MARTIN DROESHOUT REDIVIVUS: REASSESSING THE FOLIO ENGRAVING OF SHAKESPEARE

JUNE SCHLUETER

I

Among the most familiar portraits of Shakespeare is the engraving that graces the title-page of the 1623 First Folio of Shakespeare’s plays (see illustration 40). Unlike other portraits purporting to be the playwright, the engraving should present no question of authenticity, for the publication date establishes its *terminus ab quo* and Ben Jonson’s attendant verses lament the ‘Sweet Swan of Avon’ and note the figure ‘was for gentle Shakespeare cut’. Nor is the engraver’s name in question, for below the portrait is his signature: ‘Martin Droeshout Sculpsit London’. But there are two Martin Droeshouts in the records of early modern London, and the question of which of them engraved the famous title-page has not been settled. Was it the elder Martin, who was born in Brussels but spent much of his life in London? Or was it his nephew, who was born in London in 1601? The London records mention the elder several times, identifying him as the son of John Droeshout, a painter, and brother of Michael, an engraver; he himself is called a painter. The younger is mentioned only once, upon his baptism; but there are several references to his father, Michael, and his older brother, John, who were both engravers.2

In 1991, following years of uncertainty and assumption, two articles provided new evidence on the Droeshouts. But the evidence was of two kinds, and the authors came to opposite conclusions: Mary Edmond contended that the elder Martin was the likely engraver of Shakespeare;3 Christiaan Schuckman believed it was the younger.4

Astonished that some thought a case could be made for the younger Martin, Edmond pointed out that ‘there is absolutely no positive evidence that the younger Droeshout ever practiced as an engraver’; indeed, apart from the record of his baptism in London in April 1601, there was ‘no positive documentary evidence about him at all’.5 But there are London documents on the elder Martin and several speak to his profession. A 1608 grant of denization identifies the elder Martin as a painter of Brabant.6 The 1617 Registers of the

Individual notes acknowledge the help I received with particular aspects of this essay. More generally, I am grateful to my husband, Paul Schlueter, and to the Skillman Library staff at Lafayette College for their research assistance.

1 The elder Martin also had a son named Martin; born in 1607, he would have been 16 when the First Folio was published. No one has suggested him as a candidate.


3 Mary Edmond, “‘It was for gentle Shakespeare cut’”, *Shakespeare Quarterly*, 42 (1991), pp. 339–44.


5 Edmond, “‘It was for gentle Shakespeare cut’”, p. 339.

6 *Calendar of State Papers, Domestic Series, of the Reign of James I, 1603–1610, Preserved in the State Paper Department of Her Majesty's
search of the London records, however, and her sure identification of the elder Martin as a painter, her comment about the younger Martin also holds for the elder: ‘there is absolutely no positive evidence that the [elder] Droeshout ever practiced as an engraver’.

Schuckman’s essay is as provocative as Edmond’s, for it announces his discovery of ten Martin Droeshout engravings in the Biblioteca Nacional, Madrid. All are signed, and nine are dated 1635–40 or appear in books published in Madrid during those years; on four, the Droeshout signature indicates, in the same hand, the place where the engraving was done: ‘en Madrid’. Schuckman particularly notes an (undated) engraving of Francisco de la Peña, done in Madrid, that bears

Austin Friars Dutch Church in London place the elder Martin, his wife Janneken, and six children in Crossed (or Crutched) Friars and identify him as a painter. The elder Martin is in the 1617 inventory of ‘handycraftmen’ members of the Dutch Church living within the City; he is said to have dwelled there for 33 years and is listed as a denizen, a poor householder and a painter. A 1635 reference identifies him as a ‘limner’, born in Brussels and living here (in the Parish of St Olave, Aldgate Ward) 30 years. Moreover, just before publishing her essay on the Droeshout engraving, Edmond uncovered a record that identifies the elder Martin as a freeman of the Painter-Stainers’ Company. And she provides archival evidence that a member of the Painter-Stainers’ Company could well have practiced engraving. Despite Edmond’s assiduous

