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Abstract

During the 1550s, a warehouse was constructed in Antwerp with funds from both the city government and a private investor. This building, the *Tapissierspand*, became the global center for selling and distributing tapestries of extraordinary beauty, exquisite craftsmanship, and exorbitant cost. The construction of the building indicates that the very nature of how tapestries were made and purchased was changing in the 1550s. Although Antwerp’s fairs had long been convenient locations for agents to find luxury items that might please their wealthy clients, like with many luxury trades, tapestry sales were shifting from strictly commissioned sales to include on spec sales. The *Tapissierspand* was the ideal place for a dealer to purchase multiple already-made tapestries and load them onto the waiting ships in Antwerp’s busy harbor for export and resale abroad. The city’s export registers document that thousands of yards of tapestry were shipped this way.

The regulatory environment in Antwerp was much less strict than in other cities and this permitted freer interactions within guilds and across industries. The city was for this reason a desirable location for craftsmen to work and sell. But because the strict royal ordinances delivered throughout the 1530s and 1540s were frequently uninforced, workers in the industry were forced to find other ways to manage the large risk inherent in the tapestry trade. The development of the *Tapissierspand* in Antwerp was an effort on the part of merchants and the city to abate risk. The city could continue to entice merchants if it could provide
the right opportunities and environment. However, by the sixteenth century, the constant hyper-vigilance the city had experienced throughout the fifteenth century during frequent times of war and financial difficulty shaped the way the city and its occupants viewed business. In a large sense, everything came down to risk, and how to manage it and minimize it.

At a time of upheaval and mismanagement, survival and financial success through the reduction of risk became of primary importance. Tapestry weaving carried inherent—and large—risks. Raw materials were expensive, and workshops often did not have the capital needed for on spec weaving. The purchase of on spec tapestries without any guarantees of quality or origin was risky for buyers. Thus the Tapissierspand’s story is one of people seeking to maximize economic advantage and minimize risk. The Tapissierspand allowed buyers and sellers to minimize risk by facilitating exchange of knowledge, assessment of quality, negotiation of prices and commissions, and extension of credit.

This dissertation will examine the historical precedents in Antwerp that allowed the Tapissierspand to develop, and the ways in which the Pand functioned to expand trade while reducing risk for both buyers and sellers by reducing the risks inherent in the industry.
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Introduction

Objective

For a few short decades in the latter half of the sixteenth century, an 80x37m building in Antwerp, the Tapissierspand, was the center of world trade in tapestries. Most of the tapestries woven in the Low Countries between 1555 and 1584 were ultimately sold from this one place. The Tapissierspand facilitated the export of thousands of tapestries to the Iberian Peninsula, Italy, Germany, France, and England during the second half of the sixteenth century, but it has never been independently studied.¹

There is no lack of modern publications regarding tapestries, particularly from the last century,² but too often they deal with specific artists or workshops, or the production within specific cities, broad overviews of a specific time period, or exhibition and museum catalogs. All of these tend to be written from an iconographic or historiographic point of view, rather than providing critical examinations of the medium’s economic implications.³ A comprehensive study of

² By 1904, Jules Guiffrey could list 1,083 references pertaining to tapestry, many of which were brief pamphlets. See Guiffrey, La Tapisserie, Bibliothèque de bibliographies critiques publiée par la Société des études historiques, 20 (Paris: A. Picard et fils, 1904).
the role of tapestries should include not just their place as an art form, but also their function as indicators of wealth and their place in the economic climate of the late-fifteenth and sixteenth centuries in Western Europe. While the years from 1990 to 2010 have seen a marked increase in exhibitions at major museums, accompanied by catalogs and symposia,\(^4\) the emphasis continues to be on the patronage, provenance, iconography, and historiography of the objects themselves, not on tapestries as a crucial part of the economic culture of Antwerp and the southern Netherlands in the sixteenth century.\(^5\) This study hopes to add a new dimension the current understanding of Flemish tapestry by moving away from a traditional art historical approach in favor of focusing on the crucial economic and historical role of tapestry in Antwerp and the larger Southern Netherlands through an analysis of the principal locus of their sale—the

---


Tapissierspand: the first publically funded building specifically for the sale of tapestries in the world.

The type of regulatory environment in Antwerp allowed for much freer interactions both within guilds and across industries and the city was for this reason a desirable location for craftsmen to both work and sell. However, because the strict royal ordinances delivered throughout the 1530s and 1540s were frequently uninforced, workers involved in the industry were forced to find other ways to manage the large risk that was inherent in the tapestry trade. The development of the Tapissierspand in Antwerp was an effort on the part of merchants and the city to abate risk. The city knew it could continue to entice merchants if it could provide the right sorts of experiences for them. However, by the sixteenth century, the feeling of constant hyper-vigilance the city had felt throughout the fifteenth century during frequent times of war shaped the way in which both the city and its occupants viewed business. 6 In a large sense, everything came down to risk, and how to best manage it and minimize it.

At a time when upheaval and mismanagement was de rigeur, survival and financial success through the reduction of risk became of primary importance. 7 Thus the Tapissierspand’s story can be told as one of people seeking economic

---

6 For the impact this hyper-vigilance had on the market, see Clé Lesger, *The Rise of the Amsterdam Market and Information Exchange* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2006), 119.
advantage with as little risk as possible. The *Tapissierspand* allowed buyers and sellers to minimize risk by facilitating the exchange of knowledge, the assessment of quality, the negotiation of prices and commissions, and the extension of credit. Tapestry weaving carried an inherent—and large—risk. Raw materials were expensive, and workshops often did not have the capital needed for on spec weaving. The purchase of on spec tapestries without any guarantees of quality or origin was dangerous to the buyer.

The 1550s were a transitional time of growth for Antwerp. This dissertation examines the ways in which the construction and day-to-day functioning of the *Tapissierspand*—in response to a pervasive feeling of hyper-vigilance in sixteenth-century Antwerp caused by repeated war and invasion attempts—successfully allowed producers, buyers and sellers of tapestry to mitigate risk in the sixteenth century in an otherwise extremely risky industry.

**Overview**

The tapestries sold in Antwerp during the sixteenth century were mainly created on spec for sale in the open market, rather than being commissioned by a buyer or dealer. The unique economic situation of the city of Antwerp, and the degree to which capitalism and commercialism were embraced created the

---

8 For example, Christopher Plantin opened his printing establishment, once the world’s most prolific, in 1555. This enterprise is an excellent example of the type of vertical integration taking place in Antwerp during the mid-1500s.
10 For one of the most thorough studies of the Antwerp market during this time, see Herman Van der Wee, *The Growth of the Antwerp Market and the European Economy*, 3 vols. (The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1963).
perfect incubator for a developing market. Historically, Antwerp was a center of trade for craftsmen, particularly those in the luxury arts, such as jewelry, sculpture, metalwork and tapestry. Its reputation grew out of its semiannual fairs, which encouraged trading within Antwerp and also gave merchants time to restock their wares between festivals.11 As demand for luxury goods increased, the fairs gradually grew into year-round specialized sales locations. The Antwerp tapestry market encompassed two codependent groups: the weavers producing tapestries, many of whom lived in satellite cities such as Oudenaarde, Brussels, and St. Truiden, and the dealers and middlemen with the drive and capital to create a viable and profitable export market.

Chapter 1 focuses on the development of Antwerp’s tapestry market, from its beginnings in the semi-annual fairs to the Dominican Pand in the mid-1400s, where it shared space with sellers of other luxury goods, to the movement to a new pand specifically for the sale of tapestries, De Vette Hinne. Although Antwerp would not become a center of tapestry production until the end of the sixteenth century, its emergence as the predominant center of sales encouraged weavers from other cities to resettle in Antwerp so that they could benefit from and participate in the trade taking place there. It will also look at the regulatory environment in Antwerp that allowed the guilds greater freedom, particularly in light of the strict ordinances issued for the tapestry industry throughout the first half of the sixteenth century. These measures were designed to protect both the weavers’ reputations and the quality of their products, and therefore the city’s

---

11 Vermeylen, Painting, 16.
interests in the export trade, thereby reducing overall risk for all parties. Finally, Chapter 1 looks at the foreign merchant communities in Antwerp that specifically contributed to the development of an international export trade for tapestries. The city’s willingness to make special allowances for foreign communities, as well as to assist with building projects specifically intended for them not only encouraged foreign merchants to stay but drew additional sellers to the city as well.

Chapter 2 examines the construction of the new *Tapissierspand* in the early 1550s, a building reserved specifically for the sale of tapestries and materials associated with the industry. The establishment of this tapestries-only market was a response to increased demand and the resulting need for more sales space. Antwerp’s awareness of the need for urban expansion and building projects was crucial in enabling the city to provide adequate support to maintain its growing markets. The presence of one particularly savvy entrepreneur, Gilbert Van Schoonbeke, allowed Antwerp to take on new building campaigns, among them the *Tapissierspand*. Van Schoonbeke’s aggressive view toward acquiring land and developing new sections of Antwerp were frustrating to many of the city’s citizens, but they were essential to the city’s rapid expansion. Once built, the *Pand* functioned as an essential and singular forum to mitigate risk in assurances and assessments of quality, the exchange of information, negotiations, and the development of networks with the participation of a new brand of merchant: the tapestry dealer.
Chapter 3 focuses on innovations in tapestry design and production. As Italian Renaissance painting styles began to trickle into the southern Netherlands in the early 1500s, and as several cartoon designers returned home from sojourns in Italy, tapestry design began to change from local pictorial traditions to more Italianizing international styles. Figures became more fluid, clothing changed from medieval to classically-inspired in appearance, and space increased its complexity. In order to meet growing demand in the open market without incurring bankruptcy, workshops had to find ways to simultaneously lower the risks inherent in on spec production (namely paying the upfront costs of raw materials and not having a buyer lined up for the finished product) while also reducing production time and increasing output of items that would appeal to a broader audience, such as general religious or allegorical scenes. While some did so at the cost of quality, others found ways to standardize production by blending the crucial parts of a tapestry with *staffage* (stock) figures and *verdure* (greenery or floral) backgrounds that did not take as long to weave. Furthermore, tapestry was not independent of the other luxury items being sold on spec in Antwerp, and I argue that certain innovations in the production of one craft would have been disseminated to other mediums. Workshops’ cost-benefit analyses regarding the creation of pieces on commission versus on spec, the assurance of good quality to the buyer, appeal to a wide audience, and the buyer’s ability to have on spec pieces customized if desired, all contributed to the success of Antwerp’s market for noncommissioned items. All of these innovations not only streamlined
production, but the development of standard practices contributed to an overall increased transparency and more risk averse commercial environment.

Finally, Chapter 4 examines the devastating effects of the Spanish Fury, which led to the decline and eventual demise of the *Tapissierspand*. Although many weavers attempted to track down and reclaim the tapestries stolen from them in the Spanish Fury, not all were successful. In the 1580s and 1590s many of the city’s weavers and dealers (along with foreign merchants) relocated to safer and more prosperous cities in the north to practice their trades. Antwerp’s fiscal problems both before and following the Spanish Fury, the weavers’ inability to regain their footing, the loss of foreign merchants, and the development of Amsterdam as a commercial center and Brussels as a point of sales for tapestry ultimately led to the closing of the *Pand* in the seventeenth century. No other city would ever match the success of Antwerp’s tapestry market.

**Documentation and Sources**

Despite its significant role in the tapestry trade, the *Tapissierspand* seems to have existed on the fringes of Tapestry studies, and therefore demands attention. Along with examining secondary sources on Antwerp’s economy, city policies, foreign trade communities, and art markets, this study began by looking at two articles published by Fernand Donnet in the late nineteenth century that remain the major published sources on the *Tapissierspand*. Donnet’s articles, while obviously important in the tapestry canon, have their limitations, the most serious being incomplete or missing citations. Whether or not archival evidence
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12 See Donnet, “Documents,” and “Les Tapisseries”.
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still exists is difficult to determine, but the documents quoted without archival references are valuable nonetheless for the names they contain or the events they describe, as many are consistent with other previously available information and broaden the scope of what is known about the *Tapissierspand*.

Little archival evidence remains to document the activities of the *Tapissierspand* prior to the Spanish Fury in 1576. Surviving records can be primarily grouped into two categories: those that discuss the physical building (the construction of the *Pand*, the regulations for its use upon opening, the reactions of the weavers and dealers who participated in the lotteries for shop space, and the city’s partnership with Gilbert Van Schoonbeke) and those records that chronicle events following the Spanish Fury. Although there is minimal evidence about how the building functioned on a day-to-day basis or what types of tapestries were sold there in between its opening in 1555 and the Fury of 1576, inferences can be made. It is impossible to know with certainty, but many of the *Tapissierspand*’s records may have been misplaced or destroyed during the Spaniards’ invasion and looting of the building. The still-available records following the sacking of the *Pand* are perhaps even more important now because they list what was stored and sold there at the time of the Fury, who had stalls there, and the lengths to which dealers went in order to reclaim their stolen goods when faced with fiscal ruin. These records also allow for theoretical
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13 There is no way to know if documents have, for example, been misplaced or damaged since the nineteenth century, or if they were destroyed as early as the late 1570s by rampaging Spanish troops.
reconstructions of the stalls and their contents in the decades between the Pand’s opening and the looting.

Documentation is divided amongst the City Archives in Antwerp and the Royal Archives in Brussels, which contain export registers, magistrates’ rulings on important issues, royal ordinances governing the tapestry trade, the weavers’ formal responses to the rulings, urban planning projects, first-person accounts and testimonies, maps, and floor plans. The Special Collections Library at the University of Antwerp provided several primary source documents, including published copies of the early-sixteenth-century ordinances regarding the tapestry trade in Antwerp. The Reading Room at the Plantin Moretus Museum in Antwerp retains maps of the city before and after the building campaigns spearheaded by Gilbert van Schoonbeke in the 1550s.
Chapter 1: The Development of the Antwerp Tapestry Market

This chapter examines the changes in venues for the sale of tapestries in Antwerp around the 1500s, during the first two of three distinct periods: 1. sales during fair times; 2. sales at the Dominican Pand; and finally, 3. sales at the Tapissierspand. The different and ever-larger marketplaces—from annual events to year-round sales, from fair to pand to a permanent and exclusive sales hall—reflect the concurrent expansion of the overall market for tapestries on an international scale and a desire on the part of merchants and weavers to mitigate financial risk while maximizing profit. This chapter also examines the roles that Antwerp’s attitude toward guild regulations, governing ordinances, various types of workers in the industry, the export trade, and foreign merchants all played in the development of the panden, and how these attitudes were a response to risk.

Tapestry has a long history in the Low Countries. By the 1400s, brought on by an increase in production, there was a need for basic guidelines to determine how the tapestry industry should operate, and both the guilds and the emperor tried to provide structure for the industry. Squabbles between different artistic guilds were not uncommon because the artists wanted to protect their own sources of income. Edicts addressing these conflicts that established standard quality expectations and penalties for fraudulent work (which was rampant in tapestry production), became increasingly common. Because Antwerp was a center for tapestry exports, many workshops sent representatives...
to Antwerp from cities such as Oudenaarde, Brussels, and St. Truiden to act as dealers while they continued production at home and then shipped the tapestries to their dealers for sale in the city.

By the sixteenth century, the tapestry trade became so valuable that Charles V and Mary of Hungary introduced several ordinances regarding the types of tapestries that could be sold, how and where they could be sold, and requirements for quality. After the opening of the Tapissierspand in 1555, they produced further edicts on how the building was to be operated, what could be sold there and by whom, and how those people should conduct themselves so as to preserve the reputation of the Flemish tapestry industry that had brought so much financial success to both the merchants and the city of Antwerp.

A History of the Antwerp Tapestry Market

The Early Period: Fairs as Marketplaces

Antwerp, along with several other cities in the Low Countries, presented many opportunities to purchase luxury items. Artists frequently sold noncommissioned pieces directly from their homes or workshops, where a customer might find an item of interest displayed in a workshop window.¹ International buyers were lured by the availability of good quality English cloth, high quality silk from Italy, and expensive spices from Portugal. Historically, Antwerp’s reputation as a market started with its fairs that promoted a

---

semiannual influx of traders. As Pero Tafur, an Andalusian nobleman, noted in the 1430s, “The fair which is held here is the largest in the whole world, and anyone desiring to see all Christendom, or the greater part of it, assembled in one place can do so here.” Glowing descriptions of Antwerp’s overabundance of wares on sale, such as the one recorded by Pero Tafur, even if somewhat exaggerated, show that the city had gained a reputation for its ability to supply customers with goods from around the world.

By the beginning of the sixteenth century, the two annual fairs held in Antwerp, the Pentecost Fair (Pinkstermarkt) in spring and the St. Bavo’s Fair (Bamismarkt) in August, were even more popular than the city’s Friday markets (Vrijdag Markt). As seen in the image from the Camina Burana in figure 1, the fairs were often bustling, exciting places. Although similar fairs were held in Bruges and Bergen op Zoom, Antwerp eclipsed both with the quantity and quality of goods available at its marketplaces.

