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and the Giants of his Age
PUBLISH OR PERISH: MICHIEL COXCIE IN PRINT
Michiel Coxie's ventures into printmaking were distinctly modest in comparison with the oeuvres of contemporaries like Frans Floris, Maarten van Heemskerck and Lambert Lombard. While a painter like Floris in Antwerp flooded Europe with prints after his designs with the aid of publishers like Hieronymus Cock, Coxie the court painter, who worked mainly in Brussels and Mechelen, displayed an extraordinary lack of interest in having prints made after his inventions. This may be one reason why his fame was so short-lived, and why his work was forgotten for so long and was only rediscovered quite recently, for prints were already in widespread use back in the sixteenth century as vehicles for visual information. Artists like Dürer and Raphael realized very early on how useful they were for spreading their names and garnering fame on the international stage. It was often only from prints that early historians of art such as Vasari and Van Mander knew about the work of masters too far distant in time or space. It is only logical, then, that graphic art contributed greatly to the formation of an artistic canon in the age before photography.

Michiel Coxie witnessed major revolutions in printmaking during his long life. In the sixteenth century graphic art became the ideal way of disseminating the inventions of artists on a large scale. Around 1500 the top artistic segment of printmaking was still dominated by a small number of artists who usually took care of the design, production and distribution of their prints themselves. By the end of the century the market for printed images had expanded enormously, and almost all the technical and commercial aspects had passed into the hands of professional publishers, who also had an important say on the artistic side. This evolution can also be traced in the small graphic oeuvre that has come down to us from Michiel Coxie.

When he was born at the end of the fifteenth century copper engraving had reached maturity in northern Europe with the work of Martin Schongauer, and the young painter Albrecht Dürer had emerged as the leading graphic artist of his age. In the Low Countries it was Lucas van Leyden who followed in the footsteps of the great German artist. Coxie undoubtedly became acquainted with the graphic works of these masters during his youth and training in Mechelen and Brussels. Artists of various kinds eagerly availed themselves of the models that were made easily accessible through the wide distribution of these prints. Italian graphic art was not unknown in the North either. From 1510 to 1516 the Italian painter and printmaker Jacopo de' Barbari worked at the Mechelen court of Margaret of Austria and undoubtedly continued issuing his innovative engravings there.

With a few exceptions there was no appreciable output of high-grade graphic art in Brabant in the first two decades of the sixteenth century. That came to an end with Dürer's visit to the Southern Netherlands in 1520. Directly inspired by him, artists like Jan Gossaert and Dirck Vellert, and Frans Crabbe van Espleghem and Nicolaas Hogenberg in Mechelen, began experimenting with copper engraving and etching.

The young Coxie may well have known these artists and their work at first hand. He certainly did not lack models before his departure for Italy, but there is nothing to show that he took any steps towards making or designing prints in that period. A drawing of a Baptism of Christ after Jan van Scorel that Reznicek attributed to Coxie was thought by Dacos to be a design for an engraving and dated around 1530. The evidence for her theory was the delicate hatching that matches the technique that Coxie later employed for the designs for his Loves of Jupiter series. That argument is not sufficiently convincing for this sheet to be regarded as a preliminary drawing for an etching or engraving.

Coxie's earliest incontrovertible graphic projects date from his Italian sojourn or shortly thereafter, and were clearly influenced by his knowledge of Italian art and Roman printmaking. There he would have witnessed from close at hand a high
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organized production process geared mainly towards engravings that were issued in large editions by professional publishers. Raphael himself had given the initial impulse to what became a genuine industry. Inspired by Dürer’s prints he took the initiative to have his own designs turned into prints with the aid of a few collaborators, and it was those prints that largely contributed to the spread of his fame as a painter. As with the execution of his major commissions, it was due to a well-oiled machine that this project became such a success. Instead of retaining control over the design, production, financing and distribution, as Dürer had largely done, Raphael drew on the talents of different people to supervise separate links in the chain of production. In addition to Marcantonio Raimondi, who often worked with him as an engraver, he appointed his colleague Bavero de’ Caracci in 1515 to oversee the printing and dissemination of his graphic works. This laid the basis in Raphael’s workshop for the profession of commercial print publisher. After his death in 1520, Bavero, also called ‘Il Baviera’, acquired control over the plates and started a print business that would serve as a model for other enterprises that made Rome the centre of European print production in the second quarter of the sixteenth century. The legacy of Raphael and his school proved vigorous and long-lived, despite the many new trends inspired by a new generation of designers.

The Sack of Rome in 1527 led to a break in the output of the first generation, with many designers and engravers fleeing the city for a while, but from the early 1530s it had regained its lead again. When Coxcie arrived there, he found a production apparatus that would not be introduced in the Low Countries until a decade later.

THE STORY OF CUPID AND PSYCHE: COXCIE OR NOT?

The *Cupid and Psyche* series is based on the fable in Apuleius’ *Golden Ass*, otherwise known as the *Metamorphoses* (iv:28–vi:34). It consists of 33 unnumbered plates with text margins at the bottom that have remained blank. A drastically reworked state that was probably printed around the middle of the sixteenth century consists of 32 numbered engravings with two columns of Italian inscriptions below. The print with Venus ordering Psyche to collect water from a fountain is missing in this second version.

The first, very rare state and the qualitatively inferior and heavily modified version are not always clearly differentiated in the literature. The reworked state has the publisher’s address of Antonio Salamanca, who died in 1562. The reworking of the plates before 1562, a bare 30 years after they were engraved, is evidence that they had become badly worn. The first edition was undoubtedly very large and enjoyed great success, and the fact that it was known and popular outside Italy is demonstrated by the copies after 30 of the plates that were published with Latin and German inscriptions by Frans Hogenberg.

The name of the designer is not mentioned on the prints. It was Vasari who attributed the design of the series to Coxcie in his life of Marcantonio Raimondi in the second, 1568 edition of his *Vite*: ‘Next, among the many plates that have been issued from the hands of the Flemings within the last ten years, very beautiful are some drawn by one Michele, a painter, who worked for many years in two chapels that are in the church of the Germans [i.e. Santa Maria dell’Anima] at Rome. These plates contain the story of Moses and the Serpents, and thirty-two stories of Psyche and Love, which are held to be most beautiful.’

