

INFORMATION TO USERS

This reproduction was made from a copy of a document sent to us for microfilming. While the most advanced technology has been used to photograph and reproduce this document, the quality of the reproduction is heavily dependent upon the quality of the material submitted.

The following explanation of techniques is provided to help clarify markings or notations which may appear on this reproduction.

1. The sign or "target" for pages apparently lacking from the document photographed is "Missing Page(s)". If it was possible to obtain the missing page(s) or section, they are spliced into the film along with adjacent pages. This may have necessitated cutting through an image and duplicating adjacent pages to assure complete continuity.
2. When an image on the film is obliterated with a round black mark, it is an indication of either blurred copy because of movement during exposure, duplicate copy, or copyrighted materials that should not have been filmed. For blurred pages, a good image of the page can be found in the adjacent frame. If copyrighted materials were deleted, a target note will appear listing the pages in the adjacent frame.
3. When a map, drawing or chart, etc., is part of the material being photographed, a definite method of "sectioning" the material has been followed. It is customary to begin filming at the upper left hand corner of a large sheet and to continue from left to right in equal sections with small overlaps. If necessary, sectioning is continued again—beginning below the first row and continuing on until complete.
4. For illustrations that cannot be satisfactorily reproduced by xerographic means, photographic prints can be purchased at additional cost and inserted into your xerographic copy. These prints are available upon request from the Dissertations Customer Services Department.
5. Some pages in any document may have indistinct print. In all cases the best available copy has been filmed.

**University
Microfilms
International**

300 N. Zeeb Road
Ann Arbor, MI 48106

Ainsworth, Maryan Wynn

**SERNART VAN ORLEY AS A DESIGNER OF TAPESTRY. (VOLUME I:
TEXT. VOLUME II: ILLUSTRATIONS.) (VOLUME II NOT MICROFILMED AS
PART OF DISSERTATION)**

Yale University

Ph.D. 1982

**University
Microfilms
International** 300 N. Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor, MI 48106

Copyright 1982

by

Ainsworth, Maryan Wynn

All Rights Reserved

BERNART VAN ORLEY AS A DESIGNER OF TAPESTRY

VOLUME ONE: TEXT

A DISSERTATION

PRESENTED TO THE FACULTY OF THE GRADUATE SCHOOL

OF

YALE UNIVERSITY

IN CANDIDACY FOR THE DEGREE OF

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

by

Maryan Wynn Ainsworth

May, 1982

© Copyright by Maryan Wynn Ainsworth 1982

ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Recalling the names of those who have facilitated this study in so many ways is a pleasure. I am especially grateful to Egbert Haverkamp-Begemann, my advisor, for his challenging insights and continued wise counsel through several drafts of this dissertation. In early discussions of the formulation of the topic James Marrow, Larry Silver, Martha Wolff and Carol Troyen gave useful advice. The subsequent year's research in Brussels and travel throughout Europe were generously supported by the Belgian-American Educational Foundation. During my stay in Brussels I benefited immeasurably from discussions with Guy Delmarcel, Curator of Textiles at the Museum of Art and History. He has continued to stimulate my thinking on numerous issues and to provide direction for the study of sixteenth century tapestry design. Christina Ceulemans and Arnout Balis kindly shared their unpublished thèses de license on Van Orley's Hunts of Maximilian and guided me to important resources in Belgium for my own study.

For help in gaining access to private collections and research facilities abroad, I am indebted to two Fulbright Commission directors, Dorothy Deflandre-Moore in Belgium and Ramón Bela in Spain. Certain European scholars also gave special assistance and lent their expertise to my study

of drawings, notably Roger d'Hulst, Roseline Bacou, John Rowlands and Micheline Comblen-Sonkes. Further, staff members at the following institutions aided my research in innumerable ways: the Bibliothèque Royale Albert I^{er}, A.C.L., Centre National de Recherches "Primitifs Flamands," and Musées royaux d'Art et d'Histoire in Brussels; the National Centrum voor Plastische Kunsten van de 16^{de} en 17^{de} Eeuw, Antwerp; the Witt Library, London; the Frick Art Reference Library and the Watson Library of the Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York City.

I owe special thanks to individuals in this country who have continued a dialogue with me during my research on Van Orley's tapestry designs. Edith Standen has made available her personal photograph collection and that donated to the Metropolitan Museum by French and Co. as well as her vast knowledge of the field. Jack Horn and David Farmer generously shared their unpublished dissertations on Jan Vermeyen and Bernart van Orley respectively, and Molly Faries made suggestions about creative process in regard to Jan van Scorel. To this list I add Kristine Forney, Margaret Nicholson, Kristi Nelson and Dan Ewing, colleagues and friends, with whom I shared many discussions of mutual interest on our overlapping research topics. Finally, the study could not have been undertaken nor completed without the loving support, editorial help, proof-reading and personal sacrifices of J.C. Wynn and Charles Ainsworth.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

VOLUME ONE: TEXT

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS.....	iii
LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS.....	vi
INTRODUCTION.....	1
CHAPTER ONE: THE PLACE OF TAPESTRY IN THE ART OF SIXTEENTH CENTURY BRUSSELS.....	10
CHAPTER TWO: VAN ORLEY AS A DESIGNER OF TAPESTRY: DOCUMENTS AND THE EARLY WORK.....	23
CHAPTER THREE: THE CREATIVE ACT: THE DRAWINGS.....	63
CHAPTER FOUR: THE MATURE WORKS: VAN ORLEY'S TRANSFORMATION OF ARTISTIC SOURCES FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF NATURALISTIC ILLUSIONISM.....	99
CHAPTER FIVE: SUBJECT MATTER: VAN ORLEY'S INNOVATIVE APPROACH TO DEVOTIONAL AND NARRATIVE TAPESTRIES.....	145
CONCLUDING REMARKS.....	182
BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	187

VOLUME TWO: ILLUSTRATIONS

ILLUSTRATIONS.....	208
--------------------	-----

LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS

Unless otherwise noted all of the illustrations are tapestries. The artist listed is the designer of the work.

1. Bernart van Orley, The Legend of Notre-Dame du Sablon, 1: The Apparition of the Virgin to Beatrice Soetkens and the Repainting of the Statue. Formerly Berlin, Kaiser Friederich Museum; Glasg w, Burrell Coll.; Brussels, Mus es royaux d'Art et d'Histoire; formerly Berlin, Kaiser Friederich Museum; Saint-Jean-Cap-Ferrat, Villa-Mus e Ile-de-France.
2. Bernart van Orley, The Legend of Notre-Dame du Sablon, 2: The Virgin Orders Beatrice Soetkens to Carry the Statue from Antwerp to Brussels. Leningrad, Hermitage.
3. Bernart van Orley, The Legend of Notre-Dame du Sablon, 3: The Statue of Notre-Dame is Taken to the Church of the Sablon at Brussels. Brussels, Mus e Communal.
4. Bernart van Orley, The Legend of Notre-Dame du Sablon, 4: The Statue of Notre-Dame is Received in Brussels. Brussels, Mus es royaux d'Art et d'Histoire.
5. Jan van Roome, The Legend of Herkenbald. Brussels, Mus es royaux d'Art et d'Histoire.
6. Jan van Roome, Story of David and Bathsheba, 4: Bathsheba is Invited into the Palace. Paris, Mus e de Cluny.
7. Bernart van Orley, Dais of Charles V: God the Father. Madrid, Patrimonio Nacional.
8. Bernart van Orley, Dais of Charles V: Crucifixion. Madrid, Patrimonio Nacional.
9. Anonymous Flemish, early 16th century, Dais of Charles V: Christ Taking Leave from His Mother. Madrid, Patrimonio Nacional.
10. Bernart van Orley, Crucifixion, painting. Hartford, Wadsworth Atheneum.
11. Bernart van Orley, Crucifixion, New York, Metropolitan Museum of Art (Blumenthal Collection).

12. Bernart van Orley, Lamentation, painting. Brussels, Musées royaux des Beaux-Arts.
13. Bernart van Orley, Lamentation. Washington, National Gallery of Art.
14. Raphael, Study for the Entombment, drawing. London, British Museum.
15. Albrecht Dürer, Lamentation, woodcut.
16. Albrecht Dürer, Lamentation, woodcut.
17. Albrecht Dürer, Lamentation, drawing. Bremen, Kunsthalle.
18. Bernart van Orley, Adoration of the Kings. New York, Metropolitan Museum of Art.
19. Bernart van Orley, Adoration of the Kings, painting. Philadelphia, Art Museum (J. G. Johnson Collection).
20. Raphael school, Adoration of the Kings, Rome, Vatican.
21. Raphael school, Adoration of the Kings, fresco. Rome, Vatican Logge.
22. Raphael school, Adoration of the Kings, drawing. Oxford, Ashmolean Museum.
23. Bernart van Orley, The Passion: Christ Carrying the Cross. Madrid, Patrimonio Nacional.
24. Bernart van Orley, The Passion: Christ in the Garden of Gethsemane. Madrid, Patrimonio Nacional.
25. Anonymous Flemish, early 16th century, The Passion: Crucifixion. Madrid, Patrimonio Nacional.
26. Anonymous Flemish, early 16th century, The Passion: Deposition. Madrid, Patrimonio Nacional.
27. Bernart van Orley, The Passion: Christ in the Garden of Gethsemane. Washington, National Gallery.
28. Bernart van Orley, The Passion: Christ Carrying the Cross. Paris, Musée Jacquemart-André.
29. Bernart van Orley, The Passion: Crucifixion. Washington, National Gallery.

30. Jan van Roome, Funerary monument, sculpture. Bourgen-Bresse, Cathedral of Brou.
31. Jan van Roome, Feast and Punishment of Tantalus, fresco. Malines, Busleyden House.
32. Anonymous Flemish, early 16th century, The Supplication of Mestra. Brussels, Musées royaux des Beaux-Arts de Belgique.
33. Anonymous Flemish, early 16th century, Deposition. Madrid, Patrimonio Nacional.
34. Bernart van Orley, The Passion: Last Supper. New York, Metropolitan Museum of Art (Lehman Collection).
35. Bernart van Orley, The Passion: Last Supper. Madrid, Patrimonio Nacional.
36. Bernart van Orley, Crucifixion, drawing. Stuttgart, Staatgalerie.
37. Albrecht Dürer, Crucifixion, engraving.
38. Bernart van Orley, Appius Claudius and Virginia, drawing. London, British Museum.
39. Attributed to Aerdt Orkens, Power of Venus, drawing. London, British Museum.
40. Bernart van Orley, A Company of Ladies and Gentlemen in a Garden, drawing. London, British Museum.
41. Bernart van Orley, Departure of the Prodigal Son, drawing. Whereabouts unknown.
42. Bernart van Orley, Triumph of Justice, drawing. Berlin, Staatliche Museen, Kupferstichkabinett.
43. Bernart van Orley, Allegory of Pestilence, drawing. Dresden, Staatliche Kunstsammlungen, Kupferstichkabinett.
44. Bernart van Orley, Sacred and Profane Learning, drawing. Dresden, Staatliche Kunstsammlungen, Kupferstichkabinett.
45. Bernart van Orley, Allegory of War, drawing. London, British Museum.
46. Bernart van Orley, Triumph of Fortitude, drawing. Vienna, Albertina.

47. Bernart van Orley, An Offering to Venus, drawing. Berlin, Staatliche Museen, Kupferstichkabinett.
48. Bernart van Orley, Suicide of Portia, drawing. Paris, Louvre, Cabinet des Dessins.
49. Bernart van Orley, Romulus and Remus Battling Robbers, drawing. Munich, Staatliche Graphische Sammlung.
50. Bernart van Orley, Romulus and Remus Delivering the Head of Amulius, drawing. Munich, Staatliche Graphische Sammlung.
51. Bernart van Orley, Hersilia before Romulus, drawing. Munich, Staatliche Graphische Sammlung.
52. Bernart van Orley, Romulus Enthroned as Judge, drawing. Munich, Staatliche Graphische Sammlung.
53. Bernart van Orley, Adolf of Nassau and Imagina van Limburg, drawing. Munich, Staatliche Graphische Sammlung.
54. Bernart van Orley, Hendrick of Nassau and Adelheid van Heimsberg, drawing. Munich, Staatliche Graphische Sammlung.
55. Bernart van Orley, Otto I of Nassau and Agnes van Leiningen, drawing. Munich, Staatliche Graphische Sammlung.
56. Bernart van Orley, Johan V of Nassau and Elisabeth van Hessen, drawing. Munich Staatliche Graphische Sammlung.
57. Bernart van Orley, Engelbert of Nassau and Johanna van Polanen, drawing. Rennes, Musée des Beaux-Arts.
58. Bernart van Orley, March: Departure for the Hunt, drawing. Leiden, Prentenkabinett.
59. Bernart van Orley, June: The Meal, drawing. Berlin, Staatliche Museen, Kupferstichkabinett.
60. Bernart van Orley, September: Capturing the Deer before Groenendael Cloister, drawing. Leiden, Prentenkabinet.
61. Bernart van Orley, November: The Boar Hunt Dinner, drawing. Budapest, Szepmüvészti Múzeum.
62. Bernart van Orley, March: Departure for the Hunt, drawing. Paris, Musée du Louvre, Cabinet des dessins.

63. Bernart van Orley, April: The Rendez-Vous, drawing. Paris, Musée du Louvre, Cabinet des dessins.
64. Bernart van Orley, May: Preparation of a Meal, drawing. Paris, Musée du Louvre, Cabinet des dessins.
65. Bernart van Orley, June: The Meal, drawing. Paris, Musée du Louvre, Cabinet des dessins.
66. Bernart van Orley, July: The Report, with a View of the Red Cloister, drawing. Paris, Musée du Louvre, Cabinet des dessins.
67. Bernart van Orley, August: Chasing the Deer, Paris, Musée du Louvre, Cabinet des dessins.
68. Bernart van Orley, September: Capturing the Deer before Groenendael Cloister, drawing. Paris, Musée du Louvre, Cabinet des dessins.
69. Bernart van Orley, October: Feeding the Animals before Trois-Fontaines, drawing. Paris, Musée du Louvre, Cabinet des dessins.
70. Bernart van Orley, November: The Boar Hunt Dinner, drawing. Paris, Musée du Louvre, Cabinet des dessins.
71. Bernart van Orley, December: Capturing the Boar, drawing. Paris, Musée du Louvre, Cabinet des dessins.
72. Bernart van Orley, January: Singeing the Boar, drawing. Paris, Musée du Louvre, Cabinet des dessins.
73. Bernart van Orley, February: Modus and Ratio, drawing. Paris, Musée du Louvre, Cabinet des dessins.
74. Bernart van Orley, retouched by Rubens, Members of a Hawking Party, drawing. London, British Museum.
75. Bernart van Orley, March: Departure for the Hunt. Paris, Musée du Louvre.
76. Bernart van Orley, April: The Rendez-Vous. Paris, Musée du Louvre.
77. Bernart van Orley, May: Preparation of a Meal. Paris, Musée du Louvre.
78. Bernart van Orley, June: The Meal. Paris, Musée du Louvre.
79. Bernart van Orley, July: The Report, with a View of the Red Cloister. Paris, Musée du Louvre.

80. Bernart van Orley, August: Chasing the Deer.
Paris, Musée du Louvre.
81. Bernart van Orley, September: Capturing the Deer
before Groendael Cloister. Paris, Musée du Louvre.
82. Bernart van Orley, October: Feeding the Animals
before Trois-Fontaines. Paris, Musée du Louvre.
83. Bernart van Orley, November: The Boar Hunt Dinner.
Paris, Musée du Louvre.
84. Bernart van Orley, December: Capturing the Boar.
Paris, Musée du Louvre.
85. Bernart van Orley, January: Singeing the Boar.
Paris, Musée du Louvre.
86. Bernart van Orley, February: Modus and Ratio.
Paris, Musée du Louvre.
87. Bernart van Orley, detail of illus. 78.
88. Bernart van Orley, Battle of Pavia, 1: Cavalry Attack,
drawing. Paris, Musée du Louvre, Cabinet des dessins.
89. Bernart van Orley, Battle of Pavia, 2: Pursuit of
the French Troops, drawing. Paris, Musée du Louvre,
Cabinet des dessins.
90. Bernart van Orley, Battle of Pavia, 3: Abandonment
of the Fortified Camp, drawing. Paris, Musée du
Louvre, Cabinet des dessins.
91. Bernart van Orley, Battle of Pavia, 4: Rout of the
Swiss, drawing. Paris, Musée du Louvre, Cabinet
des dessins.
92. Bernart van Orley, Battle of Pavia, 5: Flight of the
Duke of Alençon, drawing. Paris, Musée du Louvre,
Cabinet des dessins.
93. Bernart van Orley, Battle of Pavia, 6: Breach in the
Fortified Camp of Mirabello, drawing. Paris, Musée
du Louvre, Cabinet des dessins.
94. Bernart van Orley, Battle of Pavia, 7: Francis I
Yields, drawing. Paris, Musée du Louvre, Cabinet
des dessins.
95. Bernart van Orley, Battle of Pavia, 1: Cavalry
Attack. Naples, Museo Capodimonte.

96. Bernart van Orley, Battle of Pavia, 2: Pursuit of the French Troops. Naples, Museo Capodimonte.
97. Bernart van Orley, Battle of Pavia, 3: Abandonment of the Fortified Camp. Naples, Museo Capodimonte.
98. Bernart van Orley, Battle of Pavia, 4: Rout of the Swiss. Naples, Museo Capodimonte.
99. Bernart van Orley, Battle of Pavia, 5: Flight of the Duke of Alençon, Naples, Museo Capodimonte.
100. Bernart van Orley, Battle of Pavia, 6: Breach in the Fortified Camp of Mirabello. Naples, Museo Capodimonte.
101. Bernart van Orley, Battle of Pavia, 7: Francis I Yields. Naples, Museo Capodimonte.
102. Bernart van Orley, Horseman in Forest, drawing. Paris, Musée du Louvre, Cabinet des dessins.
103. Bernart van Orley, Two Lovers Surprised, drawing. Paris, Musée du Louvre, Cabinet des dessins.
104. Bernart van Orley, View of Etterbeek, drawing. Paris, Musée du Louvre, Cabinet des dessins.
105. Bernart van Orley, The Parable of Lazarus and the Rich Man, drawing. London, British Museum.
106. School of Bernart van Orley, Winter Scene in a Castle, drawing. Chatsworth.
107. Bernart van Orley, Story of Jacob, 1: The Blessing of Jacob. Brussels, Musées royaux d'Art et d'Histoire.
108. Bernart van Orley, Story of Jacob, 2: Jacob's Departure and Dream. Brussels, Musées royaux d'Art et d'Histoire.
109. Bernart van Orley, Story of Jacob, 3: The Meeting of Jacob and Rachel. Brussels, Musées royaux d'Art et d'Histoire.
- 109a. Bernart van Orley, illus. 109 before loss.
110. Bernart van Orley, Story of Jacob, 4: The Division of the Flock. Brussels, Musées royaux d'Art et d'Histoire.

111. Bernart van Orley, Story of Jacob, 5: The Departure. Brussels, Musées royaux d'Art et d'Histoire.
112. Bernart van Orley, Story of Jacob, 6: The Alliance of Jacob and Laben. Brussels, Musées royaux d'Art et d'Histoire.
113. Bernart van Orley, Story of Jacob, 7: The Reconciliation of Jacob and Esau. Brussels, Musées royaux d'Art et d'Histoire.
114. Bernart van Orley, Story of Jacob, 8: Jacob and the Schechemites. Brussels, Musées royaux d'Art et d'Histoire.
115. Bernart van Orley, Story of Jacob, 9: Joseph is Sold by his Brothers. Brussels, Musées royaux d'Art et d'Histoire.
116. Bernart van Orley, Story of Jacob, 10: Jacob and Joseph are Reunited. Brussels, Musées royaux d'Art et d'Histoire.
117. Hans Schäuffelein, The Last Supper, woodcut.
118. Hans Schäuffelein, The Raising of Lazarus, woodcut.
119. Titian, The Sacrifice of Abraham, woodcut.
120. Titian, The Conversion of Saul, woodcut.
121. Albrecht Dürer, The Park of the Brussels Palace, drawing. Vienna, Akademie der bildenden Künste.
122. Cornelis Massys, View of Brussels, drawing. Berlin, Staatliche Museen, Kupferstichkabinett.
123. Albrecht Dürer, The Canon, etching.
124. Lucas van Leyden, The Dance of St. Mary Magdalen, engraving.
125. Albrecht Altdorfer, Landscape with Large Pine Tree, etching.
126. Albrecht Altdorfer, Landscape with Double Pine, etching.
127. Lucas Cranach the Elder, Christ on the Mount of Olives, woodcut.

128. Anonymous Brussels Master, View of the Court of Brussels, drawing. Copenhagen, State Archives (folio "Spanske Nederlande A. 1568 - 1591").
129. Bernart van Orley, detail of illus. 86.
130. Jan van Roome, Story of David and Bathsheba, 5: Uriah is Sent to his Death. Paris, Musée de Cluny.
131. Bernart van Orley, detail of illus. 81.
132. Jan Brueghel I, View of the Abbey of Groendael, drawing. Amsterdam, Rijksprentenkabinett.
133. G. Harrewijn, The Château of Tervueren, engraving for Brabantia illustrata.
134. Anonymous Flemish, 16th century, Berlin Sketchbook, folio 51 verso, drawing. Berlin, Staatliche Museen, Kupferstichkabinett.
135. Anonymous Flemish, 16th century, Berlin Sketchbook, folio 77, drawing. Berlin, Staatliche Museen, Kupferstichkabinett.
136. Lucas van Leyden, The Baptism of Christ in the Jordan, engraving.
137. Anonymous French, 15th century, The Gathering, Le Livre de Chasse, mss. illumination, ms. 619. Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale.
138. Anonymous French, 15th century. The Gathering, Le Livre de Chasse, mss. illumination, ms. 616. Paris, Bibliothèque National.
139. Simon Bening (?), Depart for the Chase, Grimany Breviary, mss. illumination. Venice, Marciana Library.
140. Anonymous French, 15th century, Stalking the Deer, Le Livre de Chasse, mss. illumination, ms. 616. Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale.
141. Anonymous Flemish, 15th century, Deer-Hunting, Le Livre des dēduis du roi Modus et de la reine Ratio, mss. illumination, ms. 10,218/19. Brussels, Bibliothèque Royale Albert Ier.
142. Anonymous German, 16th century, Battle of Pavia, painting. Hampton Court Palace.

143. Ruprecht Heller, The Battle of Pavia, painting. Stockholm, National Museum.
144. Wolf Huber, The Battle of Pavia, drawing. Munich Graphische Sammlung.
145. Follower of Patinir, The Battle of Pavia, painting. Vienna, Kunsthistorisches Museum.
146. Raphael, The Acts of the Apostles: Death of Ananias, cartoon. London, Victoria and Albert Museum.
147. Raphael, The Acts of the Apostles: Blinding of Elymas, cartoon. London, Victoria and Albert Museum.
148. Raphael, The Acts of the Apostles: Sacrifice at Lystra, cartoon. London, Victoria and Albert Museum.
149. Raphael, The Acts of the Apostles: Christ's Charge to St. Peter, cartoon. London, Victoria and Albert Museum.
150. Albrecht Dürer, The Bagpiper, engraving.
151. Anonymous French, 15th century, The Battle of Fornovo, engraving.
152. Albrecht Dürer, Two Peasants, engraving.
153. Bernart van Orley, detail of illus. 77.
154. Bernart van Orley, detail of illus. 79.
155. Marcantonio Raimondi, Massacre of the Innocents, engraving after Raphael.
156. Marcantonio Raimondi, Battle of Cascina, engraving after Michelangelo.
157. Marcantonio Raimondi, The Climbers, engraving after Michelangelo and Lucas van Leyden.
158. Barthel Beham, Battle of the Nudes, engraving.
159. Barthel Beham, Titus Gracchus, engraving.
160. Barthel Beham, Battle for the Banner, engraving.
161. Roger van der Weyden, St. Luke Painting the Virgin. Paris, Louvre.
162. Roger van der Weyden, Trajan and Herkenbald. Bern, Bernisches Historisches Museum.

163. Jan van Roome, Story of David and Bathsheba, 8: The Death of David's Son and Announcement of Victory. Paris, Musée de Cluny.
164. Anonymous Flemish, early 16th century, Descent from the Cross. Madrid, Patrimonio Nacional.
165. Circle of Bernart van Orley, Foundation of Rome, 1: Romulus and Remus Tend their Flocks. Madrid, Patrimonio Nacional.
166. Circle of Bernart van Orley, Foundation of Rome, 2: Numitor is Placed on the Throne. Madrid, Patrimonio Nacional.
167. Circle of Bernart van Orley, Foundation of Rome, 3: Romulus is Proclaimed King. Madrid, Patrimonio Nacional.
168. Circle of Bernart van Orley, Foundation of Rome, 4: Romulus Organizes Festivities in Honor of Neptune. Madrid, Patrimonio Nacional.
169. Circle of Bernart van Orley, Foundation of Rome, 5: Hersilia is Presented to Romulus. Madrid, Patrimonio Nacional.
170. Circle of Bernart van Orley, Foundation of Rome, 6: Romulus Establishes the Laws for the People. Madrid, Patrimonio Nacional.
171. Anonymous Flemish, early 16th century, The Children of Philip the Fair, woodcut.
172. Roger de Gaignières, The Rochefoucauld Family, drawing. Oxford, Bodleian Library.

ABSTRACT

BERNART VAN ORLEY AS A DESIGNER OF TAPESTRY

Maryan Wynn Ainsworth

Yale University

1982

Though much appreciated through the ages, Van Orley's tapestry designs have never been fully evaluated for their significant contribution to Flemish art. Previous studies have focused on questions of attribution and Roman influence, but neglected to place the designs in their proper context. This is the concern of this thesis.

The point of departure is a discussion of the tapestry industry in sixteenth-century Brussels. New guild regulations as well as certain economic and social-political factors encouraged the growth of this industry and secured a privileged position for the painter-designer within it. Van Orley's early participation in this specialized field is traced in chapter two. Following the example of his predecessors, the artist at first drew upon his painted oeuvre for inspiration. However, Van Orley subsequently began to separate the two media, seeing in tapestry design different requirements and possibilities.

The relationships between designer, cartonnier and weaver and Van Orley's control over the final product are suggested in his drawings for tapestries. Chapter three

examines the many stages in the design procedure evident in the drawings and discusses the importance of details such as color indications, shading and written instructions about both the narrative and placement of figures and motifs. This study which relates drawing technique to function helps to clarify the design terminology found in contemporary documents.

Van Orley's innovations in tapestry design and the characteristics of his works which influenced a century of designers are best seen in the mature works of the late 1520's, the Hunts of Maximilian, the Battle of Pavia and the Story of Jacob among them. Chapter four studies Van Orley's transformation of artistic sources for the development of naturalistic illusionism. The monumental scale of tapestry led him to consult Raphael's carefully devised concept of history painting. It was not simply the Italian artist's expressive figures and spatial relationships which inspired Van Orley, but his all-encompassing mode featuring variety and appropriateness of detail, consistency of approach to historical authenticity, and an incomparable sense of clarity and organization. Van Orley fused these elements of designs with familiar details from the viewer's world, creating a new sense of verisimilitude in tapestry which had never been achieved before.

Though the subjects of Van Orley's tapestries are not new, his treatment of them is. Chapter five demonstrates how Van Orley manipulated the narrative in order to make

these traditional subjects immediately accessible to the viewer. He emphasized the dramatic moments and imbued each tale with all aspects of the human condition.

This investigation of Van Orley's designs aims to clarify the artist's contribution to tapestry. It is hoped that this study may serve as a basis on which to judge other attributions and later versions.

INTRODUCTION

The study of Flemish tapestries has evolved slowly. Scholarly interest began with the investigation in the late nineteenth century of archival documents concerning the origins of the weaving industry. For Brussels, the city we will be concerned with in this essay (chapter one), Alphonse Wauters first published the guild regulations of 1449, 1472, 1475 and 1476 in Les tapisseries bruxelloises of 1878.¹ Later other documents were made readily available to historians in Joseph Cuvelier's De tapijtwevers van Brussel in de 15^e eeuw of 1912² and Joseph Duverger's Brusselsche legwerkers uit de XV^e en de XVI^e eeuw of 1934.³

Joseph Destrée's Tapisseries et sculptures bruxelloises a l'exposition d'art ancien bruxellois (1905)⁴ prompted the modern day aesthetic appreciation and critical discussion of tapestries by art historians in catalogues of collections and histories of tapestries. These publications, notably the pioneering work of Marthe Crick-Kuntziger, Ludwig von Baldass and Heinrich Göbel,⁵ have long formed the basis of more recent scholarship. However, through an international colloquium in Ghent in 1961, De Bloeitijd der Vlaamse Tapijtkunst, and several exhibitions of note (Chefs-d'oeuvre de la Tapisserie, Paris, 1973; Tapisseries bruxelloises de la pré-Renaissance, Brussels, 1976;

Tapisserien der Renaissance nach Entwürfen von Pieter Coecke van Aelst, Schloss Halbturn, 1981) many previously⁶ accepted notions about tapestry have been challenged.

It is within the context of this reevaluation of Flemish Renaissance tapestry and of the works of various artists that this study of Bernart van Orley was undertaken.

Van Orley's innovative approach to tapestry design constitutes a brilliant, even if short-lived, contribution to the medium. From its beginnings through the late fifteenth century, tapestry was meant as a two-dimensional, planar wall covering. Its closest stylistic parallels are found in contemporary manuscript illumination and medieval painting. Though this two-dimensional concept continued into the sixteenth century in the form of purely decorative weavings in armorial, verdure and millefleurs tapestries, another trend was developing. This was the piercing of that two-dimensional, planar conception to form a three-dimensional space, a development which placed tapestry design in direct competition with painting. The 1516 arrival in Brussels of Raphael's cartoons for the Acts of the Apostles weavings further encouraged this trend, for they conveyed the idea of tapestry as woven fresco painting.

This is precisely the time when Van Orley began to design for tapestry. As will be discussed in chapter two, he was not interested for very long in the accepted practice of imitating paintings in woven form. Instead, Van Orley was preoccupied with a concept of pictorial space that was entirely new to this monumental art form. His landscapes

extended both the width and depth of space in tapestry, and he relied on the availability of an increased number of dyes to insure a balance of color for convincing spatial transitions. Van Orley aimed to treat events in a realistic manner by careful attention to details, extremely individualized personages, and motifs taken from contemporary life. His approach, though not revolutionary for other media (it is evidenced in both painting and prints of this period), vastly differed from current trends in tapestry design.

Van Orley's new concept of tapestry directly influenced design for nearly eighty years, as can be seen in the works of artists such as Pieter Coecke van Aelst, Michiel Coxie and Jan Vermeyen. The end of the sixteenth century, however, experienced a reaction against the ideas Van Orley had promoted. Tapestry design reverted to the more two-dimensional concept of the previous century. In vogue again were a high horizon line, a lack of clarity in composition and a decreased interest in realistic depiction of life and movement. Colors were limited and the richness and variation of tone in Van Orley's tapestries were lost. Except for moments of recovery when artists of the caliber of Rubens and Jordaens made designs, the quality of Flemish tapestry declined rapidly in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. The important weavers' ateliers closed in the last years of the eighteenth century, and Flemish tapestry design was totally eclipsed by the Gobelins in Paris and the Mortlake factories in England.

Every survey of the history of tapestry includes at least a brief discussion of Van Orley's work.⁷ Specific articles on his designs have been almost entirely devoted to a general aesthetic appreciation of the tapestries, a summary description of the subject matter depicted and attempts to enlarge the oeuvre by further attributions. Only the Hunts of Maximilian has received full and careful analysis through monographic treatments of the series by Christina Ceulemans and Arnout Balis.⁸

A major hindrance to a better understanding of Van Orley's contribution to tapestry design has been the question of attribution. Hundreds of tapestries datable between 1515-- 1540 have been assigned to him. This is a problem complicated by several factors. First of all, Van Orley was the leading city painter and appointed court painter in Brussels during the period. Cartoon makers apparently wished to reflect his popularity by imitating the artist's figure types and poses. Since they did not assimilate other characteristics of Van Orley's style, these tapestries are readily detected and eliminated from the artist's oeuvre.⁹ Secondly, there are tapestries which, in addition to figure style, show familiarity with Van Orley's compositions or with subjects he treated. Many of these, in fact, may have been designed by assistants working with Van Orley and, therefore, are less easily separated from the master's oeuvre. Some aspect of the design, however, usually identifies the tapestry as a derivative work.¹⁰ Finally, compounding these difficulties is the fact that any tapestry

is at least twice removed from the preliminary sketch on paper. There is the enlargement of the drawing by the cartoon maker and then the further translation of that image by the weaver. The designer had to rely on other specialists for the success of the final product. In cases like the Hunts of Maximilian or Battle of Pavia where we have both Van Orley's drawings and the tapestries, the designs appear to have been followed closely. However, critical analysis of tapestries for which no drawings remain must take into account the loss of certain subtleties, a matter which confuses the issue of attribution.

The authors responsible for most of the attributions of tapestries to Van Orley are Friedländer, Hullebroeck,¹¹ Crick-Kuntziger, Baldass and, most recently, Farmer. Though there is much dissent among them, certain works are generally accepted. These tapestries, which may be securely attributed to Van Orley on the basis of their relationship to the artist's drawings or by confirmation from seventeenth century sources, will form the core group for the current study.

My intention is not a catalogue raisonné but the clarification of Van Orley's specific contribution to tapestry design in the sixteenth century. Clearly, the artist's earliest designs were tied to his painting style, and most attributions are based on this relationship. Not previously discussed is how quickly Van Orley abandoned that dependence on his paintings and began to adopt a stylistic mode particularly well suited to the tapestry medium. This is the

subject of chapter two.

The relationship between designer, cartoon maker and weaver in the early sixteenth century is not entirely clear from the remaining documents. However, some clues about the extent of the designer's participation may be ascertained from preparatory drawings. In Van Orley's case, fifty-one of his fifty-three remaining drawings are studies for tapestry. In chapter three I discuss the technique of these drawings vis-à-vis the proposed function of individual sheets.

The tapestry designs of Van Orley's mature period (after ca. 1525) reveal the solutions he reached to questions of scale and presentation. Perhaps his most immediate concern had to do with the depiction of convincing spatial relationships on vast pictorial planes. As we shall see in chapter four, Van Orley consulted a variety of sources in which this problem had been addressed successfully. Filling these vast spaces with clearly organized, yet fully expressive figures was the other major requirement. Previous studies have emphasized the importance of Raphael's figure types for Van Orley, yet ignored the latter's more profound understanding of the Italian's new concept of history painting. This chapter examines this issue and attempts to clarify Van Orley's transformation of other sources to suit his purpose.

The successful arrangement of pictorial elements was not the only way Van Orley held the viewer's attention. He chose specific narrative modes which complemented the

the subject at hand. Chapter five investigates these narrative modes and, further, Van Orley's unorthodox manipulation of certain episodes of the story for special dramatic focus. This approach is vastly different from that of Van Orley's predecessors who led the viewer from scene to scene chiefly by decorative means, for example, by trailing drapery or repeated figures or poses. These same artists had also featured only the main events in the story. Van Orley's innovation was to bring subsidiary themes to the foreground in order to emulate true-life experience, itself a succession of major and minor events.

The recurring theme of this study is Van Orley's new approach to what had been considered an essentially decorative medium. Not content to preserve the status quo of both the form and presentation of subject matter of this monumental art, he investigated new ways to modernize the medium. The current essay attempts to assess his contribution.

Notes to the Introduction

1. Alphonse Wauters, Les Tapisseries bruxelloises, Brussels, 1878.
2. Joseph Cuvelier, "De tapijtwevers van Brussel in de 15^e eeuw," Verslagen en Mededeelingen der Koninklijke Vlaamsche Academie, Ghent, 1912.
3. Joseph Duverger, "Brusselsche legwerkers uit de XV^e en de XVI^e eeuw," Gentsche Bijdragen tot de Kunstgeschiedenis, I (1934).
4. Joseph Destrée, Tapisseries et sculpture bruxelloises à l'exposition d'art ancien bruxellois, Brussels, 1905.
5. Marthe Crick-Kuntziger, Catalogue des tapisseries des Musées royaux d'Art et d'Histoire de Bruxelles, Brussels, 1938; Ludwig von Baldass, Die Wiener Gobelinssammlung, Vienna, 1920; Heinrich Göbel, Wandteppiche. I. Die Niederlande, Leipzig, 1923.
6. De Bloeitijd der Vlaamse Tapijtkunst, colloquium, Koninklijke Vlaamse Academie voor Wetenschappen, Letteren en Schone Kunsten, Brussels, May, 1961; Chefs-d'oeuvre de la Tapisserie du XIV^e au XVI^e siècle, Paris, 1973, exh. cat., Palais des Beaux-Arts; Tapisseries bruxelloises de la pré-Renaissance, Brussels, 1976, exh. cat., Musées royaux d'Art et d'Histoire; Tapisserien der Renaissance nach Entwürfen von Pieter Coecke van Aelst, Schloss Halbturn, 1981, exh. cat., Schloss Halbturn.
7. The major histories are: Göbel, Wandteppiche; E. Guiffrey, A. Muntz, J. J. Pinchart, Histoire générale de la Tapisserie, 3 vol., Paris, 1880; D. Heinz, Europäische Wandteppiche, Braunschweig, 1963; R. A. d'Hulst, Flemish Tapestries from the Fifteenth to the Eighteenth Century, New York, 1967.
8. C. Ceulemans, De zogenaamde Jachten van Maximiliaan, Leuven (unpublished thesis), 1975-76; A. Balis, De Jachten van Maximiliaan, Ghent (unpublished thesis), 1973-74.
9. Two examples of this are The Honors and The Apocalypse, tapestry series hanging respectively in the palace of La Granja and in La Valle de los Caidos near Madrid.

10. An example of this which will be discussed further in chapter five is the Foundation of Rome series in the palace of La Granja. Illus. 165-170 in this dissertation.

11. M.J. Friedländer, "Bernaert van Orley, IV. Orley's Tätigkeit von 1526 bis 1540," Jahrbuch der Königlich-Preussischen Kunstsammlungen 30 (1909), 155-178, 166-169; A. Hullebroeck, Peintres de Cartons pour Tapisseries: Bernard van Orley, Paris and Liège, 1936; M. Crick-Kuntziger, "Bernard van Orley et le décor mural en tapisseries," Bernard van Orley, 1943, 7-92; L. Baldass, "Tapisserieentwürfe des niederländischen Romanismus," Jahrbuch des Kunsthistorischen Sammlungen in Wien 2 (1928), 247-266; J. D. Farmer, Bernard van Orley of Brussels, Princeton (unpublished dissertation), 1981, 264 ff.

CHAPTER ONE

THE PLACE OF TAPESTRY IN THE ART OF SIXTEENTH CENTURY BRUSSELS

The significance of the tapestry industry in sixteenth century Brussels cannot be overestimated. True, full documentation of that city's distinction as a center for weaving has been limited by a series of disasters: the bombardment of 1695, which destroyed the guild records, the destruction of the *Chambre des Comptes de Lille* (*le Compté générale de l'Épargne*) in 1793, and the demolition of the Tournai archives. Still, overwhelming evidence remains that Brussels indeed surpassed all other cities in this art for nearly four centuries, from the end of the fourteenth century to the termination of the *Ancien Régime*. Accounts indicate princely patronage for the tapestries dating back to 1366¹ and a history of export of the precious weavings not only throughout the European continent, but as far away as Mexico.²

The success of Brussels in this field had to do not only with artistic merit but also with economic factors. The tapestry industry enlisted a wide range of employees: designers, cartoon makers, dyers, weavers and merchants. In addition, the acquisition of materials depended upon an already well-developed trade system. Wool was imported from Spain and England, silk from Italy and gold threads from Cyprus and Venice.