3 See M. J. de la Esplade, ed., Andanças é viagens de Pero Tafur por diversas partes del mundo avidos (1435-1439) (Madrid, 1874). For Tafur’s description, see Appendix 1.
5 Although rarely frequented by international customers, the popular Friday markets offered local customers the chance to shop among the stalls of used clothing and other second-hand items at very discounted prices.
6 Antwerp eventually overtook the fairs at Bergen-op-Zoom because it was more conveniently located for overland shipping routes, and because its location on the Scheldt afforded an easier access point with regard to maneuverability. See J. A. Van Houtte, “The Rise and Decline of the Market of Bruges,” Economic History Review, New Series, 19, 1 (1966): 42.
The Sale of Tapestries at Fairs
While princes and courts were able to custom-order large sets of
tapestries, many of the tapestries produced in the late fifteenth and early
sixteenth centuries were purchased on spec at semiannual fairs and markets,
such as the Easter Fair (Paaschmarkt) and Cold Fair (Coudemarkt) in Bergen op
Zoom and the Pentecost Fair and St. Bavo’s Fair in Antwerp. In 1505, Jean
Fosson, a merchant from Lyon, claimed to have purchased 2,300 ells of tapestry7
from the Cakelaars workshop of St.-Truiden, at the fair in Bergen op Zoom, as
well as an additional 250 ells of tapestry from the van Inneke workshop, also
from St.-Truiden. Fosson then brought the tapestries to Antwerp to have them
packed and shipped.8 Dealers knew that these fairs were reliable places to
replenish their stocks of tapestries and other assorted artworks, and foreign
merchants could place orders and purchase tapestries to be shipped home. These
tapestries were typically of low to medium quality, as merchants were eager to
unload less dazzling and perhaps harder-to-sell pieces from their stock. The
seasonal fairs in Antwerp nonetheless succeeded in bringing foreign merchants to
the city on a regular basis. Although Bruges was well-known for the sale of
English wool, merchants found that they could also buy wool at the fairs in
Antwerp, sometimes with far fewer sales restrictions or regulations.9

7 For the sake of simplicity, the original unit of measurement for Flemish tapestries has been used
throughout. An ell is equal to approximately .7 meters.
8 Fernand Donnet, “Documents pour servir a l’histoire des ateliers de tapisserie de Bruxelles,
Audenarde, Anvers, etc.,” Annales de la Societe d’Archeologie de Bruxelles 10 (Brussels, 1898),
48, who cites SAA CB fol. 60.
9 Donald J. Harreld, High Germans in the Low Countries: German Merchants and Commerce in
Golden Age Antwerp (Leiden: Brill, 2004), 24. In the fifteenth century Brabant and Flanders
were hit hard by the loss of the woolen industry to England and instituted a boycott of English
wares. Antwerp at that point had very little connection with the industry and thus ignored the
The fairs represented a break from regular life and, therefore, from regular purchases. Writing in the first half of the fifteenth century, Saint Bernardino of Siena discussed the competition to purchase items at these fairs as an example for his listeners to follow, except that he implored them to compete for confession rather than worldly goods: “Many people go to the fair, buying merchandise in competition with one another. And so do you during Lent, seeing one another go to confess, so much more willingly you do good, competing all the more.”

While the lower and middle classes were able to enjoy the annual fairs and engaged in haggling and bargaining, for members of the upper classes such behavior would have appeared inappropriate or provincial. Thus, while it certainly made sense to send an agent to fairs in faraway cities to make purchases on one’s behalf, even when the fair was in one’s home city, it was still often prudent to have a proxy do the actual bargaining, dealing, and purchasing.

boycott; in a wise economic move, the city opened its fairs to the English Merchant Adventurers. By doing so, Antwerp became one of the largest, if not the largest, importers of English textiles. As part of this chain reaction, merchants who previously had traveled to Bruges to shop or trade were now coming to Antwerp instead. By 1545 Antwerp had developed into one of the primary sites for English cloth. See Leon Voet, “Antwerp, the Metropolis and Its History,” in Antwerp, Story of a Metropolis: 16th-17th Century, ed. Jan van der Stock (Ghent: Snoeck-Ducaju & Zoon, 1993), 15. Ultimately, Bruges’ behavior would lead to its decline.

10 For the contrast among items that one could purchase, see Glyn Davies and Kristin Kennedy, Medieval and Renaissance Art: People and Possessions (New York: Harry N. Abrams, 2009).
12 A letter sent on May 2, 1529, from Isabella d’Este to Jacopo Malatesa illustrates this point: “Being persuaded that some beautiful new vases will be in the shops of the glassmakers this Ascension tide, be content to find up to ten or twelve drinking vessels that are different in style, cups and glasses that have thin white filaments without gold. And we desire that in buying them you should take Alfonso Facino (the Marchioness’s carver) as your companion, as he is in Venice, so that the two of you together, by advising each other, could be more diligent in satisfying our intentions,” as quoted in Alessandro Luzio and Rodolfo Renier, “Il lusso di Isabella d’Este,
It was probably rare for a buyer to come across a high-quality Brussels tapestry, woven with gold and silk threads, being offered for a “quick sale” price in one of these markets. Even a more modest tapestry, however, was still quite costly, as illustrated by a 1517 report by Cardinal Wolsey, who sent a buyer to the Pentecost Fair in Antwerp with instructions to look for tapestries to furnish several of Wolsey’s rooms, as well as smaller table linens. Even for the most inexpensive tapestries available at the fair, Wolsey had been told to expect to pay a high price.13

With regard to artistic content, the fairs provided a good location for merchants to sell tapestries depicting familiar mythological and religious scenes that would appeal to a wide audience. In contrast, specialized pieces, with a family’s heraldry or containing particular references, would be ordered rather than purchased ready-made at these fairs. A letter from a Medici agent to Govanni de’Medici in 1448 describes the different types of tapestries that were available for purchase at the fairs.14

14 See Appendix 2 for the 1448 letter.
Financial Transactions at Fairs

In the medieval period, fairs were places where all types of goods could be purchased and where money owed for commercial transactions or on loans changed hands. In the early 1500s, even as Antwerp was already growing into a site of exchange, very little money actually existed in the city except during the fairs because of the still-inherent danger of traveling with large sums of money. By the late 1530s the role of the fairs in Antwerp as places of physical commerce had begun to wane, but they still served as venues for money exchange. By the 1540s Italian firms involved in financial exchange were coming regularly to the fairs, and it was well known that those hoping to borrow or lend money could find a financial middleman there. Their established presence continued to draw patrons to the fairgrounds to conduct financial transactions or obtain loans.

Lines of Credit, Increasing Debts

In order to acquire physical goods, one had to have either readily available cash or a line of credit. However, because traveling to and from fairs could be dangerous, and as purchase prices grew, many simply stopped carrying the large amounts of cash needed to make purchases. Most customers probably relied on high lines of credit to purchase expensive goods such as tapestries.

While convenient for the buyer, credit presented risks to the lender. To counteract these risks, lenders often exacted high levels of interest, required
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15 As a basic introduction, see Jürgen Schneider, “The Significance of Large Fairs, Money Markets and Precious Metals in the Evolution of a World Market from the Middle Ages to the First Half of the Nineteenth Century,” in The Emergence of a World Economy, 1500-1914: Papers of the Ninth International Congress of Economic History, eds. Wolfram Fischer, R. Marvin McInnis, and Jürgen Schneider (Stuttgart: Franz Steiner, 1986), 15-36.
16 Wegg, Antwerp, 290.
belongings to be left on deposit, or requested favors from their customers. While a fellow merchant or middle-class customer might be subjected to a high interest rate or penalties for late repayment with little room for bargaining, customers from the upper echelons of society—popes, cardinals, dukes, or nobles—could offer special privileges or sales opportunities in exchange for much lower interest rates or even no interest at all. For the lender, there was a fair risk that the borrower might not repay his loan, especially when large sums of money were involved. Such debts were frequently left unpaid until the person’s death, at which time the lender would then attempt to collect from the family. It was also not unusual for wealthier customers to have several lines of credit with different lenders, with the result that they might have a large amount of wealth tied up in material goods, but little money with which to pay back the lenders.17 While one’s position in society, financially or politically, could certainly improve the chances of getting enough credit for large purchases, savvy lenders might still request some form of collateral, perhaps anticipating the difficulties inherent in reclaiming the lent money.18

As the number of people purchasing luxury items rose, so did the number of purchases financed by lenders; the possession of debt was not uncommon in the sixteenth century. In fact, the wealthier groups in society tended to have proportionally larger debt because, as their rank and position rose, lenders

---


18 In many instances, one person owing money to another might leave, for example, a silver object on deposit whose value far exceeded the actual amount owed, because the object represented more a promise to pay rather than an actual payment.
afforded them more credit. Although there was always inherent risk for the financier who extended loans to the middle or upper classes, it was often more difficult to collect debts from wealthier people. While it might seem that nobles and certainly dukes would have large enough reserves of gold or silver in their accounts to purchase artwork or other expensive items, this was frequently not the case.\(^\text{19}\)
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\(^{19}\) For example, Jakob Fugger, a wealthy merchant banker from Augsburg, lent the Habsburg family 20,000 ducats when the archduke of Tyrol, Sigismond, needed money to make a purchase. Fugger, a very intrepid businessman, in exchange received the most valuable silver mine in the Tyrol. When more funds were needed, Fugger advanced 150,000 ducats to Sigismond and was given complete control of the whole silver industry in the Tryol—a sizeable income. Obviously Fugger’s initial investment, though sizable, did not compare to the total value of the silver industry (Jardine, *Worldly Goods*, 55). However, at certain times even those as wealthy as the Fuggers found themselves struggling with unpaid debts, as seen in this letter from Jakob Fugger to Charles V in 1523, asking for repayment: “Your Imperial Majesty is doubtless well aware how I, and my nephews, have been devoted to the service of the house of Austria and have promoted its welfare and its progress in all humility. On that account we had dealings with the late Emperor Maximilian, your Imperial Majesty’s grandfather, and promised our help in acquiring the Roman Crown for your Imperial Majesty against some of the electors, which should establish your faith and trust in me, and perhaps in no one else. Also for the consummation of the aforesaid project which we undertook, we supplied a fine sum of money which I raised, not only from my own resources and from my nephews, but also, with great loss, from among my other good friends, in order that so praiseworthy a purpose of your Imperial Majesty for high honour and the public good might win success. It is also well known and clear as day that your Imperial Majesty could not have acquired the Roman Crown without my help, as I can demonstrate by documents of all your Imperial Majesty’s commissioners. Nor have I sought my own profit in this undertaking. For if I had remained aloof from the house of Austria and served France, I would have obtained much profit and money, which was then offered to me. Your Majesty may well ponder with deep understanding the damage which would have resulted for your Imperial Majesty and the house of Austria. Considering all this, I humbly petition your Imperial Majesty, graciously to consider my faithful and humble services, which have advanced your Majesty’s welfare, and to decree that the sum of money due me together with the interest should be discharged and paid to me without further delay. I shall always be found ready to serve your majesty in all humility, and I humbly remain at all times your Imperial Majesty’s to command. Your Imperial Majesty’s most humble servant, Jakob Fugger.” For this letter see James Bruce Ross, Mary Martin McLaughlin, *The Portable Renaissance Reader* (New York: Viking, 1966), 180-81, citing Jakob Strieder and Heinz Friederich Deiningen, *Das reiche Augsburg: ausgewählte Aufsätze zur Augsburger und Süddeutschen Wirtschaftsgeschichte des 15. und 16. Jahrhunderts* (Munich: Duncker & Humblot, 1938).
Emergence of the Wholesale Market

To understand how the capitalist market in Europe grew from the semiannual fairs into wide-scale or wholesale trading, one needs to look at how the items being sold arrived at their point of sale. Without adequate means of supply, shipping, and storage, it is difficult to sell any item on a mass scale. As demand for various types of products grew in cities such as Antwerp, which already had an expanding year-round and international market, some merchants wanted to purchase larger and larger quantities for shipment home so as to maximize their profits. The ability to obtain and store items in bulk necessitated more organization than did the smaller-scale sales. This process of organization, with the construction of depots and warehouses capable of storing large quantities of merchandise, such as the one see in figure 2 of the Hanseatic depot, helped to decrease the role that fairs played in overall commerce. The contribution of the construction of storage facilities to the development of a wholesale market, however, depends on whether the warehouse was to function as a naturalitier (simply a warehouse to store goods) or as a mercantalitier (also a warehouse, but open for commercial sales). A mercantalitier type would be
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20. Fernand Braudel, Civilization and Capitalism, 15th-18th Century: The Wheels of Commerce (New York: Haper and Row, 1984), 95-96; W. Sombart, Der moderne Kapitalismus, vol. 2, 15th ed. (Leipzig: Verlag Von Dunker and Humblot, 1928), 95-96, citing W. Sombart, Der moderne Kapitalismus, vol. 2, 15th ed. (Leipzig: Verlag Von Dunker and Humblot, 1928), 448. Braudel also notes that fairs could function as sites for both wholesale purchases made by merchants and individual purchases made by the public, and he claims that if one thinks of the fair as a pyramid, “the base consists of the many minor transactions in local goods, usually perishable and cheap, then one moves up towards the luxury goods, expensive and transported from far away: at the very top of the pyramid came the active money market without which business could not be done at all—or at any rate not at the same pace... fairs were developing in such a way as... to concentrate on credit rather than commodities, on the tip of the pyramid rather than the base” (Braudel, Civilization and Capitalism, 91).

overseen by a grossier (wholesaler), later known as a négociant,\textsuperscript{22} who would sell goods in bulk (“sous cordes,” or roped goods)\textsuperscript{23} without opening the items for individual sale.

Warehouses for practical storage (particularly for grain) had existed as early as the fifteenth century in Western Europe, but the development of warehouses as intermediate points for goods in transit from place of production to place of consumption in bulk (wholesale purchases) marked a change in how people shopped. This change was undoubtedly facilitated by increased and improved transportation that enabled the movement of large quantities of goods across land or by sea. With such improvements, the availability and accessibility of foreign goods increased. Thus cities such as Antwerp, which did not necessarily have many of the mercantilist-type warehouses, still benefited from better modes of transporting large amounts of goods. These improvements helped to increase the amount of goods being imported and exported through the city’s valuable port on the Scheldt. The construction of the Tapiessierspand reflects this growth, as it allowed greater numbers of tapestries to be stored for sale, purchased (sometimes in bulk), and then exported.

\textbf{The Middle Period—From Fairs to Panden}

\textit{The Growing Demand for Luxury Goods in the southern Netherlands}

The growing supply of luxury goods created by workshops and master craftsmen in the Low Countries in the 1500s shows that demand for these items

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{22} J. Savary des Bruslons, \textit{Dictionnaire universel du commerce} (Paris, 1748), vol. 3, entry for “Marchand,” col. 765.
\item \textsuperscript{23} Maximillien-Paul-Émile Littré, \textit{Dictionnaire de la langue française (Dictionnaire Littré)} (Paris, 1873), entry for “Corde,” 808.
\end{itemize}
had increased by the mid-sixteenth century. As Goldwaite states, “The demand for art, then, depends on changing needs for certain things; and although these needs operate as variables that do not necessarily prompt a demand for art, material culture conditions an essential component of this demand.”24 The production of tapestries in the sixteenth century was a response to growing demand, and the available numbers indicate that the number of jobs involved in producing need-based items such as textiles was decreasing compared to the steadily growing number of jobs in the luxury sector, as seen on the graphs in figures 3 and 4, which show the craftsmen employed in the textiles, furniture-utensils, and luxury sectors in Bruges and Mechelen in the fourteenth through sixteenth centuries.25 Additionally, the number of workers within the luxury industries (specifically tapestry weavers, painters, and booksellers) grew exponentially from the fourteenth to the sixteenth century. According to Van Uytven, examples of this expansion include “the inscriptions in the tapestry guilds of Ghent and Brussels ... the [increasing] number of tapestry-weavers in Tournai and Leuven, of painters, glaziers and goldsmiths in Leuven and of pewterers, copper- and silversmiths in Mechelen.”26

The expansion of the luxury goods market, particularly toward the beginning of the sixteenth century, may be related to the changing center of Burgundian power. The Burgundians’ constant struggle to maintain power in

France meant that they were infrequently in the Low Countries. As the power struggle lessened toward the end of the fifteenth century and focus was drawn more to the Low Countries, there was a renewed interest in Flanders and Brabant in the 1450s, particularly once Brussels became the region’s capital.27

The growing demand for luxury goods is clearly seen in the number of locations at which such items could be purchased by the sixteenth century: between 1430 and 1580, there were 16 different places for public art sales in Antwerp.28 The open marketplaces served another valuable purpose in attracting international merchants; foreign merchants who might be in a hurry to finish transactions, and who might not know where to find local artists and their salesrooms29 could do a sort of one-stop shopping in these marketplaces, finding paintings, metal work, tapestries and other luxury items all in one location. Wealthy merchants and individual customers could find artwork of value along with other needed items that may have attracted them to the fairs in the first place. By the sixteenth century, however, this pattern appears to have begun to change. The growth of the various panden (salesrooms) in Antwerp’s art market eventually created enough interest and demand for goods that they may have been the main attractions bringing buyers to the city.30

30 Jacobs, 150. For the role of the panden as both stimulus and response to the expanding art market, see Ewing, “Marketing Art,” 558, and Jean Wilson, “Marketing Paintings in Late Medieval Flanders and Brabant,” Artistes, artisans et production artistique au moyen âge, vol. 3: Fabrication et consommation de l’œuvre (Paris: Picard, 1990), 621-27. As James Bloom suggests, “Responding to an increased demand, painters in Antwerp began to execute works on
markets for luxury goods strongly supports the contention these items were no longer just an afterthought for merchants once they had made their other purchases.

**The Dominican Pand**

The 1438 travel journal of Pero Tafur contains the earliest known reference to specific locations in Antwerp for the sale of art. He recorded that “paintings of every kind were displayed at the Franciscan monastery during the fairs, that gold- and silverwork were sold at the Dominican monastery, and that tapestries were sold at the Church of Saint John.” By the 1450s the sale of tapestries in Antwerp had expanded to the international level, with shipments being sent across Europe. Tapestry weavers from smaller cities in Flanders such as Mechelen, Oudenaarde, and St. Truiden migrated to Antwerp in the fifteenth century, attracted by the city’s rapid growth and the potential for export.

At some point after 1438, though the precise date is unknown, the marketplace for tapestries moved from the Church of St John to a pand.