The attribution to Coxcie is based first and foremost on the authority of Vasari, who was apparently well informed, as he asserted that he had known Coxcie in Rome and
153 Michiel Coxcie, Apuleius Changed into a Donkey Listening to the Story Told by an Old Woman. Drawing for plate I of the Story of Cupid and Psyche print series. Musée du Louvre, Paris, Département des Arts graphiques

154 Michiel Coxcie, The Clemency of Sisipho (?). Drawing. The British Museum, London, Department of Prints and Drawings
correctly cited other works, including the etching with the *Erection of the Brazen Serpent.* In the earlier literature the designer was identified as Raphael. Many of the narrative compositions have several figures in a more spacious architectural or landscape setting. The classicizing inspiration of the nudes and the draperies testify to a deep knowledge of classical art. The reworking of those elements in classically articulated and carefully considered compositions, often with architectural elements that structure the image, is close to Raphael. The subject-matter and style of some of the scenes are linked to the decorations for the Loggia de Psiche on which Raphael and his workshop worked in the Villa Farnesina in Rome in 1517–19.

Nicole Dacos has repeatedly and resolutely rejected the attribution to Coxsie. According to her, the series has nothing in common with the Fleming's known works from his Roman period. In her reading it was derived from designs by Raphael for the completion of the Farnesina decorations that were never executed due to the successive deaths of Raphael and the patron Agostino Chigi. The compositions were then reworked in the workshops of Raphael's pupils and led, among other things, to the decorative cycles by Perino del Vaga in the Palazzo del Principe in Genoa and in Castel Sant'Angelo in Rome. Tommaso Vincidor supposedly took drawings of these cycles with him to the Netherlands in 1520, where they were worked up into designs for tapestries that were woven in Brussels. A lost suite of 26 tapestries belonging to Francis I that is now only known from later editions does indeed display similarities to the compositions in the print series. Dacos rightly draws attention to the complex genesis of the series, which led to numerous inconsistencies in the final design in the orientation of compositions and the left-handedness of some of the figures.

She also wants to distinguish the hand of Lambert Suavion in the hypothetical tapestry designs, and thus in the print series as well. The trouble is that her attributions of paintings and tapestry designs to this Liège artist are extremely problematic and are
based on the comparison of details executed in different media.\textsuperscript{24} In a recent publication she cites drawings by Perino del Vaga as evidence that the design of the cartoons and the engravings should be attributed to Cornelis van Cleve, who supposedly made them with Suavitus's aid in Vincidor's Brussels workshop.\textsuperscript{25}

Coxie nevertheless remains the most plausible candidate as designer of the series, meaning that he supplied the drawings, which are clearly based on models from the school of Raphael, and that the engraver used them for the prints. First and foremost, the 'names' of the engravers of the 33 plates are known for certain. Thirty were engraved by the Master of the Die, although he only monogrammed plates 6 and 9 with the die to which he owes his name of convenience. Agostino Veneziano engraved and signed plates 4, 7 and 13. The series can therefore be dated fairly precisely using the biographical information about the two of them. Agostino dei Musi, also known as Veneziano, dated his oeuvre between 1514 and his death in 1536. At the time of the Sack of Rome in 1527 he was in his native Venice, only returning to the Eternal City in 1531. His more modest share in the engravings may be attributable to his death. The Master of the Die was active as a printmaker in the period 1529–60 and repeated many compositions by Raphael and his workshop.\textsuperscript{26} This means that the series almost certainly dates from the mid-1530s, right in the middle of Coxie's stay in Rome. In addition, he could already have learned about the hypothetical tapestry designs for the Psyche series when he was working in Van Orley's shop in Brussels. He would certainly have met Vincidor in the city, and known the workshop he headed there for weaving the large tapestry series commissioned by the Pope.\textsuperscript{27}

The most important argument for attributing the design of the series to Coxie has been put forward by Achim Gnann and Domenico Laurenza,\textsuperscript{28} who correctly identified a red chalk drawing in the Louvre as the original design for the first plate.\textsuperscript{29} It is in mirror image, has almost the same dimensions as the print, and the outlines are indented with a stylus for transfer to the plate. They also established a convincing stylistic connection between this Paris sheet and a drawing in London that bears Coxie's monogram.\textsuperscript{30} In their essay they outline the close relationship between Coxie's work in his early Roman period and the example set by Raphael.

Drawings by Raphael's school, possibly in the form of tapestry designs worked up by Vincidor and his shop in Brussels, remain eminently plausible as the source of inspiration for the Psyche suite. As Dacos so rightly remarked, the transformation of the compositions into tapestries was not based on the print series but more probably on an unknown common source. Here it is worth noting a few stylistic features that reflect Vincidor's contribution. The abundant and fairly minute rendering of the landscapes, for example, displays similarities to the scenes in the Vatican Loggia, the detailing of which has been attributed to Vincidor, among others. Compared to Raphael's autograph drawings the female figures, too, are heftier, with broad shoulders and fleshy upper arms, and those elements also recur in the designs attributed to Vincidor for the Scuola Nuova tapestry designs and in the finish of the Old Testament scenes in the Vatican Loggia.\textsuperscript{31}

The designs for this cycle show that Coxie was not a very original artist. His ability was more a question of taking ideas from other artists and putting them together, and that is also seen in other parts of his oeuvre. The skill and empathy that he brought to bear in his imitations of the style of other artists also stood him in good stead in his later work as a copyist. As is almost always the case, we do not have any information about the financial background to his print designs. He was probably paid only to deliver the drawings. Apart from the experience it gave him, and the income, which was probably more than welcome, this particular commission held out not the slightest prospect of publicizing his own designs and allowing them to make a name for him.
An engraving of the Flagellation that also bears Coxcie’s monogram is heavily indebted to Michelangelo and his pupil Sebastiano del Piombo. Until now it has largely escaped the notice of scholars. The figure of Christ, bound to a pillar in the centre foreground, with jutting chest and head turned in profile away from the viewer, is clearly modelled on the one in the fresco that Sebastiano painted in the Borgherini Chapel of San Pietro in Montorio after a sketch by Michelangelo. Coxcie was very familiar with the decorations in this chapel, which were completed in 1524. Sebastiano’s fresco in the apse, just above the Flagellation, was the source of inspiration for Coxcie’s Ascension in the St Barbara Chapel in Santa Maria dell’Anima. Studies after the frescoes of both the Flagellation and the Ascension drawn on both sides of a sheet that probably comes from a sketchbook have been attributed to Coxcie by Nicole Dacos. In his version Coxcie added more variation to the compact composition of Sebastiano’s fresco. He replaced...
the central perspective of the Corinthian atrium by an architectural setting that recedes into the background in stages, but in so doing introduced some serious inconsistencies in the perspective construction. The pillar has been moved to just left of centre, and there is more variety and expressiveness in the poses of the torturers, who are also further away from Christ and have even partly disappeared out of the field of view.

