Droeshout

June Schlueter

As the engraver of the portrait that graces the title-page of the 1623 Folio of Shakespeare’s plays, Martin Droeshout has achieved lasting recognition. Christiaan Schuckman’s discovery in 1991 of some dozen engravings in Madrid was pivotal in determining which of the two Martin Droeshouts, uncle or nephew (it was the nephew), did the portrait as well as the substantial works that included his first name or initial. Although scholars previously had difficulty determining whether a print signed by Martin Droeshout was by the uncle or the nephew, it should now be generally accepted that all engravings with this signature were done by the nephew. But the canon of Michael Droeshout’s engravings is as yet unsettled: to date, scholars have acknowledged only The Powder Treason, signed ‘Mich: Droeshaut sculptis’, and Plan of the Battle of Leipzig, inscribed Sett out by Olaf Hans and cut in brasse at Leipsich by Jaacob Gabler and herein imitated by Michael Droeshout London 1632. A closer look at the collection of Droeshout engravings, however, suggests Michael’s authorship of additional works, some wrongly attributed to his son.

In his 2003 essay in Dutch and Flemish Artists in Britain 1550–1800, Gervase Hood discusses two mentions of Martin Droeshout the Elder as painter, both of triumphal arches. The first appears in a 1604–05 pamphlet, Beschryvinghe vande Herlycke Arcus Triumphal ofte Eere Poorte vande Nederlandshe Natie opgherecht in London, by (or commissioned by) Conrad Jansen, architect for the Netherlandic arch constructed in London in 1603–04 for the entry of James I. The pamphlet notes that several Dutch and Flemish painters were commissioned, namely Daniel de Vos and Pauwels van Overbeke from Antwerp; Daniel Papeler to paint the woodwork (with the help of several Englishmen, including Roelant Poquet [Rowland Buckett]); and Adriaen van Sond and Martin Droeshout to paint the canvases. The second is a record of payments to those who contributed to the Netherlandic arch intended for Charles I’s entry in 1625–26, a project for which Bernard Jansen was the architect. The painters listed as having received payments were Francis Clein, George Geldorp, Thomas...

I am grateful to Paul Schlueter, Gervase Hood, Arthur J. Rothkopf and the library staffs at Lafayette College, the Royal Library of Belgium, the Wellcome Library and the British Museum for their assistance.

4. For descriptions and in some cases reproductions of John Droeshout’s engravings, see Hind, op. cit., pp. 344–50.
5. The Powder Treason, Propounded by Sathan, Approved by Antichrist, Entreprised by Papists, Practized by Traitors, Reveled by An Eagle, Expounded by An Oracle, Founded in Hell, Confounded in Heaven. For a description and reproduction, see Hind, op. cit., p. 342 and plate 213.
8. The engraved title-page states that the book was printed in 1604, the letterpress title-page in 1605.
Babb, John Brocas and three members of the London Dutch Church: James Corselis, Jan van Belcam and Martin Droeshout. Droeshout was the only named painter who worked on both arches.

As Hood points out, Jansen’s pamphlet, published by Richard Schilders in Middelburg, is noteworthy in several ways: not only does it name the men who worked on the project; it also provides a detailed description of the completed 87-foot-high, 37-foot-wide arch. Moreover, it distinguishes between ‘painting on canvas’ and ‘painting the woodwork’. As Hood observes, ‘the great topographical paintings in the middle storey and the two smaller allegorical paintings over the side arches displayed on the rear of the arch would have been painted on canvas, the canvases being installed at the arch at the last minute. The structure would have been made of wood, painted to look like stone’. Hood goes on to note that ‘none of the other arches [there were seven] had paintings comparable in ambition and scale to the three great paintings on the rear façade of the Netherlandic arch’ – this despite the difficulty, according to Jansen, of getting painters, ‘because the best London workmen were already working on the English and Italian arches’. In fact, two of the painters, de Vos and van Overbeke, were summoned at great expense from the Netherlands, to be joined by van Sond and Droeshout, who already resided in London.

