

ART PATRONAGE

AN UNCELEBRATED PATRON OF BRUSSELS ARTISTS

St Gorik's Confraternity of Our Lady of the Seven Sorrows (1499–1516)

Edmond ROOBAERT & Trisha Rose JACOBS
Independent Scholar & Ghent University

Up until the 1560s, there were dozens of confraternities practicing their religious devotions in any one of a number of Brussels churches. Together, they formed a very diverse group; not all were equally prominent, nor were their members, both male and female, who came from significantly different socio-economic backgrounds. For example, the confraternities associated with the collegiate church of St Gudula tended to recruit their members from the upper reaches of the clergy, nobility, and wealthy bourgeoisie, and they were required to pay comparatively high annual membership fees and death dues. Other confraternities, at filial churches or chapels with more pedestrian congregants, tended to make fewer financial demands of their members and were therefore more accessible. The confraternity of the Seven Sorrows in the church of St Gorik was one such confraternity.

Decorating and equipping an altar or entire chapel, as well as arranging for opulent displays on special occasions, would have required these organizations to employ craftsmen and artists, but the investigation into the extent to which the Brussels confraternities served as patrons of urban artists throughout the 1500s has thus far yielded fragmentary results. By and large, their accounts have not withstood the ravages of time; the recently discovered records of the confraternity of Our Lady of the Seven Sorrows are a happy exception to this rule. Remco Sleiderink has already made a general survey of the confraternity's early accounts, paving the way for more in-depth study.¹ Not only do the accounts contain new, valuable data regarding folk customs and popular devotion, the veneration of saints, the liturgy, the liturgical calendar, and music in Brussels between 1499 and 1516, as we have seen in the preceding chapters of this volume, but they are also an important source of information on one contemporary network of artistic patronage.²

The materials available relating to the confraternity permit us to go beyond flat, object-oriented descriptions and general statements. Paul Trio's research into the various

1 Archives of the City of Brussels/Archief van de Stad Brussel, Historical Archives/Historisch Archief (hereafter ASB, HA), Register 3837; Remco Sleiderink, 'De dichters Jan Smeken en Johannes Pertcheval en de devotie tot Onze Lieve Vrouw van de Zeven Weeën', *Queeste, Tijdschrift voor middeleeuwse letterkunde in de Nederlanden*, 19 (2012), 42-69. Our heartfelt thanks to Remco Sleiderink for giving us the opportunity to examine the accounts, to Susie Speakman Sutch for her help in interpreting them, and to our reviewers for their kind and thoughtful corrections and suggestions.

2 The first five accounting years employ the old-style system of dating. In the sixth year, they switch, which is why the accounts for that 'year' run from March 25, 1503 (o.s.) to May 1, 1505 (n.s.). In the interest of clarity we have chosen to follow new-style dating throughout.

Ghent confraternities has shown that they were important patrons of the arts, but the scattered inventories and accounts available to him do not allow for examining their relationship with the individual artists involved, which is of particular interest in this context.³ As Susie Speakman Sutch and Anne-Laure Van Bruaene have shown, existing urban networks played an important part in promoting the devotion of the Seven Sorrows, and this chapter seeks to answer whether the Brussels confraternity of Our Lady of the Seven Sorrows relied upon such a network of artists and to what extent.⁴

Our contribution will begin by outlining the links between Brussels' artists, St Gorik, and the confraternity of Our Lady of the Seven Sorrows. We will also briefly examine the confraternity's finances, before proceeding to analyse the role it played as a patron of Brussels craftsmen, sculptors, and visual artists. This means examining not only how the confraternity outfitted and maintained its chapel but also the commissions it arranged in relation to its procession and plays. A table showing all such purchases has been placed at the end of this chapter for the reader's convenience.⁵ By determining whether the craftsmen and artists employed by the confraternity of Our Lady of the Seven Sorrows were among its members and attempting to address how they were selected for particular commissions – whether by cost, skill, proximity, or all of the above – we hope to shed light on this aspect of early sixteenth-century artistic patronage.

St Gorik and the Confraternity of Our Lady of the Seven Sorrows as Patrons of the Arts

The confraternity of Our Lady of the Seven Sorrows was situated in St Gorik, a church with strong ties to the Brussels art community. Important artists were numbered among its wardens: the master painters Bernaert van Orley and Colijn de Coter, as well as Jan II Borreman, one of the most innovative sculptors of the day.⁶ The wardens not only commissioned sculptors and painters to produce works calculated to inspire devotion and lend to the lustre of its services, but they ordered artworks as rewards for people who had done the institution some special service. For example, in 1525-26, Jean Caulier, seigneur

3 Paul Trio, *De Gentse broederschappen (1182-1580): Ontstaan, naamgeving, materiële uitrusting, structuur, opheffing en bronnen* (Ghent: Maatschappij voor Geschiedenis en Ouheidkunde te Gent, 1990) and Paul Trio, *Volksreligie als Spiegel van een stedelijke samenleving. De broederschappen te Gent in de late middeleeuwen* (Leuven: Universitaire Pers Leuven, 1993), pp. 248 and 260-65.

4 Susie Speakman Sutch and Anne-Laure Van Bruaene, 'The Seven Sorrows of the Virgin Mary: Devotional Communication and Politics in the Burgundian-Habsburg Low Countries, c. 1490-1520', *Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, 61 (2010), 252-78.

5 Table 1 is not comprehensive, and only encompasses works discussed in this chapter. Furthermore, while we have included paintings for which the provenance is not certain, we have not included repair work to the fabric or furnishings of the chapel, nor the purchase of raw materials. Rather, we merely seek to provide an overview of the confraternity's most important possessions and purchases as described in the accounts.

6 See the remaining accounts of St Gorik's church fabric, where all were listed as churchwardens on different occasions (State Archives Anderlecht, Church Archives of Brabant, 29.135, 29.172, 29.217). Colijn 'van den Couter' appears on folio 167^v of the *Liber authenticus* (ASB, HA, Register 3413), which also lists Jasper 'Hasaert' (fol. 163^v), Jan Borreman the Elder (fol. 167^v), Paeschier Borreman (fol. 167^v), Cornelis 'Gapenberghe' (fol. 178^v), and Valentin van 'Oerley' (fol. 209^v) as confraternity members.

d'Aigny, and chairman of the Privy Council, received a painting of Our Lady of the Seven Sorrows by Van Orley because he interceded on behalf of St Gorik in a dispute.⁷

Furthermore, the chamber of rhetoric that had founded the confraternity at St Gorik, *De Lelie* (The Lily), was itself comprised of writers, visual artists, master craftsmen, and other artisans, and several of its poets, sculptors, and painters performed work for the city and the ducal court.⁸ These artists played a prominent role in the confraternity, including the aforementioned Jan Borreman, and Cornelis and Joris Schernier of the Coninxloo painting dynasty, all of whom dominated its governing body.⁹ Borreman, one of Our Lady of the Seven Sorrows' founders, was a provost in 1499 and 1500; Cornelis in 1501 and 1502; and Joris served in that capacity every year from 1503 right up until 1516, the end of the extant accounts.¹⁰

Despite the presence of the confraternity's own members and other artists among the churchwardens of St Gorik – the body that supervised the confraternity's accounts – the confraternity of Our Lady of the Seven Sorrows still faced significant challenges in financing its artistic patronage.¹¹ These were not insignificant outlays, and the confraternity had limited funds: just £17.5 a year on average, although it was often much less.¹² Furthermore, the confraternity's financial arrangement with the wardens entailed giving up a portion of the offerings and monies collected on feast days, and it paid them an annual fee, which covered, among other things, the use of both the chapel and the church fabric's liturgical vestments.¹³

Indeed, the members and artists associated with *De Lelie* and with *De Violette* (The Violet), the chamber it merged with to form 't *Mariacranske* (The Garland of Mary) in 1507, often resorted to financing the confraternity's purchases and activities with their own

7 Initially, St Gorik was subordinate to St Gudula, which meant that the collegiate church was entitled to some of its tithes and offerings. St Gudula continued to attempt to exert its ecclesiastical rights over St Gorik even after it became a parish church in 1520, until the Privy Council forced the two institutions to a compromise in March of 1527. See Placide Lefèvre, *L'organisation ecclésiastique de la ville de Bruxelles au Moyen Âge* (Leuven: UCL. Bibliothèque de l'université, 1942), pp. 204-07, and Alexandre Henne and Alphonse Wauters, *Histoire de la ville de Bruxelles*, ed. by Mina Martens, 4 vols (Brussels: Culture et civilisation, 1975), VIII, p. 226. State Archives Anderlecht, Church Archives of Brabant, 29.175, fol. 15^v.

8 *Liber authenticus*, fols 161^v-162^r, records the names of the members of *De Lelie* and *De Violette* coupled with the names of their wives. The following artists and craftsmen who figure in our discussion were members of *De Lelie*: Jan II Borreman, Joris and Cornelis Schernier Coninxloo, Adam de Cupere, Gielis van Halle, Jan and Peeter van Yseren, Jan van Roome, alias van Brussel. In addition, Jan van den Dale was a member of *De Violette* and hence his name occurs twice: on fol. 193^v when he enrolled in the confraternity and again on fol. 162^r when the two chambers of rhetoric merged in 1507 to create 't *Mariacranske*. Pending the availability of source materials, it would be interesting to see how the artistic patronage of Seven Sorrows confraternities played out in other cities, particularly in Antwerp, where the artists' guild of St Luke hosted a chapter, probably aided by a local chamber of rhetoric. See Susie Speakman Sutch and Anne-Laure Van Bruaene, 'The Seven Sorrows', pp. 273-74.