Already by the end of the fifteenth century, Brussels benefited from a particular combination of circumstances which

ensured the expansion and prosperity of this art. The accession of Philip the Good to the throne in 1430 established Brussels as the center of the Court of Burgundy. From then on, the city attracted a great number of weavers from the other centers in Flanders.³ These workers joined forces with the group of cartonniers who had developed out of the large and well-known school of painters in Brussels and who knew well the special requirements of a weaver.

Furthermore, the prolonged hostilities between the King of France and Maximilian I caused the eclipse of the important Tournai ateliers. Later alliances contracted by the dukes of Burgundy with Austria and Spain placed the Lowlands in the center of the most extended and powerful empire in the world. Antwerp then replaced Bruges (whose access routes by water were silted up) as the principal commercial and financial center of Europe. The tapestry merchants of Brussels, dissatisfied with restrictions employed by Bruges on trade of their products, united with those of Louvain, Antwerp and Ghent to form the guild of St. Nicholas permanently established at Antwerp. This arrangement continued to operate advantageously since the colony of foreign merchants at Antwerp constantly supplied the best quality raw materials for tapestry, and the famous financiers, such as the Frescobaldis, the Gualterottis, the Fuggers and the Welsers, became the money-lenders for Brussels⁴ weavers.

From all accounts it appears that in the so-called Golden Age of tapestry (around 1480 — 1540) Brussels' fame as an

artistic center depended on its tapestry rather than painting production. This factor helps explain the phenomenon of painters (Bernart van Orley in particular) turning to specialization in tapestry design. The reputation Brussels enjoyed during the time of Roger van der Weyden had slowly disintegrated in the period after his death. The only other major Brussels artist after Roger and before Van Orley whose identity is certain is Hugo van der Goes, who came to live in the city in 1475.⁵ However, as he resided and worked in seclusion at the Red Cloister until his death in 1482, he exerted little influence on the Brussels school which continued in the tradition of Roger.

The unprogressive character of painting in late fifteenth century Brussels was due partly to the management of the painter's guild. Former rules made to protect the guilds from intruders became detrimental to their survival. Many of the restrictions and required payments on entrance to the guild dissuaded newcomers,⁶ and instead encouraged hereditary apprenticeships.⁷ It was not only the longlasting and powerful tradition of Roger's legacy which impeded progress in the development of Brussels painting; it was also the guild membership system which remained closed to the influx of foreigners and the new ideas that they potentially could infuse into the static Brussels school.

As Philippot aptly explained, this regression in Brussels' artistic production already began with Vrancke van der Stockt, city painter after Roger van der Weyden, and proceeded to what

he calls "the crisis of 1480."⁸ He was of the opinion that a growing tension between sculptural and pictorial traditions had been eased, even nullified, by Roger's style. However, with Roger's immediate successors, there was an incapacity to maintain that unity of the two disciplines. A tension seemed to develop between an expressive intent and the manner of representation. As a result, figures meant to convey some emotion appeared isolated and immobilized. Spatial confusions further contributed to compositional disunity. In essence, the pictorial mode was trapped between the static position of a tradition which could not be repudiated and the aspirations of an age which was striving toward a new interpretation of expressiveness.⁹ The works of the Master of St. Gudule, and of the Masters of the Legends of St. Catherine and St. Barbara¹⁰ exemplify this trend.

While panel painting experienced a general decline, other areas of production also began to show hints of deterioration. For example, increased demand from Germany, Scandanavia, France and Spain for carved altarpieces was so great that superior workmanship yielded to mass production. Controls had to be established, and only those works passing approval received the mallet mark, Brussels' guarantee of quality.¹¹ However, it was not only in craft of execution but also in style that sculpture shared in this unprogressive character of panel painting. Sculptors and painters collaborated on many of the altarpieces, and documents confirm that sculptors often worked¹² from models submitted by painters.

This regression for panel painting and sculpture was not evident in the art of tapestry which enjoyed great fame in Brussels at the turn of the century. For what became static monotony in panel painting and sculpture was not ill-suited to the purely decorative character of tapestry. Spatial confusion, diverse crowds of immobilized figures, and isolation of pictorial units, for example, constituted a mode not opposed to this decorative medium. Contemporary weavings seldom demonstrated any interest in perspective space. Instead, a sense of horror vacui predominated. Depictions of wild bushes growing on irregular rocks, stylized foliage, high rows of trees, mountain tops and buildings reaching to the upper border of the tapestry formed the backdrop for multiple scenes brought together in the same tapestry without clear division between any of them. The high quality of the woven tapestry, new dying techniques, a greater variety of shades available and the increased use of more precious materials (gold and silver threads) all combined to make a dazzling product.

Although there is previous evidence of panel painters designing for tapestry weavers,¹³ some painters of the fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries began to specialize in the field. These were registered as cartonniers and constituted a group of artists who were particularly aware of the possibilities and inherent limitations of tapestry design. They must also have been cognizant of the decorative embellishment allowed in this art which resulted in a final product quite different from paintings.

What late fifteenth century Brussels experienced, then, was the supersedure of panel painting by tapestry as the esteemed art of that city. The patronage of the Burgundian-Habsburg court further enhanced this trend and made this product of Brussels world famous. In the inventory that Maximilian I had taken in 1489 of the possessions of the House of Burgundy, the total value was estimated at 800,000 florins. The worth of the tapestries alone was one-quarter of this amount, an evaluation surpassing that of jewels, gold vessels, and the celebrated Burgundian library.¹⁴ The enormous collections were housed in special storage buildings which necessitated a large staff for their care, repair and transport. Later, the collection of Francis I, as enumerated in inventories of 1542 and 1551, included nearly two hundred tapestries, most of which originated in Brussels workshops. Spanish courts showed special interest in tapestries from Brussels. Chroniclers tell of cities, such as Toledo, Saragossa, Burgos and Cordova which were entirely hung with tapestries at the entry of royalty from the Lowlands. In fact, the first historians of the royal collections in Spain evaluated their importance¹⁵ in kilometers of weavings.

Patronage from the royal courts was not the sole factor responsible for this product of superior quality from Brussels. Increasingly stiffer guild regulations ensured quality controls and systematized production. The new laws also moved the art towards a greater specialization. The position and duties of designer, cartoon-maker, dyer, and weaver, among others, became

more carefully defined, resulting in greater expertise at each stage of production.

Among the records which remain from the middle of the fifteenth century are a few which relate restrictions placed on weavers. They were not permitted to dye wool themselves, but instead were obliged to use the local dye shops. The minimum number of threads to be used in weaving was regulated as was the sale of the finished product. Weavers were not permitted to sell goods in their homes, thus necessitating a merchant or dealer.

By 1472 - 1476 many of the previous regulations had been abolished in favor of more uniform control. This, no doubt, developed out of the growth of the industry. Four jurors among the city magistrates were appointed to perform a quality check of materials used and tapestries finished. This investigation of the work in progress on the looms took place three times a year. However, the jurors were allowed to enter the workshops at any time.

A decision of 1476 brought further clarification to the relationship between the painter's guild and the weavers. Grievances initiated by the painter's guild charged that weavers were making designs with charcoal and chalk without con-
 16
 sultation with the painters. Furthermore, the weavers were accused of using cartoons designed by journeymen who were not members of the painter's *métier*. The agreement reached authorized the weavers to design for each other only that which concerned verdures (that is, foliage, shrubbery, birds and other

animals). They also were licensed to enlarge any existing cartoon by using chalk or ink. All other work, however, had to be assigned to members of the painter's *métier*. This decision safely secured the position of invention and design for the painters. It also signalled the growing dependence of the weavers upon the painters for their own success, for a dull or technically unworkable design could be a woven catastrophe.

Two final edicts, declared by Charles V himself, indicate the careful quality control of Brussels' enviable product. They also hint at the vast growth of the tapestry industry with all of its foibles and problems since the 1476 rulings. In one edict of 1525, the most judiciously conceived rules to date were made to protect the designer, weaver, merchant and consumer. The enumeration here of some of the decisions handed down makes this clear. Under penalty of banishment from Brussels and exclusion from the *métier*, weavers of tapestries worth more than 20 - 24 sous per aune¹⁷ were prohibited from adding heads and facial features with paint. They were also forbidden to remove gold or silver threads or other materials which would result in the impoverishment of the tapestry and ruin of the master's reputation. Those infringing on this rule paid the sum of 20 florins or a pilgrimage to Rome. Fifteen Rhenish florins was the charge for anyone who made a counterproof of a design, imitated it, priced it for transfer and alteration or scribbled on it with charcoal.¹⁸

Consumer and merchant were further protected by Charles V's second edict of 1528 which severely fined weavers for

abandoning a work in progress. It also stipulated that each tapestry made in Brussels and measuring more than six aunes must undergo a quality check by the appointed jurors before the mark of the weaver and the city mark of Brussels could be added on the border.¹⁹ The product of Brussels was thereby guaranteed, its markings a matter of prestige throughout Europe and synonymous with quality.

From the paucity of mostly incomplete records that remain, it is difficult to assess the closeness of the relationship between designer and weaver. Certainly some of the previously mentioned rules which were legislated by the magistrates dictate a dependence of the weavers on the designers. We know that special orders from the courts often stipulated a particular designer and weaver. Philip the Good, for example, had written in the 1449 contract for the Golden Fleece tapestries that the petits patrons of stories and the devices were to be made by Bauduin de Bailloeul and that Robert Dary and Jehan de l'Ortye were to handle the weaving of the set.²⁰ In 1474 Pierre Spicre was contracted to paint the designs of legends of Our Lady for Cardinal Jean Rolin.²¹ In Louvain, a record of 1513 states that Master Jan van Brussel (Jan van Roome) was to be paid 2½ Rhine florins and two pots of wine for the petits patrons of the tapestries depicting the Miraculous Communion of Herkenbald. A man named Philippe made the cartoon and brought it to hang in the church of St. Peter in Louvain and Lyon (Lyon de Smet) wove the design.²²

Whether these particular designers, cartoon-makers and weavers usually worked together is not clear from the payment accounts available, nor is it explicit in any surviving contract. It is not until the beginning of the sixteenth century that a clearer picture of the relationship between designer and weaver is discernible. Bernart van Orley is one of the first painters noted as a painter-designer. His involvement with tapestry design at a time when the art was at its peak economically, aesthetically and in relationship to the development of the guilds and their protective laws, makes Van Orley's career as a tapestry designer particularly worthy of study.

Notes to Chapter 1

1. S. Schneebalg-Perelman, "Les Sources de l'histoire de la Tapisserie bruxelloise et la Tapisserie en tant que Source," Annales de la Société royale d'Archéologie de Bruxelles 51 (1966), 281.
2. S. Schneebalg-Perelman, "Un nouveau regard sur les Origines et le Développement de la Tapisserie bruxelloise du XIV^e siècle à la pré-Renaissance," Tapisseries bruxelloises, 180.
3. Schneebalg-Perelman, "Les Sources," 282. A membership list of the linen métier, afterwards the weaver's guild, from 1418 - 1446 includes around five hundred names, many of which originate from Arras and Tournai.
4. Schneebalg-Perelman, "Un nouveau regard," 181.
5. Vrancke van der Stockt, the official city painter after Roger, cannot be linked without question to any extant works, though a group of stylistically cohesive works have been attributed to him.
6. To enter a guild, one had to buy citizenship in the town, pay six old crowns, and give an amount of Rhine wine to the magistrates. Furthermore, those who had not taken their apprenticeship in Brussels were prevented from practicing there without the consent of the judges and a fourteen-day waiting period. After this waiting period, the master employing the foreigner converted part of his salary into masses to be said at the altar of St. Luke for a period of six months to one year. See C. Mathieu, "Le métier des peintres à Bruxelles," Bruxelles au XV^e siècle, Brussels, 1953, 224 - 229.
7. An ordinance of 1453 stated that the son of a master could become a master without paying the six old crowns. Ibid., 225.
8. P. Philippot, "La fin du XV^e siècle et les origines d'une nouvelle conception de l'image dans la peinture des Pays-Bas," Bulletin des Musées royaux des Beaux-Arts de Belgique 11 (March - June, 1962), 6 and 11.
9. Ibid., 5.
10. See Maryan Wynn Ainsworth, The Master of St. Gudule, Oberlin (unpublished M.A. thesis), 1973 and M. J. Friedländer, Hugo van der Goes, Early Netherlandish Painting, IV, Brussels and Leiden, 1969, *passim*.
11. Flanders in the Fifteenth Century: Art and Civilization, Detroit, 1960, 46.

12. Ibid., 47. One surviving example of this is a drawing, Men Shoveling Chairs (New York, Metropolitan Museum of Art, Lehman Collection), made by a follower of Roger van der Weyden for a sculpted capital on the exterior arcade of the Brussels Town Hall.

13. A document of 1563 notes that payments were made by the Brussels Magistrate to two painters, Michel Coxie and Pierre de Kempeneer, for agreeing to furnish patterns for weavers (Wauters, Tapisseries, 129 and note 1). On the basis of this record, Schneebalg-Perelman assumes similar agreements to have been made with all of the preceding Brussels city painters including Roger van der Weyden, Vrancke van der Stockt, Colijn de Coter, Jean van Roome, Bernart van Orley, and Pieter Coecke van Aelst (S: Schneebalg-Perelman, "Tapestry in Brussels Under the Reign of Philip the Good," Roger van der Weyden, Brussels, 1979, exh. cat., Maison du Roi, 104 and 113). Further specific documentation would be needed to substantiate this theory.

14. Schneebalg-Perelman, "Un nouveau regard," 181.

15. Ibid.

16. Wauters published this document in Tapisseries, 48 - 49, note 1.

17. The sous was the main currency at the time in Flanders. The aune, the standard tapestry measurement, is equivalent to 69.56 cm.

18. Wauters, Tapissaries, 133 - 135, note 1.

19. Ibid., 145 - 150.

20. M. B. Freeman, The Unicorn Tapestries, New York, 1976, 175.

21. Ibid., 193.

22. E. Dhanens, "L'importance du peintre Jean van Roome, dit de Bruxelles," Tapisseries bruxelloises, 235.

CHAPTER TWO

VAN ORLEY AS A DESIGNER OF TAPESTRY: DOCUMENTS AND THE EARLY WORKS

Little information about Bernart van Orley's life and artistic career is documented by primary sources. Though Le Maire established that the artist lived from 1488 to 1541,¹ we only surmise that his training as a painter took place under his father Valentin's tutelage and was complete around 1512.² After that date occasional records reveal court commissions which doubtless led to Van Orley's appointment in 1518 as official court painter to Margaret of Austria, Regent of the Netherlands.³

It is regrettable that only two archival documents link Van Orley to any specific tapestry transactions. He signed as a witness to one of September 1, 1520 when the Regent Margaret ordered tapestries of the Passion from the renowned weaver, Pieter de Pannemaker.⁴ Another, to be published by Jan Karel Steppe, mentions a series de las Muertes for which Van Orley made small cartoons to deliver to Mencía de Mendoza in 1539. The latter, of which no trace remains, was to adorn the funerary chapel of Mencía de Mendoza's family in Valencia.⁵

Later sources speak in general terms about series traditionally given to Van Orley. Though Van Mander's biographies in his 1604 Het Schilderboek are not always accurate, in the case of Van Orley (who died slightly more than sixty years before the publication of the first edition) the account may be considered more reliable. The excerpt which

mentions two of Van Orley's tapestry series, the Hunts of Maximilian and the Nassau Genealogy, is as follows:

For Margaret, the emperor and other nobles, he drew and painted many splendid tapestry cartoons; in this medium he was especially talented and surehanded, and very well paid for his services. Among other works, he made for the emperor a number of hunt scenes, in which one can see woods and locations in the Brussels environs where those hunts actually took place. The emperor and other princes and princesses have been depicted after life, and the series was woven in a most luxurious way. Recently, sixteen very beautiful and richly painted tapestry cartoons by Bernard were sent to Count Maurice at the Hague in Holland. Each shows a man or woman on a horse, and the lineage of the House of Nassau is thus depicted after life. Count Maurice had these cartoons copied in oil painting by the excellent painter Hans Jordaens from Antwerp, who lived in Delft. Because of the date which the cartoons carry, they must be now about 100 years old, from which one can infer at what time this master lived and flourished.⁶

In his Entretiens sur les vies et sur les ouvrages des plus excellens peintres anciens et modernes of 1666-1688, André Felibien provides us with another secondary source. In this passage below, he refers to the Hunts of Maximilian, adding what may be considered the earliest analysis of some of Van Orley's stylistic traits:

Aussi l'on m'a assuré qu'elles estoient de la main d'un peintre de Bruxelles, nommé Bernard van Orley, qui travailloit du temps de Raphaël, et qui a fait executer toutes les Tapisseries que les Papes, les Empereurs et les Rois faisoient faire en Flandres d'après des dessins d'Italie. D'abord sa manière etait gotique,

mais à force de voir des Ouvrages de Raphaël et de Jule, il la changea: et Même il y a en a qui ont voulu dire que les Tapisseries de l'histoire de Saint Paul, qui sont dans le Garde-Meuble du Roi et qui ont toujours passé pour être de Raphaël sont de son dessein; ce qui n'est pas vrai-semblable, car on y voit trop la manière de ce grand Maître., Peut-être ce Bernard les a-t-il conduites d'après de légers desseins de Raphaël, y ayant en effet quelques parties, qu'en voit bien n'être pas tout à fait arrêtées... Il avoit sous lui un nommé Tons, grand Paisagiste, qui a travaillé aux Chasses de l'Empereur Maximilian; et un autre ses Elèves Pierre Koeck, natif d'Alost, fort bon peintre de Architecte.⁷

Though the attribution of the History of St. Paul series to Van Orley cannot be maintained and the exact contribution of the mysterious landscape artist, Tons, is questionable, one of Félibien's observations is especially astute. He realized that Van Orley's style changed due to the influence of works by Raphael and Giulio Romano. The formerly popular notion that Van Orley traveled to Italy to find these sources is not even considered.⁸

A few facts about Van Orley's personal life further help to establish a close association between the artist and members of the vast community of weavers and cartoon makers. At the Church of St. Géry in Brussels Van Orley belonged to the Brotherhood of St. Sebastian, a group more than half of whose recorded members were legwerkers or weavers.⁹ When the entire Van Orley family was brought to trial in May - September, 1527 for having held a clandestine meeting where the reformer Jacob van der Elst preached, among those accused and subsequently interrogated was

Chrétien der Moyen, hautlisseur.¹⁰ In his defense he explained that he visited the home of the artist merely to see certain patrons for tapestry.¹¹ That the weaver's testimony apparently stood unchallenged may suggest that his explanation constituted a common occurrence. Weavers perhaps often came to discuss commissioned projects, to see Van Orley's new designs, and to acquire certain ones for weaving.

The paucity of both primary and secondary sources has led to much speculation about Van Orley's tapestry oeuvre. Attempts to define Van Orley as a designer have relied all too often on historically popular notions and the propensity to assign to the artist any significant woven series between 1515 - 1540. Still lacking is a clear understanding of the artist's oeuvre and that of his predecessors.

The problems of differentiating the artistic personalities behind Brussels tapestry design between 1510 and 1520, when masses of weavings were produced, result from several phenomena. First of all, several artists apparently worked in the same style. Among them are Adrian van den Houte, Jan van Roome and Leonard Knoest.¹² Though certain tapestries¹³ may be securely linked to each of these artists, many weavings show a style combining characteristics of all three. In one case, the Discovery of the True Cross (Brussels, Musées royaux d'Art et d'Histoire), are the letters K.N.O. E.S.T. on the step below the emperor's feet, leading to an attribution of the design to the Brussels painter of that name.¹⁴ However, as Delmarcel pointed out, the style here

is so closely related to the works of Van Roome that it is indeed difficult to distinguish the contribution of one artist from that of the other.¹⁵

In another case, the Marriage of King Oriant and Beatrice (Leningrad, Hermitage), Steppe has discussed the possibility of an attribution of the design to Van Roome. However, he also noted that subsequent steps in the working procedure may have masked the identity of the designer; that is, the enlargement of the petits patrons by the cartonniers.¹⁶ Certain adaptations to the original design (the artistic license of the cartonnier) could have generalized it in a way which reflected the prevailing style of Brussels at the time. Steppe believes that this may explain why so many sixteenth century tapestries closely resemble one another.¹⁷ The product may reflect as well the lack of a close relationship between weaver and designer.

Yet a third problem complicates efforts to distinguish styles of the early designers. In certain tapestry series replete with figures, it is likely that more than one artist may have contributed to the design. Indeed, weavings such as The Honors and The Apocalypse (Madrid, Patrimonio Nacional) show a distinct variety of figure types within one set.¹⁸ This has led to a good deal of speculation but no clear understanding about early workshop practices.

Finally, it is generally believed that the master weaver owned the cartoons after the editio princeps had been woven. He could then reweave the set for another commission or cut

up, reuse and distribute the individual figures over a new field for a different subject. The Dido and Aeneas tapestries at Hampton Court, for which the first edition is probably missing, exhibit the resulting disjointed design. They are¹⁹ full of borrowings from earlier, more original works.

In another instance, Scenes from Court Life of about 1520 (San Francisco, de Young Museum), many borrowed figures retain their original position in this new composition. However, the rather surprising number of fourteen out of twenty-four figures can be traced to other, earlier tapestries.²⁰

Standing out from this confusion of styles Bernart van Orley's early works ought to be evident and identifiable. However, specific information about the artist's early training in tapestry design is not documented. As was mentioned previously, the earliest record of Van Orley and tapestry matters places him in excellent company. I refer to the 1520 agreement Van Orley witnessed between Margaret of Austria and Pieter de Pannemaker.²¹ By this date Van Orley had already served two years as court painter to the Regent. Therefore, his presence at such a meeting would not necessarily be unusual whether or not he was the designer of the weavings in question. What may be more significant is the fact that during this same period (1515 - 1521) both the noted designers Adrian van den Houte and Jan van Roome were employed by the Regent Margaret. If Van Orley was not a pupil of either of these artists, he certainly must have known their talents well and appreciated them.

Hilary Wayment has repeatedly favored the theory of a

close link between Adrian van den Houte and Van Orley.²² Without sufficient evidence, he reattributed certain drawings formerly known as Van den Houte to Van Orley, thereby proposing a pupil-teacher relationship between the two.²³ However, it is not likely that Van Orley studied with Malines' leading glazier and designer, for the former is repeatedly associated with Brussels documents and the latter apparently always with Malines. A more plausible relationship concerns Van den Houte's design style in general and what Van Orley may have assimilated from it.

Most noted as a stained glass and tapestry designer, Van den Houte lived from 1459 to 1521. Two sketches and five tapestries have been given convincingly to the artist with the allowance for a possible link with several other works.²⁴ Certain characteristics are shared by all of these works. The compositions are divided into three parts, often by richly ornamented pillars with bowshaped gable ends. Figures stare blankly into space, though the depiction of movement is generally more convincing with Van den Houte than with his contemporary Van Roome. All are united by a repetitious use of the circle as a decorative motif.

It is somewhat difficult to differentiate the style of Van den Houte from that of his contemporary Van Roome. Unlike Van den Houte, however, Van Roome is documented as the designer of at least one tapestry, the 1513 Legend of Herkenbald (Brussels, Musées royaux d'Art et d'Histoire), made for St. Peter's Church in Louvain. The series of David and Bathsheba (Brussels, Musée de Cluny) and the Story of Mestra (Brus-

sels, Musées royaux d'Art et d'Histoire) have also been convincingly attributed to this painter-designer on stylistic grounds.²⁵ Characteristic of these tapestries are numerous personages, mostly superfluous for the themes, which serve a purely decorative function. Narrative scenes are designed in a snake-like configuration across a flowered background. Secluded episodes, relegated to the upper corners of the design, are separated by architectural motifs on an Italian Renaissance and Gothic mixture. Though there is seldom any true illusion of depth, a panoramic view is occasionally attempted in the background. In Van Roome's work, the decorative, two-dimensional nature of tapestry is respected above all else.

Perhaps also of some significance for Van Orley was Van Roome's position in society and at court. Though not officially attached to the court, the artist received important commissions from royalty and the bourgeoisie in Brussels, Louvain and Malines from 1509 to 1521. In other words, he was an established peintre-inventeur, noted for his designs in sculpture, architecture, tapestry, seals and stained glass, in the years directly preceding Van Orley's rise to fame.²⁶

Few other painter-designers have yet come to light due to the destruction of the Brussels archives, as was mentioned in chapter one. Beyond those already discussed is one additional artist of note. Leonard Knoest lived in Brussels from 1501 on and was known as a painter of designs; that is, a professional cartonnier. It is also known that he worked for Jan Colaert and followed the style of Van Roome.²⁷

Among his own designs is the Finding of the True Cross (Brussels, Musées royaux d'Art et d'Histoire), a work closely related to Van Roome's Legend of Herkenbald.

The reconstruction of the oeuvre of each of the artists mentioned above cannot be undertaken in the present study. An issue for this discussion is what aspects of the works securely ascribed to these masters Van Orley assimilated for his own designs. These influences on Van Orley by his predecessors will be noted in this and the following chapter in regard to specific designs.

Of slightly later date, but significant for Van Orley's approach to tapestry, was the influence of Raphael's work. He knew it specifically in the form of the cartoons for the Acts of the Apostles series which arrived in Brussels around 1516. Although these cartoons had comparatively little impact on Van Orley's paintings, they must be considered in a discussion of the artist's tapestry design.

By way of introduction to this topic, which will be discussed in greater detail in chapter four, fact must be separated from fiction insofar as this is possible. Some accounts have placed Van Orley in Raphael's Brussels studio as supervisor of the weaving of the tapestries.²⁸ Others state that the artist at one time owned the cartoons for the Acts of the Apostles series.²⁹ Neither supposition is based on fact. Nor can one substantiate the assertion that Van Orley designed the borders for the third weaving of the famous series.³⁰ These often-repeated claims apparently rely on Félibien's commentary that Van Orley "a fait executer

tous les tapisseries que les Papes, les Empereurs, et les Rois faisoient faire en Flandres d'après les dessins

d'Italie"³¹ or on that of Roger de Piles that the artist "a eu le principal soin de faire executer celles de Pape, et des Souverains de ce temps-la, sur les Desseins de Raphael."³²

Edith Standen, countering these popular notions, suggested that both authors may have assumed Brussels manufacturers to have been arranged similarly to the Gobelins factories; that is, with weavers subordinated to an artistic director. This, she points out, was a practice common in a later period in France and never known in Brussels.³³

Still, at least one scholar continued to link Van Orley with Raphael's workshop. De Campos suggested, unconvincingly it seems to me, that Van Orley was the cartonnier for the Adoration of the Kings, a tapestry in the Scuola nuova series, on the basis of an identification of unintelligible letters as B.O. on the collar of a kneeling king.³⁴ It is unlikely that Van Orley would have served as cartonnier for Raphael's drawings when he was considerably occupied during these years with his own projects and commissions at court.

Van Orley's direct involvement with the Acts of the Apostles cartoons was not necessary to ensure his familiarity with the designs. A commission of this kind would have been widely known especially to those already in the trade. Arriving late in 1516 or early in 1517,³⁵ the cartoons were woven in the workshop of Pieter van Aelst, who also collab-

orated on projects with Van Roome and Knoest. Van Orley probably knew the noted weaver and, as court painter-designer to Margaret of Austria beginning in 1518, would have had access to his manufactory.

The continuing stylistic tradition of the Brussels school of painting and, as was discussed in the previous chapter, its apparent unprogressive character in the late fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries are readily identifiable traits of the oeuvres of Van Roome, Van den Houste and Knoest. Therefore, the arrival in Brussels of Raphael's distinctly different drawings and cartoons must have been a startling revelation. They certainly helped to precipitate the rapid assimilation of Italian compositions and motifs into Netherlandish art, specifically into tapestry design.

Bernart van Orley initially shared with Van Roome, Van den Houste and Knoest the characteristic forms of this period of decline. In the chef-d'oeuvre of his early period, the altarpiece of the Legends of Sts. Thomas and Matthew (about 1512, Vienna, Kunsthistorisches Museum and Brussels, Musées royaux des Beaux-Arts), figures stand immobilized. Multiple scenes fill background and foreground, disconnected in space and time. The crowding of figures is hardly alleviated by the attempted ordering of space by architecture, a composite of Gothic and Renaissance elements. Little more than costume and ornamental motifs has changed from the depictions of Van Orley's predecessors in Brussels, the Masters of St.

Gudule and the Masters of the Legends of St. Barbara and St. Catherine, for example.³⁶

When Raphael's tapestry cartoons arrived about four years later, they offered an alternative to hackneyed motifs and figures which had lost their expressive capabilities. Among the major characteristics Shearman noted in Raphael's cartoons are enargeia and energeia, terms used to describe respectively "an elevated clarity or vividness of expression in placing the event before the eyes" and "an emphasis or force of detail in the illustration which tends toward hyperbole."³⁷ The overall design unity found in these cartoons at once opposes the confusion of redundant forms found in the preceding Netherlandish style. New, too, were the massive dignity given to human form and a character of refinement, eloquence and dramatic emphasis.

These two artistic influences, the traditional Netherlandish and the new Italian (mostly Raphaelesque), came together in Brussels at the incipient stages of Van Orley's efforts in tapestry design. How he perceived these disparate schools and formed his own style by integrating the two is a recurring theme of this and subsequent chapters.

Van Orley's Early Designs

Not influenced by but contemporary with the arrival of Raphael's cartoons in Brussels was the first set of tapestries which can be attributed to Bernart van Orley, the Legend of Notre-Dame du Sablon (now divided among museums in Brussels, Glasgow, Leningrad and Saint-Jean-Cap-

Ferrat; illus. 1-4).³⁸ Commissioned some time between November 12 - 30, 1516 and Nov. 20, 1517 by François de Taxis, Maître des Postes, they were finished in 1518 and moved to the chapel of the Taxis family in the Church of the Sablon in Brussels.³⁹

Van Orley's debt to his predecessors and especially to Van Roome is apparent in the division of each tapestry into three parts (the center portion of which is slightly wider than the right and left wings) and a further subdivision of these sections into an upper and lower register of scenes. One recalls these elements in particular in Van Roome's Legend of Herkenbald (Brussels, Musées royaux d'Art et d'Histoire; illus. 5). Also generally associated with those designers before Van Orley, and traditionally with Brussels style, is the fairly static mien of figures found within the Notre-Dame du Sablon panels.

Although these similarities exist, there is no mistaking Van Orley's design for those of his predecessors. The changes Van Orley made are startling today and, perhaps, appeared so in the early 1500s. Whether or not Van Roome, Van den Houte and Knoest intentionally worked in remarkably similar styles, Van Orley's work can certainly be characterized as innovative for its time. The Notre-Dame du Sablon series stands out as a transitional work in the art of tapestry design for many reasons, some of which relate directly to Van Orley's paintings.

First of all, each tapestry is conceived as a triptych with three completely independent sections as one would find in contemporary paintings (e.g. Altarpiece of the Legends of Saints Thomas and Matthew cited above). This is a subtle change from the design of Van Roome, for example, where column divisions in the Legend of Herkenbald tapestry are another decorative feature, not true space divisions. Here drapery from one side of the column division flows into the next section and backgrounds of foliage or landscape elements are continuous. Van Orley's stricter division of scenes focuses greater attention on each one individually. Also in a dramatic departure from earlier designs, the artist organized the space in his compositions to achieve a clearer definition of background and foreground. Scenes do not simply appear one on top of another. Instead, there is an attempt at spatial recession in order to allow background scenes individual integrity.

The usual horror vacui of figures and foliage is replaced here by the appropriate surroundings for each scene depicted, further heightening its realism and meaning. A good example is the lower left scene in the first tapestry of the series. Here Van Orley has filled the interior of Beatrice Soetkens' bedroom with contemporary furniture and realistic details of her personal belongings strewn around the room.(stockings, keys, shoes, and so forth). Like his predecessors, Van Orley found it necessary to fill the picture field completely. However, he respected the

requirements of perspective space and gave to the superposition of subjects an aspect less conventional and more cohesive than contemporary designs.

The realism of the scenes in the portraits shown and in the sincerity, vigor and sense of plasticity in all details is perhaps the most innovative feature of the tapestry series. From documents we know that Van Orley was occupied in 1515 with several commissions of portraits including those of the six children of Philip the Fair, of Charles and Eleanor, and of the Royal Danish couple.⁴⁰ In the Notre-Dame du Sablon series there are multiple portraits of those in the François de Taxis family (François himself, his wife, and a nephew) as well as members of the Habsburg family. Easily identifiable are portraits of Frederick III and Maximilian I (in the upper and lower scenes of illus. 3); Duke Jean III (far left scene of illus. 4), and again Duke Jean III, his son and a young Charles of Austria with his brother Ferdinand and Philibert II of Savoy (center of illus. 4). The statue of Notre-Dame du Sablon is venerated in the far right scene of illus. 4 by Marie d'Evreux (here represented by Margaret of Austria) and a young Ferdinand accompanied by his sisters Eleanor, Isabel, Catherine and Mary,⁴¹ behind whom is the wife of François de Taxis.

So vivid are the features of these personages that they appear as if they were sketched from life. Likewise, even those figures we do not readily identify are approached as portrait types. The psychology of the models, their age and

social rank are all expressed with vitality, simplicity and clarity. This is a marked change over previous tapestry designs where the facial features and poses of unidentifiable characters were repeated exactly, seemingly without concern for the resulting monotonous effect. In Bathsheba Invited to the Palace, a tapestry in Van Roome's David and Bathsheba series (Paris, Musée de Cluny, illus. 6), for example, the figure third from the right in the doorway appears several different times in the same scene with only a slight change of costume.

All of these characteristics of the Notre-Dame du Sablon series--strict adherence to the requirements of the scene as opposed to a sense of horror vacui, purposeful placement of figures for a focused attention on the meaning of the scene, realism in portraiture and interior details--signal a new trend which takes tapestry design away from the hackneyed style of Van Orley's predecessors.

Concerning the more intentionally decorative part of the tapestry, that is, the borders, Van Orley was also innovative. Before this time, floral borders surrounded the central panel. The introduction of banderoles with texts and Italianate motifs (candelabra, putti, masks, cornucopias, etc.) is based on Florentine art of around 1470.⁴² Though the Notre-Dame du Sablon series was not the first to introduce these decorative borders,⁴³ the motifs here are more elaborate in their arrangement than those in contemporary weavings. This type of design apparently was favored by Van Orley who later planned similar borders for other series.

Tapestry Design vis-à-vis Paintings

Closely following the Notre-Dame du Sablon series is a group of tapestries representing a phase in which Van Orley's designs both conform to the requirements of panel painting and begin to show an independent development. It was perhaps only by conceiving of tapestries as woven paintings that Van Orley began to realize the potential of tapestry as a medium and alter his designs accordingly. This evolutionary process is apparent in several tapestries dating from around 1518 - 1525: the Dais of Charles V (Madrid, Patrimonio Nacional, illus. 7 - 9), the Blumenthal Crucifixion (New York, Metropolitan Museum of Art, illus. 11), the Lamentation (Washington, National Gallery of Art, illus. 13), the Adoration of the Kings (New York, Metropolitan Museum of Art, illus. 20) and a series of scenes from the Passion of Christ (Madrid, Patrimonio Nacional, illus. 23, 24, 25, 26; Washington, National Gallery of Art, illus. 27, 29; Paris, Jacquemart-André Museum, illus. 28; New York, Metropolitan Museum of Art, Lehman Collection, illus. 34).

Traditionally known as a set of three tapestries--God the Father, the Crucifixion, and Christ Departing from His Mother (illus. 7 - 9)--the Dais of Charles V is mentioned in the inventory of Philip II as belonging to the throne of Charles V.⁴⁴ Another description of three tapestries in a 1523 inventory of Margaret of Austria's belongings at Malines appears to match the same set of "riche tapisseries ouvrée de fil d'or, d'argent et de soie, nouvellement achetée par Madame:"

Item, une aultre petite pièce de mêmes...,
historiée comme N^{re} S^{gr} pend en croix.

Item, une aultre petite pièce de riche tapis-
serie... historiée, comme N^{re} S^{gr} print congié
de sa glorieuse mère.

Item,... une riche ciel de tapisserie... fait
par Pietre Pannemarie à Bruxelles, ouquel est
figuré Dieu la Père, et St. Esperit, environnez
de plusieurs anges.⁴⁵

In this inventory of nine tapestries the three mentioned here were not listed consecutively. However, when Charles V sent a group of ten tapestries to Isabella of Portugal three years later as a wedding present, the three were grouped together.⁴⁶ Thereafter, they were traditionally said to be hung as an ensemble in the Escorial.

In spite of these historical associations, the three tapestries are incongruous in size, style, subject matter and date. God the Father (illus. 7) and the Crucifixion (illus. 8) both of around 1518 - 1520, together form a doctrinal statement about the redemption of man which does not relate directly to Christ Departing from His Mother (illus. 9). Furthermore, the former two present a cohesive style which can be identified as Van Orley's; the latter is by an anonymous artist and dates from around 1510 -1520.

There is no panel painting which exactly parallels the Van Orley weavings. However, there are paintings which, for reasons of style and subject matter, make helpful comparisons. A Crucifixion of around 1516 in the Wadsworth Atheneum, Hartford (illus. 10)⁴⁷ shows a similar Christ figure in pose and anatomy, and corresponding types to the other figures in the tapestry. The woman supporting the

Virgin in the Hartford painting directly relates in facial features to Justice in the tapestry (at the far left). The Hartford Mary Magdalene is not altered drastically to play the role of Mercy (the woman collecting Christ's blood). Her back to us, she displays a similar position in the composition (though reversed) and identical inclined face in profile.

In this early tapestry, Van Orley's approach is virtually the same as for his paintings. For example, the figures are brought forward, entirely filling up the foreground plane where they are arranged symmetrically around the central axis of the cross. What distinguishes the tapestry from the Hartford painting which preceded it is space, landscape depiction and embellishments in costume (perhaps decorative additions of the cartonnier and weaver). A beautiful and serene Flemish landscape by day (not unlike those one can see in Van Orley's later Hunts of Maximilian series) replaces the barren and rocky terrain of Golgotha beneath a darkened sky. Space around the figures is less restrictive than it is in the painting and figures are adorned with the kind of decorative details in costume and hair that suit the art of weaving so well.

What is so noticeably different is the subject matter of the tapestry. It represents a doctrinal statement about the salvation of mankind, a theme never found in Van Orley's paintings, but common in contemporary weavings by other artists.⁴⁸ This tapestry set essentially refers to the resolution of the divine conflict between God's justice and mercy in dispute over the fate of sinful man. In the center background

Adam and Eve commit their sin (left) and are expelled from the Garden of Eden (right). The left foreground shows the personifications of Justice and Mercy, identified by the words Justitia and Misericordia on their dress hems. Justitia, disarmed by Misericordia, replaces her sword in its sheath. Gathering in her goblet the physical evidence of God's mercy through the sacrifice of Christ, Misericordia utters, "Sanguinis hoc preciu distribuā ingenis" (Give unto them who are in need your precious blood).

The Virgin Mary, St. John and two angels witness the scene, while in the background above them souls are escorted to heaven. The words over the cross, "Prothoparētis s̄aguae solvi debita multa quod super est misericordia participa," unite the Crucifixion with the canopy weaving of God the Father above it. The Trinity (God the Father and Holy Spirit as a dove in one tapestry and Christ in the other tapestry below) is speaking in this instance: "I reveal to you the appearance of the blood poured out for (the forgiveness of) many sins which is a participation in the mercy from above." Justice and Mercy are thus reconciled by the promise of the Redeemer. The additions of text do not interrupt the scene, but unobtrusively add to it. Van Orley has rejected the old-fashioned use of banderoles and successfully integrated the words into the design as part of the flow of the composition.

Also among the earliest of Van Orley's tapestry designs is the Crucifixion of the Blumenthal Collection (illus. 11). Though the border of the work dates around 1525, the design

of the Crucifixion scene may be dated earlier, around 1515 - 20, on stylistic grounds. It is not only an historical, narrative presentation (scenes of Christ carrying the cross and the entombment are in the background), but also a specifically devotional image as the instruments of the Passion are shown.