But the Jansen pamphlet, which survives in a single copy in the Royal Library of Belgium, reveals something else as well: two engravings, one of the front façade and one of the rear façade of the James I arch. In good detail, the engravings show the elaborate design of the arch and the scale and achievement of the canvas paintings, done, at least in part, by Martin Droeshout. Hood also references Stephen Harrison’s The Arch’s of Triumph, (London 1603), which presents engraved views of all seven arches. The title-page of this earlier pamphlet identifies Harrison as ‘Joyner and Architect’ (he was responsible for the five English arches) and names William Kip as the engraver. The engravings of the Netherlandic arch published in the Jansen pamphlet, then, would be unremarkable, for even though they show both sides and are finer and more detailed than the one done by Kip, they are clearly renderings of the same structure. What makes them remarkable for the present discussion is the signature of the engraver: both the front and rear elevations are inscribed *MD sculpsit*. Could the initials stand for Martin Droeshout?

Clearly, Hood was asking the same question. After making the point that there were no known engravers...
with the initials ‘MD’ in the Low Countries at the time, he identifies two members of the artistic community in London in 1603–04 who may have done the engravings: Michael Droeshout, brother to the elder Martin Droeshout, and Martin Droeshout himself (the younger was only three or four at the time). If the initials are the elder Martin Droeshout’s, this would be evidence indeed that the elder Martin was also an engraver, as Mary Edmond contends.16 (I have argued that he was not.) But if the initials are Michael Droeshout’s, then the argument that the younger Martin was the only Martin Droeshout who practised engraving would be undisturbed.

To make the case for Michael, one need only realize that the *sculpsit* signature on the renderings of the arch — the stand-alone initials *MD* — is unlike those on the extant work by the younger Martin. In Martin’s oeuvre, the engravings either use his full or nearly full name or employ a monogram that includes not simply the ‘M’ of Martin but an ‘A’ and/or ‘R’ as well (see figs. 146–49). The pattern holds for Madrid, although there he uses Droeswood[e] rather than Droeshout or abbreviates his surname to an entwined *DR*. In signing his work with a clear indication of his first name, the younger Martin was, of course, establishing his authorship, but he may also have been distinguishing his work from his father’s. Tellingly, he made no effort to differentiate himself from his uncle, which he could have done by adopting a consistent, identifying monogram. He did not do so, I contend, because he had no need to: his uncle was not an engraver.

Among the approximately 50 engravings attributed to the younger Martin Droeshout in England and Spain, there are three examples of the atypical signature I just described — *William Fairfax*, *Gustavus Adolphus* and *Doctor Panurgas*17 — each bearing the simple *MD*


17. For descriptions of these three engravings, see Hind, *op. cit.*, pp. 332 and 362–64; for reproductions, see plates 215, 220 and 227.
monogram without an ‘A’ and/or ‘R’, suggesting that Michael, not Martin, deserves the credit. The best known of these is Doctor Panurgus (fig. 150), extant in two later impressions, one with Peter Stent’s imprint, probably sold between c. 1643 and c. 1667, and one licensed in 1672 by Roger L’Estrange. A satire on the follies of men, from country, city, and court, personified through a physician practising purges, the print has resisted topical readings. In cataloguing it for the British Museum, Frederic George Stephens read the 1672 licensing date as 1612, accepting 1612 as the date of composition. Subsequent scholars, though, have preferred a date of composition in the early 1620s, based less on the satirical subject-matter than on the standard reading of the en-


150. Martin Droeshout, To this grave doctor millions do resort (Doctor Panurgus), etching 348 x 408 mm (London, British Museum).
graver’s initials as those of the younger Martin Droeshout, who was not active until then. But if my thinking regarding the signature on the 1603–04 arches holds, it is possible that *Doctor Panurgus* is an early Stuart engraving after all, done not by the younger Martin Droeshout but by his father, Michael.

Unfortunately, the date of the *William Fairfax* portrait (fig. 151) proves inconsequential with respect to authorship. William Fairfax fought for the Palatinate from 1620 and died at Frankenthal in 1621, which means the engraving of him in uniform and the oval legend concerning the Palatinate concern those years. The elegiac verse beneath the portrait suggests a likely date of 1621 or shortly after. This might sound a bit early for the younger Martin, but Malcolm Jones has persuasively suggested that three *Saints*, one of which is signed with the younger Martin’s monogram (including the ‘A’ of his first name), date from 1622, when such a series was entered in the *Stationers’ Register*. It would not be unreasonable, then, to see the William Fairfax portrait as among the earliest of the younger Martin’s engravings, done when he was twenty or twenty-one. But lacking the indication of his first name, neither would it be unreasonable to reassign the engraving to his father.