40. Droeshout engraving of Shakespeare on the title-page of the 1623 First Folio, signed in London.

10 Edmond, “‘It was for gentle Shakespeare cut’”, pp. 340 and 340, note 3, citing Guildhall MS 5667/1: ‘at a meeting on 19 September 1634, “Mr Marcus Garrett”, “Mr Drossett”, and another man, acting as “Assistants in the Search”, reported on some very bad workmanship they had inspected’.
11 Edmond, “‘It was for gentle Shakespeare cut’”, p. 340. Records of Antwerp’s St Luke’s Guild confirm such variety of membership in the painters’ company there, as well as the preparation of many of the company’s members in several trades. Crispyn vande(n) Broeck, for example, a student of Frans Floris, named in 1555–6, was a painter, designer and engraver. And Carel Liefrinck, identified as a painter in the 1556–7 membership list, was both a painter and a copper engraver. See Jan van der Stock, Printing Images in Antwerp: The Introduction of Printmaking in a City, Fifteenth Century to 1585, trans. Beverley Jackson (Rotterdam, 1998), Appendix 1.
signatures on the 25 extant London works make a convincing case for a single engraver, whose (dated extant) work began in London with the 1623 Folio and concluded in Madrid in 1639 or 1640. Throughout his analysis, Schuckman assumes that both the London and the Madrid engravings were the work of the younger Martin. Inexplicably, he never admits the possibility that the single engraver could have been the elder.

Key to the resolution of which Martin did the portraits, title-pages and book illustrations that bear the engraver's signature is the question of which Martin emigrated to Spain - or accepted

a strong stylistic resemblance to the Shakespeare portrait (see illustration 41). He also examines the signatures, noting their variety. Five use a full or nearly full version of the name (three of these use a monogram that entwines the 'DR' of the surname and/or the 'MAR' of the first name), and five use an abbreviated form (all with a monogram that entwines the 'DR' of the surname and/or the 'MAR' of the first name, with the 'DR' monogram standing as the surname). Moreover, those that employ the fuller version reveal an intriguing change of name: from 'Droeshout' to 'Droeswood' or 'Droesoode', 'wood' being the English equivalent of the Dutch 'hout'. For Schuckman, the 1623 Folio signature, the only one using the full name 'Martin Droeshout', offers one more example of such variety. His comments on artistic style and his observation that variety also typifies the
a commission there. Schuckman assumes it was the nephew, proposing that the younger Martin emigrated between 1632 (the date of the last known London engraving) and 1635 (the date of the first known Madrid engraving). But Schuckman only glances at the London records and he does not acknowledge Edmond’s observations about the elder Martin. For although she was unaware of the Madrid engravings at the time of her argument, Edmond points out that London’s printed Calendar of State Papers for 1635 omits the elder Martin from a list of artists living there. And she observes that the only post-1635 London record that may be positively identified with the elder Martin dates from 1641, when his name appears in the Dutch Church Registers in connection with his youngest child’s admission to that congregation: “1641, Dec. 26. Daniel Drossaert with testimony of his father, Maerten Drossaert”. Hence the elder Martin could have been away from London from 1635 to 1639 or 1640.

But the case for the elder Martin’s absence from London during these years is problematic, for despite the omission of his name from the printed Calendar, it does appear in the 1635 return of aliens. The census entry, under ‘Aldgate, 12 Nov 1635, St. Olaves, Hartstreet’, reads: ‘Martin Drussett Lymner borne in Bruzills and Jane his wife borne in Antwerpe have lyved heere 30 yeares have six chil­dren all borne heere’. The elder Martin’s residence in London as late as November 1635 makes it unlikely that he was the engraver of the coat of arms of Gaspar de Guzmán Olivares in *Tractatus Absolutissimus de Triplis* . . . , by Antonio Cabreros Avendaño, and the portrait of Juan de Avila in *Vida de . . . Juan de Avila*, by Luis Muñoz, both published in Madrid in 1635. Moreover, another document, which Edmond does not notice, indicates that the elder Martin was in London in 1638. On Friday, 6 July [16, n.s.] 1638, in London, Martin Droeshoudt, along with Timotheus van Vleteren (minister of the Dutch Church from 1628–32 – ‘dienaer der Nederduytsche gemeente’) and Henric Pauwels (a painter, also of Dutch origin), signed a declaration concerning a legacy of Wessel Boots to his children. If we can infer from the body of work that Droeshout’s presence in Spain was sustained rather than occasional, then the elder Martin could not have been the Madrid engraver.

