec voluptati dediti prodigi
et Luxuriosi appareamus nec avara tenacitati sordidi aut obscuri
exitamus (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)

Museum Boijmans Van Beuningen, Rotterdam  MB 331

Provenance: Pierre Wouters (ca. 1702–1797), Lierre; his
auction, Demarneff, Brussels, November 16–18, 1801; Frans Jacob
Otto Boijmans (1767–1847), Utrecht; his bequest, 1847.

Literature: Lamme 1832, no. 196; Lamme 1869, no. 55; Van
Bastelaer and Hulin de Loo 1907, no. 95; Tolnai 1925, no. 44;
Benesch 1927, p. 4; Enklaar 1940, pp. 77–89; Tolnay 1952, no. 63;
Münz 1961, no. 148; White 1969; Berlin 1975, no. 74; Winner 1979,
p. 201; Brussels 1980, no. 34; Gibson 1981, pp. 426–17; Marijnissen
et al. 1988, p. 130; New York–Fort Worth–Cleveland 1990–91,
no. 18; Mori 1991–92; Serebrennikov 1995, pp. 231–35; Mielke
1996, no. 51.
Philips Galle
after Pieter Bruegel the Elder

77. Temperantia (Temperance), ca. 1560

Engraving; only state
22.3 x 38.7 cm (8 1/4 x 15 in.)
Inscribed at lower right: BRUEGEL; on hem of woman's dress at lower center: TEMPERANTIA (Temperance); in lower margin: VIDENDUM, VT NEC VOLVPTATI DEDITI PRODIGI ET LUXURIOSI APPAREAMVS, NEC AVARA TENACITATE SORDIDI AVT OBSCVRI EXISTAMVS (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)
Museum Boijmans Van Beuningen, Rotterdam 15043

Provenance: Schloss-Museum, Gotha; their sale, C. G. Boerner, Leipzig, May 21, 1933; bought by Johan Catharinus Justus Bierens de Haan (1867-1951), Amsterdam; his bequest, 1951.


In 1559, a year after he had completed the group of The Seven Deadly Sins (cat. nos. 42-54) and The Last Judgment (cat. nos. 56, 57), Bruegel started work on their logical sequel, the series of Seven Virtues. The sins, or vices, and the virtues Bruegel portrayed are no randomly chosen collection of human transgressions and merits but stand in a well-defined theological tradition that originated in the early Middle Ages. The Seven Virtues are character traits considered by the Catholic Church to be the core of the ethically sound conduct of every Christian on earth, and as
such prerequisites for access to heaven at the final judgment on doomsday. These virtues are divided into two categories. To the first and most highly valued group belong the theological virtues Faith, Hope, and Charity, which are named in a passage in the New Testament (1 Cor. 13:13) and are the purest Christian merits. The second group, the cardinal virtues, is made up of Justice, Prudence, Fortitude, and Temperance. Bruegel does not seem to have arranged the virtues in his series according to any such hierarchy, and their order of presentation here is the chronological sequence in which the preparatory drawings are generally thought to have been made.9

There are several marked differences between The Seven Deadly Sins and The Seven Virtues, the most immediately striking of which is presented by their settings. As Jürgen Müller notes in his introductions to the series, The Seven Deadly Sins are dominated by fantastic imagery in the manner of Hieronymus Bosch that offers no suggestion of actual time and place, whereas The Seven Virtues are shown in surroundings that any contemporary of Bruegel would immediately have recognized as his own. The Virtues are, however, entirely abstract, and, as many scholars have noted, show several iconographic peculiarities that strongly resemble features in late medieval French miniatures.10 Although there is no proof pointing to any specific sources to which Bruegel may have had access, it is clear that strong traditions in late medieval iconography that continued until well into the sixteenth century left their mark on him. While the master relied on traditional models for his choice of attributes and iconographic references, his presentation of abstract personifications in realistic, contemporary settings was innovative. Like the rhetoricians of his time who wrote the moralizing redereijker dramas, Bruegel deliberately chose to insert his complicated subjects in familiar, everyday surroundings to allow viewers to readily identify with the instructive intention of his allegories.11

If the concepts of The Seven Virtues and The Seven Deadly Sins are entirely different in both intellectual scope and choice of imagery, the style and technique of the drawings for the two series are quite similar. Although Bruegel's handling of the pen is perhaps even subtler and is certainly more effective in convincingly grouping human figures in the Virtues, his linear and graphic manner of creating a preparatory design for the engraver remained the same in both sets. It is thus intriguing to see that the prints of the Sins, carried out by Pieter van der Heyden, are so different from the present unsigned engravings, which must be by Philips Galle. Indeed, Louis Lebœuf's attribution to Galle in the Brussels exhibition catalogue of 1969 is entirely convincing, for the Virtues are comparable to signed works by Galle after Bruegel, such as The Death of the Virgin (cat. no. 117), and after other masters as well.12 Where Van der Heyden's faithful rendering of the original drawings is linear, Galle's approach is tonal and pictorial. With subtly engraved cross- and parallel hatching, Galle created endless shades of gray and black that suggest volume and texture. These results, visible especially in the rare early and beautifully printed impressions from Rotterdam, place the Virtues among the best engravings made in Antwerp in the second half of the sixteenth century. Admittedly, these velvety surfaces and tonal qualities are far less true to the character of Bruegel's drawings than are Van der Heyden's linear renditions. This deviation from the originals is perhaps partly a consequence of the fact that Galle engraved the plates in Haarlem, far from the control of Bruegel and his publisher, Hieronymus Cock, who were in Antwerp. Yet both Bruegel and Cock were familiar with Galle's manner of engraving and may have chosen him above Van der Heyden precisely for this manner and for his greater technical proficiency.

The same hand, which was certainly not Bruegel's, that added Dutch verses to the drawings and prints of The Seven Deadly Sins inscribed the two lines of Latin that appear in the bottom margin of each sheet of the Virtues. It is tempting to see these Latin texts, as well as the Latin and Dutch inscriptions on The Seven Deadly Sins, as the contribution of the moralist, playwright, and engraver Dirck Volckertsz. Coornhert. In fact, it is even more enticing to make this attribution in the case of the Virtues, for their texts are more abstract than those of the other set and are even closer to the moral opinions Coornhert expressed in his writings. Furthermore, Coornhert lived in Haarlem, where the drawings would have been sent for Galle to work from: it would have been easy for Galle to have Coornhert, who was not only a fellow townsman but also his close friend and tutor, write a few appropriate lines in the empty margins of the sheets. Another possible candidate is Hadrianus Junius, the town physician of Haarlem and a well-known scholar, who often composed verses for prints published by Cock and engraved by Galle between 1555 and 1570. Interestingly, the Virtues do not bear Dutch verses, while The Seven Deadly Sins do, and why Cock chose not to add them here is unknown. We can perhaps suppose he realized that the audience he wished to attract had mastered Latin, the lingua franca of the European world of humanists and scholars. There may have been a practical reason as well: the Latin verses are far longer here than in The Seven Deadly Sins and simply left little room for Dutch translations.
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1. Translations of the Latin verses are based on those provided in Tokyo 1989.

2. A second state without the address of Hieronymus Cock described by Van Bastelaer probably does not exist.

3. Only one state of this print is traditionally described, but Nadine M. Orenstein has discovered a second state, in which punctuation marks have been added to the inscriptions. These include a period at the end of the inscription in the lower margin, a period at the end of the word PRIVIDENTIA under the figure, and an accent over the V in that word. The first state impression in the Bibliothèque Royale de Belgique, Cabinet des Estampes, Brussels (S. II 135124), has the changes that characterize the second state added by hand in brown ink.

4. No copies of a proof state without the crossbar of the A in Vita described by Lebeer (in Brussels 1969) have been found. The present Rotterdam sheet seems to be one of the earliest impressions extant and still shows the lightly etched preparatory lines inserted to aid the engraver in incising the verses in the margin.

5. Only one state of this print is traditionally described, but Nadine M. Orenstein has discovered a second state, in which punctuation marks have been added to the inscriptions. These include commas after each appearance of the word COHIBERE, a period at the end of the word FORTITVDO under the figure, and an accent over the V in that word. A first state impression in the Bibliothèque Royale de Belgique, Cabinet des Estampes, Brussels (S. II 135130), has the changes that characterize the second state added by hand in brown ink.

6. Only one state of this print is traditionally described but Nadine M. Orenstein has discovered a second state, in which the final I in the word TENACIITAT has been changed to an E. A first state impression in the Bibliothèque Royale de Belgique, Cabinet des Estampes, Brussels (S. II 135131), has this alteration added by hand in brown ink.

7. The copperplates of the Virtues were listed in the 1601 inventory of Hieronymus Cock’s widow, Volckert Dieticae, as “Acht copere plaeten van de 7 Duyckden” (eight copperplates of the seven Virtues); Duverger 1984, p. 39. Nadine M. Orenstein convincingly suggests that the plates of The Virtues were kept together with the plate of The Descent of Christ into Limbo (see entry for cat. nos. 67, 89). The stock of eight printed sheets of the seven Virtues (‘Acht Historiën van de 7 Duizenden van achten’) cited in the inventory (Duverger 1984, p. 31) may refer to Bruegel’s series as well.

8. On this tradition, see O’Reilly 1986. See further remarks and bibliographical references in the entries for cat. nos. 42, 54, 56, 57.


10. See the remarks on individual drawings in Tolnai 1925, Van Gelder and Borns 1939, and Serebrennikov 1986, among others. A well-documented and frequently illustrated example is Temperance; see Luijtgen and Meijs in New York–Fort Worth–Cleveland 1990–91, no. 18.

11. The influence of rederijkers and painters on each other’s works in this period is discussed in Gibson 1981.


Pieter van der Heyden
after Pieter Bruegel the Elder

78. The Stone Operation or The Witch of Mallegem, 1559

Engraving; third state of nine
35.5 x 48 cm (14 x 18 1/2 in.)
Inscribed at lower center: H COCK EXCVD.CVM
PRIVILEGIO. 1559.; on panel hanging from egg on right:
P bruegel insenator; on banner in background: ...Jan kernakel;
on jar at lower left: bonich (honey)
The Hearn Family Trust


A quack doctor stands before a table as he performs an operation to remove a stone from a man’s forehead. The ludicrous, coarse-faced inhabitants of the town flock from all sides to the doctor to have the same surgery. An assistant pours water from a jug into the hole left by the stone that has been taken out of another man’s head. A man under the table with a lock on his mouth and holding up a stone provides a key to the meaning of the scene: he is a fool who reveals his identity by means of the bauble of a fool hidden in his sleeve.

Bruegel’s design for this large print of 1559 is not known, but we can assume it must have resembled the drawing for The Alchemist (cat. no. 60), an equally large engraving dating from about the same time. The traditional name of the print, The Witch of Mallegem (loosely translatable as the witch of “Crazyham” or “Foolsville”), taken from an inscription that was added to the sheet some forty years after it was made, was probably not the title originally intended. The inventory of the possessions of the widow of Hieronymus Cock, the print’s initial publisher, testifies to this: it lists the copperplate simply as a Keysnyer (stonecutter) by Bruegel, referring to the operation performed by the doctor. The margin at the bottom, where the inscription would normally be found, was left blank when the print was made to accommodate French or Flemish texts that were printed on separate sheets and cut and pasted onto the engraving. A rare impression in Rome still bears an attached inscription in Flemish of this kind that dates from Bruegel’s time (fig. 91) and gives the doctor the name Meester Snotolf (Master Snotnose). The inscription, which makes reference to details in the image, such as the assistant holding up a lantern for the doctor, was clearly written to accompany the print. The only inscription originally included on the plate to enhance the scene appears on the mostly illegible banners in the background, which are probably meant to be testimonials to the doctor’s work. One of them is signed Jan Kernakel, a play on the word akel, which means injury or damage.

The theme of the print is folly. Foolish people were said to have stones in their heads, and thus the operation that
removed a stone from an individual's head, a popular subject in sixteenth-century art and theater, was supposed to be a cure for folly. Several proverbs of the period relating to folly have been worked into this image, which shows the charlatans who perform the surgery and their patients as equally ridiculous. The figures bringing wheat to the mill in the background refer to a number of Flemish proverbs that relate mills and foolish behavior, such as "He has been to the mill," meaning that he is insane. The pod that grows out of the hollow egg on the right may allude to the proverb "When the beans are abloom, the fools are not wise." The egg that contains a man performing a stone removal has been a topic of some discussion. One theory regarding this detail notes that the Flemish for "egg yolks," daren, can also mean fools and that this foolish operation is taking the place of the yolk.  

1. The latest date of the inscription can be deduced from the style of its lettering, which is not characteristic of the lettering on the prints published by Hieronymus Cock during Bruegel's lifetime but rather of that on prints of the later states of Cock's prints published by the Galle family after 1600.  
3. The blank margins have been cut away from many examples of the print.  
4. I thank Mark Meadow for his help on the translations.  
5. "Ick sal u siet lichten met desen Lanteerm." (I will illuminate your sight with this lantern.)  
9. Ibid., pp. 48–52.  
Joannes and Lucas van Doetecum after Pieter Bruegel the Elder

79. Kermis of Saint George, ca. 1559

Etching with engraving; first state of three
33.2 x 52.3 cm (13¼ x 20¼ in.)

Inscribed on tavern sign: dit is in die kro[en] (this is the crown); on banner: laet die boeren haer kermis bouwen (let the peasants have their kermis); near lower center: H. COCK EXCVDERAT; at lower right corner: BRVEGEL INVENTOR

Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam RP–P–08–7368

Literature: Van Bastelaer 1908, no. 207; Brussels 1969, no. 52 (as Hieronymus Cock); Marijnissen et al. 1988, p. 114; Tokyo 1989, no. 52; Nalis 1998, no. 219.

At a kermis, or outdoor village fair, people dance and drink. Near the center of the background a procession moves into the church. In the left background a fight has broken out among men with raised swords and knives. Two men stand in the foreground; one of them looks out at the viewer as he points toward the scene.

Although unsigned, this large print after an unknown drawing by Bruegel can securely be given to the brothers Joannes and Lucas van Doetecum. It is the only print they executed after Bruegel following The Large Landscapes (cat. nos. 22–34), their major project with him, completed about three years earlier. Whereas other printmakers made engravings after Bruegel’s designs, the Doetecums used etching with which they imitated the look of engraved lines when they worked after the master and other artists as well. The etching medium allowed them to build up the composition in stages and thus indicate light and shadow by varying the depth of lines rather than by changing the pattern of hatching. The overall light speckling, most apparent in the sky and the otherwise blank areas of the foreground of the present print, is the result of minor problems that occurred at an early stage in the etching process. Small areas of the speckling were burnished away here and there to clean spaces for the addition of details—most obviously in the area around the windmill on the horizon—as the design was etched onto the copperplate.

The Kermis of Saint George is in the tradition of the numerous and often large-format prints showing peasant festivals produced by Antwerp artists in the 1550s and 1560s. Bruegel probably designed this large print about 1559, at roughly the same time he made his drawing for the related Kermis at Hoboken (cat. no. 80) and Pieter van der Borch, an Antwerp competitor, etched his Peasant Kermis (fig. 92). The motto on the banner in the present work—“let the peasants have their kermis”—repeats the last line of Van der Borch’s inscription, suggesting that Bruegel created the drawing for his print in response to Van der Borch’s equally large Kermis. The two images contrast dramatically with each other. The rough gestures of the crude dancers on the left of Van der Borch’s composition can hardly be distinguished from the brusque movements of the fighting peasants on the right; in Bruegel’s scene, however, the genre’s traditional element of fighting is relegated to the background, and the games, dances, and drinking that take center stage show none of the vulgarity that characterizes the same activities in the other print. Bruegel seems to have been demonstrating how much more subtly than Van der Borch he could treat the subject.

Bruegel’s depictions of kermises have given rise to a large body of scholarship debating whether the artist wished to convey a positive or negative view of peasants and their customs. The pronouncedly negative depiction of peasants in Van der Borch’s Kermis contrasts so markedly with the rendering in Bruegel’s Saint George that we must wonder whether the intent of the two artists was the same. Although their attitudes may initially appear different, we must look further, for it is impossible to consider Bruegel’s work without placing it in the context of the many negative images of peasants that preceded it and with which Bruegel and his public were certainly familiar. Moreover, Bruegel often made his points indirectly, and it has recently been proposed that he manipulated the compositions of his paintings of peasant life so that the viewer is drawn into the image slowly, taking in more and more details and reaching ever deeper levels of recognition and response. This is an analysis that might well be applied to the Kermis of Saint George: here the festival initially appears rather peaceful and pleasant, but two foreground figures rarely mentioned in the literature force us to alter our interpretation of the portrayal. One is a man who seems to be mocking the participants in the celebrations, as he looks out toward the viewer, exclaims to his companion, and points to the scene before them. Even more telling is the presence of the fool, who walks before the cart in the foreground and is followed by several children. The ubiquitous symbol of foolish behavior, he sports a basket on his shoulders
that almost obscures the points of his foolscap. Thus, we can easily fail to identify him at first; only after we closely examine the details of the image do we realize what he is, comprehend what other motifs may mean, adjust our understanding of Bruegel's seemingly appreciative view, and finally recognize its darker, more traditional negative tone.

The Kermis of Saint George was reprinted by Volckken Dierix, the widow of Hieronymus Cock, the original publisher, and after her death it was reissued by French publishers well into the seventeenth century—a history that testifies to the print's long-lasting popularity.\(^7\)

1. It was first attributed by Delen (1934–35, vol. 2, p. 66) to Hieronymus Cock. Oberhuber (in Vienna 1967–68, pp. 64–65) gave it to the Master of the Saint George's Kermis, who he thought might be one of the Doetecums. Riggs (1977, pp. 140–46) was the first to analyze the style of the Doetecum brothers and attribute to them this print and a number of other unsigned etchings published by Cock.

2. This is a technique for which they later became well known; see Nalis 1998, pp. xi–xii.

3. The genre was derived from earlier depictions by Nuremberg printmakers, most notably Sebald Beham's large woodcut the Peasant Kermis, 1535. For an analysis of Beham's print, see Moxey 1989, pp. 35–66; for summaries and analyses of the Netherlandish tradition of such prints, see Raupp 1986, pp. 195–321, and Amsterdam 1997, pp. 44–48, no. 1.

4. A clear summary of the arguments is provided in Gibson 1991, pp. 21–35.


6. The basket was often associated with gluttony; see Bax (1979, pp. 219–22), who, however, does not supply a satisfactory meaning for the basket in this print.

7. In the 1601 inventory of Volckken Dierix's possessions the print was listed as "een coperen plaetie van een Boerenkermisse van Brugel" (a copperplate of a peasant kermis by Bruegel); Duverger 1984, p. 28. The publisher of the third state was Pierre Bertrand, who was active in Paris from the 1640s until the 1670s; see Préaud et al. 1987, pp. 53–54.
Frans Hogenberg (ca. 1540–ca. 1590)

after Pieter Bruegel the Elder

80. Kermis at Hoboken, ca. 1559

Etching with engraving; first state of four
29.8 x 40.8 cm (11 3/16 x 16 1/8 in.)
Inscribed on banner: Dit is de Gulde van hoboken (This is the Guild of hoboken); on barrel at lower left: FHB [monogram]; at lower right: Bruegel; in lower margin: Die boeren verblyven hun in suiken vasten To dansen springhen en drenckendrinken als drusten. / Sye moeten die kermissen onderbouwren Al souwen sy vaste en sturen van kauwen. (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.) Bartolomeus de Mompere. Excv.

Mr. and Mrs. Julian I. Edison

Literature: Van Bastelaer 1908, no. 208; Brussels 1969, no. 30;
Monbaliu 1974; Monbaliu 1987; Tokyo 1989, no. 10; Saint Louis–Cambridge (Mass.) 1995, no. 55; Amsterdam 1997, no. 1.

The setting is a town square with a church and an inn. Religious processions take place in the background and secular pursuits—dancing, drinking, and games, including a shooting competition—occupy the foreground.

This etching, which is based on a drawing by Bruegel in London dated 1559 (fig. 55), is the only print after the master made by Frans Hogenberg and published by Bartholomeus de Mompere, one of Hieronymus Cock’s Antwerp competitors. Hogenberg’s work is in general sketchier than that of Pieter van der Heyden, Frans Huys, and Philips Galle, and his rendering here is less faithful and more schematic than that in the prints executed after Bruegel by these other engravers. Hogenberg traced the outlines of Bruegel’s drawing, but he did not closely follow the articulation of the details—the delineation of the foliage and the character of many of the faces, for example. Moreover, a cross was inserted at the head of the procession entering the church, a clear but minor addition. The pigs around the figure of the monk in the right background as well as the man kneeling in front of the other procession, present in the drawing and still visible in this impression, which is the first state, were removed in the second state. Why such seemingly insignificant changes were made is difficult to determine.

Bruegel may have felt that he could depart from his otherwise exclusive relationship with his publisher Hieronymus Cock to make this print because Cock had issued a closely related etching, the Kermis of Saint George (cat. no. 79). Indeed, the fairs in the two prints look as though they are taking place on the same stage set: the church with a row of market stalls leading up to the doorway, the stage in the background, the tavern, the cart, and the placement of the buildings in each are similar, and in each there is a banner that refers to the shooters’ guild, the guild of Saint George. These shared features and the execution of the sheet in London, which is somewhat looser than that of Bruegel’s other designs for prints, led some scholars to doubt Bruegel’s authorship of the drawing and characterize it as a copy after the print. However, it has recently been accepted without reservation. The Kermis at Hoboken is often presumed to predate the Kermis of Saint George. A comparison of Bruegel’s drawing for the Hoboken with the print of the Saint George offers no hint of which work might have been made first. But it seems more likely that the Hoboken is the later sheet, for Bruegel probably would have carried out his work for Cock first and then designed a similar print for another publisher.

Like many of Bruegel’s peasant scenes, the Kermis at Hoboken has prompted a great deal of discussion regarding the artist’s intended meaning. A clue to this meaning may reside in an unusual detail—the inclusion of the name of a contemporary town, Hoboken, on the banner in both the print and its design. Each year Hoboken held several festivals that were often enjoyed by residents of the nearby city of Antwerp. Attempts have been made to place the drawing

Fig. 92. Pieter van der Borcht. Peasant Kermis, 1559. Engraving. The Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York, Purchase, A. Hyatt Mayor Purchase Fund, Marjorie Phelps Starr Bequest, Barbara and Howard Fox Gift and Charles Z. Offin Fund, 2000-2000-437
and the print in the context of two events involving the
town that occurred in 1559, the date inscribed on the draw-
ing. That year the ownership of Hoboken changed hands,7
and Philip II of Spain issued a decree limiting the celebra-
tion of kermises to a single day per year. Thus, the image
has been seen as a plea to the new lords of Hoboken to
keep the peasant festivals as they were and allow them to
go forward as often as in the past.8

Yet in the tradition of Netherlandish peasant scenes,
Bruegel included features that reveal a negative view of
the proceedings: the fool walking with two children in the
foreground, the pigs, often associated with greed, and
the scornful inscription regarding peasants “drinking them-
selves drunk as beasts.”9 This inscription and the one on
the Saint George are versions of the text in the margin of
Pieter van der Borcht’s Peasant Kermis (fig. 92), also pub-
lished by De Mompere; in fact, the inscription here para-
phrases the first two lines of Van der Borcht’s even more
contemptuous commentary: “The drunkards rejoice in such
festivals, brawling and fighting and drinking themselves
drunk as beasts.” However, the Kermis at Hoboken is a
relatively peaceful image that presents no fighting, in dra-
matic contrast to the Van der Borcht, in which a wild brawl
has broken out among the peasants, whose violent gestures
are repeated in the brusque movements of the dancers. Per-
haps De Mompere issued two large variations on this very
popular subject as counterpoints to each other that would
appeal to different elements of the market. And he may
have added the derisive inscription to Bruegel’s picture to
make it fit in with the sort of prints he normally produced.

1. Mielke 1996, no. 44.
2. The monogram FHR on the barrel at the left of the image, identified as a
brewer’s mark by Van Bastelaer and as standing for “Frans Huys Bruegel”
by Delen (1934–35, vol. 2, p. 74), was identified by Lebeer (in Brussels 1969,
no. 30) as signifying Frans Hogenberg.
3. Monhalius (1974) identified the cross as a new element that set it apart
from the drawing. Luijten (in Amsterdam 1997) recognized that both the
pigs and the man kneeling were removed in a previously unrecognized
second state.
5. However, the only detail that is almost identical in both prints is the pair of
bagpipe players who appear in the upper left of the Kermis at Hoboken and,
in reverse, in the lower right in the Saint George print.
Pieter Bruegel the Elder

81. The Rabbit Hunt, 1560

Pen and brown ink and black chalk
21.3 x 19.6 cm (8 3/8 x 7 7/8 in.)
Signed and dated at lower left: BRUEGEL 1560
Collection Frits Lugt, Institut Néerlandais, Paris 6959
Provenance: Auction, Sotheby's, London, June 26, 1957, no. 3; Frits Lugt (Lugt 1028).
Literature: Boon 1992, no. 45 (as after Bruegel); Mielke 1996, no. 53.

Pieter Bruegel the Elder

82. The Rabbit Hunt, 1560

Etching; first state of two
22.3 x 29.1 cm (8 3/4 x 11 1/8 in.)
Inscribed at lower left: BRUEGEL 1560; in sky at right: H: cock exec
Private collection

On a hillside by an expansive river valley, a hunter accompanied by his dog aims his crossbow at two small rabbits. A second man, with a spear, circles around the tree behind him. The image of the hunter training his weapon on the rabbits may relate to an old proverb: "He who pursues two rabbits at once, will lose both." But the significance of the man with a spear is less clear and even ominous. What is his purpose? Is the hunter himself being hunted? The Rabbit Hunt presents the sort of ambiguity common to Bruegel’s work.

The drawing of The Rabbit Hunt, long considered a copy after a lost preparatory drawing for the print, has only recently been accepted as an original by the master. The execution of the drawing, which is broad but stiff in parts, was responsible for its sometime dismissal as a copy. But in reading the sheet to Bruegel’s oeuvre, Mielke pointed out that it shares qualities of handling, such as the free sketching of the background vista and the loose description of the foliage, typical of the artist’s drawings. The unusual appearance of the work may be a result of an unusual preparation—perhaps it was traced from another drawing—or of its rare function within the artist’s oeuvre as a sketch in preparation for his own etching. After he had worked out the composition in this drawing, Bruegel made many changes to the positions of the mountains and trees in the print—which he may have carried out right on the surface of the copperplate. Mielke has suggested that lines around the archer and on the dog are darker than those of the rest of the drawing because Bruegel himself went over them. It has also been proposed that they may have been reinforced by a later hand. 3

The Rabbit Hunt was the only print Bruegel executed himself and it ranks with some of his finest landscapes. 4 Akin to drawing on the surface of the printing plate, the technique of etching allowed Bruegel to return to the graphic vocabulary of dots and dashes he had used in earlier landscapes, such as the Landscape with Fortified City (cat. no. 10); because he was making the etching he could eschew the controlled and detailed style he had adopted in recent designs for prints meant to be followed line for line by professional engravers. Here Bruegel almost completely eliminated outlines, creating with flicked strokes a vivid sense of atmosphere and light and a deep recession into space that are particularly marked in strongly printed early impressions. In terms of effects of light and atmosphere, the etching anticipates such paintings as The Hunters in the Snow and The Return of the Herd of 1565 (Kunsthistorisches Museum, Vienna), in which the particular character of
diurnal and seasonal light plays a strong role. In its compositional formulation of a small foreground piece of land overlooking a valley that plunges into the distance, it resembles some of The Large Landscapes prints of about 1555–56 (cat. nos. 23, 25–34). Indeed, Bruegel’s decision to etch *The Rabbit Hunt* in 1560 may have been inspired by his renewed dealings about this time with the etchers of The Large Landscapes, the Doetecum brothers, who made the print of the *Kernis of Saint George* about 1559 (cat. no. 79). The reinclusion of the present drawing in Bruegel’s oeuvre—together with the removal from that corpus of the group of small landscape drawings now given to Jacob Savery (see cat. nos. 126–129), many falsely dated about 1560—has enhanced the prominence of both the drawing and print of *The Rabbit Hunt* in Bruegel’s work. The sheet and the drawing on the etching plate now appear to be among the artist’s last drawn landscapes, carried out some five years after the designs for The Large Landscapes.

**Pieter Bruegel the Elder**

**83. Journey to Emmaus, ca. 1560**

Pen and gray and brown-gray ink, reworked in pen and gray ink by a later hand, traces of framing line in brown ink at upper left and lower left 24.4 x 37.3 cm (9 5/8 x 14 1/2 in.) Inscribed in pen and brown ink at lower left: *bruegel;* possibly by a late sixteenth–century hand in red chalk on verso: *bruegel;* by same hand? in black chalk on verso: *BRUEG... [partly illegible];* on verso: collection stamp of Franz Koenigs (Lugt 1023a)

On permanent loan to Museum Boijmans Van Beuningen, Rotterdam N 86

**Provenance:** bought by Franz Koenigs (1881–1941), Haarlem, 1926; bought by Daniel George van Beuningen (1877–1955), Rotterdam, 1940; gift to Stichting Museum Boymans, Rotterdam, 1940.

**Literature:** Münz 1961, no. A23 (as Jan Brueghel); Haverkamp-Begemann 1964, p. 58 (as not Jan Brueghel); Royalton-Kisch 2000.

The attribution of a drawing to Pieter Bruegel is a rare event indeed.¹ In recent decades large groups of drawings, such as the Alpine views by the Master of the Mountain Landscapes (see cat. nos. 120–125) and the *naer het leven* series (see cat. nos. 130–134), as well as many individual sheets, have been removed from his accepted oeuvre. However, only a mere handful of works has been added to the small corpus of drawings given to the master—a group that at present comprises just sixty-one examples. It was the late Hans Mielke, the eminent connoisseur of Bruegel as a draftsman, who in his posthumously published 1996 catalogue attributed to the master such drawings as the *Pastoral Landscape* from Oslo (cat. no. 3), the previously unknown *Wooded Landscape with a Distant View toward the Sea* in Cambridge, Massachusetts (cat. no. 14), and *The Rabbit Hunt* in the Collection Frits Lugt, Institut Néerlandais, Paris (cat. no. 81).² With the reassessment of *The Rabbit Hunt* as an original work by Bruegel—it had long been considered a copy after a print by him—a new sketchy type of landscape drawing entered the oeuvre of the master (see entry for cat. nos. 81, 82).