In composition Van Orley again referred to his treatment of this subject in painting, thereby rejecting the tapestry designs of his contemporaries and predecessors. He chose a restricted number of figures and spaced them comfortably at the base of the cross as he had done in the Hartford Crucifixion (illus. 10) and the prototype for the Berlin Crucifixion⁵⁰ of about 1512 (no longer considered a work by Van Orley). The artist thus centered on the essence of the theme and heightened its meaning by excluding unnecessary details. Though the main figures fill the foreground space, there is an easy transition into the background and a convincing spatial relationship between the two.

Both of these features--restriction of figures to those essential for the scene and more three-dimensionally arranged spatial relationships--are a change from contemporary design practices and an indication of the innovative direction Van Orley would take in later tapestry designs. For example, one may compare an anonymous Crucifixion weaving from a Passion series of about 1515 - 1520 in Madrid (Patrimonio Nacional, illus. 25). In the Madrid tapestry the scene is cluttered with numerous figures only a few of which are essential for the scene. By entirely filling the foreground plane they

block easy access to the background which then becomes more of a backdrop than a convincing landscape. Unlike Van Orley's design, the angels around the cross are all of the same size and consequently restrict the space in and around the cross. While the artist of the Madrid tapestry has purposefully filled every space, Van Orley has created a more comfortable relationship between the figures and their setting. The latter allows one to concentrate more fully on the meaning of the scene rather than be distracted by multiple decorative effects.

Early in Van Orley's career as a tapestry designer, he was apparently well aware of the distinct differences between the two media of painting and tapestry and was not content to make one a mere copy of the other. While there are tapestries which directly reflect certain of the artist's painting compositions, the changes introduced for the tapestry version show a sensitivity to the design requirements of a monumental art form.

In the early 1520s Van Orley painted an altarpiece for Philippe Haneton.⁵¹ The Lamentation is the subject of the central panel and the Haneton family of the right and left wings (Brussels, Musées royaux des Beaux-Arts, illus. 12). In dramatic close-up, figures crowd in about the dead Christ in this Andachtsbild⁵² which itself could stand as an emblem of grief and sorrow. The sense of poignant suffering is enhanced by the soft shadows, smooth contours of forms and quietly contained facial expressions.

Subtly different in design and concept is the Lamentation tapestry in the Widener Collection (illus. 13). Whether Philippe Haneton also commissioned the woven version is not known.⁵³ In any case, the tapestry (from around 1522 - 1525) changes the idea of the theme found in the paintings from an Andachtsbild to a representation of an historical event. Van Orley altered the space, background and figural group to achieve certain goals. Characteristic of the art of tapestry are its decorative aspect and monumental form. Through the weaving technique lines and edges are exaggerated. The result is a medium ideal for the expression of the linear flow of bodies huddled together, punctuated by tortured faces with furrowed brow and sighing mouths.

Instead of the black stippled gold background, the tapestry displays part of a beautiful Flemish landscape. Atmospheric effects make a more natural and decoratively balanced scene. Also added are a weeping female figure at the far left, a full body view of Christ and the marble sarcophagus lid on which He lies. Some of these elements may have been added in order to exploit fully the decorative medium of tapestry. However, it is also true that the composition as a whole is more naturally arranged in its woven version. Forming a half-moon, the figures now comfortably fit into the space, and each one is allowed a more convincing and natural pose. Christ's body at the bottom of the curve is the weighty form which, pressed down by the sorrowful expressions of the accompanying figures, requires the support of the heavy slab beneath. By allowing more room for the mourning

figures and for Christ's body, Van Orley has expressed the sorrowful event in a different way from that of the dramatic close-up of the painting.

Both the painted and the woven versions of the Lamentation seem to have been inspired by the works of Raphael and Dürer. As mentioned above, Dürer's influence through the print medium preceded that which resulted from his trip to the Netherlands in 1520 - 1521. For Raphael's art, we are most aware of the designs for the Acts of the Apostles series. Less well documented are other examples of the Italian's work which may have arrived around the same time in the form of drawings and reproductive prints.

Raphael's 1507 Entombment in the Borghese Gallery, Rome, was perhaps known to Van Orley by way of drawings. For it is with the figure of Christ in the extant drawings, particularly one in the British Museum, London (illus. 14) that Van Orley's own Christ figure most closely agrees. Though reversed in position, the Netherlandish example generally reflects the limp, yet muscular torso in a half-sitting pose of this drawing. The slightly bent knees, dramatically turned head, and caressed hand of Van Orley's Christ in the painting and tapestry are similar to these same features in the British museum sheet.

Between Van Orley's painting and the tapestry came the increased influence of Dürer, specifically his rendition of the Lamentation subject in two woodcuts. One is an independent sheet of around 1495 (illus. 15)⁵⁴ and the other is part of the slightly later Large Passion series (1497 -

1500; illus. 16). It is quite possible that these prints were among those circulated in the Netherlands before Dürer's own trip there in 1520 - 1521. If not, then they had immediate impact on Van Orley's tapestry which, because of the absence of the Brussels city mark and weaver's mark instituted in 1528, could not be later than 1522 - 1525.

For the Lamentation tapestry, Van Orley borrowed the weeping woman from the upper left corner of the 1495 print, placing her in a similar position in the tapestry. He also may have been influenced by Dürer's unusual representation (found in both of the prints mentioned) of five women at the Lamentation. The greater spatial depth of the tapestry scene is due to the background landscape for which Van Orley also owes a general debt to Dürer. The Large Passion Lamentation (ilus. 16) shows a unique juxtaposition of dead and fully leaved trees, rocky knolls and a valley with castles in the background. Van Orley perhaps recalled this stunning combination of forms, slightly altering the architecture for his own composition.

How much of a dialogue Dürer and Van Orley carried on in the Netherlands we do not know. That they met at an elaborate dinner party hosted by Van Orley in 1520 is all that is recorded.⁵⁵ Therefore, it is difficult to say whether Dürer's Lamentation drawing dated 1522 (Bremen, Kunsthalle; illus. 17) was a composition conceived and recorded in the Netherlands or totally formed on the return home.. Remarkably alike are the two figures of St. John and Joseph of Arimathea at the far right in Dürer's drawing and Van Orley's two male figures in the same attitude in the

tapestry. The Joseph figure in Van Orley's woven design has changed from the Haneton painting. In the tapestry an older figure with a long beard, holding an urn of precious ointment, poses with inclined head gazing toward Christ. It is a softer, more human face than the severe Roman profile of the short-bearded head in the painting. Impossible to determine at present is whether this change is due to Dürer or whether the debt is reversed.

Another subject found in both painted and woven form is Van Orley's Adoration of the Kings. The tapestry of around 1525 (New York, Metropolitan Museum of Art; illus. 18) is preceded by a panel of around 1522 in Philadelphia (the Johnson Collection; illus. 19).⁵⁶ In this case, however, the source for both is more clearly identifiable; it is found in the 1520 - 1530 Scuola nuova series, Scenes from the Life of Christ (Rome, Vatican Museum; illus. 20) which was woven in Brussels.⁵⁷ As was suggested in the case of the Raphaelesque source for the Lamentation, some preliminary drawings may have been available to Van Orley as well as the tapestry itself. Van Orley apparently used part of the design of the same theme from the Logge fresco of 1519 (Rome, Vatican; illus. 21 and Oxford, Ashmolean Museum; illus. 22). The figure on the far left in Van Orley's painting and tapestry is borrowed not from the Scuola nuova design, but from the figure of St. Joseph in the Logge fresco.

A comparison of the Metropolitan Adoration tapestry and its predecessor on panel immediately shows an objective designer's eye at work. Condensing and synthesizing his

painting format, Van Orley extracted the most meaningful figures and used them to concentrate more fully on the theme. Describing some of the changes made and the sources used, Standen noted that Van Orley's tapestry in some details is closer to the Vatican tapestry than to its own painted parallel.⁵⁸ For instance, the pose of the king kissing Christ's foot, with left hand and leg extended for balance, copies the same figure in the Vatican weaving, but is not identical to the king of either Van Orley's painting or the Logge fresco and its preparatory drawing.⁵⁹ Other details, such as another king striding forward on the right and the framing of the center scene with two vertical architectural elements are also taken from the Scuola nuova tapestry, not the Logge fresco. From the Logge fresco design, Van Orley assimilated only the king presenting his gift at the far left. Presumably, then, Van Orley had at his disposal both the designs for the Scuola nuova tapestries and selected drawings for the Logge fresco. Clearly he was not simply aware of the presence of the Italian designers in Brussels but consulted their works for his own tapestry designs.⁶⁰

Both Van Orley's tapestry and painting of the Nativity borrowed from Italian sources. However, at this early stage in the artist's tapestry-designing career, he began to see the two media as quite different insofar as compositional design is concerned. In the painting one additional central figure (the rather awkwardly sprawling king to the left of the Virgin) and several inconsequential, minor background characters are scattered around an endless and meaningless

architectural maze. In the tapestry only the essential figures remain and the impressive, red-armored giant at the left makes a more powerful statement, halting the strong diagonal formed by the kneeling king and the Virgin and Child. Compared with the Nativity panel, the tapestry design is more direct, intense and compact. Cutting out the unnecessary additional figures and architecture (without compromising by reducing the impression of spatial depth), Van Orley is able in the tapestry to concentrate on the center of the Nativity, the Christ Child. What is spatially awkward or excessive in figures or details in the painting becomes clear and masterful in the tapestry version.

During this same period when Van Orley's woven designs can be so closely related to his paintings, the artist was commissioned to make drawings for scenes from the Passion of Christ. Because of the document joining Pieter de Pannemaker, the Regent Margaret and Bernart van Orley in a decision of 1520 about a Passion series, many have sought to link certain contemporary weavings of Van Orley's design with this agreement. Most often the set of four in Madrid, Patrimonio Nacional, including Christ in the Garden of Gethsemane, Christ Carrying the Cross, the Crucifixion, and the Deposition (illus. 23 - 26) has been considered the editio princeps. Steppe calls three tapestries carrying a different border and first known in the Collection of the Duke of Alba an incomplete replica set.⁶¹ These include Christ in the Garden of Gethsemane, the Crucifixion (both in Washington, the National

Gallery of Art; illus. 27, 29) and Christ Carrying the Cross (Paris, Jacquemart-André Museum; illus. 28).

I suggest, rather, that the Duke of Alba tapestries are the first edition. The Madrid weavings are a combination of two different sets; two tapestries of the four repeat the Alba series designs. Clarification of this issue helps in the evaluation of the document and discernment of Van Orley's early tapestry design. The fact that the document does not specifically name Van Orley as the designer, though he attended the signing of the agreement, may have some particular meaning. Other extant contracts of this type often name designer as well as weaver. For example, the contract Jan van Roome received for the design of the Herkenbald tapestries named a certain Philippe as cartoon-maker and Leon de Smet as weaver.⁶² Another with Lancelot Blondeel⁶³ in 1533 specifies him as patron-maker. I suggest that in the case of the 1520 contract, the designer did not need to be mentioned, that the petits patrons perhaps had already been woven previously and were owned by de Pannemaker. The Regent Margaret merely stipulates that the two new tapestries be of the same quality as the two already bought. According to a later account payment, the subjects of the two new tapestries were Christ in the Garden of Gethsemane and Christ Carrying the Cross.⁶⁴ If these orders relate to the Madrid set, then the Crucifixion and Descent from the Cross were already in hand. Though the four tapestries share the same border, the latter two discussed are of a different style than the newly ordered ones. In the

Crucifixion and Descent from the Cross, more figures than are necessary for the scene are dressed in elegant attire and arranged in frieze-like fashion before the landscape, not in it. Poses of the detached figures are graceful and poised in doll-like attitudes of conventional movements, much less natural than those of the Garden of Gethsemane or Christ Carrying the Cross. Faces, too, are devoid of expression⁶⁵ and instead project blank stares.

These figures are quite similar to those in the Herkenbald tapestry (illus. 5), the tombs of Brou (illus. 30) and even the murals at the Busleyden house (illus. 31), all works⁶⁶ attributed to Van Orley's predecessor, Jan van Roome. In fact, certain figures are taken from tapestries attributed to Van Roome and placed in the Crucifixion and Deposition scenes. The woman behind Mestra in the Supplication of Mestra (Brussels, Musées royaux des Beaux-Arts; illus. 32) who raises a handkerchief to her cheek is repeated at the far left of the Deposition (illus. 26) in changed costume; the bearded figure at the far right in the Crucifixion (illus. 25) is quoted from the Deposition (illus. 33) of another Passion series in Madrid, Patrimonio Nacional.

Why Margaret of Austria did not order the entire set of the Passion at one time is unclear and baffling. It could be simply that the original order was, for some reason, never fully delivered. Jan van Roome's recorded activities stop around 1521. If the tapestries already in hand were of Van Roome's design, the new order could have something to do with an ailing or overworked artist. The two new tapestries may

not be the two now considered as part of the Madrid set even though they carry the same border design. The original contract stipulates that these tapestries were to be delivered within a year, that is, by September of 1521. The Madrid Christ in the Garden and Christ Carrying the Cross, both clearly in the style of Van Orley, carry the Brussels city mark, which, as noted, was only instituted after 1528.

The Washington and Paris counterparts (illus. 27 and 28) for the Madrid Christ in the Garden and Christ Carrying the Cross do not carry the Brussels mark. Because they are superior in quality and subtlety of design, the former must be considered as part of the editio princeps (woven before 1528) and the Madrid parallels as a post-1528 replica. In the figure of the angel bringing the cup to Christ in the Washington Christ in the Garden of Gethsemane there is a subtle play of light and color in the folds of the garment not apparent in the Madrid parallel. Similarly, a comparison of details in the Christ Carrying the Cross in Madrid and Paris shows the latter to be more masterful in its weaving. For example, in the Madrid tapestry the lighting is harsher and subtleties in facial expression were not given the same attention they were in the Paris version. As a result, the Christ figure in the former has a rather stunned, stupid expression, not the poignant, sorrowful appeal of the latter Christ. Likewise, those who beat and torture Christ in the Madrid tapestry are almost humorous caricatures, not the terrifying, malicious human beings of what I consider the editio princeps. Notable among other differences are certain

exclusions from the Madrid tapestry: the tall, stately tree at the right which closes the composition in the Paris tapestry and haloes on the heads of Christ, John, the Virgin Mary and the Magdalene.

The editio princeps, then, is the series including the following tapestries: Christ in the Garden of Gethsemane (Washington, National Gallery of Art), the Last Supper (New York, Metropolitan Museum of Art, Lehman Collection), Christ Carrying the Cross (Paris, Jacquemart-André Museum) and the Crucifixion (Washington, National Gallery of Art). Missing from the series may be a Deposition and a Resurrection, though this is difficult to determine with present information. A Last Supper in the Lehman Collection (illus. 34) is added here on the strength of similarities it has in figure type, size, color, and identical border with the other tapestries. Less clear is the addition of a nearly identical Last Supper tapestry to the existing Passion series in Madrid (illus. 35). It has long been considered a part of that series because of its style, size and provenance, even though it has a different border from that of the others. It may have joined these weavings when it was sent to Spain as part of Charles V's wedding gift to Isabella.⁶⁷

A study of what is here called the editio princeps of the Passion of Christ in comparison to Van Orley tapestries which precede it shows dramatic developments. The entire series now displays a new control of spatial depth. Figures fit easily into the landscape or room, not before it. The

landscape itself is featured increasingly more as a part of the composition. Attention is paid to details in order to make the landscape more realistic as well as spatially more plausible. Above all, an attempt is made to vary expressions and poses of figures. The monotony of previous and even contemporary tapestries is alleviated by individual attention focused on the attitude of each figure as it applies to the scene depicted.'

Notes to Chapter 2

1. O. Le Maire, "Renseignements nouveau sur Bernard van Orley et sa famille," Bernard van Orley, 167 - 189.
2. M. J. Friedländer, Jan Gossart and Bernart van Orley, Early Netherlandish Painting, VIII, Brussels and Leiden, 1972, 51.
3. A review of these commissions may be found in Farmer, Van Orley, 17ff.
4. Though this document now appears to be lost, several scholars transcribed the text from the Archives du Royaume manuscript no. 1797, fol. 217^v. A. Pinchart's transcription is as follows (from carton no. 27, Manuscript Division, Bibliothèque Royale d'Albert I):

Assavoir que ledict maistre Pierre fera et accomplira deux pièces de fynne et riche tapisserie du mesme estoffe que desjà luy en a vendre deux pièces de l'ystoire de la Passion, pour le pris et somme l'aulne du xxxviij florins du xx patars, telle longueur, largeur et qualité que les patrons, qui pour ce luy seront baillez, contiendront.
Laquelle tapisserie sera faict et parfaicte en-dedans ung an prochainement tenent, de cette bonté manufactoire et optimarum que les aultres deux dictes pièces, ou meilleur...

Disagreement about the interpretation of this document may be found in M. Calberg, "La Comparution du Christ devant Pilate, Tapisserie de Bruxelles du premier quart du XVI^e Siècle," Bulletin des Musées royaux d'Art et d'Histoire, ser. 4, 35 (1963), 99 - 100.

5. J. K. Steppe, "Mencia de Mendoza et Gillis de Busleyden," Scrinium Erasmianum 2 (1969), 475, n. 16 and Ibidem., "Exkurs zur Familie van der Moyen und zu Marc Cretic," Pieter Coecke van Aelst, 34.

6. Carel van Mander, Het Leven der doorluchtige Nederlandtsche en Hooghduytsche schilders, Haarlem, 1604. Translated by Farmer in Van Orley, 6, from the edition of H. Floerke, Munich and Leipzig, 1906, 102 - 105.

7. A. Félibien des Avaux, Entretiens sur les vies et sur les ouvrages des plus excellens peintres anciens et modernes, Paris, 1725, II, 328.

8. Usually noted as evidence for an Italian journey is the dependence of Van Orley's Job altarpiece on Italian models which were not transferred through prints at that time. However, as Farmer points out (see Van Orley, 139ff.) and as will be shown here, the Italian influence on Van Orley's works was available in Brussels through prints and drawings.
9. See Pinchart's notes in cartoon 4 entitled "... Bruederscap van Sinte Sebastian in der Kerke von Sainte Goerys a Brusselle" (Manuscript Division, Bibliothèque Royale d'Albert I).
10. Archives du Royaume, Brussels, Papiers d'État et de l'Audience, 1177/6; also J. Duverger, "Lutherse Predicatie te Brussel en het Proces tegen een aantal Kunstenaars (april - juni, 1527)," in Wetenschappelijke Tijdingen, 36 (1977), col. 221 - 228.
11. Ibid., Archives, fol. 73 and 73^v.
12. For the most recent literature on Jan van Roome, Adrian van den Houte and Leonard Knoest, see references throughout Tapisseries bruxelloises.
13. Ibid.
14. Ibid., 76.
15. Ibid., 77.
16. Ibid., 121.
17. Ibid.
18. Guy Delmarcel, whose 1981 dissertation for Louvain University is on The Honors tapestry series, believes that it is the product of several artists. As for the Apocalypse, it has often been attributed to Van Orley on the basis of the similarity of facial types and figures. However, the borrowing from the Apocalypse print series of Dürer, Cranach, and especially Holbein, is so all-pervasive that there is very little of Van Orley there. Perhaps it is the clever pastiche of a master weaver with the print series in hand. A complete study of this tapestry set and sources is needed.
19. H. G. Wayment, "Bernard van Orley and Malines: The Dido and Aeneas Tapestries at Hampton Court," Antiquaries Journal, 49 (1969), 373 and illustrations.
20. A. G. Bennett, Five Centuries of Tapestry from the Fine Arts Museums of San Francisco, Rutland, Vermont and Tokyo, 1976, 90, illus. 91.

21. See note 4.
22. H. G. Wayment, "A Rediscovered Master: Adrian van den Houte of Malines (c. 1459 - 1521) and the Malines/Brussels School, III," Oud-Holland, 84 (1969), 257 - 269.
23. Ibid., 266 - 269.
24. Idem., "A Rediscovered Master: Adrian van den Houte (c. 1459-1521) and the Malines/Brussels School, II, Adrian van den Houte as a Tapestry Designer," Oud-Holland, 83 (1968), 71 - 94. Among those attributed to van den Houte are drawings in the British Museum and the Berlin Kupferstich-kabinett, the Power of Venus and Jupiter and Arcus respectively, and the following tapestries: Romance of the Rose (Leningrad, Hermitage), the Arming of Uriah (Padua), Funeral of Tunus (Madrid, Patrimonio Nacional) and the Moralities (Madrid, Patrimonio Nacional).
25. See the entries on Jan van Roome in Tapisseries bruxelloises, illus. 79, 29, 31, 33, 35, 37, 39, 41, 43, 45, 47.
26. Elizabeth Dhanens, "The David and Bathsheba Drawing," Gazette des Beaux-Arts, 53 (1959), 215.
27. J. Duverger, "De schilder Lenaert Knoest en de Brusselsche tapijtnijverheid in het begin der XVI^e eeuw," Oud-Holland, 48 (1931), 215 - 223.
28. John Shearman, Raphael's Cartoons in the Royal Collection and the Leonine Tapestries in the Sistine Chapel, London, 1972, 138.
29. Stated by Wauters (Tapisseries, 107), whose source apparently was M. F. Goethals, Histoire des lettres, des sciences et des arts en Belgique, III, Brussels, 1842, 52.
30. Shearman, Raphael's Cartoons, 143 - 144.
31. Félibien, Entretiens sur les vies, II, 254.
32. Roger de Piles, Abrégé de la vie des peintres, Paris, 1699, 355.
33. Edith A. Standen, "Some Sixteenth-Century Flemish Tapestries Related to Raphael's Workshop," Metropolitan Museum Journal, 4 (1921), 111, n. 5.
34. D. R. de Campos, "La tapisserie vaticaine de l'Epiphanie, une oeuvre inconnue de Bernard van Orley," L'Illustrazione Vaticana, 3 (1932), 32 - 34.
35. Shearman, Raphael's Cartoons, 210.

36. See chapter one, note 10.
37. Shearman, Raphael's Cartoons, 130.
38. Glasgow, Burrell Collection; Brussels, Musées royaux d'Art et d'Histoire; Saint-Jean-Cap-Ferrat, Villa-Musée Ile-de-France; Leningrad, the Hermitage Museum; Brussels, Musée Communal; and a missing portion formerly in Berlin, Kaiser Friederich Museum.
39. Tapisseries bruxelloises, 85.
40. See Pinchart's notes (Manuscript Division, Bibliothèque Royale, carton 3) and Farmer, Van Orley, 18ff.
41. Tapisseries bruxelloises, 92, 94, 96.
42. For example, see Luca Signorelli's Madonna and Child (Metropolitan Museum of Art, 49.7.13).
43. For example, see the Dido and Aeneas series at Hampton Court Palace (note 19).
44. A. F. Calvert, The Spanish Royal Tapestries, London and New York, 1921, 28; Göbel, Wandteppiche, illus. 121, 269, 270.
45. M. Michelant, "Inventaire des vaisselles, joyaux, tapisseries, peintures, ... de Marguerite d'Autriche, ... dressé en son palais de Malines, le 9 juillet 1523," in Compte Rendu des Séances de la Commission Royaux d'Histoire, 3^e serie, 12 (1871), 128 - 129.
46. R. Beer, "Acten ... aus dem Archivo General de Semancas," Jahrbuch der Kunsthistorischen Sammlungen des Allerhöchsten Kaiserhauses 2 (1891), cxxxii, no. 8358; Steppe in Tapisseries bruxelloises, 71.
47. E. Haverkamp-Begemann, ed., Wadsworth Atheneum Paintings, Catalogue I. The Netherlands and German-speaking countries. Fifteenth-Nineteenth Centuries, Hartford, 1978, 170.
48. For subject parallels see: Tapisseries bruxelloises, 107 - 109 and Bennett, Five Centuries, 55 - 73.
49. For a comparison in painting, see Christ on the Cross (Rotterdam, Museum Boymans-van Beuningen, no. 215). Farmer calls this painting a workshop product (Van Orley, 339).
50. Farmer differs in opinion on the Berlin Crucifixion (Ibid., 102ff).

51. There are no documents by which one might date this painting. Farmer rightly suggests 1521 or 1522, slightly preceding Haneton's death. Farmer, Van Orley, 167 - 169. The panel clearly shows features of the beginning of Van Orley's romanist period as well as parallels with paintings of 1520 - 1521. Compare the poses of Christ and the mourning women with those of the Virgin and supporting women in Gossart's Deposition of 1521, Leningrad, the Hermitage (Friedländer, VIII, plate 15) and the composition of the Lamentation of around 1520 by the Master of the Mansi Magdalene in Pasadena, Norton Simon Collection (no. 361 in Albert Dürer aux Pays-Bas, Brussels, 1977, exh. cat., Maison du Roi).

52. Farmer erroneously labels this painting a narrative work. Van Orley, 167.

53. Charles-Quint et Son Temps, Ghent, 1955, exh. cat., Musée royal des Beaux-Arts, 55.

54. For the controversy about the attribution of this print, see Willi Kurth, ed., The Complete Woodcuts of Albrecht Dürer, New York, 1963, 16 - 17.

55. Dürer aux Pays-Bas, 116.

56. Farmer dates the Adoration compositions (of which there are several paintings and one tapestry) all in the early 1530s. Farmer, Van Orley, 268. I agree with Friedländer's earlier date for the Johnson Collection panel (Friedländer, VIII, no. 105).

57. Standen, "Sixteenth-Century Tapestries," 110.

58. Ibid., 114.

59. Though reversed, this pose of the king goes back to Ghiberti's Adoration of the Magi on the north door of the Baptistery in Florence. See D. Ewing, "Further Observations on the Bruges Madonna: Ghiberti's Sources for Michelangelo," Revue Belge d'Archéologie et d'Histoire de l'Art 58 (1979), 77 - 83.

60. See Nicole Dacos, "Tommaso Vincidor, un élève de Raphael aux Pays-Bas," in Relations Artistiques entre les Pays-Bas et l'Italie à la Renaissance. Etudes dédiées à Suzanne Sulzberger. Etudes d'histoire de l'art 4 (1980), 61 - 99.

61. Tapisseries bruxelloises, 78 - 83.

62. Ibid., 80, 82.

63. This document is transcribed by Pinchart (Manuscript Division, Bibliothèque Royale, carton 3).

64. See Calberg, "La Comparution," 99 - 100.

65. In addition, Christ carrying the cross is represented in the background left of the Crucifixion tapestry, thereby rendering superfluous a duplicate tapestry of the same subject.

66. E. Dhanens, "L'Importance du peintre Jean van Roome, dit de Bruxelles," Tapisseries bruxelloises, 231 - 238.

67. See note 46.

CHAPTER THREE

THE CREATIVE ACT: THE DRAWINGS

Increased specialization of the tapestry from the mid-fifteenth to the early sixteenth century created a privileged position for Brussels' painters.¹ As was mentioned in chapter one, this special status was further secured when a major debate erupted in 1476. It will be recalled that the painters accused tapestry makers of using designs executed by journeymen not associated with their guild. The subsequent ruling settling the debate authorized weavers to design trees, animals, boats and plants for the verdures (i.e. decorative tapestries of foliage and landscape) and to complete or correct their cartoons with charcoal, chalk or pen. However, they were obliged thereafter to rely on the painters' guild for all other designs.² This agreement, endorsed by the current city painter, Vrancke van der Stodt, effected a new stylistic development in tapestry design; namely, that the weaver's art became more closely allied with developments in panel painting. Perhaps also because of the new obligatory cooperation between weavers and painters, the possible range of colors increased, new weaving techniques were developed for more subtle transitions of forms, and borders appeared as an important framing device.³ In Van Orley's time other stipulations which protected the painter's artistic investment in Brussels' weaving industry were made legally binding. In chapter one the 1525 edict of Charles V was discussed. Among the issues clarified by the ruling was the guarantee that a new patron made by a Master could not be reproduced by a counterproof or pricking for transfer

or altered by charcoal scribbling.⁴ In other words, the design was prized and its originality protected.

Aside from the ordinances and edicts noted, a few early tapestry commissions already underlined the important role of the painter-designer. The account books of Duke Louis I list a payment at the end of January, 1378 to Hennequin de Bruges, painter to the king, for both portraiteures and patrons for the story of the Apocalypse.⁵ A contract of 1449 for the Duke of Burgundy's Golden Fleece tapestries ensured the highest quality by specifically assigning the commission for the patrons to Bauduin de Bailloeul or "a better painter if he could be found." Furthermore, it called for the use of appropriate colors. The weavers were to follow the artist's color coding system using "fine gold thread of Venice for yellow" and "Venetian silver for white." The rest of each tapestry was to be made of the finest and best colors available.⁶ This is the first example we have of a written agreement in which it is clear that the designer made decisions about color as well as composition.⁷

The role of the cartoon maker or cartonnier emerged more clearly defined particularly after the 1476 debate. Since the weavers were no longer allowed to make their own cartoons, a new division of the painters' guild formed for this purpose. Though painters of an earlier period are recorded as having made cartoons,⁸ it is not until after 1476 that specific references to cartonniers began to appear. Among the earliest mentioned is a document of 1513 concerning the Legend of Herkenbald. Just as Master Jan van Brussel

(Jan van Roome) is the specified designer, hired to make the petits patrons, a certain "paintre Philippe" is designated to produce the cartoon and bring it to the Church of Saint-Pierre in Louvain for display.⁹ The identity of "paintre Philippe" remains elusive; his name joins those of other contemporary cartoon painters, such as Leonard Knoest and Jean Colaert, about whom we know very little.¹⁰ At a slightly later time the position of cartonnier may have become more prestigious. Pieter Coecke van Aelst, the most gifted of Van Orley's students, was praised "comme dessinateur et paintre de patrons" and received "une indemnité" in 1542 for having introduced the art of cartoon design and execution¹¹ to the city of Antwerp.

Due to the privileged position held by painters as a result of city statutes and guild regulations, it is not surprising that the predominant Brussels city painter of any given period directly influenced contemporary designs. The documents no longer exist which might have explained more fully contracts made with Van Orley and his predecessors for tapestry designs. However, one remaining entry of 1563, published by Wauters, describes the duties of and payments to the city painter. It stipulates "that the Magistrate shall pay annually the sum of 50 florins to Master Pierre de Kempeneer as it had done before to Master Michel Van Coxcyen because he has agreed to make designs for the tapestry makers of this city under terms to be settled."¹² On the basis of this document, Schneebalg-Perelman considered this

to have been the case for all city painters before Coxie.¹³
 The only painter before Coxie whose significant number of
 tapestry designs might suggest such a contract is Bernart
 van Orley.

Any discussion of design steps or procedures leading to
 the finished tapestry is complicated by the established
 nomenclature. Both the critical literature and contemporary
 documents confuse our understanding of the various steps by
 using terms interchangeably. Petit patron describes drawings¹⁴
 of various sizes and media. Occasionally, vidimus (the
 definitive project drawing accompanying a contract), modello
 and carton au petit pied or patron au petit pied are mentioned
 in the same context. The latter three probably are synonymous
 with petit patron, the step directly preceding the full scale
 cartoon.

Patron apparently was used in the late fifteenth and
 early sixteenth centuries to mean a design as well as a car-¹⁵
 toon whether on paper or linen cloth. In addition, cer-
 tain patrons served as presentation drawings. Pinchart
 published a 1511 account entry of 15 livres paid by Margaret
 of Austria to Pierre van Aelst for "cing patrons de la
 genealogy des Roix de Portugal, lequel madice dame a fait
 prendre de luy, et l'envoyer au seigneur empereur en Alle-¹⁶
 maigne, pour le veoir et en fair son très noble plaisir."
 Though some documents mention color in regard to a patron,
 not all seem to have been so embellished. Pieter Coecke's
patron for the Beheading of St. Paul is predominantly

monochrome with written instructions designating color, whereas Raphael's Acts of the Apostles cartoons were painted in full color.

For the sake of clarity here, the first design stage usually in pen and ink with some brown or multicolored washes, will be referred to as a preliminary study. The more finished chiaroscuro drawings¹⁷ with decorative blue or grey washes are called petits patrons. Finally, the full scale cartoon used by the weavers is the patron.

Because of the paucity of original documents which use the various terms consistently, it is difficult to reconstruct established steps in an artist's working procedure. Though we, in this century, would be tempted to regard the process of tapestry making as a production line, this would discount an artist's individuality and creativity, as well as his need to add steps in order to resolve problems of certain series or individual tapestries.

Contracts contemporary with Van Orley's designs and slightly later seem to indicate more than one design stage. For example, in 1533 Lancelot Blondeel was engaged to make patrons of the life story of St. Paul "de l'esprit de la continence des personnaiges, des couleurs, paysage, visaiges et autre articles telles comme il appertient, ainsi qu'il le veult respondre devant ouvriers."¹⁸ Such a specific request doubtless involved a series of preliminary studies before the cartoon was ready for the weavers. By 1544 Jan Vermeyen had started his designs for the Conquest of Tunis series. This involved not only sketches made in situ, but

also a set of modelli completed before the cartoons were
 executed by Vermeyen and his shop.¹⁹ In addition, his
 contract specified that he was "to make the mentioned
 large cartoons according to the small ones that he already
 has shown to his Majesty"²⁰ -- further evidence that the
modelli (or petits patrons) were presented to the patron
 for approval. From these examples one may assume that
 Van Orley proceeded in much the same manner or, indeed,
 that he initiated the working procedure that was established
 by Vermeyen's time.

The majority of extant drawings securely attributed
 to Van Orley relate to tapestry projects. These can be
 distinguished from preparatory drawings for paintings or
 stained glass by their size, shape and subject matter.
 Rectangular in format and averaging thirty by fifty centi-
 meters, the preliminary studies are usually in pen and ink,
 sometimes with a brown or multicolored wash. The slightly
 larger petits patrons (around forty by sixty centimeters)
 in pen and ink, often over a black chalk sketch, appear
 more finished in execution. They have few or no pentimenti,²¹
 are less spontaneous in draftsmanship and are embellished
 with decorative blue or gray washes. Except for depictions
 of the life of Christ, the subjects of these designs do not
 appear in Van Orley's paintings. Instead they represent
 scenes from Biblical and classical literature, contemporary
 events and allegories, all well-established themes for
 tapestry.

A nearly complete representation of stages of design (except for the cartoons) occurs only in the Hunts of Maximilian series. In this case, some theories about Van Orley's working procedures may be proposed through an examination of the preliminary studies and the petits patrons, and their relationship to the final tapestries. For other tapestry designs, only more tentative conclusions are possible due to incomplete remains. In some cases we have apparently only the preliminary studies and in others only the petits patrons. Though tapestries made from these drawings exist in many cases, several designs never reached this final form.

Preliminary Studies

We may begin to understand the function of the preliminary study vis-à-vis the final tapestry by evaluating a design of the early 1520s for which both drawing and weaving exist. The preliminary study for the Crucifixion in pen and ink with some wash (Stuttgart, Staatsgalerie, Graphische Sammlung; illus. 36) is annotated Bernhard van Brüssel,²² probably by an early German collector. Its woven version, formerly in the Duke of Alba Collection, is now in the National Gallery, Washington (illus. 29).²³

The compositional scheme of the drawing is clearly still tied to Van Orley's painting style. In fact, the Crucifixion may be one of the designs executed in both a painted and a woven form, as in the case of the previously discussed Lamentation and Adoration of the Kings, (see

chapter two and illus. 13 and 18). Though no existing panel specifically relates to this preparatory drawing,²⁴ an earlier painting in the Wadsworth Atheneum is close to it in conception. In both the Hartford Crucifixion (illus. 10) and the Stuttgart drawing, the two Marys attend to the fainting Virgin in similar poses at the lower left and St. John moves toward the crucified Christ in a supplicatory manner. In the drawing, Mary Magdalene embraces the cross in a more dramatic swooning pose, the retardataire antecedents for which are found in Roger van der Weyden and the Master of Flemalle/²⁵Campin.

Whether or not Van Orley already knew Dürer's engraving of the Crucifixion (B. 24, illus. 37) when he painted the Hartford panel, he called it to mind at this point for the more exaggerated pose of St. John in the tapestry design. He also may have found pleasing the position of the two horsemen in the woodcut Crucifixion from the Large Passion (B. 11) for his own soldiers at the right.

In comparison to the Hartford painting, some elements in the Stuttgart drawing are indicative of Van Orley's alteration of his painting style for tapestry design. As in the case of the Lamentation and Adoration of Kings painting/tapestry parallels, spatial relationships developed for the painting are altered for the tapestry. In the square format of the drawing, the artist has allowed additional room for the crowded grouping (St. John, the Virgin Mary and the attendant women) at the left in the painting. By

placing the Magdalene in a recessed position, he also has created a foreground space absent in the Hartford Crucifixion.

The differences between the Stuttgart drawing and the Washington tapestry (illus. 29) are significant. They give some indication of the relationship between preliminary sketch and final product as well as between designer and weaver. Noticeably missing in the drawing are the two thieves introduced to the tapestry. Also slightly altered in pose are the Christ figure, Mary Magdalene and the three male figures at the far right.²⁶ In most cases the changes constitute a more specific and more decorative treatment of Van Orley's general design: drapery of several of the figures is extended further in exaggerated folds, costumes are more elaborately detailed, the still-life of the carpenter's tool box is added, the landscape is filled in. Some of these additions were doubtless made by the cartonnier. However, we must assume that the more substantial changes -- those of the additional crosses of the two thieves in the middle ground and the readjustment of the other figures to accommodate them -- were made by Van Orley in another, now missing, drawing. The cartonniers were not authorized to add figures to the design of the painter.

Equally as summary and sketchlike as the Stuttgart Crucifixion are ten other drawings spanning a period of about fifteen to twenty years which also may be considered as preliminary studies for tapestry. Two of these designs, the Triumph of Justice and the Offering to Venus (both in

Berlin, Kupferstichkabinett; illus. 42 and 47), survive in relatively mediocre tapestries, most likely produced after the editio princeps.²⁷ Several others have been squared for transfer, suggesting that a tapestry, perhaps, was²⁸ executed.

Among the earliest of these single sheets, the Story of Appius Claudius and Virginia (London, British Museum; illus. 38)²⁹ may be linked to compositional schemes developed by Van Orley's predecessors. For example, generally similar in its triangular construction is the Power of Venus (London, British Museum; illus. 39), attributed by Popham to Aerdts Ortkens (alias Adrian van den Houde).³⁰ Van Orley followed this popular formula in detail, relegating subsidiary scenes to the upper right and left corners close to the horizon line.

The Story of Appius Claudius and Virginia shows a drawing style not far removed from Van Orley's monogrammed and dated 1524 Romulus and Remus series (illus. 49-- 52). There are the same general characteristics of the artist's hand: the nervous contour lines; a carefully organized system of shading by very even parallel hatching and washes; the shorthand method of indicating facial features often by flattened circles for eyes and mouths; the fleshy, boneless form of hands; and so on. However, the London sheet demonstrates some features which most likely predate the Romulus and Remus drawings. The draughtsmanship is somewhat tighter, drapery folds end more often in tiny loops, the movement of figures is restricted. This static mien of figures in

addition to the adherence to an earlier compositional scheme is echoed in Van Orley's Legend of Notre-Dame du Sablon, (see illus. 1-4) a tapestry series of 1516-18. The Story of Appius Claudius and Virginia probably dates from around the same time, from 1515-20.

Of a slightly later date are two studies which approach the more fluid lines and solidity of form found in the Story of Romulus and Remus. The subjects of these two studies are not entirely clear. One represents the crowning of a king or distinguished gentleman, perhaps Charles V, by the Muses and, for lack of a better title, is called A Company of Ladies and Gentlemen in a Garden (London, British Museum, illus. 40).³¹ Clearly by the same hand, the other sheet probably depicts the Departure of the Prodigal Son (London, at Colnaghi and Son in 1949; illus. 41).³² Neither one is known in woven form.