The case for the elder Martin weakens further when one considers the subject matter of the Madrid engravings. As Schuckman observes, the engraver’s earliest (extant) commission in Spain was the coat of arms of Gaspar de Guzmán, Count-Duke of Olivares, ‘a staunch supporter of the Spanish Counter-Reformation’. Other Droeshout engravings depict Catholic saints and Counter-Reformation iconography; among the most explicit is the illustration that follows the title-page of *Novissimus Librorum Prohibitorum et Expurgatorum Index* showing the Church as Warrior stamping out Heresy, Error and Temerity. Schuckman concludes that the engraver advocated

15 Edmond, “‘It was for gentle Shakespeare cut’”, p. 341, citing Calendar of State Papers, Domestic Series, of the Reign of Charles I, 1635, 591–4.
17 SP 16/305/111/C.
18 The full title is *Tractatus Absolutissimus de Triplis, Seu Eorum Poena, ad Elucidationem I. 18. tit. 5. lib. g. Recop. Tum novitiae preclarissimus, cum singularitate maxima praeditus, & tæ praæ dilliciss discussionis, quàm juris enucleatione creperus, sed utilitate maximus, & omnibus adprimé necessarius. Ex utriusque litteraturae fulcris compactus*, by Don Antonio Cabreros Avendaño Madrindensi I.C. Excmo Olivarum Comiti Dicatus.
19 The full title is *Vida y virtudes del venerable varón el P. Maestro Juan de Avila, predicator apostólico, con algunos elogios de las virtudes y vidas de algunos de sus más principales discípulos*, by Luis Muñoz.
20 The entry is transcribed in Epistulae et Tractatus: Cum Reformations Tum Ecclesiae Londino-Batava, ed. Joannes Henricus Hessels (Cambridge, 1897), p. 1769. Edmond notices a 28 February 1640/1 record – ‘Mr Drosset made A motion about his Sonn’ – a reference too vague to be helpful (Edmond, “‘It was for gentle Shakespeare cut’”, p. 342, citing Guildhall MS 5667/1, 155).
21 Schuckman, ‘The Engraver of the First Folio Portrait of William Shakespeare’, p. 42. Guzmán was also a patron of artists, including Velázquez, who painted Guzmán on horseback, c. 1635, and a portrait of Guzmán, 1638.
22 The full title is *Novissimus Librorum Prohibitorum et Expurgatorum Index*. Pro Catholicis Hispaniarum Regnis, Philippi III.
Catholicism and ‘clearly became a Catholic’, a suggestion consistent with the absence of any mention of the younger Martin, beyond the baptism, in the records of London’s Dutch Church. By contrast, the elder Martin’s name appears repeatedly in those records, from 1592 through 1641, tracing his own admission to the congregation, his two marriages, the baptisms of his seven children and the admission of three of his children. There are miscellaneous references as well, and the 1638 declaration that the elder Martin signed was also signed by the Dutch Church minister. Although it is risky to make assumptions about the religious and political sympathies of an artist based on a work of art, so sustained a record of the elder Martin’s commitment to the Protestant faith renders problematic any proposal that it was he who did the decidedly Catholic, Counter-Reformation engravings in Madrid.

But might both Martins have been responsible for the body of engravings that bear the Droeshout signature? Might the elder have done the London engravings, including that of Shakespeare, and the younger those in Spain? Despite the absence of evidence (beyond the engravings themselves) that either Martin was an engraver, isn’t it possible that both were? While the proposal has its attractions, the chronology of the work argues against it. For although the elder Martin had lived in London for decades before the First Folio was published, there are no known Droeshout engravings before 1623. Moreover, although there are some two dozen London engravings, with dates ranging from 1623 to 1632, there are no known London engravings after 1632; the next known engravings appeared in Madrid in 1635. The chronology points to a single engraver.

Droeshout’s penchant for the monogram is also suggestive, for the London engravings, like those from Madrid, entwine the ‘MA’ or the ‘MAR’ of Martin, the ‘DR’ of Droeshout, or the initials ‘MD’. As with the Madrid engravings, the London work also reflects variation in the spelling of ‘Martin’/‘Marten’ and three different lettering styles for the initial ‘M’: roman, italic, and swash. Most compelling is the strong similarity between two signatures, one from London — indeed, the Shakespeare engraving — and one from Madrid. A comparison of the full name signatures on the title-page of the 1623 Folio (London, 1623) and the title-page of Política Militar en Avisos de Generales (Madrid, 1638) (see illustration 42) leaves little doubt that the signatures are in the same hand.