9 The chapel also hosted the funeral of Jan van Coninxloo in 1499-1500, who was still serving as the city painter as late as 1498, thus allowing us to more precisely date the death of the founder of the Coninxloo painters dynasty. See ASB, HA, Register 3837, p. 2 and Jozef Duverger, *Brussel als kunstcentrum in de XIV^e en de XV^e eeuw* (Antwerp: De Sikkel / Ghent: Vyncke, 1935), pp. 65-66 and 86-87.

10 For a complete list of the provosts, see Sleiderink, 'De dichters', pp. 45-46.

11 The closing formula of several accounts mention that they were examined and signed off on in the presence of members of the confraternity's council and the churchwardens of St Gorik. The 1509-10 account was reviewed and approved by St Gorik's *porcionarissen* or portionaries and churchwardens, who numbered the painter Colijn de Coter among them. See ASB, HA, Register 3837, p. 219. At the close of the accounts for 1510-11 and 1511-12, Jan Borreman and De Coter were described as churchwardens. See ASB, HA, Register 3837, pp. 242 and 262. In 1516, the same men approved the account for 1513-14. See ASB, HA, Register 3837, p. 304.

12 See Sleiderink, 'De dichters', p. 47.

13 ASB, HA, Register 3837, pp. 134, 165, 189, and 318. The statue of Our Lady stood on a pedestal bedecked with a cloth, which the accounts note was cleaned in 1511-12. See ASB, HA, Register 3837, p. 259.

private funds.¹⁴ In 1504-05, Joris Schernier, alongside the other provosts, contributed 10 *schellingen* (s.) to the costs of an altarpiece and a processional piece, and Adam 'de Cuper' or Cupere, another member of *De Lelie*, gave 30s. towards the production of vestments.¹⁵ Others, such as Jan van Roome, alias van Brussel, appear to have done work as favours to the confraternity, while in 1513-14 Borreman reduced his fee for a commission he received from the confraternity, as did his fellow rhetorician, Jan van den Dale. At least one of the artists, Cornelis Schernier, continued to support the confraternity even after his death, leaving them a legacy in his will.¹⁶

Nevertheless, money was always in short supply and new sources of income eagerly seized upon. As was the usual practice among confraternities, even in those with more in the way of financial resources, the provosts of Our Lady of the Seven Sorrows had little compunction about converting gifts of silver or jewellery set with precious stones into hard cash. A gold and sapphire ring was liquidated for 27s. 6 *penningen* (d.).¹⁷ A silver gilt belt, the testamentary bequest of a young maiden, fetched 18d.¹⁸ A large paternoster, an earlier form of the rosary, bequeathed to the confraternity by the widow of Aert Boterams was disposed of for 2 *ponden* (£) 10s., while another patron's paternoster had been auctioned off for 27s. 6d.¹⁹ The confraternity's search for funds left no stone unturned: a hunk of metal found in the street was refined and the gold thus harvested sold in 1500-01 for 15s.²⁰ Once liquidated, these assets helped to fund the commissions discussed below.

Craftsmen: Supplying the Basics

Despite such significant gifts, donations, and the occasional windfall, the confraternity's constrained means limited the extent to which it could invest in commissioning or purchasing artworks for the purpose of embellishing services with lustrous adornments. And yet, the confraternity did not lack the chapel accoutrements standard in sixteenth-century Brussels: candlesticks, sconces, lecterns, and chandeliers in latten – all seemingly supplied

14 Other rhetoricians not necessarily associated with *De Lelie* also appear to have made donations to the confraternity; see Sleiderink, 'De dichters', pp. 50-51. One of these, Jan Smet, may have been a member of the Seven Sorrows confraternity. Among the names of individuals enrolling in the confraternity during the ninth year (1507-08) is a Jan Smet, *Liber authenticus*, fol. 255'. However, as that name is extremely common, the literal equivalent of 'John Smith', this could be a mere coincidence.

15 'Item ontfangen totten behulpe vander doren vanden outertafelen van gielis crabbe van Jooris schernier van pertchevale van heindric de lichte van elcken vii s. vi d. van heindric bras iii s. van Jannen segers ii s. gr. valet – i lb. xv s.', ASB, HA, Register 3837, p. 75; 'Item ontfangen van adam de cupere tot behulp van een gouden cruce op de casuffle – xxx s. gr.', ASB, HA, Register 3837, p. 75.

16 ASB, HA, Register 3837, p. 327.

17 ASB, HA, Register 3837, p. 74; for more on the owner of the ring, see Sleiderink, 'De dichters', p. 60. The accounts use Brabant *grooten* as their basic bookkeeping unit, regardless of the actual currency used. These are expressed in *ponden* (£), *schellingen* (s.), *penningen* (d.) and *mijten* (superscript te). *Stuivers* and *Rhenish guilders* also occasionally appear. Within the body of this text, we have sometimes converted figures to *schellingen* for ease of reading, retaining the original notations in the footnotes. One *pond* equals 20 *schellingen* or 240 *penningen*, and there were 24 *mijten* to a *penning*, while four *Rhenish guilders* were equivalent to one *pond*, and one *stuiver* the equivalent of three *penningen*. For more on the currencies used in the accounts, see Sleiderink, 'De dichters', pp. 46-47.

18 ASB, HA, Register 3837, p. 273.

19 ASB, HA, Register 3837, p. 293.

20 ASB, HA, Register 3837, p. 21.

by local craftsmen.²¹ In 1499-1500, a donation allowed the purchase of two, large – possibly latten – candlesticks.²² In 1502-03, Jan van Nanoenen, a well-known craftsman who established the Thienen dynasty of brass-founders in Brussels, received 9s. for a latten chancel lectern, and a cast altar bell was purchased from an unknown artist at the same time.²³ The choice of Van Nanoenen could lie in his family's ties to the Borremans. In 1489, the latter stood surety for a door cast by one 'Jan van Thienen' for St Peter's church in Leuven. Jan Borreman also collaborated with Renier van Thienen on the paschal candlestick cast for the church of St Leonard in Zoutleeuw, and later he worked with both Van Thienen and Jan de Hervy on the tomb of Mary of Burgundy in Bruges. Finally, Borreman supplied wooden models to Renier van Thienen's son, also named Renier, for figures cast for the Palais Royal in Bruges.²⁴

The confraternity made further purchases later that decade. In 1506-07, an iron candelabra with seven arms was obtained from Jan vander Goten, a member of a famous family of Brussels ironsmiths. That same year, four candlesticks, described as two beaten and two small, latten ones, were also installed in the chapel.²⁵ In 1509-10, a chandelier was hung from the vault by a chain.²⁶ In 1513-14, Joos de Ketelaar delivered four metal 'apples', or cast latten bulbs, which were placed on the apex of the chapel's roof.²⁷ The confraternity's apparently close association with this community of craftsmen was not limited to commissions: thanks to the mediation of an unidentified Brussels brass-founder, the confraternity succeeded in regaining possession of a candlestick stolen from the altar of Our Lady.²⁸

Considering the tight finances, and the sums required to outfit and maintain such a confraternity, it should come as no surprise that certain crafts and their representatives do not appear in the accounts – or do so only on rare occasions. This lack of artisans is particularly true of goldsmiths, tapestry weavers, and needle workers. In 1499-1500, the confraternity possessed just one monstrance and two ampoules, all in tin.²⁹ Liturgical vessels in such cheap metal were generally only used temporarily, or if there were not yet the means to purchase something better. Sometime during 1502-03, the monstrance was gilded and burnished in order to improve its appearance – a highly unusual practice, indicating just how strapped the confraternity was, although the gilding, burnishing, and

21 Generally speaking, latten or *latoen* referred to an alloy, usually a type of brass. While produced in sheets that were then worked further, cast work was more typical for the period – certainly for such things as candlesticks and lecterns – as one of our reviewers has pointed out. At one point the accounts even appear to distinguish between 'beaten' and 'latten' (or cast) candlesticks. See ASB, HA, Register 3837, p. 132. For more uses, see Claude Blair and John Blair 'Copper Alloys', in *English Medieval Industries: Craftsmen, Techniques, Products*, ed. by John Blair and Nigel Ramsay (London: Hambledon Press, 1991), pp. 81-106.

22 ASB, HA, Register 3837, p. 14. In 1503-04, a gift of 3s. 6d. was recorded, used to help purchase a large candleholder for the altar of Our Lady; see ASB, HA, Register 3837, p. 65.

23 ASB, HA, Register 3837, p. 52.

24 Kim W. Woods, 'Borman', in *The Grove Encyclopedia of Northern Renaissance Art*, ed. by C. Campbell, 3 vols (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009), III (2009), pp. 211-12; Kim W. Woods, 'Thienen, van', in *The Grove Encyclopedia of Medieval Art and Architecture*, ed. by C. Hourihane, 6 vols (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012), II (2012), pp. 76-77. Ann M. Roberts, 'The Chronology and Political Significance of the Tomb of Mary of Burgundy', *The Art Bulletin*, 71 (1989), 376-400 (pp. 378 and 383).

25 ASB, HA, Register 3837, p. 132.

26 ASB, HA, Register 3837, p. 215.

27 ASB, HA, Register 3837, p. 300.

28 ASB, HA, Register 3837, p. 260. Even the confraternity was not spared from the plague of church thefts, despite the drastic penalties for such crimes.