Mielke came to his conclusion about the present sheet, which is now generally accepted, at a late stage of his research;³ he had no time before his death in 1994 to determine whether other drawings thought to be from the circle of Bruegel were close in style to the Lugt drawing and could thus be reattributed as originals by the hand of the master. In the course of preparatory research for this catalogue, however, Martin Royalton-Kisch realized that the *Journey to Emmaus*, which had been kept among the anonymous drawings from the circle of Jan Brueghel in the collection of the Museum Boijmans Van Beuningen, Rotterdam, might be from the same hand as *The Rabbit Hunt*. A side-by-side comparison of the two drawings revealed that they could only be by the same artist.

The two works are strikingly similar in style as well as in their use of compositional elements. Like the Paris
The present sheet shows three figures in a landscape with a wide river valley. It probably represents The Journey to Emmaus, when, as reported in the Gospel of Luke (24:23–35), the resurrected Christ walked with two of his disciples who did not recognize him as their teacher and told him about his own crucifixion. The subject is one that Bruegel had treated a few years earlier in a drawing that Joannes and Lucas van Doetecum etched as part of The Large Landscapes group (cat. nos. 22–34). The rapid and
sketchy manner in which large parts of this newly discovered work are drawn strongly suggests that it was a compositional study for either a painting or a preparatory design for a print that presumably was never executed. Bruegel must have made many such sketches, searching for solutions for his often exceptionally complicated and iconographically detailed subjects. A far cry from the works of finished draftsmanship for which he is known and admired, and certainly not one of his most appealing and desirable drawings, the Journey to Emmaus does, nevertheless, provide us with unexpected and challenging insights into the working methods of an artist whose surviving drawings are few. Above all, it offers us a rare glimpse into Bruegel’s creative process as he invented a new composition.

1. Royaltan-Kisch first made the attribution of the Journey to Emmaus to Bruegel during a visit to the Rotterdam print room in the spring of 2000. This entry is based on his subsequent publication in Master Drawing (Royaltan-Kisch 2000) and on my discussions with him when we examined the original drawing in Paris as well as in Rotterdam. It was on 17 July 2000, that we had the opportunity to place the Rotterdam sheet next to The Rabbit Hunt at the Collection Frits Lugt and thus obtain the final visual proof that both drawings were without doubt by the same hand. I thank Maria van Berge-Gerbaud and Carlo James for their generous support in allowing us to compare the drawings and sharing their opinions with us.

2. Mielke 1996, nos. 7, 72a, 53. For further references for these drawings, see the entries for cat. nos. 3, 14, 8 in this publication.

3. Communicated to the author in a discussion with Martin Royaltan-Kisch and Maria van Berge-Gerbaud. In Boom 1993, no. 45, for instance, the drawing is still described as “after Pieter Bruegel.”

**Frans Huys**

**after Pieter Bruegel the Elder**

85. *Naval Battle in the Strait of Messina, 1561*

Engraving and etching; first state of five
42.8 x 71.7 cm (66% x 28% in.), total printed from two plates
Inscribed in cartouche at lower right: Bruegel Inventor, in cartouche lower left: F. HUYS FECIT; in letterpress in right portion of upper margin: CORNELIVS A DALEM EXCVDEBAT ANNO. M.D.LXI. CVM PRIVILEGIO; in letterpress pasted in lower margin: Trinacra insignis portumque urbemque vetustam in [Messana] veteres quam construxeret Pelagii. Parte vides dextra, & scopul[ae] sedet? Gigantum, / Quam micat borrem quom nocturnis ignibus Astrea. Rhetius a luna est, Calabrum traiectus: at illud / Inter strumquem fretum Scylla terribile monstr[ae] // Olim terra fuit, quae pót quassata debicerem Nionem except Pelagus, factumque barbarum. (Famous port and city of Trinacria [Sicily], ancient Messina, which the Pelagians of old [the Greeks] constructed. On the right you see the cliffs and the seats of the Giants, where [Mount] Etna flashes awesomely with nocturnal fires. On the left is Reggio, at the crossing from Calabria. But here, between both sides of the strait, where the horrible monster Scylla [also the name of a rock in the Strait of Messina] lies, once was land, which after being shaken and gaping open, received Pelagus [seawater] from the Ionian Sea and thus created a chasm.)

Bibliothèque Nationale de France, Paris Cc 25


**Pieter Bruegel the Elder**

84. *View of Reggio di Calabria, ca. 1560*

Pen and brown ink, with brown and gray wash added by a later, probably seventeenth-century hand
15.4 x 24.1 cm (6¼ x 9¼ in.)
Inscribed in pen and brown ink on verso: Claude Lorrain M. 24 ff.; on recto: collection stamp of Carl Rolas du Rosey (Lugt 2357); on verso: collection stamp of Franz Koenigs (Lugt 1023a)

On permanent loan to Museum Boijmans Van Beuningen, Rotterdam N 191

**PROVENANCE:** Freiherr Carl Rolas du Rosey (d. 1862), Dresden; Johan Quirijn van Regteren Altena (1899–1980), Amsterdam; Franz Koenigs (1881–1941), Haarlem; bought by Daniel George van Beuningen (1877–1955), Rotterdam, 1940, gift to Stichting Museum Boijmans, Rotterdam, 1940.


Fig. 93. Frans Huys after Pieter Bruegel the Elder. Detail, cat. no. 90. *Three Caravels in a Rising Squall with Arion on a Dolphin*
The city of Reggio di Calabria is seen from a hill on the shores of the Strait of Messina, the narrows between the island of Sicily and the Italian mainland, in the drawing from Rotterdam. Fierce fires are obviously raging in this fortified city at the southernmost tip of the Italian peninsula, for several plumes of smoke are spiraling high in the sky against the background of mountains. The dramatic sight of the burning city contrasts with the peace and quiet of the foreground, where ships float on a calm sea between nearly deserted shorelines.

The drawing was heavily worked over by a later artist, who completely changed its appearance by adding large patches of wash in the foreground and in the upper part of the sheet. This conspicuous alteration, which was probably carried out in the seventeenth century, clearly did not improve the composition and certainly makes it difficult to judge the qualities of the unsigned original and determine its authorship. It has recently been suggested that in the execution of some of its details, in particular the trees on the slopes of the mountains in the background, it is closer to a group of Alpine views attributed to the Master of the Mountain Landscapes than to landscapes drawn by Pieter Bruegel. However, despite their far sketchier style, the trees in such undisputed Bruegel drawings as the Mountain Landscape with Ridge and Valley (cat. no. 4) and the Mule Caravan on Hillside (cat. no. 6) are quite similar to those in the present example. Furthermore, the meticulous and subtle lines of the pen combined with an emphasis on parallel hatching seen here are comparable to such features in most other drawings by Bruegel and suggest that it was intended for use by an engraver—in this instance Frans Huys.

The genesis as well as the authorship of the View of Reggio di Calabria has been the subject of discussion. It has long been thought that Bruegel drew the sheet in situ during his journey through Italy from 1552 to 1554—precisely the period during which Reggio di Calabria suffered huge fires after attacks by the Turkish navy. Although the idea that Bruegel carried out his work in nature is rather tempting, it is hardly plausible, as the view is executed in reverse of the actual scene. There can be little doubt that the drawing was done in reverse to enable Huys to engrave his Naval Battle in the Strait of Messina, which was produced in 1561, with an image that would appear in the correct orientation after printing. The suggestion that about 1553 Bruegel drew a landscape that lay before him in reverse with the knowledge that a printmaker would make good use of it years later seems far fetched. More plausible is the hypothesis—now commonly accepted—that he made various sketches oriented in the correct direction during his stay in the Strait of Messina and about 1560 reworked them into several detailed preparatory studies for the print, one of which is the present drawing. At that point it would have made sense for Bruegel to draw the composition in reverse to facilitate the task of the printmaker, as he did on so many other occasions.

In 1561 the Antwerp merchant and painter Cornelis van Dalem issued Huys's monumental two-sheet engraving of the entire Strait of Messina, seen in bird's-eye view from the north with the Sicilian capital of Messina to the right and Reggio di Calabria to the left. Now largely forgotten, Van Dalem was a well-educated nobleman who practiced painting as a pastime, according to Karel van Mander. It may be that Huys brought Van Dalem, with whom he had financial dealings, and Bruegel together. But because there is no record that Van Dalem acted as a print publisher before or after this effort, the question arises as to why Bruegel chose to work with this distinguished amateur rather than with his usual publisher Hieronymus Cock, particularly in the case of what is the largest print made after one of his compositions. As the choice seems improbable and because it is unlikely that Van Dalem owned a printing press—a very expensive commodity—it is highly probable that he was not the actual publisher but rather the initiator and backer of production under whose name the privilege to publish was obtained. The printing, publishing, and distributing must almost surely have been carried out by someone like Cock, if not by Cock himself. Indeed, Cock's address appears on the second state of the print with the same date borne by the first state, 1561.

The print, with its finely engraved and slightly sketchy lines and additional touches in etching, epitomizes Huys's technique. Both in subject and technique, it is closely comparable to The Sailing Vessels after Bruegel (cat. nos. 89–94), a series Huys apparently left unfinished at his untimely death in 1562. In fact, the engraver worked concurrently on the Naval Battle in the Strait of Messina and The Sailing Vessels, and it is commonly assumed that lost studies of ships by Bruegel were used in preparation for both. A strikingly similar motif shared by these prints is a caravel in a storm that appears in one of The Sailing Vessels sheets (fig. 93); indeed that caravel is almost a replica in reverse of the sailing vessel in the foreground of the Strait of Messina.

The naval battle in the foreground of the present engraving is generally acknowledged to represent an encounter between the Turkish fleet and defending vessels from the Italian cities. This assumption is based on speculation that Bruegel himself could have seen these attacks about 1552–53.
or may have had reports of them from eyewitnesses shortly thereafter. Although the appearance in the print of galleys, which were commonly used as warships in the Mediterranean, supports this suggestion, there is not a single reference to the event in the texts inscribed on any of the five editions of the engraving. This omission may seem odd, yet it is in keeping with the humanist predilection for leaving subjects open to multiple interpretations. A contemporary viewer of Huys's battle scene might have been reminded of the Turkish raids on the Italian coast but could also have seen it as an allusion to the far more famous attack on Sicily launched by the Carthaginian fleet from 264 to 262 B.C. In fact, the inscription on the print refers to classical antiquity and mythology. Furthermore, most non-Italians would have been more familiar with the episode from ancient history than with the recent conflict through reading Pliny the Elder's Natural History, in which he wrote that the Carthaginian battle had been immortalized in a long-lost painting.

The history of the Naval Battle in the Strait of Messina and its only known preparatory drawing will probably never be revealed in all its details, yet it is clear that the importance of both works is indisputable. Although executed after his travels, Bruegel's drawing is one of the few direct testimonies we have of his stay in Italy. The print by Huys is impressive in size and quality and certainly one of the best works in the engraver's oeuvre. That it was published in multiple editions proves that earlier viewers shared this judgment. After Van Dalem and Cock issued the print in 1561, the copperplates were run through the press in Paris in 1601, in Haarlem about 1610, and one last time in Amsterdam, in 1632.9

1. A first state without a publisher's address is traditionally cited. There is no proof of its existence, and its listing is apparently based on a mistake in the nineteenth-century literature that has been perpetuated.
2. This addition has in the past been attributed to Claude Lorrain because of the inscription on the verso; see New York–Fort Worth–Cleveland 1990–91, p. 61.
4. Joris Hoefnagel, a humanist painter from Antwerp who owned several works by Bruegel, mentioned several studies of the Strait of Messina by the master; cited in Braun and Hogenberg 1572–1618, part 6, fol. 58. Mielke (1996, no. 35) cited a drawing in two sheets of the entire Strait and hesitantly suggested that it might be a copy after one of the sketches Bruegel made in Italy. This study is in an unknown private collection and is known only through photographs.
8. This was first suggested by Dominique Allot in Brussels–Rome 1995. no. 40.
9. The plates were listed in the 1601 inventory of the estate of Hieronymus Cock's widow, Volckeman Dierickx, at her death as 'Twee coperen plaeten van de Storn der zee van Messina' (Two plates of the storm [sic] in the sea of Messina; Dauvergne 1984, p. 28), as were thirty-two printed impressions recorded as 'Tweeendertig bladeren van de Stadt Reno' (Thirty-two sheets of the city of Reggio; ibid., p. 24). After the death of her husband, in 1570, Dierickx regularly reprinted plates, among them the Strait of Messina (De Pauw–De Veen 1975, pp. 228–29).
Philips Galle
after Pieter Bruegel the Elder

86. The Parable of the Wise and Foolish Virgins, ca. 1560–63

Engraving; only state
22.2 x 28.8 cm (8 3/4 x 11 1/8 in.)

Inscribed at lower right: BRUEGEL INPV; at lower left: H. cock eatw; on stairs at upper right: Non nosis vos (I know you not. [Matt. 25:12]); on banderole at center: Ecco sponsus venit exit obviam ei. (Behold, the bridegroom cometh. Go ye out to meet him. [Matt. 25:6]); in lower margin: DATE NOBIS DE OLEO VESTRO, QUA LAMBADES NOSTRÆ EXTINGVÆ TVR. / NEQVÆQVÆM, NEQVANDO NON SVFFICIAT NOBIS ET VOBIS math. 25. ([And the foolish said unto the wise.] Give us of your oil, for our lamps are gone out. [But the wise answered, saying.] Not so, lest there be not enough for us and you. [Matt. 25:8–9]), by Esdaile in brown ink on verso: collection mark of William Esdaile (Lugt 2697) and date 1825

Museum Boijmans Van Beuningen, Rotterdam BdH6789

Provenance: Rendorp collection; William Esdaile (1738–1837), London; auction, W. Gilhofer’s, Lucerne, November 17, 1926; bought by Johan Catharinus Justus Bierens de Haan (1867–1931), Amsterdam; his bequest, 1951.


In a composition divided into four parts, The Parable of the Wise and Foolish Virgins presents the well-known tale told by Christ to his followers. As set down in the Gospel of Matthew (25:1–13), ten prospective brides go to the house of their groom—to be on the eve of their weddings to await his arrival. As the future husband will not appear until midnight, the virgins carry lamps. The five wise maidens also bring oil, but the foolish ones do not. All have fallen asleep during the night and are awoken by the arrival of the groom. Only the five young women who have oil can kindle their lamps and enter their future home. The five foolish virgins, rebuked by the others for their negligence, are sent away to buy oil. Upon their return, they find the door is closed: because they were unprepared, they are too late for the wedding and will not be let in. As the Bible makes explicit, the parable warns us always to be ready for the Second Coming of Christ, for we do not know when it will occur. The groom is, of course, a metaphor for Jesus and his house is the Church. After our resurrection from the grave, symbolized by the sleep of the maidens, all souls are judged; those who are wisely prepared—that is, those who have led virtuous lives—ascend to heaven, while those who have been foolish—the sinners—are refused entrance and are thus doomed to go to hell.

The parable of the virgins was extremely popular during the Middle Ages, when it was often featured prominently in church sculpture. Because it is so obviously related to the key theme of the Last Judgment, reliefs showing the virgins were nearly always displayed in portals devoted to Judgment Day. Indeed, the predilection for linking the two subjects is witnessed in the decorative programs of Saint-Denis, Amiens, Magdeburg, Notre-Dame in Paris, and many other Gothic churches. Although the story of the Wise and Foolish Virgins is encountered less frequently in the visual arts of the sixteenth century than in medieval portrayals, the meaning of Christ’s tale as a prefiguration of the Last Judgment was as well understood in Bruegel’s time as in the Middle Ages, as The Parable of the Wise and Foolish Virgins clearly demonstrates. In the center of the composition an angel is shown in a posture that strongly resembles the traditional pose of Christ in Judgment, while two other angels herald the Second Coming by blowing the Trumpet of Doom, just as in representations of doomsday. In the upper half of the engraving, the house of God is presented as a churchlike edifice in the late Gothic style. To the left, at the central angel’s right—the blessed side in Christian symbolism—there is an open door where Christ, as the spiritual groom, receives the wise virgins with their burning lamps. On this angel’s left—traditionally the damned side—the foolish virgins stand before a closed door. Their unfortunate fate has also been determined.

Whereas Bruegel elaborated traditional iconography in the upper half of his design for this engraving, his rendering of the virgins in the lower portion is highly unusual. Although the Bible declares that the maidens sleep while awaiting their groom, Bruegel showed them awake and active. The foolish virgins dance to the music of a bagpipe, having left their lamps empty and cast aside their tools. Their wiser counterparts are working hard by the light of their lamps, another detail that flagrantly departs from the biblical description, in which the lamps are kindled only upon the arrival of the groom. The meaning is not difficult to grasp: working hard and diligently will be rewarded after life, while squandering one’s time will be punished. This is a subject that rather suddenly became popular in Netherlandish prints in the sixteenth century, when humanist literature and moral guidebooks began to laud labor and diligence as enthusiastically as they condemned indolence. These positions were not, as has long been thought, exclusive
to Calvinism, but were taken up by authors and artists of all denominations.3

Whether Bruegel's innovative representation of the Wise and Foolish Virgins was perhaps influenced by artists who worked in Haarlem is a matter for speculation. In Haarlem the well-known painter and print designer Maarten van Heemskerck, the influential humanist scholar and engraver Dirck Volckertsz. Coornhert, and the young printmaker Philips Galle all produced numerous prints and print series in which the central subject is the contrast between the virtue of Labor and the vice of Sloth.4 All three collaborated intensively with the Antwerp print publisher Hieronymus Cock, as did Bruegel himself. In fact, it was probably Galle who engraved the unsigned Parable of the Wise and Foolish Virgins, as its execution is very close to that of his signed prints after Bruegel. Given the fact that comparable prints by Galle after the master, such as The Seven Virtues (cat. nos. 65, 67, 69, 71, 73, 75, 77), were made about 1560 and that the printmaker stopped working for Cock in 1563, it seems likely that The Parable of the Wise and Foolish Virgins can be dated to 1560–63.5

1. This impression is one of the earliest known and shows light traces of the original sketch of the full inscription under the final text in the lower margin. Unlike many other prints after Bruegel, it was not reprinted, as far as is known. The copperplate was in the estate of Cock's widow, Volckern Diericks, at her death in 1601 ("Eene copere plaete van de 5 Wyse ende 5 Dwasse Maechden"), as were twenty-seven printed impressions; Duverger 1984, pp. 16, 15.

2. The Last Judgment, on the other hand, was immensely popular as a subject of prints in Haarlem and Antwerp in the second half of the sixteenth century; see Sellink 1991–92 and Sellink 1997, pp. 78–79, 83–83, 94–103. Worthy of note is a series, which is somewhat later than the present example, consisting of a title page and seven prints, engraved by Crispin de Passe after Maarten de Vos, entirely devoted to the parable of the Wise and Foolish Virgins; Hollstein 1949–58, vol. 34 (De Passe), nos. 397–604.

3. See Veldman 1952. In fact, the principle that we are all responsible for working for our own salvation and are judged by our virtues and transgressions in life is difficult to reconcile with the stricter Calvinist interpretation of the doctrine of predestination.

4. Stridbeck (1956, p. 236) pointed out that Bruegel's interpretation of the parable of the Wise and Foolish Virgins runs parallel to Coornhert's ethical opinions; on Coornhert's opinions, see also Veldman in Gouda 1990.

Pieter Bruegel the Elder

87. The Descent of Christ into Limbo, 1561

Pen and brown ink, contours indented for transfer
22.3 x 29.4 cm (8 7/8 x 11 1/4 in.)
Signed in brown ink at lower left: BRVEGEL, dated in darker brown ink in lower margin: 1561; inscribed by another hand in reddish-brown ink in lower margin: Toblite o porte capita vestea attollimine fores sempiterne et ingrediatur Rex ille gloriosus (free version of Psalm 24:9: Lift up your heads, O ye gates; even lift them up, ye everlasting doors; and the King of glory shall come in)

Graphische Sammlung Albertina, Vienna 7873

Provenance: Pierre Wouters (ca. 1702–1797); his auction, 1797; Albert von Sachsen-Teschen (1738–1822), Vienna (Lugt 174)

Literature: Romdahl 1905, p. 111; Van Bastelaer and Hulin de Loo 1907, no. 87; Tolnay 1925, no. 45; Benesch 1928, no. 79; Van Gelder and Borns 1939, no. 16; Tolnay 1952, no. 64; Münz 1961, no. 149; Marijnissen et al. 1988, p. 165; Mielke 1996, no. 55.

Pieter van der Heyden after Pieter Bruegel the Elder

88. The Descent of Christ into Limbo, ca. 1561

Engraving; first state of three
23.3 x 29.1 cm (9 1/4 x 11 1/4 in.)
Inscribed at lower center: PAME [monogram]; at lower left: H cox execv. Bruegel Inuent; in lower margin: TOBLITE O PORTE, CAPITA VESTEA ATOLLIMINI FORES SEMPTERNE, ET INGREDEIYR REX ILLE GLORIO (free version of Psalm 24:9: Lift up your heads, O ye gates; even lift them up, ye everlasting doors; and the King of glory shall come in.)

Bibliothèque Royale de Belgique, Cabinet des Estampes, Brussels S II 312 14 folio


Enclosed in a luminous bubble, Christ descends into limbo in the company of music-making angels. He has come to save the prophets and patriarchs of the Old Testament, who emerge from the mouth of hell, the gates of which have been torn aside.

Bruegel used different shades of ink in a number of designs for prints, reinforcing lines of a lighter color in a slightly darker tone to strengthen points here and there. In this sheet he appears to have made an initial drawing in light brown ink, much of which he subsequently went over in darker brown, perhaps to achieve the degree of darkness he desired in the infernal scene. Like all of Pieter van der Heyden’s engravings after Bruegel, the print follows the design almost line for line. On the left edge of the engraving, however, some lines clearly extend beyond those in the drawing and exceed the engraved border. It seems that Van der Heyden began to widen the composition slightly but never completed the attempt. Early impressions such as this example retain evidence of how the engraver of the inscription worked: first two horizontal ruling lines were laid out to set the size of the smaller letters, and then the inscription was lightly traced between them. The first words of this inscription were initially sketched farther to the right, as evidenced by a second delicately marked O still visible before the word PORTE.

Some authorities have questioned whether the drawing dates to 1561, the year inscribed on the sheet by a hand other than Bruegel’s in an ink darker than that used for the composition.¹ The style of the drawing and the Boschian imagery, they have suggested, belong to an earlier moment in Bruegel’s oeuvre, about 1556–57, when he made the series

Fig. 94. Jan Mandijn. The Descent of Christ into Limbo, ca. 1530–60. Oil on panel. National Gallery of Ireland, Dublin
of Seven Deadly Sins (cat. nos. 42–54). In fact, the style of the drawing accords quite well with Bruegel’s later work. Christ and the Old Testament patriarchs are long and thin, constituting a rather ethereal figure type that appears for the first time in Bruegel’s oeuvre in the drawings Justitia (Justice), 1559 (cat. no. 72), Fortitudo (Fortitude), 1560 (cat. no. 74), and Temperantia (Temperance), 1560 (cat. no. 76), from the series of Virtues. It makes perfect sense, therefore, that this drawing would have been done on the heels of the Virtues. Indeed, The Descent of Christ into Limbo was once considered to be the final print in that series, a theory rejected in recent times. However, some evidence suggests that this early assumption should not be discarded completely. The inventory compiled in 1601 of the possessions of Volckxken Dierick, the widower of Bruegel’s publisher Hieronymus Cock, includes a series of seven Virtues, consisting of eight copperplates—the last of which might well have been for this print.

Bruegel’s depiction of Christ’s descent into limbo is unusual. The scene, which is derived from the Gospel of Nicodemus (chaps. 13–17) in the Apocryphal New Testament, generally shows Christ as he enters the mouth of hell. Sometimes he has a luminous halo or emits an aura of light, but he is not suspended in a radiant bubble in the company of angels. As he greetsthe Old Testament figures in the standard representations, he tramples the gates of hell, under which the Devil is crushed. In contrast, Bruegel created a limbo populated by devils, monsters, and diabolic machines. The fantastic creatures and the bubble that envelops Christ are reminiscent of images in the work of Hieronymus Bosch and suggest that Bruegel may have been inspired by Boschian precedents. Although no paintings by Bosch of this subject are known, several, including one that was in the collection of Archduke Ernest in Brussels in 1599, are mentioned in archival records. Versions of the theme by Bosch’s followers perhaps provide some idea of the original works; one of these is a painting by Jan Mandyn (fig. 94), which shows Christ in a luminous oval.

1. Van Gelder and Borms 1939, p. 38.
2. Van Gelder and Borms (ibid., p. 37), Tolkay (1952, p. 75) and Münz (1961, p. 34) have all considered the drawing to be part of the series.
3. “Acht copper platen van de 7 Ducheide” (eight copperplates of the seven Virtues), Duverger 1964, p. 30; also “Acht Historien van de 7 Ducheide van achteren” (eight stories of the Seven Virtues of eight plates), but just below this note there appears the phrase “Vier Historien van de Seven Ducheden van sevener” (Four stories of the Seven Virtues of seven plates); ibid., p. 21.
4. On this subject, see Worten 1981.
5. See Vandenbroeck 1918, p. 128, and De Maeyer 1955, p. 260; see also Cinotti 1971, pp. 116–17, nos. 100, 111, 126.

Frans Huys

after Pieter Bruegel the Elder

89–94. The Sailing Vessels, 1561–65

Six prints from the series of ten


Frans Huys

after Pieter Bruegel the Elder

89. Armed Three-Master with Daedalus and Icarus in the Sky, ca. 1561–62

Engraving and etching; first state of two
22.2 x 28.7 cm (8 3/8 x 11 1/4 in.)
Inscribed in cartouche at lower left: "F H Bruegel; in right portion of lower margin: "Cum prorsum"

Frans Huys

after Pieter Bruegel the Elder

90. Three Caravels in a Rising Squall with Arion on a Dolphin, ca. 1561–62

Engraving and etching; first state of five
22 x 28.6 cm (8 3/8 x 11 1/4 in.)
Inscribed in cartouche at lower left: "F H bruegel; in right portion of lower margin: "Cum prorsum"
The Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York, Bequest of Alexandra Sinsheimer, 1958 59.534.24
Frans Huys
after Pieter Bruegel the Elder

91. Armed Three-Master Anchored near a City, ca. 1561–62

Engraving and etching; only state
23 x 28.7 cm (9 x 11¼ in.)
Inscribed in cartouche at lower right: • F·H·bruegel; in right portion of lower margin: • Cum · privileg
The Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York, Harris Brisbane Dick Fund, 1928 28.4(4)

Frans Huys
after Pieter Bruegel the Elder

93. Fleet of Galleys Escorted by a Caravel, ca. 1561–62

Engraving and etching; first state of three
22.3 x 29 cm (8½ x 11¾ in.)
Inscribed at lower left: • F·H; at lower right: bruegel; in right portion of lower margin: • Cum · privileg
The Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York, Harris Brisbane Dick Fund, 1928 28.4(10)

Frans Huys
after Pieter Bruegel the Elder

92. Four-Master and Two Three-Masters Anchored near a Fortified Island with a Lighthouse, ca. 1561–62

Engraving and etching; first state of two
22.2 x 28.9 cm (8¾ x 11¾ in.)
Inscribed in cartouche at lower right: • F·H·bruegel; in right portion of lower margin: • Cum · privileg
Watermark: pot (similar to Briquet 12638)
The Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York, Bequest of Alexandrine Sinsheimer, 1938 59.534.23
Frans Huys
after Pieter Bruegel the Elder

94. Armed Three-Master on the Open Sea
Accompanied by a Galley, ca. 1561–62

Engraving and etching; first state of two
31.3 x 24.6 cm (12⅞ x 9¼ in.)
Inscribed in cartouche at lower left: BRUEGEL F-H; in
cartouche at lower right: H·Cock ex.; at upper left: Cam
provistio

Museum Boijmans Van Beuningen, Rotterdam BdH 9590

Provenance: auction, C. G. Boerner, Leipzig, November 15,
1938, no. 140; bought by Johan Catharinus Justus Bierens de
Haan (1867–1951), Amsterdam; his bequest, 1951.

In a series of ten prints after Pieter Bruegel a wide range of
sailing vessels is displayed: merchantmen and warships,
large seagoing vessels and small coasters, three-masters and
four-masters, galleys and caravels. While some engravings
focus on one ship in particular, others show a small fleet.
The weather and water conditions vary from bright and
sunny with a calm sea to dark with threatening clouds and
strong winds that whip up the waves. The background
changes from print to print as well: ships are clearly on the
open sea, closer to the coast, or anchored near a city that is
shown in detail. Three engravings include mythological
figures; we see Daedalus and Icarus flying in the sky (cat. no. 89), Arion on a Dolphin (cat. no. 90), and Jupiter attacking Phaeton with his thunderbolt in the last print in the set, which is not shown here. Bruegel’s admirable variety in portraying these sailing ships is equaled by the liveliness of the compositional solutions in each print.

At what point in his life Bruegel became interested in ships as a subject for his work is unclear. Unfortunately no drawings or documents survive that relate to this series. But given the painstaking accuracy with which the sailing vessels are rendered in the prints, there can be no doubt that Bruegel made numerous sketches, elaborate studies, and detailed preparatory drawings—all of which are lost.¹ We would expect that he sketched many sailing vessels, as well as details of ships, that he observed in harbors, on beaches, or on the banks of rivers, either in Antwerp or during his travels. Only a mere trio of his remaining drawings betrays a little of this interest: the Ripa Grande in Rome of about 1552–54 (cat. no. 8), the Riverscape near Baasrode, made about 1555 (cat. no. 21), and the Courtauld Institute’s View of the River Scheldt near Antwerp, generally dated about 1559 (fig. 93).² Although it does not relate to any specific engraving in the group, the last sheet is very close to the prints in its composition and character, combining, for instance, the way the stormy sea is drawn in the Three Caravels in a Rising Squall with Arion on a Dolphin (cat. no. 90) with the distant view of a harbor in the Armed Three-Master Anchored near a City (cat. no. 91). Indeed, we might consider the Courtauld sheet to be a preparatory drawing for The Sailing Vessels were it not for the fact that its ships are seen from a great distance while those in the series are shown up close.