The date of the *Gustavus Adolphus* portrait (fig. 152) is similarly unhelpful in establishing authorship. Published in 1631 in Alexander Gill’s *The New Starre of the North, Shining upon the Victorious King of Sweden*, the engraving was probably done just after the Swedish King’s spectacular victory over Tilly’s Catholic forces at Breidenfeld, near Leipzig, in 1631. Indeed, there would be a nice connection between this engraving and Michael Droeshout’s *Plan of the Battle of Leipzig* (1632) if this were so. The text references ‘this present yeare 1631’, clearly dating it, and the verse beneath the portrait celebrates the Swedish king as ‘this bright Northen Starr’, supporting the narrative of Tycho Brahe’s 1572 sighting of a new star in the constellation Cassiopeia and his astronomical calculation, here applied to Gustavus Adolphus. There is a slight chance that the engraving was done for another momentous occasion in Gustavus’s life, such as his accession to the throne in 1611, aged seventeen, but the unity of frontispiece and narrative argues for 1631, when it could have been done by either Droeshout.

With respect to *Doctor Panurgus*, until the subject-matter is understood, it will be difficult to date the engraving. For now, suffice to say that if the print is the work of Michael Droeshout, as I believe it is, it could date from any time in Michael’s career, which had begun by 1620s, when Roger Daniel was active. The only known complete copy of the first edition of Droeshout’s *XII Sibyllarum icones* was acquired by the Folger Shakespeare Library in 2007. The dating of the Droeshout sibyls ‘before 1616’, based on the assumption that the sibyls in Thomas Trevilian’s 1616 *Great Book* derive from these, needs amending. See J. Schlueter, ‘De Passe and the Sibyls’, *Print Quarterly*, XXVII, 2010, pp. 62–64.

21. A. Gill, *The New Starre of the North, Shining upon the Victorious King of Sweden*, London, Printed by Augustine Mathewes for Robert Milbourne, and are to be sold at the Signe of the Greyhound in Pauls Church-yard, 1631.

1603–04 (he was about 25 then) and, judging from *Plan of the Battle of Leipzig*, extended at least into the early 1630s (Michael died in 1638). Should *Doctor Panurgus* prove to pre-date the early 1620s, we would have clear confirmation that the three prints signed with the simple ‘MD’ monogram should be transferred from the son’s list of engravings to the father’s.

Approaching the matter of authorship from another chronological perspective may also prove helpful. Aside from the portrait of William Fairfax, signed with the joined letters *MD* and, I would argue, the work of Michael Droeshout, there are four engravings that are known to be from 1622 or 1623, when the younger Martin was at the start of his professional career. Like the signatures that would mark his work in London through 1632 or 163523 and in Madrid through 1639 or 1640, these are varied, but three of the four fit the persistent pattern of identifying himself by his first name. The one of the three extant *Saints* (mentioned above) is signed with his ligatured MAD monogram; *James, 2nd Marquis of Hamilton*, which bears the date 1623, is signed *Martin D*; and the Shakespeare portrait, published in 1623, is signed *Martin Droeshout*.24 The fourth engraving, *The Spiritual Warfare*, is signed, uniquely, *MDhout sculpsit*, with the MD joined. The signature is perplexing, but it must be Martin Droeshout’s, for, as Malcolm Jones, who published this print for the first time in 2001, observes, the *Stationers’ Register* of 4 December 1623 states (one would assume correctly) that the work was ‘graven by Martin Droset’.25 One can only guess at why, in this one instance, the young engraver failed to identify himself by alluding to his first name (or why he abbreviated his last name to ‘Dhout’). Ironically, in the lower margin of the engraving, above the fourth column of text, sits the term *The Clarke*, referring to the figure above it, and here the ‘A’ and ‘R’ are ligatured in the same way that Droeshout elsewhere joined them to indicate his first name.