Five technically similar preliminary drawings of the 1520s which depict allegorical subjects are often regarded as a series. However, it is unclear exactly how these sheets relate to each other as the diverse titles imply: Triumph of Justice (Berlin, Kupferstichkabinett, illus. 42), Allegory of Pestilence and Sacred and Profane Learning (Dresden, Kupferstichkabinett, illus. 43 and 44), Allegory of War (London, British Museum, illus. 45), and Triumph of Fortitude (or of Heroic Women) (Vienna, Albertina, illus. 46).³³ Popham noted the small b on the London drawing and a majuscule F on the Vienna sheet, assuming the previous existence of a series of six sheets (including all of the above).³⁴ Farmer has called

attention to a c and a g in the so-called Roman History scene suggesting an even larger series of six drawings preceding the ³⁵g.

It is a mistake to force these stylistically cohesive drawings into one series. To do so ignores the enormous popularity of varied allegorical themes in tapestry at the time and the impressive productivity of a workshop with Van Orley at its helm.³⁶ More plausible is the suggestion of an incomplete series including the three sheets whose major motif is a triumphal wagon. Even here, however, we stand on shaky ground, for the triumphs do not follow the popular Petrarchan model. Instead, they combine heroic women (illus. 46),³⁷ justice scenes (illus. 42),³⁸ and the fall of the prideful (illus. 43).³⁹


Each of the other two drawings stands entirely on its own. The London sheet (illus. 45) shows tests of power and strength -- Hercules and the Antaeus and Hercules and the Nemean lion among them -- in a contest where the female figure on the horse appears to be the great conqueror; Mercury (with a caduceus), Saturn (with a scythe) and Neptune (with a trident) flee from her. Of a different mood entirely is the Dresden sheet (illus. 44) representing a gathering of the four cardinal virtues (Justice, Fortitude, Prudence and Temperance) before a personification of the Church (with keys and orb at the left). A king, followed by scholarly and learned men, approaches two courtly women with large volumes. The subject remains elusive. Possibly it represents sacred and profane learning, for three of the male figures at the far left seem

to direct the king toward virtuous or sacred knowledge, whereas other figures continue to press toward the two women with books.

This brief discussion of the diverse subject matter in these preliminary studies serves one main purpose: that is, to suggest that the remains reflect Van Orley's occupation with innumerable design projects in the 1520s. Some of these, perhaps, never were carried further than the preliminary study, serving instead as a reserve of possible projects for interested patrons and tapestry merchants.

Two additional drawings preserve Van Orley's late style of around 1530-35 in preliminary studies, one an Offering⁴⁰ to Venus (Berlin, Kupferstichkabinett; illus. 47) and the other, the Suicide of Portia (Louvre, Cabinet des Dessins; illus. 48). The penmanship is now looser and the definition of form more summary. Yet, the drawing style clearly derives from the characteristic expressive contour lines and hooked folds as well as the system of shading in the earlier works. Though the figures are somewhat more elongated and manneristic in their proportions, the striding poses and exaggerated gestures are related to those, for example, in the Romulus and Remus series (illus. 49 - 52).

A variation of the preliminary study classification includes composition drawings in pen and ink further elaborated⁴¹ by written instructions and multi-colored washes. The Story of Romulus and Remus inscribed and dated 1524 (illus. 49 - 52) and the Nassau Genealogy of 1530-38 (both sets in

Munich, Staatliche Graphische Sammlung; illus. 53 - 56 and one sheet in Rennes, Musée des Beaux-Arts; illus. 57) are of this type. In the Romulus and Remus series two distinct hands are evident in the instructions written on each of the four sheets. Inscriptions identifying figures, locations and even narrative events are written perhaps by Van Orley⁴² to explain details to the patron or cartonnier. The other script on the drawings is in a less clear hand not now readable. In addition to these, there are color notations made on some of the figures in the Meeting of Romulus and Hersilia (illus. 52). On the skirts of the three foreground soldiers behind Romulus at the right are "zo" for zinober (vermilion), "b" for blauw, and in an ochre area, , an abbreviation of uncertain meaning.⁴³ This is the only drawing where these notations occur. Whether they were made by Van Orley or by the cartonnier is not clear.

At first appearing simply hastily drawn, these studies, in fact, reveal the direct and assured approach of Van Orley's mature works. The new emphasis on movement is reflected not only in exaggerated poses and gestures but in the quality of the line itself. Abbreviated strokes abound, creating a staccato effect across the surface of the sheet. They are balanced by longer, curved lines in groups, forming a unified rhythm within the composition.

Van Orley's interest in anatomy apparently was more or less limited to what could be seen on a fully clothed figure. He exaggerated these visible portions -- arms, legs, hands --

in ways to enhance the suggestion of movement. In Romulus and Remus Delivering the Head of Amulius to Numitor (illus. 50), Van Orley set up a pattern of well-integrated striding and stationary figures across a foreground plane. The main characters are set apart from the others by the architecture, which now is used as a gauge for spatial recession. Characteristic of these and subsequent studies is the prominence given to the development of action in the foreground plane; landscape and figures in the background are summarily indicated.

Later in date (around 1530-38), the five sheets of double equestrian portraits of members of the House of Nassau, the Nassau Genealogy, provide a great deal of⁴⁴ information about Van Orley's method as a designer. They are the only remaining designs which show the artist's invention in the tapestry borders. The putti among the cornucopiae, the grotesques and floral motifs (illus. 53 and 57) comprise part of the store of motifs available for framing the woven picture. These drawings reveal that the choice of border (at least in Van Orley's case) was not left to the weaver, but apparently was a decision of the designer. With this evidence we may consider the borders⁴⁵ of other Van Orley tapestries as the artist's own design.

Aside from the explanatory text on the cartouches,⁴⁶ the writing on the Nassau Genealogy drawings refers to necessary alterations. In a different hand from the script of the Romulus and Remus drawings are these instructions at

the left in the Rennes sheet (illus. 57): "il fault changier les armes au tapit comme est fait." Elsewhere next to both King Nassau and his wife (illus. 53) is written "ce lion doibt estre tournu de laultre coste." These annotations suggest shields with lions similar to those appearing on the sketches of Graf Otto and his wife (illus. 55) and Graf Heinrich and wife (illus. 54). Most probably they refer to a previous design now obliterated. This helps to explain why both the double-eagle shields and the figures of Adolf of Nassau and his wife were completely cut out and pasted onto this drawing. A decision was apparently made to change the figures and heraldry represented, a more substantial alteration than could be made with pen and ink alone.

Unfortunately, no contemporary weavings made from either the Romulus and Remus or the Nassau Genealogy series designs have been preserved.⁴⁷ Therefore, a study of the correspondence between specific color indications in the drawings and those used in the tapestries cannot be undertaken. However, the choice and distribution of colors throughout these drawing sets do reflect options available and in use in Brussels tapestry manufacture in the first half of the sixteenth century.

Preliminary Studies and the Petits Patrons

Similar in technique to the Romulus and Remus and Nassau Genealogy drawings are four preliminary studies in pen and brown ink with multicolored washes (two in Leiden,

Rijksprentenkabinet, one each in Berlin, Kupferstichkabinett and Budapest, National Museum; illus. 58-61) for the Hunts of Maximilian tapestry series in the Louvre (illus. 75-86). Because the same designs are also among twelve more finished chiaroscuro drawings in the Louvre (illus. 62 - 73), the two stages have been confused and the attributions⁴⁸ disputed. These drawings for the Hunts, in fact, offer the unique opportunity in Van Orley's oeuvre for a discussion of stages of the design process.

The Hunts of Maximilian series was doubtless a royal⁴⁹ commission. The materials chosen for its execution make it one of the most sumptuous tapestry series of the sixteenth⁵⁰ century. Therefore, we can assume that a great deal of⁵¹ care was taken to satisfy the patron. This possibly⁵² involved additional steps in the design process. In other words, it is unlikely that this commission was similar to those for which the weaver visited the designer's home to see what new designs were available (as stated in Chrétien der Moyen's heresy trial testimony). However, no documents for the commission have survived, leaving the question of⁵³ design procedure open.

The four remaining of presumably twelve preliminary studies represent the months of March (illus. 58), June (illus. 59), September (illus. 60) and November (illus 61). All have the same size, medium and handwriting on inscriptions. They are freer and more spontaneous in execution⁵⁴ than their petits patrons counterparts in the Louvre.

Despite some apparent differences in handling, however, both the preliminary studies and the petits patrons show the irrefutable characteristics of Van Orley's draughtsmanship.

This one-to-one correspondence between a more spontaneous and a somewhat drier, more finished chiaroscuro drawing is not peculiar to Van Orley.⁵⁵ Similar parallels may be found among the tapestry designs of Van Orley's contemporaries. For Pieter Coecke van Aelst's St. Paul series (1535-40) there remain two drawings each for St. Paul Before Agrippa⁵⁶ and the Conversion of St. Paul. The preliminary studies are the more summary and direct drawings in pen and brown ink with brown wash. What can be considered the petits patrons are the finished sheets executed in pen, bistre, brown wash and white highlights on beige paper. These clearly indicate the areas of light and shade to be observed in the tapestry. Among the drawings for Giulio Romano's Story of Scipio (1532-35) are again the same parallels between preliminary study and petit patron found particularly in the episodes of the Meeting of Scipio and Hannibal, The Chariot of Scipio and The Banquet.⁵⁷

A brief comparative study of the Berlin preliminary drawing for June of the Hunts of Maximilian series (illus. 59) and the petit patron in the Louvre (illus. 65) elucidates the relationship between the two. Clearly the preliminary study precedes the petit patron. In several places in the Berlin drawing changes made in pen and ink over both charcoal and other pen and ink lines indicate an evolving design not yet fixed. These changes in the Berlin composition may

be seen in the upper leg contour of the servant at the left of center in the foreground, in the leg position of the servant fourth from the right, in the contours of the two women in the right middleground carrying loads on their heads, and in the striding servant delivering a plate to the far left background table.

The Louvre petit patron in pen and brown ink with a decorative blue wash reproduces the Berlin sheet without *pentimenti*. Further, it adds specific details about the various trees in the center background and slightly alters the spatial relationship of certain figures and animals. In the two foreground greyhounds, the Berlin drawing shows the back contour of the second dog; the Louvre petit patron omits this. In the Berlin sheet the head and neck contour of the foreground greyhound is echoed in the shape of the tree behind it; the Louvre drawing deletes this detail by truncating the branch at the table's edge.

The June tapestry of the editio princeps in the Louvre (illus. 78) shows further modifications that must reflect changes made in the now lost cartoon. For example, the figure to the left of Charles V behind the table is changed from an unidentifiable figure to Maximilian I (illus. 87);⁵⁸ the table service and food are slightly modified; there is a repositioning of figures around the table in the left background; a pond replaces the open field in the right background.

Because the Louvre petit patron does not reproduce many of these changed details of the tapestry, it cannot be a copy

after the tapestry. Its function, nonetheless, is not entirely clear. The petit patron may have been presented to the patron for final approval or in lieu of the tapestry set until it was completed. Or, it could have served as a model for the cartoon makers. A comparison of the Louvre sheet (illus. 65) with the tapestry (illus. 78) shows that the pattern of light and shade established in the drawing was closely followed in the weaving. In this case, the cartonnier would have to have known the Berlin preliminary study as well, since certain tapestry details follow it rather than the Louvre drawing (e.g. the motif of the paired greyhounds and tree stump in the foreground).

Additional evidence supports the theory that the Louvre petit patrons served as working designs for the cartonniers. In several places the designs have been altered to bring architectural features up to date probably for a later weaving (after the editio princeps of 1527-33).⁵⁹ Architecture in the months of March and April is corrected in pen and ink and in July in black chalk. In addition, the main figures in the drawing depicting April and July have been pricked for transfer. As was previously mentioned, Charles V's edict of 1525 prohibited the alteration of new designs and pricking for transfer. However, once the editio princeps was woven, it is generally believed that the designs and cartoons became the property of the weaver and could be rewoven for other commissions. For these subsequent series the drawings could be amended by the cartonnier for a more contemporary design, as perhaps was the case here. The Hunts

of Maximilian series enjoyed great popularity and was re woven⁶⁰ often throughout the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries.

Neither the preliminary sketches nor the more finished petits patrons provided the final design as far as the representation of royalty is concerned. Of the extant preliminary studies only the month of June (illus. 59) bears any clear identification of royalty; here Charles V appears behind the dinner table. The Louvre petit patron for June (illus. 65) again shows Charles V, July (illus. 66) Ferdinand and Charles⁶¹ V, and December (illus. 71) probably Ferdinand again. The rest of the drawings convey slight resemblances to known personalities, and some of those shown are changed in the tapestries. In fact, none shows Maximilian, for whom the tapestry series is named. It is only in the June tapestry (illus. 78) that Maximilian is substituted for the courtier at Charles V's right in the drawings. Likewise, the woven months of March, June, September, and December (illus. 75, 78, 81, 84) all exhibit portraiture of royalty which is more carefully observed than it is in any of the preparatory drawings. Therefore, it must have been in a later stage where many of these details were fully worked out.

At this point Van Orley may have supplied additional portrait studies for the specific months, once the order of appearance of these notables was established. A possible precedent for this step in the procedure may be found in a contract of the fourteenth century where Hennequin of Bruges, painter to king Charles V of France, was asked to execute portraiteures as well as patrons for the story of the Apocalypse.⁶²

It is tempting to consider a drawing fragment by Van Orley and reworked by Rubens (London, British Museum; illus. 74) as the pre-cartoon sketch which further individualized the portraits for the September tapestry (illus. 81). There is a more detailed representation of the two women (perhaps Charles V's sisters, Mary of Hungary and Eleanor of Austria)⁶³ and the male rider here than in either the preliminary sketch or the petit patron for September (cf. with illus. 60 and 68).

On the other hand, there are more arguments against than for this hypothetical function of the London drawing. First of all, the facial features of the two women are not significantly differentiated and could, therefore, not serve as models for the clearly distinguished heads of the Louvre tapestry (cf. illus. 74 and 81). Secondly, there are a number of details in the London sheet which are closer to the tapestry than to either the preliminary sketch or the petit patron: the affected hand gesture of the forefront woman, the full back view of the standing courtier's head, the less inclined head position of the horsewoman at the back, the left hand position of the horseman at the back. Though it may be argued that all of these features were changes to be implemented in the tapestry, the drawing is not complete. The horseman who is part of this group at the left in the tapestry (illus. 81) is not included; the young hunters below his outstretched arm also are omitted.

Only a few options remain for the hypothetical function of the London fragment. It is larger than the preliminary study and petit patron, but smaller than the tapestry.

Therefore, it may have served an intermediate purpose between the initial drawings and the cartoon, that is, to reverse the design for the cartonnier and for low warp⁶⁴ weaving. Again the question must be raised; why the omission of the horseman and young hunters?

In this discussion, one feature of the London sheet is prominent. It appears now as a fragment, but also it was originally executed as a fragment. We know of the considerable popularity of the Hunts of Maximilian tapestry series which was rewoven in its entirety and in parts throughout the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. Perhaps the London drawing was copied from a portion of the original September cartoon in order to serve as a model for a smaller weaving,⁶⁵ an entrefenêtre, for example.

The variety of design stages presented here -- preliminary studies, petits patrons, possible reversed pre-cartoon drawings and the cartoons -- is not known in Flemish tapestry design before 1530. Certainly, many commissions would not have included such an elaborate procedure. However, the patrons of this series apparently demanded most accurate and sumptuous results. Considering the materials used and the great expense for such an elaborate series, it is not inconceivable for the designer to have invested more time and added steps to the normal procedure in order to insure approval at court.

The possibility ought not to be discounted that Italian artists in Flanders may have influenced Van Orley. They utilized multiple steps in their established working procedures

in tapestry production, as demonstrated by the preparatory drawings and cartoons for Raphael's Acts of the Apostles series. In Shearman's understanding, Raphael's method began with compositional drafts and included life studies (bottega) and drapery studies before the modello stage, as well as additional figure corrections after this point. Finally, in the cartoon, the sum of all of the studies was reflected.⁶⁶ Certainly the increasingly greater control the designer was able to exert on the final product through an intermediary, the cartonnier, was an important factor. Multiple preliminary drawings, very carefully worked out, may have been the key to a distinctive rather than anonymous authorship of the tapestry design.

A second series for which there remains both a full set of drawings (Louvre, Cabinet des Dessins; illus. 88 - 94) and the corresponding tapestries (Naples, Museo Capodimonte; illus. 95 - 101) is the Battle of Pavia. This ambitious project was probably begun in 1525, the date of the battle, and finished in 1531, the year the completed tapestries were presented to Charles V by the States General of the Lowlands.⁶⁷ Though the seven Louvre drawings appear rather hastily executed, there can be no dispute about the attribution to Van Orley, as a comparison with the contemporary Hunts of Maximilian drawings readily demonstrates (cf. illus. 88 - 94 with 62 - 73).

Similar to both the drawing style and the medium of the petits patrons for the Hunts of Maximilian (illus. 62 -

73), the Battle of Pavia sheets are in pen and brown ink with a blue-gray wash. Most are executed on two or three sheets joined together, measuring in total approximately thirty-nine by seventy-five centimeters. Where the Pavia drawings differ from the petits patrons for the Hunts is in their degree of finish. Unlike in the Hunts petits patrons, the use of wash in the Pavia drawings is not uniformly consistent from foreground to background and from sheet to sheet. In some places, it is simply crudely applied (illus. 89). Other features of the Pavia series, such as design elements executed solely in wash (e.g. horsemen in the left background of illus. 92 and midground of illus. 93) or areas left as a pen drawing alone with no wash (e.g. background of illus. 92), seem to indicate characteristics of a working drawing. There are, as well some corrections made on the drawings in a black ink (e.g. far left horse of illus. 88, upper left horsemen of illus. 89) and with touches of oil colors (e.g. foreground horses in illus. 88, right front horse in illus. 93, flames in windows of illus. 91).

Because of the inconsistencies in these apparently hastily executed sheets it is hardly conceivable that they served as presentation drawings. Their similarity to the Hunts petits patrons in both technique and size suggest that they represent the same design stage. A now missing second set of drawings for the Battle of Pavia may have added further information in this regard. Known in the eighteenth century in the collections of Jabach and Crozat, this set was never

fully described in sales catalogues. Therefore, we may only surmise that those lost were a set of preliminary studies.

The only remaining drawings by Van Orley which may be considered as yet another stage in the design procedure are three landscapes in the Louvre, Cabinet des Dessins. These are: Man on a Rearing Horse in a Forest (illus. 102), Gentleman Surprising Lovers in a Forest (illus. 103), and View of Etterbeek near Brussels (illus. 104). These are the most likely candidates for independent drawings because of their highly finished state. However, their format and subject matter ties them to tapestry design.⁶⁹ Each drawing is elaborately executed on a brown prepared paper in brush and ink with wash over a black chalk sketch and further heightened with white. The sheets measure approximately thirty-one by forty-six centimeters each.

Designs of this degree of finish are unusual in Van Orley's oeuvre. Only one other, the Parable of Lazarus and the Rich Man (London, British Museum; illus. 105), approximates the Louvre drawings in size and technique. It has been suggested by Farmer that the Lazarus sheet served as a presentation drawing.⁷⁰ Among the designs by Van Orley's close followers are three additional sheets at Chatsworth representing scenes from the Months of Lucas (illus. 106). They, too, are drawn with the point of the brush and brown wash over black chalk, on a brown ground, and even more decoratively finished with gold heightening.⁷¹ Though no

documents label these as presentation drawings, it is unlikely that they served only as models for the cartonniers. Compared to the Louvre preliminary studies and petits patrons, their elaborate technique far surpasses that necessary for the cartonniers to follow the design indicated.

Although the remains of Van Orley's drawings for tapestries are too meager to present an entirely coherent picture of the artist's creative process, certain conclusions are possible. His technique was not always consistent. This indicates, perhaps, not only a response to varied requirements, but also the continuing development of a procedure which was not yet fixed. Through this study which relates technique to function, I have attempted to clarify the raison d'être for individual drawings or drawing sets. The hypotheses proposed await further critical analysis based on studies of the designs of contemporary painter-designers such as Pieter Coecke van Aelst, Michiel Coxie and Lancelot Blondeel.

Notes to Chapter 3

1. Wauters, Tapisseries, 32 - 33.
2. Ibid., 47 - 48.
3. Schneebalg-Perelman, "Tapestry in Brussels," 111.
4. Wauters, Tapisseries, 133 - 134.
5. Chefs-d'oeuvre, 36.
6. Pinchart, Histoire generale, III, 74, no. 5.
7. Freeman, Unicorn Tapestries, 202.
8. For example, in 1441 Jacques Daret furnished Jehan de Clercq with a "patron de toile de couleurs a destrempe ... ouquel est l'histoire de la Resurrection Nostre Seigneur" for making a high-warp loom tapestry (Göbel, Wandteppiche, I, 233, 250). It is important to note that no cartoons of the medieval period are known to exist. Therefore, it is impossible to associate any known artist with the practice of cartoon making.
9. Edouard van Even, Louvain monumental, Louvain, 1860, 181.
10. For further information on the subject of cartoon makers see J. Duverger, "Brusselse Patronschilders uit de XIV^e en de XV^e eeuw," De Bloeitijd, 205 - 225 and Leo van Puyvelde, "Het aandeel van de Voornaamste Vlaamse Kunstschilders in de Tapijtwerverij," Het Herfsttij van de Vlaamse Tapijtkunst, International Colloquium, 1959 (Brussels, 1959), 59 - 68.
11. For remarks by Guicciardini, Vasari and Van Mander in the Antwerp archival records, see Georges Marlier, La Renaissance Flamande. Pierre Coeck d'Alost, Brussels, 1966, 21 - 26 and 44 - 45.
12. Wauters, Tapisseries, 129, n. 1.
13. Schneebalg-Perelman, "Tapestry in Brussels," 113, n. 16.
14. For two varied applications of the term see Nicole Reynaud, "Un Peintre français cartonnier de tapisserie au XV^e siècle. Henri de Vulcop," Revue de l'Art 22 (1973), 7 and Edith Standen, "Drawings for the Months of Lucas' Tapestry Series," Master Drawings 9 (1971), 7. Confusion about the terms still existed in the seventeenth century.

See E. Haverkamp-Begemann, Corpus Rubenianum Ludwig Burchard, Part X: The Achilles Series, London, 1975, 57, 61, 67, 68.

15. See note 8 where cartoon is meant. Design is most probably meant in the description of the payment to Pierre van Aelst (quoted here in the text, page 55).

16. Found in the Archives départementales du Nord. Fonds de la Chambre des comptes de Lille. B2218. Compte de Jean Micault, receveur général des finances pour l'année 1511, fol. 346 v.

17. Though Baldinucci's Vocabulario Toscano restricts the use of the term chiaroscuro to "Pittura d'un color solo," it is used here to mean a drawing using only light and shade to achieve a three dimensional effect. See Filippo Baldinucci, Vocabulario Toscano dell'arte del Disegno, I, Milan, 1809 edition, 124 - 129 and Webster's Unabridged Dictionary, second edition, Cleveland and New York, 1970, 312. This drawing technique is also meant by the term cartoncino. On this and a definition of cartoon see Joseph Meder, The Master of Drawing, (trans. Winslow Ames), New York, 1978, 391 - 407.

18. Archives de la ville de Bruges, Registre van der greffe der stede van Brugge, behinnende den eersten septembre XV^eXXXIIJ ende hendende septembre XV^eXXXIIIJ (Registre de procurations) f^o 218. For other contracts, see H. Huth, Künstler und Werkstatt der Spätgotik, Darmstadt, 1967 and W. H. Vroom, Het Kunstenaarscontract in de 15^e and 16^e Eeuw in de Nederlanden, U. Amsterdam thesis, 1958-59.

19. Hendrick Jacobus Horn, Charles V's Conquest of Tunis Cartoons and Tapestries by Jan Cornelisz Vermeyen, New Haven (unpublished dissertation, Yale University) 1977, 59.

20. Ibid., 60.

21. A notable exception is in the Hunts of Maximilian series where changes appear in the architecture (illus. 64 and 65). These, however, are later alterations made in a different ink than the rest of the drawing and ought not to be confused with pentimenti contemporary with the initial completion of these drawings. The preliminary studies, on the other hand, have pentimenti made in an effort to reach the first acceptable solution for the subject.

22. Its dimensions are 35 x 37.2 cm.

23. C-302; 84 x 85 in. (200 x 212.5 cm.)

24. Two workshop paintings show familiarity with Van Orley's design. One appeared at the November 25-26, 1919 Lepke Sale in Berlin as #89. Another also at auction (Dorotheum,

Vienna, 1925) is reproduced in the Jahrbuch der Kunst-historischen Sammlung in Wien 8 (1934), 186. Further, the unfinished Crucifixion triptych in Bruges, Church of Notre-Dame, reflects the earlier National Gallery tapestry design.

25. For example, see Roger's Crucifixion triptych (Vienna, Kunsthistorisches Museum) or Christ on the Cross with Mourners (Berlin, Gemäldegalerie) by a follower of Flémalle/Campin. Illustrated in Friedländer, Early Netherlandish Painting, Rogier van der Weyden and the Master of Flémalle, II, (revised by Nicole Veronée-Verhaegen), Brussels, 1967, pls. 18-19 and 95.

26. The tapestry shows a full face view of Christ's head, a more erect body and no fluttering drapery; Mary Magdalene's head is turned toward the viewer; the body of the crouching soldier is slightly more erect, his left arm position changed; in the two men behind him, the furthest has a changed costume, the nearest altered arm positions.

27. The Adoration of Venus tapestry is in the collection of the Patrimonio Nacional in Madrid (reproduced in Calvert, Tapestries, plate 125). The Triumph of Justice weaving is with the Berlin art dealer J. Klausner and Son (reproduced in Göbel, Wandteppiche, II, pl. 377).

28. The following are squared for transfer: Allegory of Pestilence, Sacred and Profane Learning, Triumph of Fortitude (or of Heroic Women).

29. Farmer agrees with Popham's dating of ca. 1524, several years later than I suggest here in the text. Farmer, Van Orley, 281 and A. E. Popham, Catalogue of Drawings by Dutch and Flemish Artists in the British Museum, V, London, 1932, 35. Popham's suggestion that this drawing may belong to the Romulus and Remus series can not be supported.

30. See chapter II, note 24 and Popham, Catalogue, 37 - 38.

31. Popham, Catalogue, 35.

32. The Witt Library photograph of this drawing instead labels it Joseph Sold by his Brethern.

33. See note 28.

34. Popham, Catalogue, 35 - 36.

35. Farmer, Van Orley, 281

36. On Farmer's assessment of the extent of Van Orley's workshop see Van Orley, 264ff.

37. The combination here of Jael, Lucretia and Judith in the foreground is appropriate for the triumph of chastity or fortitude as well as for heroic women.

38. Among those scenes depicted are: Trajan and the widow (foreground); possibly Scipio Africanus and Cato (extreme right and left); Fabricus following the chariot; the stoning of the elders who spied on Susanna (upper left).

39. Few of the figures may be easily identified: Icarus (upper right), Cleopatra (center left), the dying Niobids (left middle ground).

40. For the corresponding tapestry, see note 27.

41. These multi-colored washes are usually in brown, blue, pink, green and yellow.

42. The figures are identified as Romulus, Remulus, Numitor, Hersilia; fighting groups are romae (illus. 50), sabini (illus. 51); locations are rom, and palatino (illus. 52).

43. For comparative examples of color indications on contemporary drawings on paper and on panel paintings see J. P. Filedt Kok, "Underdrawings and Other Technical Aspects in the Paintings of Lucas van Leyden," in Lucas Van Leyden Studies, Nederlands Kunsthistorisch Jaarboek 29 (1978), especially 110 - 11 and 169, notes 137 and 138.

44. Van Mander's description of this set as "sixteen very beautiful...tapestry cartoons...of the House of Nassau" (see chapter II for full quote) was later corrected to eight.

45. There is in particular a relationship between the borders of series such as the Hunts of Maximilian, the Battle of Pavia and the Story of Jacob and those of the Nassau Genealogy. Recently a drawing by Van Orley of two putti has been acquired by the British Museum (1979 12.15.4). The close similarity of these figures to the putti in the border of the Lamentation tapestry (illus. 13) suggests the possibility of yet further contributions by Van Orley to border designs. To my knowledge the Nassau Genealogy is the earliest set of drawings to show an artist's invention in the borders. Slightly later examples are those by Pieter Coecke van Aelst (Christ at the Marriage Feast at Cana, dated 1545, no. 52, in Teréz Gerszi, Netherlandish Drawings in the Budapest Museum. Sixteenth Century Drawings, I, Amsterdam, 1971, 36) and Jan van der Straet (drawings after 1550, nos. 170 - 185 in L. van Puyvelde, The Flemish Drawings in the Collection of His Majesty the King at Windsor Castle, London, 1942, 26 - 29). For further information on borders and the dating of borders see G. Souchal, "The Triumph of the Seven Virtues: Reconstructions

of a Brussels Series (ca. 1520-1535)," Acts of the Tapestry Symposium, Nov. 1976, San Francisco, 1976, 140, notes 5, 6.

46. W. Wegner, Die Niederländischen Handzeichnungen des 15.-18. Jahrhunderts, Katalogue der Staatlichen Graphischen Sammlung Munchen, I, Berlin, 1973, 23 - 24.

47. A set of the Story of Romulus and Remus at La Granja de San Ildefonso near Segovia (illus. in Calvert, Tapestries, pls. 29 - 31) has often been associated with Van Orley. However, these tapestries have little to do with the Munich designs and can only be considered as derivative of Van Orley's style (see further discussion in chapter V). On the original but now lost sixteenth century set and a few seventeenth century versions of the Nassau Genealogy see: F. Duverger, "Verder nieuws over de tapijten bekend als de Nassause Genealogie," Artes Textiles 7 (1971), 210 - 215; F. X. X. Cerutti, "Gegevens over Bredase kunst en kunstenaars in de zestiende eeuw," Jaarboek van de geschied - en oudheidkundige kring van Stad en Land van Breda "De Oranjeboom", 14 (1961), 35.

48. N. Beets is the main proponent of the theory that two drawings in Leyden are the first designs and the Louvre sheets copies (in "The 'Small Cartoons' of Barend Van Orley for the 'Belles Chasses de Maximilian'," Old Master Drawings 6. [1931], 25 - 28 and "Zestiende-eeuwsche kunstenaars. II. Barent Van Orley," Oud-Holland 48 [1931], 142 - 171.) F. Lugt favors the Louvre drawings as the original designs (Musée du Louvre. Inventaire générale des dessins des écoles du nord publiés sous les auspices du cabinet des dessins. Maîtres des anciennes Pays-Bas nés avant 1550, Paris, 1968, 52 - 53).

49. The abundant literature on the Hunts is restricted here to the major works: Paul Alfassa, "Les Tapisseries des 'Chasses de Maximilien'," Gazette des Beaux-Arts 1 (1920), pp. 127 - 140, 233 - 256; Gaston Migeon, Les Tapisseries des Chasses de Maximilien, Paris, 1920; Sander Pierron et Albert Houtart, Les Belles Chasses de Maximilien, Brussels, 1923; and two unpublished masters papers: Balis, De Jachten; Ceulemans, De Zoganaamde Jachten. For Van Mander's description see chapter II.

50. To my knowledge no one has challenged the label of the Louvre set as the editio princeps. Later weavings of the entire set and of fragments are found in numerous public and private collections.

51. Of all the royal personages depicted in the Hunts, Charles V is the most likely candidate for the commission of the work. His emblem of a dog trampled by a boar is literally portrayed in the December tapestry (illus. 88); his device appears on the collars of several of the hunting dogs (see E. Rosenthal, "Plus Ultra, Non Plus Ultra, and

and the Columnar Device of Emperor Charles V," Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes 34 [1971], 204-228); Van Mander states that these tapestries were commissioned by the "Emperor" (see chapter II). Less supportable are theories that the commission came from Margaret of Austria or Mary of Hungary. An inventory of 1644, the earliest reference to the series, lists twelve "chasses de l'empereur Maximilian" and gives no further clues as to the origin or previous provenance of the set (J. Guiffrey, "Inventaire des meubles précieux de l'hôtel de Guise en 1644 et en 1648," Nouvelles Archives de l'art français, Revue de l'art français ancien et moderne, ser. 3, 12 [1896], 156 - 246).

52. Of those authors who have discussed the designs for the Hunts (see note 48), few have studied all of the versions from the originals. None has attempted an examination of design stages in the Hunts as they relate to Van Orley's other tapestry designs. I have studied all but the Budapest sheet.

53. There are two documents which, in my opinion, are unconvincingly proposed in relationship to the Hunts. A 1527 payment to a tapestry merchant for weavings of "personnages et figures de chasses et de la volleries" could not be the Louvre Hunts which were woven after 1528 (they carry the Brussels mark) and do not show "la volleries." Another document of 1544 which describes "cinq pièces de la chasses de bouchefort (forêt de Soignes)" may refer to either a later version of part of the Louvre set or another series entirely. See respectively P. Saintenoy, "Les Tapisseries de la cour de Bruxelles sous Charles V," Annales de la Société Royale d'Archéologie de Bruxelles 30 (1921), 7 and 27; J. K. Steppe and G. Delmarcel, "Les Tapisseries du Cardinal Erard de la Marck prince-évêque de Liège," Revue de l'Art 25 (1974), 35 - 54.

54. There are four other drawings, three in Vienna, the Albertina and one in the Louvre, Cabinet des Dessins (inv. nos. 7805, 7806, 7807; 20.150) which have often been related to the Hunts series. While they are certainly inspired by Van Orley's compositions I believe them to be too crude in execution to be by his hand. These as well as another now lost hunting drawing formerly in the Stirling Maxwell Collection may be shop works for another project. See Otto Benesch, Die Zeichnungen der Niederländischen Schulen des XV. und XV. Jahrhunderts, II, Vienna, 1928, nos. 44 - 46, 8; Lugt, Inventaire, 57; and A. E. Popham in Old Master Drawings I (Sept., 1926), 22 - 23, pl. 31. Farmer (Van Orley 297) also suggests that the Albertina sheets are workshop products.

55. Among the drawings of Van Orley's workshop are preliminary studies and highly finished sheets for the so-called Months of Lucas. See E. J. Kalf, "Drie tekeningen van B.

van Orley of zijn omgeving," De Bloeitijd, 259 - 68 and Edith A. Standen, "Drawings for the 'Months of Lucas' Tapestry Series," Master Drawings 9 (1971), 3 - 14.

56. On the preliminary drawings for St. Paul Before Agrippa (Lübeck, St. Annen Museum) and The Conversion of St. Paul (Berlin, Kupferstichkabinett) see Marlier, Pierre Coecke, 312, 216. For the petits patrons, St. Paul Before Agrippa (Vienna, Albertina) and the Conversion of St. Paul (London, Victoria and Albert Museum) see Marlier, 317.

57. See Bertrand Jestaz and Roseline Bacou, Jules Romain. L'histoire de Scipion. Tapisseries et dessins, Paris, 1978, exh. cat., Grand Palais, 86 - 89, 135 - 137, 142 - 144.

58. The anachronistic representation of Charles V and Maximilian I together in this tapestry will be discussed further in chapter 5. For a discussion of the personages represented in the Hunts tapestries see Lugt, Inventaire, 52 - 57.

59. The new grand gallery added onto the royal palace was not ordered until 1533 (P. Saintenoy, "Les Arts et les artistes à la cour de Bruxelles. Le Palais des Ducs de Bourgogne sur le Coudenberg à Bruxelles d'Antoine de Bourgogne à celui de Charles-Quint," Mémoires, Classe des Beaux-Arts, Académie Royale de Belgique 2 1934, 270). In the drawing for April, the new hunting house shown as an addition at the left was added in 1569 (J. Destrée, "Les Chasses dites de Maximilien, exposées aux Musées Royaux du Cinquantenaire à Bruxelles," L'emulation, 8 (August, 1923), 8. The additions to the Red Cloister in the drawings of July occurred around 1535 (A. Sanderus, Chorographia Sacra. Insignis Canonicae S. Pauli Rubeae Vallis in Zonia, Brussels, 1659, 4 - 5).

60. No study has yet attempted a complete catalogue of the many later versions of the Hunts of Maximilian. Some weavings of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries are mentioned by Migeon, Tapisseries des Chasses, 12.

61. For a comparison with contemporary portraits see Charles-Quint, 48 and 52.

62. See note 5. Walter Cahn notes that portraict is usually used in the sense of representation, plan or design (private communication 7/30/80). However, as both portraiteures and patrons are mentioned, the former in this case probably means portrait.

63. See Charles-Quint, figs. 74 and 49 respectively.

64. No cartoons for the Hunts have survived. Some scholars have suggested that the cartonnier for the series was the Tons mentioned in Félibien's statement (see chapter 2, and note 7; Beets, "Barent van Orley," 162 and Crick-Kuntziger, "Van Orley," 89). However, we have no further visual or documentary evidence to substantiate this hypothesis. Farmer discusses the Tons family in Van Orley, 291 - 292.

65. A photograph in the Witt Library files, London shows an eighteenth century entrefenêtre (3.15 m. by 1.5 m.) of this same figure grouping from the September tapestry. For early examples of the entrefenêtre use of tapestries see Edith Standen, "I, Tapestries in Use: Indoors," Apollo 113 (July, 1981), 11, fig. 11.

66. John Shearman, Raphael's Cartoons, 97 ff.

67. This series has not yet received a thorough treatment. One of the earliest and most informative discussions is by A. Pais, "Tapisseries tissées d'après les cartons de Van Orley, représentant les épisodes de la bataille de Pavia et retrouvées au Musées de Naples," Les Arts 3 (Jan., 1904), 17 - 25. See D'Hulst, Flemish Tapestries, 147 - 156 for the most recent discussion including a full bibliography. On the drawings in the Louvre see Lugt, Inventaire 57 - 59.

68. Lugt, Inventaire, 58.

69. Ibid., 52.

70. Farmer, Van Orley, 266 and 345.

71. See James Byam Shaw, Old Master Drawings from Chatsworth, Washington, 1969-70, exh. cat., National Gallery, 41 - 42, no. 89.

CHAPTER FOUR

THE MATURE WORKS: VAN ORLEY'S TRANSFORMATION OF ARTISTIC SOURCES FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF NATURALISTIC ILLUSIONISM

In his effort to alter tapestry from the semblance of a woven painting, Van Orley developed a new naturalistic illusionism heretofore unrealized in tapestry and never sought after in his paintings. Clearly, the art of weaving suggested a new approach to Van Orley. His mature works, particularly the Story of Jacob, the Hunts of Maximilian, the Battle of Pavia and the Louvre landscapes represent his achievement.

As Ludwig Baldass noted in his pioneering study of 1928, the first significant development in tapestry design came¹ when panel painting began to be copied in woven form. Using Van Orley's works as a prime example, he observed that in the 1520s and 1530s these designs not only caught up with but surpassed developments in painting. In Baldass' assessment, tapestry became the most important vehicle for the new heroic "Romanism" which he characterized mainly as the presentation of a consistently deep pictorial space filled with expressive figures. The catalyst for the change, he noted, was the arrival of Raphael's cartoons for the Acts of the Apostles series in Brussels in 1516.

Though Baldass' observations are accurate in a general sense,² they need to be reevaluated in regard to Van Orley's work in two specific ways. First of all, Raphael's influence on the Brussels designer was more profound than one which concerned the simple transfer of figure style and spatial relationships. Indeed, Raphael's new concept of history

painting in the Acts of the Apostles series contributed significantly to Van Orley's sense of clarity in his own designs. Secondly, the change Van Orley instituted in tapestry design in the 1520s and 1530s cannot be attributed solely to Raphael and "Romanism." The artist's attempt to achieve results which would be totally comprehensible and accessible to the contemporary viewer required a modified approach.

Through an ingenious arrangement of motifs, Van Orley accomplished a new sense of verisimilitude in woven form. He juxtaposed familiar local sites observed from nature, portraits of well-known personages, and genre or anecdotal motifs with identifiable excerpts from contemporary herbals, hunting treatises, and manuscript illumination, for example. As Van Orley's goal was not realism but verisimilitude, he carefully constructed an aesthetic unity in his designs which would insure a pleasurable, instructive visual experience for the viewer.