Sometime before 1562—when the engraver Frans Huys, whose signature appears on eight of the ten Sailing Vessels, died—the Antwerp publisher Hieronymus Cock decided to start work on a series of prints of ships after designs by Bruegel. As the individual sheets are unnumbered and the group is often found incomplete in print rooms, the number of prints in the set has often been the subject of speculation. However, a document from 1568, in which the illustrious printer and book publisher Christophe Plantin notes that he had paid Cock for a complete set of ships consisting of ten sheets, seems to leave little doubt about the original scope of the series.³

After Huys died, in the winter or early spring of 1562, leaving eight plates completed, Cock stopped production of The Sailing Vessels. It was only after a few years that he again took an interest in the project, at which point the ninth print in the group, the Dutch Hulk and a Boater (fig. 96), was made.⁴ This sheet bears two dates—1564, engraved on the stern of the ship, and 1565, incised in the waves in the foreground. It also combines elements of Huys’s delicate style of engraving, particularly in the large hulk in the center, with omissions and treatments at odds with the other eight plates: the lively etched outlines Huys
usually added around waves and clouds are absent, there is no signature, the air is engraved rather stiffly, the city in the left background is strangely vague, and the ship in the right background, the _boeier_, is unfinished. All told, the two dates and the inconsistent style suggest that work on this copperplate was started by Huys, left unfinished at his death in 1562, and completed by another engraver in 1564–65. This man may have been the same printmaker who was responsible for the tenth plate, _Two Galleys Sailing behind an Armed Three-Master with Phaeton and Jupiter in the Sky_. With its bold handling of the burin and its strong emphasis on chiaroscuro effects, this tenth print was obviously not engraved by Huys and perhaps can be attributed to Cornelis Cort, one of the best engravers in the service of Cock before 1565.5

Why Cock as well as Bruegel took a profound interest in sailing vessels and made them the subject of a print series is easy to understand in the context of Antwerp’s economy in their time. In the sixteenth century facilities for transport were, as they are now, a key factor in the economic growth and commercial prosperity of every city or region. As a mercantile superpower with direct access to the North Sea and a favorable geographical situation in northern Europe, Antwerp had, and still has, natural advantages that were brought to bear by exploiting its harbor and focusing on the shipping trade.6 During the years they lived in the city on the Scheldt, Bruegel and Cock witnessed an unparalleled economic boom there. Since the maritime trade played a primary role in this boom, Cock would have supposed that a series of prints on the subject of ships might find favor with the local citizenry. As a businessman whose publishing house distributed prints throughout Europe, he must also have considered the theme well suited for a wide and international public. To serve such an audience, the usual explanatory Latin texts were omitted, as were specific references to the national colors under which the ships are sailing. Moreover, the clear layer of allegorical or symbolic meaning found in so many other works by or after Bruegel was avoided, notwithstanding the three prints with mythological figures—which seem to have been added as afterthoughts and perhaps were not designed by the master himself.7

What the prints do emphatically show is the importance of the shipping trade as well as its many-sided character, which any contemporary would have recognized. Their allusions to the maritime business as a major contributor to the economy and a potential source of prosperity certainly pleased the audience. But _The Sailing Vessels_ would also have appealed to public excitement about travels to distant and exotic countries, for the sixteenth century was the first great era of intercontinental voyages. Seen in this light, the series can be considered one of a rapidly growing number of related products, including printed maps and atlases, books on foreign cultures, cosmographic studies, and travel accounts, that appeared on the European book and print market during Bruegel’s time. And, in fact, Antwerp was the most important center of this production.8 Cock, a prolific publisher with a keen eye for new developments in the market, undoubtedly was aware of this trend and may have encouraged Bruegel to conceive a series of images of ships to serve the public interest he anticipated.

Whatever the source of their appeal and the circumstances of their design, _The Sailing Vessels_ was a highly original creation that by far surpassed the few existing specimens of the genre in technique, style, and imaginative vision. Combining the best of Bruegel’s draftsmanship and Huys’s abilities as an engraver, the series initiated a flourishing tradition of portrayals of ships in Dutch art that survived until the nineteenth century.9

1. Some of the lost studies for this series were probably also used for Huys’s _Naval Battle in the Strait of Messina_ (cat. no. 83).
2. Mielke 1996, no. 52. Like the other drawings from the Seiliern and Lee collections in the Courtauld Institute, this sheet is not included in the exhibition because these donors have stipulated that their gifts may not leave the London area.
3. Although not always taken into account in later literature, this document is clearly referred to in _Brusel 1669_, pp. 134–35. That there were ten prints in the original set is confirmed by the 1601 inventory of the estate of Cock’s widow, Volckken Dierick, which lists “Tien cooperen plaeten van de Scheep- kens van Bruegel” (ten copperplates of the ships by Bruegel); _Dwurger 1874_, p. 31. The confusion about the number of prints was in part caused by the as-yet-unexplained mention of “Acht Historien van Schepen van elf bladeren” (eight [printed impressions] of the history of ships consisting of eleven sheets; _ibid._, p. 21) in the same inventory and in part by a later edition of the series by Theodoor Galle—as well as by the reasons cited in the text. The _Galle_ set is unnumbered and includes two additional compositions; see _Dwurger 1879_, p. 20. Moreover, Galle’s address is found on later states of two of the prints in the original series.
4. Van Bastelaer 1908, no. 98; _Brusel 1969_, no. 41; _Tokyo 1989_, no. 41.
6. Timothy Riggs’s suggestion (1979, p. 173) that Cort was the engraver, hitherto unnoticed by me and therefore not included in my recent catalogue on the artist (Sellink 2000), seems to be convincing.
8. Several authors have questioned whether Bruegel designed these additions of mythological content, which in their composition as well as subject matter hardly accord with the primary imagery of the series; see _Lebeer in Brussels 1969 and Freieberg in Tokyo 1989_. For a summary discussion of the flags on the ships, which are often difficult to identify, see _Silver 1997_, p. 147, n. 78.
9. For a recent summary of information regarding the popularity of geography and cosmography in painting, prints, and books in this period, see _Hamburg 1999 and Büttner 2000_, pp. 47–60.
10. On this tradition, see _De Groot and Vorsten 1980_. On earlier examples and prototypes of ship imagery Bruegel may have used, see _Lebeer 1943_.
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95. *The Merchant Robbed by Monkeys*, 1562

Engraving; second state of eight
22.5 x 39 cm (8½ x 11½ in.)
Inscribed at lower left: *BRVEGHEL INVE*; at lower center: *H·C*ook excu 1562; at lower right: *PMJE* [monogram]

Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam RP-P-08-75239

Literature: Van Bastelaer 1908, no. 148; Hollstein 1949-, vol. 9 (Van der Heyden), no. 55; Brussels 1969, no. 53; Tokyo 1989, no. 53.

As an itinerant merchant takes a nap, monkeys rummage through his wares. They try on glasses and stockings, hang gloves and necklaces from tree branches, play with musical instruments and hobbyhorses, pull down his pants, and defecate in his hat.

Bruegel seems to have had monkeys on his mind when he designed this print in 1561 or 1562: his small painting *Two Monkeys* (Staatliche Museen zu Berlin, Gemäldegalerie) dates to the latter year. Although no design by Bruegel is known for this engraving, there is little doubt that Pieter van der Heyden would have followed the pattern of his past collaborations with the master and based his composition on a drawing very close to the image in the print but executed in reverse of it. As with *The Stone Operation* (cat. no. 78), the lower margin of this print in its original finished form was left empty in order to provide a space for the attachment of separately printed letterpress inscriptions in one or the other of various languages. The often-quoted inscription attached to a later state of *The Merchant Robbed by Monkeys*—*Quand le mercier son doux repos veult prendre, en vente les singes ses marchandises vont tendre* (When the
merchant wants to rest, the apes will offer his goods for sale)—probably dates from the time the Galle family first published the print.¹

The Merchant Robbed by Monkeys stands out among the engravings made after Bruegel’s designs because it is one of the few works that do not raise questions of interpretation. Indeed, the scene as represented is entirely in keeping with a longstanding popular tradition in fifteenth- and sixteenth-century art.² Certain details included here are standard for the genre: the monkey defecating into the peddler’s hat, the ape looking at himself in the mirror, the hanging of luxury items on a tree, and, of course, the snoozing merchant. A number of late-fifteenth-century examples of Italian and German origin relate quite closely to the present print. Possibly the closest known work is a German woodcut of about 1480–90, a similarly horizontal composition that also features the peddler with his head propped against a basket and the dancing monkeys (fig. 97).³ The merchants in the Van der Heyden and German examples are stretched out in opposite directions, which supports the theory that Bruegel based his drawing on this particular woodcut: his figure would have been oriented the same way as the German peddler before it was reversed in printing.

The subject’s unambiguous meaning is overridinglly humorous—the slothful merchant foolishly sleeps while his belongings are carried away by apes that mimic human actions. To the traditional image Bruegel added contemporary
symbols of folly, such as the spectacles, flutes, and Jew's harps. Bruegel's image itself spun off several copies, including prints published in Paris and Rome, as well as a variation after a design by Pieter van der Borch, clearly based on the present image but in which the monkeys have set up shop in the background and are selling the merchant's goods to simian customers (fig. 98).

Pieter Bruegel the Elder

96. The Resurrection of Christ, ca. 1562

Pen and brown ink, with light and dark blue wash in part possibly added by a later hand, pasted on oak panel; contours indented for transfer
43.1 x 30.7 cm (17 x 12 in.)
Inscribed by a later hand at lower right, partly over older signature: BRVEVEGEL; on recto of oak panel: label of De Bas (?); seal of R. Accademia di Milano...esportazione

On permanent loan to Museum Boijmans Van Beuningen, Rotterdam N 121

Provenance: August Grahl (1791–1868), Dresden; his son-in-law Alfred Rethel (1816–1879), Düsseldorf; his daughter Else Sohn–Rethel, Düsseldorf; bought by Franz Koenigs (1881–1941), Haarlem, 1925; bought by Daniel George van Beuningen (1877–1955), Rotterdam, 1940; gift to Stichting Museum Boymans, Rotterdam, 1940.

Literature: Cohen 1924; Tolkay 1935, p. 92, under no. 37 (as not Bruegel); Tolkay 1935, no. 421 (as not Bruegel); Grossmann 1954, pp. 54–63; Münz 1961, no. 438 (as not Bruegel); Van Lennep 1965, pp. 115–17; Berlin 1975, no. 85; Schneeman 1986, pp. 31–33; Marjinissen et al. 1988, p. 170; Mielke 1996, no. 56.

The Resurrection of Christ, engraved by Philips Galle and published by Hieronymus Cock about 1562–63, is one of the most impressive prints made after Pieter Bruegel, thanks to its size, quality, and dramatic impact. Using his considerable technical powers, Galle brilliantly succeeded in rendering the supernatural intensity of the moment of Christ's resurrection from his tomb. Through its subtle and finely hatched lines, its endless variety of black and gray tones, and its chiaroscuro effects, the early impressions of the engraving add an expressive vigor to the composition that Bruegel's badly damaged and poorly conserved original pen-and-brush drawing now lacks.²

After the drawing came to light at the beginning of the twentieth century, its attribution to Bruegel was doubted and several scholars considered it to be a copy after a lost grisaille by the master. However, Bruegel's authorship has generally been accepted since the publication of Fritz Grossmann's thorough analysis of the sheet in 1954.³ A problem that had made some reluctant to acknowledge Bruegel's hand in the work was the use of brush, a technique unknown in his drawn oeuvre until the recent discovery of the Wooded Landscape with a Distant View toward the Sea (cat. no. 14). As this drawing was unknown to Grossmann at the time of his study, he based his arguments in favor of Bruegel's authorship on other evidence. However damaged the work may be, he noted, the unhesitating and expert lines of the pen and the fine, painterly effects of the brushwork make it unlikely that the drawing is a copy. Furthermore, the outlines of the images are indented—as they would be if the drawing had been rubbed with chalk at the back and transferred to a copperplate—and closely match the contours in the engraving. The elongated forms of the figures and the dress and facial features of the angel also correspond to details in paintings by Bruegel, notably The Fall of the Rebel Angels from 1562 in the Koninklijk Museum voor Schone Kunsten, Brussels.⁴ It is because of these parallels that the Resurrection is commonly assumed to have been made about 1562. This date would accord with the attribution of the engraving to Philips Galle, who stopped

Philips Galle

97. The Resurrection of Christ, ca. 1562–63

Engraving; first state of three
45.1 x 33 cm (17 3/4 x 13 in.)
Inscribed at lower left: BRVEVEGEL INVEN. / COCK. EXCYDEBAT.

Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam rp-P-1950-408


1. This is one of the few printing plates after Bruegel's designs that does not appear to have been kept by the publisher Hieronymus Cock's widow since it is not listed in the 1601 inventory of her possessions.
3. Van Bastelaer and Holin de Loo 1907, p. 79, n. 2, and Lebeer 1943, pp. 221–23. The Italian examples were cataloged as Florentine, about 1470–90, by Hind, who believed that they were based on Northern models (1938–46, vol. 1, nos. A.1.76, A.1.77). Schreiber (1926–30, vol. 4, no. 198) believed the German woodcut was based on an Italian model.
working for Cock in 1563. The assignment to Galle is primarily based on the print’s close resemblance in style and technique to his signed engraving after Bruegel’s grisaille Death of the Virgin (cat. no. 117).\(^5\)

Christ’s resurrection from the grave is equivalent to his death on the Cross as a quintessential episode of the Passion. Along with the Crucifixion and the Nativity, the Resurrection is one of the New Testament stories most often illustrated in Christian art, for it is crucial in Church doctrine: the final proof that Jesus was the Son of God, who gave his life for humanity and returned to heaven to await his Second Coming on Judgment Day. Furthermore, as related in the Gospels, it is a story full of suspense and drama that offers artists countless possibilities for a compelling, theatrical presentation. For his conception Bruegel seems to have mainly followed the version of Matthew (28:1–7), the most elaborate and dramatic offered in the four Gospels:

In the end of the sabbath, as it began to dawn toward the first day of the week, came Mary Magdalene and the other Mary to see the sepulchre. And, behold, there was a great earthquake: for the angel of the Lord descended from heaven, and came and rolled back the stone from the door, and sat upon it. His countenance was like lightning, and his raiment shone as snow. And for fear of him the keepers did shake, and became as dead men. And the angel answered and said unto the women, Fear not ye; for I know that ye seek Jesus, which was crucified. He is not here: for he is risen, as he said. Come, see the place where the Lord lay. And go quickly, and tell his disciples that he is risen from the dead; and, behold, he goeth before you into Galilee; there shall ye see him: lo, I have told you.

In the lower portion of the composition Bruegel focused on the shock and distress of the soldiers, some of whom are bewildered and have been struck down by what they see, while others stare into the empty grave. Here he was adhering to the pictorial conventions of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, which often show the soldiers playing a prominent role, for Matthew does not describe the keepers but speaks of them only as having become “dead men.”\(^6\) In the upper portion, however, Bruegel’s vision literally follows the Bible: the triumphant Christ emerges miraculously from the cave in which he had been buried, and his halo is echoed by the light radiating from the angel and, above all, by the rising sun at the right, a symbol of the promise of Salvation and a new era.\(^7\)

More than Bruegel did in his drawing, Galle dramatized his engraved translation of The Resurrection of Christ by means of emphatic chiaroscuro effects that appear to be produced by three sources of light. These effects endow the composition with a striking, painterly quality that is difficult to realize in the essentially linear technique of engraving. Galle’s dazzling virtuoso display gives the work a wall power that perhaps recalls his Death of the Virgin but has little in common with the far more subtle qualities of other engravings after Bruegel. That Bruegel did not conceive his drawings of the Resurrection and the Death of the Virgin as preparatory designs for prints but as autonomous works of art surely led Galle to carry out his interpretations of the original compositions in an unusually free manner.

Although we have no evidence that the drawing of the Resurrection was not originally intended as a preparatory design for a print, there is general agreement that it was meant to be an independent work of art. There are two convincing reasons for accepting this conclusion: the sheet contains wash—a medium Bruegel never used for print designs—and he did not take the reversal that occurs in printing into account in his image. As an experienced designer of prints Bruegel would certainly have known that in the sheet printed after his drawing Christ would bless with his left hand, rather than his right as dictated by the Bible. It is true, however, that as an experienced engraver Galle could have made the necessary correction—although he did not feel the need to do so.\(^6\)

1. A first state before the completion of the thin, engraved frame that appears in later states is mentioned in all the literature. As yet, however, there is no proof of its existence. Its description is based on an unverifiable account in an 1876 auction catalogue mentioned by Lebeer in Brussels 1964, p. 186.

2. Before the early nineteenth century the drawing was pasted on an oak panel, possibly to support the fragile paper, and the glue used has worsened the condition of the sheet. Investigations regarding possible conservation treatments of the drawing were still in progress when this text was written. The drawing, which is often incorrectly described in the literature as a grisaille, is in such bad condition that it is difficult to judge its original appearance and aesthetic appeal.


5. Also supporting the attribution to Galle is the existence of a second state of the print with the address GALLE ECUDEBAT replacing Cock’s address. The plate for the second state was in the estate of Cock’s widow at her death in 1601 (Duverger 1984, p. 29), as were twenty printed impressions (ibid., p. 23). Galle, who leased only plates of prints he had previously engraved for Cock, may have leased this plate and printed it under his own name before 1601. On the practice of leasing plates, see Sellink 1997, pp. 20, 129 n. 113. A third edition of The Resurrection of Christ was published by Jan Houwens, who is unknown except for his production of this print.


7. Details of Bruegel’s composition, such as the rising sun, the cave-like grave, the bundle of wood, and the hollow tree in the left foreground, have given rise to entirely unwarranted speculation that the image is filled with alchemical symbolism; see Van Lennep 1965 and Van Lennep 1979, p. 79.
Pieter Bruegel the Elder

98. The Bagpipe Player, mid-1560s

Pen and brown ink; some contours reworked by another hand; some contours indented for transfer
20.5 x 14.5 cm (8 ⅜ x 5⅜ in.)
Inscribed at lower left: P. Bruegel f
The Woodner Collections on deposit at the National Gallery of Art, Washington


Anonymous

after Pieter Bruegel the Elder

99. The Bagpipe Player, ca. 1600

Pen and brown ink
28 x 19.5 cm (11 x 7⅜ in.)
Inscribed in pen and brown ink at lower right: Bruegel/Q, collection mark of Johann Gottlob von Quandt (Lugt 2123); in pen and brown-gray ink at lower right: G, unknown collection mark; in pen and brown ink on verso at lower center: Constich Herpen Lugten of Velen / . . . Is met den bacbus spelen / Deen kan Schauen en dander kan shpen / . . . (To play artfully the harp, lute or violin / . . . to play with the face / One can shave [?], another can sharpen / . . .)
Watermark: city gate (Briquet 15952)


Literature: Havercamp-Begemann 1974, pp. 34–35, fig. 1, p. 37 n. 1 (erroneously, with wrong accession number); Mielke 1996, under no. 58 (as copy).

With eyes tightly closed and cheeks puffed out, the musician in the drawing from Washington blows a bagpipe with great concentration and effort as he balances on a precariously tipped stool.1 Surprisingly, this type of single-figure study is a rarity among Pieter Bruegel’s drawings: we would expect to find many more works of the kind given the prominence of figures in his paintings. The sheet probably dates to the mid-1560s, as it is comparable to the drawings Spring (cat. no. 105) and Summer (cat. no. 109), dated, respectively, 1565 and 1568, in showing the same assurance, economy of line, and simple, expressive clarity of form. Unfortunately, the condition of the present work is no longer pristine. The surface is rather rubbed and has suffered several losses, which have been repaired. Moreover, some of the contours, including the outline of the lower section of the left leg, were redrawn by a later hand. Nevertheless, there is no reason to doubt the drawing’s autograph status, made evident by its quite monumental effect and the superb quality of the technique in details such as the hair, face, and subtle parallel hatchings of the left thigh.

The figure was not drawn from life but is clearly an invention that is a variation on a theme with which Bruegel was often concerned. He frequently included bagpipe players in his works, among them the drawings and prints Luxuria (cat. nos. 48, 49) and Temperantia (cat. nos. 76, 77), the print Kermis at Hoboken (cat. no. 80), and his paintings The Peasant Wedding and The Peasant Dance (both Kunsthistorisches Museum, Vienna).2 All the players in his pictures have instruments with long drones, which must have been the most popular type of bagpipe in Flanders in the sixteenth century.3 At the time, bagpipes, like most wind instruments, were associated with the lower classes, especially farmers and peasants. The deformation of the face caused by blowing them was thought to be ludicrous and even indecent by members of the upper echelons of society.4 Thus, by the standards of the sixteenth century, the musician in the present drawing is behaving in a very unrefined manner.

A comparison of the Washington sheet with the copy points up Bruegel’s mastery of subtle characterization. The great exertion clearly visible on the face of Bruegel’s figure has disappeared completely in the copy, in which the musician, who stares forward blandly, could just as well be sucking on a lollipop as playing an instrument. The copyist also stayed from the prototype in slightly altering certain details, such as the shoulder line and the hatchings in the sleeve and the left thigh. However, the copy provides us with an approximation of the original appearance of the Washington drawing, which has been cut down. It reveals that Bruegel’s image must once have included the very long drones of the bagpipe to their full extent in the upper right, a portion of the sheet that is now lost. Whether
there was also more space on the left, as in the copy, is difficult to determine. The copy is most likely a product of the Bruegel renaissance, which took place about 1600.  

1. I thank my colleague Stewart S. Pollens of the Department of Musical Instruments at the Metropolitan Museum for his help in writing this entry.

2. For other works by Bruegel showing bagpipe players, see Marijnissen et al. 1988, pp. 108 (The Fat Kitchen), 293, 316, 377, 370 (paintings with depictions of peasants), 387 (Pilgrimage of Epileptics at Molenbeek).

3. For discussions of bagpipes, see Winternitz 1979, pp. 66–85, and Boone 1983.

4. See Utrecht-Braunschweig 1986–87, pp. 113–13. The phrase “to play with the face” in the inscription on the verso of the copy seems to be related in some way to the subject of indecent blowing of wind instruments. Unfortunately, the text is too fragmentary to draw any firm conclusions about its meaning.

5. Haverkamp-Begemann 1974, p. 34.
Pieter Bruegel the Elder

100. The Painter and the Connoisseur, mid-1560s

Pen and gray-brown ink, with touches of light brown ink
25.5 x 21.5 cm (10 x 8 1/4 in.)
Inscribed in pen and light brown ink at lower left: BRUEGEL.
Graphische Sammlung Albertina, Vienna 7500


A painter, identified as such by his brush, stares intently at something outside the drawing; he has a beard, rather wild hair, and a small nutshell-like hat. Behind him stands a man, also with a hat, who seems to have no hair whatsoever (he even lacks eyebrows) and no lips. With the aid of spectacles he too scrutinizes something outside the picture space, but he does not look in the same direction as the painter. He keeps his hand on the pouch at his belt.

It is hard to miss the message of this drawing. Bruegel is contrasting the experienced, visionary painter, who has an almost prophetlike aura, with the bloodless intellectual, who cannot trust his own eyes but needs spectacles to see. He cannot see, nor can he discern, for sight is the emblem of the capacity or ability to judge. His handicap is exacerbated by his materialism, as indicated by the right hand he holds on his pouch. This connoisseur in all likelihood stands for the viewer and perhaps for the public in general. Thus, we might assume that the painter represents Bruegel himself and is a self-portrait. This is probably not the case, however, as the artist bears no resemblance to the portrait of Bruegel published by Hieronymus Cock’s widow in 1572 (fig. 1).\(^1\)

Bruegel’s subject may owe some debt to depictions of monarchs visiting artists at work, such as the many variations on the classical theme of Alexander the Great Watching Apelles Paint Campuspe, and portrayals of more contemporary figures, for example Hans Burgkmair’s woodcut Emperor Maximilian in a Painter’s Studio.\(^2\) However, the spectators in these pictures are both royal and knowledgeable, whereas Bruegel’s connoisseur is an intellectual seen in an entirely negative light and as such represents an innovative concept.

It is difficult to determine the function of this extremely unconventional drawing. That it was a preliminary study for a print or a painting is unlikely, given the insulting interpretation of the connoisseur, who represents the potential buyer of a finished work of art of that kind. For the same reason we can probably assume that it was not made as an independent drawing for sale. Perhaps, then, Bruegel executed it for himself or for one of his artist friends. But it may be that we should not consider the subject in this context, for it is possible that he did not begin the drawing with this peculiar theme in mind—which brings us to the question of how the sheet originated.

In this connection it is important to note that the appearance of the sheet was radically altered at some point after Bruegel started to draw. The paper was cut down on at least two sides, resulting in the loss of parts of the painter’s purse, left arm, and brush. Moreover, the composition is unresolved: the spatial relationship between the figures is unclear, as the painter is in front of the connoisseur, but the connoisseur’s head seems closer to the viewer than the painter’s. Furthermore, the connoisseur is obviously drawn less carefully than the artist, as attested by several inkblots on his body, the hit-or-miss nature of the pleats on his sleeve, and the unconvincingly realized area of his belt, pouch, and waist. All these considerations lead us to surmise that Bruegel’s original drawing showed a painter, possibly at full length and perhaps in front of an easel, who may have held a palette or a maulstick in addition to a brush.\(^4\) Once the sheet was mutilated, it could have lost its status as a finished work of art, encouraging Bruegel to deal with it very freely and alter his conventional subject matter. At that point, perhaps as a joke, he inserted the figure of the connoisseur.\(^3\)

The Painter and the Connoisseur is generally dated to the mid-1560s, when Bruegel considerably enlarged his figures and proportioned them more realistically than he had earlier, probably due to the influence of renewed contact with Italian art. Sheets from about the same time are The Geese Herdsman (Staatliche Kunstsammlungen, Dresden), The Bagpipe Player (cat. no. 98), and other single-figure studies, with which the drawing in its original state would have
shown close affinities. That the final version of The Painter and the Connoisseur was extremely popular is attested to by the existence of three drawn copies dating from the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, now in the British Museum, London, and the Fondation de Boer, Amsterdam, and formerly in the Kornfeld Collection, Bern. 6

1. For several identifications of the painter in the portrait, see Berlin 1975, no. 95. For Bruegel's portrait, see Hollstein 1941–66, vol. 4, p. 184; see also Berlin 1975, no. 137.

4. The original composition might have resembled that of a drawing from Bruegel's circle, now in Paris, of a painter in front of an easel (see Mielke 1996, pp. 72–73, fig. 6a–c).
5. The possibility that the figure was added by another artist should not be ruled out altogether. If the connoisseur was crudely drawn on purpose, which seems to be the case, we would assume he was probably done by Bruegel; however, if we believe that the careless execution was not deliberate, it is difficult to believe that he is from Bruegel's hand.
6. For these copies, see Mielke 1996, p. 65, ill. The Amsterdam and Berlin drawings have old annotations—"Jacques Savery" and "Huysband 1602," respectively. As Vignau-Wilberg (1987, p. 204) has noted, "Hoefnagel" may refer to Joris Hoefnagel or to his son Jacob Hoefnagel. A fourth version (formerly collection Vincent Korda, London) is in fact a copy after the Amsterdam drawing, as was noted by Bisanz-Praiken (in Washington–New York 1984–85, p. 208, under no. 35).

Pieter van der Heyden

101. Saint James and the Magician Hermogenes, 1565

Engraving; first state of three
22.1 x 29 cm (8 3/8 x 11 1/8 in.)
Inscribed at bottom center: Bruegel inuent; at lower right:
Cock: escudebat - 1565; in lower margin: DIVVS IACOBVS
DIABOLICVS PRAESTIGIUS ANTE MAGVM SISTITVR
(Saint James, by devilish deception, is placed before the magician)

Museum Boijmans Van Beuningen, Rotterdam  BdH 7166

Literature: Van Bastelaer 1908, no. 177; Brussels 1969, no. 58; Marijnissen et al. 1988, p. 239; Tokyo 1989, no. 58.

Saint James, recognizable by his pilgrim's staff, his cloak, and his hat adorned with his attribute, the scallop shell, has been transported to the lair of the magician Hermogenes, who sits in a chair reading a book, surrounded by demonic creatures. James has presumably come to help Hermogenes's assistant, Philetus, who is hunched over on a stool in the background, paralyzed by his master's spell—he has been punished by the magician for allowing himself to be converted by the saint, whom he had been sent to confront. Diabolical activities take place all around the heretic's den: a large hole in the foreground reveals a ritual performed underground in the shadow of a devil's head by a magician who reads from a book as demons nearby hold a man down; in the right corner a nude man standing on a large platter bends over to carry out a ritual with a snake and a sword; and witches mounted on broomsticks, fantastic creatures, and a goat ride up the chimney and across the sky. This is the first of two pendant prints designed by Bruegel that present parts of the apocryphal story of Saint James the Greater and the magician Hermogenes derived from Jacobus de Voragine's Golden Legend. According to the narrative, Saint James was able to convert Hermogenes after resisting several of the magician's spells and prevailing over his demonic envos.

Bruegel's design for this engraving by Pieter van der Heyden is not known, but it was most likely a precise pen-and-brown-ink drawing in reverse of the print, very much like the one for its pendant The Fall of the Magician Hermogenes (cat. no. 102). The engraving can serve as a useful guide to the appearance of the lost pen drawing because Van der Heyden was always extremely faithful to Bruegel's designs, as their many previous collaborations demonstrate. A small but significant detail in the print was changed between the first state, seen here, and a recently recognized second state. The narrow cloth draped over the back of the man bending over and performing some magic rite in the right corner is adorned with a small cross in the first state, but in the second state the cross has been transformed into a star by the addition of lines. No doubt the cloth adorned with the cross resembled the liturgical stoles worn by priests, a detail that might have been seen as equating the practices of priests with the demonic pursuits of the magician. Thus the alteration constitutes an instance of minor censorship, one of a number of such found here and there in state changes throughout Bruegel's printed
work. The early state with the cross is not rare, which suggests that this change was made after many impressions of the print had been pulled, perhaps in response to censorship regulations that were imposed at some point after the original print was made.3

The scene depicted here, in which the saint visits the magician, was not described by Voragine, who wrote that James sent only his handkerchief to release Philetus from Hermogenes’s spell.3 This story was a rare one in the visual arts of the sixteenth century. A panel painted by Bosch (fig. 99)4 also represents this episode but in a manner that is much more restrained and more clearly in keeping with the text.

1. Van Bastelaer 1992, p. 143, state B; in the impression of state B that is reproduced the date also appears to have been reinscribed. Unfortunately the location of this impression is not identified.

Fig. 99. Hieronymus Bosch. Detail, Saint James and The Magician Hermogenes, 1510–20. Oil on panel. Musée des Beaux-Arts, Valenciennes
Pieter Bruegel the Elder

102. The Fall of the Magician Hermogenes, 1564

Pen and light brown to dark black-brown ink; contours indented for transfer
23.3 x 29.6 cm (9½ x 11¼ in.)
Signed and dated at lower left: BREUDEL MDXLIII [X and L incorrectly reversed to read 1544 instead of MDLXIII, or 1546]; Rijksmuseum stamp on verso: L. 2328
Watermark: eagle with the letter F over coat of arms (see Briquet 137)
Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam RP-T-00-359
Provenance: Kupferstichkabinett van de Universiteit, Leiden; transferred to Rijksprentenkabinet, Amsterdam, after 1866.