The only impression known to me is a mediocre one of what is probably a later state in the printroom of Museum Boijmans Van Beuningen. Traces of an erased inscription that can be made out below the base of the pillar may be the address of the original publisher. The engraver gave the figures a very hard, almost geometrical musculature. The drapery folds are sharp and the figures have incisive outlines. Tonal transitions are almost totally absent. Densely hatched, shaded passages adjoin white ones. This way of engraving, which is clearly by a less gifted Roman hand, has little in common with the tonally richer and rounded style of works like the Loves of Jupiter.

The same hand is seen in two other engravings of religious and moralizing scenes that are clearly based on Coxcie’s designs. The first one, which has his monogram, is of St Jerome reading by a withered tree in a setting of classical ruins. An angel is pointing to a Last Judgement in the background. The second one is of the risen Christ appearing to Mary Magdalen. It is not signed, but is related to the St Jerome in subject-matter, style and engraving technique. The figures of Christ and the Magdalen recall the fresco with the presentation of Cardinal Van Enckewoort that Coxcie painted in the St Barbara Chapel in Santa Maria dell’Anima. The design and execution have to be placed in the Roman period. Most of the potential buyers for graphic art of this kind would have been more interested in the subjects than the artistry. These prints show that in his Roman period Coxcie was also involved in the production of this relatively simple kind of utilitarian graphic art.

THE LOVES OF JUPITER

The so-called Loves of Jupiter is a fine example of a series of drawings that were made specifically as print designs. They are preserved in the British Museum. Three have Coxcie’s monogram, and with the exception of Jupiter, in the Form of Diana, Enjoying Callisto, which is in black chalk, they are in pen and brown ink. All of them have traces left by the stylus when indenting the outlines for transfer to the copperplate. The sheet in black chalk has technical and stylistic similarities to the preliminary drawing for the first plate of the Psyche cycle, and to the drawing of the Clementy of Scipio in London, which can be fitted neatly into Coxcie’s Roman period, as Guinn and Laurensa have demonstrated. The other drawings are carefully worked up with the pen. The anatomies of the figures are defined with a clear network of parallel and cross-hatchings, and here the designer obviously made allowance for the fact that his drawing had to be interpreted by an engraver. That the drawings were made in Coxcie’s Roman period is suggested by the borrowings from classical sculptures and from works by Raphael and Michelangelo. Leda and the Swan and Jupiter and Callisto are based on classical statues that were in Rome at the time. Raphael’s influence is evident in the many borrowings from engravings by Raimondi and his school.

The iconography of the series is based on Ovid’s Metamorphoses, with the artist illustrating various passages that deal with Jupiter’s erotic escapades in different guises. Erotic print series featuring mythological figures were no novelty in Rome. One notorious example was the so-called J Modi designed by Giulio Romano and engraved by Raimondi, in which mythological and classical pairs of lovers were seen copulating with abandon. The prints and their makers were severely criticized by the papal
Michiel Coxie, Designs for the Loves of Jupiter print series. Nine pen drawings and one black chalk drawing (to). The British Museum, London, Department of Prints and Drawings

160  The Rape of Ganymede (plate 1)
161  Jupiter and Antiope (a)
162  Jupiter, in the Form of Amphitrite, and Alcmena (3)
163  Jupiter and Semele (a)
164  The Rape of Europa (3)
165  Jupiter and Aegina (6)
166  Jupiter, in the Form of a Serpent, and Proserpine (7)
167  Leda and the Swan (8)
168  Jupiter, Surprised by Jove, Transforming It into a Heifer (9)
169  Jupiter, in the Form of Diana, Enjoying Callisto (10)

authorities, and the first edition was destroyed in its entirety. A later series with *The Loves of the Gods* cut by Jacopo Caraglio after designs by Perino del Vaga is less explicit. Its popularity may have encouraged Coxie and his patron to design a suite of his own. The prime motive for an artist to design prints must have been the widespread dissemination of his ideas and the resultant fame, as well as financial gain. That being said, though, the finished prints make not the slightest mention of the artist, the engraver or the publisher. Were the makers afraid of being prosecuted as Marcantonio Raimondi and Giulio Romano had been?

There is therefore no certainty about the engraver or place of publication. Several elements might indicate that the plates were made after Coxie’s return north and were printed in and sold from the Low Countries. The traditional attribution to Cornelis Bos, which Schéle doubted, might be worth reconsidering, for there are very close similarities to his early monogrammed oeuvre. The result of an engraver’s work is often highly dependent on the style or quality of the preliminary drawing. In Bos’s secure
works, for instance, one can see clear differences in the treatment of tonal contrasts between the works after Van Heemskerck and those after Lombard. In the case of the Loves of Jupiter, we know the quality of the precisely detailed preliminary drawing, which the engraver often followed meticulously. If one takes account of the variations in style and quality between the two designers, then the engravings with the Loves of Jupiter are very comparable indeed to Cornelis Bos’s early work of about 1540. It is not out of the question that Bos spent some time in Rome before settling in Antwerp in 1540, and might already have collaborated with Coxcie there. It is more likely, though, that the designs were not engraved until shortly after Coxcie’s return home.

That may also have been the case with a large engraving with the Conversion of Saul. It is one of Coxcie’s most ambitious prints, and the only one from the early period that is dated (1539). His monogram at bottom left is accompanied by the inscription “I. V E N,” which explicitly identifies him, possibly for the first time, as the inventor of the composition, although not with his full name.

Needless to say, it is a work that owes much to the influences that he underwent during his Roman period. Nicole Dacos sees echoes of Bernard van Orley’s Crucifixion Triptych in the Church of Our Lady in Bruges, and consequently argues for a dating shortly after Coxcie’s return. Rightly, too, she notes the influence of Salvati, who had been working on a Conversion of Saul in Rome in the 1530s, which appeared as a print in 1545.

In the centre, below the horse’s left hoof, is the enigmatic inscription “D V E. C O. S T. C A.” Rathgeber attributed the print to Cornelis Bos, but that was rejected by Schelle. Given the date, Bos is certainly worth considering as the engraver, but the handling of the figures and the shaded passages looks harsher and less supple than in his firmly established oeuvre. A few references in Plantin’s financial accounts may indicate that he also dealt in this print from time to time and that the plate was in the Low Countries and used there.