The most immediate considerations regarding the design no doubt were practical. The size of the weavings, particularly of the mature works, required an imaginative scheme to fill the space available. Van Orley used this to his advantage, joining the newly introduced Italian preference for vast, deep vistas with the accustomed northern love of detail. Since the tapestries were to be hung at floor level,³ they offered a unique opportunity for the development of designs which could extend the observer's space. The weavings were also meant to be appreciated from afar in groupings. Hence,

the design would have to take into account communication over a distance. In seeking solutions for these design problems, Van Orley consulted a variety of contemporary sources, altering them to suit his purpose.

Setting, Space, Environment

The development of a convincing, deep space in tapestry design was fundamental to the sense of naturalistic illusionism Van Orley promoted. The success he achieved in the Hunts of Maximilian, Battle of Pavia and Story of Jacob followed a trial period evident in the earlier works.

In the Lamentation, Adoration of the Magi, Blumenthal Crucifixion and Dais of Charles V (illus. 13, 18, 11, and 8), Van Orley first confronted the problems of the successful arrangement of large-scale figures and the placement of those figures in a convincing landscape setting. For the two Crucifixions (illus. 8, 11) he relied on well-established conventions in painting. In both he placed the figures in the forefront of the picture plane and created an illusionary depth by a lateral progression of hillocks toward a low horizon. The left and right edges in each are closed off by trees or rocky outcroppings and architecture. In the Lamentation and Adoration (illus. 13 and 18) the setting appears stage-like and symbolic rather than illusionistic.

By around 1520 Van Orley had already begun to alter significantly the established limited aspect of space in tapestry design. As he became more aware of the potential

for illusionism in tapestry, Van Orley began to implement a sense of real landscape which had not been successfully achieved in his smaller scale panel paintings. In fact, the artist left ~~totally~~⁴ unexplored the treatment of illusionistic landscape in his paintings.

In Van Orley's tapestry designs of the early 1520s, his depiction of landscape not only enhanced the veracity of the event portrayed, but also often served a function complementary to the meaning of the subject.⁵ The three landscape settings for the Passion series (illus. 27 - 29) use a device already established in Netherlandish painting. This is a stage-like foreground set above a middle ground valley which climbs again to an elevated distant horizon. Accompanying this familiar formula are other motifs which add to the particular individual success of these landscape scenes. For Christ in the Garden of Gethsemane (illus. 27), the subject called for a rugged, yet enclosed setting. In compliance Van Orley constructed the terrain as a central rocky and wooded mass which obstructs the view into the distance and compels the viewer to concentrate on the main theme, a suppliant Christ. In Christ Carrying the Cross (illus. 28), a central tunnel space of clearly defined vertical and horizontal planes of recession is bordered at the left by a powerful orthogonal line of the city gate and wall, and at the right, a high rocky outcropping in the style of Patinir. Here a procession goes from the Ecce Homo (middle background) through the foreground space toward Golgotha at the right. In the Crucifixion (illus. 29), the

overlapping hills and the cityscape in the valley form an infinite space, possibly expressing the cosmic significance of and heavenly blessing on the event at hand. The Last Supper (illus. 34) is presented in a single room, separated from its surroundings and far removed from the outside, background architecture (where Christ washes the feet of the disciples) to which there is no easy access. As well as reinforcing the meaning in these tapestries, the varied settings and distinctly different landscapes also indicate movement through time and space, relating the subjects as historical events.

In the drawings for the Story of Romulus and Remus (or The Founding of Rome; illus. 49 - 52) of 1524 the landscape settings and their architectural counterparts are also varied. The figures of the main action are again brought forward to the forefront of the picture plane. Though events do take place in the background, these play a subsidiary role and are nearly buried in the rather confused levels of the backdrop-like space.

Van Orley deliberately placed figures in the History of Jacob (ca. 1525-30; Brussels, Musées royaux d'Art et d'Histoire; illus. 107 - 116) in order to form the contributing lines of a one-point perspective at the center back of each composition. The designer⁷ had the viewer in mind, for when the tapestries are hung at floor level (as they are currently) there is an immediate rapport between the viewer and the nearly life-sized protagonists of the story which invites participation in the scene.

Van Orley was doubtless aware of attempts made in other media to integrate large-scale figures into a vast space. Specifically, he turned to the achievements in oversized, multi-block woodcuts which themselves may have been an inexpensive substitute for tapestries.⁸ Unfortunately, these monumental prints have received little scholarly attention, and dating is problematic. Of around the same date as Van Orley's Jacob series are two works by Schäufelein, the Last Supper (illus. 117) and the Raising of Lazarus (illus. 118).⁹ These bear a close stylistic relationship, for example, to the Blessing of Jacob (illus. 107) and Jacob and Joseph Reunited (illus. 116) in the compartmentalization of space, successfully described diminution of figures into that far-reaching space and the presentation of a featured narrative episode by large-scale figures in the foreground plane.

The antecedents for both the Schäufelein and Van Orley compositions are most probably found in the monumental prints of Titian.¹⁰ Compare, for example, the general similarities in format, arrangement of large-scale figures and extensive landscape views which exist between Titian's Sacrifice of Abraham (ca. 1514-15; illus. 119) or Conversion of St. Paul (ca. 1515-20; illus. 120) and Van Orley's History of Jacob series (especially illus. 110 and 114). The proof that Titian's oversized prints directly influenced tapestry designs is found in the slightly later works of Pieter Coecke

van Aelst, where the artist copies Titian's Conversion of Saul¹¹ for his own composition for the St. Paul series.

The realistic construction of space and the successful integration of figures into that space were not the only means by which Van Orley approached verisimilitude. In the Hunts of Maximilian (illus. 75 - 86), the Battle of Pavia (illus. 95 - 101) and the Louvre landscapes (illus. 102 - 104), he incorporated the depiction of specific, well-known sites, some apparently studied from nature. Van Orley's representation signals a pivotal point in Netherlandish landscape art which has not been adequately noted.¹²

Except for Franz, who devoted two pages to a discussion of Van Orley's landscape depiction, the artist's contribution is side-stepped in favor of the work of those artists who diminished more fully the human element in their depictions. Until now, landscape art of this period has been considered a mode only of manuscript illumination, drawings and paintings. It is the premise here that Van Orley preceded Bruegel in the successful juncture of the Weltlandschaft and Nahlandschaft modes. He did so not in his paintings but in woven form. In order to achieve this, Van Orley discarded the spatial constructions of his paintings. He widened the foreground plane, lowered the horizon line and, most importantly, relied on observed landscapes.

To what extent the landscapes of the tapestry designs are actually observed sites has often been questioned in particular with regard to the Hunts of Maximilian and the

Battle of Pavia. Because it was precisely the representation of accurately or semi-accurately recorded sites which enabled Van Orley to abandon the set formula of his predecessors and join together the intimate and panoramic modes, this issue is important to examine. There is no intention here to infer that the designs to be discussed are solely the presentation of topography. The aim, rather, is to attempt to determine to what extent Van Orley's landscapes are a combination of on-the-spot reportage and a felicitous arrangement of landscape motifs.

The opinions vary concerning the topographical accuracy of the Hunts landscapes.¹³ That these scenes represent specific locations in the immediate Brussels area is noted in a sixteenth century hand on three of the four remaining preliminary sketches (illus. 58 - 61). The view for the month of March is "La court de bruxelles quant on voit derrière dedans la parck" (illus. 58); for September (illus. 60) it is "Groendaal"; and for November (illus. 61), "An mennckens dans" (a site also known as Mennckens block or Moynkens¹⁴ plas). The drawing for June (illus. 59) is labelled simply "L'assemblée dans bois," referring to part of the established medieval hunting procedures, not to a location. These drawings in themselves, may suggest Van Orley's method throughout the series. Where it was possible or appropriate to include specific haunts of the court, the artist did so. Otherwise, as will be explained below, Van Orley relied on familiar illustrations such as those found in

Gaston Phébus' Livre de Chasse or the Grimani Breviary.

For some of these more general descriptions, he indicated the location by including the towers of Ste. Gudule and the Town Hall on the horizon (illus. 77).

In both instances (i.e. the specific or general description of forest locale) Van Orley never sacrificed his sense of design for realism. He knew well the formulas of contemporary landscape art specifically as they were found in prints and he used them to achieve a pleasing arrangement. A few representative examples of the Hunts of Maximilian will serve to illustrate Van Orley's successful integration of observed topography, older well-known pictorial sources, and contemporary sources.¹⁵ Of the twelve scenes, there exist nearly contemporary prints or drawings of local sites which confirm the artist's rendition in at least half of the cases. In addition, there are descriptions of exact locations and building programs of several landmarks.

In the case of the month of March (illus. 75), the view of Brussels is so well documented that the series may be dated between 1527-33 on the basis of Van Orley's depiction.¹⁶ The corrections in black chalk on the Louvre drawing (illus. 62) show later additions to the ducal palace.¹⁷ Among the numerous renderings of the site is Dürer's drawing made on his first trip to Brussels in 1520. Observed from an upper window in the Coudenberg palace (illus. 121), it is a view a quarter turn to the left of Van Orley's design.¹⁸ Slightly later examples include a drawing by Cornelis

Massys of ca. 1540 (illus. 122) showing most of Van Orley's view (excluding the Coudenberg ¹⁹palace) and a sheet by Hans Bol ²⁰ca. 1560.

Though the distant city view in March is accurately recorded, the spatial construction of the landscape and the arrangement of some of the motifs is contrived in order to invite the spectator into the scene. To create the desired effect, Van Orley borrowed in a general way from devices found in earlier art. The panoramic depth and clarity of this setting, for example, readily call to mind Dürer's 1518 etching, Landscape with a Canon (illus. ²¹123). Of a similar construction, but even closer to Van Orley's design because of the use of trees and figures as spatial markers in landscape, is Lucas van Leyden's 1519 engraving The Dance of Mary Magdalene (illus. 124). Though there is no need to prove Van Orley's familiarity with these prints, we can assume that they probably changed hands on occasions such as Dürer's visit to Brussels in ²²1520.

For landscape motifs carefully observed from nature, Van Orley may have been aware of works by German print-makers, especially those of the Danube School who were well versed in this mode. Altdorfer often employed the motif of a darkened foreground hillock with a large tree to one side (The Landscape with Large Pine Tree, 1520 - 23, illus. 125) or double trees in the center (Landscape with Double Pine, 1515 - 20, illus. 126). These trees displayed both bare and foliate limbs as well as knobby, protruding

roots below. Here and there are small burrows made through the upheaval of the earth by roots and animals (illus. 125). Van Orley placed these same motifs in similar positions in the month of March, adding to them the ivy vines climbing up the foreground trees as did Lucas Cranach in his woodcuts (e.g. Christ on the Mount of Olives, ca. 1502, illus. 127).

For the final tapestry of the series, February (illus. 86), Van Orley required a palace setting for the allegorical figures of King Modus and Queen Racio. Minor adjustments were made from the Louvre drawing (illus. 73) to the finished tapestry. The positions of the columns of the porch and the legend were exchanged, but the characteristic details of the court of Brussels remained unaltered. An anonymous drawing of 1589 - 90 (illus. 128) in the State Archives of Copenhagen confirms Van Orley's meticulous rendering. The rectangular enclosure of the courtyard was constructed between 1509/10 - 21. True to the state of the balustrade at that time, only five of the twenty-seven statues commissioned from Jan van Roome of the dukes and duchesses of Brabant were executed on the tall columns. The shorter columns (to the right in the tapestry and drawing) were decorated with birds and other animals, designed by Jacques van Laethem (illus. 129).²³ The open throne room of the foreground has no known basis in architectural fact. Inspiration for its spatial construction may have come from any number of similar scenes in illu-

minated manuscripts or, perhaps, from previous tapestry designs. An example of the latter which is similar in setting and deployment of figures (and which Van Orley certainly would have known) is the central scene from Jan van Roome's fifth tapestry of the Story of David and Bathsheba where David orders Uriah into battle (Paris, Musée de Cluny; illus. 130).

For the month of September (illus. 81) Van Orley recorded in detail the setting of the Abbey of Groendael (detail, illus. 131). His faithful rendition is corroborated by Jan Bruegel I's sketch from the same viewpoint (illus. 132) about ninety years later. The locale in which the Château of Terveuren is situated was included in the background of the January scene (illus. 85). It had not changed much by the time Harrewijn made his engraving in 1705 (illus. 133, after J. Leroy, Brabantia illustrata).²⁴

All of these examples presuppose an observed record of the site. Beets assumed the March and September drawings²⁵ in Leyden (illus. 58 and 60) to be studies from nature. Because of the carefully constructed fore- and midground planes and, as we have seen, their possible print sources, I think it more probable that these preliminary drawings were made by Van Orley in his studio. Perhaps he recorded the topography in a sketchbook similar to those drawings of the Errera or Berlin sketchbooks (illus. 134 and 135), leaving in reserve the foreground space in order to include later the carefully arranged landscape motifs of the final design.

In scenes such as the month of June (illus. 78) which is not a readily identifiable site (the inscription "l'assemblée dans bois" refers to a hunting procedure, not a location, illus. 59) Van Orley carefully constructed a seemingly realistic landscape inspired in part by contemporary sources. In the manner of Dürer (e.g. scenes from the Life of the Virgin of ca. 1505 - 11)²⁶ and Lucas van Leyden (e.g. the Baptism of Christ, ca. 1510 - 12, illus. 136) Van Orley placed proportionately large figures at eye level in the immediate foreground as a compositional device to establish the viewer's position. The two figures to the far right gesture toward the subject of the scene, the repast. The arrangement of figures on both sides of the table and the placement of trees emphasize two receding axes which meet at the head of Charles V at the right table end.²⁷ This construction of space is very similar to that found in Van Leyden's Baptism of Christ (illus. 136) and²⁸ is quite possibly indebted to him.

Van Orley was aware as well of depictions of this scene in illuminated manuscripts of Gaston Phébus' Livre de Chasse. Numerous copies of this text invariably represent the repast in the same way (e.g. illus. 137, illus. 138). The arrangement of a centrally located table, behind which the ruler turns to speak with a courtier at his right, the flowing river at the lower left used to keep the immersed canteens cool, even the poses of approaching servants all share a²⁹ common source in the Phébus manuscripts. The poses of

the two dogs in the foreground have been related to the same motif in the month of August in the Grimany Breviary (illus. 139).³⁰ However, they appear even earlier as two deer again in Phébus' Livre de Chasse manuscripts and also in another hunting treatise used for Van Orley's series, Le Livre des déduis du roi Modus et de la Reine Ratio.³¹

The former, in the Bibliothèque Nationale (no. 616; illus. 140) and the latter in Brussels (B.R., ms. 10,218/19; illus. 141) show deer in the same configuration.

In summary, Van Orley drew together diverse elements in the Hunts of Maximilian in a way which had never been done in tapestry. He totally transformed these elements, many of which were particularly familiar to members of the Brussels court, arranging them into one well-integrated design. The ingenious combination unites illustrations from hunting treatises, local sites observed from nature, and a carefully constructed naturalistic space which joins a distant view with the foreground. Van Orley's formula for the hunt scenes varied according to the subject and location; however, each one would have triggered immediate recognition on the part of the viewer.

This combination of carefully observed local sites with artificially constructed space is found in other tapestry designs by Van Orley. Among these are three exquisite landscape drawings, here considered an incomplete set of the ages of man (illus. 102 - 104). The supposition that illus. 104 represents a view of Etterbeek relies on a

description in an inventory of 1659.³² The twin towers of St. Gudule (above the head of the horseman) and the city wall of Brussels appear on the horizon of illus. 102; illus. 103 is, as yet, an unidentified location. Anzelewsky suggested that for the View of Etterbeek (illus. 104) Van Orley had assimilated Domenico Campagnola's landscape constructions of his 1517 woodcuts or Dürer's of the 1518 Canon.³³ Though Van Orley may have known these prints, an earlier source might also be considered. Lucas van Leyden's 1510 Return of the Prodigal Son is a mirror image of the View of Etterbeek in several respects. The protruding plane with trees in the foreground on which and before which figures are arranged, the mid-ground dip in the landscape where a few figures walk, the far distant view again elevated to eye level, are similar in both. Though in the case of these landscapes there is no confirmation of the exact location, it can be assumed that Van Orley again drew on both reality and artificially constructed features of landscape to form these most convincingly arranged scenes.

The requirements of Van Orley's Battle of Pavia (1525 - 31; illus. 95 - 101) were in many ways similar to those of the Hunts of Maximilian. Many figures had to be placed within a panoramic landscape which could also be read convincingly as topography. Unlike the views of the Hunts, we have no reason to believe that the Battle of Pavia was observed by Bernart van Orley. Scholars generally suppose that he produced his designs after a print or drawing by

another artist.³⁴ It is debatable how accurate these settings are. In some of the designs only a few monuments can be identified, in others none.

Illustrations 91 and 98 show a view of an Italian Renaissance city which is more convincing as Pavia than several contemporary painted examples. An early sixteenth century anonymous panel at Hampton Court (illus. 142) is typical of numerous images of the Battle of Pavia which restrict the depiction of the site to a few Italian Renaissance buildings while filling in the rest of the city with northern Gothic spires.³⁵ Contemporary prints, such as one by Hans Schäufelein appear to be more concerned with the representation of military maneuvers than with topography.³⁶ From other depictions (which have been assumed to be more reliable) come the features of the walled-in city with the Ticino River to the right and the Mirabello Park before it (e.g. those of Ruprecht Heller, illus. 143; Wolf Huber, illus. 144; and a follower of Patinir, illus. 145).

As Antonio Pais suggested, Van Orley's drawings may depend on the eyewitness reports of the Marquis de Pescaire.³⁷ However, disputes and contradictions in the numerous accounts of the Battle of Pavia leave the ordering of scenes open to questions.³⁸ With identifying labels only on the major characters and no legends describing location or event, a correct sequence remains elusive.³⁹ Therefore, clues about the accuracy of actions and sites and the arrangement of scenes must be found in the tapestries themselves.

As in the Hunts of Maximilian, I would suggest that Van Orley joined fact with fiction to achieve the great sense of verisimilitude inherent in the tapestries.

From contemporary descriptions of the site,⁴⁰ it is clear that Van Orley at least knew the orientation of Pavia. The city was protected on the Milan side by a substantial citadel, bounded by the Ticino River to the south, and by a large walled-in park called Mirabello to the north (illus. 91). Within the Mirabello Park was a castle adorned⁴¹ as a palace but constructed with the solidity of a fortress. Perhaps this is the building of illus. 94 behind the capture of Francis I.

The individual settings are less varied than those of the Hunts of Maximilian. However, it cannot be assumed because of this that Van Orley did not know the site. The Battle of Pavia occurred in a relatively restricted area over one to two days. Appropriately, then, Van Orley confined his depiction to the few locations of the battle and concentrated on other elements intended to enhance verisimilitude, namely, the convincing deployment of figures in battle. For this he turned especially to the art of Raphael whose sense of clarity and historical veracity exemplified in the Acts of the Apostles tapestries was unparalleled in contemporary northern art.

Varietà e stravaganza

If the size of the tapestries offered Van Orley the opportunity for a new organization of space in this medium and for the development of a sense of verisimilitude previously unrealized, it also presented problems. The preliminary compositional sketches had to suggest ways to fill these large pictorial planes without the loss of clarity demanded by the new spatial structure. Further, it was necessary to insure unimpeded reading of the narrative depicted even from a great distance.

In considering these challenges, Van Orley turned to Raphael's concept of history painting as it is exemplified in the Acts of the Apostles cartoons. Vasari's account of Raphael's new mode could describe as well the mature tapestry designs of Van Orley. He noted that Raphael's storie were endowed with the varietà e stravaganza of

backgrounds of buildings or of landscape, a pleasing treatment of draperies, the management of figures so that they are at times pushed back into shadow and at other times brought forward into strong light, and the making of heads of women, children, young men and old men, alive and beautiful, with appropriate expression and vigour. He considered also the value of such things as the flight of horses in battle, the bravery of soldiers, the ability to make all kinds of animals, and above all the representation of lifelike and identifiable portraits and an infinite number of other things such as clothing, footwear, helmets, armour, the headdresses of women, hair-styles, beards, vases, trees, caves, rocks, fires, murky or clear atmosphere, clouds, rain, lightening, fine weather, night, moonlight and sunlight and many other things that contribute the necessities of the art of painting.⁴²

Further, Shearman has succinctly analyzed Raphael's presentation as encompassing not only a variety of detail (as Vasari noted) but also the appropriateness of these details of costume, objects and setting, a consistency in approach to historical authenticity and, finally, a characterization of gesture and expression which combined elegance, eloquence and emphasis.⁴³ These features formed the basis for Van Orley's expression of clarity in the tapestry designs. However, acting on an impulse to make the tapestries more easily accessible to the viewer, the artist transformed Raphael's approach in some significant ways as will be explained.

Van Orley's first effort to emulate Raphael's approach is in the drawings for the Story of Romulus and Remus (illus. 49 - 52). In composition, figure style and, even details of settings, these preliminary drawings follow the design of the Acts of the Apostles cartoons. Especially similar is the frieze-like deployment of figures brought far forward and kept in that space by architecture or landscape elements which close off the background. For both series the spectator views the scene at eye level, while the background space tilts slightly upward.

From Raphael's design Van Orley borrowed the compelling rhythm developed by the opposition of striding, gesticulating figures and stationary, immobile ones. This is particularly notable in a comparison of Van Orley's Romulus as Supreme Judge (illus. 52) with The Death of Ananias (illus.

146) and The Blinding of Elymas (illus. 147). The left two-thirds of Romulus and Remus Delivering the Head of Amulius (illus. 50) show how Van Orley referred to Raphael's Sacrifice at Lystra (illus. 148) for his arrangement of striding, half-kneeling and standing figures all pressing toward Numitor. The dramatic space between the two main protagonists in the Meeting of Hersilia and Romulus (illus. 51) and the way female and male figures are grouped at the right and left sides are reminiscent of the placement of figures in Raphael's design for Christ's Charge to St. Peter (illus. 149).⁴⁴

Though these preliminary studies for the Story of Romulus and Remus were meant to indicate the design in only a general way, it is already apparent here that Van Orley was concerned with representing variety in many ways: setting, poses, dress, facial types, and so on. However, his sense of historical authenticity was somewhat lax. Van Orley probably depended again on Raphael's cartoons for the appropriate scallop-edged togas and shorter-skirted costumes of his Roman male figures (cf. illus. 49 and 50 with 146 and 149) and for certain architectural motifs (cf. the right sides of illus. 52 and 148). But he filled in the columns and architraves of his portico with Italian Renaissance grotesques (illus. 50) and dressed Hersilia and her companions in contemporary northern dress (illus. 51). This juxtaposition of quasi-authentic historical motifs with contemporary details is indicative of Van Orley's approach in later tapestry series. The former sets the stage

for the story, the latter renders it unquestionably familiar to the contemporary viewer.

For the History of Jacob of ca. 1525 - 30 (illus. 107 - 116)⁴⁵ Van Orley's particular sense of historical accuracy for this Biblical tale suggested multifarious Italian Renaissance motifs and details of contemporary Brabant life.⁴⁶ As will be shown, the artist aimed to evoke the viewer's empathy with the subject, allowing him to experience the story as it is being told and to understand the world depicted as his own.

To the right in the Division of Laban's Flock (illus. 110) is a wealth of detail from the sixteenth century Brabant life: a boy maneuvers his sheep through a fence toward a group of thatched-roof huts in the background as a bagpiper plays by a tree; in the foreground, a maid unpacks her picnic lunch. Jacob buys land outside of Schechem (illus. 114) while family members carry on as any sixteenth century folk. A couple play with their infant and workers build a timber house at the left.

Never added at the expense of the main subject, these genre motifs are always well integrated into the theme at hand. In this regard, Van Orley probably took his inspiration in general from Dürer. The Life of the Virgin series, for example, shows contemporary secular themes successfully juxtaposed with the sacred story.⁴⁷ More specifically, the bagpiper mentioned above is assimilated from Dürer's 1514 engraving (illus. 150).

Van Orley secured the viewer's interest and attention not only by adding contemporary details but also by presenting instantly legible images. A specific characterization of gesture and expression served his purpose well. Though few poses and gestures are taken directly from Raphael's cartoons,⁴⁸ the Italian artist's general patterns of expression influenced those in the Jacob series design. Represented here is not a full range of psychological and physical emotions but, as Shearman phrases it, "a conception of the exemplary" in patterns of expression.⁴⁹

Following Raphael's example, Van Orley achieved a continuity in expression which was characterized by a unique combination of features. First of all, he used visual hyperbole; that is, he exaggerated gestures in order to guarantee clarity and legibility. In the first tapestry of the series (illus. 107) Rebekah pushes Jacob, whose open hands indicate reception, towards Abraham's blessing gesture. Secondly, Van Orley enlarged certain features of the main figures, generally eyes, nose, mouth and especially hands, so that an expression could be communicated over a distance. Finally, on occasion he repeated certain poses and gestures meant to convey a specific emotion so that when seen again (even at a glance) the mood would be instantly conveyed. In the tenth tapestry (illus. 116) Van Orley emphasizes the importance of the reunion of Jacob and Joseph by repeating the greeting pose in three pair of figures directly behind the father and son.

Shearman sums up Raphael's new approach in history painting by three terms: enargeia, an elevated clarity or vividness of expression; energeia, an emphasis on force of detail which tends toward hyperbole; and decorum, or, the fitness of each illustration to its purpose.⁵⁰ In the Story of Jacob, Van Orley employed Raphael's approach with success, conveying a variety of expressions with clarity. However, he truly excelled in the Hunts of Maximilian and Battle of Pavia series where he could conjoin this characterization of gesture and expression more completely with appropriateness of detail and a great consistency in his approach to historical authenticity. In these series Van Orley did not need to force a juxtaposition of fitting historic details with contemporary motifs, for the scenes to be presented were current events. In these cases, the artist developed his own combination of fact and fiction in a unique way.

We have already seen how Van Orley arranged the settings for the Hunts and the Battle of Pavia, joining observed studies of local or foreign sites in the background with carefully arranged foreground constructions. In much the same way, the artist filled the scenes with familiar details of various activities, costume, even of flora and fauna as markers to facilitate identification or reading by the viewer. The aim, again, was verisimilitude, not pure realism, for these details are not always entirely appropriate to the scene. Each detail served as part of a greater aesthetic unity not to be disrupted by any distasteful aspects of the hunt or of battle.

Both the Hunts of Maximilian and the Battle of Pavia give the impression of contemporary reportage by unrelenting attention to details rather than to accuracy in all respects. For example, if a tapestry from the Hunts is compared to one from the Pavia series, there are aspects of the depiction which do not support an individual treatment of each. In both there are early sixteenth century northern European houses with thatched roofs (cf. illus. 76 and 101); the same foliage appears in the lower right of illus. 101, the Capture of Francis I, and in the center of illus. 80, August. Although the Pavia Battle occurred in February, the deciduous trees all retain their leaves.

A close look at the Battle of Pavia and especially the Hunts reveals in certain instances an array of plant and animal life not possible at one time for any given month. The central tree of the December composition (illus. 84), for example, holds not only a squirrel, but five different varieties of bird not all found in the winter months. Except for the few broken limbs on trees and the occasional prominently placed, insect-eaten leaves (e.g. in the front center of January, illus. 85), each plant is represented in its most perfect state. For the winter months of the Hunts, the trees are bare, but the process of the decay of their leaves is nowhere in evidence. Though the placement of flora and fauna in these tapestries seems natural, one soon becomes aware that this is a real, but idealized, world in a state never seen by man. Presumably, the cartonniers added

these details to Van Orley's designs since they appear only in very general form in the preliminary drawings and, it will be recalled, the guild regulations allowed for this type of participation.⁵¹ Final approval of the cartoons, however, was doubtless given to Van Orley, especially on such important commissions as the Hunts of Maximilian and Battle of Pavia series.

The representation of some of these plants and animals may have symbolic significance, but to the Renaissance humanist it would have satisfied the current interest in scientific observation of the natural world. Though no specific relationships could be found, the tapestries might reflect plant and animal studies newly published at the time. Representative of this literature, the dissemination of which was closely tied to the development of the printing press, were De Viribus Herbarum (1477) of Macer Floridus, Der Gart der Gesundheit (1485) by Peter Schoeffer and the later works of Otto Brunfels (Herbarum Vivae Eicones, 1530) and Hieronymous Bock (Kreüter Buch, 1539). Information on the animal kingdom was readily available in studies such as Ermolao Barbaro's Castigationes plinanae (1492 - 93). As illustrations and descriptions of flora and fauna were improved they found their way into the artist's vocabulary. The textbook-like representation of these forms in Van Orley's tapestries indicates not only the scientific interest of the time but also the probable source.⁵²

The same sense of accuracy pervaded the representation of costume, weaponry and military procedures in the Battle of Pavia. Following the example of the Fornovo Battle (illus. 151) and numerous German woodcuts of the 1520s and 1530s of soldiers isolated in landscape and in triumphal processions, Van Orley separated one military group from another by dress. This distinction of the soldiers also served to describe more clearly the action taking place.

From all descriptions the representation of arms and armor in the tapestries is up to date. The close-fitting helmets (especially the armet) developed between 1500 - 30, the German-made armor of the "SS" style of 1510 - 20, the costume armor displaying the trend for puffs and slashes⁵³ in the sleeves are all featured in Van Orley's designs. Among the booty confiscated after the battle was Francis I's gauntlet which then joined the splendid examples in Charles V's armor collection.⁵⁴ Whether the cartonniers had access to the actual armor or only the drawings, they saw that care was taken to note dress in a generally accurate way⁵⁵ for the design.

Perhaps even more important than the depiction of armor is the impressive display of Italian-made halberds, the pikes ~~and~~ swords, and especially the arquebus. It was Charles V's arquebusiers who proved for the first time in the Battle of Pavia that a heavily armored cavalry could no longer successfully counter the power of firearms. Francis I's chivalrous Compagnies d'Ordonnance could not enter the modern age.

In addition to these details, Van Orley interjected portraiture and particularized facial types in the Hunts of Maximilian and Battle of Pavia designs.⁵⁶ Although there is some dispute about the identification of certain figures in the Hunts series, distinguishing features confirm the identities of Maximilian I, Charles V and his brother Ferdinand, and possibly two of Charles's sisters, Margaret and Isabelle,⁵⁷ The Battle of Pavia was the first military series in which the number of actual portraits was one dozen or more and in which there was a proliferation of other individualized faces. To further give the impression of a mass of clearly distinguished fighting men, Van Orley placed the important personages almost exclusively in the foreground, adding identifying labels on several of them.⁵⁸

Portraiture in tapestry was not first presented by Van Orley. However, his particular treatment is new. Aside from the formal woven portraits, such as that of Duke Louis I of Savoie and his wife Anne de Lusignan (called Couple under a Tent, Paris, Musée des Arts décoratifs), there are few early examples of known personages participating in a woven representation of an historical event. Closest to Van Orley's Notre-Dame du Sablon series in this regard is the tapestry of Trajan and Herkenbald (illus. 5) which copies a replica of a wall painting by Roger van der Weyden. Here members of the Burgundian court have been identified, some more convincingly than

59

others. However, unlike in Van Orley's Sablon series, most of these figures play the role of spectator rather than participant in the narrative. This, as well as the carefully studied detail of Van Orley's portraiture depiction, add to the Sablon series a sense of verisimilitude heretofore unattained in tapestry.

A decided advancement over the Sablon series portraits is Van Orley's more comfortable placement of the notable visages in the composition. In the Sablon series nearly all portraits are seen full face or at a 3/4 turn. In the Hunts and Pavia tapestries Van Orley makes more use of profiles or views turned away from the observer. By so doing, the natural aspect of poses and, thus, the more convincing involvement of the personage in the scene works toward enhanced realism. This use of portraiture is in marked contrast to the more formal portraits of the Nassau Genealogy (illus. 53 - 57), a type which was not totally new either to painting or tapestry.

Those series such as the Founding of Rome or the Story of Jacob which do not include known members of the court and the unidentified figures in the series already mentioned display a studied variety in facial types. Van Orley sustained the interest of the viewer by differentiating these facial types and displaying in them a range in psychological mien and pose (e.g. illus. 50, 52, 110, 111). Both major and minor figures are individualized. Though in other media such as printmaking and painting, interest

60

in the depiction of a wide variety of characters and types developed, in tapestry Van Orley forged the way. Previous to this time, stock types were repeated from tapestry to tapestry and often in the same individual weaving.

In order not to draw attention away from the main subject, Van Orley organized this mass of individualized figures very skillfully. His sense of order is achieved by repeating postures and gestures of key figures from scene to scene and leading the viewer on to the next scene through directed gesture. Van Orley always carefully controlled the placement of portrait types so that they would contribute to the scene's veracity rather than stand apart from it.

This careful control of the placement of figures is indicative of Van Orley's treatment in general. That he valued the maintenance of aesthetic unity more than the attainment of the greatest possible accuracy is true of the Battle of Pavia and of the Hunts of Maximilian in two ways. First of all, as previously noted, Van Orley deleted from his battle scenes and from the hunt the gory side and the impromptu, unorganized aspect of the fight. All is organized and aesthetically arranged by the artist. An especially good example of this is the scene of the surrender of Francis I (illus. 101) where a somewhat dazed and fully clad king is helped from his collapsed horse while Charles of Lannoy nonchalantly looks on. As reported by Giona,⁶¹ after having had his horse shot from under him, Francis I continued on foot against the Spaniards who

butchered his knights and severely wounded him. Lannoy and the Neapolitan soldiers intervened at the point where Francis was half dressed and bleeding badly. Likewise, in the Hunts of Maximilian the bloody side of the chase, the wounding and disembowelment of the catch, the feeding of the organs to the dogs (all so well explained in the Phébus hunting manuals) are left out.

Instead Van Orley favored the representation of daily activities, all of which were part of the more informal aspects of hunting and fighting battles. In the Battle of Pavia Van Orley introduced military genre as an integral part of monumental military art for the first time. The story of the battle in this telling encompassed camp life as well as military strategy. In the third tapestry (illus. 90 and 97) the women of the camp take their leave; an old hag and a young maiden exit at the right. In another scene (illus. 93 and 100) the retinue comes through the broken wall of the Mirabello Park, one soldier carrying chickens strung on his lance; elsewhere a monkey rides horseback.

The genre motifs came from Van Orley's own experience and from a source he often consulted, printmaking. Works such as Dürer's 1519 engraving, Two Peasants (illus. 152), may have generally inspired motifs like the chicken carrying soldier in the Pavia series (illus. 93). Since Van Orley apparently had on hand the work of many printmakers, the tradition of genre in prints promoted by earlier artists, Israel van

Meckenem and the Housebook Master among them, ought not to be entirely discounted. The record of the secular world, contemporary costumes and interiors is rarely conveyed with more sensitivity and even humor than by those early printmakers.

Van Orley achieved his greatest success with the integration of genre motifs into tapestry with the Hunts of Maximilian series. To heighten the realistic portrayal of the monthly scenes he interjected small, whimsical incidents into the otherwise serious business of hunting.⁶² In May (illus. 153) a loving couple flirt beneath a tree and in July (illus. 154) a dog defecates in the foreground. In placing these motifs in the forefront of the design Van Orley adds to them a previously unrealized significance. They become part of the narrative and important ingredients for the convincing portrayal of daily life.

Even though Van Orley limited each tapestry of the Hunts and Battle of Pavia to the depiction of one major event, he required a vast spatial plane with the interaction of many figures to give a successful impression of hunt or battle. In order to achieve this impression of action and yet retain great clarity and spatial unity, Van Orley organized his scenes very carefully. He limited the height of the viewpoint and complexity of action to attain a relatively smooth transition from foreground to background. In addition, he grouped figures around an elliptical open space, carefully arranging them at strategic points to

indicate depth recession. This is in marked contrast to the German Überschaubild (e.g. of Schäußelein's Battle of Pavia)⁶³ where groups of soldiers were seen from a high vantage point. Though these latter may represent a clearer idea of military strategy, Van Orley's representation realizes more fully the actual human element of the battle.

In order to convey the pandemonium of war or the suspense of the hunt while only representing a few selected events, Van Orley relied on the expressive poses and gestures of individual figures. Though continued inspiration came from Raphael's art, the model was not always the Acts of the Apostles cartoons. In the Battle of Pavia some specific examples illustrate the point well. The soldier in the right foreground whose right arm is raised holding a club (illus. 90) is freely adapted from the spear-wielding nude at the left in Raphael's Massacre of the Innocents (illus. 155); the soldier running behind the dog at the left of illus. 90 is inspired by the pose of the woman (foreground, second from the left, illus. 155) whose child⁶⁴ is about to be stabbed.

The most successful of the Raphaelesque prints (which were often made directly from the preliminary drawing rather than from the completed work) were designs which embodied⁶⁵ the stylistic principles of Raphael's frescoes. Van Orley perhaps recognized the monumental aspect of these figures and extracted them from their context only to alter them in his own way and replace them in another monumental format.

The works of Raphael were not the only source; Van Orley also borrowed from Michaelangelo. The general impromptu scrambling of figures in the Battle of Pavia is loosely modelled after similar types in the 1504-06 Battle of Cascina (illus. 156).⁶⁶ Specifically, Van Orley's two figures struggling to mount the wall in the foreground of illus. 91 were inspired by a pair (illus. 157) from this work of Michelangelo. To the left is a running soldier who gestures just as the figure behind Michelangelo's climbing pair does (illus. 157).

Better than many of his contemporaries, Van Orley understood the restrained energy of the contrapposto stance⁶⁷ and the inherent unrest in opposing postures found in the works of Raphael and Michelangelo. He most likely relied on Marcantonio's prints as well as what drawings came with Raphael's cartoons and workshop members⁶⁸ in the second decade of the sixteenth century. For scenes of continuous fighting and pockets of action or skirmishes (e.g. illus. 90, 92), Van Orley may also have had in hand the adaptations of Italian designs by German printmakers, such as Barthel Beham's Battle of the Nudes, Titus Gracchus or the Battle for the Banner (illus. 158, 159, 160) all of ca. 1520. Here are only a few of the examples which supplied those interested with a sourcebook of material on poses of fighting or running men. Whether Beham's and Van Orley's figures borrow from a common source or the latter borrowed from the former (which predates it

by almost five years), both use the striding, running, fighting figures placed alone or often with a mate. Both expressed par excellence this particular form of Romanism in the North.

Van Orley's contribution in his mature works was the establishment of a new style in tapestry conceived specifically to complement its monumental form. His main inspiration was Raphael's concept of history painting as exemplified in the Acts of the Apostles cartoons. It was not simply the Italian artist's expressive figures and spatial relationships which appealed to Van Orley, but an all-encompassing mode featuring variety and appropriateness of detail joined with a consistency of approach to historical authenticity. Binding these elements together was Raphael's incomparable sense of clarity and organization.

However, Van Orley was equally influenced by his own environment which he set out to convey for the first time in woven form. His effort to infuse Raphael's concept of history painting with naturalistic illusionism led Van Orley to consider a variety of available sources: prints, illuminated manuscripts, and scientific treatises, as well as common everyday occurrences in familiar locations which he probably sketched from life. For Van Orley telling a story meant not simply depicting the known facts but creating a readily recognizable environment for the tale. In his unabridged version, he meant the viewer to follow the narrative not simply as an intellectual endeavor but as a real-

life experience. To insure this, Van Orley filled his compositions with familiar elements intended to unite the pictorial world with the viewer's own. In essence, though obviously influenced by Raphael's concept of history painting, Van Orley could not reject his own northern sense of narrative and the anecdotal. The elements of his designs which make the story most accessible to the viewer are the same ones which oppose the new "Romanism." Van Orley's successful fusion of the two modes allowed for a new sense of verisimilitude in tapestry which had never been achieved before.