Literature: Van Bastelaer and Hulst de Loo 1907, no. 88; Tolnay 1925, no. 47; Tolnay 1952, no. 66; Münz 1961, no. 150; Berlin 1975, no. 89; Boom 1978, no. 105; Mielke 1996, no. 61.

Pieter van der Heyden
after Pieter Bruegel the Elder

103. The Fall of the Magician Hermogenes, 1565

Engraving; first state of four
22.2 x 28.8 cm (8¼ x 11¼ in.)
Inscribed on table: IMM [monogram]; at lower center: Cock: excudbat 1565; at lower right: Bruegel: inuent; in lower margin: IDEM IMPETRATIT A DEO VT MAGUS A DEMONIVS DISCERPEREVT.- (Hence [the saint] obtained from God that the magician should be torn to pieces by demons)

The Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York, Harris Brisbane Dick Fund, 1928 28.4(48)

Literature: Van Bastelaer 1908, no. 128; Hollstein 1947–;
vol. 9 (Van der Heyden), no. 16; Brussels 1969, no. 58;

Saint James stands in front of a church door, his hand raised in a sign of blessing. Hermogenes the magician has been brought before James by his own demons, now in the service of the saint. The magician has been thrown off his chair and is dangled upside down; according to the Latin inscription on the print, he is to be torn to pieces by demons. The figure of the falling magician is quoted from a figure of Pride in a Florentine engraving of about 1470–80 (fig. 100). The print is the second of a pair after Bruegel depicting the story of Saint James and Hermogenes derived from Jacobus de Voragine’s Golden Legend. Bruegel’s assortment of demons is more unusual in the present composition than in the first print (cat. no. 101) because here he incorporated not only strange Boschian characters among them but also performers, including acrobats walking a tightrope, balancing on stacked stools, standing on their hands, and turning somersaults, as well as musicians banging drums and playing horns, a magician showing a trick with cups and balls, and a puppeteer.

Bruegel’s drawing is typical for his print designs. The measured yet mellifluous pen lines do not set out to evoke textures or tones but are meant to define the composition as clearly as possible. While doing so, Bruegel managed to impart a great deal of liveliness, not only in the wild gestures of the attacking demons but also in less obvious details—for instance, in the interaction between the fool playing the drum and the small monkey dressed as a fool at his side. The sheer abundance of demons depicted suggests that Bruegel must have enjoyed drawing such fantastic compilations of creatures. Careful examination reveals that in this drawing, as in many of Bruegel’s designs for prints, the artist went over outlines with a slightly different color.

Fig. 100. Anonymous Florentine. Pride, ca. 1470–80. Engraving. The British Museum, London
ink than he used initially, probably to reinforce a lightly traced original sketch of the composition. The engraving by Pieter van der Heyden, executed in reverse of the drawing, remains true to its model. In a second state, changed after numerous impressions of the print were pulled, further definition was given to the saint’s face and beard.

The inscription strays from the text by Voragine, which reports that Hermogenes was converted to Christianity rather than torn apart by demons. It has been suggested that in Bruegel’s interpretation the magician’s fate was confused with that of another apocryphal magician, Simon Magus, whose confrontation with Saint Peter led to his death. The present scene has been considered a disguised satire on the abuses of the Inquisition, likening the holy man, Saint James, to the inquisitors who torture heretics, such as Hermogenes. This negative view of the saint, who was popular at the time Bruegel conceived the image, seems unlikely. A more probable message is the more straightforward one that a man of God can overcome even the most potent magical powers. The inclusion of the acrobats, magician, and puppeteer among Hermogenes’s demons would accord with the contemporary association of street performers, victims of persecution since ancient times, with evil and diabolical magic, but the reason for their emphatic presence here deserves further investigation. A detail rarely remarked upon is the beheaded body and a sword laid out on a table in the lower right corner of the composition. This may refer to the future martyrdom by beheading of Saint James.

5. Lebeer in Brussels 1969, no. 58.

Pieter Bruegel the Elder

104. The Calumny of Apelles, mid-1560s

Pen and gray-brown ink, with gray and brown wash; face of Calumnia reworked, probably by another hand, in black and brown ink and white gouache; left hand of Calumnia filled in and retouched, probably by another hand, in pen and brown ink 20.3 x 30.6 cm (8 x 12 in.)

Signed and dated at lower right: M.D.LXV/P BRUEG., signature reworked by another hand; inscribed by the artist across drawing: [V]ERITAS, PENIT[EN]CIA, INSIDILE, FALLACIA, CALUMNIA, LIVOR, SV[SPICIO], IGNORAMCIA; inscribed in red chalk on verso: n° 917

The British Museum, London 1959–2-14-1 (P16)

Provenance: Auction, Sotheby’s, London, January 21, 1959, no. 2; bought by P. and D. Colnaghi.


Enthroned on the right is Prince Ptolomeus. Next to him are his two female advisers, Ignorantia and Suspicio (Ignorance and Suspicion). Livor (Envy) stands before him with one foot on the platform of the throne, pointing at him and gesturing for silence. Envy is followed by Calumnia (Calumny), in a state of high excitement; she has a torch in one hand and pulls a child with the other. Behind them we see two women, Insidia (Guile), counting false arguments, and Fallacia (Deceit), waving both arms in the air. The group concludes with a woman in mourning, Poenitentia (Repentance), who turns toward the last figure, the naked Veritas (Truth), who is kneeling. The drama unfolds against a blank backdrop.

The drawing should be dated to the mid-1560s on the basis of its stylistic affinities with works securely placed in that period. Here we see the same focus on relatively large figures and the same manner of depicting folds in clothing encountered in Spring (cat. no. 105), dated 1565. The Calumny is also closely related to Bruegel’s grisailles of the mid-1560s, in particular Christ and the Woman Taken in Adultery (formerly Courtauld Institute Galleries, London), which is marked by a comparable composition, with three interrelated figure groups shown against a closed-off background.

The Calumny was one of the most famous works of Apelles, the celebrated Greek painter of the late fourth and the early third century B.C., who painted it in response to false accusations that he had participated in a plot to overthrow
Ptolemy. Starting in the early Renaissance, artists, more frequently in southern than in northern Europe, attempted to reconstruct his picture; indeed it was a Renaissance subject par excellence, and interpreting it must have been considered as worthy as designing buildings according to the specifications of Vitruvius. The Calumny of Apelles is Bruegel’s only known drawing on a classical theme and as such occupies a special place in his oeuvre. Apelles’ Calumny, like the rest of his work, was no longer extant by Bruegel’s time but was known through a description by the Syrian-Greek author Lucian. Bruegel probably was familiar with Lucian’s account through Philipp Melanchthon’s translation, published in Frankfurt in 1543, and Alberti’s De Pictura, issued in 1435. Whether Bruegel referred to a particular pictorial source for his drawing is still to be determined. Surprisingly, the precedent that seems closest to it is an illustration in a fifteenth-century manuscript made for Ercole I of Ferrara, a copy of which Bruegel may have known (it does not seem likely that he would have seen the original).

Since its relatively recent discovery, in 1959, The Calumny of Apelles has been cited as proof that Bruegel, the painter of peasants and peasant life, was concerned with intellectual, humanist issues as well as vernacular themes. A close reading of the drawing, however, does not fully bear out this analysis, as it shows that the image is not entirely classical in feeling. The figures, for example, are not wearing antique clothing. More important, they are shown as if on a stage before a theatrical backdrop, and the attitude and gestures of Lyvor, who addresses the viewer, reinforce the sense that a play is being presented. These features suggest that Bruegel was not following exclusively classical precedent but was inspired by bourgeois vernacular culture in the form of contemporary drama by rederijker rhetoricians. Thus he was conjoinig elitist and popular models in the Calumny.

That Bruegel not only drew but probably also painted a Calumny of Apelles is indicated by a letter of 1670 written by the Antwerp art dealer Gilliam Fourchoudt that mentions a painting by the master titled De Calomnia. In fact, the present sheet may be a study for that painting: it is the only known drawing by Bruegel that exhibits extensive use of wash, which is characteristic of a preparatory study for a painting rather than an engraving.
The painted Calumny of Apelles may well be the work that Karel van Mander described in his Schilder-boeck of 1604 as “a picture of Truth Will Out—which according to Bruegel] was the best he ever made.”

1. This comparison was made by White (1959, p. 339).
2. Bruegel’s portraits closely follow Meanchthon’s descriptions of the figures, as noted by Winner in Berlin 1975, under no. 98. For the relationship to the Dulle Martin, see Ramakers 1997, pp. 91–94. Whether Bruegel himself read Latin or had these sources translated for him (perhaps by Abraham Ortelius, as White [1959, p. 347] suggested) is unknown.
3. The manuscript, which is now in the Staatsliche Museum zu Berlin, Kupferstichkabinett, was reported to be in Escorial’s library as early as 1674; White 1959, p. 340; Berlin 1975, under no. 98. For the manuscript, see Massing 1990, pp. 257–58, ill.
4. White (1959, p. 339) pointed out that Lyvra’s gesture corresponds to one described in Cesare Ripa’s Iconologia (1611, p. 262). Although Ripa wrote

---

**Pieter Bruegel the Elder**

**105. Spring, 1565**

Pen and brown ink; contours indented for transfer

Signed and dated at lower right: M.D.LXV/BRVEGEL;

inscribed by the artist in lower margin: de lente Mert April Mei

Graphische Sammlung Albertina, Vienna 23.720

**Provenance:** Max Strauss; his auction, Miethke, Vienna, May 2, 1906, no. 17; Gottfried Eissler, until 1924; acquired 1924.


**Pieter van der Heyden**

**after Pieter Bruegel the Elder**

**106. Spring, 1570**

Engraving; first state of four

Inscribed at lower left: Bruegel iisuet.; at lower right: H•Cock exxrun 1570.; Bâme (monogram); in left portion of lower margin: Marius, Aprilis, Maius, sunt tempora seris. (March, April, and May are the months of Spring.); in cartouche in center of lower margin: VER / Pueritie compar (Spring, similar to childhood); in right portion of lower margin: Vere Venus gaudet florentibus aera seris. (In Spring golden Venus rejoices in garlands of blooming flowers.)

The Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York, Harris Brisbane Dick Fund, 1926 26.72.57

---

The composition is divided into three unequal compartments. The foreground is taken up by a formal garden in which people are hard at work digging with spades, planting, raking, and clipping. At one side a woman is giving instructions to a gardener. A little above the center of the image there is a sheepfold in which animals are being sheared. In the background a May garden is shown; here people make love, boat, and play music.

With fabulous mastery of the pen Bruegel alternated fine, long, even lines with careful hatchings and areas of delicate, light stippling to achieve an extraordinary range of tones in his drawing. Following his usual practice with designs for prints, he went over the sheet once it was finished, reinforcing it here and there with quick strokes—for example in the sleeves, the hat, and the back of the left leg of the stooping gardener in the foreground. Like The Beekeepers (cat. no. 107), Summer (cat. no. 109), and other drawings made after 1563, this sheet stands in remarkable contrast to Bruegel’s earlier designs for prints, in which tiny figures pile up on one another. Here and in all the later drawings the foreground figures have a monumental, three-dimensional quality, and the staffage elements diminish gradually in scale as they move toward the background. It is thought that the new stylistic character of such sheets
reflects a renewed contact Bruegel may have made with
Italian art during this late period, when he moved from
Antwerp to Brussels, but the decisive influences have not
yet been clearly identified.¹

The drawings *Spring* of 1565 and *Summer*, carried out three
years later, are designs for a set of engravings devoted to the
cycle of the seasons, which Bruegel unfortunately did not
complete: in 1570, a year after Bruegel’s death, Hieronymus
Cock issued the full, four-part series with *Fall* and *Winter*
designed by Hans Bol. Although only *Spring* bears the
monogram of Pieter van der Heyden, we can be reasonably
certain that this printmaker engraved the entire series;² and
we can clearly see that in both *Spring* and *Summer* he beauti-
fully preserved the power of Bruegel’s spatial conception
as well as the more delicate aspects of his drawings. The
inscriptions in the lower margins of the sheets, some of
which compare each season with an age of man (spring, for
example, is childhood), must have been afterthoughts, per-
haps invented by Cock, as the images themselves offer no
hint of these ideas.³

During the Middle Ages a tradition evolved that dic-
tated the representation of each month in the cycle of a year
by means of a specific activity and the representation of
each of the four seasons by the activities of the months it
encompasses. For *Spring*—which Bruegel executed the
same year—he painted his famous series of the twelve months
(now dispersed in Vienna, Prague, and New York)⁴—the
master drew on this tradition, altering only one of the pre-
scribed details. Depicting an activity associated with one
month of spring in each division of his tripartite com-
position, he showed gardening for March, sheep shearing for
April, and fêtes galantes for May. It is in the sheep shearing
that Bruegel departed from the standard iconography, for
driving sheep to pasture is the usual activity associated with
April. This was no doubt a deliberate variation, chosen to
express his notion of spring as the season of regulated, well-
ordered country life, when humanity is in control of nature.
This message is conveyed as well by the geometrically
arranged garden in which peasants work together harmo-
niously, by the gardener who carefully flattens the edge of
an already immaculate flower bed—the very embodiment
of the idea of our supremacy over nature—by the potted
plants, by the clipped and tied climbing plants, and by the
birds flying in strict formation. Even the tucked-away por-
trayal of May is dominated by a large tree that is clipped.
The atmosphere of controlled regularity stands in glaring
contrast to Bruegel’s vision of *Summer*.⁵

1. Veldman (1980, p. 160) discovered that the texts inscribed at the right in the
lower margins of the four prints of the sets series are taken from the
*Anthologia Latina* and that each is from a different epigram by a different
author. The lines inscribed on *Spring* are from Euphorbius.

2. Tolnay (1951, pp. 31-32) suggested that one of the foreground figures was
inspired by the image of Noah digging in Michelangelo’s Sistine ceiling. It
has also been proposed that this same figure is derived from a print after
Maarten van Heemskerck (see Orenstein 1998a, p. 417).

3. Remarkably, thirty years after the set was published the contributions of Bol
and Van der Heyden seem to have been forgotten. The series was described in
the 1601 inventory of the estate of Volckaren Dietric, the widow of
Hieronymus Cock, as “Vier copereen plaeten van tw Mennes van Bruegel”
(four copperplates of 12 months by Bruegel), Duveger 1954, p. 31.

4. Freedberg (in Tokyo 1989, p. 177, under no. 77), posits that it was probably
Cock’s idea to add these.

5. For this cycle of paintings, see New York 1998-99, pp. 386-91.

6. Van Gils (1947, pp. 14-18) proposed that *Spring* and *Summer* be contrasted in
this way.

---

**Pieter Bruegel the Elder**

**107. The Beekeepers, ca. 1567-68**

Pen and brown ink

20.3 x 30.9 cm (8 x 12 1/4 in.)

Signed and dated at lower right: *BRUEGEL MDLXV...*
inscribed, probably by the artist, at lower left: *diejen nes Weten
dijen Roft dij beaten (He who knows where the
nest is has the knowledge / he who robs it has the nest)*; on
verso: collection stamp of Karl Ferdinand Friedrich von Nagler
(Lugt 2530)

Staatliche Museen zu Berlin, Kupferstichkabinett KdZ 713

Provenance: Karl Ferdinand Friedrich von Nagler
(1770-1846), Berlin; acquired 1835.

---

Literature: Van Bastelaer and Hulin de Loor 1907, no. 100;
Tolnay 1951, no. 50; Bock and Rosenberg 1930, p. 18, no. 731;
Boström 1949, pp. 77–89, Tolnay 1952, no. 69; Münz 1961,
no. 154; Berlin 1975, no. 100; Washington–New York 1986–87,
no. 31; Marijnissen et al. 1988, pp. 342-45; Brandt 1989,
pp. 59-61; Sybesma 1991, pp. 467-78; Mielen 1996, no. 66;
In a hilly farmyard in the vicinity of a village church three beekeepers appear with beehives, probably preparing to catch a swarm of insects. On the right a boy or a young man has climbed a tree. To the left of center, in the background, a brook with a water mill can be seen.

The sheet shows striking parallels with *Spring*, 1565 (cat. no. 103), and *Summer*, 1568 (cat. no. 109). So close is *The Beekeepers* to them in style, with its large figures placed in the foreground, and in its subject, an outdoor scene, that we might think it belongs to the same series as those designs for prints. This idea would seem to be supported by the great care invested in the details here, a characteristic of Bruegel’s designs for prints. But such an assumption is overturned by two factors: *The Beekeepers* is slightly larger than *Spring* and *Summer*, and, unlike them, it is inscribed with a proverb. We can, however, posit that the three works were created in the same period on the basis of their stylistic affinities and also because the present sheet, which is trimmed, bears an incomplete date that now appears to be *MDLXV* (1565) but must originally have read 1566, 1567, or 1568. It seems most plausible to date *The Beekeepers* to about 1567–68, as it is a little closer to *Summer* than to the earlier *Spring*.
The text in the lower left corner of *The Beekeepers*—in all likelihood written by Bruegel himself—reads: "He who knows where the nest is has the knowledge / he who robs it has the nest." This Flemish proverb, still in use today, alludes to the futility of knowing having knowledge unless it is accompanied by action. It should explain the image but in fact it obscures the meaning of this ostensibly simple peasant scene, making it mysterious and difficult to interpret.

Interestingly, in 1568—about the same time Bruegel drew *The Beekeepers*—he painted the Peasant and the Bird Nester (Kunsthistorisches Museum, Vienna), whose subject clearly relates to the proverb, and about forty years later two etchings bearing the text of the saying and made after a composition by David Vinckboons (figs. 75, 101) were issued. Although the boy in the tree is the only element of the present drawing that appears in the *Peasant and the Bird Nester* and the etchings, one scholar has attempted to show that Bruegel’s drawing carries the same meaning as the other works. He noticed that just as in Vinckboons’ composition a young lad strips the nest while peasants merely watch and allow themselves to be robbed, so in Bruegel’s drawing activity and passivity are contrasted in the form of the boy who steals a swarm of bees while the oblivious beekeepers concern themselves with their work. This argument founders, however, because there is no swarm of bees in Bruegel’s image, nor does the boy seem to have a receptacle for the insects, and, furthermore, the proverb speaks of nests rather than beehives.

Recently *The Beekeepers* has been the subject of several other studies. One of these suggests that the sheet illustrates the deadly sin of avarice and unwittingly revives the earliest identifications of the subject, which date from the late eighteenth and the early nineteenth century, in maintaining that the figures are robbers who are looking for a treasure (the nest) in the beehives. The boy in the tree is the lookout and the thief on the right is still searching for the prize. The villain on the left has found it and is trying to flee without sharing the spoils; the man in the center knows this and grabs at a dagger with which to threaten his partner and prevent his escape.

Another recent analysis views the image as symbolic rather than as a straightforward representation of a real activity and considers its message to be religious and political. According to this interpretation, Bruegel’s beehives stand for the Catholic parish churches, for in the sixteenth century the Church was frequently compared to a beehive. After the iconoclastic raids of August 1566 many churches in Flanders had been emptied of their clergy (bees) and their contents (honey). Thus, in Bruegel’s picture three faithful Catholics (the beekeepers) are attempting to restore the hives and put them back in their proper places, while an iconoclast (the boy in the tree) turns his back on them, doing nothing. The work of the beekeepers, the action alluded to in the inscribed proverb, is action that benefits the Church. The study also suggests other possible readings—for example, that the boy sees how a Catholic hive and a Protestant church can coexist peacefully—and concludes with the rather farfetched idea that the image may present a Protestant point of view as well.

Whether there is truth in any of these theories remains to be seen. It also remains to be seen whether *The Beekeepers* is the sole survivor of a group of Bruegel’s drawings with sensitive religious and political content that Karel van Mander asserted the dying master asked his wife to burn because “he was afraid that on their account she would get into trouble or she might have to answer for them.” Clearly Bruegel’s *Beekeepers*, “one of the most enigmatic drawings” of the sixteenth century, has not yet yielded all its secrets.

1. The date is also incomplete on the two known copies of the drawing, which are in the British Museum, London (5237–59), and the Achenbach Foundation for Graphic Arts, The Fine Arts Museums of San Francisco (1978.2.32).
2. Vanbeselaere (1944, p. 83) and Boström (1949, pp. 79, 88) had doubts about whether Bruegel inscribed the text.
4. Reiger (in Berlin 1975, no. 100) suggested that the drawing might also contrast audacity and caution, as symbolized by the unprotected boy and the covered-up beekeepers.
5. Admittedly, as Kavaler (1999, p. 233) has noted, the drawing may have been trimmed along the upper edge, which would perhaps have eliminated this crucial detail.
8. According to Sybesma (ibid., p. 472), the three beekeepers may be agents of the Inquisition, since the Dutch word varfbrenger can mean “hew or basket carrier” and also “secret informer.”
9. Sybesma (ibid., pp. 476, 478) notes that the source for any presumed Protestant content would have been *De Bixonphor der H. Roomeke Kerko* (The Beehive of the Holy Roman Church) of 1569 by Philips van Marnix van Sant Aldegond, in which the Catholic Church is ridiculed. However, this was published after the drawing was made, a fact that Sybesma explains away by hinting that Bruegel deliberately misdirected his sheet to protect himself from the Inquisitors. Sybesma proposes that the proverb as well as the image can be interpreted as a Protestant message. Another recent interpretation suggests that *The Beekeepers* contrasts the communal ethic (as represented by the beekeepers) to individual enterprise (symbolized by the boy in the tree); see Kavaler 1999, pp. 233f.
10. Van Mander 1594–99, vol. 1, pp. 93–94 (1604, fols. 233v–234r) describes these sheets as “neatly and carefully drawn with some captions on them.”
ANONYMOUS
AFTER PIETER BRUEGEL THE ELDER

108. The Wild Man or The Masquerade of Orson and Valentine, 1566

Woodcut, lower corners replaced
27.4 x 41 cm (10 13/16 x 16 15/16 in.)
Inscribed at lower right: 1566 / BRUEGEL.

The Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York, Harris Brisbane Dick Fund, 1926 26.72.45

Literature: Van Bastelaer 1908, no. 215; Brussels 1969, no. 60; Tokyo 1989, no. 60.

A male figure in the dress of a wild man and carrying a club is confronted by a man with a crossbow, a royal figure wearing a crown and holding an orb, and a woman holding a ring. They are itinerant actors wearing false beards and costumes who are performing a Shrovetide folk play. Two costumed figures in the background collect money from spectators in a nearby building.

This appealing print is the only woodcut after a design by Bruegel that was ever completed. Most likely it was...
meant to have a pendant in the unrealized print from the unfinished woodcut of *The Dirty Bride* (cat. no. 111). Presumably, Bruegel drew the design for *The Wild Man*, like that of *The Dirty Bride*, on the surface of a woodblock coated with a white ground. If this were the case, his drawing would have been lost when the block, which no longer exists, was cut to make the print. Although the print is not signed by the block cutter and bears no publisher's address, we can be fairly certain that it was not made in the shop of Bruegel's longtime publisher Hieronymus Cock. Cock did not issue any woodcuts, which required craftsmen and a kind of press different from those employed for the engraved metal plates produced by his establishment, Aux Quatre Vents. The skillfully cut block for this print was no doubt made by one of Antwerp's many block cutters—who were more often occupied with book illustrations than with large single-sheet prints by the 1560s, when the popularity of woodcuts was waning as engravings and etchings came into favor. A letterpress text with verses and the name and address of the print's publisher probably originally accompanied the print and likely over time was cut from many impressions, as often happened.1

Of all the prints after Bruegel produced during the master's lifetime, the woodcut of *The Wild Man* and the engraving of *The Dirty Bride*, originally meant to be a woodcut, are the most closely related to any of his paintings. Indeed, both repeat small details showing street performers in Bruegel's painting of some years earlier, *The Battle between Carnival and Lent*, 1559 (fig. 102).2 It seems likely that the two woodcuts were commissioned from Bruegel by someone familiar with the painting because both the medium and the close repetition of subject matter fall outside the scope of the artist's other printed work.

The play shown in *The Wild Man* may be one of two frequently performed medieval dramas. It is often identified as *Orson and Valentine*, the story of twin brothers abandoned in the forest as infants. Orson, reared by bears, became a wild man. He would be the figure standing in the center held at bay with a crossbow by a knight, Valentine, who was reared by King Pepin, on the left. The woman holding up a ring on the right may be the mother of the twins, Bellisant.3 Alternatively, the subject is thought to be a more generic sort of play, a dramatization of the hunt for the wild man that was often performed before Lent. According to this interpretation, the wild man in the center has been brought out of the forest, lured by the woman holding the ring, who has tempted him with a symbol of holy matrimony, a state from which he is barred. The crowned man on the left would be the emperor, who will judge the wild man before he is killed by the soldier holding the crossbow.4

1. According to Hollstein (1949–, vol. 3 [Bruegel], no. 213), impressions of *The Wild Man* were often accompanied by four lines in letterpress beginning: *Ick Wildeman, moet mij nu wel ghevenen gheven* (I, Wild Man, have let myself be captured now), but no such examples have been found.
2. Bruegel repeated another detail from the background of the painting in a small panel, *Crippled Beggars*, in the Louvre, Paris (RF 770).
4. Ibid., pp. 52–53 and 49–84 (on theatrical depictions of the wild man).
Piet Bruegel the Elder

109. Summer, 1568

Pen and brown ink; contours indented for transfer
22 x 28.6 cm (8½ x 11¼ in.)
Dated in brown ink at lower center: M.D.LXVIII; inscribed in brown ink at lower left: RVECHHEL (partially cut off); in red ink at lower left: collection mark of Johann Goll van Franckenstein I, No. 38; Lugt 2987; Beck 1980
Watermark: small eagle with letter F in a shield (similar to Briquet 197)

Hamburger Kunsthalle, Kunsterstichkabinett 21978

Provenance: Jan van der Does, lord of Bergestein (1621–1704); Valerius River (1686–1739); Johann Goll van Franckenstein I (1722–1783); Johan Goll van Franckenstein II (1756–1831); Pieter Hendrik Goll van Franckenstein (1787–1832); his auction, Amsterdam, July 1, 1833, album X, no. 10; to Ernst Georg Harzen (1790–1862); bequest, 1865.


Piet van der Heyden after Pieter Bruegel the Elder

110. Summer, ca. 1570

Engraving; first state of two
22.5 x 28.3 cm (8½ x 11¼ in.)
Inscribed at lower right: Cock excu. Bruegel Inuert; in left portion of lower margin: Iulius, Augustus, nec non et Iulius Aestas. (July, August, and also June make Summer.); in cartouche in center of lower margin: AESTAS // Adoles centii imago // image (Summer, image of youth); in right portion of lower margin: Frugiferas aruis fert Aestas torrida musellis. (Hot summer brings bounteous harvests to the fields.)

The Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York, Harris Brisbane Dick Fund, 1926 26.72.23

Literature: Van Bastelaar 1908, no. 202; Hollstein 1949–, vol. 9 (Van der Heyden), no. 64; Brussels 1969, no. 78; Tokyo 1989, no. 77.

Near a village in a hilly landscape peasants are hard at work. In the foreground several are busy reaping and gleaning corn. Farther back, in the middle ground, sheaves of corn are carried away one by one, and fruit is picked from trees. At the very front of the picture a man drinks greedily from a jug; beside him are two women, one of whom is heavily laden with fruit. In the background, near the river and on the hill, people are harvesting hay. This is summer, represented by the activities traditionally associated with the months June (fruit picking), July (hay harvesting), and August (corn harvesting).

The drawing was clearly meant to be engraved, as revealed by the careful execution and the left-handed figures—which are intended to appear in reverse and thus right-handed in the printed image based on it. The engraver, doubtless Pieter van der Heyden, followed Pieter Bruegel’s model faithfully, changing only one detail: he raised the scythe in the foreground slightly, in order to show more of it. He also translated the drawing with great skill, beautifully rendering the effect of sunlight and heat on the distant field and the richness of the shadows in the foreground. The print bears an inscription that compares summer to adolescence, just as its companion, the engraving for Spring, presents a text that equates its season with childhood (see entry for cat. nos. 105, 106). And Summer—again like Spring—is a characteristically late work, made after Bruegel moved to Brussels, which probably reflects the influence of Italian art: in their contraposto stances some of the foreground figures certainly recall Italian prototypes and, according to some scholars, may specifically reveal the inspiration of Michelangelo. The drinker’s attitude has prompted art historians to look for precedents in classical antiquity also, and recently it has been suggested that some of the peasants may have had their source in the work of Maarten van Heemskerck. Whatever the models may be for the individual figures, the composition is one of the most powerful in Bruegel’s oeuvre.

Whereas in Spring Bruegel emphasized all that is regular, well ordered, and controlled in country life, here he portrayed the disorganized, unbridled, and humorous character of the peasantry. This he accomplished through various strategies. For example, he chose not to segregate the activities of each month of the season in compartments as he had done in the rigorously organized Spring. Above all, he set the tone by boldly allowing the scythe and a bare foot of the drinker to cross over the border of the image. This unprecedented and daring manipulation of details represents a literal depiction of an expression still in use in the Netherlands: over de schreef gaan, meaning to cross permitted borders or to go beyond all bounds. The unrestrained gesture of the drinker conveys the same idea, as do the attitude and appearance of the boy mowing at one side.
of the picture. His behavior is strange, dangerous, and disorganized, for he is working against the grain, that is, in the direction opposite that of the other peasants; and his disorderly character is underscored by his wild, curly hair—a style encountered nowhere else in Bruegel’s work—which was thought to indicate a passionate, stubborn nature. Visual jokes add notes of humor, as peasants fuse with the products of the earth: a woman’s head seems to have become a basket of vegetables; a sheaf of corn appears to be growing out of the boy bending over near the center of the composition, a detail that probably refers to the Netherlandish word *cornuut* or *cornuyt*, literally meaning corn out of it and figuratively a peasant, crock, or bumpkin. These are no doubt the comical effects Karel van Mander had in mind when he wrote, “one sees few pictures by [Bruegel] which a spectator can contemplate seriously and without laughing.”