29 The monstrance was purchased for 6s. 9d.; see ASB, HA, Register 3837, pp. 7 and 14.

repair of altar vessels were typical commissions that many Brussels goldsmiths performed for the local churchwardens.³⁰ The monstrance does not ever appear to have been replaced by a better quality piece either. There is also no reference in the accounts to the purchase of church plate from a known Brussels goldsmith, although this cannot have been for lack of contacts. Indeed, the accounts reference one of the few goldsmiths working in sixteenth-century Brussels: Jaspas Hazaert, a member of the confraternity, but only because he delivered materials to the artists working for the confraternity in 1513-14.³¹ In fact, apart from a crucifix, the confraternity had no precious metalwork worthy of the name.³²

The confraternity also possessed little in the way of tapestries and thus borrowed some on occasion, a practice that was not unheard of in Brussels, at least not among those organizations with the right connections. The ducal palace, for example, loaned works to St Gudula's confraternity of Our Lady.³³ Likewise, tapestries were regularly conveyed from the court to St Gorik for the Feast of the Assumption in mid-August and returned afterwards.³⁴ This practice was not without its costs – for example, in 1513-14 the *tapissier's* assistants received 2s. 6d. 'for their wine' – but it was still far less expensive than having tapestries made to order.³⁵ In fact, the confraternity owned nothing in this line apart from two 'cussenbladeren', small cushions covered with inferior tapestry, usually depicting heraldic or animal and plant motifs.³⁶

During the confraternity's early years, they did not yet have their own vestments. Instead, the confraternity paid an annual sum to St Gorik's churchwardens to cover the cost of wear and tear resulting from their use of the church's best adornments on high Marian feast days, and this amounted to 7 stuivers in 1505.³⁷ Around that time, two chasubles were commissioned for the 'porcionarissen' or portionaries, who conducted services in the confraternity's chapel, one of red velvet and the other coloured red, white and yellow. An embroidered cross, made from one 'ell' of cloth of gold, was placed upon one of the

30 The work cost just 7d. 12 mijten; see ASB, HA, Register 3837, p. 52. In 1505-06, the monstrance was burnished again and its glass was replaced; see ASB, HA, Register 3837, p. 108. Both the monstrance and the ampoules appear in the lists of the confraternity's 'jewels' from 1499-1500 to 1513-14; among others, see ASB, HA, Register 3837, pp. 14 and 295.

31 It seems Hazaert was familiar with the confraternity's members and artists; in 1519 he sold gold leaf to Cornelis Schernier. See State Archives Brussels, Kwisjeschriften van de Rekenkamer 1077, loose document dated 14.06.1513, and Eddy D'Hondt, *Extraits des comptes du domaine de Bruxelles aux XV^e et XVI^e siècles concernant les artistes de la cour*, *Miscellanea Archivistica, Studia 4* (Brussels: Algemeen Rijksarchief, 1989), no. 62, 40-41; no. 79, 53; no. 81, 54-55; and no. 85, 60.

32 ASB, HA, Register 3837, p. 66. What trinkets it did possess were obviously common among the inventories of both the clergy and laity of the period: a red coral paternoster with seven chaplets and five gilt medals, a paternoster with jet beads, and another with gilded latten medals and scallop shells; see ASB, HA, Register 3837, pp. 76 and 111-12. At the time, a paternoster was a typical votive gift from a devout person, who in turn received the confraternity's prayers for their salvation; see ASB, HA, Register 3837, p. 76. The one with the scallops was obviously contributed by a pious individual who had undertaken the pilgrimage to Santiago de Compostela; see Edmond Roobaert, 'Brusselse bedevaarders en hun bedevaarten in de 16e eeuw', *Volkskunde*, 102 (2001), 97-144 (pp. 106-07). Any ex-votos, usually in silver or wax, left by devout worshippers are missing from the lists of 'jewels', unless the small silver rings, spoons and medals described as hanging on two wooden plaques may be taken into consideration here. See ASB, HA, Register 3837, pp. 66, 112, and 264.

33 The court *tapissier*, Pieter van Aelst, was remunerated with one gold crown for his time and trouble: Edmond Roobaert, 'Een driemanschap: Peter Coecke van Aalst, Peter van Edingen van Aalst en Peter Fabri van Aalst', *Archief- en Bibliotheekwezen in België* (2004), 74, 9-124 (p. 85).

34 ASB, HA, Register 3837, pp. 9, 37, 77, 127, 276, and 314.

35 ASB, HA, Register 3837, p. 296.

36 ASB, HA, Register 3837, p. 112.

37 ASB, HA, Register 3837, p. 85.

chasubles. In total, the sewing and embroidery cost 6 *Rhenish guilders*, not a great deal of money given the work involved.³⁸

Often, the craftsmen performing such commissions or carrying out other work are mentioned anonymously or by first name only in the accounts, making their identity difficult to determine.³⁹ For example, we do not know whether a vestment maker or an embroiderer made the chasuble cross, just that it was a master who employed an apprentice.⁴⁰ In 1510-11, thanks to a donation from a pious woman, a certain William added embroidered panels depicting Our Lady of the Seven Sorrows to the vestments and was even given 12d. to break his fast, indicating that his skills were valued.⁴¹ However, it cannot be stated with any certainty that he was the embroiderer of the chasuble cross, nor is it possible to identify him as either the 'Willem the embroiderer' interred at the Carmelite church of Brussels in July of 1523 or Willem de Meester, an embroiderer whose widow signed over a legacy provided for her in her late husband's will to the almoners of Saint-Jacques-sur-Coudenberg in 1525-26.⁴² We do not even know the first name of the artisan who made the mantel for the new statue of Our Lady, only that some of the multi-coloured cloth left over from one of the chasubles was used and that the work was paid for well in advance.⁴³

Sculptors: the Role of Specialization in Making Commissions

While craftsmen from assorted trades provided Our Lady of the Seven Sorrows with the smaller items necessary to hold services, such as vestments and liturgical objects, statue makers, stone carvers, and woodworkers were essential in outfitting and decorating the confraternity's chapel and choir. One important structure was the *apporte*, where the confraternity's *apportenaars* received gifts and money, a substantial source of much needed income.⁴⁴ According to the accounts for 1499-1500, confraternity member Gielis van Halle was paid for 'an *apporte* with a screen and a bench', and while unclear, the entry suggests that the items were related to one another and produced by Van Halle. He certainly seems

38 ASB, HA, Register 3837, pp. 75 and 82. See the analysis of costs associated with English liturgical garments from the same period in Judith Middleton-Stewart, *Inward Purity and Outward Splendour: Death and Remembrance in the Deanery of Dunwich, Suffolk, 1370-1547* (Woodbridge, Suffolk: Boydell Press, 2001) pp. 197-212. It was not until 1505-06 that the provost of the Augustinian monastery at Saint-Jacques-sur-Coudenberg could consecrate the velvet chasuble and its alb. The suffragan bishop of Cambrai consecrated the other because prior to the creation of the Archbishopric of Malines in 1559, the Brussels clergy were under his jurisdiction. See ASB, HA, Register 3837, p. 102.

39 One exception is Hendrik Doeghens, a 'gelaesmaker' who worked on a window in the choir in 1504-05; see ASB, HA, Register 3837, p. 79. Hendrik Dueghens was active in Brussels from 1488 to 1535; see Edmond Roobaert, 'Doegens [Duegens], Hendrik', *Saur Allgemeines Künstlerlexikon*, 28 (2001), cols. 225-26.

40 The cloth of gold cost 9 Rhenish guilders total, with an advance of 6 Rhenish guilders. The apprentice had to be satisfied with 6d. Tassels and trimming were included, paid for in part by a small gift. See ASB, HA, Register 3837, p. 82. Adam de Cupere also gave 30s., which covered the down payment for the production and sewing of the gold embroidered cross; see ASB, HA, Register 3837, p. 75.

41 'Item Willemen die de ornamenten maecte, van Jouffrouwe van catthem om dat hij ons vrouwe vanden weeden daer op ghestelt heeft gesconcken tot eenen inbijte - xii d. gr.'; see ASB, HA, Register 3837, p. 236.

42 See the State Archives Anderlecht, Archive of the Capital Church of St Michael and St Gudula, 2.655, fol. 135^v; Placide Lefèvre, 'Obsèques et sépultures d'artistes à Bruxelles au XVI^e siècle', *Pictura*, 2 (1945), 39-41, for Willem the embroiderer, and Brussels, Openbaar Centrum voor Maatschappelijk Welzijn, B 1.147, fol. 11, for Willem de Meester.

43 In 1502-03, a generous individual gave 7 *stuivers* for the making of the mantel, and the trimming and tassels were purchased in 1503-04. See ASB, HA, Register 3837, pp. 45 and 64.

44 The provosts may have collected these offerings themselves, although there is mention in the accounts of five or six women who were paid a *stuiver* apiece to carry out the task; see ASB, HA, Register 3837, pp. 35 and 49.

capable of carrying out the work; he placed another screen behind the altar while making several other repairs and additions to the chapel.⁴⁵

Just keeping things in good order required the employment of a professional artist such as Antoon Wittric.⁴⁶ A Brussels burgher up until 1506, Wittric was a member of the *steenbickeleren* guild, which included masons and both stone and woodcarvers. He joined at least as early as 1479 and became an officer in 1501.⁴⁷ First, he repaired the confraternity's tabernacle when it was moved.⁴⁸ Then in 1500-01, Wittric carved large capitals on wooden columns and worked on the choir seating.⁴⁹ Finally in 1506-07, he carved two more capitals and again repaired the tabernacle.⁵⁰ All of this amounts to some rather minor commissions, yet this does not appear to have been because of a lack of skill. For example, he carved an altar retable for the church fabric of St John the Baptist in Sint-Jans-Molenbeek.⁵¹ However, Wittric was not a member of the confraternity, and when it came to the more significant commissions, the provosts simply seem to have preferred to hire Jan II Borreman, one of their own.