Notes to Chapter 4

1. Baldass, "Tapisserieentwürfe," 247 - 66.
2. In my opinion several of Baldass' attributions to Van Orley are unreliable. The David and Bathsheba series is now given to Jan van Roome (see Tapisseries bruxelloises, 25 - 51); the Cephalus and Procris set, like the Hampton Court Dido and Aeneas and Metropolitan Museum Twelve Ages of Man, are probably designed by Adrian van den Houde; the Vienna Tobias and Abraham sets and the Florence Accademia Story of Adam and Eve are later than Van Orley's work and, perhaps, should be assigned to Michiel Coxie. For other opinions on these later series see: E. Mahl, "Die 'Mosesfolge' der Tapisseriensammlungen der Kunsthistorischen Museen in Wien," Jahrbuch der Kunsthistorischen Sammlungen in Wien 63 (1967), 7 - 38, A. Mislav-Bocheska, "Storied Tapestries: Scenes of Genesis," in J. Szablowski, ed., The Flemish Tapestries at Wawel Castle in Cracow. Treasures of King Sigismund Augustus Jagiello, Antwerp, 1972, 75 - 190, and M. Roethlisberger, "Deux tentures bruxelloises du milieu du XVI^e siècle," Oud-Holland 86, pt. 2 - 3 (1971), 88 - 115.
3. See Standen, "I, Tapestries," 6 - 15.
4. Even the fairly successful landscape of the left inside wing of the 1521 Job Alterpiece employed long-established conventions of overlapping hills.
5. For the pioneering study of the relationship of landscape depiction and subject matter see Erwin Panofsky, "Die Perspektive als symbolische Form," Vorträge der Bibliothek Warburg (1924 - 25), 258ff.
6. This little-studied series of ten tapestries is discussed most thoroughly by M. Crick-Kuntziger, La Tenture de l'histoire de Jacob, Antwerp, 1954 and d'Hulst, Flemish Tapestries, 183 - 192. The discovery of William de Kempeneere's mark and surviving order of 1534 to de Kempeneere from the merchant Jons de Veseleere establish the weaver for the set which was woven once again in 1539. Usually the 1534 order is considered as the Brussels set since it was known to have entered the collection of Cardinal Lorenzo Campeggi between 1528 and 1539. Confusing the issue is another now lost set formerly in the Spanish Royal Collection. Crick-Kuntziger favored it instead of the Brussels set as the editio princeps since the latter was not woven with gold thread. See M. Calberg and H. Pauwels, "Découverte de la marque du tapissier sur la tenture de l'histoire de Jacob," Bulletin des Musées Royaux d'Art et

et d'Histoire, ser. 4, 33 (1961), 112-- 113 and Crick-Kuntziger, Jacob, 28 - 29, 43, n. 24.

7. Though clearly in the style of Van Orley, the attribution of the complete series to him is somewhat problematic. Delmarcel noted a stylistic difference between the first four and last six tapestries, correctly distinguishing the former by the clarity of their compositions, the simple attitudes of figures, and the effective disposition of landscape and architectural elements in space, and the latter by a less harmonious arrangement of overabundant episodes and a weaker rapport between figures (G. Delmarcel, Tapisseries 2. Renaissance et Manierisme, Guide du visiteur, Brussels, 1979, 7). The unmistakably clear spatial separation in the first four tapestries into two-thirds and one-third compartments by columns (1 - 3) or a tree (4) is not carried out in any of the other six weavings. Though the known provenance does not reveal whether we are dealing here with two partial sets joined together at some point or with a collaboration between two artists, I believe we can find the clue in the fifth tapestry. The figure in the upper left-hand corner staring out at the viewer bears a remarkable resemblance to portraits of Pieter Coecke van Aelst (cf. the portrait engraving in D. Lampsonius, Pictorum aliquot celebrium inferioris effigies, Antwerp, 1572 and Coecke's Self-portrait with his Wife, Zurich, Kunsthau in Marlier, Frontispiece and 264, fig. 210). Coecke had returned from Italy by 1527, in time to help finish the designs, or to augment a partial set of them in the hands of Willem de Kempeneer. If Coecke's hand is evident here it is certainly under the direct guidance of his teacher Bernart van Orley.

8. See Horst Appuhn and Christian v. Heusinger, Riesenholtzschnitte und Papiertapeten der Renaissance, Unterschneidheim, 1976.

9. These multiblock prints made of nine and eight blocks respectively measure 79.7 x 111.1 cm. and 77.9 x 116.6 cm. Tilman Falk, whose vol. II of the Illustrated Bartsch, Early German Masters, New York, 1980, includes the Schäufelein prints has suggested a date of ca. 1525 (oral opinion, January, 1981).

10. For a helpful discussion of these prints see David Rosand and Michelangelo Muraro, Titian and the Venetian Woodcut, Washington, 1976 - 77, exh. cat., National Gallery.

11. For an illustration see Marlier, Pieter Coecke, 317.

12. Ludwig Baldass' study is the fundamental publication for the establishment of scholarly interest in Netherlandish landscape painting. Ludwig Baldass, "Die Niederländische Landschaftsmalerei von Patinir bis Bruegel," Jahrbuch der Kunstsammlungen des A. H. Kaiserhauses 34 (1917), 111 - 37.

In it he characterized Patinir's development along with that of eleven other Flemish painters from Isenbrandt to Bruegel. Subsequently the development of this category of Netherlandish art was dealt with most notably by Hoogewerff, Sterling, van Puyvelde, and Franz (see H. G. Hoogewerff, "Joachim Patinir en Italie," La Revue d'Art 45 [1928], 117 - 34; Charles Sterling, "Le Paysage fantastique néerlandais," L'art vivant 6 [1930], 270 - 2; Leo van Puyvelde, La Peinture flamande au siècle de Bosch et Bruegel, Brussels, 1962, 216 - 62; Heinrich G. Franz, Die niederländische Landschaftsmalerei in Zeitalter des Manierismus, Graz, 1969). Though there is not agreement on all issues the sum of these appraisals permits the division of landscape development into three major phases. 1500 - 30 fostered the proliferation of the panoramic Weltlandschaft of Patinir, Bosch and their followers. From 1530 - 60 landscape became more naturalistic, atmospheric and intimate in works by the Brunswick Monogrammist, Cornelis Massys and Pieter Bruegel. Late in the century artists such as Gillis van Coninxloo and Paul Brill led a generation of artists who were preoccupied with dramatic luminosity and expansive vistas.

Others have attempted to break down Baldass' chronological distinctions more completely. Cornelis van de Wetering (Die Entwicklung der niederländische Landschaftsmalerei vom Anfang des 16. Jahrhunderts bis zur Jahrhundertmittel, Berlin, 1938), for example, explained the differences between the generations of 1500 and 1530 as a nationalistic matter. The Weltlandschaft, he noted, was indigenous to the South Netherlands and the more intimate "park-like" Nahlandschaft, typically Dutch. In his estimation, Bruegel's art formed the fusion of these types in mid-century.

The "autonomous landscape" was discussed by both Gombrich and Raczynski ("Renaissance Artistic Theory and the Development of Landscape Painting," Gazette des Beaux-Arts, ser. vi, 41 [May - June, 1953], 335 - 60, and Die flämische Landschaft vor Rubens, Frankfurt am Main, 1937, respectively). The former argued that the demand for landscape as a mode in painting existed in Italy in the fifteenth to sixteenth centuries and that this made its development in the North possible. Raczynski characterized medieval landscapes as simply a Schauplatz for figures. He singled out the Italianate landscapes of Matthys Cock as the turning point between the medieval concept of and the "autonomous landscapes" of the seventeenth century, especially of Rubens. Added now to these studies is the more recent work of Detlef Zinke, Patinir's "Weltlandschaft" Studien und Materialien zur Landschaftsmalerei im 16. Jahrhundert, Frankfurt am Main, Bern, Las Vegas, 1977.

13. On the identification of sites see: J. Destrée, "Les Chasses," 8, 12; S. Pierron, Histoire illustrée de la Forêt de Soignes, III, Brussels, 1936, 366ff., 403ff.; P. Saintenoy, "Les arts," 30 - 35 and passim; P. Verhaegen,

"Le vieux Boitsfort," Annales de la Société Royale d'Archéologie de Bruxelles 33 (1927), 15 - 47.

14. See Ceulemans, De Jachlen, 64 - 65.

15. It is unlikely that Raphael's landscapes in the Acts of the Apostles cartoons served as models for Van Orley's concept. However, it is worth noting Shearman's observation that Raphael developed a new landscape style for this series, combining conventions of the Sistine frescoes and direct study of farms of the Campagna. Shearman, Raphael's Cartoons, 136.

16. A terminus post quem is established by the chapel of Filippus and Johannes built in 1522 by Charles V in memory of his ancestors. By 1527 the chapel as shown in the tapestry (illus. 77) was finished (Saintenoy, "Les arts" 2, 235 - 36, 253 - 54). A terminus ante quem is 1533, the date a new grand gallery was built onto the court (Ibid., 270).

17. These corrections were included in later tapestries, one of which was identified by Crick-Kuntziger (De tapijtwerken in het Stadhuis te Brussel, Antwerp, 1944, 24 - 26).

18. The drawing is inscribed "Dz ist zw Prüssel des diergarten und die hust hinden aus dem schloß hinab zu sehen." See Fedja Anzelewsky, "A propos de la topographie du Parc de Bruxelles et du quai de l'Escaut à Anvers," Bulletin van de Koninklijke Musea voor Schone Kunsten 6, no. 1 (1957), 87 - 107.

19. On the revised dating of this drawing see Burton L. Dunbar III, "A 'View of Brussels' by Cornelis Massys," Master Drawings 17, no. 4 (Winter, 1979), 392 - 401.

20. Illustrated in Saintenoy, "Les arts," pl. XVI.

21. The relationship of Dürer's print to Van Orley's work (particularly the View of Etterbeek, illus. 107) has been suggested by Anzelewsky in Pieter Bruegel d. A. als Zeichner, Berlin, 1975, 152.

22. Dürer recorded in the diary of his Netherlandish trip that he gave Margaret of Austria (Van Orley's employer) a complete set of his prints; since Van Orley entertained Dürer he may also have received some of the master's prints. See J. Veth and S. Muller, Albrecht Dürers Niederländische Reise 2 vols., Berlin and Utrecht, 1918. On the wide circulation of prints at the time see Henri Estienne, The Frankfurt Book Fair, trans. and ed. J. W. Thompson, Amsterdam, 1969.

23. Tapisseries bruxelloises, 144.

24. Vicomte Charles Terlinden, Charles Quint Empereur des Deux Mondes, Brussels, 1965, 201.
25. N. Beets, "The 'Small Cartoons'," 25 - 28 and "Barent van Orley," 145 - 71.
26. For a detailed analysis of this print series see Carol L. Troyen, Dürer's Life of the Virgin, dissertation, Yale University, University Microfilms, 1979.
27. The identification of the two figures at the table's far end as Maximilian I and Charles V is most convincingly supported by a South German alabaster plaque of 1529 (Vienna, Kunsthistorisches Museum; illustrated in J. Pope-Hennessy, The Portrait in the Renaissance, N. Y., 1963, illus. 189) in which the two profiles face one another. For other opinions about the identity of the two noblemen (variously called Maximilian I, Charles V, Ferdinand I, King Henry VIII and Jehan de Berge) see: Destrée, "Les Chasses," 12; d'Hulst, Flemish Tapestries, 172; Lugt, Inventaire, 55; and Bruegel, 154.
28. This was first suggested by Anzelewsky, Bruegel, 154.
29. This conclusion was also reached independently by Arnout Balis in "De 'Jachten van Maximiliaan', Kroonstuk van de Hoofse Jachticonografie," Gentse Bijdragen tot de Kunstgeschiedenis, 25 (1979 - 80), 31 - 32.
30. Anzelewsky, Bruegel, 154.
31. On the relationship of the Modus and Ratio tale to Van Orley's tapestry designs see Balis, "De 'Jachten'," 34 - 39.
32. Le Siezième Siècle Européen, Dessins du Louvre, Paris, 1965, exh. cat., Louvre, no. 69.
33. Anzelewsky, Bruegel, 152.
34. For differing opinions see d'Hulst, Flemish Tapestries, 154; G. J. Hoogewerff, Vlaamsche Kunst en Italiaansche Renaissance, Malines, Amsterdam, 1935, 135; Lugt, Inventaire, 52 - 57.
35. For a list of representations of the Battle of Pavia see Colin Bisler, Paintings from the Samuel H. Kress Collection. European Schools Excluding Italian, London, 1977, 88 - 90.
36. Illustrated in Tilman Falk, ed., The Illustrated Bartsch 11, Sixteenth Century German Artists, New York, 1980, 282.

37. Antonio Pais, "Tapisseries tissées d'après les cartons de Van Orley, représentant les épisodes de la bataille de Pavie et retrouvées au Musées de Naples," Les Arts 25 (January, 1904), 25.
38. Jean Giona, A. E. Murch, trans., The Battle of Pavia, 24th February 1525, London, 1963, 138 - 49.
39. For varying opinions see: Luca Beltrami, La Battaglia di Pavia, 21 Febbraio 1525, illustrata negli Arazzi del Marchese del Vasto al Museo Nazionale di Napoli, Milan, 1896; L. Conforti, "La bataille de Pavie. Tapisseries...", Les Arts Anciens de Flandres 3 (1908), 188 - 193; and d'Hulst, Flemish Tapestries, 151 - 54.
40. See note 38.
41. Hans Stöcklein, "Die Schlacht bei Pavia zum Gemälde des Ruprecht Heller," Beiträge zur Geschichte der deutschen Kunst, Oberdeutsche Kunst der Spätgotik und Reformationszeit 1 (1924), 230 - 39.
42. G. Vasari, Le vite de' piu eccellenti pittori, scultori e architettori, ed. G. Milanesi, Florence, 1906, 375 - 6.
43. J. Shearman, Raphael's Cartoons, 128 - 129.
44. In addition to these are other observations made by Wolfgang Krönig. In Romulus and Remus Fighting Robbers (illus. 51) he noted that the soldier at the far left comes from Marcantonio's translation of Raphael's forms in his print of David and Goliath (B. 10); in Romulus and Remus Delivering the Head of Amulius (illus. 52) Krönig called attention to the triangular composition of Raphael's Death of Ananias cartoon; the Sabine Hersilia with her Companions before Romulus and his Followers (illus. 53) he compared to Raphael's cartoon of the Charge to St. Peter; for Romulus as Supreme Judge (illus. 54) Krönig considered the influence of Raphael's cartoons for the Blinding of Elymas and the Death of Ananias as well as the architecture in the Offering of Paul and Barnabas at Lystra. Wolfgang Krönig, Der italienische Einfluss in der flämischen Malerei in ersten Drittel des 16. Jahrhunderts, Würzburg, 1936, 41 - 44, 84, 123 - 26.
45. See note 6. Of all the tapestries attributed to Van Orley these are the best preserved particularly in regard to original color. The Story of Jacob inspired a number of other Biblical series, among them the Story of Abraham, the Story of Moses and other Jacob sets. Though Marcel Roethlisberger ("Deux tentures," 88 - 115) presumes Van Orley's direct association with those works, I believe

their style is merely derivative and that they were produced after his lifetime.

46. Van Orley's earliest tapestry designs (e.g. the Notre-Dame du Sablon series, 1516 - 18) provide clear evidence of a particular interest in detailed description of his contemporary natural and social environment. The polychromer's studio and Beatrice Soetken's bedroom (illus. 1) show accoutrements of daily use. These objects -- some neatly arranged, others carelessly strewn around the room -- are depicted to a degree of detail not previously realized in either tapestry design or Van Orley's own paintings.

Though in the Notre-Dame du Sablon series the depiction of a local, historical event naturally called for details from everyday life in Brussels, scenes from the Passion of Christ do not necessarily require the same approach. Van Orley's inclusion of contemporary elements in Christ Carrying the Cross and the Crucifixion (illus. 28, 29) -- e.g. the coiled trumpet and shawl in the former, up-to-date weapons and carpenter's tools in each -- is a deliberate choice, emphasized by the prominent placement of these features in each composition.

Van Orley's inclusion of contemporary details already in his early tapestry designs, doubtless, had to do with several issues. First of all, Van Orley apparently recognized the requirements of the weaver's art. Because of restrictions of color modulation and technique, large open spaces presented a significant challenge for the early 16th century weaver in Brussels. The most visually successful weavings were still those which followed an intricate design. Van Orley's ingenious contribution was the filling of these spaces with objects from everyday life instead of the monotonous, ubiquitous flora of many contemporary tapestries. This predilection for the inclusion of numerous details did not pervade Van Orley's paintings or, as significantly, those tapestries most closely associated with his paintings.

47. See Troyen, Dürer's Life, 118.

48. For example, one may compare the stance of Abraham in illus. 108 with that of the fisherman standing in the Miraculous Draught of Fishes or the general pose of Laban in illus. 110 with the ax-wielding man in the Sacrifice of Lystra.

49. Shearman, Raphael's Cartoons, 129.

50. Ibid., 130.

51. Wauters, Tapisseries, 47 - 48.

52. On the appearance of these scientific studies in the Renaissance see Allen G. Debus, Man and Nature in the Renaissance, Cambridge, 1978; Otto Pächt, "Early Italian

Nature Studies and the Early Calendar Landscape," Journal of the Warburg Institute 13 (1950), 13 - 47; and Frank J. Anderson, An Illustrated History of the Herbals, New York, 1977.

53. See Ewart Oakeshott, European Weapons and Armor from the Renaissance to the Industrial Revolution, North Hollywood, Calif., 1980.

54. Illustrated in Charles-Quint, illus. 30, cat. 448.

55. Two illustrated inventories of Charles V's armor collection between 1540 - 50 exist: Inventaire Enluminé de la Collection d'Armes de Charles-Quint at the Real Armeria, Madrid and the Artilleria del Invictissimo Emperador Carolo V in the Österreichische Nationalbibliothek, Vienna. Helmut Nickel (Curator, Arms and Armor Department, Metropolitan Museum of Art) noted that the depiction of armor is representative for the period even though these may not be specific portraits of weapons as, for instance, in Titian's Portrait of Charles V at Muhlberg (verbally, June, 1981). The inclusion of details of arms and armor must have been left to a later stage than the preliminary drawings, for Van Orley's sketches indicate the costume and weapons in a more general way.

56. In his role as court painter to both Margaret of Austria and Mary of Hungary, Van Orley was often called upon to paint portraits of court members. Even before his appointment as painter in 1518, he was commissioned to paint the likenesses of the six children of Philip the Fair in 1515 and of Charles V and his sister Eleanor in 1516. The demand for portraits in and outside of the court then continued with the artist's service to Margaret of Austria and Mary of Hungary. These and the donor portraits on altarpieces (e.g. the Haneton Triptych, the Death of the Virgin triptych) are all of the conventional bust-length or kneeling full-length type. It was only in his tapestry designs that Van Orley involved some of these same personages in historical events and everyday genre scenes.

Even among his earliest works, such as the 1516 Legend of Notre-Damedu Sablon (illus. 1 - 4), the artist showed a particular interest in portraying known historical personalities in sufficient detail to enable their recognition. The event of 1348 is reenacted as if it were taking place in 1518 (except for the inclusion of Frederick III and Maximilian I). The third and fourth tapestries of the series show the participation of the postmaster general, François de Taxis (far right the third tapestry, illus. 3, and in all three divisions of the fourth tapestry, illus. 4). There is, as well, an anachronism in the presence of emperor Frederick III and his son Maximilian I (far right third tapestry, illus. 3), who are portrayed here in the establishment of the postal service. In the fourth tapestry

(illus. 4) numerous personages of the Hapsburg court take part when the statue of the Virgin arrives in Brussels. Kneeling before the statue at the far left is supposedly Duke Jean III, here represented with the features of Philippe le Beau. Again, the intended Duke Jean III and his son are replaced by the portraits of the young Charles V (left) and his brother Ferdinand (right) who carry the statue through town (the central scene). Philibert II of Savoy follows behind Charles and François de Taxis and his nephew Jean-Baptiste look on from the road's edge. At the far right the statue is venerated by Marie d'Evreux in guise of Margaret of Austria, and (from left to right) Ferdinand and his sisters Eleanor, Isabelle, Catherine and Marie -- at the back left is Theodora Luytvoldi, wife of François de Taxis. See Tapisseries bruxelloises, 92 - 99.

57. See Lugt, Inventaire, 52 - 57 for the most plausible suggestions of identification.

58. For example, above the horseman fleeing across the bridge in illus. 103 is "DDALENSO" identifying the Duke of Alençon.

59. See Schneebalg-Perelman, "Tapestry in Brussels," 106.

60. This is discussed in chapter 5.

61. Giona, Battle, 157 - 8.

62. The association of the hunt and love-making did not originate with Van Orley. Digby and Hefford cite a 1440 inventory of belongings of Amadeus VIII of Savoy which included "two tapestries, one with a hunt and love-making,..." (George W. Digby and Wendy Hefford, The Devonshire Hunting Tapestries, London, 1971, 29). However, the possible meaning intended is less clear. For the interpretation of some examples found in medieval art see Freeman, Unicorn Tapestries, 45 - 49. Arnout Balis suggested that the flirting couple relates to the month of May, as the same motif is found in that month in Der Scaepherders Kalengier of 1514 - 15 (Balis, "De 'Jachten'," 21).

63. Illustrated in F. W. H. Hollstein, German Engravings, Etchings, and Woodcuts, ca. 1400 - 1700 IV, Amsterdam, n.d., H. 53.

64. Because of these borrowings, a trip by Van Orley to Italy has been suggested by Baldass before 1520 ("Die Entwicklung des Bernart van Orley," Jahrbuch der Kunst-historischen Sammlungen in Wien, new series, 13 (1944), 141 - 191), by Alfred Wottmann and Karl Woermann between 1527 - 32. (Geschichte der Malerei II, Leipzig, 1882), by Alphonse Wauters in 1509 (Barend van Orley. Les Arts célèbres,

Paris, 1893), by A. J. Wauters between 1510 - 12 (Biographie nationale, 14, Brussels, 1901, 258 - 82) and by Aschenheim between 1510 - 14 (Charlotte Aschenheim, Der Italienische Einfluss in der vlämischen Malerei der Frührenaissance, Strassburg, 1910). But the evidence shows that Italianate influence was perceived by the artist through indirect means, mostly prints and drawings.

65. J. Pope-Hennessy, Raphael, New York, 1970, 27.

66. Van Orley may have been attracted to this print not only by the expressive figures of Michelangelo, but also the fact that Marcantonio joined them with a landscape depiction of Lucas van Leyden, a frequently consulted source for Van Orley's tapestry landscapes. A more often noted and locally accessible Michelangelesque source was the Bruges Madonna which Van Orley assimilated for his Holy Family (Paris, Louvre). See Dan Ewing, "The Influence of Michelangelo's Bruges Madonna," Revue Belge d'Archéologie et d'Histoire de l'Art 47 (1978), 77 - 105.

67. Ibid., 85 - 86.

68. See Edith Standen, "Sixteenth-Century Tapestries," 109 - 15.

CHAPTER FIVE

SUBJECT MATTER: VAN ORLEY'S INNOVATIVE APPROACH
TO DEVOTIONAL AND NARRATIVE TAPESTRIES

Except for devotional themes, the subject matter of Van Orley's tapestries is not found in his paintings. Perhaps because of this as well as the serial format of the medium, the artist sought a new approach to these depictions. He departed from the cyclical narrative form used for most tapestry subjects to adopt instead a different narrative mode each for devotional subjects, ancient historical or Biblical stories, and contemporary themes. His innovative approach, however, was limited to these; portraiture and allegories or triumphs apparently did not inspire a treatment counter to traditional ones.

The previous chapter included a discussion of how Van Orley added incidents and genre motifs to expand the event depicted, making it immediately accessible to the viewer. In his approach to the subject matter of devotional and narrative tapestries, Van Orley took even greater liberties. For devotional themes, he added or subtracted elements of the accustomed depictions for dramatic emphasis. For narrative subjects, he chose certain episodes of the story (not always those traditionally featured) in order to create a sense of anticipated climax or unresolved action. The artist's aim was to lead the viewer from one episode to the next toward the conclusion.

Though we may assume some preference on the part of the patron or, perhaps, court scholars for specific episodes

in a narrative sequence, there are no remaining documents to confirm this. Contemporary contracts and inventories yield little, for they describe subjects in an extremely summary manner. In my opinion, we must consider this consistent element in the tapestries, i.e. the manipulation of the subject matter for dramatic focus or emphasis, as characteristic of Van Orley's approach. His importance as a designer of tapestry rests on his reevaluation of established subjects. Through a study of Van Orley's innovations, we can establish both a clearer idea of his contribution to tapestry design and some additional criteria for judging questions of attribution.

Narrative Terminology

The terms used to discuss narrative in art go back to early medieval times when theologians, seeking to justify religious imagery, differentiated ~~between~~ ¹ imago (votive icon) and historia (didactic narrative). The latter illustrated Biblical stories and seems to have been used in a general way. Through medieval and Renaissance times a more flexible approach to these depictions evolved, whereby pictorial narrative was taken to include any image that attempted to illustrate or relate a story. This formed the basis for more recently developed categories and nomenclature.²

Refining the ideas of Robert and Wickhoff, Weitzmann established a convenient and clearly stated terminology

for pictorial narrative. Basing his conclusions on a study of the origins of book illustration, he noted three types.³ Where each scene is to be devoted simply to one event suggesting the unity of time and place, the monoscenic method is employed. In the cyclic method, the scene is meant to be read from left to right and the protagonist appears repeatedly. Finally, simultaneous narrative shows scenes of several events taking place at the same time and in one space. Renaissance pictorial narrative encompassed all three of these types which go hand in hand with some contemporary developments best described by Ringbom and Gombrich. In his study Icon to Narrative, Ringbom noted that even the closest form to the imago depiction, the Andachtsbild, acquired a strong narrative character in the fifteenth century.⁴ Gombrich asserted in Art and Illusion that imitation was perfected in ancient and Renaissance art in order to serve the ends of convincing and readable narratives.⁵ These developments are important to keep in mind, for it is Van Orley's expansion of themes in order to imitate true-life experience more convincingly which separates his sense of narrative from that of his predecessors.

Previous to Van Orley's time, tapestry design most often made use of the cyclic and monoscenic forms. The former was used almost exclusively for scenes of Biblical, historical or mythological history and the latter nearly always for tapestries which were replicas of paintings.

In essence, these two favored forms represented the dichotomy between historia and imago which continued in tapestry design long after it did in painting. However, with a number of changes at the end of the fifteenth and beginning of the sixteenth century, the woven art yielded to modifications taking place in other art forms. For example, in Van Orley's designs we can see the influence of a growing interest in naturalism and topics of everyday life, and the revival of illustrated texts made possible by new developments in printmaking and distribution. These and other factors contributed to a fuller description in the service of narration.

Devotional Themes

Already in his earliest designs, e.g. the Lamentation (illus. 13) and the Adoration of the Magi (illus. 18), Van Orley began to alter the standard devotional representations. As was noted in chapter two, the artist instituted some changes to accommodate tapestries and to differentiate them from their painted counterparts. At the same time, he boldly altered the narrative aspect of the theme represented. In the Lamentation, for instance, the Andachtsbild presentation of the Haneton Triptych (illus. 12) was restored to its narrative matrix whence it had previously been isolated.⁶ By introducing an additional anonymous mourning figure and the landscape background, Van Orley infused the depiction of the panel painting with

an element of realism and an implication of time and place. On the other hand, in the Adoration of the Magi the narrative content of the corresponding painting was reduced. The deeper space and multiple figures of the Johnson Collection panel (illus. 19) are removed to create the abbreviated representation of the tapestry devoted to the essential figures.⁷

These are only hints of the innovative approach Van Orley sought to introduce to tapestry design. A brief look at contemporary and preceding weavings which copy paintings almost exactly demonstrates this. Except for a few details of the interior scene, the Louvre St. Luke Painting the Virgin (illus. 161) of the first third of the sixteenth century is a mirror image of Roger van der Weyden's painting of the same subject (Boston, Museum of Fine Arts). Likewise, there is the tapestry of Trajan and Herkenbald (ca. 1445; illus. 162), a woven version of Roger's famous paintings of Justice made for the Town Hall of Brussels (destroyed in 1695). It is evident from drawings made after the wall paintings that the tapestry⁸ is closely allied to its model.

The Cyclic Method

The cyclic method, or a design of continuous narrative, was employed most often by Van Orley's predecessors. A classic example may be found within the set designed by Jan van Roome of the Story of David and Bathsheba (Paris,

Musée de Cluny). The eighth weaving of the group (illus. 163) represents five episodes of the tale. Beginning at the lower left and continuing to the upper right are these scenes: news of Nathan's fulfilled prophecy sends David to pray; (above) David prays and fasts, begging God to spare the life of his son; David enjoys a meal; (in the foreground) the message of the siege of Rabbah comes; (at the far right) David sets forth for Rabbah. In another example, from the Passion of Christ (Madrid, Patrimonio Nacional; illus. 164), the scenes are read from the center Descent from the Cross to the upper right Lamentation and the upper left Harrowing of Hell. Or, in the case of the 1513 Legend of Herkenbald (Brussels, Musées Royaux d'Art et d'Histoire; illus. 5) also designed by Jan van Roome, the story reads from upper left, to upper right, to the final scene in the center. Regardless of category -- Biblical histories, Passion cycles, legends -- the pattern remained the same with only slight changes in the positions of the scenes.

Van Orley rarely chose this cyclic presentation as it is used in the examples above. It does appear in what I consider his earliest extant drawing for tapestry design, the Legend of Appius Claudius and Virginia (London, British Museum; illus. 38)⁹. The choice may have been due partly to the early date of the design (ca. 1515 - 20) and the direct influence of Van Roome. However, it is equally plausible that Van Orley deliberately selected this mode.

because of the subject matter and purpose of the tapestry. At the lower left is M. Claudius who, at the bidding of the lecherous Appius Claudius, maintains before a lawyer and assembled citizens that Virginia is his slave because she is the daughter of one of his slaves. Above, the maiden's father, Virginius, and fiancé, L. Icilius, succeed with legal counsel in delaying a decision on the matter.¹⁰ Following in serpentine movement across to the right side are: Virginius questioning Virginia's wetnurse ("Notrice") before Appius Claudius about his daughter's parentage, Virginius stabbing Virginia to protect her from dishonor and shame, the horror of the assembled crowds on seeing the dead maiden, Virginius' escape from Rome.

This constitutes nearly the complete tale except for the eventual overthrow, imprisonment and suicide of Appius Claudius. The continuous narrative form is a logical choice when the requirements are to compress the entire story into one tapestry. Since this is the only such design which remains, any theories about the commission must remain speculative. It may have existed alone as an exemplum virtutis or, more likely, was meant to be one of a series depicting famous virtuous women such as Esther, Lucretia, Susanna, Cloelia and Judith. Possibly a woven set similar to Duke Wilhelm IV of Bavaria's later painted series (1528¹¹ - 37) for his "Lusthaus" in Munich was contemplated. Or, as in the didactic tapestry of the Legend of Herkenbald (illus. 5), Van Orley's design fit into a planned series

of unjust and/or just rulers. Because of the prominent placement of both Appius Claudius and Virginia, either could be the case. Of the events depicted in this story Van Orley chose to feature the moment of greatest emotional pitch--namely Virginius' attempt to clear his daughter and, this failing, his protection of her honor by killing her. In later designs, Van Orley featured certain episodes to retain the viewer's interest and attention over a series of multiple weavings.

Considered by most to be Van Orley's earliest extant tapestry series,¹² the Legend of Notre-Dame du Sablon (illus. 1-4) employs a continuous narrative mode altered from that of the designer's predecessors, Jan van Roome and Adrian van den Houte. Though the scenes may still be read from left to right, the three basic units of each tapestry are so totally separated one from the next that they form a triptych. Earlier works, like the Herkenbald tapestry (illus. 162) also show units divided by columns, but with overlapping draperies of figures from one section to the next forming a continuous space. In the Notre-Dame set, even where there are two scenes within a unit (e.g. in scene three; illus. 3) each is a separate entity, the figures in the background being adequately reduced in size to allow for a readable space.

Van Orley's alteration of the spatial concept to allow for a more easily read narrative is a departure from his antecedents in whose work one part of the story merged with

the next. In order to present an absolutely clear reading of the Notre-Dame story, accompanying legends were placed¹³ in the borders above and below, designated by letter.

The Modified Cyclic Method: the Epitomized Cycle

As Van Orley achieved a certain facility with the special requirements of tapestry design, he developed further his own sense of narrative. For Biblical, historical and mythological subjects, he chose to use a modification of the traditional cyclic form. That is, he limited these narratives increasingly to highlights or, as Weitzmann calls it, an epitomized cycle.¹⁴ This development can be shown best in the Passion tapestries of 1520 - 25 (illus. 27, 28, 29, 34). Somewhat later this epitomized cycle was further refined to feature those elements of the story which represented the greatest emotional pitch or moments of heightened drama in the sense of unresolved emotion. As will presently be discussed, it is partly due to this new feature in tapestry narratives that Van Orley's designs may be distinguished from workshop versions.

The weavings of the Passion of Christ must be differentiated from those previously mentioned in a discussion of single devotional tapestries. As the latter are closely associated with panel paintings by Van Orley, they do not belong to the category currently under discussion. In this incomplete set there is only a slight reference to any

events other than those featured, and in some cases the usual subsidiary scenes are left out altogether. In the Lehman Collection Last Supper (illus. 34) the episode of Christ washing the feet of the disciples is hardly recognizable in the right background. In the left and right background of Christ in the Garden of Gethsemane (Washington, National Gallery; illus. 27) are tiny representations of the advancing soldiers and Christ appearing after the Crucifixion. With some difficulty the Ecce Homo may be recognized in the far distance of Christ Carrying the Cross (Paris, Jacquemart-André Museum; illus. 28). The Crucifixion weaving (Washington, National Gallery; illus. 29) stands on its own. Perhaps, if this was the central tapestry of the series, its totally monoscenic format was planned intentionally for greater emphasis. Elimination of subsidiary scenes allows for special consideration of one particular theme. The resulting detailed depiction of the featured event reflects developments in devotional piety at the time.

The Passion plays doubtless influenced some of Van Orley's depictions. The end of the fifteenth and the beginning of the sixteenth centuries saw the growth and popularization of narrative treatments of the Passion. This manifested itself in vernacular Passion tracts excerpted and expanded from earlier devotional literature such as Ludolph of Saxony's Vita Christi or the Pseudo-Bonaventure's Meditationes Vitae Christi. These in turn prompted the

development of Passion plays, a mirror of the emotional religious fervor of the times.¹⁵ Among the better known plays were those of Arnoul Gréban of ca. 1450 and Jean Michel of 1486.¹⁶ The latter work was especially noted for its expanded narrative, heightened dramatic sense, and full development of characters. It continued to be popular into the mid-sixteenth century with fifteen new editions.¹⁷

The close association between the Passion plays and tapestry design has often been noted. The attention to detail in elaboration of narrative episodes, the stage-like monumentality of the scenes and their movement from left to right mark the similarities. An account of Philip II's entry into Louvain during his 1549 - 50 trip to the Netherlands stated it succinctly. Speaking of a tableau vivant performance in Philip's honor, it says "...l'expression des acteurs, hommes et femmes, offraient un spectacle merveilleux: on eut dit une tapisserie vivante."¹⁸

Though comparisons with Passion plays may be apt, it is only necessary to note the all-pervasive emotional realism in Passion meditations of the time. As Marrow has pointed out, the fifteenth century experienced the growth of the narrative Passion tract as a result of devotional piety which swept through Germany and the Low Countries. "Increased ... readership of Passion literature due to adoption of vernacular texts and tendencies toward intensely emotional religiosity led to a dramatic rise in

its pathetic content and to its greatest degree of narrative elaboration."¹⁹

Thus, in Christ Carrying the Cross (illus. 28) the motifs of Christ kicked and beaten, of the Jews blowing their trumpets and horns, of the mocking children, can all be related to specific texts.²⁰ The realism of the event is made all the more compelling by the attention to contemporary details: the musical instruments, the costumes of many of the figures, and the elevated wagon wheels on which criminals are left to die (in the far right background).

By featuring specific scenes from the Passion narrative in his tapestries, Van Orley came closer to establishing unity of time and place. With the addition of details from contemporary life, he approximated the viewer's own environment. The de-emphasis of the narrative continuum manipulates the observer's attention to concentration on one scene and its dramatic presentation, evoking from the observer, perhaps, the anticipated empathic response.

The Modified Cyclic Method: Episodic Emphasis

Van Orley was a quintessential storyteller. Biblical, historical and mythological tales all offered opportunities for tapestry design that were unavailable to him in painting, and he excelled in arranging scenes to convey best the essence of the narrative. For this purpose, Van Orley often chose the most dramatic moment or one of unresolved emotion in order to hold the viewer's interest. This episodic empha-

sis is different from the epitomized cycle of the Passion scenes just discussed in two ways. As the establishment of a human dilemma was of principal importance, it often necessitated a featured representation of more than the one event of the epitomized cycle. Secondly, whereas each tapestry of the epitomized cycle could stand convincingly on its own as well as in a series, the individual parts of a representation using episodic emphasis are dependent upon each other. Certain scenes propose a dilemma which can only be resolved by reading on to the next tapestry. The Story of Romulus and Remus and the Story of Jacob show Van Orley's clever manipulation of the narrative to involve the viewer in this way.

For the Story of Romulus and Remus (also called the Founding of Rome) we have a set of drawings, probably incomplete, signed with Van Orley's monogram and dated 1524 (Munich, Staatliche Graphische Sammlung; illus. 49 - 52) and a set of tapestries (La Granja, Spanish Royal Collection; illus. 165 - 170).²¹ Both have been ascribed to Van Orley, but, on the basis of narrative representation, it is apparent that the designer is not the same for both sets. Each series relies on the account of the story as it is found²² in volume I of Titus Livius' history. The featured events, however, differ significantly. The drawings employ episodic emphasis; the tapestries do not.

In two of the drawings from the Munich group, Romulus and Remus are shown attacking robbers, sharing the booty

with their shepherd companions (illus. 49), and advancing toward Numitor with the head of Amulius (illus. 50). These are both action scenes with the added element of anticipated climax. The result of the former is the capture of Remus by Amulius' men, and of the latter, the replacement on the throne of Amulius by Numitor. The tapestry set shows instead a tranquil, self-contained scene of Romulus and Remus tending their flocks (illus. 165) and the staid procession of Numitor as he is made king (illus. 166). Far in the background of illustration 166 are the fight with the robbers and the murder of Amulius. The tapestries feature the results of more turbulent action rather than events leading up to them.

Although we are missing as many as four scenes from the group of drawings, in the designs which do remain it is clear that there is a deliberate narrative motion proposed. That is, ongoing action is propelled by scenes such as Romulus and Remus attacking robbers and running into court with the head of Amulius. Action is slowed at the end of the series by two scenes with little action -- Romulus distributing the law to the people and Hersilia, a Sabine woman, presented to Romulus (illus. 51 and 52). By contrast, the woven version (illus. 165 - 170) maintains a consistently static mode by depicting with little or no activity episodes which are the result of violent or unresolved action. Because of this each tapestry stands alone as a separate unit, not as part of a continuous narrative.

Though this set relates to Van Orley's designs in its deep space and figure types, it does not possess the mastery of manipulation of episodes demonstrated in the drawings. Most likely, it is a variation of Van Orley's designs by a workshop or studio assistant.²³ Van Orley strayed little from the narrative source, but he did take liberties with episodic emphasis. His approach is more empathic than didactic or simply illustrative.