173 Cornelis Bos(?), after Michiel Coxcie, The Conversion of Saul, 1539. Engraving, with details of the inventor’s monogram and the enigmatic inscription. Albertina, Vienna
THE ERECTION OF THE BRAZEN SERPENT:
EXPERIMENTING WITH ETCHING

In addition to the Psyche series, Vasari mentions a print whose authorship cannot be contested: a signed etching of the Erection of the Brazen Serpent.⁵⁷ It is quite clearly of a very different nature from the engraved narrative suite. The predominant influence is Michelangelo rather than Raphael and his school. The signature – ’MICHEL FLAM.=/ MINGO.IN./VENEV’ – refers to Coxe’s Flemish origins, not to his actual surname. This could be a clue that the print was made abroad, in Italy, where he was known by that name, but it is also possible that it was used with an eye to the international distribution of the print.⁵⁸

The monumental composition can be regarded as a one-off and possibly autograph experiment with the etching technique. Unlike the handling of the burin, which requires a great deal of skill, the etching needle is easy to use for an artist who knows how to draw. Coxe may have intended to make the etching look like a pen drawing. A number of leading Netherlandish artists and printmakers started experimenting with etching in the 1520s.⁵⁹ Frans Floris and Pieter Bruegel the Elder also tried their hands at it, but much later, and like Coxe only once.⁶⁰ The fact that they then abruptly abandoned their experiments may have been due to the technical limitations of the
medium. Although the scene can be drawn easily and directly on the etching ground, biting it into the plate is not without risk. The lines do not always have the desired sharpness and depth, which can create problems when inking and printing the plate, especially when larger numbers of high-grade impressions are required. There are obvious technical defects in Coxie’s Erection of the Brazen Serpent, and attempts were made to correct them by biting the plate a second time and ultimately by reworking it radically with the burin, for which Coxie may have called in the assistance of a professional engraver.

A date shortly after Coxie’s return to the Netherlands is plausible on several counts. In technique and typography the print has little in common with the etchings of his Italian contemporaries. The large scale of the sheet and the broad draughtsman-like execution recall the etchings of the School of Fontainebleau, which were distributed on an international scale from the late 1530s on, so a date in the early 1540s would not be unlikely. Jan Cornelisz Vermeyen, Coxie’s fellow court painter and tapestry designer, made iconographically and technically outlandish etchings in the same period that are closely related to his drawings. Dirck Vellert already had two decades of experience as an etcher when he tried his hand at a monumental etched Flood in 1544. There is of course no stylistic similarity between Coxie’s attempt and those works, but the ventures into etching by artists from his circle may have been what inspired him to try the etching needle for himself. Maarten van Heemskerck, often working jointly with Dirck Volckertsz Coornhert, also made numerous etchings that have a distinctively draughtsman-like look that betrays the influence of the School of Fontainebleau. Van Heemskerck had returned to Haarlem from Rome in 1536, and started publishing prints almost immediately. The first one is dated 1537 and is signed with Cornelis Bos’s initials. Two years later he engraved an ambitious print of the raising of the brazen serpent after a design by Van Heemskerck. It is tempting to see the prints by Van Heemskerck and Coxie as a duel in virtuosity between two artists who had returned from lengthy stays in Rome and now wanted to show off their skills to a large international public.

The subject was obviously ideal for depicting the human (and overwhelmingly male) nude in the most contorted and contrived poses, so the sheets by Van Heemskerck and Coxie should not primarily be regarded as depictions of a religious subject but as displays of their mastery. In Coxie’s case the result is a rather incoherent compilation of quotations from contemporary Italian works and classical sculpture. As Molly Faries has demonstrated, there is some connection between this sheet and a drawing in Swarthmore College, which in turn displays technical similarities to the monogrammed design for the Loves of Jupiter series preserved in London. The Swarthmore drawing may be a fragment of an initial design for the print. Only the large reclining nude in the foreground is found in the etching, albeit in a radically different form. The nude is a striking borrowing from the drawing of the famous Tityus that Michelangelo made for Tommaso de’ Cavalieri in 1532–33. Coxie could have copied that motif at first hand when he was in Rome, but the figure also appeared in a print published by Antonio Salamanca. The facial expressions of some of the Israelites being assailed by snakes on the right are also noteworthy for their close resemblance to a head, the so-called Farcy or Anima damnata that Michelangelo drew for Gherardo Perini in the 1520s. Salamanca published a very similar head in an engraving. However, the graphic stylization of the hair and the shadows on the face are so similar that it is more likely that Coxie based himself on that print rather than on the original drawing.
REGRESSION

As already noted, there are persuasive indications that it was not until he was back in the Low Countries that Coxie had the prestigious and Italianate Loves of Jupiter series engraved and marketed. With his Erection of the Brazen Serpent he himself experimented with a technique that had been employed with some success by a few prominent contemporaries. Although he had been fairly productive in the realm of graphic art during and immediately after his stay in Rome, it seems that his output dried up completely after his return to the North. The Conversion of Saul dated 1539 is the only firm point of reference in the chronology. There is a terminus ante quem for the edition of the Loves of Jupiter in the form of a weak and probably Italian copy in reverse of Leda and the Swan, which is dated 1545. A complex scene of Invidius that can be attributed to the burin of Cornelis Bos has points of resemblance to Coxie’s work, and may also have been made in the 1540s. On occasion Coxie also seems to have supplied cheap, utilitarian graphic works like processional banners, possibly in the form of woodcuts. There is a surviving record of payment to him for a cartoon or model for one such banner for the Miraculous Sacrament in Brussels. It may have been a simple and traditional religious scene for which Coxie had no need to draw on his knowledge of modern Italian art.

Not a single invention by Coxie then appeared in print until the 1560s. He himself does not appear to have had the slightest interest in the distribution of his work in graphic form, in marked contrast to contemporaries like Lombard, Van Heemskerck and Floris, all of whom were closely involved in print production. Lombard took a keen interest in the training of engravers as part of the schooling he offered in Liège, which was run along Italian lines. Like Van Heemskerck, he worked first with Cornelis Bos before switching almost exclusively to Hieronymus Cock shortly after 1550. Van Heemskerck formed a duo with the engraver and humanist Dirck Volckertsz. Coornhert, and later he too found a reliable artistic and commercial partner in Cock. Although he regularly had prints produced after earlier drawings and compositions, he developed into a hugely creative and productive designer who provided Cock, and later his pupil Philips Galle, with dozens of majestic narrative cycles. It was Floris who exploited intaglio printing the most to promote himself as a leading painter. His native Antwerp naturally gave him direct access to the city’s many engravers and publishers.

It is remarkable that Coxie lagged so far behind his contemporaries in taking advantage of the opportunities presented by printmaking until at least the middle of the century. He never seems to have built up a relationship with Cock or any other publisher or printmaker. This will no doubt have had other causes than a failure to enter into a partnership. Coxie may have been wary of the medium because he quoted so often and so literally from the work of other artists, which would have come to light all the sooner through the international distribution of prints. Even that, though, is an inadequate explanation, since quoting another person’s work was often seen in a very positive light, certainly until the middle of the century. A better explanation may be that as a court painter he occupied a different social and economic position. In contrast to Van Heemskerck and Floris, who operated in a modern, urban and cosmopolitan milieu, Coxie worked for the traditional elite of court, nobility and public dignitaries, the Church, and the great religious institutions and confraternities. He supplied the designs for ambitious projects like stained-glass windows and tapestries, and was entrusted with the prestigious task of decorating Binche Castle, as well as with royal commissions including the production of meticulous copies after masterpieces by Jan van Eyck and Rogier van der Weyden.