The first known owner of *Summer*, Jan van der Does, had at least two other sheets by Bruegel in his collection: *Landscape with Three Pilgrims* (cat. no. 23) and a large, double-folio *View of Naples*, which is lost. Given the high quality of Van der Does’s two known drawings, we can probably assume that the *View of Naples* was authentic and important; it may have been the preparatory drawing for Bruegel’s painting *View of Naples* in the Galleria Doria Pamphilj, Rome.
1. Veldman (1980, p. 160) discovered that the inscriptions in the right bottom margins of the prints of the seasons series to which the engraving of Summer belongs are from the Anthologia Latina, and that each is a different epigram by a different author. The lines inscribed on Summer are from Julian.
2. Tolnay 1934, p. 129 n. 32; Tolnay 1952, p. 76, under no. 68; Blunt 1968, p. 191.
3. For classical prototypes, see Tolnay 1952, no. 68, and Stridbeck 1936, p. 286.
On Heemskerck and Bruegel, see Stuttgart–Bochum 1997–98, p. 120, and Orenstein 1998a, p. 417. Orenstein has drawn my attention to the resemblance between the mower on the right in Bruegel’s drawing and a figure in a representation by Heemskerck of people laboring in the fields (see Veldman 1993–94, part 1, no. 500 [also Galle after Heemskerck]).
4. Buiten schreef, literally “over the border,” connotes extreme, excessive behavior and drunkenness. For these and other meanings connected with the word schreef, see Woordenboek der Nederlandsche taal, vol. 14, pp. 1088–10.
5. For the word heren, which signifies very curly hair, see ibid., vol. 8, pp. 357–58.
8. All three Bruegel drawings owned by Van der Does were bought by Valerius Röver (see Röver manuscript inventories at the University Library, Amsterdam [inv. nos. 17-A54, 17-A58]). For the View of Naples in Rome, see Marijnissen et al. 1988, p. 382.
Pieter Bruegel the Elder

III. The Dirty Bride or The Wedding of Mopsus and Nisa, ca. 1566

Pen and black-brown ink on white-prepared partially carved block of applewood
26.4 x 41.6 x 2.9 cm (10¼ x 16¼ x 1¼ in.)
The Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York, Harris Brisbane Dick Fund, 1932 32.63

Provenance: Blasius Höbel (1792–1863); F. J. Geeli; Carl Kayser; Theodor von Frimmel; Albert Figdor (Lugt Suppl. 926d).


Pieter van der Heyden after Pieter Bruegel the Elder

II. The Dirty Bride or The Wedding of Mopsus and Nisa, 1570

Engraving; first state of four
22.2 x 28.9 cm (8¾ x 11⅞ in.)
Inscribed at lower left: BAME [monogram]; at lower right: Hock-exad-1570 Bruegel-Insuen(s); in lower margin: MOPS NISA DATVR QVID NON SPERMVS AMANTES (Mopsus marries Nisa, what may not we lovers hope for)
The Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York, Harris Brisbane Dick Fund, 1926 26.72.39


The subject is a group of street performers putting on a comical Shrovetide folk play, De Vaile Bruid (The Dirty Bride). A coarse, bedraggled bride is led from a shabby nuptial tent by her prancing groom and a motley band of celebrants. A man with a false nose plays music with a shovel and a knife. A boy in front of the tent carries a teardrop-shaped container to collect money from passersby.

This remarkable drawing on wood was meant to serve as a design for a woodcut. Although designs for woodcuts were often made on paper for transfer onto the block, the lively nature of the lines in this composition indicate that Bruegel drew directly on the block over a now-faded white ground that coats its surface. For an unknown reason the carving of the block was abandoned after the cutting in the upper left corner was carried out. (Other drawings on uncut or partially cut woodblocks exist, most notably examples by Albrecht Dürer and Albrecht Altdorfer.) Bruegel executed this drawing with more brio than he displayed in his relatively measured designs for engravings, and he worked out the hatching and finer details with far fewer lines. The foliage, for example, is defined in a general way and the individual leaves are not delineated. He may have adopted this abbreviated approach at least in part for a technical reason: woodcuts cannot support the degree of detail that engraving allows. Indeed, the incised tree trunk and branches in the upper left corner demonstrate the complex nature of the cutting required to produce even simple parallel hatching in a woodcut. Moreover, Bruegel had not worked with woodcutters before he made this drawing, and he appears to have been willing to leave them a good deal more room for invention in the definition of patterns and hatching than he granted the engravers who executed his designs.

The woodcut that was to be produced from this block was probably intended as a pendant to The Wild Man (cat. no. 108). Thus, the present block, which is undated, may have been executed in the same year as The Wild Man, which is dated 1566. In fact, the figure of the groom is a variation on the man dancing in the lower right foreground of Bruegel’s painting The Wedding Dance, also dated 1566 (fig. 104). It

Fig. 103. Pieter Bruegel the Elder. Detail, The Battle between Carnival and Lent, 1559. Oil on panel. Kunsthistorisches Museum, Vienna
seems likely that the woodblock predates the engraving of *The Dirty Bride*, which was issued a year after Bruegel died by his publisher, Hieronymus Cock. Presumably it was the death of the artist that brought the design on the block, never realized as a woodcut, into the publisher's hands and to fruition as an engraving. The present, like *The Wild Man* print, must have been produced in the shop of one of Antwerp’s many block cutters. However, as Cock never produced woodcuts, he had the design engraved by the most consistent printmaker after Bruegel, Pieter van der Heyden. The engraving stands as a good representation of the original appearance of the now-worn woodblock, which, on the basis of comparison with the print, seems to have been cut down on the top and on the right. The untrimmed block would have been closer to *The Wild Man* print in height, although somewhat wider than that probable pendant.

For *The Dirty Bride*, as in *The Wild Man*, Bruegel took his central subject from a minor detail in his painting *The Battle between Carnival and Lent*, 1559 (fig. 103). When Cock published the image, he added the inscription *MOPSO NISA DATVR, QVID NON SPEREMVS* AMANTES (Mopsus marries Nisa, what may not we lovers hope for). The phrase derives from the story of Mopsus and Nisa in the Eighth Elegy of the Roman poet Virgil and appears in several contemporary books of proverbs. In Virgil’s time, as well as when they were taken up in the sixteenth century, these words were understood as an ironic reference to a world turned upside down—if Mopsus can marry Nisa, anything can happen. Certainly, learned members of Cock’s audience would have been amused by the association of the ancient quotation with contemporary folk custom.

If the woodblock does in fact date to about 1566, it may be that the cutting was halted because of a perceived relationship between the farcical marriage depicted and the extravagant wedding that Margaret of Parma, the regent of the Low Countries, hosted in Brussels in 1565 for her son, an event that was much criticized by contemporaries. The inventory taken of Cock’s widow’s possessions in 1601 shows that, despite the inscription, the plate was still identified as *The Dirty Bride* when the list was made.

---

2. The Dürr blocks are in the Staatliche Museen zu Berlin, Kupferstichkabinett; see Basel-Berlin 1997–98, pp. 96–109, nos. 10.3, 10.4. The Altdorfer block is in the Staatliche Graphische Sammlung, Munich; Winzinger 1950.
5. I extend my thanks to Margaret Sullivan (correspondence with the author, May 4, 2000) for sharing her theory about why the block was not finished. See also Sullivan 1994, p. 102.

---

**Pieter van der Heyden**

**after Pieter Bruegel the Elder**

**113.** *The Peasant Wedding Dance*, after 1570

Engraving; first state of four

37.5 x 42.3 cm (14 11/16 x 16 11/16 in.)

Inscribed at lower left: *PBRVEGEL INVENT*; at lower center: *Aux quatre Vents*; at lower right: *PAME* [monogram]; in lower margin: *Locht op speelman ende latet wel dureen, / Soo langh als de luy ghae te den rommel vermaeh: / Doet lyse wel dapper haer bilen rueren / Want ten is oym met haer ghewe bruylof alden dach. / Nu hebbelech bunnem danst soomen plaich, / Ick lusten na de pyp en ghy mist den voete: / Maer ons bruyt neemt nu van dansen verdracht, / Trouwens, tis ookt best, want sy ghae tel en sooete. (Keep it up musicians and make it last, / So long as the flute and drum play. / Liz will pluckily move her rump / Because her wedding is not every day. / Tricky Dicks are doing fancy steps, / I’m listening to the fife and you’ve missed a beat. / Our bride has given up dancing. / Which, by the way is for the best, because she’s full and sweet.)

The Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York, Harris Brisbane Dick Fund, 1933 33.52.29

**Literature:** Van Bastelaer 1908, no. 210; Hollstein 1949–, vol. 9 (Van der Heyden), no. 61; Brussels 1969, no. 61; Tokyo 1989, no. 61.

Guests take part in a boisterous wedding celebration, as the bride, seated at a table in the background, accepts gifts brought to her by a lively, milling crowd. According to the accompanying inscription, she is “full and sweet”—in other words, she is pregnant. A man in scholarly garb on the right, unnoticed by the couples embracing and dancing around him, observes the unrestrained revelry.

*The Peasant Wedding Dance* relates to Bruegel’s 1566 painting *The Wedding Dance* in Detroit (fig. 104). However, there are substantial differences between the two works, which have led to much scholarly debate as to whether this
print executed by Pieter van der Heyden—as well as the many variations on it produced by Bruegel’s sons, Pieter II and Jan—was based on another, now-lost painting or a now-lost drawing by the master. While the foreground couples in the print correspond fairly closely to those in the painting, the background scenes in the two works diverge markedly. The words Aux quatre Vents inscribed at the bottom of the image indicate that the print was produced after the publisher Hieronymus Cock’s death in 1570, since this is the form of Cock’s address used by his widow when she took over her husband’s business. The address also reveals that the publication of the print postdates Bruegel’s death in 1569 by at least a year. Although it is certainly possible that a drawing by Bruegel for the print had been deposited with Cock before 1569, characteristics of the engraving

Fig. 104. Pieter Bruegel the Elder. The Wedding Dance, 1566. Oil on panel. The Detroit Institute of Arts
The present print and similar scenes by Bruegel have generated a good deal of controversy as to whether he was sympathetic to or critical of the festivities he depicted. Is this engraving a warning against lust and gluttony or a celebration of national traditions? As the inscription implies, the bride is pregnant, yet even discounting this information, there is less ambiguity in the print than in the Detroit picture. In the print a cradle is among the presents offered to the bride, while in the canvas there is no such suggestive detail—here one woman carries a box to her. Moreover, the bride in the painting is certainly not the straightforward center of attention she is in the print; rather she is relegated to the background and barely visible. And the meaning of the observer is far more mysterious in the painting than in the engraving. Clothed as a scholar in the print, he stands among the wedding guests yet is clearly set apart from them in social class; in the painting, however, the corresponding figure is dressed quite similarly to the revelers but is placed far from them, on the outer edge of the celebration. We must, therefore, wonder whether or not he is one of the peasants.

Because the engraving lacks the extreme ambiguity we see in Bruegel’s work in general and in the Detroit painting in particular, it is likely that the print follows an intermediary work based on the Detroit picture. This would have been an adaptation of the Detroit canvas, perhaps by someone in Cock’s workshop but probably not by the master himself. Bruegel’s initial conception of the theme was no doubt influenced by a print of 1560 by Pieter van der Borch showing a peasant wedding (fig. 105).

Pieter van der Heyden
after Pieter Bruegel the Elder

114. The Festival of Fools, after 1570

Engraving; first state of three
32.5 x 43.7 cm (12 3/4 x 17 1/8 in.)
Inscribed at lower left: PBrueghel Inuentor; PAMV: [monogram];
at lower center: Aux quatre Vents; in lower margin: Ghy Settebollen,
die met ydelheyt, ybequynt-ysyt, / Compt al ter banen, die lust hebt om
rollen, / Al wordt déen syn eere en dander t’ gelt-quaust, / De werelt
die pryxt, de grootste Settebollen. // Men vint Settebols, onder elcke
nactie, / Al en dragen sy geen sotscappen, op boeren cap. / Die int
dansen bieben, al sulken gracie, / Dat bunnen Settebol, drayet,
ghelyk eene top. // De wyylste Settebols, lappen al duer de billen. /  
Dan synder, die d’een dander, meten nuwe vatten, / De sulck,
vercoopt trompen en dander brillen, / Daar sy veel, Settebollen mede
verschatten. // Al synder Settebols, die haer wyylcyck draugen, / En
van de Settebollen, den rechten sin-smaken, / Om dat sy in hun selve
sotheby hebben behagen / Sal boeren Settebol alder best de pin-raken.
(You numbskulls who are plagued with foolishness, / Come to
the green if you want to go bowling, / Although one has lost his
honor and another his money, / The world values the greatest

Fig. 166. Pieter van der Heyden. The Festival of Fools, after 1570.  
Engraving; second state. The Metropolitan Museum of Art, New
York, The Elisha Whittelsey Collection, The Elisha Whittelsey
Fund, 1969 69.598
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numbskulls.// Numbskulls are found 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 foulest numbskulls squander their estates./ Then there are those who take others by the nose./ Some sell Jew's harps and the others spectacles/ With which they deceive many nitwits./ Yet there are numbskulls who behave themselves wisely./ And understand the true sense of numskulling/Because they [who] have found folly in themselves/ Shall best hit the pin with their numbskulls.4

Private collection

Literature: Van Bastelaer 1908, no. 195; Hollstein 1949—, vol. 9 (Van der Heyden), no. 60; Brussels 1969, no. 29; Feinblatt 1971; Moxey 1982; Tokyo 1989, no. 29.

Fools of all sorts with their characteristic eared hoods hold a festival. They dance, play music, perform tricks, play games with balls, and make lewd gestures.

Bruegel's drawing for this engraving is not known. Nevertheless, the print is often placed about 1559, the date of The Stone Operation or The Witch of Malegem (cat. no. 78), which also treats folly and, with its large figures concentrated in the foreground of the scene, is compositionally similar. However, the words Aux quatre Vents inscribed on The Festival of Fools argue for a later dating—after Bruegel's death in 1569—for this is the form of the publisher's address used by the widow of the print's publisher, Hieronymus Cock, following his death in 1570.5 The sheet exhibited here is one of only two known impressions of an early proof state of the print taken before shadows in the foreground were lengthened, vines were added to the pergola in the left background, and the cupola in the right background was ornamented (fig. 106).6 The existence of these early proofs further supports a late dating for the engraving, since they show Van der Heyden working in a manner very different from that of his usual collaborations with Bruegel. In engravings known to have been executed during Bruegel's lifetime, Van der Heyden followed the master's designs to the letter, effecting few if any alterations and none after the addition of the inscription. Here, however, significant changes were made once the plate had reached a relatively finished level of completion, after the inscription was appended. This suggests that Van der Heyden most likely engraved or at least finished The Festival of Fools after Bruegel's death and perhaps that he was working from an unfinished drawing.

This humorous scene showing fools playing with balls is enhanced and illuminated by the inscription, which puns on the words sottebol, meaning fool, and its component bol, meaning head or ball, and bollen, meaning to play the game of boules. Here the bald heads of the fools resemble the balls they carry, and several fools are playing boules in the foreground. The inscribed phrase "there are those who take others by the nose," which means that some lead their fellows astray, is illustrated literally by two fools pulling each other's nose. The inscription also plays on the word trompe, which can mean either trumpet or Jew's harp.4 It surely means Jew's harp here, for the print does not show a trumpet but includes a fool on the right who plays a Jew's harp. Indeed, the selling of Jew's harps and spectacles, which signified swindling and is referred to in the inscription, is a motif that also appears in Bruegel's Merchant Robbed by Monkeys (cat. no. 95). The conclusion of the inscription extols the wise fools who recognize folly in themselves, embracing the idea that self-knowledge is the key to overcoming moral failings, a notion that has its source in Erasmus's Praise of Folly (1509).5 Some scholars have associated The Festival of Fools with an actual Feast of Fools organized by the Chambers of Rhetoric in Brabant in 1551.6 It seems, however, that this print was meant not as a representation of a real festival but rather as an allegory on the many forms of folly, which certainly could have been made to coincide with or to be sold at the time of some such event.7

1. Translation adapted from Moxey 1982.
2. The Festival of Fools was listed in the inventory taken of her possessions after her death in 1602 as "Een plaete van de Sottebollen" she had thirty-one impressions of the print; Duverger 1984, p. 26.
3. De Pauw-De Veen included a proof impression from the collection of Paul van den Bosch in Brussels 1970, no. 115, which may be the same impression exhibited here. A second proof impression is in the Los Angeles County Museum of Art (Feinblatt 1971).
Pieter van der Heyden
after Pieter Bruegel the Elder

115. The Battle about Money, after 1570

Engraving; second state of four
23.6 x 30.4 cm (9½ x 12 in.)
Inscribed at lower right: Aux quatre Vents, P. Bruegel intu[er]te;
at lower center: BAME [monogram]; in lower margin: Quid
modo diuitias, quid fulus, vasta metallici Congeries, nimmis arca
referta nosuis:// Etlectres inter tantas, atque, agmina furorum, 
Indition cumitis offeras vinctus eris, // Pr[a]es facit furarem, ferens
mala cumita ministrat, Impetus, et spolia optia rapina fers. (The
savage grappling hook will reveal to all the riches, the vast pile of
yellow metal, the strongbox stuffed with new coins among these
great enticements and the ranks of thieves. Booty makes the
thief, the assault that serves all evil helps him, and so does the
pillage good for fierce spoils.);3 Wel aenghi Spaerieten, Toonen,
en Kisten. //Tis al om gelt en goet, dit striden en twistren. //Al seet
men u ooc anders, willet niet geblouen. //Daerom vuren[n] vij den
bavik die ons noije en mistelf[n] //Men vochte wel actie om ons te
uerdooven. // Maer men souweer niet krijgen, waerdier niet te rooven.
(Forward, you piggy banks, barrels, and chests. // It's all for
money and goods, this fighting and quarreling. // Even if they
tell you something different, don't believe it. // That is why we
carry that hook, which has never forsaken us, on our banners. //
They are taking action to quiet us down, // but there would be no
battle if there were nothing to steal.)

The Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York, Harris Brisbane
Dick Fund, 1926 26.72.40

Literature: Van Bastelaer 1908, no. 146; Hollstein 1949− ,
vol. 4 (Cock), no. 252, vol. 9 (Van der Heyden), no. 53; Württen-
berger 1957, pp. 78−80; Vienna 1967−68, no. 61; Brussels 1969,
no. 54; Brussels 1970, no. 113; Tokyo 1989, no. 54; Brussels 1991,
no. 322; Van Bastelaer 1992, no. 146; Kavaler 1997; Gibson 1998,
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In what seems to be a highly peculiar picture, strongboxes, piggy banks, money bags, barrels of coins, and treasure chests heavily armed with swords, knives, and lances fight ferociously with one another. Some of these warriors are equipped with human heads, others are headless, but all have limbs with which they attack their opponents. Although the subject is always identified as a fight between money bags or piggy banks and strongboxes, it is, in fact, impossible to determine who is fighting whom. Both from the left and the right all kinds of money soldiers assault whomever or whatever they encounter on the battlefield. As the Dutch verses inscribed in the lower margin of the print inform us, this is a battle about possessions: “It’s all for money and goods, this fighting and quarreling.” Led by greed, exemplified by the banner with the “savage grappling hook” identified in the Latin inscription, humanity’s lust for money is here shown to be at the root of armed conflict.

Given the strong linear and graphic qualities of Pieter van der Heyden’s print, we can assume that the original composition by Pieter Bruegel on which it is based was probably a drawing that was meant to be engraved. Although undated, the engraving was certainly executed some years after Bruegel’s death in 1569; it bears the address Aux Quatre Vents, which is found only on prints that were published by Volckken Diericx, the widow of Bruegel’s publisher Hieronymus Cock, who continued to operate her husband’s print shop on a modest scale after his death in 1570.1 The composition’s stylistic affinities with certain dated engravings, notably the pendant The Thin Kitchen (fig. 59) and The Fat Kitchen (fig. 60), suggest a date about 1563 for Bruegel’s original image, although other dates have been proposed.2

Because the inscriptions on the posthumously published print would have been written after Bruegel’s death, we can only speculate about what meanings he intended to convey with the unprecedented iconography of The Battle about Money. It is not surprising that the master took up the subject of acquisitiveness, for criticism of greed for money was common in precapitalist Netherlandish society, and avarice is one of the vices he so strikingly illustrated in his series The Seven Deadly Sins (cat. nos. 42–54). The enormous growth of mercantile trade and commerce in Antwerp as well as in other cities in Europe during the sixteenth century gave rise to many discussions on such issues as the tension between the desire for profit and self-interest, on the one hand, and the concern for the general welfare, on the other. Bruegel may well have been inspired by arguments in this debate, which was especially important in Antwerp, where trade and commerce were at the very core of the city’s prosperity.3 But we can suppose that he was also looking beyond these contemporary references to illustrate the old and universal truth that the longing for riches leads to war—a message clarified in the engraving’s Latin and Dutch inscriptions. To underscore this reading, the publisher Johannes Galle added the following verses from the Old Testament Book of Ecclesiasticus (8:3) on a mid-seventeenth century reprint of the image: “Riches make thieves. Gold and silver have destroyed many.”4

1. The state of the print exhibited here has traditionally been considered the first state. However, Nadine M. Orenstein recently discovered that an impression in the Graphische Sammlung Albertina, Vienna, bears an earlier form of the inscription: in the two bottom lines of the second group of verses the word occ is written occ and there is no line over the re in suare. A fourth state listed as state B in Van Bastelaer does not exist.

2. Translation from Tokyo 1989, no. 54.


4. The copperplate for the engraving, as well as sixteen printed impressions, were in the inventory of Aux Quatre Vents taken after Volckken Diericx’s death in 1601: “Een copperen plaat van eenen Gelsack” and “Zestien bladeren van den Spierps”; Duverger 1984, pp. 32, 33. Johannes Galle reprinted the plate in two editions in the mid-seventeenth century.

5. Lebeer (in Brussels 1969) first proposed 1563; Tobnay (1935, p. 27) suggested 1567; and Würtenberger (1957, p. 96) put forward 1558. For The Thin Kitchen and The Fat Kitchen, see Brussels 1969, nos. 53, 56.

6. For an interpretation of The Battle about Money as a satirical comment on an ideological discussion of this topic, see Kavaler 1967 and Kavaler 1999, pp. 98–110 (a slightly revised version); Bruegel’s Everyman (cat. nos. 58, 59) also, in part, treats humanity’s search for possessions.

7. In the literature this text has sometimes been identified as a quotation from Ecclesiastes. Ecclesiasticus, or the Book of Sirach, is included in the Apocalypse of the King James Version of the Bible but has always been part of the Vulgate.
Attributed to Pieter van der Heyden
After Pieter Bruegel the Elder

116. The Land of Cockaigne, after 1570?

In the land of plenty a soldier, a farmer, and a clerk lie on their backs, sleeping and idling their time away after they have eaten all they can swallow. This is the mythical Land of Cockaigne, or Luilekkerland—the country of the lazy and the gluttonous—as it has been called in Dutch literature since the middle of the sixteenth century. The immensely popular story of Luilekkerland tells of a place where there is no need to work and where food is so abundant that we have only to open our mouths to catch roasted fowl flying in the air—as demonstrated at the right of the engraving—or lie on the ground and wait for drink to drip...
down from above—as the clerk does in the left foreground. The only way to reach this land is to eat a passage through an enormous mountain of buckwheat pudding. In the left background we see someone who is falling out of this mountain, with the spoon he has used still in his hand.

The engraving accurately follows in reverse a painting by Pieter Bruegel, which is signed and dated 1567 (fig. 107). Whether the master intended the composition to be reproduced is uncertain, given that no preparatory drawing for the engraving has survived. Moreover, it is possible that Bruegel was not even involved in the production of the print, as there are no known impressions that bear the address of Hieronymus Cock, his usual publisher. In fact, no publisher is noted on the first, most widely known state, an omission that suggests that the engraver himself may have undertaken to print and publish *The Land of Cockaigne*. This engraver’s identity is a matter for speculation because the print is unsigned, but the plate’s traditional attribution to Pieter van der Heyden seems entirely plausible for various reasons. The long and fluent lines of the burin find parallels in many signed works that Van der Heyden engraved after Bruegel on behalf of Cock, such as *The Merchant Robbed by Monkeys* (cat. no. 93). Furthermore, in the style of engraving and of the lettering of the inscription *The Land of Cockaigne* closely recalls five unsigned circular prints that are often given to Van der Heyden. We can perhaps assume that Van der Heyden, or whoever else might have been responsible for the engraving, did not have a drawing by Bruegel at his disposal but worked from the painting or relied on a drawn copy of it by another artist. This procedure would account for some of the deficiencies of the print, such as the lack of depth and the overcrowding in the composition as well as the rather awkward foreshortening of the prone figures. These lapses and also the notion that the printmaker was solely responsible for the production of the engraving would accord with a probable dating of the work to after 1570, after both Bruegel and Cock had died, when Cock’s widow took over his printshop: it was then that the quality of prints produced in the establishment declined and new opportunities for other individuals arose on the Antwerp print market.

Bruegel’s interpretation of Luilekkerland was clearly inspired by an engraving by Peeter Baltens (fig. 108), with whom he had collaborated in Mechelen in 1551, when he was a young, up-and-coming painter. Bruegel copied all his major compositional elements as well as several telling small details from Baltens’s undated print: the tree in the center, the figures lying around the tree, the mountain of buckwheat in one corner of the background, a house with tarts on the roof in the other, the sea between them, the roasted pig with the knife in its back, and the fence of sausages. But it is also obvious that Bruegel improved on his predecessor’s model by translating its incoherent composition into a unified and powerful image.

Dutch verses in the margins of both the print by Baltens and the engraving after Bruegel give a short characterization of the apparently desirable land of plenty that is portrayed. However, an anonymous Flemish poem from 1546 offers us a better understanding of the meaning of the subject in the Netherlands in the middle of the sixteenth century. The poet leaves no doubt about his moral purpose in describing Luilekkerland: “To be lazy, to eat plenty, and do what you want, those are three things that are wrong. . . . Until now this land was known to nobody, except the good-for-nothings, who discovered it first, and it is to be found near the gallows.” The last words alert the reader to what
can happen when humans give way to their inclination to sin, an inclination common to individuals from all levels of society, as the soldier, clerk, and farmer of Bruegel’s portrayal testify. Although contemporary viewers were expected to appreciate the humor and wit of the comic reversal of the rules of society Bruegel showed, they would also have understood his picture’s serious undertone, which decries the vices of sloth and gluttony.9

1. Of the five states listed in Van Bastelaer 1992, states B and C (taken from Van Bastelaer 1908 and Brussels 1969) probably do not exist. In addition, state D listed in Van Bastelaer 1992 does not exist; its citation is based on a misreading of earlier literature. No impressions bearing the address of Hieronymus Cock or erasures thereof have been found; also compare Riggs 1973, p. 387, no. A-13, and Riggs 1979, p. 173. This would lead us to surmise that Cock did not publish the print, a notion supported by the fact that the plate is not listed in the 1601 inventory of the stock of his shop, Aux Quatre Vents. The second edition was published in the mid-seventeenth century by Johannes Galle.

2. Translation adapted from Tokyo 1989, no. 63.

3. On the literary and visual tradition of the subject, see Lebeer 1935, with additional remarks by Lebeer in Brussels 1969, no. 63. On Luilekkerland in the context of late medieval Netherlandish texts that mock and reverse commonly held ethical opinions and social conventions, see Pleij 1983, especially pp. 181–82, 220.


5. See Van Bastelaer 1908, nos. 181–84, 186, and Brussels 1969, nos. 72–76. These prints, now no longer considered to be after designs by Bruegel (see Tokyo 1989, p. 16), were also issued without the address of a publisher.


7. On the relationship between Baltens and Bruegel, including an analysis of their individual versions of The Land of Cockaigne, see Kostvyn 1994, pp. 254–304.

8. “Luy en lecker en veel te meughen, Dat zijn drie dinghen die niet en deughen . . . Dit landt is tot nog toe niemand bekend geweest, dan alleen den Deugh-nieten, diet alder eerst gevonden hebben, ende het is gheleghen . . . na by die Galghe”; quoted from Brussels 1969, p. 136. See also Lebeer 1955.

9. See also Kavaler 1999, pp. 8–9 and no. 124. For a rather overwrought interpretation of Bruegel’s picture, seen in the light of allusions to political events of his time, see Frank 1991.
Philips Galle
after Pieter Bruegel the Elder

117. The Death of the Virgin, 1574

Engraving; first state of two
30.6 x 41.8 cm (12 x 16½ in.)
Inscribed in cartouche at left in lower margin: Sic Petri Brugelij/ archetypa[m] Philipp. / Gall[,]aei imitatatur [Thus Philips Galle
reproduced the prototype by Pieter Bruegel]; in cartouches at
right in lower margin: Abrah. Ortelius, / sibi & amici, / fieri
curabat. [On behalf of himself and his friends Abraham Ortelius
took care of the production.]; at bottom center below line of
cartouche in lower margin: 1574; in lower margin: Gnati certa
tui Virgo cum regna petebas/ Complebant spectus gaudia quanta
tuam?/ Quid tibi dulce magis fuerat quam carcer[a] terre:/ Migrare
optasti in templo superna poli?/ Cum[q][ue] sacram turbam, fuerat
cui pr[a]sidium tu. / Linguebas, nata est qu[a]e tibi maestitia/
Quam m[a]estus quo[q][ue], quam [a]estus spectabit eunte[m]./ Te,
nati atque idem grex tuus ille pias?/ Quid magis bis gratum,
quom te vagnare, quid [a]eque/ Triste satis, facie quam caruisse tua?/
M[a]estit[a]l[e] l[a]estus habitus, vultusque proborum/ Artificis
monstrat picta tabella manu? [Virgin, when you sought the secure
realms of your son, what great joys 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 followers of Christ] whose
mentor you had been, what sadness sprang up in you. How sad
as well as 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 appearances? This picture, created by a skillful hand,
shows the happy bearing of sadness on the faces of the just.)

Mr. and Mrs. Julian I. Edison

Literature: Van Bastelaer 1908, no. 116; Popham 1931;
Hollstein 1949 –, vol. 7 (Galle), no. 155; Vienna 1967–68, no. 98;
Brussels 1969, no. 86; Dolders 1987, no. 60; Tokyo 1989, no. 86;
Van Bastelaer 1992, no. 116; Saint Louis–Cambridge (Mass.)
1995, no. 17; Meillon 1997; Sellink 1997, p. 23; Gibson 1998,

In several respects The Death of the Virgin is an extremely
unusual engraving after Pieter Bruegel. It was not made
until five years after Bruegel’s death in 1569, and it repro-
duces a grisaille painting by the master that was not meant
to be engraved. Executed as a result of the efforts of two
eminent men who were close friends of Bruegel, it inspired
two illustrious contemporary scholars to pen apprecia-
tions—which are among the very few commentaries written
on prints in the sixteenth century. And finally The
Death of the Virgin is simply one of the best prints engraved
after a composition by Bruegel.