---


31 See Ewing, "Marketing Art." Ewing (p. 560, n. 17) is unable to identify the Church of St. John and surmises that it must have been a chapel or monastic church. He also notes that Tafur’s reference to a Franciscan monastery must mean the Beghard convent—the Antwerp Beghards were Franciscan tertiaries—rather than the Minderbroedersklooster, since the Friars Minor were not established in Antwerp until 1446. For Tafur’s original statement, see ed. M. J. de la Esplade, *Andaças é viajes*, 259: “En un monasterio de Sant Francisco se vende todo lo de pintura, é en una yglesia de Sant Juan todos los paños de Ras, é en un monasterio de Sant Domingo toda la orfeberia de oro.” Jan Goris also provides a discussion of Tafur’s observation in *Lof van Antwerpen: Hoe reizigers Antwerpen zagen, van de XVe tot de XXe eeuw* (Brussels: Standaard-Boekhandel, 1940), pp. 24-27. For more discussion of Tafur’s journey, see H. van Linden, “Le Voyage de P. Tafur en Brabant en Flandre et en Artois (1483),” *Revue du nord* 5 (1914): 216-31. See also Appendix 2.
(salesroom)\(^{32}\) in the Dominican convent (shown in figure 5) northwest of the city center on the Zwartzustersstraat.\(^{33}\) The Dominican Pand (Predikheeren Pand) thus became the center of tapestry sales in Antwerp; it was expanded in 1460.\(^{34}\) In addition to tapestries, the salesroom was devoted to the other wares of the St. Nicolas Guild, including luxury goods such as jewelry made with precious gems or metals, as well as wares from St. Eligius Guild (gold and silver wares) and from the Antwerp and Brussels members of the Guild of St. Luke. The Dominican Pand was enlarged again in 1479 to keep up with the expanding art market, but the building of new panden led to conflict between the Dominicans and the Guild of Saint Luke regarding who could sell what at each pand in Antwerp.\(^{35}\) When no resolution was reached, the Brussels and Antwerp members of the Guild of Saint Luke left the Pand and sought other sales locations in the newer and more

\(^{32}\) The precise definition of the word “pand” is difficult to determine. Speculation suggests that it comes from the French word “pan,” referring to a section of wall. Although there is no precise English translation, Ewing suggests that, of the eight possible meanings in medieval and Renaissance vernacular given in the following list, numbers 7 and 8 survive today in modern Dutch: “1. A section of a wall or part of a building; 2. An ambulatory around the choir of a church (koorpand); 3. A cloister or gallery where merchandise is sold; 4. A specified value for money; 5. A legal certainty, as in a notarial oath; 6. A burden laid upon someone else; 7. An article given in pledge (security or pawn); and 8. Premises or, more specifically, a legal residence (pandhuis)” (Ewing, “Marketing Art,” 559). For the specific definitions from above, see Eelco Verwijs and Jakob Verdam, eds., Middelnederlandsch Woordenboek, vol. 6 (The Hague: Flandra Nostra, 1902), cols. 93-103, 106. Additionally, Plantin provided the following definition for pandt: “Un pan de muraille, ou une galerie ou cloître, lieu où on vend quelque marchandise (see Christopher Plantin, Dictionarium Tetratlotton (Antwerp, 1562).

\(^{33}\) The Dominican church, built in 1276, regularly struggled with damage from frequent flooding and was replaced in 1571 by a much larger church, Sint-Pauluskerk, whose outdoor grotto is in the area that would have housed the marketplace for luxury items. For what little information remains regarding the Dominican Pand, see Dora Schlugheit, “De Antwerpsche goudsmeden bij de Predikheeren,” Bijdragen tot de gescheidenis, inzonderheid van het oud hertogdom Brabant 28 (1937): 268-78. See also Schlugheit’s “De Predikheerenpand en St.-Niklaasgilde te Antwerpen (1445-1553),” Bijdragen tot de gescheidenis, inzonderheid van het oud hertogdom Brabant 29 (1929): 99-119; Jean Denucé, “De Beurs van Antwerpen: Oorsprong en eerste ontwikkeling, 15e en 16e eeuwen,” in Antwerpsch Archievenblad, 2nd ed., 6 (1931): 82-83.

\(^{34}\) For the expansion of the Pand, see Ewing, “Marketing Art,” 560.

\(^{35}\) Documentation pertaining to this dispute is found in the Antwerpsch Archievenblad, part 21, 165, 170-71, 175-76, as transcribed by F. J. van den Branden. See appendix 3.
specialized sites in Antwerp. It is likely that many of them moved to the nearby and much larger Our Lady’s *Pand* (*Onser Liever Vrouwen Pand*). Prior to this split, the Guild of Saint Luke had leased two properties from the Dominicans. Afterwards, members of the St. Nicholas guild controlled the properties located between the salesroom and the Dominican convent.

As noted above, the Dominican *Pand* was not reserved for craftsmen and merchants from Antwerp; in an example of the freer guild environment in Antwerp, St. Nicholas guild members were not required to be citizens of Antwerp. This rule encouraged foreign sellers to rent stalls, and the number of Brussels members selling in the *Pand* was in fact quite high. Prior to their departure from the Dominican *Pand*, the majority of St. Luke’s Guild members were from Brussels rather than Antwerp. The fact that only membership in the appropriate guild, not citizenship, was sufficient for participation is evidence of an enlightened view on the part of the city government. Quite simply, the city was willing to meet supply demands for goods with the wares of foreigners if it

---

36 Van der Stichelen and Vermeylen suggest that, “The Antwerp guild not only facilitated collaboration between different types of artisan in production, but it displayed a similarly remarkable pragmatism at the level of retailing, even though the right to sell paintings was—in theory—very regulated indeed. Individuals who wished to sell pictures within the walls of the city of Antwerp had to be a member of the guild. Already in the fifteenth century, however, *foreign* artists were allowed to sell paintings, carved retables, prints, and so on at a designated sales area at the Dominican friary...moreover, artists and dealers from Brussels—thus, foreigners—are believed to have been the often in the majority at these specialized art markets during the fifteenth century. It was common in the Low Countries and elsewhere for foreigners to be allowed to sell during annual fairs, but the involvement of the Brussels guild in retailing in Antwerp presaged something bigger, and very different.” See Katlijne Van der Stichelen and Filip Vermeylen, “The Antwerp Guild of Saint Luke and the Marketing of Paintings, 1400-1770,” in *Mapping Markets for Paintings in Europe, 1450–1750* (Studies in European Urban History (1100-1800) 6), eds. Neil De Marchi and Hans J. Van Miegroet (Turnhout: Brepols, 2006) 193.

meant that the sale would take place in Antwerp.

The idea that bringing in money was more important to the city than recruiting new citizens would evolve through the history of Antwerp's tapestry market; by the sixteenth century, Antwerp would actively recruit weavers to emigrate, mainly through promised privileges and bribes.

As the demand for tapestries from the southern Netherlands increased both domestically and abroad, so did the need for more sales space. This need was universal for the sale of most art forms in Antwerp. 39

39. Antwerp's city officials actively participated in making the city's panden the primary locations for the sale of art. See Vermeylen, Painting, 28. For the early growth of the region's art markets, see Neil De Marchi and Hans Van Miegroet, The History of Art Markets, in Handbook of the Economics of Art and Culture, eds. David Throsby and Victor Ginsburg (Amsterdam: Elsevier Science, 2006) 69-122; Elizabeth Honig, Painting and the Market in Early Modern Antwerp (New Haven: Yale, 1998); Michael North and David Ormrod, eds., Art Markets in Europe, 1400-1800 (Aldershot: Ashgate, 1998); Jean Wilson, "Marketing Paintings in Late Medieval Bruges," in Artists and Production Artistic en monnaie: somme du regime des confréries du St-Luc, Mécénates cour Romains et artistes de production, ed. et repr. (Bruges: Musées de la Ville de Bruges, 1983); also, Amand de Lattin, Evoluties van het Antwerpsche staatsbeeld, Geschiedkundige kronijken, vol. 3 (Antwerp: Mercurius, 1942). 86, and Jan Van der Stock, "Enkele nieuwe gegevens over Cornelis Matsys (1510/11-1559/60)," Jaarboek van het Koninklijk Museum voor Schone Kunsten (Antwerp, 1986), 125-27. Additionally, historians also speculate that the city may have had as many as 16 different panden for art as various points during the early and mid-sixteenth century. These include (in chronological order): the Beghards convent, St. John's Church, the Dominican Pand, Our Lady's Pand, the Friday Market, the Tapestry Pand (De Vette Hine), the Kammenstraat, the Painters' Guild Hall, the Groote Markt pand, the Beghards convent, and the Groote Markt pawn. See Vermeylen, Painting, 28. The Antwerp Art Market in Early Modern Antwerp (New Haven: Yale, 1998). 39. Michael North and David Ormrod, eds., Art Markets in Europe, 1400-1800 (Aldershot: Ashgate, 1998). Jean Wilson, "Marketing Paintings in Late Medieval Bruges," in Artists and Production Artistic en monnaie: somme du regime des confréries du St-Luc, Mécénates cour Romains et artistes de production, ed. et repr. (Bruges: Musées de la Ville de Bruges, 1983); also, Amand de Lattin, Evoluties van het Antwerpsche staatsbeeld, Geschiedkundige kronijken, vol. 3 (Antwerp: Mercurius, 1942). 86, and Jan Van der Stock, "Enkele nieuwe gegevens over Cornelis Matsys (1510/11-1559/60)," Jaarboek van het Koninklijk Museum voor Schone Kunsten (Antwerp, 1986), 125-27. Additionally, historians also speculate that the city may have had as many as 16 different panden for art as various points during the early and mid-sixteenth century. These include (in chronological order): the Beghards convent, St. John's Church, the Dominican Pand, Our Lady's Pand, the Friday Market, the Tapestry Pand (De Vette Hine), the Kammenstraat, the Painters' Guild Hall, the Groote Markt pand, the Beghards convent, and the Groote Markt pawn. See Vermeylen, Painting, 28. The Antwerp Art Market in Early Modern Antwerp (New Haven: Yale, 1998).
perhaps the first area to be set aside specifically for art sales; it was reserved for paintings and sculptures. The records regarding the rental of stalls in this Pand provide a timeline for the sale of artworks in Antwerp. The biggest growth in sales and thus rental income for Our Lady’s Church occurred between 1540 (when the rental of stalls changed from leases during fair times to year-round) and 1554. The rise in income from renters between 1550 and 1554 correlates with the rise in tapestry sales as well. As will be discussed below, the market for tapestries experienced tremendous change in the same period, when a new sales hall specifically for tapestries was built. The growth of art sales during the mid-1500s is a reflection of Antwerp’s expanding international trade. The panden, as James Bloom suggests, “in effect existed to supply foreign demand.” However, as will be discussed further, the governance of the panden needed to be carefully balanced with their productivity.

**The Need for More Space**

Although the Dominican Pand would operate until 1581 as a site for the sale of jewelry and precious metals, records from 1517 show that tapestry sales

---

40 For information on the types of artwork that were sold at the Pand, see C. van de Velde, “De Schilderkunst,” *Antwerpen in de VXIe eeuw* (Antwerp, 1975), 422-24; Leo de Burbure, *Toestand der Beeldende kunsten in Antwerpen omtrent 1454* (Antwerp: Peeters, 1854); and Jean de Boschere, *La sculpture anversoise aux XVe et XVIe siècle* (Brussels: G. van Oest & cie, 1909).

41 Ewing, “Marketing Art,” 565. Ewing cautions, however, that the extreme peak in 1554 should be viewed with some caution because of the church’s policy of letting renters go for several years before the total rent due was collected. With this policy, then, it is difficult to determine how much of the rise in rental income reported by the church was due to belated collection of multiple years of rent. Ewing suggests that, instead, a calculation of five-year moving averages might be more reflective of the church’s annual rental income (p. 575, n. 118). Braudel also suggests that there may be a corollary between years in which rental income for the church was high and the years in which many apprentices and masters registered with Antwerp’s Guild of St. Luke (Braudel, *Civilization and Capitalism*, 148-54).

were officially moved from the Dominican *Pand* to a property on the Cammerstraat, behind the Our Lady’s *Pand*, as seen on *Bononiensis*’ map of Antwerp in figure 6. The property (known as *De Vette Hinne*) was leased by the church to a certain Frans Birckmann. Descriptions of the building suggest that it was quite large and therefore well suited for the sale and display of tapestry; it had an accompanying storage area for tapestries, most likely in the cellar space, which was also rented. The new location was soon operating as a year-round sales site. Frans Birckmann continued to be mentioned in *Pand* records until his death in 1529, when his brother Arnout Birckmann gained control. Arnout was then mentioned throughout the *Pand* records until its closure in the early 1550s, when sales were moved to the new *Tapissierspand*.

The combination of *De Vette Hinne*, Our Lady’s *Pand*, and a specialized parchment sales house, all in close proximity to one another along the Cammerstraat (seen on the diagram in figure 7), created a new nexus of luxury goods for sale in Antwerp. Our Lady’s *Pand* most likely provided painters with

---

43 SAA SR 150, fol. 410, 23 Maart 1517.
44 See KAA OR 12, fol. 8, 1518, and Ewing, “Marketing Art,” 568. Ewing also notes that the building’s rent in 1520 was 12 pounds at a time when nearby houses were leased for 1 or 2 pounds, suggesting that the building must have been significantly larger.
45 I am grateful here to Dan Ewing for his transcription of a record which has since been slightly damaged: “Item, vanden huyse aende pant cam[m]erstrate frans berckma[n] Inne woont metten tapisher pande buyten en[de] binnen mercten alle Jae[r]” (KAA OR, 1523, fol. 8; Ewing, “Marketing Art,” 568 n. 78).
46 Regarding Arnout Birckmann in relation to *De Vette Hinne*, including a raise in yearly rent in 1543 to 30 pounds, see KAA OR 1537, fol. 8 and KAA OR 14, 1543, fol. 6 vo.; Ewing, “Marketing Art,” 568 n. 79.
the same types of services that would eventually be available to dealers and weavers in the *Tapissierspand*, which not only functioned as a salesroom for finished goods, but also had space for vendors selling dyes, cartoons, looms, and wool. The growth of these year-round salesrooms that specialized in certain items coincided with another dramatic change for artisans. Although some artists were still employed at royal courts, many of them would no longer have to travel as frequently to peddle their wares or find commissions; rather, the establishment of the *panden* meant that now their artworks were doing the traveling, sometimes in large quantities.

**Tapestry Weavers and the Artistic Environment in Antwerp**

Antwerp’s growing international market in the sixteenth century, in combination with the development of new *panden* for specific types of products, created a welcoming environment for artists of all types to sell their wares. For the market and the marketplaces to survive, Antwerp needed to maintain its access to shipping routes, good relations with foreign merchants, and flexible rules for the guilds in order to keep them in the city. Tapestry weavers and sellers had an early relationship with Antwerp, dating back to the 1400s when they sold their wares in the specialized Dominican *Pand*. As Antwerp’s market grew, the increasing demand led to larger marketplaces. Antwerp’s desire to sustain its economic power led the city to make special exceptions for emigrating weavers,

---

49 Jean Denucé, *Antwerp Art Tapestry and Trade* (Historical Sources for the Study of Flemish Art, 4) (Antwerp: De Sikkel, 1936), xxv.
even to the point of bribes, in order to encourage them to come to Antwerp. The influx of people into the tapestry trade encouraged dealers selling on behalf of weavers, or weavers who served as their own dealers, to move their businesses to the Tapissierspand.

As the tapestry industry in the southern Netherlands expanded, the weavers recognized that it could succeed only in larger cities with more resources and workers available. Thus, many employees who formerly found work in smaller towns and rural areas were forced to relocate in order to find work; for example, as seen in figure 8, there was an approximately 44 percent decline at the beginning of the sixteenth century in the number of tapestry weavers living in Leuven. Moreover, many weavers chose to relocate because the fairs held in major cities such as Bruges and Antwerp brought large numbers of foreign merchants to the cities and exposed them to local styles and products, thereby providing more work for the craftsmen than they could have found in their native towns.\textsuperscript{51}

Eventually, however, growing demand began to approach its maximum capacity. Potential problems from the boom in market demand were that once production capacity within workshops was reached, there was no space for masters to take on additional apprentices for training, and productivity could not

\textsuperscript{51} Raymond Van Uytven, \textit{Production and Consumption in the Low Countries, 13th-16th Centuries} (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2001), 113. Van Uytven states, as one example, that “the strong reputation of the Gothic architects and stonecutters of Brabant made them much sought after in other countries as well; due to the unity of Gothic style, their building activities abroad equally meant a stimulus for the Brabantine sandstone quarries, the Mechlin bell-foundries, and the export of brass and other furniture” (p. 113).
increase without a natural trend toward specialization within trades and the division of labor either within workshops or between several workshops.⁵²

**Early Organization of the Guild of Tapestry Weavers**

Prior to 1415, tapestry weavers in Antwerp were governed as part of a group with the linen weavers. In July 1415 the tapestry weavers were finally granted permission to organize as a separate group.⁵³ Despite this independence, the group maintained some connection to the drapers’ guild as a form of fiscal protection from the magistrates.⁵⁴ By the late 1400s, weavers working in Antwerp (though not necessarily natives of Antwerp) were part of the St. Nicholas Guild, along with jewelers, who sold their wares in the Dominican Pand. For the most part, weavers as a group enjoyed a great deal of freedom. The city’s attitude toward the guilds’ abilities and authority was one that reflected Antwerp’s interest not so much in strictly governing the day to day functioning of the guilds, but rather, in minimizing risk by protecting the guilds’ output and therefore the city’s profit.⁵⁵ The city and not just the artists, was actively engaged in finding

---

⁵² This was not an issue only for tapestry weavers. For example, the Bruges Painters’ Guild was eventually split up into painters, painters on cloth, painters on mirrors, saddlers, harness-makers, stained glass workers, parchment makers, and printers, so that each group could more efficiently make items that would sell, rather than flooding the market with too much of one type of item. For the split of the Painters’ Guild, see L. Gilliodts-van Severen, “L’oeuvre de Jean Bito, prototypographe brugois,” *Annales de la Societe d’Emmulation de Bruges* 47 (1897): 361-67; see also Van Uytven, *Production and Consumption*, 109.