There is nothing to suggest that Coxie played an active part in the creation of the single prints after his designs that appeared sporadically from the 1560s onwards.
Hieronymus Cock published most of them, including two engravings that bear his monogram and which seem to be closer to his early work in style. The Antwerp publisher may have got hold of earlier drawings by the master, or perhaps drawn copies were made of works that were on public display. Some of those prints are important in that they give an idea of the original appearance of lost works by Coxcie.

The model for the engraving Jesus Among the Doctors that Cornelis Cort engraved for Cock and dated 1562 is not known. The composition was very clearly inspired by Raphael. The central perspective, the architectural subdivision of the space and the placement of the figures recall the School of Athens. The composition could date from the 1540s and may have been worked up into a monumental version along the lines of Coxcie’s large altarpieces. Cort also engraved a Resurrection for Cock. The print has perhaps rightly been associated with Van Mander’s report of a lost fresco of the same subject that Coxcie painted in the old Basilica of St Peter in Rome. The poses of the soldiers are clearly influenced by Michelangelo, in particular by the so-called Ignudi on the Sistine Chapel ceiling. The famous figure of Adam is immediately recognizable in the soldier lying in the foreground. Christ’s legs and torso are based on a Crucifixion by Michelangelo. The fresco probably owed its fame to its location, which would have been why Cock had a print made of it, complete with the familiar monogram.

Cornelis Cort, after Michiel Coxcie, Jesus Among the Doctors, 1562. Engraving. Bibliothèque royale de Belgique/ Koninklijke Bibliotheek van België, Brussels, Print Room
Cort also engraved a plate after the central panel of the *Marillon Triptych* in St Peter’s in Leuven.\(^8^0\) The print was certainly made before Cort’s departure for Italy in 1565, and was probably commissioned by Cock.\(^8^1\) For some reason it lacked an inscription for a long time, and it was only in the third state, which was published by Theodoor Galle in the seventeenth century, that the words ‘Michael Coxsi pinxit’ were added. The proportions in the print differ quite considerably from those on the panel, so it is not inconceivable that Cort based himself on a preparatory drawing or on a drawn copy of one.

The attribution to Coxcie of an unsigned engraving of the *Fall of Man* that was published by Cock can be firmly rejected.\(^8^2\) The fine depiction of the Garden of Eden may have reminded some authors of Coxcie’s tapestry designs, but the elegantly intertwined figures have nothing in common with his work. The roots of this scene lie in France, with the School of Fontainebleau and their followers. A similar pose may be found in an etched roundel of *Venus and Mars* by Jean Mignon after Luca Penni from the mid-1540s.\(^8^3\) The figures in a print of the *Fall* by Jean II de Gourmont are set in a vertical composition which Zerner regarded as a copy after Cock’s print, but the relationship may be the very opposite.\(^8^4\) The invention is said to be by Jean Cousin the Elder, and the landscape and the vegetation with the hanging foliage are typical of his style.\(^8^5\)

---

175 Giorgio Ghisi, Paul's Sermon on the Areopagus in Athens, after Raphael's School of Athens. Engraving, Staatsgalerie, Stuttgart, Graphische Sammlung
FURNIUS AFTER COXCIE:
THE ASEMBERG CRUCIFIXION IN PRINT?

One of the largest and most ambitious prints after a surviving work by Coxcie is the engraving of a large Crucifixion by the Liège painter and engraver Petrus Furnius. He was a product of Lambert Lombard’s school, and started working as an independent printmaker in the mid-1560s. He relied heavily on Antwerp for the printing and distribution of his graphic works, which are after his own designs as well as those by Lombard and other famous contemporaries. His hand can be detected in many unsigned prints. There is every indication that he worked for his own account, but from time to time he accepted commissions from Antwerp publishers like Hieronymus Cock and, after 1570, his widow Volcxken Diericx. Sometimes his style reaches the heights of virtuosity and was clearly influenced by Cort, although his engravings never achieve the same level of perfection.

In this engraving Furnius added his own monogram beside Coxcie’s name, who is identified as the inventor. It shows Christ on the Cross between the two thieves. The bad thief on Christ’s left is seen from the back and is looking over his shoulder between his left arm and the crossbeam. Rubens repeated this motif literally in a preliminary drawing for a book illustration for Balthasar Moretus, so it can be assumed that the composition was fairly well-known, undoubtedly through the engraving. In addition to the large figure of St John seen from behind and the Holy Women mourning behind him, one’s eye is caught by the Roman soldiers dicing and drinking in the foreground. The crouching one at the front is looking up at the cross over his shoulder and is holding the lance with the sponge, which creates a powerful diagonal.

The engraving perfectly matches a monumental panel that is now in Valladolid Cathedral. Ollero Butler pointed out that this work may be identical with an important work by Coxcie which Van Mander says was in Asemberg before being sent to Spain by Cardinal Granvelle. “His first and most important work, two or three miles outside Brussels in Asemberg, was the high altarpiece: a large piece with a Crucifixion, an excellently artistic work on account of which many artists often came from Brussels to see it. During the Netherlandish revolt this important work was taken to Spain by a certain Thomas Werry, merchant of Brussels, and sold to Cardinal Granvelle for King Philip.”

The existence of this engraving, which was unknown to Ollero Butler, reinforces his hypothesis, for knowledge of the painting may have contributed to Furnius’s decision to transform it into an ambitious print. He did so in 1574 at the latest, for on 19 December of that year he supplied Plantin with three impressions. The fact that it was in an easily accessible location meant that a drawing could be made of it without involving Coxcie in the production of the print at all.

The same applies to the very last prints to be published after Coxcie’s designs, which date from the mid-1570s. In 1574 in Antwerp Pieter Baltens issued a Christ Triumphant that had been engraved by Jan Ditmar, on which Coxcie is credited as inventor. It shows Christ seated in the clouds and triumphing over Death in the form of a skeleton on the terrestrial globe below. The figure of Christ was quite clearly inspired by Michelangelo’s Last Judgement in the Sistine Chapel. He is surrounded by the symbols of the four evangelists and by angels carrying the instruments of the Passion. The composition and details recall the central panel of the Morillon Triptych. It is possible that the print was modelled on a lost painted composition that was also executed around 1560.