Borreman was in charge of providing one of the confraternity's single most important pieces of statuary: an image of Our Lady. There was already a figure of the Holy Virgin on the chapel's altar, where it seems to have remained until 1513-14, when the accounts state that it was sold for 12s. 6d.⁵² Yet a gift 'to help' fund a new statue was made in 1499, and in 1500-01, Borreman was paid £2 10s. for carving it.⁵³ As usual, the figure was immediately polychromed for a cost of £3 – an expense only partially covered by a further gift of 21d. – and the new statue was placed in the chapel.⁵⁴ The following year, Borreman

45 'Gielis van halle van dappoert metten scutsel ende banck, 17s. 6d.'; see ASB, HA, Register 3837, pp. 12 and 26. The entry is ambiguous as it is not clear if the payment was for the production or merely the placement of these items and if they were associated with one another. Also unclear is whether this bench is actually the one gifted to the confraternity by Philip the Fair and simply installed by Van Halle. We do not know what year the duke donated it, just that it survived to be restored by the Archdukes; see *Liber authenticus*, fols 43^v-48^r. Yet while the later inventory does list one bench with two doors, even if this were the same item, the document does not link it with Philip, or the *apporte*; see ASB, HA, Register 1499, p. 48. Nor does it seem likely that the accounts would have failed to mention Philip's name as a patron when they do list other benefactors. Furthermore, Tine L. Meganck and Sabine van Sprang suggest in their chapter that Philip's gift may in fact have been one of stalls, not a mere 'bench'. Finally, our source discusses the 'apporte' as though it were itself a structure, but this is rather unusual; originally the term referred only to the offerings themselves and their place of collection described as a bench, lectern, or other such piece of furniture. This one, whether with bench and screen or not, appears to have been a freestanding cabinet with locking doors; see ASB, HA, Register 3837, pp. 8 and 108. See Antoon Viaene, 'Appoort. Een term uit de kerkelijke boekhouding in Vlaanderen 1300-1600', *Handelingen Genootschap 'Société d'Emulation' Brugge*, 103 (1966), 87-101. Nevertheless, the 'apporte' was a featured item in the chapel: the candelabra delivered by vander Goten in 1506-07 was intended to highlight the inscription above it; see ASB, HA, Register 3837, p. 132.

46 Antoon Wittric is also known as Anthonis van Wittriet.

47 For more information on the *steenbickeleren*, see Daniel De Stobbeleir, 'Le nombre des nouveaux membres et la corporation des maçons, tailleurs de pierre, sculpteurs et ardoisiers bruxellois (1388-1503)', in *Hommage au professeur Paul Bonenfant*, ed. by Maurice A. Arnould and others (Brussels: Université Libre, 1965), 293-333; Jozef Duverger, *De Brusselsche steenbickeleren. Beeldhouwers, bouwmeesters, metselaars in de XIV^e en de XV^e eeuw* (Ghent: A. Vyncke, 1933).

48 ASB, HA, Register 3837, p. 11.

49 ASB, HA, Register 3837, pp. 25-26.

50 ASB, HA, Register 3837, p. 132.

51 Duverger, *De Brusselsche steenbickeleren*, Name Register; C. Van de Velde, 'The Sixteenth Century', in *The Cathedral of Our Lady in Antwerp*, ed. by Willem Aerts (Antwerp: Fonds Mercator, 1993), p. 180, where the name of the stone carver is spelled Anthonis Wytack. It is interesting to note that *De Violette*, the chamber of rhetoric that merged with the *De Lelie* in 1507, had a long history of involvement with Sint-Jans-Molenbeek; see Sleiderink, 'De dichters', pp. 50-51. Perhaps Wittric could have gained commissions elsewhere via his association with the confraternity.

52 ASB, HA, Register 3837, pp. 7 and 293.

53 'Item tot behulp van een Nieuw marien beelde ontfangen van mijn Jouffrouwe van pe - iiiii s. vi d.'; see ASB, HA, Register 3837, pp. 4 and 26.

54 Original notation: 7 stuivers, see ASB, HA, Register 3837, pp. 21, 26, and 38.

was responsible for producing the statue of an angel for which he was paid 30s.; this figure was also polychromed upon completion for 20s.⁵⁵

The accounts of 1508-09 show that carvings depicting the Annunciation, described the following year as statues of Our Lady and the Archangel Gabriel to be placed on pillars before the chapel's altar, were ordered from Jan II Borreman for 40s.⁵⁶ The payments were made in instalments: an advance of 15s. upon ordering, 20s. in 1509-10, and the remaining 5s. in 1510-11.⁵⁷ This method of payment was a typical move for the cash-strapped confraternity, which was also not above taking advantage of artists' devotion. In 1513-14, for example, Borreman waved 30s. of an agreed upon fee of 200s. for four carvings depicting Mary's Seven Sorrows – referred to in the source as 'poenten' – agreeing to take the rest of the money in instalments: £6 10s., with a further £2 to be paid later on.⁵⁸ The same piecemeal payment scheme applied to Borreman's last mention in the accounts: for his work on the fifth sorrow in 1515-16, he received a new advance of 5s., followed by payments of 3s., 10s., and a further 5s.⁵⁹

However, despite being the confraternity's most prolific sculptor, Borreman was not the artist behind one of the confraternity's most visible works of art. In 1510-11, donations were made to aid in purchasing a new image of Christ to place on the crucifix carried in processions, and the artist was paid 25s. for the carving, which was to be painted.⁶⁰ The name of the sculptor is unclear but could be read to indicate Jacques Daret. This master became a burgher of Brussels in 1516, and during the first quarter of the sixteenth century, he carried out numerous commissions for various institutions in the city, religious and otherwise. Daret may also have been the same artist mentioned in 1514-15 in connection with creating another image of God for the confraternity.⁶¹ If so, it would

⁵⁵ ASB, HA, Register 3837, pp. 51-52.

⁵⁶ ASB, HA, Register 3837, pp. 188 and 214. While locally made like French wooden 'altar angels', it seems somewhat unlikely that Borreman's figures were used as supports for curtains to enclose the altar, as Richard Randall states was common in northern churches. In such instances, four or six columns with angels affixed to the top were employed, usually holding candlesticks or instruments of the Passion. The accounts only mention this Annunciation set, plus the angel carved by Borreman in 1501-02, and neither its placement nor its attributes are mentioned; ASB, HA, Register 3837, pp. 51-52. See Richard H. Randall, Jr., 'Thirteenth Century Altar Angels', in *Record of the Art Museum, Princeton University*, 18 (1959), 2-16 (pp. 8 and 10).

⁵⁷ ASB, HA, Register 3837, p. 188, 'Item Jan borreman op de boodscap van onser vrouwen die coste ii lb. gr. betaelt xv s. gr.'; ASB, HA, Register 3837, p. 214, 'Item Jan borreman van dat men hem sculdich vanden ij beelden die staen op de pilaren in onser vrouwen choir, voer den outaer – xx s. gr.'; ASB, HA, Register 3837, p. 240, 'Item Jan borreman vander boodscap boven vij rijngulden die hij daer af ontfangen heeft noch v s. gr.'

⁵⁸ Original notation: 10 *Rhenish guilders* per piece, 6 *guilders* waved, see ASB, HA, Register 3837, p. 300. As one of our reviewers pointed out, these carvings may be comparable in appearance to the reliefs depicting the Seven Sorrows of Mary in the choir of the Grote Kerk in Breda, on the wall behind the monument to Frederik van Renesse. Yet our objects are of particular interest from an art historical perspective because the accounts are unclear as to where they were placed. If wooden, it would make sense for them to have been hung in the chapel, out of the elements, much as panels depicting the Stations of the Cross were displayed in sixteenth-century Catholic churches as a Poor Man's Bible. However, it appears that they may have been affixed to the outside of the building: a stonemason was hired to make holes in a wall to attach the scenes, while Jan van Yseren, together with a colleague, made shingled canopies to place above the first four. Van Yseren, who did other work for the Seven Sorrows, was likely a relative of Peeter van Yseren – both were members of *De Lelie*, both belonged to the confraternity from its inception, and Peter van Yseren served as provost in 1502-03 and 1503-04. See Sleiderink, 'De dichters', p. 45.

⁵⁹ ASB, HA, Register 3837, p. 331. The additional 6d. worth of drinking money the confraternity paid him may have been for his apprentices, as was customary. The accounts also offer an intriguing detail here: the second payment was made 'dat men hem tachter was inde cluiyse'. It could be that the confraternity may have been repaying him for a bar tab run up at an inn called 'The Hermitage'.

⁶⁰ ASB, HA, Register 3837, pp. 229, 236, and 235.

⁶¹ ASB, HA, Register 3837, p. 316.

seem that he specialized in these types of carvings; in 1511-12, a 'Jacquet, resident of the Coolmarkt' produced one for the almoners of Saint-Jacques-sur-Coudenberg.⁶²

Indeed, the sculptors employed by the confraternity each seem to have had their own skill sets. Wittric, who we know was capable of highly skilled work, handled small odd jobs, as did one 'Hendrik', who was hired in 1506-07 to make among other things cabinets, a decorative screen behind the tabernacle, and pillars and arches to help frame various items.⁶³ Jacques Daret, if he is the sculptor mentioned in the accounts in association with the image of Christ, may have specialized in such carvings. Of the two confraternity members employed, Gielis van Halle and Jan II Borreman, the former appears to have focussed on decorative furniture and the latter provided the confraternity with several statues and other figurative works. While Borreman's close ties to the confraternity and willingness to defer payment were undoubtedly a factor in his employment, the quality of the St George retable now housed at the Royal Museum for Art and History in Brussels that bears his signature, as well as the sheer number of his attested commissions, makes it clear that proximity was not the only consideration. Rather, the confraternity placed a high value on hiring the right people and would turn to outside artists like Wittric or Daret when necessary, even if it may have cost them more.