The renowned Antwerp humanist and geographer
Abraham Ortelius owned Bruegel’s grisaille Death of the
Virgin, painted about 1564 (fig. 109). As one of the inscrip-
tions in the lower margin of the print tells us, he had the
engraving made for himself and his friends; in 1574 he asked
Philips Galle to copy the composition in copper so that he
could give away printed reproductions of his admired posi-
session. It is generally assumed that the erudite Ortelius
himself wrote the unsigned Latin verses in the margin,
which dwell on the religious content of the image. That
the scholar did present friends with impressions of the
print is known from the written testimony of two men. In
July 1578 the Dutch moralist, playwright, and engraver
Dirck Volkertsz. Coornhert thanked Ortelius for sending
it to him and offered elegant words of praise for all con-
cerned: “from top to bottom I viewed [the sheet] with
pleasure, and in admiration for the artful drawing and the
meticulous engraving. Bruegel and Philips [Galle] have
surpassed themselves. I do not think that either has ever
done better. Thus their friend Abraham [Ortelius] with his
favors [in acquiring the painting and ordering the print]
encouraged both their arts. Never did I see, such is my
opinion, a better drawing, nor an engraving of the same
quality than this sorrowful chamber.” Some twelve years
later the Spanish theologian and royal librarian Benito
Arias Montano appealed to Ortelius for an impression as a
token of friendship, recalling in a letter of March 1590 that
he had seen the grisaille at his friend’s house and describing
it as “painted in the most skillful manner and with the
greatest piety”; the next year, in April 1591, he gratefully
acknowledged receipt of the engraving.

The death of the Virgin is not recorded in the Bible. Only
in the Middle Ages was the theme gradually incorporated
into what were for the most part apocryphal accounts of the
life of Mary. The subject became increasingly popular, due
especially to a detailed narrative in the Golden Legend by
Jacobus de Voragine, a much-read compilation of writings
from the second half of the thirteenth century on the lives
of Christian saints and martyrs. Although it never found as
much favor as stories about other moments from the life of
Mary, the theme of The Death of the Virgin was taken up
by some of the greatest northern European artists of the fif-
teenth century. Paintings by Hugo van der Goes and Dieric
Bouts and prints by Martin Schongauer and Albrecht Dürer
on the subject established a pictorial tradition that Bruegel
embraced. Indeed, for his own Death of the Virgin Bruegel borrowed specific compositional elements from engravings by Schongauer (fig. 110) and Dürer (fig. III).  

Like most artists of his time, Bruegel derived his conception of the death of the Virgin from the Golden Legend. While other artists based their representations of the subject quite directly on the account in that volume, however, he introduced highly unusual, innovative features into his scene. According to tradition, he chose to show the sad event at night, which enabled him to dramatize the composition by means of emphatic chiaroscuro effects especially appropriate to the grisaille technique of his painting. In Galle’s powerful translation of Bruegel’s image, the bedroom is dimly lit by a fireplace, a few candles, and the light radiating from Mary. Bruegel filled the room—which literary sources tell us is in the house of the apostle John—with furniture and household utensils, creating an unusually domestic setting, replete with homely details such as the table in the foreground with the remains of a meal. Whereas the Golden Legend speaks only of the apostles present, here many individuals pay their respects to the dying Virgin. Dressed as a priest, the apostle Peter, the first leader of the Christian community after the death of Christ, stands at Mary’s bed as if he were administering extreme unction; an acolyte holding a cross-staff appears behind Peter; and a friar kneels at the edge of the bed in the right foreground: like the numerous guests in the background, these are elements that are new to the story and suggest that the events shown could just as easily have taken place in Antwerp in the sixteenth century as in biblical times.

It seems probable that here Bruegel chose a familiar contemporary setting, as he did in other religious works, to bring his image close to his viewers so that they could identify with those attending Mary on her deathbed and thus elicit from them strong spiritual feelings. As one scholar has recently pointed out, Bruegel’s reading of the event as taking place in his own time is close to that of roughly contemporary Jesuit texts on the meaning and interpretation of the Virgin’s death. The only inexplicable detail in his composition is the sleeping man in the left foreground. He is generally considered to be John the Evangelist, although there is no evidence to confirm this identification, nor has anyone yet convincingly accounted for why he is so conspicuously sleeping at the very moment of the Virgin’s death.

It is usually assumed that Ortelius was the first owner of Bruegel’s grisaille of The Death of the Virgin and that he may have helped to conceive its innovative iconography. His involvement on this level is certainly plausible, for he belonged to a circle of learned friends in Antwerp that included Bruegel as well as Galle and Arias Montano. It was in this circle of humanist scholars and a few artists, with the publisher Christophe Plantin and his press, Officina Plantiniana, at its heart, that Bruegel’s Death of the Virgin originated and was circulated by means of Galle’s engraving. Ortelius’s tribute to Bruegel, written in his Album Amicorum about 1573, is both brief and apt: “That Pieter Bruegel was the most perfect painter of his age, no one—unless jealous or envious or ignorant of his art—could ever deny.”  

---

Fig. 109. Pieter Bruegel the Elder. The Death of the Virgin, ca. 1564. Oil on panel. National Trust, Upton House, Banbury
2. "A gis... / Dyce ic..." / "...van boven tot ondren/ vrolyc doorsach met verwondren,/ om..." constifte resehen en..." / Bruegel en Philips hebben..." / Elc van hen, acht ic, hevet..." / Zo..." heeft hun vriend... /..." /..." /..." /..." /..." /..." /..." /..." /..." /..." /..." /..." /..." /..." /..." /..." /..." /..." /..." /..." /..." /..." /..." /..." /..." /..." /..." /..." /..." /..." /..." /..." /..." /..." /..." /..." /..." /..." /..." /..." /..." /..." /..." /..." /..." /..." /..." /..." /..." /..." /..." /..." /..." /..." /..." /..." /..." /..." /..." /..." /..." /..." /..." /..." /..." /..." /..." /..." /..." /..." /..." /..." /..." /..." /..." /..." /..." /..." /..." /..." /..." /..." /..." /..." /..." /..." /..." /..." /..." /..." /..." /..." /..." /..." /..." /..." /..." /..." /..." /..." /..." /..." /..." /..." /..." /..." /..." /..." /..." /..." /..." /..." /..." /..." /..." /..." /..." /..." /..." /..." /..." /..." /..." /..." /..." /..." /..." /..." /..." /..." /..." /..." /..." /..." /..." /..." /..." /..." /..." /..." /..." /..." /..." /..." /..." /..." /..." /..." /..." /..." /..." /..." /..." /..." /..." /..." /..." /..." /..." /..." /..." /..." /..." /..." /..." /..." /..." /..." /..." /..." /..." /..." /..." /..." /..." /..." /..." /..." /..." /..." /..." /..." /..." /..." /..." /..." /..." /..." /..." /..." /..." /..." /..." /..." /..." /..." /..." /..." /..." /..." /..." /..." /..." /..." /..." /..." /..." /..." /..." /..." /..." /..." /..." /..." /..." /..." /..." /..." /..." /..." /..." /..." /..." /..." /..." /..." /..." /..." /..." /..." /..." /..." /..." /..." /..." /..." /..." /..." /..." /..." /..." /..." /..." /..." /..." /..." /..." /..." /..." /..." /..." /..." /..." /..." /..." /..." /..." /..." /..." /..." /..." /..." /..." /..." /..." /..." /..." /..." /..." /..." /..." /..." /..." /..." /..." /..." /..." /..." /..." /..." /..." /..." /..." /..." /..." /..." /..." /..." /..." /..." /..." /..." /..." /..." /..." /..." /..." /..." /..." /..." /..." /..." /..." /..." /..." /..." /..." /..." /..." /..." /..." /..." /..." /..." /..." /..." /..." /..." /..." /..." /..." /..." /..." /..." /..." /..." /..." /..." /..." /..." /..." /..." /..." /..." /..." /..." /..." /...`
Pieter Bruegel the Elder (?)  

118. The Damned  

Pen and brown ink  
26 x 16.9 cm (10¼ x 6¾ in.)  
At lower left: stamp of Louvre (Lugt 1886a)  

Département des Arts Graphiques du Musée du Louvre, Paris 19.185  

Literature: Benesch 1935, pp. 181–86 (as Netherlandish, mid-15th century); Brussels–Delft 1957–58, no. 43 (as Netherlandish, first half of 16th century); Winkler 1958, pp. 105–6; Lugt 1968, no. 66 (as Netherlandish, probably Bruegel); Berlin 1975, no. 179 (as Netherlandish, second half of 15th century); Mielke 1996, probl. 4.  

The damned are carried by devils and monsters down into the gaping and fiery mouth of hell. The sheet most likely copies a panel from a lost fifteenth-century altarpiece, possibly by Jan van Eyck, Dieric Bouts, or Colijn de Coter.  

A surprising change of attribution for this sheet and a stylistically similar drawing of Christ Carrying the Cross (fig. 112) from “anonymous fifteenth-century” to Pieter Bruegel was first proposed in 1958. Since then there has been no clear consensus among scholars in regard to the period in which the present drawing was made, let alone concerning the identity of its author. Most recently it has been brought back into Bruegel’s oeuvre as a problematic attribution. Although The Damned shares affinities with drawings of the fifteenth century, and its source must certainly have been a work from that period, the attribution to Bruegel is not without merit. Many characteristics of the draftsmanship find parallels in securely attributed works. For example, the combinations of dots and dashes used here to differentiate surfaces are seen throughout Bruegel’s drawings, and the clear outlines of forms that are assured yet also slightly tremulous are typical of the master’s pen work. Moreover, lines and details are reinforced here and there with a darker ink than that of the original drawing, following a practice Bruegel frequently indulged, particularly in his figural compositions. Further support for the attribution to Bruegel, although not a confirmation of it, is the appearance of several of the drawing’s details in Aeneas in the Underworld, a painting by the artist’s son Jan Brueghel (Kunsthistorisches Museum, Vienna). Jan may have been using his father’s work as a source for his own image, as he often did, but it is also possible that he was quoting the same fifteenth-century model that was the basis for this drawing.  

Fig. 112. Pieter Bruegel the Elder? Christ Carrying the Cross. Pen and brown ink. Graphische Sammlung Albertina, Vienna

1. The drawing shares certain details with Bouts’s Fall of the Damned (Louvre, Paris, on loan to Musée des Beaux-Arts, Lille), but that painting was clearly not its source; see Benesch 1913, pp. 181–82, fig. 3.  
2. Benesch (ibid.) first related the two drawings, and Winkler (1958) proposed the change of attribution.  
3. Grossmann (1939, p. 343), Popham (orally, according to Lugt), and Lugt (1968) all agreed with the attribution to Bruegel; Anzelewsky (in Berlin 1973), however, ascribed the authorship to a Netherlandish master of the second half of the fifteenth century. Mielke (1996) included it among his list of problematic works that might be given to Bruegel.  
4. Erzr 1979, no. 67, fig. 133.
Attributed to Jan Brueghel
(1568–1625)
after Pieter Bruegel the Elder?

119. Landscape with Exotic Animals, ca. 1600?

Pen and brown ink, brush and brown ink at upper left added by another hand
33.5 x 23 cm (13 3/16 x 9 in.)
Inscribed at lower right: [Br]uegel inuen 1554
The Fogg Art Museum, Harvard University Art Museums,
Cambridge, Massachusetts 1977.4
Provenance: Auction, Sotheby’s, London, March 11, 1964,
no. 194; Schaeffer Galleries, New York.
Literature: Arndt 1965–66, p. 10, no. 6; Arndt 1972, p. 105;

Pieter Bruegel’s younger son, Jan Brueghel, copied a number of drawings by his father. After the master’s death, some of his drawings apparently remained in the family and were employed by Jan and also by his other son, Pieter Brueghel, as sources of inspiration for their own workshop practice and as models to copy. (Their continual use of these sheets may partially explain why so many drawings by Bruegel the Elder are lost and why so many of his studies that have survived are in poor condition.) Several copies by Jan are known. One is a sheet in London drawn after his father’s Riverscape near Baasrode (cat. no. 21); the other is the present Landscape with Exotic Animals in Cambridge, Massachusetts, which appeared on the art market in the 1960s and is considered by some to be modeled after a lost composition by Pieter Bruegel the Elder.

The Landscape with Exotic Animals must be considered in light of what has become known as the Lugt group, a cluster of wooded landscapes, mostly in vertical format and drawn by Bruegel about 1554. To this group belong the Brussels Stream with an Angler (cat. no. 18), the Bears in a Wood from London (fig. 19), the Prague Landscape with Bears (cat. no. 15), and numerous sheets by later artists that reflect lost prototypes by Bruegel.1 All these drawings are dominated by a large, twisted tree with massive roots. At the foot of the tree, animals and occasionally human figures are presented against a background of distant houses, a village, or a city on a hill. In style and technique the Lugt group reveals the influence that drawings by and prints after Titian exerted on Bruegel during his stay in Italy in the years 1552 to 1554.

That the Landscape with Exotic Animals is not by Bruegel the Elder is made clear not only by its style but also by its inscription, Bruegel inuen 1554: “Bruegel designed this in 1554,” not “Bruegel made this in 1554.” The Wooded Landscape with a Family of Bears, Deer, and Other Wild Animals, ca. 1600, in Paris (fig. 113) bears an almost identical inscription in the same handwriting in the lower left corner and is closely comparable to the present sheet in subject, size, and technique.2 The drawing in Paris is generally accepted to be by Jan Brueghel, who must also be the author of the Cambridge landscape. However, whether or not Jan copied a specific composition by his father, as the inscription suggests, remains very much in question. Karel Boon remarked of the Lugt drawing that the animals and the human figures are placed more or less arbitrarily, without any relation to one another or to the landscape. This observation

Fig. 113. Jan Brueghel? Wooded Landscape with a Family of Bears, Deer, and Other Wild Animals, ca. 1600. Pen and brown ink on brownish paper. Collection Frits Lugt, Institut Néerlandais, Paris.
and his conclusion that "Jan Brueghel the Elder, instead of literally copying a drawing of his father's, was probably content to borrow some motifs from the latter and combine them in a different fashion" seem to apply to the *Landscape with Exotic Animals* as well.³

1. The name of this group originates from a 1927 study by Frits Lugt. See Mielke 1996, pp. 16–17, for a discussion of the group and further references. On the London drawing, see ibid., no. 18.
2. Boon 1992, no. 46. This inscription reads: *Bruegel inven 1554. Roma.* The Lugt drawing is the best of a group of five versions. Although he catalogues it as school of Pieter Bruegel, in his text Boon clearly accepts the attribution to Jan Brueghel.
3. Ibid., p. 78.
MASTER OF THE MOUNTAIN LANDSCAPES (late 16th or early 17th century)

120–125. Six drawings

The most controversial scholarship of the last few decades regarding Bruegel’s drawn oeuvre is a study that deattributes twenty unsigned Alpine landscapes long considered core works by the artist. These majestic views, some of them large finished sheets, others smaller, incomplete sketches, had been viewed as testimony to Bruegel’s encounter with the Alps during his Italian journey. The sheets in question would have been the sketches famously mentioned by Karel van Mander in his biography of the master. “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.” This remarkable subtraction from Bruegel’s oeuvre was proposed by Hans Miëls in 1991; surprisingly, it was brought about by a straightforward observation. Two drawings in the group, the Mountain Landscape with a River, Village, and Castle (cat. no. 120) and the Broad Mountain Range in Dresden (fig. 114), were executed on paper that has an identifiable watermark constituted of the Strasbourg Lily with the initials WR attached below it—a watermark found on paper dating from the mid-1580s through the seventeenth century. This indicates that both drawings must date, at the very earliest, to about fifteen years after Bruegel’s death and some thirty years after the period 1552 to 1554, when they were generally supposed to have been created. The implications raised by this observation were especially significant because they applied not only to the two sheets with the lily watermark but also to other drawings that are stylistically similar. Eighteen sheets were originally included in this extended group, but we are adding one more, the Solicitude Rustica (Rustic Cares) (cat. no. 125), to their number. It should be noted that some of these drawings had been taken away from Bruegel at various times in the past, but the entire group had never been deattributed nor had the large finished landscapes ever been questioned. Now that Bruegel is no longer considered the author of these sheets, his oeuvre is almost entirely restricted to finished works composed in the studio.

The deattributed works all have a certain statuesque monumentality and a reserved character that now seem atypical for Bruegel as well as unusual for drawings produced in the mid-sixteenth century. They also share sharp, thin, controlled pen work that describes the contours of mountains and parallel hatching, which differ from the relatively thick, minutely wavering lines characteristic of Bruegel’s accepted drawings. In addition, the drawings of the deattributed group often show light traces of a careful black chalk underdrawing that the pen lines follow.

The watermark evidence threw into a new light certain features previously recognized in the drawings. For instance, it had been noticed that several of the sheets contain details that directly correspond to elements in The Large Landscapes etchings (cat. nos. 22–34), and this led to the supposition that Bruegel had used some of the sketches as models for prints. However, this theory was now seen to be suspect because the motifs in the sheets in both media appear in the same direction, rather than in reverse of each
other, which is usually the case when prints are based on
drawings. In addition, some of the details are repeated in
several drawings, which likely would not have happened if
they had been made on site. These facts suggest that the
author of the drawings had a number of The Large Land-
scapes before him from which he picked and chose motifs
that he artfully worked into his Alpine scenes. In fact, in
these sketches ostensibly executed in nature he also appears
to have copied from the prints pointillist delineation of
foliage and cross-hatching on rock faces.

It remains to be determined who drew these fascinating
works, which have lost their attribution to Bruegel but none
of their grandeur and monumentality. Indeed, we must
admire not only these qualities but also the artist’s skill in
imitation. Roelant Savery was tentatively suggested as a
possible author, and Jacob Savery, his older brother, has
been proposed more recently.1 Neither supposition is
entirely satisfying, however. For want of a more acceptable
attribution, here we have chosen to give the name Master
of the Mountain Landscapes to the late-sixteenth- or early-
seventeenth-century Netherlandish author of this stylisti-
cally and, for the most part, thematically coherent group of
sheets. Perhaps now that the negative evidence pointing
away from Bruegel has been assessed, we can examine more
closely the positive aspects of the drawings and finally iden-
tify the artist responsible for them.

2. He first published his conclusions in Mielke 1991a and Mielke 1991b; see
also Mielke 1996, p. 74 and no. 20.
3. No watermark evidence was available for the other drawings: some had no
watermark, while others were pasted onto thick backing that would have
obscured any watermark that might exist.
4. The Landscape with the Martinswand near Innsbruck in the Staatliche
Museen zu Berlin, Kupferstichkabinett, which Tönn (1951, no. 44) and
Müller (1961, no. 416) both doubted, is among the drawings deattributed
in earlier years.
5. Mielke (1991a, 1991b) made a possible attribution to Roelant Savery and
cataloged the drawings as Roelant Savery? in 1996. Royalton-Kisch
(1998, p. 208, n. 3) suggested Jacob Savery as an alternative, in his review
of Mielke 1996.
Master of the Mountain Landscapes

120. Mountain Landscape with a River, Village, and Castle, late 16th or early 17th century

Pen and several shades of brown ink with black-brown reinforcements, and brush and brown ink in foreground
35.7 x 44.4 cm (14 x 17¾ in.)
Inscribed at lower right: P. Brueg... L. in brown ink on verso: Hemskirk; in graphite on lining: This drawing comes from a collection formed in 1770 by the Rev. Thos. Carwardine of Earl Colne Priory Essex when travelling on the Continent with George Romney; Romney painted the Rev. and Mr Carwardine with son; below in an earlier hand, partially effaced and crossed out: John Vosterman b. 1643 / J. Savery / et Dom. Campagnola d. 1540; numerous inscriptions in a more recent hand: Watermark: Strasbourg Lily with letters WR below (similar to Briquet 7210 and Piccard 1297-1330).

The Pierpont Morgan Library, New York, Purchased with the assistance of the Fellows, 1952-1952.25

(Exhibited in New York only)

Provenance: Rev. Thomas Carwardine (1715-1824); probably his daughter Anne (Mrs. Thomas Probert); her son W. J. Probert; his son Geoffrey Probert; his descendant Col. Oliver Probert; auction, Christie's, London, May 16, 1952, no. 41.

Literature: Benesch 1953, p. 79; Münz 1961, no. 21 (as Bruegel); Berlin 1975, no. 57 (as Bruegel); Washington–New York 1986–87, no. 25 (as Bruegel); Marijnissen et al. 1988, p. 68 (as Bruegel); Mielke 1991b (as Roelandt Savery); Stampfle 1991, no. 43 (as Bruegel); Mielke 1996, no. A1 (as Roelandt Savery?).

A fortress stands on the hilltop above a small village nestled in a magnificent mountain valley.

This sheet, which was believed to be a presentation drawing rather than one done in nature, was long considered one of Bruegel’s most accomplished works. However, the appearance of the Strasbourg Lily watermark in the paper—a mark found on paper dating to the mid-1580s through the seventeenth century—revealed that it should be removed from Bruegel’s drawn oeuvre. The watermark was only the first evidence pointing to deattribution, for this grand mountainscape, like the stylistically similar Rhine landscape at Bowdoin College (cat. no. 121), differs in many respects from accepted Bruegel sheets. For example, the silhouettes of the hilltops are sharp and careful, as are the lines of parallel hatching on shaded faces of the mountains, while Bruegel’s pen lines are generally more energetic and playful, tending to wander slightly, even in his more controlled print designs. We need only compare the bushes that frame the foreground in the present sheet with similarly placed greenery in the accepted landscapes in Oslo (cat. no. 3) and Braunschweig (cat. no. 4) to fully appreciate the greater vivacity of Bruegel’s briefly sketched foliage. Moreover, the dotted contours of small trees that line the mountains in the background of this drawing have not been composed with the same softness as those in accepted Bruegel landscapes. And in general the lines here are somewhat thinner than the ones produced by Bruegel’s use of the pen.

The foliage of the trees in the foreground is defined by straight sprays of lines that are reminiscent of the leaves seen in landscape drawings known to be by Jacob Savery. However, this drawing and the other sheets in the group to which it belongs for the most part differ dramatically from his characteristic works. Nevertheless, an assignment to Jacob Savery may be worthy of consideration, as his name is cited in an inscription on the verso of the present sheet that seems to list artists to whom it might have been attributed at an early date.

NMO
Master of the Mountain Landscapes

121. Alpine Landscape (View of Waltensburg), late 16th or early 17th century

Pen and brown ink
32 x 27.4 cm (12 3/4 x 10 7/8 in.)
Inscribed at upper center: 226 Waltersburg; on verso: den oden broegeel No. 56
Bowdoin College Museum of Art, Brunswick, Maine 1877.142
Provenance: Bequest of James Bowdoin III, 1811.
Literature: Tolnay 1935, p. 102, no. 5 (as Bruegel); Tolnay 1952, no. 16 (as Bruegel); Münz 1961, no. 19 (as Bruegel); Berlin 1975, no. 57a (as Bruegel); Brunswick–Williamstown–Lawrence–Toronto 1985–86, no. 8 (as Bruegel); Marijnissen et al. 1988, p. 71 (as Bruegel); Mielke 1996, no. A10 (as Roelandt Savery?).

A broad mountain valley with a lake partly conceals a small house in the foreground. Two tiny figures walk with a dog in the lower left. An inscription at the top in a hand later than that of the drawing’s author identifies the view as “Waltersburg,” or Waltensburg, in the Upper Rhine, but it is probably an invented landscape.

This drawing was recently removed from Bruegel’s oeuvre as a consequence of the deattribution of the stylistically similar majestic mountain view in The Pierpont Morgan Library (cat. no. 120). The connection of the present sheet to Bruegel was made long before it was associated with other drawings given to the artist in 1914; an early-eighteenth-century inscription on the verso shows that it was given to Bruegel at that time, but that attribution evidently was forgotten at some point before 1914. As in the Morgan drawing and other sheets in the group to which it belongs, motifs have distinctive silhouettes that are carefully described by sharp, thin lines, and the ridges of the mountains are brought out with dark ink—features not seen in works by Bruegel. Moreover, the foliage of the bushy
tree in the lower left is mostly delineated with straight lines, which is not characteristic of the practice of Bruegel, who seems to have enjoyed suggesting the leaves on a tree with innumerable loops.

The identity of the author of this drawing is not clear. The trees in the foreground here and in the Morgan Library sheet are composed of sprays of dashes arranged in semicircles that recall trees found in the work of Jacob Savery. However, the grandeur of the scene is not typical of his work as we know it.

1. Mather 1914. Before 1914 it had been catalogued in the Bowdoin College Museum of Art collection as anonymous. For early references to the drawing, see Brunswick–Williamstown–Lawrence–Toronto 1985–86, no. 8.

---

**Master of the Mountain Landscapes**

122. *Landscape with Cross*, late 16th or early 17th century

Pen and brown and red–brown ink, and brush and brown ink 23.5 x 27.5 cm (9 1/4 x 10 1/4 in.)

Museum Boijmans Van Beuningen, Rotterdam N 145

**Provenance:** Burlet, Berlin (Tolnai 1925, p. 72); J. W. Böhler, Lucerne; bought by Franz Koenigs, 1929 (Lugt Suppl. 1023a); gift of Daniel George van Beuningen, 1941.

**Literature:** Swarzenski and Schilling 1924, no. 22 (as Bruegel); Tolnai 1925, p. 72 (as Bruegel imitator); Tolnay 1932, no. 28 (as Bruegel follower, last quarter of 16th century); Grossmann 1954, pp. 32–34 (as Bruegel); Münz 1961, no. 20 (as Bruegel); Berlin 1973, no. 34 (as Bruegel); Mielke 1996, no. 411 (as Roelandt Savery?).

By the shore of a mountain lake stands a wooden cross. The landscape includes several small figures, among them two people in a boat on the lake and a man fishing.
The deattribution of this drawing is based on its clear resemblance to the mountain landscape in The Pierpont Morgan Library (cat. no. 120), which was removed from Bruegel’s oeuvre on strong evidence. The straight vertical hatching used to shade the sides of the rocks in the background and the dots and dashes that delineate the fir trees are the most evident stylistic parallels between the two sheets. A comparison of the firs in this drawing with those in the indisputably genuine Mule Caravan on Hillside (cat. no. 6) clearly reveals stylistic differences. In Landscape with Cross brusque dots and dashes suggest the branches and leaves of the firs, while in the Mule Caravan the equivalent motifs are drawn with fluid lines that end in broad loops.

As one authority has noted, the pointillist delineation of the other trees in the present sheet is based not on landscape drawings by Bruegel but on The Large Landscapes prints after the master (cat. nos. 22–34), in which the foliage is treated as empty-centered clumps defined by short dashes.¹

Significantly, The Large Landscapes also served as sources for rocks shown in some of the other drawings in the group of recently deattributed drawings that includes this piece. In the past some scholars had discounted the Landscape with Cross, considering it the product of a follower of Bruegel of the last quarter of the sixteenth century, while others doubted some of the lines in the foreground and the boat on the lake as rework by a later artist.² The brushwork has long been rejected by students of Bruegel’s drawings as a later addition.

². Tolnay (1935, 1942) rejected the work. Grossmann (1944) maintained that Roelandt Savery had redrawn much of the foliage and added the boat as well.

---

**Master of the Mountain Landscapes**

123. *Mountain near a Lake*, late 16th or early 17th century

Pen and brown ink

17.5 x 25.6 cm (6 ⅞ x 10 ⅝ in.)

Inscribed on verso: *M. No. 19*

The Duke of Devonshire and the Chatsworth Settlement Trustees, Chatsworth 1994

**Literature:** Tolnay 1935–36, p. 37 (as Bruegel); Tolnay 1952, no. 14 (as Bruegel); Münz 1961, no. 11 (as Bruegel); Berlin 1975, no. 53 (as Bruegel); Oberhuber 1981, p. 147 (as Bruegel); Mielke 1996, no. 11 (as Roelandt Savery?).

A massive range of mountains rises beyond the banks of a calm lake.

This drawing and several related mountainscapes in which the foregrounds are largely left blank were long considered unfinished sketches that Bruegel had made on site in the Alps during his Italian journey. The attribution to Bruegel has now generally been discounted, prompted by the evidence provided by two such sheets, the Mountain Landscape with a River, Village, and Castle in New York (cat. no. 120) and the Broad Mountain Range in Dresden (fig. 124), each of which bears a watermark associated with paper made in the mid-1580s and later.¹ The handling of the thin, sharp lines and the fine parallel hatching are atypical for Bruegel, as is the emphasis on the silhouette of the mountains produced by its slightly darker outlines and hatching.

¹. Mielke 1992a, Mielke 1996b; see also Mielke 1996, pp. 74, 100, and no. 20.
MASTER OF THE MOUNTAIN LANDSCAPES

124. *Path through a Village*, late 16th or early 17th century

Pen and brown ink
15.4 x 21.6 cm (6¼ x 8½ in.)
Inscribed in brown ink at lower right: *P. Bruegel*; at lower right:
collection stamp of Spencer (Lugt 1530); inscribed in black ink
on verso: *P. Flyuwelden Bruegel*

Staatliche Museen zu Berlin, Kupferstichkabinett, KD Z 4468

PROVENANCE: Spencer collection; acquired 1909.

LITERATURE: Friedländer 1921, p. 128 (as Bruegel); Tolnai
1925, p. 73, no. c (as not Bruegel); Bock and Rosenberg 1930,
p. 20 (as Bruegel); Münz 1961, no. 113 (as Jacob Savery?); Berlin
1975, no. 36 (as after Bruegel); Mielke 1981b, pp. 133–34 (as
Roelandt Savery); Mielke 1996, no. A16 (as Roelandt Savery?).

A peasant approaches a small village nestled among trees.
Two other figures stand talking in the middle of the road
that winds through the village.

This is the only drawing in the Master of the Mountain
Landscapes group of sheets recently removed from Bruegel’s
oeuvre that does not represent a mountainscape. It is instead
a village scene, similar in subject to the drawings and prints
by and after the so-called Master of the Small Landscapes
(cat. nos. 135–144). The attribution to Bruegel had been
doubted at times in the past, but only recently has the draw-
ing been associated with the mountainscapes now thought
of as the Master of the Mountain Landscapes group. The
most evident feature it shares with that group is the treat-
ment of the foliage on the trees as empty clumps defined
by dashes and straight horizontals, a treatment apparent,
for example, in the trees in the foregrounds of the Morgan
Library and Bowdoin College sheets (cat. nos. 120, 121).
In addition, the small man with hunched shoulders and a
flat hat who is viewed from the back is a type that wanders
through several of the Alpine mountainscapes; he sits in
the lower left foreground of the *Landscape with the Mar-
tinswand near Innsbruck* in the Staatliche Museen zu Ber-
lin, Kupferstichkabinett,1 and just the head and shoulders
of the same sort of person can be spotted fishing in the
foreground of the *Landscape with Cross* (cat. no. 122).