Unhappily, I must leave the matter of *The Spiritual Warfare* unresolved. Despite this outlier, however, I believe my argument stands and that the extent of Michael Droeshout’s surviving work needs to be acknowledged. Two engravings, *The Powder Treason* (date unknown, although between 1610, when Reynold Elstrack’s plate from which it was partially derived was published, and 1638, when Michael died) and *Plan of the Battle of Leipzig* (1632), are already, and rightly, attributed to Michael Droeshout, who gave a clear indication of his first name on both. To these I would add the two

---

23. Jones, *op. cit.*, pp. 152 and 154, proposes that the *Four Seasons* entered in the *Stationers’ Register* on 6 April 1633: ‘8 plates containing the four parts of the yeare and the four seasons of the yeare’ could refer to the series by Martin Droeshout. For a description, see Hind, *op. cit.*, p. 366. For a reproduction of *Winter*, see Griffiths, *op. cit.*, p. 107.

24. For descriptions of these three engravings, see Hind, *op. cit.*, pp. 354–65, 353, and 354–59; for reproductions, see plates 219 and 221.

25. See Jones, *op. cit.*, pp. 154, 157–58, and plate 142. *The Spiritual Warfare* is extant in a unique later state impression at the Library of the University of Alberta, Edmonton, Canada, in the Bruce Peel Special Collections, Shelfmark PR 3991 A1 S85 1680 folio. Such a print is listed in Pickering & Chatto’s 1932 sale catalogue no. 214, item 1639: ‘The Spiritual Warfare. Printed and Sold by John Garet at his Shop next the Stairs of the Royal-Exchange in Cornhill; c. 1670. Folio, BROADSIDE WITH ENGRAVING (24 in. by 21 1/8 in.), depicting the warfare against all the Vices, treated in a Military manner with horse, foot and infantry, etc., etc.; the Poem printed in eleven columns (a bottom corner slightly defective); A VERY FINE BROADSIDE. £1 3s.’ Although the University of Alberta has no record of provenance, the copy advertised, with its defective bottom corner, may well be the one that it now owns. I am grateful to the Princeton University Library for supplying a copy of the catalogue page.
of the arch, signed with the initials MD from 1603–04; although based primarily on circumstance, I would also include the two unsigned engravings in the Beschryvinge, one of the ground plan for the arch and the other of the title-page. Finally, I would add three engravings currently attributed to the younger Martin: William Fairfax (probably 1621–22), Gustaenus Adolphus (1631) and Doctor Panurgus (date unknown, but by 1638), for a total of seven to nine, the uncertainty resting in the unsigned Beschryvinge engravings.

But how do the signatures articulate with the respective London careers of the younger Martin and his father? The evidence for the younger Martin’s adult presence in London is, simply, the body of engravings from 1622 or 1623 to 1632 or 1635. Clearly, Martin was professionally active in the English capital during those years, before leaving for Spain. The evidence for Michael’s presence in London rests in his engravings and in the regular appearance of his name in the city’s records for some 50 years. He was settled there by 1593, when he is listed in the Returns of Aliens as a chamber­keeper in Broad Street Ward, a ‘graver of Copper’ (having learned the trade in Brussels). In 1595, when he was about seventeen, Michael married Susanneken van der Ersbek and by 1596 he was father to a son named John. By 1598, however, he had taken a second wife, who gave birth the following year to a son named John, suggesting that both his first wife and his first-born John had died. Michael’s second wife, Dominick Verricke [Vereyke], was the mother of the second John and of Martin, William and Susanna, all baptized in the Dutch Church in, respectively, 1599, 1601, 1603 and 1606. In 1607, the year after Susanna was born, Michael married a third wife, Jacobmijtgen van Bosijn, suggesting that, for a second time, Michael may have lost a wife and an infant. The possibility that Susanna died is prompted by the fact that one of Michael’s four children is not included in a Dutch Church record of 1617 which states that Michael and his wife Martha – Martha Sleuwen Lambert, a fourth wife, whom he married in 1611 – were living in London with three children.