The scenario, then, that chronology, style, signatures and the subject matter of the Madrid engravings urge — and that is supported by the London records — is the one that Schuckman assumes: the younger Martin, born in London in 1601, began his

---

23 Schuckman, ‘The Engraver of the First Folio Portrait of William Shakespeare’, p. 43 (fig. 28).
24 Two comments are appropriate here. First, Malcolm Jones, ‘English Broadides – I’, Print Quarterly, 18 (2001), pp. 149–63, suggests the possibility that Droeshout’s portrait of William Fairfax and his Saints might be from 1621 or 1622 (p. 152). In addition, Jones publishes, for the first time, a later state of a 1623 Droeshout engraving entitled The Spiritual Warfare (pp. 153 (fig. 142), 154, 157–8), available in the Bruce Peal Special Collections of the Library of the University of Alberta, Edmonton, Canada, Wing S5002A. Jones’s research suggests that the 22-year-old may already have been an established engraver when he did the Folio Shakespeare. Second, the unsigned title-page engraving in the 1615 edition of Helkiah Crooke’s Makrokosmographia includes two flanking figures that are similar to those in the 1631 title-page engraving that bears Droeshout’s monogram, but there is no reason to conclude that Droeshout did the earlier engraving. For as the sub-titles of both editions indicate, the illustrations were collected by Crooke from the ‘best authors of anatomy’, especially Gasper Bauhinus and Andreas Laurentius. A review of anatomy books reveals that similar illustrations, including those on the 1615 title-page, appeared earlier in Juan Valverde de Amusco, Historia de la composicion del cuerpo humano (Rome, 1556). I am grateful to William Schupbach, Iconographic Collections Curator at the Wellcome Library, London, for his help in identifying sources.
25 Jones, ‘English Broadides – I’, offers a solid argument for affixing a 1635 date to Droeshout’s Four Seasons, which would make his last London commission before his departure for Spain (pp. 152, 154).
Before closing this discussion of the Folio engraver, I would like to present additional new evidence...
concerning the Droeshouts. Until now, it was thought that John and Mary Droeshout emigrated from Brussels to England c. 1569 and that their two sons, Michael and Martin, were born in the 1560s, before their parents' departure. The assumption may be attributed not only to several references in the London records indicating that Michael and Martin were born in Brussels but also to a troublesome transcript of an entry in the 1593 return of aliens stating that John and Mary Droeshout had been in England twenty-four years. It is not hard to see how Edmond and others, relying on these records, assigned the Droeshout emigration to c. 1569.

Nor is it difficult to see how Edmond deduced that 'John and Mary had six children, Michael and Martin born in Brussels in the late 1560s and two sons and two daughters born in London between circa 1574 and 1589'. The relevant portion of Irene Scouloudi's 1985 transcript of the 1593 return reads: 'Druessait, John and Mary, his wife, householders, 2; born in Brussels (Brisle); painter; two sons of 19 and 15, two daughters of 12 and 4 years, all English-born . . .'. If the four children referenced in the 1593 return were all born in England and Michael and Martin were born in Brussels, then John and Mary must have had six children.

But Belgian documents tell a different story. The Brussels archive has yielded a marriage record for the senior Droeshouts and a baptismal record for their son Martin. John and Mary were married in Brussels in 1572/3; the elder Martin was baptized in Brussels in 1573/4. Both events took place in the Onze-Lieve-Vrouw van de Kapel (the Church of Our Lady). The record for the senior Droeshouts reads: 'Jan Droeshout, Maijken De Looze gudilana 13 jan. 1572 stijlo brab' (see illustration 43). The baptismal record for the elder Martin reads: 'die septima baptizatus est Martinus filius Joes [Joannes] Droessaert; susceptor Martinus De Loose et Gertrudis Clemens' (the seventh [of January] Martin Droeshout, son of John Droeshout, is baptized; godparents Martin De Loose and Gertrude Clemens) (see illustration 44). Moreover, the 1593 London return does not state that the four Droeshout children were 'all English-born', as Scouloudi reports. That column of the return actually reads:

2 sonnes one 19 another 15 & 2 daughters one 12 4 borne in England

The four-year old was, indeed, born in England, but the others were not.

includes neither in her listing of Woode engravings in Reper‌toria de Grabados Españoles.


28 See, for example, Edmond, "'It was for gentle Shakespeare cut'' , p. 341, and Hind, Engraving in England in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries: A Descriptive Catalogue with Introductions, Part II: The Reign of James I, p. 341. (Edmond points to several errors in Hind's account of the Droeshout family. Indeed, there are several more. Although Hind's work on engraving in England is magisterial, his narrative on the Droeshout family needs to be read with caution.)