The first few decades of the sixteenth century experienced a renewed interest in Biblical themes, particularly those of the Old Testament. As Strumwasser pointed out, Old Testament stories were "frequently understood as a historical narrative running from generation to generation." They set up human dramas spanning all aspects of life from "birth to death, love to hate, embracing even questions of politics and social behavior."²⁴ Lucas van Leyden was among the artists who led the way to interpreting these Biblical stories for more than their symbolic content, focusing instead on their anecdotal and narrative content.²⁵

Very much in the same spirit is Van Orley's Story of Jacob (Brussels, Musées Royaux d'Art et d'Histoire; illus. 107 - 116). The depictions of the story of Jacob in fifteenth and sixteenth century Netherlandish art are extremely rare. The most familiar image before Van Orley's 1525 - 30 series is the large-scale drawing by Hugo van der Goes of Jacob and Rachel,²⁶ which may have been a preparatory sheet for a wall painting. The most detailed cycles are found

in the sixth century Vienna Genesis. From that time multi-illustrated depictions do not seem to appear again until after Van Orley's and then mostly in printed Bibles such as Plantin Moretus' Antwerp Bible of 1573. Even Vincidor's six scenes from the Vatican Logge could not have influenced Van Orley since they differ markedly.²⁷

We must assume, then, that Van Orley's narrative was more inspired by its Genesis text than by any particular visual precedents. If this is indeed the case, then his manipulation of the narrative for dramatic focus (i.e. his selection of story segments with the most profound emotive force) is worthy of note. The main scenes represented are: the blessing of Jacob, Jacob's departure and dream, the meeting of Jacob and Rachel, the division of the flock, Jacob's departure, the alliance of Jacob and Laban, the reconciliation of Jacob and Esau, Jacob and the Shechemites, Joseph sold by his brothers, and Jacob and Joseph reunited.

Some of these episodes are often portrayed. The difference, however, is Van Orley's exploitation of the psychological potential of the narrative by his choice of scenes of leave-taking or anticipated climax. He thus appealed to the expectation of the viewer who necessarily would read further to discover how the drama developed. By stressing the less conventional scenes of the story, Van Orley built into his narrative a sense of unresolved action. For example, in the second tapestry (illus. 108) the scene usually featured, Jacob's dream, is relegated to the right third of the

tapestry while Rebecca's warning to her son to flee Esau's wrath is given more space for representation. In other words, Rebecca's warning establishes a problem which is resolved in the dream scene. In the third tapestry (illus. 109) Jacob and Rachel reveal their identity to each other only in the background (at the left). The cause for that meeting is the featured scene; Rachel shyly looks on as Jacob removes the stone from the well where the maiden's sheep must drink. The right third of this tapestry (now lost, see illus. 109a) is the result of this first chance meeting, the wedding scene.²⁸

This pattern of action and reaction or of anticipated climax is used further in the tapestry series, but now from tapestry to tapestry rather than from scene to scene within one tapestry. The fourth weaving (illus. 110) depicts chapter 30 of Genesis. In the Biblical rendition, more than half of the chapter is devoted to the inability of Rachel to bear children until the birth of Joseph (verses 1 - 24). Another substantial portion deals with the discussion between Jacob and Laban about Jacob's ensuing departure (verses 25 - 34). These two matters, as well as a scene of Jacob tending the flocks, fill the background space. But the verses Van Orley chose to feature were 34 - 35, that is, the actual division of the flock. This sets up the inevitable result in the depiction of the next tapestry. It shows Jacob's hasty departure upon

learning of Laban's jealousy at his growing wealth, the outcome of Jacob's successful breeding of the flock.

Likewise, in the ninth tapestry (illus. 115), Van Orley established the anguish of Jacob at the sight of his son's bloody robe in order to prepare for the tenth scene where Jacob and Joseph are reunited (illus. 116). The remaining scenes depicted here -- the death of Jacob and the blessing of his grandsons among them -- though substantial parts of chapter 35, 37 and 42, are not imbued with the same emotional impact and unresolved questions as the featured scene.

The other means by which Van Orley ensures the viewer's sustained interest is a sense of quickened pace in the story. line.. In episode one of the Jacob series (illus. 107) the design rather equally emphasizes three scenes (from left to right, but not in chronological order). Tapestries two and three (illus. 108, 109, 109a) highlight two main scenes. Thereafter, since the major themes of the plot have been established, one specific event almost invariably takes precedence over the others represented. These occur for the most part in open vistas. The last tapestry (illus. 116) emphatically closes off the narrative sequence by architectural elements at the right side as if adding a period to the last sentence of the story.

Simultaneous Narrative: the Hunts of Maximilian and Battle of Pavia

With the Hunts of Maximilian and Battle of Pavia, Van Orley firmly established contemporary events as an appropriate subject for tapestry. He chose a narrative mode different from the one he had used for either devotional themes or Biblical and ancient historical subjects. In order to imitate true-life experience, Van Orley employed the simultaneous form in which several events take place at the same time in one space. As with his other tapestry designs, he featured one event in the foreground plane, again not always one which followed the given textual source explicitly. In both the Hunts and the Battle of Pavia, we happen upon occurrences surrounding the main theme, such as hunters en route to a meeting place rather than depictions strictly limited to hunting procedures, or the flight of the military entourage in place of a specific battle. In this way the viewer is led to experience the narrative as he does his own life, as a continuum of major and minor events, not solely major ones.

Though there are no details about the commission of the Hunts of Maximilian, there is general agreement that the request came from the Habsburg court, probably from Charles V or Margaret of Austria.³⁰ This series is quintessentially up-to-date. It joins together a new reliance on observation of flora and fauna, a unity of man and nature and a

sense of the relationship between man and the macrocosm. The series also continues a long tradition of court art which advanced the notion that hunting was not only an essential part of the training of a nobleman but that it strengthened those who would participate in it both morally and physically.³¹

The subject matter of the Hunts is a combination of myth and reality, allegory and fact. Some of the stylistic sources for the representation were discussed in the previous chapter. Here the intent is to investigate Van Orley's use of the possible subject sources for what may be described as a pictorial guide to hunting procedures.

Though there were hunting allegories (e.g. Allegorical Hunt, André Collection)³² and intentionally realistic hunt scenes (e.g. the Devonshire Hunts, Victoria and Albert Museum)³³ in tapestry before this time, the Hunts of Maximilian is one of the first series so obviously to join the two together. February (illus. 86), the last scene, has a Latin cartouche which in translation says the following:

If you neglect not what is just and live well,
no evil do but fulfill your duty to everyone;
what -- when Modus gives the rules and Queen
Ratio the commands -- can there be more
beautiful than the hunt to cultivate?

Free of emptiness and greediness and striving
for honor, you reason. Through this work you
cherish your body; with these exercises the
year in joy passes and your blissful life runs
throughout days of health.³⁴

One possible source for the cartouche is Henri de Ferrières' Livre des Déduis du Roi Modus et de la Reine Ratio (written between 1354 - 76). Well known in the fif-

teenth and sixteenth centuries and among the volumes in the library of Margaret of Austria, it consists of two parts: 135 chapters of a hunting treatise and 119 of the "Songe de Pestilence." As Balis pointed out, however, this treatise alone does not provide enough information for the tone of the verses.³⁵

The second portion of the verses, in particular, relates to ideas in the prologue of another famous hunting treatise, Gaston Phébus' Livre de la Chasse (written 1387 - 91).³⁶ Still unexplained, however, is the act of Modus and Ratio stamping on Otium and Gula (in antique dress). Neither the Ferrières nor the Phébus treatises describes this action which may have been based on pictorial tradition.³⁷

The anachronism of Charles V and Ferdinand I appearing along with Maximilian I contradicts the idea that this is an actual hunt. The appearance of these three as well as other members of the Habsburg court (not all of whom could have met at any one time for the hunt) establishes this series as an allusion to the continuation of good, just leadership.³⁸ Similar statements were made in other art forms, for example in a game table (Vienna, Kunsthistorisches Museum)³⁹ whose program is the glorification of Charles V and his brother Ferdinand I. It represents Charles among the portraits of Albrecht II, Frederick III, Maximilian I and Philip the Handsome as well as those of four great monarchs of ancient times: Ninus, Cyrus, Alexander and Romulus.

Ceulemans has suggested another parallel in a poem by Hughes Salel, La Chasse Royal, which relates a fight of Francis I and Charles V against the wild boar, a personification of discord. The allegory tells of nations at peace and the new political rapprochement between the two monarchs; it also includes other major political figures of the time (e.g. Pope Paul III, Eleanora of France, Mary of Hungary and Christina of Denmark, among others). Though slightly later (1536 - 39) than the date of the Hunts tapestries, this poem, nonetheless, is typical of the allegories relating court members and the hunts.⁴⁰

On the other hand, the systematic treatment of the hunt brings to this series a sense of realism not found outside of the hunting books. The series continues a traditional court interest in the hunts featured in the writings of Charles' grandfather, Maximilian. Among these are the Tiroler Jagdbuch, Fischereibuch and Das Geheime Jagdbuch. In essence, the Maximilian Hunts are a visual counterpart to these practical treatises on the hunt.

Though there is no precedent for ordering hunt scenes by the zodiac, this scheme undoubtedly puts the program on a higher level, giving a spiritual basis for very practical, everyday occurrences.⁴¹ At the same time, this arrangement of scenes on a monthly basis imposed an artificial scheme on the most noble hunt, that of the stag and wild boar, which ordinarily took place only a few months out of the year.⁴² If this choice of the stag and boar hunt was

imposed on Van Orley, it nevertheless served his narrative scheme well. A depiction of the hunt of a different animal for each month would have destroyed the continuity of the scenes.

Using Phébus' text as his source, Van Orley spread over several months events which otherwise could be compressed into a few days of hunting. His clever manipulation of the text also guaranteed that no representation would be inappropriate to the month at hand. Phébus explained that the stag and the boar are pursued in autumn and winter.⁴³ In compliance, Van Orley filled the months of August through October with the stag hunt and November through January with the boar hunt.

The months of March through July depict other procedures explained by Phébus: setting out for the hunt (March), the special training and care of the dogs (April), the preparation of the meal before the hunt (May), the meal itself (June), instructions to the hunters (July).⁴⁴ The procession to the prearranged meal site, the anticipation of how the hunting instructions would be carried out, or whether the quarry would succumb, all keep the viewer reading to the following tapestry.

Other tapestries offer the spectator an illustrated instruction on individual hunting procedures. The December attack of the boar (illus. 84) follows the Phébus text closely. In attacking the boar, the huntsman is to slow his horse, rear up on his stirrups and try to hit the animal with his

pike. If he succeeds, the boar squeals in pain and then is besieged by the pack of dogs.⁴⁵ The text speaks through Van Orley's representation.

Though individual analysis of each scene is not possible here, these few examples give an indication of the artist's approach. Phébus' instructions were the textual core to which Van Orley added details from actual and imaginary occurrences. There is a sequence to the events depicted. However, they did not suggest to Van Orley a cyclic method or continuous narrative treatment. Rather, in this case, the effort to approximate reality dictated a more natural representation of events.

Aside from the aesthetic value of the hunt promoted by Phébus' writings and its moral lessons stressed in the Livres des Déduis du Roi Modus et de la Reine Ratio, the chase was looked upon as an ideal way to keep the body fit and in practice for military campaigns. In The Prince Machiavelli stressed the importance of the hunt for keeping the ruler in good health and allowing him complete familiarity with his region for future use in military maneuvers.⁴⁶ In other words, war in many respects was understood as a parallel to the hunt. Van Orley reflected this in numerous ways in the Hunts of Maximilian and the Battle of Pavia; in the importance given to topography and especially in the accurate description of costumes, weapons and trained actions and reactions of the participants. In both tapestry sets,

the essence of the narrative conveyed pertained to the human interaction or drama suggested by the text.

As with the Hunts of Maximilian, each of the seven tapestries of the Battle of Pavia (illus. 95 - 101) features one event from a series of those which occurred simultaneously. Unusual in this narrative treatment is that the events depicted happened in an extremely short period of time (less than a day); it is by no means the total battle story. Van Orley dealt here with an entire set of tapestries as he usually did with each scene. That is, the most dramatic moment was chosen, the phase of the battle in which the imperial troops gained control, and this moment was expanded in a detailed way over seven tapestries. Possibly the commission stipulated a series concentrating on this phase of the battle.⁴⁷

Military maneuvers were popular subjects for tapestries before Van Orley's time. However, these were more often representations of mythological battles or wars waged in the histories of famous heroes like Caesar or Charlemagne. Among them are the well-known History of Troy (based on the romance of Benoît de Saint-More),⁴⁸ the History of Caesar,⁴⁹ the History of Charlemagne,⁵⁰ and Alexander and King Nicholas of Caesarea.⁵¹ Legend and myth form the basis of these weavings which often aimed at the association of contemporary rulers with former kings and heroes.

There were some precedents for Van Orley's Battle of Pavia, though these were apparently in the minority and have not survived. The Battle of Roosebeke, given in 1386 to

Philip "Le Hardi" by Michael Bernard of Arras, was last noted⁵² in the sixteenth century after which it disappeared. Still remaining are a set representing the exploits of the fourteenth century freedom fighter Du Guesclin⁵³ and three panels⁵⁴ of the Conquest of Arzila by Alphonse V of Portugal. Though these are significant departures from the romantic legend weavings, they still present the subject in the standard melee form. The further jump to representation of actual maneuvers in a battle and verity of detail in regard to location, weaponry, etc. is not truly made in tapestry until Van Orley's Battle of Pavia.

What distinguishes this tapestry series from other contemporary battle scenes in paintings and prints is that it does not take the Überschaubild approach. The Überschaubild has a built-in limitation; it is inimical to dramatic concentration on the decisive moment. By featuring one event the artist enhances the sense of on-the-spot reportage and, thereby, the realism of the scene. Van Orley chose this approach which was to be most influential for military battle depictions thereafter in tapestry.⁵⁵

There is no agreement about the exact order of events as they took place on February 24, 1525. As a result, there⁵⁶ is confusion about the sequence of Van Orley's scenes. Therefore, we must examine the weavings individually and as a set to understand the artist's approach. As in the Hunts of Maximilian, the featured scenes here are about equally divided between events which are known to have taken

place and those which are added from imagination. The intent was to give a complete chronicle of war, the significant battles as well as the more personal human dramas involved.

Van Orley began the series with a clear indication of the melee of battle; illustration 95 shows the advance of the Spanish arquebusiers under the Marquis of Pescara and the cavalry led by the Constable of Bourbon, and illustration 96 the disorder caused by the assault on the French artillery and near extermination of the "Black Regiment" by the lansquenets of Fundsberg and the arquebusiers led by the Marquis of Pescara. In the third tapestry (illus. 97), Van Orley placed the invasion of the encampment of Francis I by the lansquenets of the Marquis of Vasto in the middleground in order to convey the human drama of deserters and members of the military entourage in flight. In illustration 98, de Leyva's cavalry is seen in the left background pouring out of the gates of Pavia in order to attack the rear guard of the enemy; the more poignant drama of the Swiss soldiers forced into the Ticino River and scrambling over the retaining wall is featured. In other words, what comprises the horror of war for Van Orley is not a series of documented skirmishes but the personal tragedies of those involved, including the cowardly escape of the Duke of Alençon (illus. 99) and the surrender of Francis I (illus. 101). This approach also keeps the viewer's interest as he becomes personally involved in the varied emotional pitch of each scene. Though we cannot be sure what account of the

battle Van Orley consulted, it is likely that his treatment relates an amplified version which more closely imitated true-life experience.

Other Representations: Portraiture, Allegories, Triumphs

There are a few subjects among Van Orley's tapestry designs which fall outside the category of narrative representation.⁵⁷ These themes (e.g. portraiture and triumphs) did not suggest an innovative approach to Van Orley.

Because the subject of tapestry portraiture is little studied and few examples remain which can be identified convincingly, Van Orley's designs for the Nassau Genealogy (illus. 53 - 57) appear at once as a startling, innovative series.⁵⁸ Upon closer scrutiny, the subject matter itself is less innovative than Van Orley's treatment of it.

Single portraits are not anomalous to the art of weaving. Double portraits, however, are somewhat rarer. Painted double portraits were to be found in civic buildings and religious institutions as decorations on the walls.⁵⁹

Van Acker cites the examples in the Ypres Town Hall, panels in the Ter Duinen Abbey, and frescoes in the Gravenkapel, Courtrai.⁶⁰

Inventories mention similar portraits in tapestry. There is, for example, a full-length double portrait of Margaret of France, Countess of Artois and her son, Louis de Mâle, Count of Flanders, listed in the 1404 inventory of Philip the Bold's possessions.⁶¹ However, the only surviving fifteenth century double portrait in tapestry

seems to be of a couple under a tent (Paris, Musée des Arts décoratifs), identified by Cetto as portraits of Duke Louis I of Savoie and his wife, Anne de Lusignan.⁶²

Portraiture was an important part of Van Orley's realistic depiction of contemporary events, as in the designs for the Hunts of Maximilian or the Battle of Pavia. Individual woven portraits in his work are rare and equestrian portraits are unusual for tapestry. Few previous examples remain.⁶³ As Fock has pointed out, the closest parallels for Van Orley's Nassau Genealogy may be found in contemporary prints.⁶⁴ The most convincing examples are a woodcut series of ca. 1515 of the Counts and Countesses of Holland attributed to Lucas van Leyden and a woodcut representing the children of Philip the Fair on horseback (anonymous Flemish, ca. 1525; illus. 171).

Though Van Orley's composition of male and female riders facing one another on the front plane may have derived from prints of processions and formal portraits, the informality of the riders as they appear to be arriving before a spacious landscape setting may be found in a few tapestry portraits. An example is a drawing made for Roger de Gaignières (1642 - 1715) after tapestries now destroyed (illus. 172). In each case, Marguerite de la Rochefoucauld is surrounded by her family and courtiers in an enclosed garden before a landscape or cityscape.

For the Nassau Genealogy Van Orley seems to have united two concurrent trends in portraiture, the formal equestrian

portrait and the more casual portrait group. In gesture and pose, the Nassau figures present an image similar to a candid photograph. The artist's innovation was to place equestrian portrait figures within a narrative context, as if they had just arrived at the location depicted. His fine decorative sense allowed for the identifying inscriptions and coats of arms without disruption of the flow of the composition.

Among the popular representations in tapestries of early sixteenth century Flanders are allegories of man's moral struggles. These include the Redemption of Man, the allegories inspired by Petrarch's I Trionfi, and the battles waged between the vices and Christian virtues. Van Orley's contribution to this subject consists of an incomplete set of drawings for a triumph of virtues (Triumph of Justice, illus. 42; Triumph of Fortitude, illus. 46; Allegory of Pestilence, illus. 43), an allegory of death or war (illus. 45) and a single sheet possibly representing sacred and profane learning (illus. 44). Only one of these designs, the Triumph of Justice,⁶⁵ has survived in woven form.

Before Van Orley's time, the triumphs were generally a diverse group in subject matter. They had in common a central point of emphasis (a triumphal chariot or group of figures) around which other subsidiary stories or themes were depicted.⁶⁶ Van Orley hardly strayed from the status quo in this regard. In each of the triumph scenes the chariot moves across the foreground; around it are figures supporting

the central subject. There is less of an attempt here than in other categories of Van Orley's designs to depict a deep space and realistic scene. Rather, the design emphasizes the confusion of figures and figure groups characteristic for each virtue. The treatment was the same for the allegories of war and learning.

Van Orley was foremost a storyteller. In his approach to devotional themes as well as ancient historical, Biblical and contemporary subjects, he rejected the established tapestry representations. In reevaluating these subjects he blended fact with imagined events. Most importantly, he imbued each story with all aspects of the human condition, covering a range of behavior, emotions and daily foibles not previously included in tapestry. Van Orley's achievement in this regard has made these subjects immediately accessible both to the sixteenth century viewer and to the observer of today.

Notes to Chapter 5

1. Sixten Ringbom, Icon to Narrative, Abo, 1965, 11 - 16.
2. See Franz Wickhoff, Die Wiener Genesis, Vienna, 1895 and Kurt Wetizmann, Illustrations in Roll and Codex. A Study in the Origin and Method of Text Illustration, Princeton, 1947. Among the most recent discussions of narrative are Sandra Hindman, "Fifteenth Century Dutch Bible Illustration and the Historia Scholastica," Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes 37 (1974), 131 - 44 and Peter Parshall, "Lucas van Leyden's Narrative Style," Nederlands Kunsthistorisch Jaarboek 29 (1978), 185 - 237.
3. Weitzmann, Roll and Codex.
4. Ringbom, Icon to Narrative, 58.
5. E. H. Gombrich, Art and Illusion, New York, 1960, 129. This is not the same as what Svetlana Alpers describes as ekphrasis in her confusing study, "Describe or Narrate? A Problem in Realistic Representation," New Literary History 8 (1976), 15 - 41.
6. This dramatic close-up format is derived from Hugo van der Goes' Deposition. See Ringbom, Icon to Narrative, 134 - 41 and Brigitte Völker, Die Entwicklung des Erzählenden Halbfigurenbildes in der Niederländischen Malerei des 15. und 16. Jahrhunderts, dissertation, Göttingen, 1968, 156 - 61. On the definition of Andachtsbild and its distinction from "devotional image" see Ringbom, 52 - 58.
7. Standen, "Sixteenth-Century Tapestries," 115.
8. Schneebalg-Perelman, "Tapestry in Brussels," 104ff. and A. M. Cetto, Der Berliner Traian - und Herkenbald - Teppich, Berne, 1966.
9. Popham, Catalogue, 35 (with some minor confusion about the scenes and inscriptions). I would date this drawing ca. 1515-20, earlier than the 1524 Munich Romulus and Remus series (Popham's suggestion) because the penwork is tighter and less fluid and the poses of figures more staid than in the Munich drawings.
10. This is probably a mistake. In Livy's account L. Icilius and his uncle, P. Numitorius, arrange the delayed decision while Virginus is still in military camp. See G. Wissowa, W. Kroll, and K. Witte, Paulys Real-Encyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft, Stuttgart, 1894-1967, 8A², reihe 2.

11. For more information on this series see Halldor Soehner, ed., Altdeutsche Malerei, Munich, 1963, 202 - 17, illus. 288 - 300.

12. See M. Crick-Kuntziger, La Tenture de la Legende de Notre-Dame du Sablon, Antwerp, 1942; Crick-Kuntziger, "Bernard van Orley," 72 - 76, 87; Tapisseries bruxelloises, 85 - 99.

13. As Anne van Buren points out, these alternating legends have no equivalent in surviving fifteenth century tapestries in which titles appear in one or another border, but not both. She also suggests that these titles served to advance the rather static representation of the Sablon series. See 366ff. in "The Model Roll of the Golden Fleece," The Art Bulletin 61 (September, 1979).

14. Weitzmann, Roll and Codex, 23.

15. See Larry Salmon, "The Passion of Christ in Medieval Tapestries," in Acts of the Tapestry Symposium, San Francisco, 1976, 79 - 101 and James Marrow, "Circumdederunt me canes multi: Christ's Tormentors in Northern European Art of the Late Middle Ages and Early Renaissance," The Art Bulletin 59 (June, 1977), 167ff. and note 10.

16. See Gaston Paris and Gaston Raynaud, ed., Le Mystère de la Passion d'Arnoul Gréban, Paris, 1878 and Jean Michel Le Mystère de la Passion (ed., Omer Jodoque), Gembloux, 1959.

17. Grace Frank, The Medieval French Drama, Oxford, 1954.

18. Vibeke Woldbye, "Adoration of the Magi," Kongernes Filbedelse, Det Danske Kunstindustrimuseum, Copenhagen, 1964, 2.

19. James Marrow, Passion Iconography in Northern European Art of the Late Middle Ages and Early Renaissance: a Study of the Transformation of Sacred Metaphor into Descriptive Narrative, Kortrijk, 1979, 25.

20. Ibid., 155.

21. Schneebalg-Perelman calls this set a replica of one mentioned in the inventory of Francis I of five pieces sold by Marc Crétif, a Brussels merchant, in 1534. See "Richesses du Garde-Meuble Parisien de François 1^{er}. Inventaires inédits de 1542 et 1551," Gazette des Beaux-Arts 78, ser. 6 (1971), 261, Actes, VII, 28673.

22. The 1523 inventory of the library of Margaret of Austria lists Roberto della Porta's Romuleon ou Faits des Romains (translated by Jean Miélat) and three volumes of Titus Livius' Histoires romaines (translated by Pierre Bersuire). See Camille Gaspar and Frederic Leyna, La Bibliothèque de Marguerite d'Autriche, Brussels, 1940, exh. cat., Bibliothèque de Belgique, 47.

23. The close similarity of the Procession of Numitor (illus. 166) with the Triumph of David (Santa Barbara, private collection), another workshop piece, suggests the reuse of certain compositions for varied series. Both of these tapestry series may possibly be related to the early designs of Pieter Coecke van Aelst, whose hand can be identified on the British Museum drawings of the Story of David (nos. 1853-10-8-13 through 17). See L. Beauvois-Faure, "Een Nieuwe Reeks met de Geschiedenis van David naar een Ontwerp van Barend van Orley," in De Bloeitijd, 29 - 39 and Edith Standen, "Tapisseries Renaissance, Manieristes et baroques: nouveaux développements," Revue de l'Art 22 (1973), 91.

24. Gina Strumwasser, Heroes, Heroines and Heroic Tales from the Old Testament: An Iconographic Analysis of the Most Frequently Represented Old Testament Subjects in Netherlandish Painting, ca. 1430-1570, dissertation, University of California at Los Angeles, University Microfilms, 1979, 140 - 41.

25. See Parshall, "Lucas van Leyden."

26. Illustrated in James Byam Shaw, Old Master Drawings from Christ Church Oxford, Washington, 1972, exh. cat., the National Gallery of Art, no. 98.

27. On Vincidor in Brussels see Dacos, "Tommaso Vincidor."

28. A complete replica of this tapestry including the wedding scene is in the Burrell Collection in Glasgow.

29. On how the organization of scenes may be associated with the question of attribution, see chapter four, note 7.

30. See chapter three, note 51.

31. These concepts are stressed both in the Phébus and Ferrières texts to be discussed.

32. Illustrated in Göbel, Tapestries, no. 94.

33. See George Wingfield Digby and Wendy Hefford, The Devonshire Hunting Tapestries, London, 1971.

34. This is my translation. Another is found in Balis, "De 'Jachten'," 37ff.
35. Ibid.
36. Ibid.
37. Ibid., illus. 12.
38. See Marcel Thiebaux, "The Medieval Chase," Speculum 42, no. 2 (April, 1967), 260-74.
39. Illustrated in Katalog der Sammlung für Plastik und Kunstgewerbe, II. Renaissance, Vienna, 1966, plates 48 - 49.
40. Ceulemans, De Jachten, 108.
41. It was used elsewhere, for example, in the Sala dei Mesi of the Palazzo Schifanoia in Ferrara. See Charles M. Rosenberg, "The Iconography of the Sala dei Stucchi in the Palazzo Schifanoia in Ferrara," The Art Bulletin 61 (September, 1979), 377 - 84.
42. Gunner Tilander (ed. and trans.), "La chace dou cerf," Cynegetica 7 (1960), lines 24 - 27.
43. Gaston Phoebus (trans. J. Peter Tallon), Medieval Hunting Scenes ("The Hunting Book" by Gaston Phoebus), Barcelona, 1978, 56 and 61.
44. Ibid., 47; 36, 42 - 43, 44, 48; 58; 58; 15.
45. Ibid., 74 - 75.
46. Niccolo Machiavelli, The Prince (ed., and trans. Thomas G. Bergin), New York, 1947, chapter 14.
47. Though we know the series was presented to Charles V by the States-General in Brussels in 1531, there is no record of the commission.
48. The most complete existing set is at Zamora. See A. Gomez Martinez and B. Chillon Sampedro, Los Tapices de la Catedral de Zamora, Madrid, n.d., plates 7 - 10.
49. M. L. A. Jubinal. Les anciennes tapisseries historiées, II, Berne and Paris, 1838, plates 5 - 10.
50. Betty Kurth, "Die Blütezeit der Bildwirkerkunst zu Tournai und der Burgundische Hof," Jahrbuch der Kunsthistorischen Sammlungen des Allerhöchsten Kaiserhauses 34 (1918), 77, fig. 13.

51. Ibid., fig. 32.
52. Göbel, Wandteppiche, 237.
53. Marquis L. J. E. S. de Laborde, Les ducs de Bourgogne II, Paris, 1849-52, 271, no. 4285.
54. Reynaldo Dos Santos, As Tapeçarias da Tomada de Arzila, Lisbon, 1925.
55. Horn, Charles V's Conquest.
56. See chapter four, note 39.
57. Another series not mentioned in the discussion here is the Ages of Man (Laarne) which I do not believe to be by Van Orley. More on this series, which is accepted by Farmer is found in Farmer, Van Orley, Chapter 8.
58. On the Nassau Genealogy see: Duverger, "Verder nieuws;" C. W. Fock, "Nieuws over de tapijten, bekend als de Nassause Genealogie," Oud-Holland 84 (1969), 1 - 28; and Th. M. Roest van Limburg, "Vier Cartons van Barend van Orley," Onze Kunst 3 (1904), 8 - 14.
59. For comments on double portraiture see L. Campbell, "A Double Portrait by Memlinc," Connoisseur 194 (1977), 187 - 89.
60. K. G. van Acker, "Iconografische beschouwingen in verband met de 16^e eeuwse gegraveerde 'portretten' der graven van Vlaanderen," Oud-Holland 83 (1968), 95 - 116.
61. Pinchart, Tapisserie, 16.
62. Cetto, Traian und Herkenbald, 1966 - 168.
63. The 1420 inventory of the dukes of Burgundy mentions an image of John the Fearless and his duchess hunting on foot and on horseback. Closer to a more formal equestrian portrait is the millefleurs tapestry in Montacute House of a cavalier identified as Jean de Daillon. Pierre de Rohan, maréchal de Gie, had himself depicted similarly in five different tapestries for his château at Verger. Chefs-d'oeuvre, 122 - 124.
64. Fock, "Nieuws over de tapijten," 1 - 28.
65. Friedländer, VIII, 78 mentions a Triumph of Trajan, the reverse of the design in Berlin, Kupferstichkabinett. Göbel, Tapestries, 377 shows a version of Van Orley's design, certainly not the editio princeps.
66. The Triumphs of Prudence, Fortitude and Justice in San Francisco, The Fine Arts Museum are typical examples. Bennett, Five Centuries, 97, 99, 101.

CONCLUDING REMARKS

Though documentary proof of Bernart van Orley's activity as a designer of tapestry is scanty, the remaining drawings and tapestries indicate the artist's active participation in that field particularly in the years following his official appointment as court painter to Margaret of Austria in 1518. All but a few of Van Orley's fifty-three extant drawings are designs for tapestry, and some of these relate directly to the large group of weavings said to reflect his inventions. In order to critically evaluate Van Orley's contributions to the tapestry medium, it has been necessary to restrict this investigation to those designs which can be attributed most securely to him.

Both Friedländer and Baldass praised Van Orley as an innovator in the field, but neither fully explored the issue. To do so it is important to understand the artist's development in the context of contemporary tapestry design. Van Orley's earliest works, for example, the Story of Appius Claudius and Virginia or the Legend of Notre-Dame du Sablon, generally show the influence of designs by Van Roome and Van den Houte; however, the Sablon series, at least, already indicates the new directions Van Orley would take. Spatial relationships are clarified, personages individualized and the accustomed horror vacui replaced by

carefully positioned objects relating specifically to the story.

Another popular trend had been to duplicate painting compositions in woven form. Although Van Orley represented certain religious themes in both painting and tapestry, he realized early on that tapestry could be something other than a woven painting. For the Lamentation, Adoration of the Magi and Passion cycle themes, he altered the concept of space, number of figures and sometimes the emphasis of the subject from one medium to the other to effect a change. We can only surmise that these initial efforts to differentiate tapestry from painting through various pictorial means were the beginnings of Van Orley's interest in finding new solutions for traditional representations in tapestry.

In his search for new solutions Van Orley consulted a variety of sources. Certainly a key factor to his especially good understanding of the requirements of the medium was his apparently close relationship to weavers and cartoon makers. This we have seen not only in his personal relationships (e.g. ~~the~~ weavers and cartoon makers charged along with Van Orley in the heresy trial of 1525 and Van Orley's membership in the Guild of St. Sebastian), but also in his drawings. That fifty-one of his fifty-three extant drawings are tapestry designs may be important; however, more significant are the stages of design that these drawings represent, from the preliminary sketch to presentation drawings. Van Orley is the first in a series of sixteenth century northern artists

(Pieter Coecke van Aelst, Jan Vermeyen and Michiel Coxie to name a few) whose works indicate progressive stages of design, the beginning, perhaps, of greater specialization within the design procedure. Though one could devote an entire study to this issue alone, I believe the method used here, which relates technique to function, may be the key to untangling the purpose of drawings of the same composition in varied media by other artists. Besides the multiple stages of design, there are further hints of Van Orley's control over the final product through instructions on various sheets. These range from color indications, to written identification of figures and narrative episodes, to notes about alterations to be made. Since in later times, namely in the eighteenth century, more of these decisions were made by the weaver, one might partially attribute the success of Van Orley's tapestries to his direct involvement in many stages of production.

Though Van Orley's relationship with the cartonniers and weavers may have helped him to understand better the design requirements of the medium, the artist had to look elsewhere to effect the change which altered tapestry from a two-dimensional wall covering to a three-dimensional reflection of the outside world. Baldass, Friedländer, Crick-Kuntziger and others have dwelled on the influence of Raphael's Acts of the Apostles tapestries, but they have emphasized exclusively Van Orley's borrowing of certain figure types and spatial relationships. The drawings

for the Story of Romulus and Remus alone are Van Orley's most Raphaelesque designs in this regard. What has been overlooked until this study is Van Orley's more meaningful understanding of Raphael's new total concept of history painting. His comprehension and implementation of Raphael's consistent approach to historical authenticity through both the variety and appropriateness of details far surpassed that of his northern contemporaries. Van Orley's sense of clarity and organization in the tapestries also came from Raphael and from the achievements found in large-scale woodcuts. These design ideas are embodied in Van Orley's mature works, the Story of Jacob, the Hunts of Maximilian and the Battle of Pavia.

Though he is often considered an eclectic artist, Van Orley's direct quotation of motifs from the work of others is the exception. His method was to substantially rework these ideas; his design mastery lay in the successful integration of them with his own understanding of the real or natural world. This he accomplished by integrating the various motifs with carefully recorded and accurately rendered geographical locations in the Brussels area or abroad. The combination of familiar motifs with well-known sites insured total accessibility of these images to the viewer. The nearly one-to-one scale of these monumental weavings allowed the viewer to walk into the scene, to experience the story in other ways than exclusively intellectually. This effort to unite the tapestry environment in numerous ways with the

viewer's own world had never been attempted in tapestry before Van Orley's designs.

Van Orley's innovative treatment, however, was restricted to certain subjects. His designs for allegories and portraiture, for example, continued in the traditional mode of the previous decades. On the other hand, any theme which involved a narrative sparked his creative genius. Van Orley excelled as a story teller. Both in Biblical tales and contemporary events he ignored the accustomed representation of main scenes in the foreground. Instead, Van Orley focused on the range of human emotion implied in the subject at hand. This often meant the emphasis of portions of the story which were not treated in such detail in the text (e.g. in the Jacob series) or focus on a dramatic moment which could only be resolved by reading on to the next tapestry. He, likewise, gave unprecedented importance to genre details in current event subjects (e.g. the Hunts of Maximilian or the Battle of Pavia) in order to suggest more closely true-life experience.

The success with which Van Orley was able to balance design and subject matter has resulted in the appreciation of his tapestries through the ages. The current study, which has investigated Van Orley's innovations within the context of sixteenth century tapestry design, has aimed to clarify the extent of his achievement. Through this approach, we may both better understand the artist's contribution to this medium and be able to separate it from the works of followers.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Acker, K. G. van, "Iconografische beschouwingen in verband met de 16^e eeuwse gegraveerde 'portretten' der graven van Vlaanderen," Oud-Holland 83 (1968), 95 - 116.
- Ackerman, P., "Bernard van Orley as Tapestry Designer," Art in America 13 (Dec. 1924), 38 - 48.
- Albert Dürer aux Pays-Bas, Brussels, 1977, exh. cat., Palais des Beaux-Arts.
- Alfassa, P., "Les Tapisseries de 'Chasses de Maximilian'," Gazette des Beaux-Arts, ser. 5, 1 (1920), 127 - 140, 233 - 256.
- Altmeyer, J. J., Marguerite d'Autriche. Sa Vie, sa politique, et sa cour, Liège, 1840.
- Anderson, Frank J., An Illustrated History of the Herbals, New York, 1977.
- Anzelewsky, Fedja, "A propos de la topographie du Parc de Bruxelles et du quai de l'Escaut à Anvers," Bulletin van de Koninklijke Musea voor Schone Kunsten 6, no. 1 (1957), 87 - 107.
- Appuhn, Horst, Die Jacht als Sinnbild in der Norddeutschen Kunst des Mittelalters, Berlin u. Hamburg, 1964.
- Appuhn, Horst, and V. Heusinger, C., Riesenholzschnitte un Papiertapeten der Renaissance, Unterschneidheim, 1976.
- Archives de la ville de Bruges, Regisare van der greffe der stede van Brugghe, beënnende den eersten september XV^eXXXIIJ ende hendende septembre XV^eXXXIIIJ (Registre de procurations) f^o218.
- Archives départementales du Nord. Fonds de la chambre des comptes de Lille. B2218. Compte de Jean Micault, receveur général des finances pour l'année 1511, fol. 346 v.
- Archives du Royaume, Bruxelles, Papiers d'État et de l'Audience, 1177/6.
- Artilleria del Invicittissime Emperador Carolo V, Österreichische Nationalbibliothek, Vienna.

Aschenheim, C., Der italienische Einfluss in der vlämischen Malerei der Frührenaissance, Strassburg, 1910.

Asselberghs, J. P., La Tapisserie tournaissienne au XVI^e siècle, Tournai, 1968.

_____, Les Tapisseries flamandes aux États-Unis d'Amérique, Brussels, 1974.

Bacou, R., Cartons d'artistes du XV^e au XIX^e siècle, Paris, 1974, exh., cat., Louvre, Cabinet des dessins.

Baillie-Grohman, W. A., "Bernard van Orley's Cartoons," Country Life (April 12, 1913), 535 - 539.

Baldass, L., "Die Entwicklung des Bernart van Orley," Jahrbuch des Kunsthistorischen Sammlungen in Wien, N. F. 13 (1944), 141 - 191.

_____, "Die Niederländische Landschaftsmalerei von Patinir bis Bruegel," Jahrbuch der Kunstsammlungen des Allerhöchsten Kaiserhauses 34 (1917), 111 - 157.

_____, "Die niederländischen Maler des spätgotischen Stiles," Jahrbuch des Kunsthistorischen Sammlungen in Wien, N. F. 11 (1934), 117 - 138.

_____, Die Wiener Gobelinsammlung. Vienna, 1920.

_____, "Tapisserieentwürfe des niderländischen Romanismus," Jahrbuch des Kunsthistorischen Sammlungen in Wien, N. F. 2 (1928), 247 - 266.

Balis, A., De Jachten van Maximilian, unpubl. thèse de license, Ghent University, 1973-74.

_____, "De 'Jachten van Maximiliaan,' Kroonstuk van de Hoofse Jachticonografie," Gentse Bijdragen tot de Kunstgeschiedenis 25 (1979-80), 14 - 41.

_____, "Een zeethiasos door Bernard van Orley," in Libellus discipulorum, aangeboden aan R.-A. d'Hulst op 20 dec. 1977 ter gelegenheid van zijn zestigste vergiardag, Antwerpen, 1977.

Baudson, F., Margareta van Oostenrijk en haar hof, Mechelen, 1958, exh. cat.

Baumgart, F., Zusammenhänge der niederländischen mit der italienischen Malerei in den zweiten Hälfte des 16 Jhdts., Marburger Jahrbuch für Kunstwissenschaft, 13 (1944), 187ff.

Beauvois-Faure, L., "Een nieuwe reeks met de geschiedenis van David naar een ontwerp van Barend van Orley," De Bloeitijd van de Vlaamse tapijtkunst, Brussels, 1969, 29 - 39.

Beets, N., "The 'Small Cartoons' of Barend van Orley for the 'Belles Chasses de Maximilien'," Old Master Drawings 6 (1931), 25 - 28.