If Susanna survived, however, then we need to ask which of her brothers was away from the family. John, who was eighteen in 1617 and who became an engraver, could have been living apart from the family by then, but he is not separately listed in the Returns. He is, however, mentioned in later London records: in 1627, when he married; in 1632, when he was made a free Brother of the Clockmakers’ Company; in 1637, when he took an apprentice, Daniel Jolly; in 1640, when his wife died; in 1647, when he paid final quarterage to the Clockmakers’ Company, and in 1651–52, when he died; and his signature appears on numerous London engravings. William, who was fourteen in 1617, is mentioned in connection with Mortlake in 1629 and 1640 (he may have been involved in the Flemish tapestry works there). Only Martin, who was sixteen in 1617, is not mentioned at all after his baptism, although he was surely in London by 1622 or 1623, the date of his earliest work. Could he have been on the Continent learning engraving? This was, after all, where his father learned the craft, and in London children of aliens were prohibited both by the Goldsmiths’ Company and the City of London from serving apprenticeship or from learning the trade from their fathers. The year 1617 was also when Michael was made free of the Goldsmiths’ Company; shortly after, a Dutch Church

26. The engravings of the arch, of course, were intended to be descriptive of the arch constructed for James’s entry. But the wall monument on the title-page is the engraver’s creation. Interestingly, the capitals of its Corinthian columns are virtually identical to those that support the arch, suggesting that they were done by the same engraver.

27. For a discussion of the younger Martin’s earliest and latest London engravings, see Jones, op. cit., pp. 152–57. The engraving of William Fairfax may date from 1621; although it was probably done in London, it bears no mark identifying place.

28. Returns of Aliens Dwelling in the City and Suburbs of London: The Publications of The Huguenot Society of London, X, Part 3, edited by R. E. G. Kirk and E. F. Kirk, Aberdeen 1907, p. 146 (English) and p. 160 (Dutch), citing Dutch Church Registers, X, no. 40. This 1617 record notes the presence of three children. Another record, from 1617 or more likely 1618, since it states that Michael has been living in London for 30 years (the 1617 record says 29 years), also records the presence of three children; in addition it names his wife Martha and identifies Michael as a silversmith. Returns of Aliens Dwelling in the City and Suburbs of London, X, Part 3, edited by Kirk and Kirk, p. 178, citing Dutch Church Registers, X, no. 47.

29. The Susanna Droeshout [Drossaert] who married Joos de Neve on 10 April 1604 and court painter Daniel Mijten, on 2 September 1628 was clearly not Michael’s daughter, who was baptized in 1606. A miniaturist painter, the Susanna who married de Neve and Mijten was the daughter of Pieter Drossaert of Antwerp, a deacon (1586) and an elder (1593) of the Dutch Church in London who was living in London by 1575.

30. Both John and his father engraved plates of 1631 battles: John, The Siege of Magdeburg by Tilly, Michael, Plan of the Battle of Leipzig (where Tilly was defeated). Quite possibly, Michael and his two sons worked together prior to the younger Martin’s departure for Spain c. 1635.


record identifies him as a silversmith living among the handicraftmen in St Martin's. Silversmiths by then were much in demand. Could Martin have returned in or after 1618, when his father's status with the Goldsmiths' Company may have allowed him to apprentice in London with his father or with an Englishman? Or might he not have been on the Continent at all, the missing child being his sister?

No children by Michael and his third and fourth wives are recorded in the baptismal Dutch Church Registers, nor do they record any children with his fifth wife, Sara Wagenaer, whom he married in 1628. Michael died in 1638, aged approximately 60. Although one would wish that the record of Michael's engravings were as abundant as that of his marriages, it is clear from his domestic history that Michael spent his entire adult life in London, where Hood believes the plates for the 1603-04 Beschryvinghe were made and possibly printed, to be incorporated into the pamphlet that Schilders printed in Middelburg.

Having proposed that the canon of extant engravings by Michael Droeshout be expanded from two to seven or nine, I end on a thematic note. Ironically, Michael's engravings, which clearly favoured the Protestant cause, serve as counterpoint to his son's Madrid engravings, which are Catholic and Counter-Reformation. If celebrating Protestantism is the pattern of Michael's work, then in decoding Doctor Panurgus, we may wish to consider more carefully the inset of the two men bearing churches on their backs, labelled: 'Who bore two churches and complained of none: / Nowe being purged finds too much of one'.