29 Edmond, "'It was for gentle Shakespeare cut'' , p. 341.

30 Scouloudi, Returns of Strangers in the Metropolis 1593, 1627, 1635, 1639: A Study of an Active Minority, Quarto Series of the Huguenot Society of London 57, p. 173.

31 The item appears in 'Transcriptum Registrum Matrimonialis Ecclesiae Parochialis B. Mariae V. de Capella', which lists marriage licenses issued from Christmas 1572 (Sponsalia contracta a Festo Nativitatis 1572 stijlo Brab'). By local custom, the couple would have married soon after – in late January or February 1572/3 (gudilana' may refer to Maijken De Loose's place of origin or, possibly, to her membership in the Church of St Gudule).

32 Paul de Clerck, amateur genealogist and a volunteer at the Rijksarchief Leuven, has been immensely helpful in my research on the Droeshouts in Belgium. It was he who uncovered the marriage record and referred my further query to Henri De Greef, who located the baptismal record. The Rijksarchief Leuven is the repository for Brussels church records; it also holds LDS-microfilms of the parish and civil records of the old province of Brabant: Brussels, Flemish Brabant, and Walloon Brabant. I am also grateful to de Clerck for reviewing my transcripts of Flemish hand.

33 I am grateful to D. J. Pohl of The Huguenot Library, London, for photocopies taken from the microfilm of the manuscript on file there. The 1593 return of aliens is part of the Dugdale MS at Merevale Hall; it is bound in vols. 3 and 4 of the manuscript of The History of Warwickshire, by Sir William Dugdale.
43. Marriage record for John and Mary Droeshout.

44. Baptism record for the elder Martin Droeshout.
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Clearly, the assumption that John and Mary emigrated to London in or about 1569 needs amending, as does the consequent assumption that there were six Droeshout children. There were, in fact, other Droeshouts from Brussels who arrived in London in the late 1560s – Hans (John) and Hendrick, both joiners34 – and it may be that English commissioners mistakenly incorporated material from the 1569 record for John and Margaret Droeshout into the 1593 entry for John and Mary Droeshout. In any event, there is no known record of John Droeshout in London prior to 1583, when he is listed, as a Dutchman and a painter, in an inventory of strangers in Broad Street Ward.35 John’s name first appears with Mary’s in 1585, when the two were admitted to the Dutch Church congregation.36 The first reference to the family in London is a 4 November 1587 Lay subsidy indicating that John and Mary, their two sons, and a daughter were living in Broad Street Ward.37 Hence it is safe to assign a 1583–4 arrival to the Droeshout family.

A 1583–4 arrival date is consistent with the 1617 Dutch Church Registers, which state that the elder Martin had ‘dwelled here’ for thirty-three years and Michael for twenty-nine. The four-year disparity may be explained by an entry in the 1593 return, which reads: ‘Mychaell Drowshot . . . born in Brussell in Brabant, but dyd remayne sumtyme in Andwarpe, sometyme in Fryzeland, and sometyme in Zeland, and from thence came hyther. A graver in Copper, which he learned in Brussell.’38 One could read the entry to mean that Michael came to London with his family. But it is more likely that he came to London a few years after his family in c. 1583–4 and, sometime after 1587, returned to the continent to learn copper engraving. Another 1593 entry, described as a ‘duplicate return’, states that Michael has been ‘3 years in the realm’.39 If both the 1617 record (‘twenty-nine years’) and the 1593 record (‘three years’) are accurate, then it would appear that between 1587 and 1593, Michael was on the continent for three or four years.

It should be noted that the Brussels baptismal record for the elder Martin is consistent with the age of the elder son in the 1593 London return: born in 1574, Martin would have been nineteen when the census was taken. Moreover, a London


I have information on the younger Martin's two brothers as well. John (1599–1651/2), an engraver, was made a free Brother of the newly formed Clockmakers' Company in 1632; in 1637, he took an apprentice, Daniel Jolly; he paid his membership fee ("quarterage") until 1647 and (as Edmond notes) died in 1651/2. His younger brother, William (b. 1603), may have been associated with the tapestry works at Mortlake (southwest of London), a manufactory staffed by
there is no known record of this marriage, as there is for the other four, the Lay Subsidies of 1598 and 1600 for Aldgate Ward, Duke's Place, list Dominick as Michael's wife. The records indicate the following sequence of events: in 1595, Michael married Susanneken; in 1596, a son, John, was born; by 1598, Michael had married Dominick; in 1599, a son, John, was born. The recording of Dominick's name as Michael's wife and the naming of Michael's two sons 'John' suggest that the first John died; indeed, Michael, who was only seventeen when he married Susanneken, may have faced the death of both his firstborn and (in childbirth?) his wife.