All these graphic works were published in Antwerp, which had grown to become the leading centre of print production around 1570. Large publishing houses, like those of Hieronymus Cock, Gerard de Jode and Philips Galle, met the ceaseless and growing
international demand for printed images. The design, production and distribution of devotional prints and narrative religious scenes of a high artistic and technical standard was a growth industry, and artists of a new generation were more than willing to give the public what it wanted. Figures like Maarten de Vos, Jan Snellinck and Gerard van Groeningen designed hundreds of individual prints and series. The inventions of an older man like Coxcie very rarely found an opening in this crowded market, and when they did it may well have been through sheer coincidence.

Gerard de Jode commissioned hundreds of prints of a similar size depicting all the books of the Old and New Testaments. He assembled the plates over the years and in 1579 first published a specially printed title plate and table of contents for the entire collection. This *Thesaurus sacrarum historiae veteris testamenti* required a huge investment. Artists like De Vos and Van Groeningen supplied most of the drawings, but earlier designs were also recycled in order to complete the series. The Book of Genesis includes three prints that Jan Sadeler engraved after Coxcie's designs in 1576. They are scenes from the story of Cain and Abel: *The Sacrifice of Abel, Cain Killing Abel and Adam and Eve Mourning Abel's Death*. The compositions are very similar to the Genesis tapestries after the cartoons by Coxcie that were woven in the first edition for the Polish king Sigismund Augustus between 1548 and 1553. The kneeling figure of Cain by the smoking sacrificial altar is an identical reversed version of the one in the tapestry, although there his nudity is concealed by an animal pelt. It is unlikely that the Antwerp publisher asked Coxcie to supply designs for these three prints. It was far
more common for a compilation to be made from the available models or for earlier variants to be reworked. Antwerp was the centre of the tapestry trade, and Coxie's work would certainly not have been unknown there.

It is almost symbolic that one encounters the grandmaster of the ancient and prestigious medium of tapestry at the birth of a monumental and trailblazing work in the new medium that printmaking had become in Coxie's day. The contrast between princely, costly, time-consuming, fragile yet long-lasting tapestries and the democratic, fleeting, swift, controversial but temporary nature of printmaking is symbolic of two worlds that existed in parallel yet often touched in the sixteenth century.

In his Roman period, and perhaps shortly after his return home as well, Coxie tried to swim with the second current. He had been designing prints in Rome, perhaps solely for financial reasons, and when he got back to the Low Countries he briefly tried to gain fame with his own signed work. A train of events then made him change course and enter circles where he had no need to seek commissions and status by having his works appear in print. He was more of a court painter who gained his standing from his contacts with the political elite and from commissions for ecclesiastical and civic authorities who were often extremely conservative. This may have been due to his own nature. Unlike several of his famous Netherlandish contemporaries, Michiel Coxie never initiated a school of followers, and that may have been a conscious decision on his part. As far as can be deduced from the fairly sparse biographical data, teaching did not suit him. In contrast to painters like Floris or Lombard, who established an Italian-style bottega that nurtured a sizeable number of pupils who went on to make successful careers for themselves, Coxie evidently felt no desire to combine training and self-promotion. In that respect, at least, he has to yield the title of "the Flemish Raphael" to Frans Floris.
1 On the prints of these three masters see, respectively, E. Woe in 1970 (Florence) 2011; 1986 (Van Heemskerck 1993-94; Denham 1990.


3 There is barely a mention of Cocozzi in Delen, the large survey of printmaking in the Netherlands, and not one of his works is discussed there. See Delen 1914-35.

4 See Lebeer 1947 for a survey of graphic production in Mechelen.

5 For Dürer’s influence, see Held 1931.

6 On De Barbari as a painter and printmaker, see Van der Sman 2002-03, pp. 15-19, and Stack 1999.

7 The Baptism of Christ, Uffizi, Florence, Gabinetto Disegni e Stampe, inv. 2314 vi; pen and brown ink on paper, 230 x 378 mm. On the reverse, in a sixteenth-century hand: ‘Michiel Coxies feit’. The attribution is backed not only by Renzneck and Dacos but also by Faries as well. The composition is a variation on Jan van Scorel’s Baptism of Christ in the Prado’s Hals Museum in Haarlem. See Renzneck 1964, no. 245, pp. 172-28 and fig. 25; Faries 1970, p. 137-35 and p. 141 n. 15. Dacos 1993, pp. 51-54.

8 Dacos 1993, pp. 51, see below for the Lucre in Jupiter.

9 Nor is the composition reversed left for right relative to the model, which is usually the case when working from a drawing that was specifically assigned to be turned into a print. The hypothetical impressions, not one of which has ever been found, would consequently show St John baptizing with his left hand.


12 The British Museum has an early eighteenth-century album from the Cracherode Collection that contains impressions of the entire first series that once belonged to Sir Peter Lely (6, 67-1-32). Pasto onto the facing pages are the text margins from the second version of the series. See Griffiths 1996.


14 Bartsch maintained that the plates of the first state were reworked by Francesco Villamena (c. 1565-1664). It is not clear whether all the plates have been reworked, some may simply have been copied. Important etched passages have been completely reworked. The attribution to Villamena is chronologically impossible, since he was born after Antonio Salamanca’s death (see below). See Bartsch xv, p. 232. For Villamena, see Bury 2001, p. 236.

15 The first plate is also known in a later state in which Salamanca’s address has been struck through and that of Giovanni Battista de Rossi has been added: ‘Si Stampo O Vende In Piazza Navona/ Gio Battista de Rossi/ Milanese In Roma’. See The Illustrated Bartsch 29, no. 39.

16 2010 (Paris Hogenberg), nos. 37-37; the copy after Bartsch 50 is missing.

17 Vasari (ed. Milanese), vol. 5, pp. 435-36: ‘Pon molte carte piccoli che sono uscita di mano ai Fiamminghi da dieci anni in qua, sono molto belle alcune disegnate da un Michele pittore, il quale lavora molti anni in Roma in due capelle, che sono nella chiesa de’ Tedeschi; le quali carte sono la storia del pius di Moisè, e trentadue storie di Paio e d’Amore; che sono temute bellissime.’ The translation is from Getscher 2003, p. 208.

18 By Armenini and Bellori, among others; cited by Dacos 2003, pp. 81-83. The title page of the last state, the plates of which are preserved in the Instituto Nazionale per la Grafica, also bears his name. See Bernini Peruzzi, Massari et al. 1985, pp. 250-51. Bartsch describes the prints separately, attributing the three by Venetian to Raphael (Bartsch xv, pp. 119-30, nos. 135-38). The others are described as being the work of the Master of the Di without naming the designer (Bartsch xv, pp. 211-14, nos. 59-70).