⁵³ See Appendix 4 for the 1415 permission. See also *Antwerpsch Archievenblad*, 2nd ed. (Antwerp, 1928), part 27, 24; also Erik Duverger’s entry in *Antwerpse wandtapijten*, exh. cat. (Antwerp: Provinciaal Museum Sterckshof, 1973), 17. A similar process was seen in Brussels, when the weavers were allowed to separate from the wool trade in 1447, at which point they formed their own independent guild and created their own guidelines and rules. See Sophie Schneebalg-Perelman, “Le Retouchage’ dans la tapisserie bruxelloise ou des origines de l’édict impérial de 1544.” *Annales de la Société Royale d’Archéologie de Bruxelles* 50 (1961), 110; Eichberger, “Tapestry Production,” 33.

⁵⁴ For this protection, see Denucé, *Antwerp Art*, xi.

⁵⁵ For the guild environment in Antwerp, see De Marchi and Van Miegroet, “Rules versus Play,” 145-165. S.R. Epstein has noted that during the early modern period, guilds could perform one or
new and better methods for the sales of art. The guilds in Antwerp, however, also actively played a role in securing the interests of its members. As Van der Stichelen and Vermeylen suggest, “whereas most artists’ guilds in Europe concentrated on production rather than distribution, in Antwerp the guild addressed various issues involving marketing as they arose and developed a surprisingly clear and positive approach in practice, while mostly retaining the much older attitude in its statutes.” Brosens suggests that the high degree of autonomy enjoyed by the weavers from as early as the fifteenth century “enabled the development of a self-interested production and marketing strategy, and allowed the tapissiers to secure this strategy at a higher level as the deans of the tapestry guild could penetrate the cloth guild—the institution monitoring all textile guilds.” The weavers’ guild no doubt felt similarly to the members of the

more of the following functions: “it acted as a cartel, both as buyer of raw materials and as seller of its products; it enforced quality standards which lowered asymmetries in information, particularly outside the local marketplace where the products were little known; it provided members with intertemporal transfers of income in highly unstable markets, smoothing the trade cycles...and it served as a bargaining unit in narrow markets in which agents held market power.” See S. R. Epstein, “Craft Guilds, Apprenticeship, and Technological Change in Preindustrial Europe,” The Journal of Economic History, 58, 3 (1998): 685. Of the guild system in general, Gadd and Wallis state, “the guild as an analytic category is best defined not by its role but its structure as a formally-constituted, exclusive association with some power to regulate occupation(s) over a limited geographical area, even if there is variation around these basic characteristics.” (in Ian A. Gadd and Patrick Wallis, eds. Guilds and Association in Europe, 900-1900 (London: Centre for Metropolitan History, 2006), xvi.)

56 For example, “When the Antwerp magistracy approved a large gallery—one hundred shops—exclusively for the marketing of art, on the upper floor of the new exchange in 1540, the guild did not formally participate in this venture.” See Van der Stichelen and Vermeylen, “The Antwerp Guild,” 193.

57 Van der Stichelen and Vermeylen, “The Antwerp Guild,” 190. As will be discussed, the presence of such strict statutes did not necessarily stifle the functioning or output of the guild, particularly that of the weavers in Antwerp.

St. Luke’s Guild, who seemed “to have recognized that it had a vested interest in facilitating the distribution of paintings and acted so as to maintain the dominant position it achieved in northern European markets in the sixteenth-century, in the face of rapidly changing opportunities and challenges.”

**Guild Troubles in Bruges: A Forerunner to the Tapestry Edict of 1544**

The looser guild environment of Antwerp, however, was not true of other nearby cities. Weavers were just one of the groups that came under fire in Bruges with regard to trade regulations. Guilds wanted to protect their artistic territory, and any overlap between media was a cause for concern. A 1444 ruling mentioning the *cleederscrivers* (painters on fabric) outlines a concern for maintaining a high level of quality within the industry of fabric painting. A more significant ruling in 1458 detailed a lawsuit brought by the head of the guild and several panel painters against the *cleederscrivers* Berthelmeeuse Dringhenbeerch and Janne Vanden Gouden for displaying paintings—a privilege exclusively reserved for the panel painters. The linen painters maintained that in

---


59 Van der Stichelen and Vermeylen, “The Antwerp Guild,” 190. As Dambruyne notes, “In order to reinforce their self-image and public profile, the guilds paid attention to how they were perceived by society. To improve their reputation guilds invested substantially in building up their social capital,” (see Johan Dambruyne, “Representation and Investment Strategies in the Early Modern Guild World: A Comparison between the South and the North of the Low Countries,” in *Guilds and Association in Europe, 900-1900*, Ian A. Gadd and Patrick Wallis, eds. (London: Centre for Metropolitan History, 2006), 105), social capital being investments “in commitment and loyalty...that aim at strengthening or consolidating the social position of the members of the group” (p. 103). Sheilagh Ogilvie further states that social capita is “the stock of shared norms, information, mutual sanctions and collective action which are created by closely knit, multi-stranded social networks, and are supposed to have far-reaching benefits for economic development.” See Sheilagh Ogilvie, *Institutions and European Trade: Merchant Guilds, 1000-1800* (Cambridge Studies in Economic History, Second Series) (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011), 6.

order to sell their wares, they needed the same right to display their paintings, and that the court should not find such a drastic difference between cloth and panel painters so that only panel painters should continue to be allowed this right. The court, however, ruled against the cleederscrivers, allowing them to continue to paint statues, cloths, and panels, but also stipulating that they could not exhibit paintings for sale and, furthermore, that commissions could be received only within their homes or workshops. Additionally, the two groups were each forbidden from hiring apprentices from the other group. Ironically, the brief detailing the contestation ends with specific instructions on how the art of linen painting should be undertaken.  

This type of lawsuit is not surprising when viewed in light of the primary goals of the guilds, which were established in order to protect their members. In an age without intellectual property laws, the guilds were artists’ primary means of protection, both professionally and financially.

Conflicts Among Other Guilds

The extent to which guild “territory” was protected could be clearly seen in Bruges throughout the late fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries. The weavers, panel painters, and cloth painters were not the only groups to experience conflict with one another. They also launched attacks on various

---

61 Wolffthal, Beginnings, 6.
63 Wolffthal, Beginnings, 8.
other guilds, both in Bruges and in the nearby town of Sluis, about six kilometers away, which linked Bruges to the sea via canal. As the nearest seaport, Sluis was especially important for overseas shipping from Bruges. While the Bruges guilds understandably wanted to gain an advantage over neighboring competition, their decision to pursue legal action against the groups in Sluis might appear odd given their dependence on this town. Perhaps this litigation was part of an attempt to lessen the control that Sluis may have held over Bruges. Bruges did, however, benefit from the favor of the court. In the early 1440s Philip the Good was content to afford greater privileges to the guilds in Bruges while curtailing the rights of guilds in Sluis.64

**Bargaining Power of the Weavers and Merchants**

For tapestry weavers and merchants, given the interest Antwerp had in encouraging the tapestry trade, the city represented an area where their demands were more likely to be met than in the towns from which many of them had migrated. The burgeoning tapestry trade had to accommodate an ever-growing population of skilled labor and dealers. In the 1540s and 1550s great numbers of *legwerkers*65 involved in the tapestry trade emigrated to Antwerp66 and were

---

65 Originally a reference to weavers in particular, by the sixteenth century the term *legwerker* tended to refer to anyone involved with the trade of tapestries; it is unclear in most instances whether the word always applied strictly to weavers or whether it sometimes included dealers and other assorted people. It is seen in Brussels records for the first time in 1499; see Jozef Duverger, “Brusselsche legwerkers uit de XVe en XVIe eeuw,” *Gentse Bijdragen tot de Kunstgeschiedenis* 1 (1934): 214-39. Additionally, Delmarcel notes that the term was used in Bruges as early as 1488, and that it was mentioned once in 1388 in Oudenaarde records. See Guy Delmarcel, *Flemish Tapestry from the 15th to 18th Century* (New York: Harry N. Abrams, 2000), 28; Guy Delmarcel and Erik Duverger, *Bruges et la tapisserie*, exh. cat. (Bruges: Louis de Poortere, 1987), 20-30; and Florent Van Ommeslaeghe, *Wandtapijten uit Oudenaarde*, exh. cat. (Bergen op Zoom: Markiezenhof, 1988), 12-13.
easily able to obtain citizenship papers. The city’s magistrates, quickly realizing the economic value of the tapestry market, sought to assist weavers or merchants from other cities who had moved to Antwerp, and to entice more to resettle in the city. In some instances the city extended fairly extravagant privileges, but the immigrants knew that they had the advantage in negotiations. Jan Collaerd, for example, skillfully negotiated one of the most impressive packages. As a well-known and popular pattern painter from Brussels, he knew that the city would gratefully welcome him. Thus his proposed terms of 300 pounds per year for six years to cover materials and other startup costs, in addition to another 50 pounds per year as a salary for the rest of his life, were accepted by the city.67

Jan Collaerd was not alone in seeking new profits in Antwerp. Peter van Uden, a well-known weaver from Brussels, came to Antwerp at some point prior to 1560 and reportedly brought with him 400 additional weavers from Brussels. With those weavers he was easily able to establish a new tapestry workshop that included 126 looms overseen by 33 master tapestry weavers; the workshop was fully operational by 1561.68 While these numbers may be part of slightly (or very) exaggerated accounts, the legend trailing van Uden unmistakably indicates the willingness of weavers or their merchant-representatives to come to Antwerp.

66 When the weavers emigrated to Antwerp, many of them rented houses along the Meir (a prominent boulevard in Antwerp), and for a while the Korte Clarestraat was referred to as the Tapestry Street, “de nyeuw strate geheelen de lang tapystrie strate loopende van vuyter Cleerensstrate nade nyeuwe borsse toe.” See SAA Nts. Shertogen, senior, 1545, fol. 121; Donnet, “Documents,” 65.

67 For Jan Collaerd’s negotiations, see Appendix 5. Denucé (Antwerp Art, xxiv) discusses Jan Collaerd briefly.

68 The references to Van Uden and his 400 weavers seem to be a part of art history lore, as they are often repeated, but with an accompanying caveat regarding reliability. For the earliest modern (and potentially exaggerated) account of Peter Van Uden, see F. J. Van den Branden, Geschiedenis der Antwerpsche schilderschool (Antwerp: Drukkerij J.-E. Buschmann, 1883), 687.
However, there was a limit to the benefits native Antwerpers were willing to allow the foreigners. A complaint to the city magistrates, dated June 2, 1564, about the governance of the Tapijsterspand was brought against all of the Oudenaarde manufacturers or dealers, including Antoon van Coppenolle, Boudewijn Hoevicx, Jan de Moor I, Dirk Maes, Gerard Rullens, Arend Roze, Roeland van den Hove, Arnold Cabeliau, Peter Hoevicx, Loijs de Vos, and Lauwereyns van Coppenolle. The complaint involved the listed men’s failure to have sworn an oath of allegiance to the city of Antwerp and its governing ordinances, which the citizens and workers of Antwerp felt was necessary, and it proposed that new ordinances be introduced to govern the day-to-day functioning of the Tapijsterspand, for the sake of fair business dealings within the Pand and to protect the interests of those native to Antwerp. Unfortunately, there is no record of the men’s reply or the magistrates’ response. Thus, it seems likely that there was a constant struggle on the part of both the city and the workers in the Pand to maintain a careful balance that would allow maximum profit for all groups selling from the Pand, not just one particular group.

**The Regulatory Environment in Antwerp**

An initial examination of both the city’s and the Emperor’s involvement with the tapestry industry during the mid-1500s would indicate that both parties were interested in heavily regulating the industry and thus the guild and workshops. However, the motivations for this regulation run a bit deeper than a desire for surface control, and instead lie in attempting to both preserve and

---

69 See SAA RB Pk 632, fol. 65 vo, and Appendix 6.
promote the strength and value of tapestry exports from Antwerp. As will be discussed, the strict ordinances for tapestry during the 1500s again tie back to the mitigation of risk. These rulings, as Brosens notes, “aimed to reduce uncertainties or doubts that prospective buyers might have had about the quality of the products...[and] tried to reduce the distance between buyers and sellers, which was significant since tapestry was first and foremost an export product.”

**Concerns for Authenticity: The Edict of 1539 and Its Implications for Antwerp**

The regulations developed for the tapestry trade in Antwerp in the 1550s have their roots in a series of edicts released during the late fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries that primarily involved production in Brussels and Oudenaarde. Brussels tapestries were known to be among the most finely woven and of the highest quality, and therefore often commanded the highest prices.

---

70 The notion that stricter ordinances did not necessarily mean a guild lost control of its production is supported by Van der Stichelen and Vermeylen, who state, “The existence of a series of strict regulations regarding the organization of the art market does not necessarily signify that the guild lacked flexibility. Quite the contrary is true.” See Van der Stichelen and Vermeylen, “The Antwerp Guild,” 193-94.

71 Koenraad Brosens, “Quality, risk and uncertainty and the market for Brussels Tapestry, 1450-1750,” forthcoming, 5, and Bo Gustafsson, “The Rise and Economic Behavior of Medieval Craft Guilds. An Economic-Theoretical Interpretation,” *The Scandinavian Economic History Review and Economy and History*, 35 (1987), 9-10. The nature of tapestry, and its cost, meant that it saturated a domestic market much more quickly than cheaper items such as paintings or books might, which forced it to rely more heavily than other luxury industries on export trade.

72 The workshops in Brussels earned a reputation for producing a significant number of technically skilled and high-quality tapestries as part of the much larger overall tapestry industry in that city. Several scholars have studied the importance of Brussels’ tapestry output to the economy of the city and the entire region: see Sophie Schneebalg-Perelman, “Importance économique de la tapisserie bruxelloise au XVIe siècle,” *Annales de la Société royale d’Archéologie de Bruxelles* 58 (1981), 219-235; E. Aerts and F. Daelemans, “Sociaal-economische aspecten van het 16de-eeuwse Brussel,” *Tijdschrift voor Brusselse geschiedenis* I (1984), 9. Thomas Campbell proposes that, by the 1510s, thousands of the city’s residents would have been by employed in this industry, and that this number grew further in the following decades. He notes that in 1545, Cosimo de’ Medici’s Brussels agent claimed that at least 15,000 people were working in the tapestry industry in Brussels. Since the total city population was around 50,000 in 1545, roughly one-third of the city’s people were employed by the tapestry trade in some manner,
Weavers and the magistrates had genuine concerns about less skilled weavers from other cities attempting to pass off their tapestries as Brussels-made. In an effort to mitigate reputational risk, from 1450 to 1472, weavers were required to present all tapestries intended for sale to their guild, in the Chapel of Saint Christophorus, to be scrutinized before they could be declared appropriate for sale. In 1472 the process was slightly altered to mandate that tapestries be examined before their removal from the loom, to further ensure that all tapestries marketed as products of Brussels had actually been made there and to prevent weavers from other cities from bringing their work to Brussels for sale. But by 1525, the industry had changed sufficiently that the Brussels city council raised serious questions about the quality of tapestries produced there, for the city’s own weavers were producing substandard work. One of the most flagrant violations was the process of *afzetten*, the painting of facial features, landscape details, and complicated patterns or shading directly onto the surface of the tapestry rather than weaving them into the piece. The royal ordinance of April 25, 1525 states in its introductory paragraphs that anyone in the tapestry trade including preparing the looms, procuring materials from abroad, drawing cartoons, supplying raw materials, and the weaving and sale of tapestries. See Thomas Campbell, *Tapestry in the Renaissance: Art and Magnificence* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2002), 279; Candace Adelson, “Documents for the Foundation of Tapestry Weaving under Cosimo I de’ Medici,” *Renaissance Studies in Honor of Craig Hugh Smyth*, eds. Andrew Morrogh, Fiorella Superbi Gioffredi, Piero Morselli, and Eve Borsook, vol. 2 (Florence: Giunti-Barbera, 1983), 15; Brosens, “The Organisation,” 268-269; Koenraad Brosens, *A Contextual Study of Brussels Tapestry, 1670-1770. The Dye Works and Tapestry Workshop of Urbanus Leyniers (1674-1747)*, (Verhandelingen van de Koninklijke Vlaamse Academie van België voor Wetenschappen en Kunsten, Nieuwe Reeks, vol. 13) (Brussels: Paleis der Academien, 2004).