The Painters: Making Careful Use of the Confraternity's Membership

From the accounts, it appears that the confraternity employed far more painters than sculptors – or, at least, more who can be identified – but it did not pay them better than other artists. Rather, the confraternity paid its painters in accordance with the standards of the time, which dictated payment on the basis of the duration and difficulty of the labour, and the quality and amount of materials used, and not the intrinsic artistic value of the work produced.⁶⁴ Such was the case when the confraternity hired two painters in 1505-06, one with an established reputation and the other hitherto unknown, to work on the same piece. In return, they each received the usual daily wage for painters of the time: 15d., which is comparable to that given to craftsmen employed by the confraternity.⁶⁵

While a painter's work was far more varied, it was probably performed according to the methods and styles of the time and consisted of routine, decorative tasks. Only a few inventive master artists of established reputation would have had the opportunity to produce an original piece of their own devising for the confraternity. Painted altarpieces and altar doors were ordered, but more frequently polychroming was requested for wooden or stone statues, the less expensive and more ephemeral canvas props and scenery for processions and plays, wall and vault decorations for the chapel, doors, windows and screens or other building elements, or furniture. Indeed, even the candle-rings on the candlesticks and the candles themselves were sometimes painted.⁶⁶

62 Eugène Frankignoulle and Paul Bonenfant, 'Notes pour servir à l'histoire de l'art en Brabant', *Annales de la Société Royale d'Archéologie de Bruxelles*, 39 (1935), 1-204 (p. 62).

63 ASB, HA, Register 3837, p. 132.

64 Edmond Roobaert, 'Een prinselijke bruiloft in Brussel in 1565 en de schilderwerken in het paleis op de Coudenberg. Het profiel van de Brusselse schilder in de 16de eeuw: archivalische gegevens', *Oud Holland*, 117 (2004), 1-32 (pp. 21-27).

65 The hitherto unknown Peter vander Wouwere spent two days painting the processional piece and the provost Joris Schernier a further thirteen. See ASB, HA, Register 3837, pp. 106, 161, 185, and 301.

66 ASB, HA, Register 3837, p. 52.

Such work appears to have been tendered to one of the confraternity's founders, the aforementioned Joris Schernier van Coninxloo, by preference. In 1506-07 alone, the provost painted the tabernacle, the inside of an *ammarisen* or aumbry, and decorated the red wall above the altar with small lilies, the symbol of both the chamber of rhetoric and the Virgin.⁶⁷ In 1507-08, he polychromed the figures on the Holy Sepulchre.⁶⁸ Over the course of twelve days in 1513-14, he carried out further decorative tasks, probably with the assistance of a journeyman, one Andries Veylen, who received 12d. a day.⁶⁹

Another Coninxloo and confraternity founder, Cornelis Schernier, also performed small jobs for the confraternity – indeed, he is the first painter to appear in the accounts.⁷⁰ For example, he primed portions of the lectern, whitened and glazed elements of the Holy Sepulchre, painted the base of the altar, coloured the trellis of the choir screen red and 'seeded' small lilies across it, and painted a wall red as well, the start of the colour scheme Joris later continued. All told, Cornelis' efforts made him 17s. richer.⁷¹ He carried out further decorative work in 1507-08 when he painted the *wintberch* or bargeboard.⁷² His only substantial commission came in 1502-03, when he was hired to polychrome Borreman's angel for 20s.⁷³ Just as was often the case with the sculptor, he was not paid all at once and in 1504-05 received a back payment of 12d. for his work.⁷⁴

Indeed, just painting Borreman's sculptures was enough to keep several artists of varying degrees employed. In 1500-01, Cornelis Capenbergh, a competent but not particularly illustrious painter, guild official, and one of Borreman's fellow confraternity members, polychromed the sculptor's statue of Our Lady for £3.⁷⁵ Another, Jan van den Dale, member of both the confraternity of Our Lady of Seven Sorrows and *De Violette*, was famous as a poet if nothing else. Jozef Duverger states that his surviving artwork – one polychromed piece and a tabernacle – is not spectacular.⁷⁶ And while renowned for the tapestry designs he created for Jan de Roy, the Brussels weaver, around 1520, his work for the confraternity was not particularly original: in 1513-14 he polychromed the first scene

67 An aumbry was a kind of cabinet, either free-standing or a wall niche, formerly used for storing vessels or the reserved sacrament; see Jonathan Goodall 'Aumbry', in *New SCM Dictionary of Liturgy and Worship*, ed. by Paul F. Bradshaw (London: SCM Press, 2005), p. 33; ASB, HA, Register 3837, p. 133.

68 ASB, HA, Register 3837, p. 155. This item appears to have been in the chapel when the confraternity took it over. Though it was consecrated so that they could employ it in the service of their cult, there is no mention in the accounts of its construction; see ASB, HA, Register 3837, p. 7. A Holy Sepulchre, or 'Holy Grave', could vary widely in appearance, from a stone tomb to a simple pit. That this one had figures suggests a rather more elaborate set-up. See Charlotte Stanford 'From Bishop's Grave to Holy Grave: The Construction of Strasbourg Cathedral's St. Catherine Chapel', *Gesta*, 46 (2007), 59-80, Caroline Bynum, *Wonderful Blood* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2007), pp. 60-61, and Poul Grindler-Hansen, 'Public Devotional Pictures in Late Medieval Denmark', in *Images of Cult and Devotion, Function and Reception of Christian Images in Medieval and Post-Medieval Europe*, ed. by Søren Kaspersen and Ulla Haastrup (Copenhagen: Museum Tusulanum Press, 2004), pp. 229-44.

69 Original notation: 4 stuivers, see ASB, HA, Register 3837, p. 299.

70 This particularly active member of the family still awaits further research; see Placide Lefèvre, 'Travaux exécutés à la collégiale Sainte-Gudule à Bruxelles par les peintres Corneille Coninxloo Père et Fils', *Pictura*, 2 (1945), 90-93; D'Hondt, *Extraits des comptes du domaine de Bruxelles*, see Index; Edmond Roobaert, 'De Brusselse seculiere clerus als opdrachtgever van schilders in de 16de eeuw', *Archief- en Bibliotheekwezen in België* (2010), 90, 87-124, see Index; Duverger, *Brussel als kunstcentrum*, pp. 66-69.

71 In 1500-01, he received a further 6s. for the work (see ASB, HA, Register 3837, pp. 13 and 27), which suggests that it may have taken more time and labour than he had originally estimated.

72 ASB, HA, Register 3837, p. 160.

73 ASB, HA, Register 3837, p. 52.

74 ASB, HA, Register 3837, p. 80.

75 ASB, HA, Register 3837, p. 26. For more on Capenbergh, see Duverger, *Brussel als kunstcentrum*, pp. 63-64 and 67-8; Roobaert, 'De Brusselse seculiere clerus', pp. 93, 94, and 119.

76 Duverger, *Brussel als kunstcentrum*, p. 80.

in the Seven Sorrows series produced by Borreman.⁷⁷ In what is apparently a later addition to the accounts, the third bookkeeper inserted 'aent gout en stoffe' (for gold and pigments) at the end of the entry, suggesting that the painter did not claim any fee for the labour, possibly out of devotion, and was satisfied with reimbursement for the materials used.⁷⁸

It is not clear whether Colijn de Coter, churchwarden of St Gorik, worked for the confraternity despite having been a member and having collaborated with both Van den Dale – his son-in-law and student, according to Duverger – and Borreman elsewhere.⁷⁹ There is one 'Colijn' listed in the account of 1502-03, but no last name is given, and it was not a large job: painting the frame of 'his' *tafereel* for the princely sum of 2s.⁸⁰ It could be that this master, who had certainly already won his spurs as an artist by that time, had either donated a painting to the chapel or received a commission for one, but finding definitive confirmation of it has proven difficult. In 1499-1500, the accounts mention that the confraternity already owned an image of the Crucifixion.⁸¹ And we know that there was a large painting of Our Lady on the altar when the confraternity moved into the chapel, and the accounts record that extensions were attached to it in 1501-02.⁸² Both would have been serious works of art, and De Coter would have been a logical choice for any such commissions. However, while it seems unlikely that Pertcheval, the confraternity's industrious keeper of the accounts at the time, would have failed to mention such an important donation or commission, he did not indicate any other origin for these works.⁸³

It is equally unclear who was responsible for an item mentioned under miscellaneous expenses from 1511-12, which state that iron hooks were purchased to hang a *tafereel* by one 'master Jan' in the St Jacob guesthouse, which was later moved back to the chapel of Our Lady.⁸⁴ This may have been by the hand of Jan van Roome, a member of *De Lelie* and the confraternity who occasionally carried out work for the provosts. However, while Van Roome was referred to in the accounts as a master more than once, his preference for designing rather than doing means that not all of the early sixteenth-century works ascribed

77 Edmond Roobaert, 'De Brusselse tapijtindustrie rond 1520. Tapijthandelaars, grotere en kleinere weefateliers, legwerkers in loondienst en kartonschilders', *Belgisch Tijdschrift voor Oudheidkunde en Kunstgeschiedenis*, 71 (2002), 3-46 (pp. 35-40).