19 Compare, for example, Jupiter Enhancing Cupid at top right on plate 29 with the predilection of the same subject in the Putten and the figures of Venus and Cupid at top right on plate 2 with their counterparts in the Loggia di Paio. There is also a striking similarity to the wedding banquet of Cupid and Psyche with nymphs scattering flowers on plate 31. See Höpper 2001, p. 208. For the depredation of the Psyche engravings on the decoration of the Pare Desi and other works by Raphael, see further Dacos 2003, p. 85 and n. 14.

20 Dacos 1993; Dacos 2003; see also Dacos 2012, pp. 82 and 38 n. 54.

21 Dacos 2003.

22 Dacos 1980.

23 An original set of tapestries woven in Brussels after these cartoons was in the collection of King Francis I of France and was lost during the French Revolution. Several later re-editions are known to exist, including those in the Château de Pau and the Château of Rome. The composition of the first tapestry is particularly interesting in its strong resemblance to its counterpart by Perino del Vaga in Castel Sant’Angelo. See Dacos 2003, p. 91; Duverger 1993, pp. 186-88.
See Dacos 1993b, the only work by Suvius that is known properly dates from 1540-65 (see Hollstein xvii, pp. 165-99). It is characterized by elongated figures that are extremely sculptural in appearance who are draped in arithic, classical garments. In his engravings Suvius also displays a marked and refined sense of lighting effects and imitation of materials. In most cases these elements cannot be reconciled with the works that Dacos attributes to him.

Dacos 2012, pp. 88 and 238 n. 34. The author does not substantiate this attribution. I regard these attributions as problematic, for we have very little information about the early styles of both Suvius and Van Cleve.

See Milne 1966, The Illustrated Bartch 29, pp. 159-212.

Another illustration of the connection between Vincidor's workshop in the Netherlands, Raphael's artistic heirs in Rome and the Master of the Die is the fact that the latter also made engravings after the tapestry series with playful putti with festoons woven in Brussels after designs attributed to Giovanni da Udine and Vincidor. See Bartch xv, pp. 288-209, nos. 32-35, and The Illustrated Bartch 29, pp. 189-92, nos. 32-35 see Dacos 1983.


In their 1996 inventory Cordellier and Py still considered the sheet to be a copy after Coxcie, but nowadays it is attributed to Michiel Coxcie. The Old Savants Telling the History of Psyche to the Young Cupid, Musée du Louvre, Paris, Département des Arts graphiques, inv. 4310: red chalk over an underdrawing in black chalk, indented for transfer, 171 x 300 mm.

Michiel Coxcie, The Clemency of Scipio, red chalk, 222 x 288 mm, British Museum, Department of Prints and Drawings, 1946-773.137.

Compare, for example, the figures on the left in plate 3 (Bartch xx, p. 213, no. 40), The Illustrated Bartch 29, p. 195, no. 40) with the scene of Jacob and the Daughters of Leathur by the Well, which was probably worked up by Vincidor in the Vatican Loggia, in relation to the drawing by Raphael in the Albertina, Vienna (28 311, n. 103, inv. 173). See Gaun and Plotrop 2012, p. 146, no. 48, Dacos 2008, p. 317, fig. 137.

Anonymous engraver after Michiel Coxcie, The Flagellation, engraving, 238 x 190 mm. See Hollstein v, p. 62, no. 23; Hollstein xxi, p. 23, no. 1. For Sebastiano del Piombo's influence on Coxcie, see Dacos 1993b, 64-77.

Listed by Nagler (1858-79, vol. 2, p. 169, no. 2), who wrongly identified the monogram as Jan de Cock's, and in Hollstein (see note 3 above) under the monogrammist (without further identification) and under Cock.


Dacos 1993b, p. 70 and p. 88, figs. 7 and 8.

Musée Boijmans Van Beuningen, Rotterdam, Prentenkabinet, inv. BH 15416.

Engraving, 335 x 191 mm. There are two impressions in the British Museum: inv. 1874.063.660 and a damaged impression inv. 1.5.36. See Hollstein iv, p. 62, no. 4.

There are also points of similarity to the Psyche series. For instance, the poses of Mary Magdalene and Christ can also be seen in plate 3, in which Psyche is being presented to a king.

They are: (1) The Rape of Ganymede, (2) The Rape of Europa, and (10) Jupiter, in the Form of Diana, Enjoying Castita.

The British Museum, inv. 1871.1.12.1-12.9 and 1861.1.14.10. The numbers at top centre in pen and brown ink give the sequence. (1) The Rape of Ganymede, 177 x 137 mm; (2) Jupiter and Antiope, 174 x 135 mm; (3) Jupiter and Alcmena, 175 x 138 mm; (4) Jupiter and Semele, 174 x 139 mm; (5) The Rape of Europa, 178 x 138 mm; (6) Jupiter and Argina, 170 x 128 mm; (7) Jupiter and Pomerippe, 172 x 137 mm; (8) Eole and the Swan, 173 x 138 mm; (9) Jupiter and Io, 172 x 138 mm; (10) Jupiter, in the Form of Diana, Enjoying Castita, 176 x 134 mm.


See also the drawing in Swarthmore College, which does not appear to have been translated directly into print. See Faries 1975.

Various stylistic arguments can be put forward for placing the preliminary drawings in Coxcie's Roman period. In his entry on those drawings Van der Siman (Koenraad Jonckheere, Michiel Coxcie. De Vlaamse Rafael, Leuven 2011) refers to the loose handling of the rounded foliage, which matches that in a drawing of the Colosseum that Coxcie is thought to have made on the spot, and which is now in the Szépmüvészeti Múzeum, Budapest, inv. 1451. See Gerstel 2012, no. 11. Laurence has also drawn attention to the similarities between Europe's profile in the Rape of Europa and the frescoes that he attributes to Coxcie in the Marcia Chapel in Santa Trinità dei Monti in Rome. See Laurence 1993, p. 100.

See Bober, Rubinstein and Woodford 1986, nos. 5 and 94.

See Dacos 1995a, p. 173.

See Talvacchia 1999.

After the first edition was destroyed, the designs were said to have been engraved a second time by Agostino Veneziano. See Turner 2004 and James Grantham Turner, in Bayer 2008, pp. 200-201, no. 99.
The great success of the series can be deduced from the many copies and variants. The first version, and not only in Italy. See The Illustrated Bartoccia 18 (Commentary), pp. 97–99; Turner 2010.