The appended Chronology abstracts the records of the Droeshout family from 1572/3 to Michael's death in 1638 and provides several items from

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Michael Droeshout</th>
<th>(1) Susanneken</th>
<th>(2) Dominick Verricke (?)</th>
<th>(3) Jacobmitgen</th>
<th>(4) Martha Sleuwen</th>
<th>(5) Sara Wagenaer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>b. c. 1578, Brussels</td>
<td>m. 1595</td>
<td>m. 1598</td>
<td>m. 1607</td>
<td>m. 1611</td>
<td>m. 1628</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John</td>
<td>John</td>
<td>Martin</td>
<td>William</td>
<td>Susanna</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. 1596</td>
<td>b. 1599</td>
<td>b. 1601</td>
<td>b. 1603</td>
<td>b. 1606</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

43. The Mortlake lists for 1640, 1655 and 1663 are published in W. G. Thomson, *Tapestry Weaving in England from the Earliest Times to the End of the Eighteenth Century* (London and New York, 1914), pp. 96, 98. In an e-mail communication, Wendy Hefford of the Victoria and Albert Museum advised that in Thomson the list headed '1655' begins with the membership list of 1640, which was derived from records of the 1620s and 1630s. I am grateful to Hefford for the record of the baptism: on 1 March 1629, William stood godfather to Elizabeth, daughter of Hendrick de Bock (Guildhall MS 7382).


45. Edmond, "It was for gentle Shakespeare cut", p. 342.

46. The Mortlake lists for 1640, 1655 and 1663 are published in W. G. Thomson, *Tapestry Weaving in England from the Earliest Times to the End of the Eighteenth Century* (London and New York, 1914), pp. 96, 98. In an e-mail communication, Wendy Hefford of the Victoria and Albert Museum advised that in Thomson the list headed '1655' begins with the membership list of 1640, which was derived from records of the 1620s and 1630s. I am grateful to Hefford for the record of the baptism: on 1 March 1629, William stood godfather to Elizabeth, daughter of Hendrick de Bock (Guildhall MS 7382).

47. Edmond, "It was for gentle Shakespeare cut", p. 342.
the 1640s and later. While many of the dates reference records already published by Cust, Kirk and Kirk, Scouloudi, Edmond and others,48 the new evidence presented in this essay both extends and revises that base of information.

As Edmond’s research shows, the London records clearly establish the elder Martin’s profession as a painter. Until now, however, there have been no examples of his work. Recently, I examined an album amicorum belonging to Michael van Meer, a northern European who had origins in Antwerp, lived most of his life in Hamburg, and spent a year-and-a-half in London in 1614–15, where he obtained signatures of English royalty, noblemen, and others.49 The album contains numerous coats of arms and watercolor illustrations, including a painting of Ceres, Bacchus, and Venus (with Cupid) on a monumental pedestal engraved with the message ‘SINE CERERE ET BACCHO FRIGET VENUS’ (Without food and wine, love grows cold, fo. 475v), a familiar trope in early modern European art50 (see illustration 45). On the base of the pedestal is the contributor’s signature: ‘1615 MARTIN DROESHOVIDT’.

But which Martin Droeshout contributed the painting of the classical gods to the van Meer album? Here, there is little doubt that it was the


elder. For below the carefully executed painting is the signatory’s dedication to the album owner, which reads: ‘Dits ter gedachtenisse van den erewerdigen ende Eedelen ende goeden vrint Michell van Mere’ (This is in remembrance of my venerable and noble and good friend Michael van Meer).\(^{51}\) The mature, fluent (though less than exemplary) hand and the styling of van Meer as a ‘good friend’ make it likely that van Meer offered the uncle, not the fourteen-year-old nephew, a page in his album. Moreover, though inscribed in London, the dedication is in Flemish, which also points to the elder Martin, for this was the language of his and van Meer’s birthplace; preferring it over English would have been an earnest of friendship, evoking, as it did, their common origin in Brabant.