78 ASB, HA, Register 3837, p. 301.

79 *Liber authenticus*, fol. 167^v. See Duverger, *Brussel als kunstcentrum*, pp. 68 and 81. De Coter collaborated with the Borreman workshop (Jan II, his brother Paeschier, and Jan III) on an altarpiece centred on the Virgin for the Strängnäs Cathedral in Sweden; see *Het meesterlijke atelier. Europese kunstroutes (Sde-18de eeuw)*, ed. by Roland Recht and others (Brussels: Museum voor Schone Kunsten/Mercatorfonds, 2007), pp. 128-29; Kim W. Woods, 'Five Netherlandish Carved Altar-Pieces in England and the Brussels School of Carving c. 1470-1520', *The Burlington Magazine*, 138 (1996), 788-800 (pp. 791-92).

80 ASB, HA, Register 3837, p. 52. Caution must be exercised when interpreting 'tafereel' in the accounts. For example, the two that hung above the altar were little more than wood boards decorated with ex-votos, while the one listed as having been placed (but not purchased or commissioned) in the choir in 1500-01 showing the Apostles can be considered an actual painting; see ASB, HA, Register 3837, p. 26.

81 ASB, HA, Register 3837, p. 10.

82 'Item Aen i groot tafereel voerden choir daer ons vrouwe Inne staet met twee oversprongen', see ASB, HA, Register 3837, pp. 12 and 40.

83 There is another mystery piece mentioned in the accounts of 1503-04: an image of Christ bearing the cross. No artist is listed as having been commissioned for the piece, and it is not clear if it was ever purchased. 'Item betaelt tot behulp vanden tafereele daer ons heer zijn cruce draegt, ij s. vj d. gr.', see ASB, HA, Register 3837, p. 65.

84 ASB, HA, Register 3837, p. 259.

to this extremely talented artist may have actually come from his hand, and so we should exercise caution before adding yet another to the list.⁸⁵

More is known about the source of the altarpiece depicting Our Lady of the Seven Sorrows that the confraternity commissioned in 1503-04. Nearly every confraternity would have had a large carved retable or a painted altarpiece in its chapel. Such works of art not only inspired devotion among members of the confraternity, but they also attracted visitors and potential patrons. Oddly enough, this appears to be the only piece that the provosts decided to outsource. A readied panel, planed and primed, was shipped to a 'master Albrecht' in Leuven.⁸⁶ This was likely Albrecht Bouts, a leading artist of the time and the son of master painter Dirk Bouts.⁸⁷ What can account for the decision to employ someone so wholly unconnected with the confraternity? The provosts must have known several artists in Brussels with the skills to complete the painting, including a few among its own membership. On top of which, master Albrecht may not have been especially zealous in carrying out his commission: in 1505-06 he was sent *six* whole sausages as an incentive to speed up the work.⁸⁸

Nevertheless, the central panel appears to have been finished by 1506-07 because that was the year that Joris Schernier gilded 'the scene from Lovens (Leuven)'.⁸⁹ Meanwhile, in 1504-05, the provosts organized the financing for the polyptych's side panels, and master Jan van Roome received 2s. 6d. for the 'vidimus' or design of the doors.⁹⁰ With the collected monies, Valentin van Orley, father of the famous master Bernaert and a member of the confraternity, was paid £6 2s. 6d. 'for the portraits on the outside of Our Lady's altarpiece'.⁹¹ However, judging by similar works of the time, these probably were not portraits but rather figurative representations based on the theme. The time and effort in arranging and organizing the work, which was carried out by several artists and in two different cities, demonstrates how important it was to the confraternity that they have a stunning centrepiece for the chapel.

Yet despite Bout's involvement in the altarpiece, which could have been due to availability, it is clear that the provosts preferred to rely on the confraternity's own members: the Scherniers, Van den Dale, Van Roome, Van Orley, and possibly De Coter, whether for larger, more important commissions or smaller, more insignificant work. Again, proximity to the confraternity and its leadership counted, as did skill. If Bouts were unable to live up to the standard set by his father, for example, it hardly seems likely that the provosts would have bothered going as far afield as Leuven to find an artist. Cost may have been a

⁸⁵ For example, Thomas Campbell, among others, has pointed out that while Jan van Roome was responsible for designing the *Miraculous Communion of Herkinbald* tapestry, he did not draw up the cartoons for the work, as has often been assumed. Rather, the contract specifies 'Philip den Schilder' as the cartoon artist, and so the ultimate product may reflect his style more than that of Van Roome. *Tapestry in the Renaissance: Art and Magnificence, Exhibition Catalogue*, ed. by T. Campbell (New York: Metropolitan Museum of Art, 2002), pp. 137-38. Van Roome even collaborated with Loys van Boghem to design the church of St Nicolas of Tolentino in Brou along with its tombs of Margaret of Bourbon and Margaret of Austria, 'the ultimate manifestation' of Renaissance Netherlandish Gothic. See Ethan Matt Kavaler, 'Renaissance Gothic in the Netherlands: The Uses of Ornament', *The Art Bulletin*, 82 (2000), 226-51 (pp. 237-39).

⁸⁶ The account refers to the latter as 'whitening'. See ASB, HA, Register 3837, pp. 65 and 108. For preparatory painting techniques of the time, see Catheline Perier-d'Ieteren, *Colyn de Coter et la technique picturale des peintres flamands du XV^e siècle* (Brussels: Lefebvre et Gillet, 1985), p. 17.

⁸⁷ With the exception of a small gift to the almoners of St Gudula in 1529-30, see Valentine Henderiks, *Albrecht Bouts (vers 1460-1549)* (Brussels: Centre d'étude des primitifs flamands, 2011), pp. 25 and 33. The suggestion that Albrecht Bouts either resided or owned property in Brussels has not been confirmed by any documents originating in that city.

⁸⁸ ASB, HA, Register 3837, p. 108.

⁸⁹ ASB, HA, Register 3837, p. 133.

⁹⁰ ASB, HA, Register 3837, p. 80.

⁹¹ 'Item betaelt Valentijne van Orley voer de pointratuere buten op onser vrouwen tafele'. Van Orley also received 12d. drinking money for his assistants, original notation: 24 ½ Rhenish guilders (ASB, HA, Register 3837, p. 80).

factor here as well; Van den Dale did work at cost on one occasion, and Cornelis Schernier accepted back payments, but otherwise it appears that the confraternity's painters worked for standard rates, at least when paid by the day.

There were assuredly more artists employed, however, than those the accounts indicate because the officers of public institutions, including those belonging to church fabrics and fraternities, were not required to mention the craftsmen or artists by name in the records. For example, the confraternity did not always keep track of who kept up the chapel's paintwork, so while we know that Father Gheerde vander Horst contributed 2s. 3d. towards the whitening of a wall, we do not know who actually did the work.⁹² He may have been a member of the confraternity, or he may have been an apprentice working for one of the confraternity's members. However, the nature of the work and the fact that no name is recorded indicate that the individual painter involved – while part of the confraternity's network of patronage – was not considered a particularly significant member of it.

Artists, the Annual Processions, and Plays: Increasing the Confraternity's Public Profile

The entries in the accounts regarding the annual procession in Brussels also reveal a great deal about the confraternity's patronage of the arts simply because it was a major production and one that grew year after year with the addition of new wagons to accompany the statue of Our Lady through the streets of Brussels on her bier. The scale and ambitiousness of such an event could have forced the provosts to turn to outside help out of necessity, but by and large, that does not appear to have been the case. The first procession, which took place in 1505, naturally centred on a scene depicting Mary's Seven Sorrows in as many 'ronden' or rounds.⁹³ The priming and painting of these canvasses cost 2s. 6d., and the design was from the hand of Jan van Roome. Five of the paintings were covered via donations, and the confraternity contributed a further £1 6s. 3d., 3s. of which came out of Joris Schernier's own pocket.⁹⁴

In 1509-1510, Jan van Roome was again at work, painting Our Lady of the Seven Sorrows and St Gorik on one of the processional pieces, possibly a painted canvas, fastened to a support structure on one of the procession *huyskens*.⁹⁵ It appears that this work was done almost as a favour to the confraternity, which only paid 3s. 1.5d. for the work, and on at least one occasion Joris Schernier seems to have earned more than Van Roome while working on the same item.⁹⁶ In 1506-07, the latter was given 7s. 3d. for a piece to be used in the procession of Our Lady, and this piece could have been the same one that Schernier was paid 17s. 6d. for painting.⁹⁷ This difference does not, however, mean that Van Roome was donating his services; it may be that he was merely the designer, as he so often was.

92 ASB, HA, Register 3837, pp. 36 and 39.

93 The term here may derive from the roundels employed in stained glass windows, either as separate circular pieces or incorporated into a larger work. The exact configuration in this context is unclear.

94 ASB, HA, Register 3837, p. 75. Other painted elements were also commissioned, such as fourteen large scrolls 'with scripture', banderoles with text, fourteen small scrolls, and a crown of thorns, which all carried the meaning of the presentation to the audience; see ASB, HA, Register 3837, p. 82.

95 This account entry probably refers to painted figures, rather than props or *tableaux vivants*. A *stuk* or *huysken* was a wooden platform, sometimes vaulted, covered with canvasses at the front and sides, and carried by ten of the members via straps and poles in the confraternity's procession.

96 ASB, HA, Register 3837, p. 214. In actuality, they paid this sum to Jan van Roome's wife; compensating the spouse of a craftsman either *in natura* or with a small sum was a common practice often stipulated in a contract.