A statement in the 1601 probate inventory of Volcker Dierickx may refer to impressions of this series: ‘Twentewintig bladen van Standeckens van vier op een blad’ [Twenty-two sheets of Portraits, with four to a sheet]. See Duveger 1956–2002, vol. 1, p. 22.


Schele lists the series as ‘doubtful’ but gives no reason for those doubts; see Schele 1965, pp. 203–05, nos. 225–34.

On 1 April 1540 one ‘Cornelis Willeme Claesoon van S’Hertogenbosh, figurersnyder in coper’ [Cornelis Willeme Claesoon van S’Hertogenbosch, carver of images in copper] was registered as a burgon of Antwerp. In 1537 Bos had already dated a Sacrifice of Isaac that he had engraved after Maarten van Heemskerck. See Schele 1965, no. 1, and Van der Coelen 1995.

CE: the monogram and signature on the wings of the St Luke for Mechelen.

Dacos 1959a, pp. 85–86, no. 18.

Rathgeber 1844, p. 372.


The Elevation of the Brazen Serpent, etching, reworked with the burnis. 39.6 x 41.5 mm, signed at bottom right: ‘MOOREE FLAM: fungo IV VENTIV.’

Oberhuber 1667, p. 89: ‘Der Aufschritt nicht ist es wahrscheinlich, dass sie in Italien entstanden’.


In 1554 Hieronymus Cock published an etching by Fran Floris of a Victory after a painting that adorned the Arch of the Genove for Philip II’s Joyous Entry into Antwerp in 1549. See Wouw 2011, pp. 216–22, and no. 156; and B. Wouw in Van Grieken, Luijten and Van der Stock 2013, pp. 314–15, no. 86. In 1560 Cock published the famous Hare Hunt that was etched by Pieter Bruegel the Elder himself. See Oversteegen and Sellink 2001, pp. 200–03, no. 82; W. Bruegel, no. 31; and C. Tainturier, in Van Grieken, Luijten and Van der Stock 2013, p. 392, no. 109.

Zerner 1969.

As early as 1536 and 1538 Vermeyen requested monopoly privileges for printed material (maps, it is thought, but also etchings like the Portrait of Maida Hares) documenting Charles V’s Tunisian campaign. A large group of the works is dated 1545; see Horn 1989, vol. 1, pp. 19–31, 33–35.


Etching and engraving, attributed to Cornelis Bos, 213 x 336 mm; see HID (Van Heemskerck), no. 76.

Oberhuber saw quotations from the work of Michelangelo and Raphael, but also influence from Beccafumi and Saviti. See Oberhuber 1967, pp. 88–89, no. 101.

Attributed to Michiel Coxie. Details from the Elevation of the Brazen Serpent, pen and brown ink, 335 x 327 mm, Swarthmore College, Swarthmore, Pennsylvania; see Fairly 1975.

Michelangelo Buonarroti, Yipar, black chalk on paper, 290 x 338 mm, Windsor Castle, Royal Library, inv. 127717.

Barthay xv, 11, p. 259, no. 39; The Illustrated Bartoccia 29, p. 266, no. 39. On the prints after the Cavalieri drawings, see Barnes 2010.

Michelangelo, Donned Soul, Galleria degli Uffizi, Florence, Gabinetto Disegni e Stampe, black chalk on paper, 351 x 337 mm.

Barnes 2010, p. 68; Rotelli et al. 1964, p. 56, no. 18.

Compare the seated mother with children in the right foreground with the figure in the left foreground of The Holy Kinship in Keuramünster.

‘Jerst Vie Juby betult Meester Machielten van cocxeyn schildere van een patroon toetser vormen vanden vaenken vanden heylighen sacramente te makehen een gouden croon x ac. vii den. gi. Item betult eenen vormenmuster van antwerpen vander vooreenwen vormen te snyden xv sc. gr.’Archive of the Collegiate Church of St Michael and St Gudula, Brussels, 8674, fol. 481r, quoted in Roobaert 2000, pp. 276–77 and 276 n. 71.


It is repeatedly stated in the literature that the print after Van der Weyden’s Quasifian, which was engraved by Cort and published by Cock, was made after a copy or drawing by Coxie. I have rejected this unfounded assertion on the evidence of the major discrepancies between the print and the original, which Coxie copied fairly faithfully. The print is clearly the product of an Antwerp copying tradition of placing Rogier’s famous composition in a landscape, which may hark back to a box prototype by Quinten Metsys. See Josi Van Grieken, in Van der Stock and Campbell 2009, pp. 489–90, no. 70; idem, in Van Grieken, Luijten and Van der Stock 2013, p. 276, no. 75.

Cornelis Cort after Michiel Coxie, Jesus Among the Doctors, 1562, engraving, 337 x 321 mm. See HID (Cort), p. 128, no. 44; Sellink 1994, p. 47, no. 131; and Josi Van Grieken, in Van Grieken, Luijten, Van der Stock et al. 2013, p. 154, no. 32.
The fresco with the School of Athens in the Vatican was turned into a print by Giorgio Ghisi, working for Cock, who published the engraving in Antwerp in 1590. Van Mander relates that this inspired Coxcie, because now everyone could see how clearly he had based his composition on Raphael. See Van Mander 1604, fol. 358v-359r; Ger Luijten, in Van Grieken, Luijten, Van der Stok et al. 2012, p. 126, n. 20.

Cornelis Cort after Michiel Coxcie, The Resurrection (1593), engraving, 306 x 260 mm; NH (Cort), no. 75, with further literature.

89 Van Mander 1604, fol. 358v: 'Sijn eerste en bevooroordeerde werk was, bayers Brussel twee oft drie mijlen, te Halschenbergh, 't Ooogh Altare-cafel, een groot stuk, wesende een Crucifix, een oymemende constigt werk, daer menig Cornelis dicswils met Brussel quam om te allen. Dit heerlijck stuk werck was in de Nederlandsche beroerte gevoet in Spaaengen, door eenten Thomas Werry, Coopman van Brussel, en een den Cardinel Grandvolles vercocht, om den Coning Philips'. See Van Mander (ed. Maldemal), vol. 4, p. 188.

90 Pierre du Four paintre et tailleur a Liége Le 9 Decembre 1574, recue les pourtraictures ensuivantes; 3 Crucifix double feuille de 35 ¥ pat. a 2 pat, see Delen 1935, p. 169.

91 Jan Ditmar after Michiel Coxcie, engraving, 337 x 335 mm (xix, n. 1.14567).

92 Mielke 1975. In this pioneering study of the Theatrum and its makers Mielke assumed that the first edition dated from 1585. More complete editions have emerged since then, among them an early one dated 1579 on the title page. See Rijksprentenkabinet, Amsterdam, inv. 497-1593-26.