1. It was doubted by Tolnay (1925) and by Münz (1961); the latter tentatively
attributed it to Jacob Savery based on the JS, the Spencer collection stamp, in
the lower right, which he misinterpreted as a possible Savery monogram.

MASTER OF THE MOUNTAIN LANDSCAPES

125. *Sollicitudo Rustica (Rustic Cares)*, late 16th
or early 17th century

Pen and brown ink over black chalk
24.4 x 35.2 cm (9¾ x 13¾ in.)


LITERATURE: White 1963, p. 360 (as Bruegel); Brussels 1980,
no. 14 (as Bruegel); Mielke 1996, no. 25 (as Bruegel).

An expansive view reveals a winding river that passes through
a valley amid high mountains.

There had been little doubt about this sheet’s authen-
ticity since it first came to light in 1963.1 Scholars consid-
ered it a preparatory drawing in reverse for the *Sollicitudo
Rustica (Rustic Cares)* (cat. no. 28), one of The Large Land-
scapes etchings after Bruegel; more specifically, it was

thought to be an intermediary sheet that the master would
have produced before he created the final design for the
print. Although the drawing is very close to the print, it
diverges from it in several ways; most noticeably, it lacks
elements of the etching—the tree and figures in the fore-
ground, as well as some of the staffage that dots the land-
scape—but shows a detail not seen there—smoke rising
from a fire burning in the village on the far right.

Despite this sheet’s similarity to the *Sollicitudo Rustica*
print, there can be no doubt that the hand that drew it is the
same one responsible for the mountainscapes in the Master
of the Mountain Landscapes group that has recently been
removed from Bruegel’s oeuvre.2 The draftsmanship is
more precise and measured than is typical for Bruegel, and
it lacks the spring and movement found in the accepted
landscapes. Characteristic of the Master of the Mountain
Landscapes group are the fine, sharp, controlled line work
and the pen strokes that define the shading of the rock faces in careful parallel hatching and delicately emphasize the silhouette of the mountain range against the sky. Moreover, light traces of a carefully executed black chalk underdrawing are visible, as in many of the Master of the Mountain Landscapes drawings. The sheet most closely resembles a number of other drawings in the group, such as *Mountain near a Lake* (cat. no. 123), in which the artist: left foreground areas blank as he might have done in quick sketches created in nature.

Some of the other drawings by the Master of the Mountain Landscapes quote details from The Large Landscapes in the direction in which they appear in the etchings, suggesting that they are copies after, rather than designs for, the prints. However, the image here is executed in reverse of the composition of the *Solicitude Rustica* etching, as we would expect of a design for the etching. This most puzzling fact leads to the supposition that the drawing perhaps was made as a very precise copy of a lost preparatory sketch by Bruegel for the print or that it is a skillful, intentionally deceptive imitation of such a preparatory sketch. NMO

1. The work was accepted as a Bruegel in the most recent monograph by Mielke (1996, no. 23), who proposed that it was a faded drawing by the master that had been largely reworked by the same careful hand responsible for the addition of the fire in the village. However, the entire drawing seems to have been executed by one hand, and no faded elements are visible.

2. The drawing was first connected with this group by Royalton-Kisch (1996, p. 208).

3. A copy in reverse of the *Solicitude Rustica* print that includes the foreground elements and staffage missing from the present sheet is in the Louvre, Paris (19,726), see Mielke 1996, p. 45.

**Jacob Savery (ca. 1565–1603)**

**126–129. Four drawings**

Included here are four of a group of some twenty-five closely related pen landscapes, long given to Pieter Bruegel the Elder, that are now generally considered to have been created by the late-sixteenth-century artist Jacob Savery, probably as forgeries of the master’s work. These small drawings of rocky landscapes with fortifications or villages bear Bruegel’s name as well as dates ranging from 1559 to 1562. All were executed in pen and shades of brown ink, which now tend to have a distinctive orange tone, usually over black chalk. And all are carried out in a style characterized by frequent use of rather free parallel hatching and foliage modeled with a combination of dots and zigzag strokes that sometimes resemble corkscrews. Although some of the drawings are sketcheiner than others, all are closely related enough in style and technique to allow us to conclude that the entire group is by the same hand.

Since the 1920s various authors have expressed doubts about the attribution of certain of the sheets, mainly on the basis of quality and because their style does not accord well with that of Bruegel’s drawn oeuvre of the 1560s. Bruegel’s freely drawn *Rabbit Hunt* of 1560 (cat. no. 81), for example, does not contain the kind of loose corkscrewlike zigzag strokes seen in the disputed works. At first the misgivings centered on the sketchier sheets from the group, but later some of the more precisely executed drawings also came under fire. A clear indication that something was amiss with the more finished examples was the fact, noted in 1935, that two sheets dated 1562 that depict the walls, towers, and gates of Amsterdam include architectural elements that were not built until the 1590s. It was not until 1986, however, that the entire group of dubious landscapes was definitively removed from Bruegel’s oeuvre.

In 1925 it was suggested for the first time that Jacob Savery might be the author of one of these sheets. In succeeding years the name of this pupil of Hans Bol was repeated time and again in connection with drawings from the group. Indeed, two signed drawings by Savery corrobore the attribution of the disputed works to him. These are *Landscape with a Castle* in the Morgan Library, New York (fig. 115), and *A Ruined Circular Bastion and Bridge* in the Collection Frits Lugt, Institut Néerlandais, Paris, which are characterized by the same loose parallel hatchings and the same airy building up of forms with dots and small strokes that we see in the group. These two signed sheets
and, in turn, all the landscapes formerly given to Bruegel that are discussed here must date from the end of Savery’s career, which would be in the 1590s.

One question remains: what was the intent of these drawings? The “signatures” often were carried out in the same color ink as the drawings themselves, so in all likelihood they were written by Savery himself. Does this indicate that these drawings were deliberate falsifications? The answer seems to be yes. Contemporaries of Savery are known to have executed drawings and prints that were virtuoso emulations of the works of famous artists, but these were not meant to be passed off as the real thing nor were they carried out in large groups. The great number of the Savery landscapes leads us to believe that they were not displays of artistic skill of this sort. In 1598, not long after the group was completed, Jacques de Gheyn II made a print after one of the drawings, on which he transcribed the words Brueghel inv. 1567; this perhaps suggests that there was purposeful deception on Savery’s part, for it seems unlikely that De Gheyn would have engraved this inscription on the plate if he had known that the image was an imitation. Perhaps Savery started these Bruegel-like drawings in good faith and only after noticing how easily he could mislead did he choose to make deliberate forgeries. The deceit was not discovered until well into the twentieth century because Savery was ingenious enough, or perhaps just lucky enough, to date his forgeries to a period from which very few landscape drawings by Bruegel survive: thus the Savery landscapes filled a gap in the chronology of the master’s oeuvre.

2. Significantly, Savery lived in Amsterdam in the 1590s and therefore could certainly have drawn these details from life; Van Eeghen 1935, p. 4. For a summary of his argument, see Mielke 1996, p. 84.
4. For a full analysis of this drawing, View of a Castle on a Rock (Blick auf ein Schloss auf einem Felsturm), in Besançon, see Tolnai 1975, p. 73, and Mielke 1996, no. A38.
5. For these two drawings, see Mielke 1986, pp. 76–81, figs. 3, 4, and Washington–New York 1986–87, p. 233, fig. 1, p. 234, no. 100.
8. This may explain why some of the drawings, and possibly the earlier ones, are inscribed in ink of a color different from that of the image.

Fig. 115. Jacob Savery. Landscape with a Castle, ca. 1590. Pen and brown ink. The Pierpont Morgan Library, New York

100
126. Rocky Landscape, ca. 1590

Pen and light brown ink, with traces of black chalk
11 x 20.1 cm (4 3/8 x 7 7/8 in.)
Inscribed at lower left: P BRVEGEL 1590

Collection Frits Lugt, Institut Néerlandais, Paris 1973


Literature: Tolnai 1925, no. 86; Tolnay 1932, no. 27; Münz 1961, no. 31; Liess 1982, pp. 81, 93–95, pl. 150; Mielke 1986, pp. 76–82; Boon 1992, no. 43; Mielke 1996, no. 423.

This sheet stands apart from the other drawings formerly attributed to Bruegel and now given to Jacob Savery because it depicts merely a cluster of rocks rather than a fuller landscape. The few dispersed bushes and trees hardly alleviate the desolate and remote effect created by the rockscape. A close look does, however, reveal a possible trace of human intervention: a path, starting in the right foreground corner, passes under a large overhanging rock and appears again, only to quickly vanish behind the large boulder in the center.

It seems likely that Savery's drawings were based on firsthand knowledge of works by Bruegel, which he may have owned. This surmise is supported by the backing used on the present work, six other drawings in the group to which it belongs, and three genuine sheets by Bruegel, the Riverscape near Baasrode (cat. no. 21), Gula (Gluttony) (cat. no. 44), and The Rabbit Hunt (cat. no. 81).7 The backing paper on these sheets is identical and bears a watermark of a double-headed crowned eagle that is datable to about 1590,8 which suggests that all were in the same collection at the end of the sixteenth century. It may well be that Savery himself added the backing paper to these drawings and that therefore the Bruegels as well as his own works were in his collection. This is, of course, pure speculation, but it is relevant to note here that two of the Bruegel sheets in question are landscapes and one, the Riverscape near Baasrode, shows trees that closely resemble the trees in sheets by Savery.

1. Mielke 1996, p. 84. The same backing paper is also found on two drawings by Peter Stevens in the Collection Frits Lugt, Institut Néerlandais, Paris (see Boon 1992, vol. 1, nos. 193, 194, vol. 2, p. 90 [illustration of watermark]).
2. Briquet 6164.
Jacob Savery

127. Rocky Landscape with Castle and a River, ca. 1590

Pen and yellow-brown and darker brown ink over black chalk
19.2 x 31 cm (7½ x 12½ in.)
Inscribed at upper center: Bruegel 1562; at lower right: 8948
Staatliche Graphische Sammlung, Munich 1992

Provenance: Freiherr Georg von Stengel; Baron Stephan von Stengel; acquired from his estate, 1824.

Literature: Van Bastelaer and Huin de Loo 1907, p. 177, no. 25; Tolnai 1935, no. 35; Tolnay 1953, no. 39; Münz 1961, no. 44; Wegner 1973, no. 27; Berlin 1975, no. 81; Munich 1989–90, no. 60; Mielke 1996, no. 442.

In an almost barren rocky mountain landscape, a river meanders toward the horizon. On the right is a road with several travelers; one, a man on horseback, pauses to speak to another, a man standing beside him. On the left, at the foot of two tall cliffs, rises a fortress overgrown with foliage.

The characteristics of Jacob Savery’s drawing style are in evidence here. Typical are the airy and delicate modeling of the castle, effected with dots and small strokes rather than outlines; the free zigzag hatching of the rocks, bushes, and foreground trees; and the handling of the composition, which focuses far more on the foreground and middle ground than on the background. These features are inconsistent with Bruegel’s manner, as are the chubby, compact elements of the staffage, which are at odds with the generally thinner figures seen in the master’s work of the late 1550s and early 1560s.¹

Stylistically, this drawing is close to three sheets by Savery that depict the city walls of Amsterdam with its towers and gates.² All share the same precise draftsmanship, and the castle shown here, with its pair of towers overlooking the river, seems to be inspired by the elaborate fortifications of the city of Amsterdam presented in the other drawings. That this sheet and the group of imaginative compositions to which it belongs are not by Bruegel’s hand should not detract from their high quality. Together with many paintings and drawings carried out in the manner of Bruegel by Roelandt Savery, David Vinckboons, Jan Brueghel, and Jacques de Gheyn II, the Savery landscapes testify to the revival of interest in the master’s art that took place between about 1590 and 1610.³

¹. This was observed by Bevers in Munich 1989–90, under no. 60.
Jacob Savery

128. River Flowing by Rocky Cliffs and a Town, ca. 1590

Pen and light brown ink, possibly with traces of black chalk 14.4 x 19 cm (5 3/8 x 7 3/8 in.)
Inscribed at lower right: P. BRUEGEL 1560
Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam, RP–T–1948–386

Provenance: Barthold Suermond, auction, Prestel, Frankfurt, May 5, 1879, no. 28 (with Mielke 1996, no. 223); Jozef Carl Ritter von Klinkosch, auction, C. J. Wavra, Vienna, April 15, 1889, no. 223; auction, Frederik Muller, Amsterdam, May 27, 28, 1913, no. 69; Prince of Liechtenstein; acquired through Cassier, Zurich, 1948.

Literature: Tolnai 1925, p. 73; Tōnai 1952, no. 28; Müntz 1961, no. 36; Boon 1978, no. 103; Mielke 1996, no. 226.

Several boats navigate a broad river that flows through a barren, rocky landscape. A curving road supported by tall stakes planted in the rock leads to a fortification that overlooks a city standing on the bank of the river.

Although the subject matter of this drawing appears typical for Bruegel’s landscape drawings, the technique, with its airy zigzag and parallel hatchings, betrays Jacob Savery’s authorship. For the delineation of the fortress and the city, Savery cleverly imitated a notable feature of Bruegel’s execution—the suggestion of houses and trees with brief dots and dashes. Here the overall effect is quite different from that of the master’s drawings, however. Whereas the empty spaces between Bruegel’s dots and dashes suggest light and form, the openness of Savery’s hatchings makes shapes seem insubstantial.

NMO and MCP
JACOB SAVERY

129. Castle in a Ravine, ca. 1590

Pen and red-yellow-brown ink with traces of black chalk
16 x 21 cm (6 1/2 x 8 1/4 in.)
Inscribed at upper left: BRVEGEL 1591 / S.
Museum Boijmans Van Beuningen, Rotterdam MB 1687
Provenance: Carel Emil Duits (b. 1882), London; dealer
P. de Boer, Amsterdam, 1934; acquired 1938.

Literature: Tolnay 1952, no. 37; Münz 1961, no. 42; Boon

A small brook divides a rocky landscape. On the right rise steep cliffs; on the left a road leads uphill to a small castle. Two travelers ascend the hill on horseback.

The execution, with its profuse parallel hatchings, zigzag strokes and dots used to represent foliage, and airy, delicate modeling of the castle, clearly indicates that this sheet belongs to the group of some twenty-five drawings by Jacob Savery that were formerly attributed to Bruegel. Savery often employed variations of the same motifs to articulate the invented landscapes in this group. In its structure the castle on the left of this drawing, consisting of a single tower connected to a cluster of additional towers by an arched bridge, resembles the fortress in another drawing in the group, the Rocky Landscape with Castle and a River (cat. no. 127). And the figures heading up the hill on horseback are similar to figures in yet another, the Besançon View of a Castle on a Rock. The Besançon sheet was given a probable attribution to Savery in 1925, prompting a reevaluation of the entire group to which it belongs, which is now convincingly assigned to him.1

1. Mielke 1996, no. A38; Tolnai 1925, p. 73 (Blick auf ein Schloss auf einem Felsen).
Roelandt Savery (1576–1639)

130–134. The *naer het leven* Drawings, ca. 1605–10

Five drawings from a group of about eighty


---

Roelandt Savery

130. *Standing Peasant Seen from the Rear*, ca. 1605–10

Pen and brown ink over traces of black chalk

19.3 x 12.4 cm (7 3/8 x 4 3/4 in.)

Inscribed at upper right: *swartte hoedt* (black hat); at right side: *grisse rok* (gray tunic); at left side: *[ges]e tas* (gray bag [text partially cut off]); at lower right: *swartde lersen* (black boots); *nar bult [leveren]* (from life [text partially cut off]); on verso: 1102; collection stamp of Franz Koenigs (Lugt Suppl. 1023a)

On permanent loan to Museum Boijmans Van Beuningen, Rotterdam N 144
Provenance: Julius Wilhelm Böbler (1883–1966), Lucerne; bought by Franz Koenigs (1887–1941), Haarlem, 1929; bought by Daniel George van Beuningen (1877–1955), Rotterdam, 1940; gift to Stichting Museum Boymans, Rotterdam, 1940.


Roelandt Savery

131. Peasant Seen in Half-Length, ca. 1605–10

Pen and brown ink over traces of black chalk
19.2 x 14 cm (7 7/8 x 5 1/2 in.)
Inscribed at upper right: [illegible signature]; at right side: gris roek (gray tunic); at left side: gris / maal (gray bag); at lower right: nards bedt leven (from life); on verso: provenant de la collection/ d’Armand Mestral—St. Saphorin/1738–1805/acheté a un de ses descen- dants... [illegible signature]; on recto: collection stamp of Charles Eggiman (Lugt 350); on verso: collection stamp of Franz Koenigs (Lugt Suppl. 1023a); collection stamp of Charles Eggiman (Lugt 350)

On permanent loan to Museum Boijmans Van Beuningen, Rotterdam N 126

Provenance: Armand de Mestral St. Saphorin (1738–1805); Charles Eggiman (1863–1948), Paris; R. Blay, Paris; his auction,
Roelandt Savery

132. Two Peasants Standing, ca. 1605–10

Pen and brown ink over black chalk
17.6 x 12.9 cm (6 3/8 x 5/8 in.)
Inscribed at upper right: svartttte bruot (black hat); vijlje/voede/rock (dirty red tunic); at right side: grijse/broek (gray trousers); svijlttes/kussen (wide stockings); at left side: re[text partially cut off]; ie [text partially cut off]; on recto: collection stamp of Emile Wauters (Lugt 911); collection stamp of Franz Koenigs (Lugt Suppl. 1023a); collection stamp of D. G. van Beuningen (not in Lugt; compare Lugt 758)

Museum Boijmans Van Beuningen, Rotterdam MB 1958/T 27

Provenance: Emile Wauters (1846–1933), Paris; his auction, Frederik Muller, Amsterdam, June 15, 1926, no. 30; bought by Franz Koenigs (1881–1941), Haarlem; bought by Daniel George van Beuningen (1877–1955), Rotterdam, 1940; acquired with Van Beuningen collection, 1958.


Roelandt Savery

133. Two Beggars and a Woman’s Headdress, ca. 1605–10

Pen and brown ink over red chalk
15.5 x 20.7 cm (6 3/4 x 8 1/4 in.)
Inscribed at upper left: svartttte muis (black bonnet); gelle grisse/rock (yellow-gray tunic); near upper center: vijlte/voöck (dirty white cloth); at upper right: griss taking (gray tunic); at left side: vijlte svartttte/rock (dirty black tunic); at right side: vijlte svartttte/lappen (dirty black rags [text partially cut off]); svartttte rock (black tunic); gelle lappen (yellow rags); at lower right: nar bedt leven (from life); brewel; on verso: collection stamp of Boijmans bequest (Lugt 1857)

Museum Boijmans Van Beuningen, Rotterdam MB 1791

Provenance: Frans Jacob Otto Boijmans (1767–1847), Utrecht; his bequest, 1847.

Literature: Lamme 1883, pp. 191–95; Lamme 1869, pp. 50–54; Van Bastelaer and Hulin de Loo 1907, no. 76; Tolnay 1925, no. 71; Hansema 1927, no. 534; Tolnay 1952, no. 104; Grossmann 1954, pp. 45–46; Münz 1961, no. 83; Spicer-Durham 1979, no. 215.

Redefining the oeuvre of a famous artist can attract a great deal of attention, not only from art historians but also from the press and the general public. In the field of Bruegel studies by far the most sensational reassessment was the removal of a large group of so-called naer het leven drawings (studies from life) from the master’s work and their attribution to Roelandt Savery—an artist who was not even a pupil of Bruegel and was born in 1576, seven years after the master died.

For a number of reasons this provoked an uproar in the press—mainly in the Netherlands and Belgium—in the early 1970s. First, these studies of peasants, beggars, and other men and women from the lower strata of society were essential to the common notion, held by specialists and laymen alike, of Boeren Bruegel (Peasant Bruegel): an artist of humble peasant origin who painted and drew the people, the farms, and the peasant villages as he knew them from his own life.1 Removing these sheets from the oeuvre leaves no surviving drawings of peasants by Bruegel except for The Bagpipe Player (cat. no. 98) and two other sheets, a circumstance that was as disturbing to scholars as it was to the public at large, whose image of the artist is perhaps mostly defined by the immensely popular paper place mats with exactly such subjects in Dutch pancake restaurants.
Furthermore, it was, as it always is, difficult to acknowledge that highly praised works are not by one of the great masters in the history of art but by a much lesser known artist without any public appeal. And the deattribution resulted in an enormous decrease in the value on the art market of the works in question. This was a touchy issue, especially for an established generation of connoisseurs of Bruegel drawings whose previously held opinions were being disputed and whose reputations were, at least in part, at stake. Finally, there was controversy about who first came forward with the idea that Savery, not Bruegel, was the author of the drawings.

The inscription *naer bet leven*, borne on many of the sheets in the group, gives the drawings their name. The group consists of roughly eighty drawings, mostly sketched in black chalk and then emphatically reworked in pen and ink that has now turned brown, but was probably darker and blacker when it was applied. A handful of the drawings, two of which are shown here (cat. nos. 133, 134), were set down in red chalk. The peasant subjects were drawn not from life, as was long thought, in Flanders about 1560, but from models in Bohemia, in central Europe, after 1603. Indeed, Savery lived and worked for several years in Prague and its surroundings, and it was there that he found the subjects of these figure drawings: beggars on crutches in the streets or crouching in porches, peasants huddled in layers of clothes to protect themselves against the fierce winter cold, and better-dressed peasants with money bags shown as the artist must have seen them in marketplaces.

Once scholars accepted the *naer bet leven* group as the work of Savery, they realized that several of the drawings show subjects typical of Prague, a city Bruegel had never visited. Among these are the sheet with the Bohemian headdress of a woman (cat. no. 133) and a number of examples featuring people from the large Jewish community in Prague. The spontaneous and lifelike nature of the primary chalk sketches and the oft-repeated inscription *naer bet leven* leave little doubt that Savery wandered through the streets of Prague and the surrounding countryside with a sketchbook in hand to look for models, quite a novel practice for a Netherlandish artist of his time. It also seems clear that the drawings were meant as sketches for paintings, as they are annotated with quickly written descriptions, for example, “black straw cap,” “dirty white cloth,” and “umber trousers.” We have enough evidence to show that Savery used these studies in his paintings, although there is no complete survey that reveals exactly how and to what extent he did so. The old, bearded peasant seen in half-length (cat. no. 131), for instance, reappears in the background of Savery’s painting *Village Feast* (private collection, the Netherlands).

Some of the *naer bet leven* studies, such as the two drawings with red chalk in the present exhibition, were attributed to Bruegel in the early nineteenth century. Judging by annotations made on the versos of sheets by their owners, many others have been given to artists as various as Hieronymus Bosch, Albrecht Dürer, and Hans Bol, as well as Roelandt Savery himself. But it was only at the beginning of the twentieth century, when Bruegel’s reputation was growing rapidly and the first studies of his drawn œuvre were published, that the *naer bet leven* sketches were described as a coherent group of works by a single artist, namely Pieter Bruegel the Elder. After René van Bastelaer and Georges Hulin de Loo isolated a series of these sheets in their pioneering catalogue of Bruegel drawings published in 1907, subsequent authors added ever more examples until their number reached the present total of about eighty. This they did even though the studies are unsigned and with only one exception show no relation to Bruegel’s paintings.

Yet to have made the assignment to Bruegel was perhaps not as strange as it now seems, given that their conclusions rested in good measure on the testimony of the artist-biographer Karel van Mander. From Van Mander, whose writings were once taken to represent the literal truth reported by a near-contemporary eyewitness to the events of Bruegel’s life, we learn that “Brueghel entertained himself observing the nature of the peasants” and that “he was wonderfully sure in his poses and he had a very pure and subtle technique with the pen with which he drew many small views from life [nae t’leven].” Scholars were understandably tempted to link these two passages from different parts of Van Mander’s text and to connect them, incorrectly as it turns out, with studies of peasants annotated with almost the identical phrase—*naer bet leven*—the author used. Bruegel was considered the painter par excellence of peasant life, and there are no signed figure drawings by him that could have served as studies for his paintings. With the benefit of hindsight, it is easy to see that the vivacious *naer bet leven* studies neatly accorded with what art historians expected Bruegel’s peasant drawings to look like and with sketches that might have been used for his paintings.

In private several scholars apparently voiced doubts about the attribution to Bruegel, possibly based on variations in the quality of the drawings and on the lettering of annotations, which is unlike that seen in the master’s inscriptions. Not until 1932, however, was it suggested in print that Savery might be the author of the group. The suggestion was immediately refuted, and over the next
fifteen years Bruegel scholars and connoisseurs argued against it. But the lengthiness of Fritz Grossmann’s 1954 defense of Bruegel’s authorship indicates how seriously the unpublished attribution to Savery was taken. It seems that only a new generation of experts could change the image of the revered Bruegel. Between 1967 and 1971 two young art historians working independently of each other considered earlier arguments in favor of an attribution to Savery together with new observations and concluded in a number of studies that he was responsible for the entire *naer het leven* series. In 1967 the Dutch student Frans van Leeuwen announced his findings in a lecture in Amsterdam. Focusing on the annotations, he argued convincingly that the handwriting had no relation to that of known inscriptions by Bruegel but corresponded closely with the lettering that appears on drawings securely given to Savery. At the same time in the United States Joaneath Spicer proposed in her dissertation that Savery was responsible for the group, based on her study of watermarks, stylistic issues, and comparisons of the drawings to Savery’s paintings.

Van Leeuwen and Spicer each claim to have been the first to show that Savery was responsible for the drawings, and, fueled by their hot dispute, the press gave the deattribution from Bruegel considerable attention. The new attribution has not been doubted, although it has taken art historians some years to adjust to it. The text in the catalogue that accompanied the Bruegel exhibition held in Berlin in 1975 left little doubt that the organizers fully
accepted Van Leeuwen’s and Spicer’s assignment. However, the captions for the reproductions of the drawings read “probably by Roelandt Savery,” as if there were still some hope that they could have been made by Bruegel. In all later publications these last hesitations have been dropped, and the naer het leven sheets are now accepted for what they are: a fine group of figure drawings by Roelandt Savery.

1. For various interpretations of the meaning of peasants in Bruegel’s work and a survey of the abundant literature and widely diverging opinions on the subject, see Gibson 1961, Sullivan 1984, Silver 1997, and Kaveler 1999.

2. The inscriptions on the naer het leven drawings are studied in detail in Van Leeuwen 1970.

3. It has been suggested that some of the drawings were first sketched with graphite, a new medium in the last decades of the sixteenth century and a precursor of our pencil, rather than black chalk; see Spicer 1970a, pp. 12–13.

4. The subjects, style, technique, and chronology of the naer het leven drawings are studied most fully in Spicer-Durham 1979, pp. 206–243. The dates given for the four sheets in the present exhibition follow Spicer’s chronology for the entire group. In her chronology she convincingly proposes that all four drawings shown here belong to the latest, most mature period of Savery’s figure drawings of this kind.

5. Raupp (1985) does not contest that the drawings were made from life but argues that in them Savery was more concerned with the Netherlands tradition of peasant motifs than with the inspiration of life models. See the critical remarks on this supposition in DaCosta Kaufmann 1986.

6. For the painting see Cologne–Utrecht 1981–86, no. 3 (ill. p. 67). The old man appears in the doorway in the left background. According to the Cologne catalogue, the date on the painting could be either 1605 or 1615. Other readings of the date are 1609 or 1611 (Spicer–Durham 1979, p. 211) and 1616 (De Gruy van den Heuvel 1963, no. 59). For recent studies of comparable naer het leven drawings and their use in paintings, see Washington–New York, 1986–87, nos. 102, 103; Schapellekman 1987, nos. 71–72; and Boon 1992, no. 174.

7. As far as I know, only two drawings (Spicer–Durham 1979, nos. clix, clixvi) are annotated with the name Savery.

8. The one exception is a naer het leven drawing from the Museum Boijmans Van Beuningen, Rotterdam, that shows two figures also found in Bruegel’s painting Christ Carrying the Cross in the Kunsthistorisches Museum, Vienna; see Grossmann 1954, pp. 43–51, figs. 6–7. It is now generally assumed that Savery copied the two men from Bruegel’s painting. The sheet is one of the few in the group that does not bear the annotation “from life.”


10. Before World War II Lugt, for instance, seems to have had some doubts; see Boon 1992, no. 174. In his revised catalogue of Bruegel drawings Tolnay (1982, p. 99) wrote that several scholars thought that Savery might be responsible for the group, but he did not specify who they were or when they gave their opinions.


12. Van Leeuwen gave his lecture to a small audience of students at the Art Historical Institute of the University of Amsterdam, April 12, 1967. In 1969 he privately published a text based on the lecture and sent it to museums, universities, and scholars. The manuscript was published in a revised version in Oud-Holland (Van Leeuwen 1970), after which the original text was printed verbatim in Simiolus (Van Leeuwen 1971).

13. Spicer’s opinions, possibly sharpened by the knowledge that Van Leeuwen was working on the same topic and arriving at a similar conclusion through a different line of research, were known to several people through correspondence. Her arguments were first made public in 1970 in a lecture in Prague, published as Spicer 1970b, and fully elaborated in Master Drawings (Spicer 1970a).

14. Van Leeuwen claims that Spicer came to her conclusions after learning of his discoveries, for which she did not credit him. He also asserts that he was hindered in his attempt to publish his findings in Oud-Holland. For several arguments on the controversy, see the editorial in Simiolus (1971, pp. 137–38) and letters to the editor in Master Drawings (1971, pp. 264–65). Van Leeuwen continues publishing on the affair through his private press. Documentation on the dispute and publications, as well as several official and unofficial reports, can be found in most large art libraries in the Netherlands, including those of the Rijksprentenkabinet, Amsterdam, and the Museum Boijmans Van Beuningen, Rotterdam.

**Master of the Small Landscapes**

135–144. *Ten drawings*


---

**Master of the Small Landscapes**

135. *Bleaching Fields before a Town, ca. 1555–60*

Pen and brown ink  
13.4 x 20.3 cm (5⅜ x 8 in.)  


**Provenance:** Amedée-Paul-Emile Gasc (b. 1817); Charles Gasc (b. ca. 1850) (Lugt 543); Kate de Rothschild; Vermeer Associates, Brampton, Canada.