Eichberger, “Tapestry Production,” 33-34.
working on any piece worth more than 20 florins or guldens per ell was required to weave in entirety the heads, mouths, noses, and other difficult sections and could not use any form of liquid to “retouch” the figures. If any such violations were detected, the person could be excluded from the weavers’ guild and would not be allowed to leave the city in an effort to continue his lucrative but fraudulent practices in another city. Stricter regulations were created in 1528 to ensure that all tapestries larger than six by six Flemish ells bore a mark woven into the tapestry signifying the high quality of Brussels work, as seen in figure 9: two uppercase B’s on either side of a red shield and an identifying mark for the weaver or workshop. The introduction of this now-famous city mark was a means of risk mitigation, and was intended to protect the output of the famous Brussels manufactories and ensure that the workshops’ reputations were not tarnished when held in comparisons to the fraudulent tapestries purporting to be from Brussels. In the short term, this would protect the workshops and weavers, but in the long term, it would also protect the city’s employment and thus the region’s economy. As Brosens notes, “weavers were vulnerable to sudden

75 For the beginning of the edict, see ARAB Reg. de la Gilde nr. 1436, fol. 160.
76 Denucé, Antwerp Art, xiv.
77 For this safeguarding of employment levels, see Brosens, “The organization,” 268. In a nod to how much circumstances would change by the mid-1600s, dealers would begin to actively choose pieces for sale that did not include the city of origin marks, and instead would sometimes include their own names in place of such marks as indications of their involvement in the transaction, and in an effort to obscure the city of origin. For the behaviors of one such dealer, Pieter Wauters, see M. Crick-Kuntziger, “Contribution à l’histoire de la tapisseries anversoise: Les Marques et les tentures des Wauters,” Revue belge d’archéologie et d’histoire de l’art 5 (1935): 35-44; A. Coulin Weibel, “Tapestries by Peeter Wauters,” Detroit Institute of Art Bulletin, 14 (1934-5), 44-7.
changes in their economic circumstances, with little margin to absorb the unexpected,” and that in turn impacted the city’s economy as well.78

The number of commissions filled in the years following the edict indicates that Brussels workshops continued to make tapestries, though perhaps now with a more cautious attention to quality and detail. As recorded in one document in the Antwerp city archives, Jan de Clerck, Willem de Kempeneere, and Willem and Jan Dermoyen, all weavers and pattern makers and dealers in Brussels, and all mentioned in various letters or edicts as potential rule-breakers, brought forward Jan Mostinck van Endigen, who worked for 12 years as the official tapestry weaver of the king of England, as a witness on behalf of the quality of their tapestries, perhaps in an effort to show their innocence and their adherence to the edict.79

Rules had been issued through the late 1520s and into the 1530s, but a 1539 edict was of greater significance. In January 1539, Mary of Hungary wrote a letter to two officials in Brussels, Pierre du Fief and Charles Tserraerts, outlining her instructions regarding the fraudulent tapestries. The inspectors were to go to the Antwerp tapestry Pand, by this time at De Vette Hinne, or anywhere else where Willem de Kempeneere’s tapestries might be displayed for sale, to check if


79 SAA GA 4047.
the pieces had been retouched or woven with poor quality wool. The group was also to find the pieces de Kempeneer had sold in 1538 to check them as well, and to confiscate any such fraudulent pieces.\textsuperscript{80} Just a few months later, a formal edict of March 4, 1539, attempted to reassure the angry weavers of Oudenaarde, many of whom felt that they had been unjustly persecuted and subjected to confiscation when they had done nothing wrong.\textsuperscript{81} As an example of the ways in which risk could be minimized, this edict also formally laid out the policies regarding quality control and fraudulent practices (there could be no embellishing, trimming, or aiding a tapestry with any sort of paint or liquid color substance, regardless of the current colors or weave), and it announced that all such retouched or fraudulent pieces would be confiscated, causing even more uproar among weavers. The March 1539 edict also planted grains of doubt in some customers’ minds that they might not receive what they had paid for, which surely caused worry among those weavers and merchants who had maintained the expected level of craftsmanship. The van der Molens even communicated to some clients that the weavers had lost their old methods and were now subject to regulations and accompanying penalties.\textsuperscript{82}

\textit{Expansion of the Industry: The 1544 Statute}

The expansion of the tapestry industry, however, also increased risk by creating opportunities for dishonest businessmen and weavers. Cheaper

\textsuperscript{80} For Mary’s letter of January 28, 1539, see Appendix 7; ARAB Papiers d’Etat et de l’Audience, no. 1233; Schneebalg-Perelman, “Retouchage,” 4.
\textsuperscript{81} See Appendix 8 for the March, 1539 edict.
\textsuperscript{82} Denucé, \textit{Antwerp Art}, 8. For a transcription of the van der Molens’ letter to customers regarding the delays caused by the Edict of 1539 policies, see Appendix 9.
materials continued to be passed off as more expensive ones, and city-of-origin marks were forged because, although many tapestries were brought to Antwerp and sold there, the city where they were woven was a major factor in setting the price. As the tapestry market continued to grow through the mid-1500s, a statute issued in 1544 by Charles V, the *Ordonnance imperial sur l'industrie de la tapisserie aux Pays-Bas*, imposed very strict regulations on the manufacture and marking of tapestries. As noted, many sellers were finding ways to fake a higher-quality tapestry and sell it at the price reserved for the true higher-quality pieces. But honest weavers and merchants resented having to defend their wares as authentic, and they worried about the long-term loyalty that clients had invested in them since the late Middle Ages. The free-trade environment in Antwerp had made the city lucrative for many merchants, and the strict regulations greatly dampened this freedom; thus the city—not just the weavers and merchants affected—refused to recognize the decree, fearing economic regression.

---


85 The infamous 1544 decree was written first in French and then in Flemish, which is a slightly longer version. For a published version of the decree, see Anna Van den Steene, *Ordonnanciene, Statuten, Edicten ende Placcaerten van Vlanderen*, 2nd ed. (Ghent, 1639), part I, fol. 610. Van den Steene includes both the Flemish and French transcriptions. However, these ordinances should not be interpreted as implying that Charles V and Mary of Hungary were no longer enthusiastic fans of the medium of tapestry. They continued to commission tapestries and communicated with their weavers in excruciating detail, on such items as how many weavers would be working on any particular piece, the number of silk threads, or the weight of the gold used as thread; additionally, they preferred to have every preliminary sketch sent to them for approval. Schneebalg-Perelman provides the following two transcriptions of letters between
Outrage ensued as Antwerp, used to a less-regulated guild environment, demanded an explanation for the new rules outlined in the statute. One year later, Mary of Hungary insisted that Antwerp adopt the rules, which were similar to those that Brussels had enacted in 1525. Ghent similarly protested, to no avail. Charles V may have had additional reasons for the statute, as he may have been banking on increased profit from industries such as tapestry to help in pulling Antwerp out of an economic slump. But Charles V was certainly aware that he was issuing guidelines for an industry in which much of the region was involved in some manner, and that saw a significant amount of money change hands; thus he was no doubt very concerned about poor-quality fakes negatively impacting the tapestry market.

The statute contained 91 articles specifying how tapestry weavers and dealers were to behave; the necessary quality of the tapestries they sold; how the guild was expected to uphold the new rules; and continued restrictions on the production of fraudulent tapestries. It also included some stipulations that were

Mary of Hungary and her weavers: (1). “Lettre du Octobre 1551 à la reine de Hongrie: Quant à ce que m’aves escript par Boussu des piecset de tapesserye de Thunnes, j’en suis bien empesché, car d’un costé je les voudrois bien veoyr, et d’autre costé les affaires sont de sorte que je ne say que je doys fayre, car sy je doys returner par delà et les fayre venyr ce sera autant de peine perdue et sy me failloit fayre autre chose je ne voudroys le dyviser, d’autant plus que les deux pieces qui restent à fayre ne seront faytes que jusques à Paques, et entre cy et la l’on verra de quelle mort nous deverons mourir” (ARAB Papiers d’Etat et de l’Audience, no. 64, fol. 212); (2). “Lettre du 23 novembre 1551 de Insbruck: Quant aux pieces de Thunes avoye sceu que les quatre pieces sont de fayte et m’ont acru l’envye que j’avoys de les veoyr et combine que je tiens que sy je les fays venir vous pourra donner quelque pensement que n’ay espoir des les aler veoyr sur le lieu, toutefois je suis certain que pourr̩s bien yimaginer que plus grande chose que ceste là est celle qui me doit mener là ou ailleurs où les affayres, le temps et la reyson me forceront de aller car benoit soit Dieu je suis já sy acoustumé d’aller on moyns je le desire que pour ceste heure je n’en espère moins. Parquoy ayant demandé oires ’a tous Cecil de ma chambe qui ont autant d’envye de les veoy que moy nous sommes conformes qu’il ne sera que bien que les me envoyés et ainssy vous prie le fayre” (ibid, fol. 223 vo.). See also Schneebalg-Perelman, “Retouche,” 9.

86 For a transcription of the city’s response to the edict, see Appendix 10.
87 Denucé, Antwerp Art, xix.
88 This attitude seems consistent with Charles V’s future economic policies.
seen as not only unfair to some workshops but potentially financially damaging as well. For example, tapestries now had to be woven in one continuous piece, as an additional safeguard against tampering and against using a weaver from one city for figures and a weaver from elsewhere for the background. This measure was troubling to the smaller workshops that sometimes broke large cartoons into smaller portions to be woven by one person and then combined subsequently. Such a division of labor had allowed workshops with fewer large looms to rely on smaller looms for some pieces so as not to tie up the larger looms for months at a time and thereby reduce their annual capacity and profits.

Through the various articles of the statute, Charles V continually stressed the importance of quality. Table 1 provides a breakdown of the statute’s content according to topic.\textsuperscript{89} The table shows that approximately 30 percent of the document related to the need for maintaining high quality, through either selection of raw materials, assurance of artistic skill, or the prohibition of retouching. In Charles V’s explanation of quality, he also included three price categories to be used in judging tapestries: those priced at fewer than than five stuivers per ell, those between six and 22 stuivers, and those at more than 23 stuivers per ell. The cost was to be determined by the number of weft threads used, a reliable source of quality.

With the building of the new Pand for tapestries already underway in 1553, and with economic losses looming, Antwerp again asked for a repeal of the

Despite this denial, the Council of Brabant did wait until 1562 before forcing Antwerp to officially publish and accept the ruling. But Antwerp had special favor with the Emperor, and the strict rules were rarely enforced.

**Table 1. Analysis of the contents of the 1544 ordinance by subject**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Number of articles</th>
<th>Percentage of total document</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Introductory remarks</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mastery of the art of tapestry</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The role of dealers and brokers</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protection of quality of raw materials</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The city and weavers’ reputation or brand</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Privilege afforded the above because of their reputation</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changes made to finished tapestry, retouching</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rights and obligations of apprentices</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rights and obligations of the guild</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rules relating to quality</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization and operation of the guild</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>91</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


In summation, the regulatory environment for tapestry sales in Antwerp had one primary focus: maintaining a steady stream of quality products to fill the demand. However, without Antwerp’s ability to retain merchants in its bustling export trade, demand would cease and the trade would decline. Thus, this discussion now turns its focus to Antwerp’s tapestry export trade.

---

90 For Antwerp’s request, see Appendix 11; SAA GA 4047; see also Denucé, *Antwerp Art*, xix.
91 It seems likely that such a delay was granted in part because, as discussed, the value of the tapestry industry was so great that a careful balance needed to be maintained because the free guild environment in Antwerp, and the strict ordinances ensuring quality and thus continued sales.
92 Denucé, *Antwerp Art*, xix.
The Role of Foreign Merchants in the Development of the International Tapestry Trade: Fueling Demand for the *Tapissierspand*

**The Appeal of Antwerp to Foreign Merchants**

It is easy to see the appeal of Antwerp to the foreign merchant communities. Antwerp’s fairs had historically drawn large crowds of foreign merchants, and the combination of the fairs and the influx of merchants helped Antwerp to develop the commercial infrastructure that was fully in place by the 1550s. As van der Wee has noted, the city’s growth during this period was due primarily to “the foundations of three huge agglomerates—boatmen representing the service sector, a cloth guild for manufactures, and a guild of mercers for just about everything else.” As the number of foreign merchants increased, so too did demand for new products to export, which increased competition between craftsmen, which in turn further increased variety in production and therefore demand. By the mid-1560s, Antwerp’s “demographic peak,” the population is

---

93 Baily W. Diffie and George D. Winius state that in the stone above the city’s main gate were chiseled the words “For Merchants of All Nations.” See Diffie and Winius, *Foundations of the Portuguese Empire, 1415-1580* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1977), 412.


96 This point will be further illustrated in Chapter 2’s discussion of the specialization seen across weaving workshops. See De Marchi and Van Miegroet, “History of Art Markets,” 81. Additionally, Mackenney, citing Wee, argues that “The Guild of St. Luke helped fuel the city’s export-led expansion with a ‘section of luxury crafts almost entirely working for an international
estimated to have been about 90,000 permanent and 100,000 temporary residents. Included among the permanent residents, as seen on Table 2 there were approximately 1,150 foreign merchants actively engaged in buying and selling their wares: about 300 Spaniards, 200 Italians, 150 Portuguese, 150 Hanseatics, 150 High Germans, 100 English, and 100 French.98

Table 2. Foreign Merchants by country of origin by 1560s

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country of Origin</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italian</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portuguese</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hanseatics</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Germans</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


market,’ producing everything from harpsichords to fancy buttons.” (Richard Mackenney, Tradesmen and Traders. The World of the Guilds in Venice and Europe, c.1250-c.1650 (London: Croom Helm, 1987), 118, citing Wee, The Growth, vol. 2, 225-26). With regard to the luxury trade itself, Dubbe and Vroom state that these products “are characterized not so much by the high amount of capital invested in them or the special quality of the raw materials used as by the high artistic and technical standard of their workmanship and production...coupled with an increasing division of labour in the workshops.” (see B. Dubbe and W. Vroom, “Patronage,” 29, who cite H. Van der Wee, “Structural changes and specialization in the industry of the Southern Netherlands 1100-1600,” Economic History Review second series, 28 (1975): 211-18). However, for tapestries, I would argue that the products are in fact characterized to some degree by both the capital needed, and the types of raw materials used as well as the levels of artistic and technical standard, particularly because of the broad range of production in the 1500s—while tapestry in general was a luxury product in all forms, the output in Brussels, for example embodied a very different degree of needed capital, raw materials, and artistic and technical standard than did that of Oudenaarde.

98 Marnef, Antwerp in the Age, 5-6.
It was economically advantageous for these merchants to set up communities in their new city as a means of establishing security, particularly in terms of property ownership. Settling together also helped them to secure the most favorable privileges from the city’s magistrates in order to lower their costs. Even small reductions in taxes could significantly increase profits for the merchants. Those groups seen as most valuable to the city’s own finances were generally granted better privileges in an effort to lower costs for not only the foreigners, but the city itself—each time taxes were levied or property seized, the transaction costs rose.99

The foreign associations that formed in the sixteenth century also created varying degrees of structure and control within the groups. Just as a guild without any guidelines or rules would have trouble selling its wares without conflict, so it was with groups of foreigners settling in a new city. It was not unusual for an already established member of a foreign group to vouch for a fellow immigrant also hoping to work in that city. Additionally, if a city could entice a group of especially profitable foreign merchants to stay by giving them privileges, perhaps more merchants from that region would be encouraged to come as well, thus adding further to the city’s commercial growth. Moreover, the success of one foreign merchant community in a certain city might encourage merchants from another foreign location to come and establish trading activities as well.

Better privileges could also give a particular group an advantage over other foreign groups, thereby spurring further competition in the market. The Hanse, for example, were granted extremely favorable privileges as early as the fourteenth century. They established a factory in late 1468 after they were given a house in Antwerp’s Corn Market called the Hermitage (or De Cluyse) in order to establish a physical presence in the city. The house allowed them to concentrate their stockrooms for merchandise, living quarters, and other needed spaces into one area. Setting up their own somewhat separated areas within Antwerp certainly created a sense of familiarity for foreign merchants living as outsiders; even if they had come from a city not far from Antwerp, such as Cologne, significant differences in language, culture, and customs were still present.  

Although Antwerp also gave the group funds to furnish the house, many of the Hanse still preferred to live in Bruges at that time. Even at the end of the fifteenth century, with the silting of the Zwyn and the movement of many

---

100 A quotation from Justus Lipsius’s De Constantia, written in 1584, highlights the degree to which the sense of being foreign may have penetrated merchant life: “See how every day some for anger, some for love, some for ambition forsake their country? And what a multitude are drawn away by that idol Lucre? How many Italians forsaking Italy the Queen of countries only for greed of gain have removed their dwellings into France, Germany, yea even into Sarmatia? How many thousand Spaniards doth ambition draw daily into another world from us: these arguments prove invincibly that the band whereby we are linked thus to our country is but external and accidental, in that it is so easily broken by one inordinate lust.” Justus Lipsius, Two Books of Constancie, trans. John Stradling (London, 1594), 97; further translation in Harreld, High Germans, 48. Thus, although Lipsius’s characterization of the foreign merchant seems a bit misguided, the success of the many foreign groups within Antwerp and other cities should be viewed not only in terms of a group’s ability to prosper economically within a foreign environment, but also in terms of its ability to adapt to and prosper within an environment that was perhaps politically welcoming, but less so on a more basic, social, day-to-day level. Braudel’s characterization of the function of foreign merchant communities is perhaps a bit more realistic: “We must imagine these groups with their kinship systems and friendships, their servants, correspondents, accounts, and ledger clerks” (Civilization and Capitalism, 153).
merchants away from Bruges, the Hanse remained reluctant to move to Antwerp because of the very favorable privileges that they had in Bruges, and because they viewed Antwerp as a city that had constant troubles.¹⁰¹

But such privileges were not just favorable to one side; the city magistrates granted them primarily in the hope that they would benefit the city in the long term.¹⁰² The success enjoyed by the Hanseatic League resulted in a move in 1568 to new, larger quarters in the *Nieuwstad*. To give some idea of just how immense the trade along the Hanseatic commerce routes was (as seen on the map in figure 10), the new house, seen in figure 11, could provide space for more than 300 Hanse merchants.¹⁰³ Over time, the city magistrates would grant houses to additional nations whom they viewed as valuable to continued trade. Soon the English, Portuguese, and Genoese natives were established in new headquarters, as shown on the map in figure 12.¹⁰⁴ In 1511, the city magistrates gave the Portuguese a house on the Kipdorp.

Portugal had enjoyed favored status from the beginning of the sixteenth century, when the first ships carrying pepper arrived at Antwerp’s port in 1501. With developments in navigation, the Portuguese were soon bringing back spices


from Africa and India, and they needed a distribution center closer to major trading routes than Lisbon. Antwerp, already home to many foreign merchants, was an ideal location. But the King of Portugal’s decision to make Antwerp the primary point of sales had another motivation: in addition to Antwerp’s established markets, the king also wanted access to the copper and silver controlled by German firms in Antwerp such as the Fuggers. The importance of the spice trade (and the large sums of money accompanying it) to Antwerp enabled the Portuguese to acquire numerous privileges from the city, and by the mid-1520s they were importing figs, raisins, dates, wax, wine, grain, and salt in addition to spices.