97 ASB, HA, Register 3837, pp. 133 and 130.

If Van Roome was indeed the designer, it would again demonstrate that the confraternity chose artists according to their talents rather than who was immediately available. However, it must be said that Schernier was well positioned to receive such commissions and did fairly well out of it. In 1505-06, he made 15d. a day while working with Peter vander Wouwere on a *tableau vivant* depicting the Road to Calvary; in 1508-09, he made 30d., the standard rate, for two days working on 'pieces'; in 1509-10, he painted one element and decorated another piece with a temple, possibly as part of a scene showing the Presentation in the Temple, which was the first sorrow, making him 17s. 6d. the richer; and he later polychromed the crucifix carried during the procession, which netted him a further 15s.⁹⁸

In 1508, in addition to the annual procession, the confraternity began putting on a cycle of yearly plays, each depicting one of the Seven Sorrows of the Virgin, first in St Gorik's churchyard and then later in the *Markt* / Grand Place.⁹⁹ This was yet another instance in which the provosts had to call upon artists' skills. Joris Schernier, for example, painted a canvas showing four children drowned by the Pharaoh in the Exodus for use in 1509.¹⁰⁰

However, it is not always easy to determine from the accounts whether any particular painting commissioned by the confraternity portrayed figures or scenes for use in a play or a procession. For example, the two new 'pagan hats' and 'devils' skirts' that Cornelis Schernier painted on canvas in 1507-08 could have been used in either, as could the other accessories made from six more 'ells' of cloth purchased in 1510-11.¹⁰¹ The following year, various props to help illustrate the Flight into Egypt were purchased from Josse van Loven, including lances, pagan hats, and six small shields for the cavalry. And while the accounts state that these were to be used during the procession, they could just have easily been used in a play.¹⁰²

Whether their commissions were for a play, a procession, or both, Josse van Loven and Peter vander Wouwere were the only two named individuals involved in this aspect of the confraternity's activities that do not appear to have been part of the confraternity of Our Lady of the Seven Sorrows.¹⁰³ There were also anonymous artisans who helped to print and decorate the hundreds of small flags that were distributed, presumably for free, during the processions.¹⁰⁴ Overall, however, the provosts once again demonstrated their preference for hiring the confraternity's own artists, relying upon Jan van Roome and the Scherniers, Joris in particular, to design and paint the pieces for the processions and plays. Again, proximity was not necessarily the deciding factor as the choice of artists indicates that the confraternity wanted to ensure that its hard-won monies were used to best advantage. It made perfect sense to employ Van Rome, who would have been up to the task of designing eye-catching works on a large scale, alongside the Scherniers, who were no doubt already familiar with the production and staging of public spectacles via their association with *De Lelie*.

⁹⁸ ASB, HA, Register 3837, pp. 106, 186, 211, and 235.

⁹⁹ See Sleiderink, 'De dichters', pp. 62-65, for the involvement of 't *Mariacranske's* playwrights.

¹⁰⁰ ASB, HA, Register 3837, pp. 187 and 262.

¹⁰¹ ASB, HA, Register 3837, pp. 160 and 234. For more on 'devils' skirts', see Luther Link, *The Devil. A Mask without a Face* (London: Reaktion Books, 1995), pp. 59-60.

¹⁰² ASB, HA, Register 3837, p. 260.

¹⁰³ Personal communication with Speakman Sutch, 13 September 2013.

¹⁰⁴ On the use of flags in processions, see Edmond Roobaert, 'Michiel van Coxcie, de schildersfamilie van Coninxloo alias Scherniers, en andere Brusselse schilders als ontwerpers en verlichters van 16de-eeuwse processievaantjes voor de broederschappen van de stad', *Volkskunde*, 101 (2000), 257-303.

TABLE 1: Commissions and Purchases by St Gorik's Confraternity of Our Lady of the Seven Sorrows

Year of the Account Book	Commission/Purchase	Artist(s)	ASB, HS, Register 3837
1499-1500	Tin monstrance and ampoules	Unknown	pp. 7, 14
1499-1500	Two large candlesticks	Unknown	p. 14
1499-1500	Apporte, bench, and screen ¹	Gieles van Halle	p. 12
1499-1500	Screen behind the altar	Gieles van Halle	p. 12
1499-1500	Painting of Crucifixion ²	Unknown	p. 10
1500-01	Wood capitals	Antoon Wittric	p. 25
1500-01	Statue of Our Lady	Jan II Borreman	p. 26
1500-01	Our Lady polychromed	Cornelis Capenbergh	p. 26
1500-01	Painting of the Apostles ³	Unknown	p. 26
1501-02 ⁴	Statue of an angel	Jan II Borreman	p. 51
1501-02	Extensions to painting of Our Lady ⁵	Unknown	p. 40
1502-03	Latten chancel lectern	Jan van Nanoenen	p. 52
1502-03	Cast alter bell	Unknown	p. 52
1502-03	Angel polychromed	Cornelis Schernier	pp. 52, 80
1502-03	Monstrance gilded and burnished	Unknown	p. 52
1502-03	Mantel for statue of Our Lady ⁶	Unknown	pp. 45, 64
1502-03	Frame of painting painted	'Colijn'	p. 52
1503-04	Large candleholder for altar	Unknown	p. 65
1503-04	Painting of Christ bearing the Cross ⁷	Unknown	p. 65
1503-04	Altarpiece of Our Lady of the Seven Sorrows	'Master Albrecht' Joris Schernier Jan van Roome Valentin van Orley	pp. 65, 80, 108, 133
1504-05	Two chasubles	Unknown	pp. 75, 82
1504-05	Procession paintings: Mary's Seven Sorrows	Jan van Roome	p. 75
1504-05	Procession elements: various	Unknown	p. 82
1505-06	<i>Tableau vivant</i> : Road to Calvary	Joris Schernier, Peter vander Wouwere	p. 106
1506-07	Iron candelabra	Jan vander Goten	p. 132
1506-07	Four candlesticks: two beaten, two latten	Unknown	p. 132
1506-07	Two wood capitals	Antoon Wittric	p. 132
1506-07	Decorative screen	'Hendrik'	p. 132
1506-07	Pillars and arches	'Hendrik'	p. 132
1506-07	Cabinets	'Hendrik'	p. 132
1506-07	Inside of aumbry painted	Joris Schernier	p. 133
1506-07	Tabernacle painted ⁸	Joris Schernier	p. 133

Delivered by Brepols Online to:

Guest (guest)

IP: 216.73.216.171

On: Sat, 06 Dec 2025 10:40:29

Year of the Account Book	Commission/Purchase	Artist(s)	ASB, HS, Register 3837
1506-07	Wall above altar decorated	Joris Schernier	p. 133
1506-07	Procession painting: unspecified	Jan van Roome, Joris Schernier ⁹	pp. 130, 133
1507-08	Holy Sepulchre polychromed	Joris Schernier	p. 155
1507-08	Bargeboard painted	Cornelis Schernier	p. 160
1507-08	Procession/play elements: 'pagan hats', 'devils' skirts'	Corenelis Schernier	p. 160
1508-09	Statues: Our Lady, Archangel Gabriel	Jan II Borreman	pp. 188, 214, 240
1508-09	Play painting: Exodus scene	Joris Schernier	p. 187
1509-10	Chandelier	Unknown	p. 215
1509-10	Procession paintings: Our Lady of the Seven Sorrows, St Gorik	Jan van Roome	p. 214
1509-10	Procession paintings: Presentation in the Temple	Joris Schernier	p. 211
1510-11	Embroidery for vestments	'William'	p. 236
1510-11	Carving of Christ for processional crucifix	Jacques Daret (?)	pp. 229, 235, 236
1510-11	Procession crucifix polychromed	Joris Schernier	p. 235
1511-12	Painting: subject unknown ¹⁰	'Master Jan'	p. 259
1511-12	Procession/play elements: Flight into Egypt ¹¹	Josse van Loven	p. 260
1513-14	Cast latten bulbs for roof	Joos de Ketelaar	p. 300
1513-14	Carvings of Mary's Seven Sorrows (nos 1-4)	Jan II Borreman	p. 300
1513-14	Mary's first sorrow polychromed	Jan van den Dale	p. 301
1513-14	Procession pieces: unspecified	Joris Schernier, Andries Vervlen	p. 299
1514-15	Carving of image of God	Jacques Daret (?)	p. 316
1515-16	Carving of Mary's fifth sorrow	Jan II Borreman	p. 331

¹ These items may or may not be part of a single structure, and it is not clear if Van Halle produced them or merely installed them.

² It is not clear if this was a purchase, a gift, or if it came with the chapel.

³ It is not clear if this was a purchase, a gift, or if it came with the chapel.

⁴ This date is an inference. The accounts state on page 51, the start of the bookkeeping for 1502-03, that the angel already stood in the chapel.

⁵ This is just the first mention of the painting in the accounts, but it is clear that it was already there when the confraternity moved into the chapel.

⁶ The entry only refers to sums collected to cover costs, while the exact year of its completion is unknown.

⁷ It is not clear if this was ever actually purchased or if this was an extant painting (either a gift or a painting inherited by the confraternity) that needed some kind of repair work.

⁸ Like the Holy Sepulchre sculpture, the tabernacle appears to have been in the chapel when the confraternity moved in.

⁹ That they both worked on the same piece is a conjecture.

¹⁰ It is not clear if this was a purchase, a gift, or if it came with the chapel, nor is it clear when it was obtained. This mention in this account just refers to the purchase of iron hooks for hanging it up.

¹¹ The accounts state that these were used for the procession but like many other processional elements could have been used to help illustrate the play.

Conclusion: Skilled Artistry and the Role of Competition

Just as Emily Thelen's chapter on the hiring of singers for liturgical celebrations makes clear, the provosts, despite their financial constraints, still managed to hire skilled artists to contribute to the Brussels confraternity's *raison d'être*: the promotion and veneration of the Seven Sorrows of the Blessed Virgin both in the relatively private services held in their chapel in St Gorik and in public through the use of plays and processions. In both contexts, craftsmen, sculptors, and painters were required to help bring the message to the people. Yet the identities of those charged with outfitting Our Lady of the Seven Sorrows with the basic necessities required for holding services are, by and large, unknown, as are their possible ties to the confraternity. Of the two known artists who were not members of the confraternity, Jan van Naoenen and Jan vander Goten, we know that both came from well-known families of highly skilled craftsmen in Brussels and that the former was connected with the Borreman workshop.