Appendix
Michael Droeshout: A Chronology

(Brackets around date indicate that the date is inferred from, but not specified in, archival records.)

1570s
1572/3, Jan (John) and Mayken (Mary) Droeshout marry in Brussels, 13 January
1573/4, Michael's brother, Martin, baptized in Brussels, 7 January
[1578], Michael born in Brussels
1580s
1581, Michael's sister, Janneken born (on Continent)
1583-84, Michael's parents, with Martin (age nine) and Janneken (age two), arrive in London; John is a painter
1585, Michael's parents admitted to Dutch Church
1587, Michael (age 9), after spending time in Antwerp, Friesland and Zeeland, joins family in London
1587, Michael's parents listed in Lay Subsidies, living with their three children

1589, to his belonging to a family of two sons and two daughters.


34. In 1607 the 'London Goldsmiths' Company conceded... that "aliens and strangers [are] in better reputation and request than that of our own nation". In 1617, the Dutch Church Registers recorded some 24 of its members as goldsmiths, jewellers and diamond cutters... and the Goldsmiths' Company records indicate that twelve aliens were admitted to the Company between 1616 and 1619. But the flow of goldsmiths emigrating from the Continent was slowing, and by 1624 it had come to a halt. Luu, op. cit., pp. 224, 231, 239 and 227.

35. The chronology of Michael's early years is not as clear as one would wish. There is a marriage record for his parents in Brussels, dated 13 January 1572/73, and a baptismal record in Brussels for his brother Martin, dated 7 January 1579/80. Several London records refer to Michael's having been born in Brussels and, by 1589, to his belonging to a family of two sons and two daughters. Michael's parents emigrated to London in 1589, but Michael apparently did not join the family until 1587, when he was nine, having remained on the Continent in Antwerp, Friesland and Zeeland. In 1593 he was settled in London as an engraver, a craft he learned in Brussels, and is said to have lived in London for three years. He probably was in London from 1587 to 1590 and in Brussels from 1590 to 1593. But even by Continental standards, his apprenticeship was short. Luu, op. cit., p. 234, points out that an apprentice in Antwerp usually began his four or more years of training at age twelve, after which he either undertook his Wanderjahre in various cities or came directly to London.