In contrast, several other groups were never granted privileges but still managed to enter the market successfully. Merchants from Scandinavia, parts of Italy, and much of southern Germany never enjoyed the same degree of privileges as the other groups, but were nonetheless able to gain a firm foothold in the commercial arena, as seen the maps in figures 13 and 14, showing the number and value of exports from Antwerp to Germany.

The foreign merchants’ ability to speak several languages, gain repeat customers (with whom they might build standing relationships), and sometimes even attain citizenship status provided them with great advantages over traveling merchants who might only be in the city temporarily, as well as advantages over
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105 Leon Voet, “Antwerp, the Metropolis,” 15.
the old fair model for sales. Guicciardini cites the freedom afforded these foreigners by the city magistrates as the reason for the high number of men with families in these communities and their ability to retain their manners and customs of their homelands.

**Where Were the Tapestries Going?**

By the mid-1550s, tapestry made up almost 5 percent of all exports from the Netherlands and at least 16 percent of exports to countries such as France, Spain, and England, where demand for tapestry was especially high. England was one of the main importers. One English merchant, William Towerson, claimed 27 yards of silk tapestry on his customs documents, among other textiles that he had bought in Antwerp in 1567. The amount was most likely recorded as yardage rather than as a number of tapestries because the price of a tapestry was based on both quality and size. In fact, Brulez has estimated that tapestry exports constituted an amount of 700,000 guilders a year—an amount that Vermeylen cautions is most likely too low. Table 3 gives an overview of
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107 All of these factors were even more beneficial to merchants living in Antwerp who were native to the Low Countries. Their ability to speak three or more languages, their awareness of global cultures, and their permanent citizenship all affected their sales rates. Guicciardini refers to these native merchants as “revera strenui et industrii mercatores” (Descrittone, 223). See also Leon van der Essen, *Contribution à l'histoire du port d'Anvers et du commerce d'exportation des Pays-Bas vers l'Espagne et le Portugal à l'époque de Charles-Quint (1553-1554)* (Antwerp, 1921), 14.


110 Ewing, “Marketing Art,” 579. Ewing relies on Brulez’s figures of 700,000 guilders as the value of Netherlandish tapestry exports and 16 million guilders as the total for Netherlandish exports. See Brulez, “The Balance of Trade,” 41-43.

111 Vermeylen, *Painting*, 88. Vermeylen sites SAA CB 16, fol. 256 ro; CB 39, fol. 96 vo; and CB 40, fol. 230 ro. as one such example.

Netherlandish tapestry export estimates for several different time periods and according to several historians’ interpretations of the data.\textsuperscript{113}

**Table 3. Tapestry exports in the second half of the sixteenth century: estimated percents of total Netherlandish exports**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Time Period</th>
<th>Total Exports for Period in guiders\textsuperscript{114}</th>
<th>Tapestry Exports</th>
<th>Percent of Total Exports</th>
<th>Destination</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brulez\textsuperscript{115}</td>
<td>Second half of 16th century</td>
<td>16,000,000</td>
<td>700,000</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td>Estimate, all destinations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bril\textsuperscript{116}</td>
<td>4/1/1552-6/3/1553</td>
<td>3,301,239</td>
<td>176,458</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td>Iberian Peninsula</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schneebalg-Perelman\textsuperscript{117}</td>
<td>4/1/1552-5/27/1553</td>
<td>3,524,400</td>
<td>66,250</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
<td>Iberian Peninsula</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schneebalg-Perelman\textsuperscript{118}</td>
<td>1/1/1553-6/30/1553</td>
<td>9,237,000</td>
<td>40,498</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
<td>Iberian Peninsula</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vermeylen\textsuperscript{119}</td>
<td>1/1/1544-12/31/1544</td>
<td>2,368,392</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>0.07%</td>
<td>Germany (exports from Antwerp only)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Export registers and aldermen's account books show substantial shipments of tapestries to the Iberian Peninsula between 1530 and 1560. In order to fill that demand, weavers and merchants had to have initial capital for startup costs or, in the case of established weavers, continued financing for materials. Without a contract and a specific patron, the exorbitant cost of creating tapestries for on spec or open market sales would have been a burden to most workshops. Thus, those merchants who were willing and able to provide such financing did so in order to keep the market at which they purchased items

\textsuperscript{113} Vanwelden, *Productie*, 208-9.

\textsuperscript{114} For the sake of simplicity, all values have been converted into guilders.


\textsuperscript{117} Sophie Schneebalg-Perelman, “Importance économique,” 223.

\textsuperscript{118} Ibid., 225.

\textsuperscript{119} Filip Vermeylen, *De export vanuit de zuidelijke Nederlanden naar Duitsland omstreeks het midden van de 16de eeuw* (Leuven: Onuitgegeven licentiaatsverhandeling, 1989), 112.
The demand for luxury items such as tapestries had skyrocketed in the middle of the sixteenth century, no doubt an effect of the growing importation of silver from South America. Spain especially experienced a great influx of the metal, and its citizens’ increased buying power reflected this new wealth. Philip II purchased large quantities of tapestries during visits to Flanders in the 1540s, and accordingly, export registries from 1553 show that very few ships left the port of Antwerp for Spain without at least a few tapestries as part of their cargo. In 1553 alone, 314 shipments containing tapestries were recorded for Spain and Portugal, with a total value of 530,388 guilders. The tapestries exported to Spain and Portugal in that year were worth an estimated 30 times the value of the paintings sent to the peninsula. Ships heading for the Iberian Peninsula in the mid-1550s were known to carry about four tons of paintings and 70,000 yards of tapestry annually.

An examination of the tapestries exported to the Iberian Peninsula from Antwerp in 1553 provides a good idea of the breakdown of the cities of origin, and therefore of the types of tapestries being exported. The tapestries produced in Oudenaarde constitute almost 75 percent of exports for 1553, 16 percent were of unidentifiable origin, with another significant portion coming from St. Truiden (8
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121 Vermeylen, De export, 96.
122 Vermeylen, Painting, 89.
123 I am grateful to Filip Vermeylen for a conversation regarding these figures in April 2009.
percent); 2 percent were from Brussels, and 1 percent from Tournai. However, while the exports coming from Brussels in 1553 represented only 2 percent of the products, these pieces constituted the bulk of the cost.\textsuperscript{125} The striking difference between price and origin for tapestries from Oudenaarde and Brussels is seen in Table 4, where exports from a two-month period in 1552 have been divided according to city of origin.\textsuperscript{126}

Table 4. Tapestry exports by city of origin from Antwerp to the Iberian Peninsula, April 1, 1552-May 27, 1552.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City of origin</th>
<th>Number of tapestries exported, 4/1/1552-5/27/1552</th>
<th>Percent of total</th>
<th>Average value of 1 ell in guilders</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brussels</td>
<td>5,391</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
<td>7.5 to 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tournai</td>
<td>416</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enghien</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oudenaarde</td>
<td>45,886</td>
<td>65.7%</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ronse</td>
<td>830</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sint-Truiden</td>
<td>7,079</td>
<td>10.1%</td>
<td>4 penningen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not specified</td>
<td>9749</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>69,851</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Table 4 illustrates the dramatic disparity between price and quantity. Oudenaarde’s exports for two months in 1552 accounted for 65 percent of the total number of tapestries exported from Antwerp, but commanded the average

\textsuperscript{125} See Vermeylen, Painting, 89, and ARAB RK 23358-64 for a breakdown of the exports from 1553.

\textsuperscript{126} Vanwelden, Productie, 212.
price of just 6 guilders per ell. On the other hand, Brussels tapestries cost on average 7.5 to 18 guilders per ell (roughly three times the price of Oudenaarde pieceese at the upper end) and comprised only around 7.7 percent of the total exports. Thus, despite being of poorer quality, the Oudenaarde tapestries were by far the choice for exports, given the risk of purchasing more expensive pieces without a guaranteed buyer.

Technical skill was only one factor here; tapestries from Brussels were also typically made from the most expensive materials, using the finest quality silk and gold threads. Verdure scenes that were more colorful but poorer in quality could typically be purchased from an Oudenaarde workshop. Thus it is possible to see the clear differentiation between the high quality and higher price of Brussels tapestries and the cheaper and lesser-quality items woven in Oudenaarde. The Oudenaarde tapestries listed in the Antwerp registers for 1553 were consistently priced at six guilders per Flemish yard, indicating that the tapestries coming from the Oudenaarde workshops must have already been somewhat standardized—whether the same background, from a reused cartoon, would be woven many times, or if sets of borders were woven in advance. Oudenaarde tapestries from this period lend themselves well to this sort of study, as the typical verdure scenes of greenery are very recognizable. Additionally, many of the decorative pieces of tapestry for cushions, tablecloths, and the like would have come from Oudenaarde as well. The tapestries from Brussels,
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127 Vermeylen, Painting, 89; ARAB RK, 23469-74.
however, would not have a standard price because of the possibility for large differences in cost.

The large variation in price for tapestry seen in these data also suggests that tapestries could now be collected by persons of slightly varying (though still relatively wealthy) socioeconomic levels, despite the fact that tapestries were typically luxuries that only royalty could afford. In other words, a wider group of the urban patriciate could now add tapestries to their collections.

**The Export Logs from Antwerp to the Iberian Peninsula, 1553-1554**

The impact of foreign merchants on the market in Antwerp during the reign of Charles V can be gauged from an examination of export records extant in archives today. One set of data, the export logs from Antwerp to the Iberian Peninsula during 1553-1554, is particularly helpful because these logs remain largely intact. Carton 326 at the Chambre des Comptes (Board of Auditors) of the Royal Archives in Brussels consists of eight large volumes of 152 folios, containing a list of all goods leaving Antwerp on which a 2 percent tax was paid before export. The title of the first volume reads:

> Listed in this book are all merchandise that left the city of Antwerp for Spain and Portugal and other parts and that paid two percent. Beginning from January 1552 and ending in June 1553, in the style of Brabant.\(^{128}\)

---

\(^{128}\) “Cuaderno enel qual estan sentadas todas mercaderias que an salido de la ville de Envees para Espana e Portugal e otras partes e an pagado dos po ciento. Enpreca desde prymero de Enero de 1552 estilo de Brabante acaba en fyn de Junyo de 1553.” This is followed by the later addition of a French translation of the title that clarifies the “other parts” referred to in the Spanish title: “Cahier qui contient une liste de toutes les marchandises sorties de la ville d’Anvers pour l’Espagne, le Portugal et d’autres endroits et qui ont payé deux pour cent, depuis le premier janvier 1552 jusqu’à la fin de juin 1553.” At the beginning of the first folio, the title in Spanish is repeated, but with the following addition: “1553. Relacion de las mercaderias que se an cargado en esta ville de Enveres para Bizcaya, Portugal e Andaluzia, Canaria e ysla de la Madera e otros partes e de los nombres de maestras de naos e charrueros en que se cargaron e de lo que rrecabio del valor dellos del dos por ciento Gherhart Gramay prescibidor general de lo ynpuesto del dos por ciento loqual comienca desde primero de Henero año del nacimiento de Nuestro Redentor.”
The eight volumes follow the same format: at the top of a page, the captain of the ship or other type of carrier (carriage, etc.) bearing the items to be exported is listed, then a list of the merchants whose items are on board, with a detailed list of each merchant’s items, including quality, price, and weight, and then on the side a listing of the 2 percent tax that has been levied. Thus the folios provide historians with a complete list for that period, not only of what was exported from Antwerp and to where, but also of who was exporting it and the value of those goods.

The data give us a list of merchants—both foreign and native to the Low Countries—who were exporting goods to the Iberian Peninsula.129 This list consists of nearly 300 Spaniards and Portuguese, two Germans, 17 Italians, and 190 natives, as seen in Table 5. While background information is not known for all of the names listed, making it impossible to know whether they were all merchants or if some of them were acting on behalf of a specific firm, the varied lists of exported items associated with the names listed indicate that most were in fact merchants actively involved in the export industry.

Jhesu Christo de 1553. ... En libras de gruesos moneda de Flandes e de las dichas multiplicadas en lo que montan en libras tornesas.” For the additional inscription, see Léon van der Essen, Contribution, 7-8.
129 For a list of the merchants from the 1553-1554 data, see Appendix 12.
The breakdown of merchants by nationality shows that about 59 percent of export trade to the peninsula was controlled by the Spanish and Portuguese. This finding conflicts with theories that trade with that region was declining under Flemish control while the Spanish and Portuguese focused instead on the West Indies.\(^{130}\) Alongside the foreigners, the list of almost 200 native merchants indicates that they also played a significant role in the export trade of Antwerp during this period.\(^ {131}\) Finally, the data show that it was not primarily native merchants who were exporting domestic goods, but the Spanish and Portuguese.

---

\(^{130}\) Van der Essen, *Contribution*, 18, cites Felix Rachfall, *Wilhelm van Oranien und der nierderlandische Aufstand* (Halle, 1906), vol. 1, 296, as an example of one such theory.

Throughout the folios, there are numerous examples of foreign merchants whose shipments consisted solely of goods from the Low Countries.\textsuperscript{132}

The information on the types of goods exported allows historians to determine whether most exports were domestic or items that had been imported to Antwerp for re-export. Based on the industries present at the time in the Low Countries and on our knowledge of the sorts of items commonly imported to Antwerp, it is possible to ascertain which items in these shipments were domestic.\textsuperscript{133} For the export data from 1553-1554, there do not seem to be any specific merchants (or nationalities) who had monopolies on the export of specific goods, with the exception of the Fuggers, who shipped leather to the Baltic region. \textsuperscript{134}

\textsuperscript{132} These shipments led van der Essen to claim that Antwerp could no longer be called a city of “transit-trade” after 1553-1554, which is quite contrary to statements made by many modern historians, including Braudel (Van der Essen, Contribution, 26-27). However, he does not include any data about when he believes a change occurred in the balance of trade in Antwerp, or if, in fact, any change took place to shift the city’s trade from import and re-export to primarily the export of domestic goods.

\textsuperscript{133} Among the most commonly exported domestic items were canvas, cloth, linen, ribbons, draperies, cushions, tablewares, haberdashery, tapestries, glass, sugar, luxury items (jewelry, paper, books, metalwork), weapons, soap, glue, dyestuffs, and supplies for ships. Most native exports were finished products rather than raw materials, which were primarily imported and then re-exported. Commonly exported raw materials included wax and fruits (from France); metal for bell-casting (from Germany);\textsuperscript{133} copper (from Russia, Germany, and the Baltic States); skins, leather, tin, and lead (all from England), amber (from Scandinavia and Russia); alum, silk, satin, and velvet cotton (from Italy); household utensils (from Germany); and planks or chopped pieces of wood (from France, Russia, the Baltic States, and Scandinavia). See Van der Essen, Contribution, 26. For the import and export of metals, see H. Kellenbenz, ed., Precious Metals in the Age of Expansion (Stuttgart: Klett-Cotta, 1981).

\textsuperscript{134} The following list demonstrates not only that merchants’ shipments were often quite varied, but also that multiple merchants exported the same goods: “Le marchand espagnol Diego de Santa Cruz exporte de la garrance, de la toile de Hollande, de la toile de Holland, de la serge de Lille, de la toile de Rouen, de la mercerie, du lin, de la toile de fil crue, des nappes et des serviettes. des rubans de soie, des tapis d’Audenarde, de la futaine d’Augsburg. Alonso de la Torre charge à Anvers des lames d’épées de Milan, des clavicordions des toiles crues, de la tapisserie, des draps “outre-fin,”
Of the large amounts of tapestry included in these export data, it is likely that the bulk of it was not high-quality tapestry (such as that from Brussels), but instead included a large number of smaller woven pieces, such as tablecloths, chair and bench coverings, curtains, small carpets and rugs, mats of various size, and personal clothing pieces (many of which listed Tournai as their city of origin), in addition to the more traditional hautelisse tapestries. The repeated mention, for example, of “verdura de Sint Truyden” and “tapicera de verdura”\footnote{Van der Essen, \textit{Contribution}, 22.} most likely refer to inexpensive tablecloths or other smaller pieces, to be discussed further in chapter 2.

Each tapestry listed in the export records was qualified as either common (standard, or average quality), fine, or Gobelins (very high quality), and the majority came from Oudenaarde, Tournai, Brussels, Enghien, Diest, and St. Truiden. As Table 6 shows, a wide variety of tapestries, with different qualifiers, was exported from Antwerp.

del la toile d’Audenarde, de la futaine de Rouen, des livres, des nappes et des serviettes, de l’étain, de la toile de Hollande, du fil de fer, des clefs, des orgues, de la mercerie. L’Italien Giovanni Battista Affaitadi envoie dans la péninsule ibérique des cuirs de vache, de la toile, du drap, du laiton, des coffres remplis de vêtements, de l’étain, des chandeliers, du camelot, de la toile de Brabant et de Hollande, etc. Le marchand flamand Hendrik Van Onse envoie de la toile de Brabant, des corbeilles de fileuse, de la mercerie, des pendules, des lames d’épée de Milan, du fil, de la colle, du lin. L’Anversois Willem Van Immerseel expédie de la toile d’Audenarde, de la futaine de Bruges, des chaudrons, des feuilles d’or et d’argent battu, des ustensiles de cuisine,” (van der Essen, \textit{Contribution}, 28). Unfortunately, van der Essen does not provide any archival citations for these lists, so it is not clear if they are meant to represent items included in a single shipment together, or if they are just examples of items shipped by each merchant.
Table 6. Descriptors of Types of Tapestry Recorded in the 1553 Antwerp Export Registers for Exports to the Iberian Peninsula

| Tapestry curtains, verdure | Curtains, verdure |
| Tapestry coverlet         | Tapestry bedclothes |
| Tapestry tablecloth       | Tapestry door coverings |
| Tapestries                | Verdure tapestries  |
| Oudenaarde tapestries     | Brussels tapestries |
| Diest tapestries          | Herenthal tapestries |
| St.-Truiden tapestries    | Tournai tapestries |


In some instances, certain tapestries within a group were recorded as “large,” while others were labeled “small.” For the 1553 exports, some pieces listed in the otherwise nondescript “Tapestries” category were labeled small. That the labels occurred within a specific group in which not all tapestries had labels may indicate that those particular ones were considered significantly smaller or larger than the more conventionally sized pieces. It may also mean that tapestries were not consistently described when recorded. The possibility that there may have been far more smaller-sized tapestries than previously thought is important in trying to determine—without much extant archival evidence—what was sold in the Tapissierspand.