**Literature:** Liess 1982, pp. 159–60 (as copy after “Pieter Bruegel” drawing in Florence); Washington–New York 1986–87, p. 230, n. 6; Boon 1992, p. 91, n. 13 (as Matthijs Cock).
**Master of the Small Landscapes**

136. *Village View*, ca. 1555–60

Pen and brown ink
12.7 x 39.7 cm (5 x 15½ in.)
Inscribed at lower center by a later hand: *Peter Bruegel*

The Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York, purchase, Rogers Fund, 1906 06.1042.6

**Literature:** Hellman 1915, pp. 390–92 (as Bruegel); Bierens de Haan 1948, pp. 220–21, nos. 6 (left half), 11 (right half as Cornelis Cort); Berlin 1975, no. 158; Haverkamp-Begemann 1979, p. 16, no. 9 (as Joos van Liere); Liess 1979–80, no. 86 (as Cornelis Cort?).

---

**Master of the Small Landscapes**

137. *Street Scene in a Village*, ca. 1555–60

Pen and brown ink
12.3 x 19 cm (4¾ x 7½ in.)
Inscribed at upper center: iii; at upper right: 3

The Duke of Devonshire and the Chatsworth Settlement
Trustees, Chatsworth 843 A

**Literature:** Bierens de Haan 1948, p. 220, no. 1 (as Cornelis Cort); Berlin 1975, p. 140, no. 2; Haverkamp-Begemann 1979, p. 25, no. 2 (as Joos van Liere); Liess 1979–80, no. 62 (as Bruegel); Mielke 1996, no. 446.2.

---

Fig. 116. Joannes and Lucas van Doetecum after the Master of the Small Landscapes, *Village View*, 1559–61. Etching. Museum Boijmans Van Beuningen, Rotterdam
Fig. 117. Joannes and Lucas van Doetecum after the Master of the Small Landscapes. *Street Scene in a Village*, 1559–61. Etching. Museum Boijmans Van Beuningen, Rotterdam
Master of the Small Landscapes

138. *Music Making Party before a Castle, ca. 1555–60*

Pen and brown ink; figures in foreground slightly reworked in pen and darker brown ink by another hand
13.1 x 19.5 cm (5¼ x 7¾ in.)

The Duke of Devonshire and the Chatsworth Settlement Trustees, Chatsworth

Literature: Bierens de Haan 1948, p. 221, no. 10 (as Cornelis Cort); Berlin 1975, no. 193; Haverkamp-Begemann 1979, p. 25, no. 14 (as Joos van Liere); Liess 1979–80, no. c4 (as Bruegel); Mielke 1996, no. A46.8.

Master of the Small Landscapes

139. *Landscape with Figures Throwing Clubs at a Goose, ca. 1555–60*

Pen and brown ink
13.1 x 19.5 cm (5¼ x 7¾ in.)
Inscribed at upper center: /i; at upper right: 7

The Duke of Devonshire and the Chatsworth Settlement Trustees, Chatsworth

Literature: Bierens de Haan 1948, p. 221, no. 9 (as Cornelis Cort); Berlin 1975, no. 193; Haverkamp-Begemann 1979, p. 25, no. 13 (as Joos van Liere); Liess 1979–80, no. c3 (as Bruegel); Mielke 1996, no. A46.7.

Master of the Small Landscapes

140. *Antwerp with the Kronenburg Tower, ca. 1555–60*

Pen and brown ink; several ships, figures, and birds in foreground reworked or added in pen and darker brown ink by another hand
12.3 x 19.2 cm (4¾ x 7¼ in.)

The Duke of Devonshire and the Chatsworth Settlement Trustees, Chatsworth

Literature: Bierens de Haan 1948, p. 221, no. 8 (as Cornelis Cort); Berlin 1975, p. 140, no. 7; Haverkamp-Begemann 1979, p. 25, no. 15 (as Joos van Liere); Liess 1979–80, no. c5 (as Bruegel); Mielke 1996, no. A46.9.
Master of the Small Landscapes

141. Village View, ca. 1555–60

Pen and black ink, gray wash, traces of white and blue gouache on blue-green prepared paper
18.3 x 25.6 cm (7¼ x 10½ in.)
Inscribed at lower right in pen and black ink by a later hand:
van Uden

Collection Frits Lugt, Institut Neerlandais, Paris 3440


Literature: Bierens de Haan 1948, p. 221, no. 7 (as Cornelis Cort); Berlin 1975, no. 189; Haverkamp-Begemann 1979, pp. 18–19 (as Matthijs or Hieronymus Cock); Lies 1979–80, no. A5 (as Bruegel); Boon 1992, no. 54 (as Matthijs Cock); Mielke 1996, no. A46-5.

142. Village View, ca. 1555–60

Pen and brown ink
9 x 19.3 cm (3½ x 7½ in.)
On recto: collection stamp of Earl Spencer (Lugt 1530)

On permanent loan to Museum Boijmans Van Beuningen, Rotterdam N 119

Provenance: probably John Spencer (1708–1766), Althorp; John, first Earl Spencer (1734–1783), Althorp; George John, second Earl Spencer (1758–1834), Althorp; bought by Franz Koenigs (1881–1944), Haarlem, 1928; bought by Daniel George van Beuningen (1877–1955), Rotterdam, 1940; gift to Stichting Museum Boymans, Rotterdam, 1940.

Literature: Bierens de Haan 1948, p. 221, no. 17 (as Cornelis Cort); Berlin 1975, p. 140, under no. 9 (as not by the Master of the Small Landscapes); Lies 1979–80, no. D6 (as by unknown draftsman).
Master of the Small Landscapes

143. *Village View*, ca. 1555–60

Pen and brown ink
12.4 x 19.8 cm (4⅞ x 7⅛ in.)

On permanent loan to Museum Boijmans Van Beuningen, Rotterdam N 31

Provenance: Franz Koenigs (1881–1941), Haarlem; bought by Daniel George van Beuningen (1877–1955), Rotterdam, 1940; gift to Stichting Museum Boymans, Rotterdam, 1940.

Literature: Bierens de Haan 1948, p. 221, no. 16 (as Cornelis Cort); Berlin 1975, p. 140, no. 9; Haverkamp-Begemann 1979, p. 27, no. 19 (as Joos van Liere); Liess 1979–80, no. 92 (as Bruegel?).
Master of the Small Landscapes

144. View of Antwerp, ca. 1555–60

Pen and brown ink
12.9 x 20.1 cm (5 1/2 x 7 3/4 in.)
Inscribed at upper center: aelij; at lower center by a later hand:
Bruggel fecit

Staatliche Museen zu Berlin, Kupferstichkabinett, Berlin
KdZ 5719

Provenance: Adolf von Beckerath (1834–1915), Berlin; gift with Beckerath collection, 1902.


“Many and very attractive places of various cottages, farms, fields, roads, and the like, ornamented with animals of all sorts. All portrayed from life, and mostly situated in the country near Antwerp.” Under this title Hieronymus Cock published a remarkable series of forty-four etched landscape views in two sets, the first issued in 1559, the second in 1561 (see figs. 116, 117). It has as yet been impossible to determine how the prints were originally divided between the two editions. Moreover, their authorship is in question: for unknown reasons Cock did not list either the designer of the prints or the printmaker. Scholars now generally accept that the etchers were the brothers Joannes and Lucas van Doetecum, but the identity of the draftsman responsible for the designs of these innovative and influential landscapes remains an intriguing enigma that countless art historians have tried to solve over the past century. They have attributed the designs as well as a large group of related drawings, ten of which are included here, to artists as various as Hans Bol, Pieter Bruegel the Elder, Hieronymus Cock himself, his brother Mattheüs Cock, Cornelis Cort,
Cornelis van Dalem, Joos van Liere, Cornelis Massys, and the anonymous draftsman called the Master of the Small Landscapes. Opinions regarding that master's identity are as diverse as opinions on whether all the drawings in question are by one hand. And those who, probably correctly, believe that several hands are discernible in the group do not agree about how to divide the works or to whom certain clusters of drawings within the group should be given.  

Together the prints and drawings are known as The Small Landscapes, and all show the Flemish countryside at its most peaceful, an idealized world of quiet villages with animals and with people resting, taking strolls, and playing games. They do not present the humblest parts of the landscape but include, in addition to modest houses of wood and straw, larger buildings of stone, or even stately country mansions and castles. The people and animals do not play important roles but function as staffage to underscore the peace and quiet of the surroundings. All the drawings are horizontal in format, and most feature a low and flat horizon. With an impressive inventiveness, however, the draftsman countered the horizontal emphasis by introducing clusters of deftly situated tall trees, one or two tall buildings, or diagonally placed fields, roads, and stretches of water in the foreground. In their focus on the Flemish countryside as subject, their tranquil and bucolic atmosphere, their skillful execution, and subtle style, both the drawings and the prints of The Small Landscapes series were novel in the Netherlands; moreover, by virtue of these qualities the etchings became highly influential in the development of Dutch landscape art from the early seventeenth century onward.  

The Small Landscapes drawings constitute a heterogeneous group, and while all are related to the prints, not every one is preparatory to an etching. All feature the same technique, namely pen and various shades of brown ink. In several drawings, among them Music Making Party before a Castle (cat. no. 138) and Antwerp with the Kronenburg Tower (cat. no. 140), the figures and animals were added or reworked by a later hand. Infrared examination of Bleaching Fields before a Town (cat. no. 135) has confirmed theories that several sheets in the group were drawn by the same hand in two campaigns, each in a different type of brown ink: the town in the background in one ink, the bleaching fields in the foreground in the other. (It seems likely that the artist drew the town in situ and later filled in the foreground in his studio.)  

The quality varies from sheet to sheet, prompting several scholars to distinguish at least two hands in the sequence: an extremely talented draftsman—the Master of the Small Landscapes—and one or more lesser imitators. But which artist was responsible for which drawing remains a subject of controversy, as we have already noted. Thus, of the works exhibited here, only the rather stiffly drawn Village View from Rotterdam (cat. no. 142) is thought by nearly all scholars to be the product of an inferior artist, while the four sheets from Chatsworth (cat. nos. 137–140) have traditionally been considered part of the core group of works by the Master of the Small Landscapes. The handsome View of Antwerp from Berlin (cat. no. 144) was given to the master, and convincingly so, only fairly recently, at the time of the Bruegel exhibition in Berlin in 1975. On the other hand, the Village View from Paris (cat. no. 141) had always been seen as part of the core group of drawings by the master, despite its clearly anomalous technique, until 1992, when Karel Boon attributed it to Matthijs Cock.  

And the Cambridge, Massachusetts, Bleaching Fields before a Town (cat. no. 135), which came to light only some twenty years ago, has also provoked much dispute. Depending on the scholar, the drawing is either a copy after a similar composition in the Uffizi or the original drawing after which the version in Florence was copied. Of the sheets in the present exhibition, only two are preparatory to Cock’s series of etchings and thus relate directly to them. The Street Scene in a Village (cat. no. 137) is repeated in reverse in an etching (fig. 117), while the left half of the exquisite New York Village View (cat. no. 136) is reproduced in another print (fig. 116).  

The others are linked to The Small Landscapes through comparison with such preparatory drawings.  

While the 1559 and 1561 editions of The Small Landscapes provide no clue to the identity of their designer, a reprint of the entire group published in 1601 lists Cornelis Cort as draftsman. This new edition was issued by Philips Galle, who had acquired the plates from the estate of Cock’s widow, Volxchen Diericx, after her death. Galle was a renowned Antwerp printmaker and print publisher who had been close to Bruegel, Cort, and Cock, as well as to all the other masters to whom The Small Landscapes have been attributed. Because Cort was famous for his prints after Italian masters but not for Flemish landscapes, Galle can hardly have added his name to boost sales of his reissue; thus an attribution to Cort should perhaps be considered seriously.  

Pieter Bruegel too has been associated with The Small Landscapes—hence the inclusion of these drawings in the present catalogue. His name is listed on the title page of a series of twenty-three copies of The Small Landscapes, executed in a slightly smaller size than the originals and in the same direction, that was etched and published by Clæs
Jansz. Visscher in Amsterdam in 1612. The title page (fig. 118) declares “A P. BRUEGELIO DELINEATÆ” (drawn by Pieter Bruegel); yet this hardly constitutes good evidence of a link between Bruegel and The Small Landscapes, as the Amsterdam series appeared more than fifty years after the original group and marks the first time that the master’s name was connected to the prints. It is for other reasons that Bruegel has been considered the author of the initial designs. Art historians of the earlier twentieth century, recognizing the originality and importance of The Small Landscapes for the development of Dutch landscape art, almost automatically attributed them to Bruegel precisely because of their innovative character and their significance.

Several authors, however, saw that there was no factual evidence for this supposition and brought other suggestions to the fore. Two relatively plausible alternatives have been proposed in recent scholarship, although a number of attempts, most notably by Reinhard Liess, have been made to reinstate the assignment to Bruegel. One of these alternatives is Cornelis Cort. This identification is based mainly on the evidence of the addition of his name to the 1601 reprint of The Small Landscapes by Galle but also on affinities between them and the handful of signed landscape drawings by Cort. Problematic here is the fact that Cort’s drawings were probably made after 1565 and that they show Italian subject matter and a strong Titianesque influence not present in The Small Landscapes. The alternative theory is offered by Egbert Haverkamp-Begemann’s proposal that the little-known landscape artist Joos van Liere was responsible for most of the landscapes. Crucial evidence in this attribution is a badly damaged drawing in Vienna of a fortified village or small city that seems to carry the signature Joost van Liere? (fig. 119) that Haverkamp-Begemann believes is by the same hand that drew the core group of The Small Landscapes. The execution of the sheet, however, especially the lack of depth and volume and the rather poorly drawn figures, does not convincingly support the assertion that this work is by the Master of the Small Landscapes.

In sum, there is as yet no persuasive solution to the riddle of the master’s identity. Although Bruegel’s depictions of the Flemish landscapes—in, for instance, the backgrounds
of such riverscapes as the *Riverscape near Baarlebroe* (cat. no. 21) and *The Virtues* (cat. nos. 64–77)—show affinities with The Small Landscapes, there is no firm evidence that Bruegel himself was responsible for these charming village views. But it is certainly in his circle that future art historians will find the artist who was the Master of the Small Landscapes.

MS


2. The first serious attribution to the Doorecum brothers was made by Oberhuber (in Vienna 1967–68, pp. 43–49). The Latin titles of the series are *multi farctarum casurarum variarumque lineamenta curiose ad viuum expressa* (first edition) and *praeclarae villarum et rustiarum casurarum icones elegantissimae ad viuum in aere deformatas* (second edition). For recent descriptions of the prints and further references, see Sellink 2000, nos. 851–94 (as not by or after Cort), and Nalis 1998, nos. 118–61 (as etched by the Doorecum brothers).

3. Two recent and balanced surveys of the entire group of prints and drawings in relation to Flemish landscape traditions are Gibson 2000, pp. 1–16, and Hautekeete 2000. By far the most detailed study — although not the most convincing one in terms of attribution — of all the drawings associated with The Small Landscapes is by Liess (published in three parts, 1979–80 [with catalogue], 1981, and 1982).

4. For Netherlandish landscapes in the sixteenth century and the role of The Small Landscapes in their evolution, see Franz 1969 and Gibson 1989. On sources of the landscapes, also see Spickernagel 1970. The influence of The Small Landscapes as effected mainly through copies made by Claes Jansz. Visscher (see below) is discussed in Freedberg 1980 and Amsterdam 1991–94. The relation between popular cosmographic studies and Netherlandish landscapes of the second half of the sixteenth century is a new subject of research; see Hamburg 1999 and Büttner 2000.

5. I thank William W. Robinson of the Fogg Art Museum, Cambridge, Massachusetts, for sharing this information with me.

6. Boon 1994, no. 54. Although the attribution of this sheet to Matthijs Cock is not improbable, Boon’s conclusion that all designs of the 1599 series, but apparently not the 1561 edition, are by his hand seems rather farfetched. Boon (ibid., pp. xxii–xxiii) suggests that Hieronymus Cock let another draftsman “translate” his brother Matthijs’s spontaneous landscape drawings for the first group into more mechanical preparatory drawings for the etcher. While this may have been done in the case of the Paris drawing — of which there is a finished version in Berlin (KAB 14529; Berlin 1975, no. 190) — it was used as a preparatory design for the etching — there is no evidence that this procedure was followed for any of the other sheets.

7. *For Street Scene in a Village and Village View*, see Van Bastelaer 1908, nos. 33, 55, and Nalis 1998, nos. 176, 174, respectively.


9. The prints are listed in the inventory of her estate as “Negen copeperen plaeten van Boerenhuyskens” (Nine copperplates of farmhouses [1599 edition?]) and “Dertien copeperen plaeten van Boerenhuyskens met een plaetek van’t Copertement” (Thirteen copperplates of farmhouses with a plate of tin [1561 edition?]); Duverger 1984, p. 34. As has been proven recently (Nalis 1998, vol. 1, pp. 94–95), the plates were uncum at the time of the inventory, with two compositions on one copperplate. Galle, who was trustee of Dierick’s estate, cut the twenty-two copperplates and issued them as forty-four separate prints.

10. In an exhibition in Rotterdam and Maastricht in 2002 that will focus on the Master of the Small Landscapes and in a forthcoming publication on Cort’s drawings, I hope to shed more light on a possible identification of Cort as the Master of the Small Landscapes.


12. Haverkamp-Begemann (1979) also draws attention to an etching from 1614 after Van Liebre as a stylistically related work. The Vienna drawing is also discussed in Mielke 1996, pp. 70–71, as a problematic sheet, with an unconvinced attribution to Bruegel.
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Cort, Cornelis, attributed to, print after Bruegel, Pieter the Elder, The Two Gallies Sailing behind an Armed Three-Master with Phaeton and Jupiter in the Sky, 217, 218

Coter, Collin de, 202

Crabbe, Frans, 41

Dalem, Cornelis van, 206, 207, 297

David, Gerard, 35

Delamardelle after Campagnola, Domenico, print,

Landscape with Mills (Fig. 77), 19, 19
Lombard, Lambert, 43, 45, 48
drawing, *The Raising of Lazarus* (Fig. 40), 43, 43
prints after
anonymous, *The Raising of Lazarus* (Fig. 41), 43, 43
by Heyden, Pieter van der, *The Crucifixion* (Fig. 44), 43, 45
Londerseel, Johannes van, 72, print, after Vanckboons, David, *Landscape with Travelers Attacked by a Gang ofRobbers* (Fig. 76), 75, 29, 79
Lucas van Leyden, 50, 81
Lucien, 63–64, 235
Mander, Karel van, 7–6, 7, 9, 13, 19, 26, 30–31, 31, 35, 43, 50, 59, 64, 65, 69, 72, 81, 120, 206, 236, 240, 244, 266, 285
Mandijn, Jan, 28, painting, *The Descent of Christ into Limbo* (Fig. 94), 207, 222
Margaret, duchess of Parma and regent of the Netherlands, 8, 248
Mariette, Pierre-Jean, 22
Massys, Cornelis, 19, 41, 98, 247, drawing, *Landscape with a Castle* (Fig. 13), 17, 18, 19
Master of the Eerrera Sketchbook, 23, 24; drawings:
Coastal Landscape with a Windmill (Fig. 35), 24, 25
Tree (Fig. 26), 24, 25
Master of the Mountain Landscapes, 11, 23, 206; drawings:
Broad Mountain Range (Fig. 114), 266, 266, 272
Landscape with a Milkmaid (Fig. 83), 127, 127
Landscape with the Martinswoud near Ensbrück, 274
six drawings (Nos. 130–135), 11, 23, 33, 41, 88, 94, 121, 127, 129, 203, 266–76
Alpine Landscape (View of Waltenburg) (No. 121), 70, 88, 94, 268, 270, 270–71, 274
Landscape with Cross (No. 122), 88, 94, 271, 271–74
Mountain Landscape with a River, Village, and Castle (No. 120), 70, 88, 94, 266, 267, 268, 269, 270, 271, 275, 276
Mountain near a Lake (No. 121), 88, 94, 272, 273, 275, 276
Path through a Village (No. 124), 88, 94, 274, 274
Sulcitio Rustica (Rustic Caro) (No. 135), 88, 94, 128, 266, 274–76, 275
Master of the Small Landscapes drawings (Nos. 115–144), 23, 24, 33, 82, 112, 274, 289–99
Antwerp with the Kronenburg Tower (No. 140), 293–295, 297
Blazing Fields before a Town (No. 135), 289, 289, 297
Landscape with Figures Having Clubs at a Goose (No. 139), 292, 293, 297
Music Making Party before a Castle (No. 138), 292, 293, 297
Street Scene in a Village (No. 137), 290, 291, 297
View of Antwerp (No. 144), 296, 296, 297
Village View (No. 156), 290, 290–91, 297
Village View (No. 141), 294, 294, 297

Village View (No. 141), 294, 295, 297
Village View (No. 143), 295, 295
prints after, by Doetecum, Joannes and Lucas van:
Street Scene in a Village (Fig. 117), 292, 296, 297
Village View (Fig. 116), 290, 296, 297
Maximilian I, Holy Roman emperor, 218
Melanchthon, Philipp, 235
Mendoza, Mencia de, marquesa de Cenete, 26
Michelangelo, 15, 21, 30, 31, 243; paintings: *The Conversion of Saint Paul*, 15; *The Crucifixion of Saint Peter*, 15; *The Last Judgment*, 15; *The Sacrifice of Noah*, detail (Fig. 13), 15, 16
Michel, Marcantonio, 26
Mielke, Hans, 14, 16, 24, 38, 30, 32, 77, 78, 90, 104, 113, 179, 179, 179, 200, 202, 266
Mompere, Bartholomeus de, 52–53, 74, 198, 199
Mompere, de, family, 69
Müller, Jürgen, 158, 172, 192
Müller Hofstede, Justus, 104
Muziano, Girolamo, 212

Norgate, Edward, 31, 36
Novellanus, Simon, attributed to, print, after
Bruegel, Pieter the Elder, *Landscape with Mercury Abducting Psyche* (Fig. 4), 6, 6

Ortelius, Abraham, 9, 10, 13, 35, 64, 238, 260
Patinir, Joachim, 19, 69, 98, 100, 116, 116, 120; drawing, *Landscape with Cliffs* (Fig. 16), 19, 19
Paul III, pope, 15
Penca, Georg, print, *Nobody (Die Niemandt)*, 269
Petrarch, 172
Philip II, king of Spain, 26, 199
Plantin, Christophe, 35, 49, 50, 64, 217, 260; print, *The Funeral Procession of Charles V, 50
Pliny the Elder, 13, 207

Rabelais, 145
Raphael, 15, 19; prints after, by Ghisi, Giorgio, of Stanze frescoes, 48
Romano, Giulio, 15
Royalton-Kisch, Martin, 90, 202
Rubens, Peter Paul, 31, 36, 57, 69; painting, *Kermis*, 68
Rubens, Peter Paul, attributed to, drawing, after
Bruegel, Pieter the Elder, *The Painter and the Connoisseur*, 67, 68
Rudolf II, Holy Roman emperor, 20, 26, 32

Sadeler, Agelius, portrait of Bruegel, 81
Savery, Jacob, 11, 13, 13, 67, 68, 70, 71, 73–74, 75, 76, 76, 82, 116, 202, 267, 268, 273, drawings:
The Blind (Fig. 73), 73, 77
horrors of war, scene, 73
Castle in a Ravine (No. 129), 281, 281
River Flooding by Rocky Cliffs and a Town
(No. 128), 280, 280
Rocky Landscape (No. 116), 278, 278
Rocky Landscape with Castle and a River (No. 127), 279, 279, 281
Landscape with a Castle (Fig. 133), 276–77, 277
A Ruined Circular Bastion and Bridge, 276–77
View of a Castle on a Rock, 281
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Savery, Roelandt, 21, 24, 32, 34, 67, 68, 71, 73, 82, 267, 279, 285
painting, Village Feast, 285
naer het leven drawings (Nos. 130–134), 23, 32, 33,
67, 202, 282–88
Peasant Seen in Half-Length (No. 131), 283,
285–84, 285
Standing Peasant Seen from the Rear (No. 130),
282, 282–83
Three Peasants (No. 134), 284, 285, 287
Two Beggars and a Woman’s Headdress (No. 133),
284, 285, 287
Two Peasants Standing (No. 132), 284, 288
Schoon, Erhard, formerly attributed to, print, The
Oval Hat Light, 169
Schongauer, Martin, 248–60; print, The Death of the
Virgin (Fig. 110), 248–60, 261
Scorel, Jan van, drawing, The Tower of Babel (Fig. 37),
34, 34
Serlio, Sebastiano, 15
Spicer, Joaneath, 286–88
Stridbeck, Carl Gustaf, 160
Terencius, Johannes, 35
Titian, 15–16, 19, 23, 63, 81, 98, 99, 100, 102, 104, 106,
110, 112, 113, 115, 264, 298
drawing, Landscape with a Fortified Castle (Fig. 22),
21, 22
print after, by Boldrini, Nicolò, Saint Jerome in
the Wilderness (Fig. 14), 17
Titian or Campagnola, Domenico, anonymous
Italian woodcut after, Two Goats at the Foot of a
Tree (Fig. 79), 88, 89
Tobias, Charles de, 104, 136, 137, 139
Trompaz, Antonio, 31
Vasari, Giorgio, 10, 13, 15, 22–23, 26, 27, 31
Vedel, Esaias van de, painting, 76, 80, 81; Garden
Party, 80
Vedel, Jan van de, painting, Winter from the
Four Seasons series (Fig. 70), 74, 74
Veinert, Dirk, 44
Verhulst, Mayken, 5, 7, 21, 22
Vermeyen, Jan, 41
Veroneese, Paolo, 35
Vinckboons, David, 68, 73, 74, 75–80, 82, 279
paintings: Blind Hardy-gurdy Player, 77;
Census at Bethlehem, 76; Conversion of
Paul, 76; Peasants’ Distress, 79; Peasants’
Revenge, 79; The Preaching of John the
Baptist, 76
drawings: bievenenstuijven scene, 75; Boy Bird-Nester
(Fig. 76), 78, 78; Festive Peasants, Soldiers,
and Harlots (Fig. 77); 79, 80; Village Kermis
(Fig. 71), 76, 77
prints after
by Bruyn, Nicolaes de, The Feast in the Glade
(Fig. 78), 80, 81
by Gerritsz, Hessel; The Bird-Nester (Fig. 73),
78, 79, 240
by Londerseel, Johannes van, Landscape with
Travelers Attacked by a Gang of Robbers
(Fig. 76), 75, 79
by Visscher, Claes Jansz., The Bird-Nester
(Fig. 101), 239, 240; Harper Procession
(Fig. 73), 75, 77–78
Vinckboons, Philip, 75–76
Virgil, 248
Visscher, Claes Jansz., 73, 76, 79, 83, 267–98;
prints: Pleasant Places series, 83; title page,
The Small Landscapes (Fig. 128), 267–98, 298
after Vinckboons, David: The Bird-Nester
(Fig. 101), 239, 240; Harper Procession (Fig. 72),
27, 77–78
Vitruvius, 135; On Architecture, 145
Vivant-Denon, Baron Dominique, 104, 160
Voragine, Jacobus de, Golden Legend, 230, 231, 232,
234, 238, 260
Vos, Maarten de, 6
van, Sebastian, 33. See also Brueghel, Jan, with
figures by van, Sebastian
Vries, Jan Veredeman de, 48
Wellens, Cornelis, 176
Weyden, Rogier van den, 13, 14
Wierix, Hieronymus, prints: Twelve Flemish
Proverbs series, 77
Wierix, Johannes, attributed to, print, Portrait of
Pieter Bruegel the Elder (Fig. 1), 3, 3, 3, 228
Württenberger, Franzsepp, 169
Photograph Credits

Photographs were in most cases provided by the owners of the works and are reproduced by their permission; their courtesy is gratefully acknowledged.

New photography of works in the Metropolitan Museum collection by Bruce Schwarz and Juan Trujillo, the Photograph Studio, The Metropolitan Museum of Art

© A.C.L., Brussels: figs. 25, 31

Sina Althofer: fig. 7

Biblioteca Ambrosiana, Milan., all rights reserved: cat. no. 2

© Ashmolean Museum, Oxford: cat. nos. 36, 59, 61

© British Museum, London: cat. nos. 9, 10, 43, 45, 49, 54, 58, 104, 125; figs. 14, 17, 19, 30, 66, 70, 76, 78, 79, 82, 100

© 1999 Chatworth Photo Library: cat. nos. 8, 113, 137–39

Charles Choffet: fig. 33

© 1997 Detroit Institute of Arts: fig. 104

DOWIC: fig. 24

Lutz Ebhardt: fig. 97


© 2000 President and Fellows of Harvard College: cat. no. 35; fig. 80

© President and Fellows of Harvard College / photograph by David Mathews: cat. nos. 14, 119

© KIK/IRPA, Brussels: fig. 8

© Kupferstichkabinett, Staatliche Museen zu Berlin-Preussischer Kulturbesitz / photograph by Jörg Anders: cat. nos. 1, 13 recto, verso; 21, 40, 60, 70, 107, 124, 144; figs. 9, 12, 15, 34, 73

The Pierpont Morgan Libray, New York: cat. no. 62

The Pierpont Morgan Library, New York / photograph by David A. Loggie: cat. no. 120


Národní Galerie, Prague / photograph by Jan Divič: cat. no. 15 recto, verso

Board of Trustees, National Gallery of Art, Washington: cat. nos. 19, 35, 33, 41, 98

Board of Trustees, National Gallery of Art, Washington / photograph by Dean Beason: cat. no. 11

© Rijksmuseum-Stichting, Amsterdam: cat. nos. 53, 64, 79, 102; figs. 43, 74, 75, 77, 89

Photo RMN: figs. 10, 11, 22, 81

Photo RMN / Michèle Bellot: cat. nos. 12, 118

Photo RMN / R. G. Ojeda: fig. 99

The Royal Collection © Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth II: fig. 36

Musées Royaux des Beaux-Arts de Belgique: Koninklijke Musea voor Schone Kunsten van België, Brussels / photograph by Cissac: cat. no. 68

The Saint Louis Museum of Art: cat. no. 16

© Photo d’Art-Kunstfoto Speltdoorn / photograph by Speltdoorn: fig. 26

© Staatliche Graphische Kunstsammlung, Munich: cat. no. 7

© Teylers Museum, Haarlem: fig. 21

© Herzog Anton Ulrich Museum, Braunschweig / photograph by Bernd-Peter Keiser

Richard Valencia: cat. nos. 82, 114

© Elke Walford: cat. no. 109

Elke Walford: fig. 18

323