We can say with rather more certainty that the confraternity rarely employed non-members to fill the commissions for sculptures and paintings, and such partisanship appears to have been standard practice, at least for confraternities that began as artisanal associations. The painters, stained glass artists, and goldsmiths who took part in the day-to-day management of the brotherhood of St Eloy, for example, were routinely requested to produce decorative elements for the confraternity's chapel or cult objects for use during the services.¹⁰⁵ However, the Seven Sorrows confraternity's unique relationship with *De Lelie*, or *'t Mariacranske*, as it later became, meant that they did not have to settle for second best. Both the chamber of rhetoric and its confraternity included many top artists, and they could be prevailed upon to accept lower fees, payment in instalments, or even – as may have been the case with Jan van den Dale – to do the work at cost. And in terms of promoting the devotion, it seems that this was quite a successful strategy: in 1511, the confraternity's ultimate patron, the Emperor Maximilian, expressed his approval of their 'very devout procession', conferred princely status upon their chapel, and raised the rhetoricians to the status of princely servants.¹⁰⁶

Yet despite the court's promotion of the cult, the pattern of patronage exhibited by St Gorik's chapter of Our Lady of the Seven Sorrows suggests that the rhetoricians who organized it were playing their own game. The commissions outlined in Table 1, incomplete as they are, show that the confraternity made many initial purchases that were simply meant to put the chapel in order. This pattern makes sense because, as Thelen points out in her chapter, liturgical celebrations and Masses were important parts of the cult's activities and Masses for the dead one of its major benefits. The devotional space of Our Lady of the Seven Sorrows had to be ready for operation as quickly as possible; hence the early commissions for accoutrements, furniture, and even basic statuary.

However, around 1505 the nature of the commissions began to change. First, rather than continuing to make do with the painting of Our Lady it had inherited and then modified or renting the vestments of St Gorik's, the confraternity ordered its own chasubles and altarpiece. Next, they began to hold processions and elaborate on the interior of the chapel, purchasing more lighting fixtures and decorative elements and making outlays for improving on what they had. Finally, they branched out into plays and improving the external appearance of the chapter, with accessories for the roof and possibly even carvings.

¹⁰⁵ Frankignoulle and Bonenfant, 'Notes pour servir à l'histoire de l'art en Brabant', pp. 18-30.

¹⁰⁶ Duverger, *Brussel als kunstcentrum*, p. 94 and Speakman Sutch and Van Bruaene, 'The Seven Sorrows', p. 275.

This pattern of purchases seems to conform to that described by Trio in his research on Ghent's confraternities, with basic outfitting followed by the purchase of more extravagant items as funds allowed, an altarpiece first and foremost among them. Not only was this done to enhance the devotional space, but garnering prestige was an important motive as well, and that certainly seems to be the case here.¹⁰⁷ As Van Bruaene has shown, rhetoricians' chambers strived for precedence and honours, and not just among themselves, but against the archers' guilds as well.¹⁰⁸ Indeed, in his contribution to this volume, Sleiderink discusses the rivalry between *De Lelie*/*'t Mariacranske* with the *Grote Gilde* (Great Crossbow Archers Guild of Brussels).

This latter guild dominated the city's feast culture through both its annual procession to Our Lady of the Sands, the related plays devoted to the Seven Joys of Mary, and the performances given by its own rhetoricians. And while *De Lelie* was increasingly paid to perform at public functions from 1486 onwards – such as the celebrations held to commemorate peace with France, the christening of Archduchess Eleanor, and the birth of Charles V – it seems they still regularly lost to the *Grote Gilde* in the rhetoricians' competitions held during various festivities.¹⁰⁹ The confraternity's patronage of craftsmen and artists could reflect *De Lelie's* struggle to gain prestige, in which they may have used the devotion to Our Lady of the Seven Sorrows as another vehicle for competition.¹¹⁰ Such rivalry could help to explain the effort poured into the procession and later on the plays. With regard to their success, Sleiderink points out in his chapter that it is difficult to say whether Our Lady of the Seven Sorrows ever managed to achieve the same level of devotional fervour that the well-established devotion at Our Lady of the Sands had obtained, while Van Bruaene is certain that *De Lelie's* efforts in this area had a positive effect on their position in the feast culture of Brussels.¹¹¹

This competition may have also driven some of the confraternity's choices in *who* it hired. Of the princely rhetoricians, Jan II Borreman and Joris Schernier carried out the greatest number of commissions and this must, at least in part, be linked with the fact that they were both counted among its provosts, Schernier for many years. Judging by the commissions they received, Borreman was up to the task of handling the most important sculptures, but Joris does not seem to have been trusted to execute the most demanding or original works. Rather, the provosts employed leading masters such as Jan van Roome or Jan van den Dale more than once and even turned to an apparent outsider, Albrecht Bouts, for the central panel of the all-important altarpiece.¹¹²

When commissioning works, skills and ability apparently counted for more than membership or proximity to the confraternity's leadership. This suggests that no matter

¹⁰⁷ Trio, *Volksreligie*, pp. 248 and 260-61.

¹⁰⁸ Anne-Laure Van Bruaene, *Om Beters Wille. Rederijkerskamers en de Stedelijke Cultuur in de Zuidelijke Nederlanden (1400-1650)* (Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, 2008), pp. 218-26.

¹⁰⁹ Duverger, *Brussel als kunstcentrum*, pp. 85-92.

¹¹⁰ For more on this rivalry, see the chapter by Remco Sleiderink in this volume. For the cult of Our Lady of the Sands in particular, see Andrew Brown and Graeme Small, *Court and Civic Society in the Burgundian Low Countries c. 1420-1530* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2007), pp. 242-45.

¹¹¹ Van Bruaene, *Om Beters Wille*, pp. 69-70.

¹¹² This competition may also help to clarify what seems – on the face of it – a rather odd purchase in 1508-09: two statues representing the Annunciation, which was counted as the first of Mary's Seven Joys. In her chapter of this volume, Dagmar Eichberger states that having representations of both the sorrows and joys in one devotional space was not a unique combination.

how short of funds they may have been, quality came first. Their personal aesthetic values aside, well-made, beautiful objects or eye-catching public displays were more likely to inspire devotion, expand the Marian cult, and increase the prestige of *De Lelie/t Mariacranske*. However, the precise meaning of the laconic entries in the accounts is not always evident, probably at least in part because the keepers of these accounts were well-acquainted with the matter at hand, as well as the people involved, and so they omitted what they considered to be excessive details, including precise descriptions of the works commissioned. Despite these lacunae, this examination of their records has made clear that the Confraternity of Our Lady of the Seven Sorrows in Brussels was not only an important patron of the arts during the early sixteenth century, but also that it was highly selective, relying heavily upon an established network of local artists.

Epilogue: Works that Survived into the Seventeenth Century

How many, if any, of the items described in this chapter survived the later religious upheavals is unknown. There are a few entries in the late seventeenth-century inventory of the confraternity's various properties and belongings that are possibly related to the items described in the accounts.¹¹³ For example, the inventory lists a number of undated 'copere' and 'kopere' candle holders as well as a type of chandelier.¹¹⁴ If the author meant 'latten' or copper alloys such as brass or bronze, then perhaps these are among the earliest fittings purchased for the chapel. Delicate items such as a set of chasubles are also listed, including one in red and another with red stripes, as well as several cushions.¹¹⁵ However, the accounts only mentioned two, and they are not described in enough detail to make a positive identification here.¹¹⁶

With regard to paintings, most of those in the inventory are clearly dated to the seventeenth century, yet two could relate to an item in the accounts: a painting of the Seven Sorrows depicted between poems with the date of the confraternity's founding and a painting with two doors.¹¹⁷ Either of these could refer to the painting of Our Lady to which extensions were added in 1501-02. If so, the additions may have converted a basic painting into an object more typically associated with the cult – like those with a central image accompanied by text given by Jan van Coudenberghe to the three original confraternities in Bruges, Abbenbroek, and Reimerswaal, or Palencia Cathedral's *Altar de Nuestra Señora de la Compasión* as described by Rosario Inés Granados Salinas.¹¹⁸ Finally, the inventory lists a bench with two doors;¹¹⁹ it is possible that this refers to the bench installed in the chapel by Gieles van Halle. It must be stressed that all of these identifications are highly speculative. The accounts have an entirely different function than the later inventory and so do not provide detailed descriptions of most of the items contained therein.

113 For a complete transcription of this document, see Brecht Dewilde and Bram Vannieuwenhuyze, 'De zeventiende-eeuwse inventaris van de broederschap van Onze-Lieve-Vrouw van de Zeven Weeën in Brussel', *Handelingen van de Koninklijke Commissie voor Geschiedenis*, 180 (2014), in press. See also the chapter by Brecht Dewilde and Bram Vannieuwenhuyze in this volume.

114 ASB, HA, Register 1499, p. 32.

115 ASB, HA, Register 1499, pp. 40-41.

116 ASB, HA, Register 3837, p. 112.

117 ASB, HA, Register 1499, p. 46.

118 Rosario Inés Granados Salinas, 'Sorrows for a Devout Ambassador. A Netherlandish Altarpiece in Sixteenth Century Castile', in *POTESTAS. Religión, Poder y Monarquía*, 1 (2008), 101-29 (pp. 104-07 and 113-14).

119 ASB, HA, Register 1499, p. 48.