Shipping the Tapestries Abroad

Although in general sea routes were preferred by the middle of the sixteenth century, trade between Antwerp and cities in northern Italy via overland routes still remained popular for the transport of heavier items and
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136 Goris, Étude, 303.
textiles. The estimates of the value of the overland routes are quite astonishing. These routes accounted for almost 18 percent of the value of all exports from the Low Countries, including sea routes, or an approximate value of 3,567,000 guilders.\textsuperscript{137} Because of the value of goods still being transported overland, there was room for plenty of commercial competition. Of the approximate 300 shipping or trading firms involved, Brulez calculated that 56 firms were Flemish, accounting for 23 percent of the total value of the exports; 185 Italian firms represented 63 percent of the total value, with about 31 percent destined for Venice; and 59 firms of Spanish, French, German, or English origin represented 14 percent of the value.\textsuperscript{138} These numbers indicate that Flemish groups were exporting slightly more goods than most other firms. Although the Italians had more people (or firms) working in the industry, the Flemish proportionally had a larger percentage of the total value. Part of the difference can be accounted for through an examination of the types of goods exported by the different groups. While the Flemish exported a high number of valuable items, such as tapestries, the Italians frequently exported high volumes of much cheaper items, such as unfinished wool or raw materials.

\textit{Chronic Problems with Shipping}

Shipping tapestries either by land or sea always presented the possibility of trouble. On land, silks and cloths were packed into cases very tightly, and cords tied around the bales could cut into the fabrics and damage them.

\textsuperscript{138} Brulez, “L’exportation,” 465-78.
Melchisedech van Hooren’s *Een paardt trekt een wagen beladen mit een ton, twee balen en een kist* (seen in figure 15) gives an idea of how the cases were precariously stacked. Poorly covered or protected cases could be damaged by rain. Overland routes were also dependent on fair weather and roads clear of snow, fallen trees, and other detritus. Severe weather in winter could delay shipments for weeks, if not months, and icy roads or overflowing riverbanks made it impossible for carts to pass safely. Complaints from the van der Molens’ Italian customers were common. The van der Molens switched shipping firms several times in the 1530s and 1540s in an effort to find the best options for their customers. For example, in 1541 they ceased using the Lederer company because “the company had become too rich and wished to be served, not to serve.” At the same time, shipping by sea was equally problematic; there was no advanced warning of severe storms, and barges on the rivers could become water-soaked, allowing for mold or rot within the wooden cases, which was particularly problematic for delicate fabrics such as silks, and tapestries. The shippers, in these cases, could be held accountable for anywhere from 50 percent to the entire cost of the damaged goods. Additionally, because of the boats’ frequent stops en route, where they were sometimes detained for several weeks at a time, shipping by sea could take far longer than overland.
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139 Edler, “The van der Molens,” 139 n. 248: “Li sono un male che sono tropo richi, et non vorebene servire ma esser serviti” (SAA Brievenkopij, fols. 34 vo., 40 ro., 177 vo.).
140 Edler, “The van der Molens,” 137-38; SAA Brievenkopij, fos. 63 vo., 116 ro., 119, 159 vo. Edler also notes that the van der Molens, perhaps unlike other firms, charged only for damages accrued by rain, but that there is an account in the Certificatieboek from 1544 in which Giovanni Battista Danon demanded and collected payment from several Lucchese merchants in Antwerp for damages accrued from satins and silks that were drenched in water because the boatmen were not careful enough: “Y avoit du dommage advenue comme il apparut par la negligence des naveurs par moillieure d’eau sur Rhin” (p. 138 n. 241; see also SAA Brievenkopij, fols. 12 ro.-13 vo.).
Because of the high costs associated with shipping, IOU’s, or a *billet à ordre*, were sometimes exchanged between ship captains and charterers. If the captain did not have enough money immediately available to pay for the appropriate outfitting of his ship, he would approach the customer for a loan in the form of an advance for a portion of the shipping costs to be accrued. The following is a basic example of this type of note:

22 January 1535
I, Pedro de la Palma, residing in Brabant, say that I owe you, Francisco de Barros, the sum of 17 pounds flemish, which will serve to clear the accounts I had with you. I promise and am forced to pay the said sum to you, the aforementioned Francisco de Barros, at the next fair of Santa Quaresma without any contradiction. And as a sign of truth, I certify this to be my signature. Dated in Antwerp, July 10, 1534.  

The following excerpt from another promissory note provides an example of a freight charge cancelled because of shipwreck:

Genoa, December 24, 1182
I, Guillem of Tarascon of Aste, give you, Arnaut of Avignon of Narbonne, by [title of] donation among the living, the entire freight charge which was shipwrecked in the grau of Norbonne. The aforesaid donation I promise you, etc. Done on the shore, on that day.

In some instances, the seller might have to assume not only the payment for shipping, but also the risk of lost or damaged property; in others, the
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141 Goris, *Étude*, 340; source: SAA Streyt, fol. 7.—Vendredi, 22 janvier 1535, which reads: “Veneris 22 Januarii 1535. Yo, Pedro de la Palma, estante en Brabante, digo que es verdad que devo a vos, Francisco de Barros, la suma de dies y syete libras de groesos moneda de Flandres las quales son por renescimiento de todas cuentas que he tenydo con ell, la qual diche suma prometio y me obligo de pagar a vos, el dicho Francisco de Barros, o al portador a los pagos de la feria de Sante Quaresma que viene sin contradixion alguna. Y por que es verdad firme esta de my nombre. Fecho en Enveres, los 10 de julio 1534.”


143 One such example in which the seller was required to assume all shipping and loss costs occurred in 1561, when King Eric of Sweden wrote to his agents, Hendrich Hambach and Arvid Trolle, that they should purchase the *History of Emperor Octavian* that they had found for him,
shipper needed to cover costs up front. All of these details had to be worked out in advance.\(^{144}\)

**Growth of the Tapestry Industry under Royal Patronage**

Despite the important role that the foreign merchant communities played in expanding the tapestry export business, the domestic royal patronage that tapestry production enjoyed throughout the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries no doubt also contributed to expanding the export trade as well. Charles the Bold’s sumptuous courts fostered a growing interest in the luxury arts, which was also embraced by his successors, Maximilian I (though reluctantly at first) and Charles V. The growing popularity of portable grandeur also boosted tapestry sales, as members of the royal family and the uppermost levels of civilian society demanded more tapestries for a variety of purposes, such as commemorating victories and famous events, influencing their guests’ opinions of them, or encouraging their troops on the battlefield.

The aspect of portable grandeur within Burgundian court culture was instrumental in helping tapestry to flourish. Unlike smaller objects, the larger size of most tapestries could provide a life-size depiction of whichever allegory, myth, or historical event the owner viewed as relating to his own life, actions, or family. Tapestries could also be easily taken down and replaced with others from the court’s wardrobes, depending on the event or time of year. They might be

---

\(^{144}\) For an example of one such shipping agreement, see Appendix 13.
hung outdoors to mark a joyous entry, or they could be installed to completely cover the walls of a room and thereby signify the importance or gravity of the event held there. Because of the court’s constant travel, the tapestries might be replaced four or five times a year, turning otherwise grim surroundings into what Huzinga calls dreamlike “textile narrative spaces.”

These objects served an important function: the owner's surroundings could be transformed into a mirror of his own life and actions, or into any other scene that he might want, with artworks such as tapestries being used as what Franke and Welzel refer to as easily changed “props.” For example, in 1448 Jehan de Haynin, the lord of Louvignies, described seeing a series of tapestries that represented various conquests, triumphs, and alliances, which no doubt left him with a bolstered impression of their owner:

In the hall where the sideboard was situated were hung the tapestries of the great battle of Liège, where Duke John of Burgundy and Duke William of Bavaria, count of Hainault, defeated the Liègeois near Othée in the year 1408. ... The hall ... of the chamberlains was hung with a superb tapestry showing the coronation of King Clovis, called Louis, the first Christian king of France; the renewal of the alliance between him and King Gundobad of Burgundy; the wedding of King Clovis to Gundobad’s niece; his baptism with the Holy Ampula; his conquest of Soissons; how the stag showed him the way across a river which he had not dared to cross; and how the angel gave an azure cloth with three fleurs-de-lys in gold to a hermit, who gave it

---


146 Franke and Welzel, “Palaces and Tents,” 57. The task of hanging, taking down, rolling, packing, storing, and transporting tapestries is certainly not easy; it is, however, quite manageable when it can be delegated to a large staff, as was the case in Burgundy and elsewhere, and it was preferable to having no decoration (and therefore no pictorial messages displayed) at all.
to the queen, who passed it on to said King Clovis to bear for his coat of arms. 147

This aspect of tapestry installation had not changed significantly by the mid-1500s. Although Frans Hogenberg’s etching of The Abdication of Emperor Charles V in Brussels in 1555 (figure 16) includes imagined tapestries, the massive items lining each wall and even covering the door nonetheless convey the complete sense of enclosure at such an important event. In Theodore Gramineus’s 1587 Wedding Party of Johann Wilhem of Jülich, Cleve, and Berg watching performances in the dining hall (figure 17) the tone is decidedly more jovial than that at Charles V’s abdication, but the covered walls convey the same idea—namely, that the event and the people attending are very important, and completely separated from the outside world.

While many objects commissioned or purchased by members of the royal courts were obviously valuable, even those items that looked less impressive were frequently very costly. A case in point is the millefleur tapestry shown in figure 18 that was woven for Philip the Good in Brussels around 1466. At first glance, the tapestry could be mistaken for Oudenaarde verdure. However, it is filled with expensive gold thread, which would have made it far more costly to produce. It is also replete with extremely detailed leaves, curling vines, and tendrils of

147 Jehan de Haynin, Mémoires (1468), ed. D. D. Brouwers (Liège: Cormaux, 1905-1906), as cited in Marina Belozerskaya, Luxury Arts of the Renaissance (London: Thames and Hudson, 2005), 231. See also Barty Phillips, Tapestry (London: Phaidon, 1994), 57, which quotes the following from William Harrison, in The Chronicles of England (1577): “In the houses of knights and gentlemen, merchantmen and some other wealthy citizens, it is not so geson [rare] to behold generally their great provision of tapestry, turkey work ... and fine linen. ... Many farmers and skilled tradesmen garnish their joined beds with tapestries and silk hangings and fine napery whereby the wealth of the country do infinitely appear.”
plants that snake together, which would have called for the weaver to change the weft threads frequently, making the tapestry even more labor-intensive than others of similar size. Thus the highly detailed plants are actually representations of Philip’s wealth and authority. While the most expensive tapestry commissions typically contained several large and highly detailed figures, in this tapestry the greenery has been supplemented with his coat of arms in the center of the scene, leaving no need for figures to serve as representations of his good actions or power.¹⁴⁸

**Royal Patronage further Afield: Tapestries at the Court of Henry VIII**

Royal families outside of the southern Netherlands nurtured the tapestry industry as well. The inventory taken in 1547 following the death of Henry VIII shows an astounding number of tapestries—2,450, not including embroideries or other wall hangings—in his royal collections. The list includes approximately 300 sets of at least three tapestries each, sixty-five pairs, and the remainder as individual tapestries to be displayed independently. An additional 300 tapestries were described as furnishings.¹⁴⁹ The tapestries in this massive collection were not carefully selected by one person, but rather were purchased to fill what Campbell refers to as “practical, aesthetic, and political”¹⁵⁰ roles over a period of at least 200 years. Although Henry VIII did inherit a large number of older tapestries upon ascending to the throne, he was also responsible for purchasing

many more for the royal collection. The varying ways in which each tapestry was recorded in the inventory indicate how the collection was assembled by different people, at different times, and for drastically different purposes.\textsuperscript{151}

However, although the medium of tapestry enjoyed significant royal patronage throughout the sixteenth century, the increasing portion of tapestries woven on spec drove the expansion of the export industry. The construction the new \textit{Tapissierspand} to support this growth will be discussed in Chapter 2.

\textsuperscript{151} T. Campbell, \textit{Henry VIII}, ix.
Chapter 2: The Emergence of the Tapissierspand

This chapter discusses the ways in which the new Tapissierspand functioned to abate risk for both weavers and merchants. It will analyze the construction of the new building and its day-to-day operations; examine the connections between cities and families; and discuss how the Tapissierspand functioned as a location for the assessment of quality, a site for negotiations, and a place for the extension of credit.

The opening of the Tapissierspand signified that the interest in tapestries, like the Schilderspand had warranted for the sale of paintings, had increased to the point where it could support its own sales hall.¹ The construction of this specialized marketplace, the Tapissierspand, was a costly undertaking for the city of Antwerp, but the new building also offered the potential for increased sales in tapestry that would boost Antwerp’s economy. To facilitate and expedite construction of this unique structure, the city, in a public-private partnership, turned to the principal builder of an ever-urbanizing Antwerp: Gilbert Van Schoonbeke. But the Tapissierspand was not a singular construction project; rather, it was the centerpiece of a massive redevelopment project for the entire southeast quadrant of the city. The distribution of land in Antwerp designated as commercial, residential, civic, and religious was clearly evident until the mid-1500s. Certain areas of the city were intended for very specific functions and, in a

¹ For the development of the Schilderspand, see Filip Vermeylen, Painting for the Market: Commercialization of Art in Antwerp’s Golden Age (Leuven: Brepols, 2003).
sense, became larger more permanent settlements within the city for merchants or homeowners, rather than being grouped in small clusters throughout the city. Part of the story of the Tapissierspand, however, seems at odds with what the merchants and weavers were trying to accomplish. As has been noted, feelings of hyper-vigilance permeated all levels of life in Antwerp. But the opening of a new building which cost a great deal to construct, in an extremely risky industry, seems at odds with the idea of reducing risk. The first half of the sixteenth century had seen repeated stressors. While the city had benefited economically from the influx of foreigners and trading, that influx put strain on the city’s infrastructure and also created two distinct groups in Antwerp’s civic and religious matters: new and old. Antwerp’s heavy reliance on the export market also made it susceptible to changes or fluctuations in trade. Furthermore, although some were benefiting from the speculations in real estate, rents became very high and therefore often unmanageable for some. Finally, the precarious financial situation of the Habsburgs, and their increasing debt, was

---

2 These new residential areas, though sometimes further from the city center as cities expanded and needed new land, were still created in areas that the developers expected to become popular. Industry, however, could be relegated to the more undesirable or unattractive parts of a city. Lees and Hohenberg note, “In autocratic St. Petersburg or in republican Venice, as in Bordeaux, industry was relegated to outlying districts. Residential areas, particularly new ones, acquired a clear and often contrasting social personality.” P. M. Hohenberg and L. H. Lees, The Making of Urban Europe 1000-1994 (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1995), 156. For discussion of the city’s efforts at urbanism in the early 1500s, see Augustin Thys, “La creation d’un quartier à Anvers en 1516,” Recueil des Bulletins de la Propreté 20 (Antwerp, 1888): 3-20, and Hugo Soly, “Huurprijzen en reele opbrengst van arbeiderswoningen te Antwerpen in de eerste helft der 16e eeuw,” Bijdragen tot de Geschiedenis inzonderheid van het oud hertogdom Brabant 53 (1970): 81-90. For a more general discussion of urban renewal in Antwerp, see Augustin Thys, Historiek der straten en openbare plaatsen van Antwerpen (Antwerp: Kennes, 1893).

beginning to trickle down to all parts of society. These economic worries, in conjunction with memories of the wars of the late 1400s, and the attempted invasions of Antwerp, like that of van Rossom, created an environment that was stressful enough.⁴ Thus, any ways in which risk could be reduced were a welcome change, and it was this type of worry that shaped the *Tapissierspand*. This chapter will also look at the ways in which the *Tapissierspand* actively worked to centralize the industry, increase confidence and security, and effectively reduce risk in a trade that was more or less full of risk. The cost of raw materials, looms and wages, in combination with the start-up costs of weaving on spec, should have been enough to dissuade most from participating in the industry. Instead, the *Tapissierspand* allowed the industry to flourish.

**A New Marketplace for Tapestries: the Royal Decree of 1549**

In 1549 a royal decree proclaiming plans for a new *pand* was announced and construction began in the southeastern region of the city, far away from much of the economic infrastructure of Antwerp. The decree stated that tapestry was a particularly valuable commodity in Antwerp, and that the Emperor had a keen interest in regulating and taxing its production.⁵ It also indicated that the discussion of building a new *pand* specifically for tapestries had been ongoing for some time, perhaps beginning just a few years after the move to *De Vette Hinne* in 1517. This observation suggests that the primary motivation for a new building was not the impending demolition of the Dominican friary (which did not occur

---

⁵ SAA Manuscrit. Serie van Valckemisse, B, fol. 132.
but rather a recognition of the immediate need for additional space to serve a rapidly growing trade. Nevertheless, fearing a loss of sales, dealers were extremely reluctant to move to the new location.