The watercolour further secures the elder Martin’s membership in the community of artists in London; and it offers the first pictorial evidence of his identity as a painter in colour. (In 1991, Edmond observed that ‘Martin Droeshout is entered as “limner” in the aliens’ return of 1635, although, so far as we know, he did not paint miniatures’.\(^{52}\) Though the elder Martin is no longer a candidate for the engraving of Shakespeare, this painting, along with the references to him as a painter, renews, and encourages research into, E. A. J. Honigmann’s proposal that the elder Martin did the painting that formed the basis for the Shakespeare engraving.\(^{53}\)

### APPENDIX: A DROESHOUT FAMILY CHRONOLOGY

- Brackets indicate that the date is inferred from, but not specified in, archival records.
- Unless otherwise specified, ‘Martin’ refers to the elder Martin.

#### 1570s

1572/3 Jan (John) and Maÿken (Mary) Droeshout marry in Brussels (13 January)
1573/4 Martin baptized in Brussels (7 January)

#### 1580s

1581 Janneken, Martin’s sister, born [on continent]
1583 John arrives in England
1583-4 John’s family arrives in England
1585 John and Mary admitted to Dutch Church
1587 John and Mary listed in Lay Subsidies, Broad Street Ward, St Peter le Poor and All Hallows, London Wall Parishes, three children
1588 John listed in Dutch Church Registers as householder
1589 Maria, Martin’s sister, born in London
[c. 1589–90] Michael returns to continent, learns copper engraving in Brussels

#### 1590s

1592 Martin (age 18) admitted to Dutch Church
1593 Michael returns to London
1593 John and Mary listed in return of aliens, March through May, householders, two sons and two daughters

---

\(^{51}\) I am grateful to Paul Franssen and Lia van Gemert of the University of Utrecht for reviewing my transcript of the Flemish dedication.

\(^{52}\) Edmond, ‘“It was for gentle Shakespeare cut”’, p. 340. It is conceivable that the elder Martin was the painter(/friend) van Meer commissioned to do other London paintings in his album.

\(^{53}\) E. A. J. Honigmann, ‘Shakespeare and London’s Immigrant Community Circa 1600’, in *Elizabethan and Modern Studies Presented to Professor Willem Schrickx on the Occasion of His Retirement*, ed. J. P. Vander Motten (Gent, 1985), p. 147. Also see Edmond, ‘“It was for gentle Shakespeare cut”’, p. 344. Edmond points to London records linking the elder Martin, Marcus Gheeraerts II, John Taylor and John Droeshout (the elder Martin’s nephew), all members of the Painter-Stainers’ Company, and proposes that Gheeraerts may have done the lost painting. I would add that the 1593 return of aliens lists, on the same page as the senior John Droeshout, Cornelius Johnson, probably the father of the Cornelius Johnson (1593–1661) once thought to be the painter of the ‘Janssen’ portrait of Shakespeare.
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1593 Michael listed in return of aliens, March through May, chamber keeper, Broad Street Ward
1594 John, Mary, and Martin (age 20) listed among Dutch Church Members, Aldgate Ward, Duke’s Place
[1594-9] John dies
1595 Michael (age 17) admitted to Dutch Church
1595 Michael (age 17) marries first wife, Susanneken van der Ersbek of Ghent
1596 John, Michael’s first child, baptized (the child must have died young – see 1599 below)
1598 Michael and second wife, Dominick Verricke (?), listed in Lay Subsidies, Aldgate Ward, Duke’s Place
1598–9 Mary, John’s widow, and son listed in Lay Subsidies, Aldgate Ward, Duke’s Place
1599 John, Michael’s second child, baptized
1599 Michael and wife listed in Lay Subsidies, Aldgate Ward, Duke’s Place

1600
1600 Mary, John’s widow, and son listed in Lay Subsidies, Aldgate Ward, Duke’s Place
1601 Michael and second wife, Dominick, listed in Lay Subsidies, Aldgate Ward, Duke’s Place
1601 Martin, Michael’s third child, baptized (‘the younger Martin’) or 18
1602 Martin (age 28) marries first wife, Anna Winterbeke of Brussels (widow of Hans Sele of Rouen)
1603 William, Michael’s fourth child, baptized or 18
1603 Janneken, Martin’s sister (age 22), marries Guillaume Beijart
1604 Martin (age 30) marries second wife, Janneken’s Molijn of Antwerp
1605 Martin and wife living in Aldgate Ward, Parish of St Olave, Crossed (Crutched) Friars
1605 Johaneken, Martin’s first child, baptized
1606 Susanna, Michael’s fifth child, baptized
1607 Martin, Martin’s second child, baptized
1607 Michael (age 29) marries third wife, Jacobmijntgen van Bosijn, widow of Daniel Blommaert
1608 Martin granted denization
1609 Maria, Martin’s third child, baptized