36. Because Schilders does not appear to have owned a rolling press (I found no engravings in any of his other publications), it is likely that all four engravings were done by 'MD' and, as Hood suggests, printed in London for insertion in the Beschryvinghe.
members, October
[1594–96], Michael’s father dies sometime during these years
1595, Michael (age seventeen) admitted to Dutch Church
1595, Michael (age seventeen) marries first wife, Susanneken van der Erbek of Ghent, 17 August
1596, Michael’s first child, John, baptized, 16 May (the child must have died young, see 1599 below)
1598, Michael and second wife, Dominick Verricke [Vereyke], listed in Lay Subsidies
1598–99, Michael’s widowed mother and brother listed in Lay Subsidies, 1 October
1599, Michael’s second child, John, baptized, 20 May (John became an engraver)
1599, Michael and wife listed in Lay Subsidies, 1 October
1600, Michael’s widowed mother and brother listed in Lay Subsidies, 1 October
1600, Michael and second wife, Dominick, listed in Lay Subsidies, 1 October
1601, Michael’s third child, Martin, baptized on 26 April (Martin became an engraver)
1602, Michael’s brother marries first wife, Anna Winterbeke, 26 October
1603, Michael’s sister Janneken marries Guillaume Beijart, 11 January
1603, Michael’s fourth child, William, baptized 2 August
1603, Michael’s brother marries second wife, Janneakens Molijns, 30 October
1604, Michael’s brother and second wife listed in Returns of Aliens, as having lived there 30 years
1605, Michael’s brother’s first child, Johanekken, baptized 29 September
1606, Michael’s fifth child, Susanna, baptized 4 March
1607, Michael’s brother’s second child, Martin, baptized 22 February
1607, Michael (age 29) marries third wife, Jacobmijntgen van Bosijn, widow of Daniel Blommaert, 29 September
1608, Michael’s brother granted denization, 20 January
1609, Michael’s brother’s third child, Maria, baptized 28 May
1610
1611, Michael (age 30) marries fourth wife, Martha Sleuwen Lambert, widow of Jan Lambert, 15 October
1611, Michael’s brother’s fourth child, David, baptized 9 July
1613, Michael’s brother’s fifth child, Hester, baptized 10 October
1616, Michael’s brother’s sixth child, Anna, baptized 18 February
1616, Michael’s sister Maria marries Dierick Wessels of Swol, April
1617, Michael’s brother listed in Dutch Church Registers as living among handicraft members within the city, grouped with poor householders, under painters within the city; from Brussels, 6 children, lived here 33 years
1617, Michael listed in Dutch Church Registers as living among goldsmiths, silversmiths, jewellers, and diamond cutters; from Brussels, three children, lived here 29 years
1617, Michael (age 39) made free of the Goldsmiths’ Company
1618, Michael’s brother listed in Dutch Church Registers under handicraftmen, free denizens; wife Janneken, six children born here 1618, Michael listed in Dutch Church Registers under handicraftmen; silversmith; wife Martha, three children born here; lived here 30 years
1618, Michael listed in Certificate of Strangers, 6 September
1619, Michael’s brother (‘Martin Drusett’) is among the merchant strangers named in a Star Chamber case, accused of illegally exporting gold and silver (others, but not Droeshout, were fined)
1620
1621, Michael’s brother and wife listed in Lay Subsidies, 27 September
1622, Michael’s brother’s seventh child, Daniel, baptized 29 September
1624, Michael’s brother’s son Martin (age 17) and daughter Maria (age 15) admitted to Dutch Church, 26 December
1627, Michael’s son, John (age 28) secures license to marry Anne Ward in June
1628, Michael (age 50), widower, marries fifth wife, Sara Wagenaar, widow of Jacob Sele [Jaques Selam] of Antwerp, 30 December
1629, Michael’s son William (age 26) stands godfather for Elizabeth, daughter of Hendrick de Bock, at Mortlake
1630
1632, Michael’s mother mentioned in letter from former Dutch Church minister Simon Ruytingius, 4 May [N.S.] (his books were packed up in her house)
1632, Michael’s son John made a free Brother of the Clockmakers’ Company
1634, Michael’s brother mentioned in Painter-Stainers’ Court Minute Book as reporting on bad workmanship he and Marcus Garrett had inspected, 9 September
1635, Michael’s brother listed in Returns of Aliens as limner, born in Brussels; wife Jane, born in Antwerp; six children English-born; has lived here [i.e., in this area of London] 30 years
1636, Michael’s brother’s son Martin (age 17) and daughter Maria listed in Painter-Stainers’ Court Minute Book, citing the intention to engage him and Daniell Great to give information on strangers’ names and dwelling places, 6 April
1637, Michael’s son John takes an apprentice, Daniel Jolly, in the Clockmakers’ Company
1638, Michael listed as householder
1638, Michael (age 60) dies (his widow is listed in Dutch Church Registers, 16 December)
1638, Michael’s brother signs a declaration in London concerning a legacy of Wessel Boots to his children, 6 July
1640
1640, Anne, wife of Michael’s son, John, dies
1640/1, ‘M’ Droset made A motion about his Sonn’ (unclear which Droeshout this is)
1641, Michael’s brother’s son Daniel (age 19) admitted to Dutch Church with testimony of his father, 26 December
1647, Michael’s son John pays final quarterage to Clockmakers’ Company
1650
1651/2, Michael’s son John (age 52) dies; second wife Elizabeth proves will on 18 March; neither brother (Martin or William) is mentioned in will; only blood relative named is a nephew Martin
1655, Michael’s son William (age 52) listed among members of the Dutch Congregation of London in Mortlake, but having left [in 1672, a ‘Martinus Driesvolt’ is listed in a Mortlake petition asking the King and Council to reconsider the requirement that Catholics leave the country in order that Catholic tapestriers – weavers of figured cloth or tapestry – who had been brought to England to work at Mortlake could remain]