_____, "Zestiende-eeuwsche kunstenaars. II. Barent van Orley," Oud-Holland 48 (1931), 142 - 171.

Beltrami, Luca, La Battaglia di Pavia, 21 Febbraio 1525, illustrata negli Arazzi del Marchese del Vasto al Museo Nazionale di Napoli, Milan, 1896.

Benesch, O., Die Zeichnungen der niederländischen Schulen des XV. und XVI. Jahrhunderts (Beschreibender Katalog der Handzeichnungen in Graphischen Sammlung Albertina, II), Vienna, 1928.

_____, Meisterzeichnungen der Albertina, Salzburg, 1964.

Bennett, Anna G., Five Centuries of Tapestry from the Fine Arts Museum of San Francisco, San Francisco, 1976.

Bernard van Orley, Brussels, 1943.

Bialostocki, Jan, "Nouvelles notes sur 'album Errera'," Bulletin Koninklijke Musea voor Schone Kunsten 4 (1955), 233ff.

Blaze, E., Le Livre du Roy Modus et de la Royne Racio, Paris, 1839.

Bock, E., and Rosenberg, J., Die niederländischen Meister (Die Zeichnungen alter Meister in Kupferstichkabinett, ed., M. J. Friedländer), Frankfurt-am-Main, 1931.

Bonenfant-Peytmans, A. M., La Patrimoine artistique de l'Assistance Publique de Bruxelles, Brussels, 1950.

Boom, G. de, "Les Collections artistiques de Marguerite d'Autriche," Revue de l'Université de Bruxelles 36 (1930-31), 291 - 318.

_____, Marguerite d'Autriche-Savoie et la Pré-Renaissance, Paris and Brussels, 1935.

Boom, A. Van der., "Nieuwe van Orley Studies," Oudheidkundige Jaarboek 12 (1943), 58 - 62.

Boon, K. G., "Een onbekend Glaskarton van ca. 1538 in het Rijksmuseum," Album Amicorum J. G. van Gelder, The Hague, 1973, 51 - 57.

- _____, Netherlandish Drawings of the Fifteenth and Sixteenth Centuries, The Hague, 1978.
- Boussuet, R. and A., Le Livre de la Chasse de Gaston Phébus, Paris, 1931.
- Branden, J. Van den, Geschiedenis der Antwerpsche schilder-school, Antwerp, 1883.
- Brandi, K., Kaiser Karl V, Werden und Schicksel einer Persönlichkeit und eines Weltreiches (trans. C. V. Wedgwood), London, 1939.
- Bruchet, M., and Lancien, E., L'Itinéraire de Marguerite d'Autriche, gouvernante des Pays-Bas, Lille, 1934.
- Bruxelles au XVme siècle, Brussels, 1953.
- Buren, Anne van, "The Model Role of the Golden Fleece," The Art Bulletin 61 (1979), 359 - 376.
- Cahn, W., Masterpieces: Chapters in the History of an Idea, Princeton, 1979.
- Calberg, M., "La Comparution der Christ devant Pilate tapisserie de Bruxelles du premier quart du XVI^e siècle," Bulletin des Musées royaux d'Art et d'Histoire, sér. 4, 35 (1963), 93 - 105.
- Calberg, M., and Pauwels, H., "Découverte de la marque du tapissier sur la tenture de l'Histoire de Jacob," Bulletin des Musées royaux d'Art et d'Histoire, sér. 4, 33 (1961), 112 - 113.
- Calvert, A. F., The Spanish Royal Tapestries, London, 1921.
- Campos, D. R. de, "La tapisserie vaticaine de l'Epiphanie, une oeuvre inconnue de Bernard van Orley," L'Illustrazione Vaticana 3 (1932), 32 - 34.
- Catálogo de la Instalacion de la Real Casa en el Palacic de Bellas Artes, Barcelona, 1888, exh. cat.
- Catalogue de l'Exposition retrospective du Paysage flamand, Brussels, 1926, exh. cat., Musées royaux des Beaux-Arts de Belgique.
- Cetto, A. M., Der Berliner Traian - und Herkenbald-Teppich, Berne, 1966.
- Ceulemans, Ca., De zogenaamde Jachten van Maximiliaan, unpubl. thèse de license, Leuven University, 1975-76.

Charles Quint et son temps, Ghent, 1955, exh. cat., Museum voor Schone Kunsten.

Chefs-d'oeuvre de la Tapisserie du XIV^e au XVI^e siècle, Paris, 1973, exh. cat., Palais des Beaux-Arts.

Chew, S., The Virtues Reconciled, Toronto, 1947.

Conforti, L., "La bataille de Pavie Tapisseries...", Les Arts Anciens de Flandres 3 (1908), 188 - 193.

Crick-Kuntziger, M., "Bernard van Orley et le décor mural en tapisseries," Bernard van Orley, 1943, 71 - 92.

_____, De tapijtwerken in het Stadhuis te Brussel, Antwerp, 1944.

_____, "De Vlaamsche Tapijtweverij in de 14^{de}, 15^{de} en 16^{de} Eeuwen," De Geschiedenis van de Vlaamsche Kunst, Antwerp, 1936-37, 482 - 510.

_____, "Marques et signatures de tapisseries bruxelloises," Annales de la Société royale d'Archéologie de Bruxelles 40 (1936), 166 - 183.

_____, "La tapisserie bruxelloise au 15^e siècle," Bruxelles au 15^e siècle, Bruxelles, 1953, 85 - 102.

_____, La Tenture de l'histoire de Jacob, Antwerp, 1954.

_____, La Tenture de la légende de Notre Dame du Sablon, Antwerp, 1942.

_____, Musées royaux d'Art et d'Histoire de Bruxelles, Catalogues des tapisseries du XIV^e au XVIII^e siècle, Brussels, (n.d.).

_____, and Friedländer, M. J., et al., Bernard van Orley, The Apocalypse Tapestries. Antwerp, 1956.

Crowe, J. A., and Cavalcaselle, G. B., Anciens Peintres flamands, annot. by A. Pinchart, Brussels, 1862.

Cuvelier, J., "De tapijtwevers van Brussel un de 15^e eeuw," Verslagen en Mededeelingen der Koninklijke Vlaamsche Academie, Ghent, 1912.

Dacos, N., Les Peintres belges à Rome au XVI^e siècle (Études d'histoire de l'art publiées par l'Institut Historique Belge de Rome, I), Brussels and Rome, 1964.

_____, "Tommaso Vincidor, un élève de Raphael aux Pays-Bas," Relations artistiques entre les Pays-Bas et l'Italie à la Renaissance. Etudes dédiées à Suzanne Sulzberger (Etudes d'histoire de l'art publiées par l'Institut Historique Belge de Rome, IV), Brussels and Rome, 1980, 61 - 99.

De Bloeitijd van de Vlaamse Tapijtkunst, colloquium, Koninklijke Vlaamse Academie voor Wetenschappen Letteren en Schone Kunsten, Ghent, 1961

Debus, A. G., Man and Nature in the Renaissance, Cambridge, 1978.

Delmarcel, G., "De Structuur van de Brusselsche tapijtreeks Los Honores," Annales du XLIIe Congrès, Fédération Archéologique et Historique de Belgique 1 (1971), 352 - 356.

_____, Tapisseries. 2. Renaissance et Manierisme, Guide du visiteur, Brussels, 1979.

Deshaisnes, C., Inventaire des archives départementales antérieures à 1790. Nord. Archives Civiles -- série B. Chambres des Comptes de Lille, nos. 1842 à 2338, Lille, 1881.

Destrée, J., "Les Chasses dites de Maximilien, exposées aux Musées royaux du Cinquantenaire à Bruxelles," L'Emulation 8 (August, 1923), 8.

_____, Tapisseries et Sculptures Bruxelloises à l'Exposition d'Art ancien Bruxellois organisée à Bruxelles au Cercle artistique et littéraire, Brussels, 1905, exh. cat.

Destrée, J. and Ven, Paul van de, Tapisseries des Musées royaux du Cinquantenaire à Bruxelles, Brussels, 1910.

Dhanens, E., "L'Importance du peintre Jean van Roome, dit Bruxelles," Tapisseries bruxelloise de la pré-Renaissance, Brussels, 1976, 231 - 238.

_____, "The David and Bathsheba Drawing," Gazette des Beaux-Arts, sér. 6, 53 (1959), 215 - 225.

D'Hulst, R. A., Flemish Tapestries from the Fifteenth to the Eighteenth Century, New York, 1967.

Digby, G. W. and Hefford, W., The Devonshire Hunting Tapestries, London, 1971.

Donnet, F., "Documents pour servir à l'histoire des ateliers de tapisseries de Bruxelles, Audenarde, Anvers, etc. jusqu'à la fin du XVII^e siècle," Annales de la Société d'Archéologie de Bruxelles 10, 11, 12 (1896-98).

Dunbar, B. L., "A 'View of Brussels' by Cornelis Massys," Master Drawings 17, no. 4 (Winter, 1979), 392 - 401.

Duverger, E., "Verder nieuws over de tapijten bekend als de Nassause Genealogie," Artes Textiles 7 (1971), 210 - 215.

Duverger, J., Brussel als Kunstcentrum in de XIVe en XVe eeuw, Antwerp, 1935.

_____, "Brusselsche Legwerkers uit de XV^e en de XVI^e eeuw," Gentsche Bijdragen tot de Kunstgeschiedenis, 1 (1934).

_____, "Brusselse Patroonschilders uit de XIVe en de XVe eeuw," De Bloeitijd van de Vlaamse Tapijtkunst, Brussels, 1969, 205 - 226.

_____, "De schilder Lenaert Knoest en de Brusselse Tapijtweverij in het begin der zestiende eeuw," Oud-Holland 48 (1931), 215 - 223.

_____, "Lutherse Predicatie te Brussel en het Proces tegen een aantal Kunstenaars (april - juni, 1527)," Wetenschappelijke Tijdingen 36 (1977), col. 221 - 228.

_____, "Marie de Hongrie, Gouvernante des Pays-Bas et la Renaissance," Actes du XXII^e Congrès International d'Histoire de l'Art, Budapest, 1969: 115- 267.

Ferrières, H. de, Le Livre du roi Modus et de la reine Racio, Gunnar Tilander, ed., Paris, 1932.

Eisler, Colin, Paintings from the Samuel H. Kress Collection. European Schools Excluding Italian, London, 1977.

Erkelens, A. M. L. E., Rijksmuseum Amsterdam, Wandtapijten. I. Late gotiek en vroege renaissance, Amsterdam, 1962.

Estienne, H. The Frankfurt Book Fair, J. W. Thomson, ed. and trans., Amsterdam, 1969.

Ewing, D., "Further Observations on the Bruges Madonna: Ghiberti's Sources for Michelangelo," Revue Belge d'Archéologie et d'Histoire de l'Art 58 (1979), 77 - 83.

- _____, "The Influence of Michelangelo's Bruges Madonna," Revue Belge d'Archéologie et d'Histoire de l'Art 47 (1978), 77 - 105.
- Falk, T., ed., The Illustrated Bartsch, II, Sixteenth Century German Artists, New York, 1980.
- Farmer, J. D., Bernard van Orley of Brussels, unpubl. dissertation, Princeton University, 1981.
- Félibien des Avaux, A., Entretiens sur les vies et sur les ouvrages des plus excellens peintres anciens et modernes, 3 vols, Paris, 1725.
- Fénaille, M., État général des tapisseries de la manufacture des Gobelins, 5 vols, Paris, 1903-23.
- Fêtes et cérémonies au temps de Charles Quint (IIe Congrès de l'Association Internationale des Historiens de la Renaissance, 2e Section, 1957), J. Jacquot, ed., Paris, 1960.
- Filedt Kok, J. P., "Underdrawings and Other Technical Aspects in the Paintings of Lucas van Leyden," Lucas van Leyden Studies. Nederlands Kunsthistorisch Jaarboek 29 (1978), 1 - 184.
- Flanders in the Fifteenth Century: Art and Civilization, Detroit, 1960, exh. cat., Detroit Institute of Art.
- Fock, C. W., "De voorgestelde personen op de tapijtenreeks 'De Nassause Genealogie'," Oud-Holland 89 (1975), 73 - 78.
- _____, "Nieuws over de tapijten, bekend als de Nassause Genealogie," Oud-Holland 84 (1969), 1 - 28.
- Foncke, E., "Aantekeningen betreffende Hieronymus Busleyden," Gentsche Bijdragen tot de Kunstgeschiedenis 5 (1938) 209 - 219.
- Franz, G., Die niederländische Landschaftsmalerei in Zeitalter des Manierismus, Graz, 1969.
- Freeman, M. B., The Unicorn Tapestries, New York, 1976.
- Friedländer, M. J., "Bernart van Orley," Jahrbuch der Königlich Preussischen Kunstsammlungen 29 (1908), pp. 225 - 246, and 30 (1909), 9 - 35, 89 - 107, 155 - 178.

- _____, Die altniederländische Malerei, VIII, Berlin, 1930.
- _____, "Die brüsseler Tafelmalerei gegen den Ausgang des 15. Jahrhunderts," Belgische Kunstdenkmäler 1 (1923), 309 - 320.
- _____, Early Netherlandish Painting, Brussels and Leiden, 1967-76, 14 vols.
- _____, Essays über die Landschaftsmalerei und andere Bildgattungen, The Hague, 1947.
- Gaspar, Camille and Leyna, Frédéric, La Bibliothèque de Marguerite d'Autriche, Brussels, 1940, exh. cat., Bibliothèque de Belgique.
- Gelder, J. G. van, "Scorel, Mor, Bellegambe und Orley in Marchiennes," Oud-Holland 87 (1973), 156 - 176.
- Gerszi, T., Netherlandish Drawings in the Budapest Museum, Sixteenth Century Drawings, Amsterdam and New York, 1971.
- Giona, Jean, The Battle of Pavia, 24th February 1525, A. E. Murch, trans., London, 1963.
- Göbel, H., Wandteppiche. I. Die Niederlande, Leipzig, 1923.
- Goethals, M. F., Histoire des lettres, des sciences et des arts en Belgique, 3 vols, Brussels, 1842.
- Gombrich, E. H., "Action and Expression in Western Art," Non-verbal communication, R. A. Hinde, ed., Cambridge 1972.
- _____, Art and Illusion, New York, 1960.
- _____, "Renaissance Artistic Theory and the Development of Landscape Painting," Gazette des Beaux-Arts, sér. 6, 41 (May - June, 1953), 335 - 60.
- Goris, J. A., and Marlier, G., Albrecht Dürer: Diary of his Journey to the Netherlands, 1520-21, New York, 1971.
- Grace, F., The Medieval French Drama, Oxford, 1954.
- Guiffrey, E., A. Müntz, J. J. Pinchart, Histoire générale de la Tapisserie, 3 vols., Paris, 1880.
- Guiffrey, E., "Inventaire des meubles précieux de l'hôtel de Guise en 1644 et 1648," Nouvelles Archives de l'art français, Revue de l'art français ancien et moderne, sér. 3, 12 (1896), 156 - 246.

- Grauls, J., "Een caemer tapisserie. Een kleine bijdrage tot de studie der terminologie van de Vlaamse tapijtkunst," Wetenschappelijke Tijdingen 18 (1958), 177 - 191.
- Gudlaugsson, S. G. "Het Errera-sketsboek en Lucas van Valckenborch," Oud-Holland 74 (1959), 118ff.
- Guesnon, A., Décadance de la Tapisserie à Arras depuis la seconde moitié du XV^e siècle, Lille, 1884.
- Haverkamp-Begemann, E., Corpus Rubenianum Ludwig Burchard, Part X: The Achilles Series, London, 1975.
- Heinz, D., Europäische Wandteppiche, Braunschweig, 1963.
- , "Karl V als Mäzen des niederländischen Tapisseriekunst," Alte und Moderne Kunst 3 (1958), 25 - 30.
- Held, J., Dürers Wirkung auf die niederländische Kunst seiner Zeit, The Hague, 1931.
- Henne, A., "Les Arts en Belgique sous Charles-Quint," Revue Universelle des Arts 1 (1855), 100 - 101.
- Henne, A. and Wauters, A., Histoire de la ville de Bruxelles, 3 vols., Bruxelles, 1845.
- Hindman, S., "Fifteenth Century Dutch Bible Illustration and the Historia Scholastica," Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes 37 (1974), 131 - 144.
- Hollstein, F. W. H., German Engravings, Etchings, and Woodcuts, ca. 1400-1700 IV, Amsterdam, n. d.
- Holm, E., Pieter Bruegel and Bernaert van Orley: Die Jagd als Motiv in der niederländischen Kunst um 1550, Hamburg and Berlin, 1964.
- Hoogewerff, G. J., Vlaamsche Kunst en Italiaansche Renaissance, Malines and Amsterdam, 1935.
- , "Joachim Patinir en Italie," La Revue d'Art 45 (1928), 117 - 34.
- Horn, H. J., Charles V's Conquest of Tunis Cartoons and Tapestries by Jan Cornelisz Vermeyen, unpubl. dissertation, Yale University, 1977.
- Houdoy, J., Les Tapisseries de Haute Lisse. - Histoire de la Fabrication Lilloise du XIV^e au XVIII^e siècle et Documents inédit concernant l'histoire des tapisseries de Flandre, Lille and Paris, 1871.

- Hullebroeck, A., Peintres de Cartons pour Tapisseries: Bernard van Orley, Paris and Liège, 1936.
- Hunter, G. L., "Two Tapestries in the Lehman Collection," International Studio, 85 (1926), 54 - 62.
- Huth, H., Künstler und Werkstatt der Spätgotik, Darmstadt, 1967.
- Hymans, L., Bruxelles à travers les ages, 3 vols, Bruxelles, 1882-1884.
- Inventaire Enluminé de la Collection d'Armes de Charles-Quint, coll. Real Armeria, Madrid, 1540-50.
- Inventaire sommaire des Archives du Nord, Lille, 1895.
- Jestaz, B., and Bacon, R., Jules Romain. L'histoire de Scipion. Tapisseries et dessins, Paris, 1978, exh. cat., Grand Palais.
- Jubinal, A., Recherches sur l'usage et l'origine des Tapisseries apersonnages dites historiées depuis l'antiquité jusqu'au XVI^e siècle, Paris, 1840.
- Junquera, P., "Los Tapices de la Pasion," Reales Sitios (Revista del Patrimonio Nacional) 7 (1966), 49 ff.
- Katzenellenbogen, A., Allegories of the Virtues and Vices in Medieval Art (Studies of the Warburg Inst., 10), London, 1939.
- Kalf, E. J., "Drie Tekeningen van Barent van Orley of zijn omgeving," De Bloeitijd van de Vlaamse tapijtkunst, Brussels, 1969, 259 - 277.
- Krönig, W., Der italienische Einfluss in der flämischen Malerei im ersten Drittel des 16. Jahrhunderts, Würzburg, 1936.
- Kurth, B., "Die Blütezeit der Bildwirkerkunst zu Tournai und der Burgundische Hof," Jahrbuch der kunsthistorischen Sammlungen des allerhöchsten Kaiserhauses 34 (1917), 53 - 110.
- Kurth, Willi, ed., The Complete Woodcuts of Albrecht Dürer, New York, 1963.
- Laes, A., "Le Paysage Flamand," Miscellanea Leo van Puyvelde, Brussel, 1949, 166-182.
- Lafond, A., "La Tapisserie en Espagne," Revue de l'Art ancien et moderne 2 (1912), 113 - 207.

- Lampsonius, D., Pictorum aliquot celebrium inferioris effigies, Antwerp, 1572.
- Lauriol, C., "Les influences reciproques du paysage flamand et du paysage italien pendant la Renaissance," Les Arts plastiques 5 (1951), 105 - 120.
- Lefeure, P., "Obsèques et Sépultures d'artistes à Bruxelles au XVI^e siècle," la Pictura 1 (1945) 39 - 41.
- _____, "A Propos des donateurs du triptych Haneton conservé aux Musées royaux de peinture de Bruxelles," Pictura 1 (1945), 126 - 130.
- Lessing, J., Die Wandteppiche aus dem Leben des Erzvaters Jacob, Berlin, 1900.
- Limburg, Th. M. Roest van, "Vier Cartons van Barend van Orley," Onze Kunst 3 (1904), 8 - 14.
- Le Livre de la Chasse de Gaston Phoebus, Bassuat, R. and A., trans. and intro., Paris, 1931.
- Lugt, F., Musée du Louvre. Inventaire générale des dessins des écoles du nord publiés sous les auspices du cabinet des dessins. Maîtres des anciennes Pays-Bas nés avant 1550, Paris, 1968.
- Madrazo, Dan P. de, Tapices de la Corona de España. El Apocalypsi. Madrid, 1881.
- Mahl, E., "Die Romulus and Remus-Folgen der Tapisserien-sammlung des Kunsthistorischen Museums," Jahrbuch der Kunsthistorischen Sammlungen in Wien, 63 (1967), 7 - 38.
- Maire, O. Le, "Les Portraits de François de Tassis, Organisateur des Postes Internationales, 1459-1517," Revue Belge d'Archéologie et d'Histoire de l'Art, 23 (1954), 203 - 216.
- _____, "Renseignements nouveau sur Bernard van Orley et sa famille," Bernard van Orley, Brussels, 1943, 167 - 189.
- Mander, Carel van, Het schilderboeck, Harlem, 1604.
editions consulted:
Floerke, Hanns, ed., and trans., Das Leben der niederländischen und deutschen Maler des Carel van Mander, 2 vols, Munich, 1906.
- Hymans, Henri, ed. and trans., Le Livre des peintres de Carel van Mander, 2 vols., Paris, 1884-85.

- Waal, Constant van de, trans., Carel van Mander, Dutch and Flemish Painters, New York, 1936.
- Marez, G. des, L'origine et la développement de la ville de Bruxelles, Le Quartier Isabelle et Terarken, Paris and Bruxelles, 1927.
- Marillier, G., Subject Catalogue of Tapestries, (Mss., Victoria and Albert Museum, London), n.d.
- Marillier, H. C., The Tapestries at Hampton Court, London, 1962.
- Marlier, G., "Lambert Lombard et les Tapisseries de Raphael," Miscellanea Josef Duverger: Bijdragen tot de Kunstgeschiedenis der Nederlanden, I, Ghent, 1968.
- _____, Pierre Coecke d'Alost, Brussels, 1966.
- Marrow, J., "Circumdederunt me canes multi: Christ's Tormenters in Northern European Art of the Late Middle Ages and Early Renaissance," The Art Bulletin 59 (June, 1977), 167 - 181.
- _____, Passion Iconography in Northern European Art of the Late Middle Ages and Early Renaissance: a Study of the Transformation of Sacred Metaphor into Descriptive Narrative, Kortrijk, 1979.
- Masterpieces of Tapestry from the Fourteenth to the Sixteenth Century, New York, 1974, exh.cat., Metropolitan Museum of Art.
- Mathieu, C., "Le Métier des peintres à Bruxelles aux XIV^{me} et XV^{me} siècles," Bruxelles aux XV^{me} siècle, Brussels, 1953, 224 - 229.
- McCall, G. H., The Joseph Widener Collection: Tapestries at Lynnewood Hall, Philadelphia, 1932.
- Michel, J., Le Mystère de la Passion, Omer Jodoque, ed., Gembloux, 1959.
- Michelant, M., "Inventaire de la librairie de Marguerite d'Autriche le 9 juillet 1523," Bulletin de la Commission Royale d'Histoire de Belgique, sér. 3, 12 (1871), 10 - 78.
- _____, "Inventaires des vaiselles, joyoux, tapisseries, peintures, etc. de Marguerite d'Autriche, de Charles Quint, et de Philippe II," Bulletin Commission Royal d'Histoire 12, 13, 14 (1870 - 72), série III, t. XII, XIII.

- _____, "Inventaire des vaisselles, bijoux, tapisseries, peintures, manuscrits, etc, de Marguerite de l'Autriche, régente et gouvernante des Pays-Bas dressé en son palais de Malines, le 9 juillet 1523," Compte Rendu des Séances de la Commission Royale d'Histoire ou Recueil de ses bulletins, 12 (1871).
- Migeon, G., Les Tapisseries des Chasses de Maximilian, Brussels, 1920.
- Mislag-Bocheska, A., "Storied Tapestries: Scenes of Genesis," The Flemish Tapestries at Wawel Castle in Cracow, Treasures of King Sigismund Augustiss Jagiello, Antwerp, 1972, 75 - 90.
- Monzio, E. Tormo, et Sanchez Cantón, F. J., Los tapices de la casa del rey N. S., Madrid, 1919.
- Müntz, E., "Tapisseries allegoriques inédites ou peu connues," Monuments Piot 10 (1902).
- _____, "Un collaborateur peu connu de Raphaël, Tommaso Vincidor de Bologne," La Revue de l'Art 6 (1899), 336 - 38.
- Oakeshott, E., European Weapons and Armor from the Renaissance to the Industrial Revolution, North Hollywood, 1980.
- Oberheide, A., Die Einfluss Marcantonio Raimondis auf die nordische Kunst des 16. Jahrhunderts, dissertation, University of Hamburg, 1933.
- Pächt, O., "Early Italian Nature Studies and the Early Calendar Landscape," Journal of the Warburg Institute, 13 (1950), 13 - 47.
- _____, The Rise of Pictorial Narrative in Twelfth-Century England, Oxford, 1962.
- Pais, A., "Tapisseries tissées d'après les cartons de van Orley, représentant les episodes de la bataille de Pavie et retrouvées au Musée de Naples," Les Arts 3 (Jan.1904), 17 - 25.
- Panofsky, E., "Die Perspektive als symbolische Form," Vorträge der Bibliothek Warburg (1924-25), 258ff.
- Paris, G. and Raynaud, G., ed., Le Mystère de la Passion d'Arnoul Gréban, Paris, 1878.
- Parshall, P., "Lucas van Leyden's Narrative Style," Nederlands Kunsthistorisch Jaarboek 29 (1978), 185 - 237.

Pearsall, D. and Salter, E., Landscapes and Seasons of the Medieval World, London, 1973.

Phébus, G. Comte de Foix, Le Livre de la chasse, Bibliothèque nationale, Paris, mss. 616.

Philippot, P., "La fin du XV^e siècle et les origines d'une nouvelle conception de l'image dans la peinture des Pays-Bas," Bulletin des Musées royaux des Beaux-Arts de Belgique 11 (March - June, 1962), 3 - 38.

_____, Pittura fiamminga e Rinascimento italiano, Torino, 1970.

Pickering, F. P., Literature and Art in the Middle Ages, London, 1970.

Pierron, S., Histoire illustrée de la forêt de Soignes, III, Brussels (n. d.).

Pierron, S., and Houtart, A., Les Belles Chasses de Maximilian, Brussels, 1923.

Pieter Bruegel d. A. als Zeichner, Berlin, 1975, exh. cat., Berlin, Kupferstichkabinett.

Piles, Roger de, Abrégé de la vie des peintres, Paris, 1699.

Pinchart, A., Archives des arts, sciences et lettres, 3 vols., Ghent, 1860-81.

_____, Histoire générale de la tapisserie, III, Pays-Bas, Paris, 1878-85.

_____, Cartons 27, 4, 3, Manuscript Division, Bibliothèque Royale d'Albert I, Brussels, n. d.

Piquard, M., "Le Cardinal de Granvelle, amateur de tapisseries," Revue Belge d'Archéologie et d'Histoire de l'Art 19 (1950), 111 - 127.

Pope-Hennessy, J., The Portrait in the Renaissance, New York, 1963.

_____, The Raphael Cartoons, London, 1950.

Popham, A. E., "An Orley Drawing Retouched by Rubens," Old Master Drawings 1 (1927), 45 - 47, pl. 53.

_____, "Bernard van Orley, Hawking Scene," Old Master Drawings 1 (1926), 22 - 23.

_____, Catalogue of Drawings by Dutch and Flemish Artists in the British Museum, V, London, 1932.

Primitifs flamands anonymes: Maîtres aux noms d'emprunt des Pays-Bas méridionaux du XVe et du début du XVIe siècle, Bruges, 1969, exh. cat., Musée Communal.

Puyvelde, L. van, "Het aandeel van de voornaamste Vlaamse Kunstschilders in de Tapijtweverij," Het Herfsttij van de Vlaamse Tapijtkunst, International Colloquium, Brussels, 1959, 59 - 68.

_____, La Peinture flamande au siècle de Bosch et Bruegel, Brussels, 1962.

_____, Renaissance italienne et Renaissance flamandes (Atti del XVIII^e Congresso internazionale di storia dell'arte), Venice, 1955, 189 - 196.

Raczynski, J. A. G., Die flämische Landschaft vor Rubens, Frankfurt am Main, 1937.

Reynaud, N., "Un Peintre français cartonnier de tapisserie au XVe siècle. Henri de Vulcop," Revue de l'Art 22 (1973), 7 - 21.

Ringbom, S., Icon to Narrative: The Rise of the Dramatic Close-up in Fifteenth Century Devotional Painting, Abo, 1965.

Roethlisberger, M., "Deux tentures bruxelloises du milieu der XVI^e siècle," Oud-Holland 86, pt. 2 - 3 (1971), 88 - 115.

Roggen, D. and Dhanens, E., "De humanist Busleyden en de oorsprong van het Italianisme in de Nederlandse kunst," Gentse Bijdragen tot de Kunstgeschiedenis 13 (1951), 127 - 52.

Rombouts, P. and Lerijs, T. van, Les Liggers en autres Archives Historiques de la Gilde Anversoise de Saint Luc, I: Liggere de 1453-1615, Antwerp, n. d.

Rosand, D. and Muraro, M., Titian and the Venetian Woodcut, Washington, 1976-77, exh. cat., National Gallery.

Rosenthal, E., "Plus Ultra, Non Plus Ultra, and the Columbar Device of Charles V," Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes 34 (1971), 204 - 228.

Rubinstein, S., "A Tapestry from a Cartoon by Bernard van Orley," Art in America 4 (1916), 258 - 262.

Rubenstein-Bloch, S., Catalogue of the Collection of George and Florenne Blumenthal, I, Paris, 1926.

Ruiz Alcon, M. T., "A Treasure-house of Tapestries," Apollo 87 (1968), 330 - 339.

Ruszczy, J., "Au sujet de l'iconographie des tapisseries aux éléments grotesques," Bulletin du Musée National de Varsovie 2 (1961), 103 - 114.

Saintenoy, P., "Les Arts et les artistes à la cour de Bruxelles. Le Palais des Ducs de Bourgogne sur le Coudenberg à Bruxelles d'Antoine de Bourgogne à celui de Charles-Quint," Mémoires, Classe des Beaux-Arts, Académie Royale de Belgique 5 (1934).

_____, "Les Tapisseries de la cour de Bruxelles sous Charles V," Annales de la Société Royale d'Archéologie de Bruxelles 30 (1921), 1 - 31.

Salmon, L., "The Passion of Christ in Medieval Tapestries," Acts of the Tapestry Symposium, San Francisco, 1976, 79 - 101.

Sanderus, A., Chorographia Sacra. Insignis Canonical S. Pauli Rubeae Vallis in Zonia, Brussels, 1659.

Santos, R. Dos, As Tapeçarias da Tomada de Arzila, Lisbon, 1925.

Scheicher, E., "Die Groteskenmonate eine Tapisserienserie des Kunsthistorischen Museums in Wien," Jahrbuch der Kunsthistorischen Sammlung in Wien 69 (1973), 55 - 84.

Schneebalg-Perelman, S., "Les Sources de l'Histoire de la tapisserie bruxelloise et la tapisserie en tant que source," Annales de la Société royale d'archéologie de Bruxelles 51 (1966), 279 - 337.

_____, "Richesses du Garde-Meuble parisien de François I^{er} Inventaires inédits de 1542 et 1551," Gazette des Beaux-Arts 78, sér. 6 (1971), 253 - 304.

_____, "Tapestry in Brussels Under the Reign of Philip the Good," Roger van der Weyden, Brussels, 1979, exh. cat., Palais du Roi, 102 - 115.

_____, "Un nouveau regard sur les origines et le développement de la tapisserie bruxelloise du XIV^e siècle à la pré-Renaissance," Tapisseries bruxelloises de la pré-Renaissance, Brussels, 1976, 161 - 191.

Shaw, J. B., Old Master Drawings from Chatsworth, Washington, 1969-70, exh. cat., National Gallery.

_____, Old Master Drawings from Christ Church Oxford, Washington, 1972, exh. cat., National Gallery of Art.

Shearman, J., Raphael's Cartoons in the Collection of her Majesty and the Tapestries for the Sistine Chapel, London, 1972.

Le XVI^e Siècle européen. Tapisseries, Paris, 1965-66, exh. cat., Mobilier National.

Standen, E., "Drawings for the 'Months of Lucas' Tapestry Series," Master Drawings 9 (1971), 3 - 14.

_____, "Some Sixteenth-Century Flemish Tapestries Related to Raphael's Workshop," Metropolitan Museum Journal 4 (1971), 109 - 121.

_____, "I, Tapestries in Use: Indoors," Apollo 113 (July, 1981), 6 - 15.

_____, "Tapisseries Renaissance, Maniéristes et Baroques: nouveaux développements," Revue de l'Art 22 (1973), 91 - 97.

_____, "The Twelve Ages of Man. A Further Study of a Set of Early Sixteenth-Century Flemish Tapestries," Metropolitan Museum Journal 2 (1969), 127-- 169.

Steppe, J. K., "Exkurs zur Familie van der Moeyn und zu Marc Crétic," Tapisseries der Renaissance nach Entwürfen van Pieter Coecke van Aelst, Schloss Halbturn, 1981, 33 - 35.

_____, "Mencia de Mendoza et ses rapports avec Gilles de Busleyden," Scrinium Erasmianum 2 (1969), 469 - 484.

_____, "Inscriptions décoratives contenant des signatures et des mentions du lieu d'origine sur les tapisseries bruxelloises de la fin du XVe et du début du XVI^e siècle," Tapisseries bruxelloises de la pré-Renaissance, Brussels, 1976.

Steppe, J. K. and Delmarcel, G., "Les Tapisseries du Cardinal Erard de la Marck prince-évêque de Liège," Revue de l'Art 25 (1974), 35 - 54.

Steppe, J. K., "Vlaams tapijtwerk van de 16^e eeuw in Spaans koninklijk bezit," Miscellanea Jozef Duverger, II, Ghent, 1968, 719 - 765.

- _____, "Vlaamse wandtapijten in Spanje. Recente gebeurtenissen en publicaties," Artes Textiles 3 (1956), 27 - 66.
- Sterling, C., "Le Paysage fantastique néerlandais," L'art vivant 6 (1930), 270 ff.
- Stöcklein, H., "Die Schlacht bei Pavia zum Gemälde des Ruprecht Heller," Beiträge zur Geschichte der deutschen Kunst, Oberdeutsche Kunst der Spätgotik und Reformationszeit 1 (1924), 230 - 239.
- Strumwasser, Gina, Heroes, Heroines and Heroic Tales from the Old Testament: An Iconographic Analysis of the Most Frequently Represented Old Testament Subjects in Netherlandish Painting, ca. 1430-1570, dissertation, UCLA, university microfilms, 1979.
- Sulzberger, S., "Bernard van Orley," Revue Belge d'Archéologie et d'Histoire de l'Art 14 (1944), 100.
- Tapisseries bruxelloises de la pré-Renaissance, Brussels, 1976, exh. cat., Musées royaux d'Art et d'Histoire.
- Tapisserien der Renaissance nach Entwürfen von Pieter Coecke van Aelst, Schloss Halbturn, 1981, exh. cat., Schloss Halbturn.
- Terlinden, Vicomte C., Charles Quint Empereur des Deux Mondes, Brussels, 1965.
- Tervarent, G. de., "Les Sources littéraires de van Orley: Légende dorée et vie de bienheureux Martin," Revue Belge d'Archéologie et d'Histoire de l'Art 4 (1930), 19 - 20.
- Thiebaux, M., "The Medieval Chase," Speculum 42, no. 12 (April, 1967), 260 - 74.
- Tormo Monzo, E., and Sanchez Canton, F. J., Los Tapices de la Casa del Rey N. S., Madrid, 1919.
- Troyen, C. L., Dürer's Life of the Virgin, unpubl. dissertation, Yale University, 1979.
- Valencia de Don Juan, Conde V. de, Tapices de la Corona de Espana, Madrid, 1903.
- Valentiner, W. R., "Tapestries from Designs by Bernaert van Orley," Art in America 1 (1913), 53 - 58.

- Vasari, G., Le vite de' piu eccellenti pittori, scultori e architettori, M. G. Milanesi, ed., Florence, 1906.
- Verhaegen, P., "Le vieux Boitsfort," Annales de la Société Royale d'Archéologie de Bruxelles 33 (1927), 15 - 47.
- Versyp, J., De geschiedenis van de tapijtkunst te Brugge, Brussels, 1954.
- Veth, J. and Müller, S., Albrecht Dürers Niederländische Reise, 2 vols, Berlin and Utrecht, 1918.
- Vlaamse Wandtapijten uit Spanje, Ghent, 1959, exh. cat., Museum voor Schone Kunsten.
- Völker, B., Die Entwicklung des Erzählenden Halbfigurenbilds in der Niederländischen Malerei des 15. und 16. Jahrhunderts, dissertation, Göttingen, 1968.
- Vroom, W. H., Het Kunstenaarscontract in de 15e en 16e Eeuw in de Nederlanden, dissertation, Amsterdam, 1958-59.
- Wace, A., The Marlborough Tapestries at Blenheim Palace, and their Relation to other Military Tapestries of the War of the Spanish Succession, London and New York, 1968.
- Wauters, A., Bernard van Orley, Brussels, 1893.
- _____, "Bernard van Orley, sa famille et ses oeuvres. Notice," Bulletin de l'Académie Royale des Sciences, des Lettres et des Beaux-Arts de Belgique, sér. 3, no. 1 (1881), 369 - 444.
- _____, Les Tapisseries bruxelloises, Brussels, 1878.
- _____, "Les Verrières de Bernard van Orley," L'Art 56 (1894), 39 - 44.
- Wauters, A. and Henne, A., Histoire de la Ville de Bruxelles, Brussels, 1845.
- Wayment, H., "A Rediscovered Master: Adriaen van den Houte of Malines (c. 1459-1521) and the Malines/Brussels School.
- "I. A Solution to the 'Ortkens' Problem," Oud-Holland 82 (1967), 172 - 202.
- "II. Adrian van den Houte as a Tapestry Designer," Oud-Holland 83 (1968), 71 - 94.
- "III. Adrian's Development and his Relation with Bernard van Orley," Oud-Holland 84 (1969), 257 - 269.

_____, "Bernard van Orley and Malines: The Dido and Aeneas Tapestries at Hampton Court," The Antiquaries Journal 49 (1969), 267 - 376.

Wegner, W., Die niederländischen Handzeichnungen des 15.-18. Jahrhunderts (Katalogue der Staatlichen Graphischen Sammlung München, I), Berlin, 1973.

Weitzmann, K., Illustrations in Roll and Codex. A Study in the Origin and Method of Text Illustration, Princeton, 1947.

Wetering, C. van de, Die Entwicklung der niederländischen Landschaftsmalerei vom Anfang des 16. Jahrhunderts bis zur Jahrhundertmitte, Berlin, 1938.

Wickhoff, F., Die Wiener Genesis, Vienna, 1895.

Wissowa, G., Kroll, W. and Witte, K., Paulys Real-Encyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft, Stuttgart, 1894-1967.

Ysselstein, G. T. Van, Tapestry. The Most Expensive Industry of the XVth and XVIth Centuries. A Renewed Research into Technic, Origin, and Iconography, The Hague and Brussels, 1969.

Zinke, D., Patinir's "Weltlandschaft" Studien und Materialien zur Landschaftsmalerei im 16. Jahrhundert, Frankfurt am Main, Bern, Las Vegas, 1977.

PLEASE NOTE:

Plates in volume 2 have not been filmed at the request of the author. They are available for consultation, however, at Yale University Library.

University Microfilms International