Michael (age 33) marries fourth wife, Martha Sleuwen Lambert, widow of Jan Lambert
David, Martin’s fourth child, baptized
Hester, Martin’s fifth child, baptized
Anna, Martin’s sixth child, baptized
Maria, Martin’s sister (age 27), marries Dierick Wessels of Swol
Martin listed in Dutch Church Registers (English and Dutch versions) among painters within the city; from Brussels, denizen, six children, has lived here 33 years
Michael listed in Dutch Church Registers (English and Dutch versions) among goldsmiths, silversmiths, jewellers, and diamond cutters; from Brussels, three children, has lived here 29 years
Martin listed in Dutch Church Registers among handycraftsmen within the walls of the city, Crossed (Crutched) Friars, painter, wife Janneken, six children born here
Michael listed in Dutch Church Registers among handycraftsmen in the suburbs of London, St Martin, silversmith, wife Martha, three children born here, has lived here 30 years
Michael (age 39) made free of the Goldsmiths’ Company
Martin listed in certificate of strangers, Aldgate Ward
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1618</td>
<td>Michael listed in certificate of strangers, Aldersgate Ward</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1620s</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1621</td>
<td>Martin and wife listed in Lay Subsidies, Aldgate Ward, St Olave’s, Hart Street</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1622</td>
<td>Daniel, Martin’s seventh child, baptized (Martin age 48)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1623</td>
<td>Engraving of Shakespeare published in First Folio</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1624</td>
<td>Martin, Martin’s son (age 17), admitted to Dutch Church</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1624</td>
<td>Maria, Martin’s daughter (age 15), admitted to Dutch Church</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1627</td>
<td>John, Michael’s son (age 28), secures license to marry Anne Ward</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1628</td>
<td>Michael (age 50), widower, marries fifth wife, Sara Wagenen, widow of Jacob Sele (Jaques Selam) of Antwerp</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1629</td>
<td>William, Michael’s son (age 26), stands godfather for Elizabeth, daughter of Hendrick de Bock, at Mortlake</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1629–32</td>
<td>Additional signed, dated London engravings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1630s</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1632</td>
<td>Mary, John’s widow, mentioned in letter from Simon Ruijtinck, former Dutch Church minister, whose books were packed up in her house</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1632</td>
<td>John, Michael’s son, made a free Brother of the Clockmakers’ Company</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[1632–5]</td>
<td>The younger Martin goes to Madrid</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1634</td>
<td>Martin’s name, along with that of Marcus Gheeraerts II, appears in first Court Minute Book of Painter-Stainers’ Company</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1635</td>
<td>Martin and wife Jane listed in return of aliens, Aldgate Ward, St Olave’s, Hart Street, six children born here; described as limner</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1635–44</td>
<td>Signed, dated Madrid engravings</td>
<td>John, Michael’s son, takes an apprentice, Daniel Jolly, in the Clockmakers’s Company</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1637</td>
<td></td>
<td>Martin, with Timotheus van Vleteren (former minister of Dutch Church) and Henric Pauwels, signs declaration concerning a legacy of Wessel Boots to his children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1638</td>
<td></td>
<td>Michael listed as householder, Aldersgate Ward, St Leonard’s, Foster Lane Michael dies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1640s</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1640</td>
<td>Anne, wife of John, Michael’s son, dies</td>
<td>William, Michael’s son (age 37), listed among members of the Dutch Congregation of London at Mortlake, but having left</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1640</td>
<td></td>
<td>‘M’ Drosset made A motion about his Sonn’ (which ‘Mr Drosset’ is unclear)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1640</td>
<td></td>
<td>Last known Madrid engraving</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1641</td>
<td>Daniel, Martin’s son (age 19), admitted to Dutch Church</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1647</td>
<td>John, Michael’s son, pays final quarter-age to Clockmakers’s Company</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1650s</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1651/2</td>
<td>John, Michael’s son (age 52), ‘Of St Bride’s, Fleet St., London, Ingraver’, dies; wife Elizabeth proves will 18 March; neither brother (Martin or William) is mentioned in will; only blood relative named is a nephew Martin</td>
<td>a Martinus Driesvolt is mentioned in petition from Mortlake regarding Roman Catholic tapicers (possibly the nephew named in John’s 1651/2 will)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>