The initial efforts to rally the city to construct a new sales hall specifically for tapestry were spearheaded by both the magistrates and guild members tired of the cramped exhibition spaces in the Dominican Pand. Some artisans also saw the possible closure of the church’s pand as providing the impetus needed to help them secure more suitable space. Until 1549, even after the departure of the St. Luke’s guild members, the weavers clashed with members of the St. Nicholas guild who sold various other luxury goods from the Dominican Pand. The importance of the tapestry trade to the city’s economy impelled the city magistrates to begin thinking about constructing a new building. Even though the city was still struggling with debts accrued in the previous decade, the loss of sales should the weavers and merchants settle elsewhere would be too great a

---

6 The demolition of the old Dominican church in 1571 was primarily a result of overcrowding and the limited church space available in the small building; a larger Dominican church, Sint-Pauluskerk, was built on the same space immediately following the old church’s demolition. However, there are confusing references to the operation of the Dominican Pand through 1581. The tapestry dealers and weavers had been gone for almost three decades at that point, and most of the members of St. Luke’s Guild had moved to the Our Lady’s Pand. No suggestions are given as to location in records that refer to the Dominican Pand after 1571. For example, Ewing states that “the Pand remained a market for jewelers, tapestry weavers, and goldsmiths until its demise in the 1550s, under competition from larger and more specialized panden. The Dominican Pand was dismantled in 1581, although art was still exhibited at the site in the seventeenth century.” See Dan Ewing, “Marketing Art in Antwerp, 1460-1560: Our Lady’s Pand,” The Art Bulletin 72, 4 (1990): 560, citing J. M. Montias, who refers to the site as the Prekerenpant in Artists and Artisans in Delft: A Socio-Economic Study of the Seventeenth Century (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1982), 210-11. Thus, it is difficult to determine what was sold from 1551 to 1581, and at what specific site. In 1517 all tapestry sales and many of the silver and goldsmiths were moved to other nearby spaces, so there could not have been much merchandise to sell by 1581.


blow, particularly if foreign merchants left and stopped shipping through Antwerp’s port. The advice of one entrepreneur in particular, Gilbert Van Schoonbeke, was sought on the building because of the favor he had gained with Mary of Hungary (by fulfilling her request for new, cheaper methods of building) and with the city magistrates.\(^9\)

**Gilbert Van Schoonbeke’s Role in the New Tapiesserspand**

Van Schoonbeke began his business career by investing a small amount of capital in some land within the city, purchasing a few houses, reselling them, and then reinvesting the profits in a new project. His role as a wealthy and aggressive land developer within the city was soon very well established,\(^10\) and he became

\(^9\) Their willingness to rely on his advice is a good example of Piet Loembaerde’s description of the government: “The city administration, which was powerful and wealthy at that time, provided freedom and many opportunities for enterprising building contractors, traders, merchants and bankers. There was a high degree of tolerance towards new ideas and trade practices. ... Nevertheless, the municipal authority exercised little initiative of its own in the domain of urban planning or in the development of public spaces.” See Piet Lombaerde, “Antwerp in Its Golden Age: ‘One of the Largest Cities in the Low Countries’ and ‘One of the Best Fortified in Europe,’” in *Urban Achievement in Early Modern Europe: Golden Ages in Antwerp, Amsterdam, and London*, ed. Patrick O’Brien (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001), 100.

\(^10\) Soly described the traditional scholarly approach to the Early Modern merchant with regard to investments and capital as the classical idea that “the majority of merchants and industrialists in modern times have been ambitious to acquire property and thus to repudiate as soon as possible the status to which they owe their rise in the social scale.” See Hugo Soly, “Het veraad der 16de-eeuwse burgerij: een mythe?” *Tijdschrift voor geschiedenis* 86 (Groningen, 1973): 262-80, reprinted as “The Betrayal of the Sixteenth-Century Bourgeoisie: A Myth? Some Considerations of the Behavior Pattern of the Merchants of Antwerp in the Sixteenth Century,” *Acta Historiae Neerlandica: Studies on the History of the Netherlands* 8 (The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1975), 31-49. A good example of this theory is found in Jean Sentou’s *La Fortune immobilière des Toulousains et la Révolution française* (Paris: Bibliothèque Nationale, 1970), 174: “Dans le mesure ou le profit cherché a s’investir presque uniquement dans la rente fonciere, comme le negoce nous en fournit un bon example, le capitalisme industriel. L’inflation, au lieu de fournir des capitaux neufs qui auraient pu orienter les investissements dans un sens novateur, a ete utilisee par la grande bourgeoisie toulousaine dans le sens le plus conservateur qui fut, c’est-a-dire l’acroissement de son capital imobilier.” Soly argues that the use of the term “trahison de la bourgeoisie” (taken from Pierre Jeannin, *Merchants of the Sixteenth Century*, trans. Paul Fittingoff (New York: Harper and Row, 1972), 175-76) to indicate a change from “the economically profitable employment of capital in commerce and industry, to ‘pernicious’ investment in real property, i.e., in capital whose aim was no more than inertly to accumulate interest (rent)” —which is in keeping with the traditional viewpoint—is not warranted (Soly,
one of the primary figures in the urbanization of Antwerp during this period.  
Along with the expansion of city streets and the revitalization of several canals, he 
became involved with the construction of public buildings and new city 
fortifications, including the city walls, five large entry gates, and nine bastions.  
At one point in his career, Van Schoonbeke not only controlled the city’s brewing 
industry and its building trade but also had contracts to distribute provisions to 
Dutch troops. 11 Van Schoonbeke was not particularly interested in the new pand 
per se; rather, he saw an opportunity to develop a whole area and make more 
money along the way.  

Antwerp’s urban renewal, advanced in part by Gilbert Van Schoonbeke, is 
a clear example of how need drove building programs. New warehouses and 
sales halls such as the Tapiessierspand were built when existing structures were 
no longer adequate to support the level of commerce taking place in the city. The

---

“Betrayal,” 31). According to Soly, the alternate way to consider the situation is that the 
merchants’ attitudes towards capital and investment changed “only from the moment when 
commercial or industrial opportunities in the economic center where the entrepreneur was 
established were severely limited by internal or external factors” (p. 31).  
11 Soly, Urbanisme. The supply of provisions to Dutch troops was an especially innovative 
endeavor for Van Schoonbeke; while typically food and other supplies were provided to the troops 
by local merchants, this was a risky transaction because troops would often mobilize quickly, 
without notice, and the merchants were often left without payment for their products. Van 
Schoonbeke secured an exclusive contract with 13 groups of soldiers stationed along the French 
border, and, although the project required immense startup capital, his company was able to 
recoup nearly 60% of the investment costs in only one transaction in 1557. Unlike in his building 
campaigns, Van Schoonbeke was not able to provide his own raw materials and was dependent on 
merchants and farmers in smaller towns to provide his supplies. See Catharina Lis and Hugo 
Soly, “Subcontracting in Guild-Based Export Trades,” in Guilds, Innovation, and the European 
Economy, 1400-1800, eds. Stephan R. Epstein and Maarten Roy Prak (Cambridge: Cambridge 
University Press, 2008), 81. Van Schoonbeke’s company even shared some of the profits with the 
independent merchants or suppliers in very small towns, such as their oxen supplier in Lier, 
Grommaer Puttaert; see Hugo Soly, “Een Antwerpse Compagnie voor de 
levensmiddelenbevoorraad van het leger in de Nederlanden in de 16de eeuw,” Bijdragen en 
Thus, this is perhaps one instance in which Van Schoonbeke’s monopoly benefited other workers 
in a community.
construction of the new *Bourse* in 1531, for example, is a clear indicator of the city’s economic success at that time. Foreign merchant groups constructed their own headquarters when their populations within the city grew, and new residential areas were created to house the increasing number of city-dwellers.\(^{12}\) These campaigns allowed cities not only to revitalize their terrain, but also to exert a further degree of control over their residents by governing where certain activities could and could not take place. The more ordered and organized a city’s layout was, the easier it was for the government to maintain control over its citizens. Those in charge of the building projects also maintained (or obtained) a certain degree of power or authority over those living in the area.\(^{13}\)

**Potential Sites for the New Pand**

The magistrates developed four possible building options, each of which faced opposition from various sources.\(^{14}\) The first option was to install the weavers and merchants on the second floor of the nearby stock exchange, the benefits being better air circulation (because of the building’s open air gallery) and the presence of a large staircase to the second floor. The city also stated that

---

\(^{12}\) While Antwerp is the focus of this study, it is by no means the sole example of such renewal or redistribution in Europe during the late fifteenth and sixteenth centuries. In her own comparison of metropolitan Italian cities, Calabi comments that, “In Florence ... the government, business and manufacturing districts, as well as the neighbourhoods where the city’s most important families lived, came to be separated during more or less the same period. ... The loggia for the central silk and gold market [in] 1547-51 ... was only slightly later than the rebuilding of the Drapperia and the Ruga degli Orefici. ... In Seville, in 1582, the making of major local and international deals in the courtyard and on the wide steps of the cathedral finally became unacceptable. A decision had to be reached, and the outcome was the new Casa Lonja, which reoriented, re-articulated, and subdivided the central urban spaces” (see Donatella Calabi, *The Market and the City: Square, Street and Architecture in Early Modern Europe* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2004), 13).

\(^{13}\) However, the ruling body’s power over growing marketplaces did derive partly from a market’s ability to attract a diverse clientele, bringing in a continuous supply of money and a steady (and preferably large) supply of goods for sale.

two small cranes could be installed to help with raising and lowering the


tapestries to and from the second floor.\textsuperscript{15} A second alternative was to set up a


long row of shops in the middle of the \textit{Meir}, continuing on both sides of the street


for 45 feet. A third was a new location for the weavers in the \textit{Nieuwstad} area in


the northern part of town, and the fourth option, the one eventually selected, was


a new building in the \textit{Schuttershoven} area, relatively far from the traditional


trading areas of town around the \textit{Burcht} and the Exchange.\textsuperscript{16}


\textbf{Development of the Schuttershoven}

Mary of Hungary and the city magistrates were eager to have Van

Schoonbeke’s advice on where the new building would be best situated. His

recommendation of the \textit{Schuttershoven} was based on the fact that the area would

see a large increase in property value because of the new influx of commerce and

residential buildings. Although the \textit{Nieuwstad} was perhaps better situated for

transport of the tapestries via water, Van Schoonbeke argued that just as many

tapestries were transported overland as by sea. The remaining ideas were

discarded as too complicated, and Van Schoonbeke argued that many would

object to the new buildings in the \textit{Meir}, stating that the location’s beauty and

spaciousness would be overwhelmed by the introduction of new commerce.\textsuperscript{17}

\textsuperscript{15} Ibid. 445. This seems problematic from the start because the city had already installed the

painters’ market, or \textit{Schilderpand}, on the second floor of the bourse in 1540. Surely space would

have been an issue for the competing groups, particularly in light of the the size of the tapestry

merchants’ wares.

\textsuperscript{16} Soly, \textit{Urbanisme}, 222; see also Donnet, ”Les tapisseries,” 445. A discussion of possibly building

a commercial area for tapestries in the \textit{Meir} is found in SAA, Icon P 13/16a–d.

\textsuperscript{17} Van Schoonbeke argues that ”la beaut et spaisosité du lieu, laquelle leur semble que l’on ne

doibve deformar ... ne aussy hoster ceste commodité et plaisir a la communauté des merchants,

lesquelz, pour estre le lieu prochain de la bourse, y se viennent recreer et expatier en temps

d’este” (Soly, \textit{Urbanisme}, 222). With regard to the \textit{Meir}, Van Schoonbeke stated that “te
Van Schoonbeke’s efforts to overhaul the city of Antwerp were not welcomed by all parties. To permit development of the area around the Schuttershoven, the current residents, primarily the shooters’ (schutters’) guild and the Sint-Elisabethgasthuis (a hospital), needed to vacate their property. The main concern that these groups presented to Van Schoonbeke and the city magistrates was whether or not they would be given equally good land in exchange. Being exiled to the outskirts of the city or to unsuitable or relatively inaccessible land was understandably unacceptable to them. When the city magistrates offered a training ground in the northeastern part of the Nieuwstad, the guild initially rejected the proposal. Charles V became involved, though, and the guild agreed to the move provided that several conditions, including proximity to a new hospital, were met. After much argument, the land was transferred to the city for Van Schoonbeke’s building project. Along with directing construction of the Pand itself, Van Schoonbeke also facilitated a project to make the existing area around the Pand—the Schuttershoven—, as seen in the map of the area in figure 20, easily accessible to buyers and sellers.

bedachten (was) dat het voirs. concept wesen zal tot descontemente van veele personen vuytdyen zij aldaer hebben een schoon open locht ende plaetse aldaer zij hen wandelinge oft spaseringe hebben.” For this and Van Schoonbeke’s commentary regarding the beauty of the Meir, see SAA, T 726, fol. 21 vo.

18 With regard to the Gasthuis in particular, Houghton notes that the nuns had already had several run-ins with Van Schoonbeke over possession of their land: “Van Schoonbeke had maintained great interest in the southeastern quadrant since 1543, when he and Hubrecht de But had bought the large parcel there from the Carmelite Monastery. It is not difficult to see his influence behind the scenes when in 1547 van der Heyden [an old friend of Van Schoonbeke’s], in effect, bribed the prioress with a gilded cup decorated with 50 gold coins, 100 gilders in cash, and other items, to sell 520 rods to Jacob Wofflaert. Shortly thereafter, Wolffaert sold one half the land to Van Schoonbeke, and most of the rest in parcels to van de Heyden, de But and Stadseecretaris Willem van der Ryt. Van der Ryt, in turn, received handsome gifts from Van Schoonbeke for his role in the transaction” (“Meat, Social Status,” 177, n. 184. Houghton cites Soly, Urbanisme, 176).

19 Soly, Urbanisme, 234.
and thus more enticing to merchants reluctant to leave the city’s center of business. For example, entirely new streets were organized, as seen on the map of Antwerp street development from 1500 to 1600 in figure 21. One street, where the Comedieplaats lies today, ran from the west end of the Pand to the large Huidevetterstraat, while another, the Arenbergstraat, running east to west, was more than 12 meters wide and connected to the Lange Gasthuistraat. Access via wide roads would ensure easier delivery of merchandise to the Pand and facilitate the shipping of items once they were sold. Van Schoonbeke once again received praise from both Mary of Hungary and the city for these urban improvements and was asked for further advice on how to continue the urbanization of the Schuttershoven area. With the continued growth of the city, new residential and commercial areas developed, and the quarter surrounding the new Pand soon became as viable as the previous market’s surroundings.

---

20 Van Schoonbeke’s role as go-to developer for the city of Antwerp was no doubt a very profitable one. Houghton has discovered archival evidence alluding to this and states, “the second item listed in the inventory of Gilbert Van Schoonbeke’s goods at his death is the authorization and imperial approbation of the contracts for these projects...This is the same set of contracts and letters referenced in SAA T 16, Collegiale Actenboek, 1551-53, fols. 29 ro., 29 vo. ...Van Schoonbeke’s inventory itself provides an insight into changing values in 16th-century Antwerp. Such inventories traditionally began with the most important object in a given room, and often with the most important room in a given home or building. Therefore, the first listed item was frequently a significant work of art or furniture—a material object embodying special monetary and/or symbolic value. Van Schoonbeke’s inventory begins with twee coffer (two boxes or cases) in which were held copies of his numerous contracts with the city and other agencies. The listing of this wealth on paper first in Van Schoonbeke’s home stands in contrast to earlier inventories and is itself emblematic of financial change,” in Houghton, “Meat, Social Status,” 178-9, n. 186. See also “De Inventaris van het sterfhuis van Gillebert Van Schoonbeke,” in Antwerpsch Archievenblad, vol. 17 (Antwerp: Guillaume van Merlen, 1870), 180.

21 Soly, Urbanisme, 223.

22 For the other suggestions, see SAA IB 2141, nrs. 51, 100-1, KK 2141.
Construction of the Building

The project was initially begun by the city, and it was anticipated that the cost of the new building could be covered by profits from the sale of some city lands. Mary of Hungary asked the city magistrates to revise the list of municipal properties currently for sale and to put on hold those properties that would not net as much money for the city’s finances and thus for the new project. But the profits from land sales fell short and the city was forced to find additional funds through tax collections levied on farmers, who were told to pay their dues immediately. Gilbert Van Schoonbeke paid the remaining initial building costs. Because the total building cost was quite high, Mary instructed her builders to begin work only on the foundation and on readying the surrounding streets, in the hope that the sale of more municipal properties would help with financing. Two citizens of Antwerp, Nicolaas van der Meere (a nobleman) and Jacob Masius (a retired merchant), were assigned the arduous task of overseeing the project, as dictated by the city magistrates and Van Schoonbeke. As construction continued and the specific amount of land needed became clearer, the city was able to supplement its coffers by selling neighboring land that was no longer needed.

---

23 Fernand Donnet, “Documents pour servir a l’histoire des ateliers de tapisserie de Bruxelles, Audenarde, Anvers, etc.,” Annales de la Societe d’Archeologie de Bruxelles 10 (Brussels, 1898), Donnet, 83.
24 Jean Denucé, Antwerp Art Tapestry and Trade (Historical Sources for the Study of Flemish Art, 4) (Antwerp: De Sikkel, 1936), xxi.
25 Donnet, “Les tapisseries,” 4, n. 1 and “Documents,” 84. Donnet does not provide archival references for the two citizens assigned to the project.
The initial plans called for a building approximately 18.3 meters by 164.6 meters in size, but this floor plan was rejected and replaced by a simpler plan with measurements specified in an ordinance of 1553: 37 meters by 80 meters, a surface area of 2,961 square meters, and gables running the length of the six naves (as shown in the plan seen in figure 23 and model in figure 23). Each stall was approximately 91 square meters, with close to 3,000 square meters of possible selling space. Every available space, including the cellars (as storage space), was to be rented to merchants. These dimensions suggest that at most, the Pand could accommodate 30 stalls on the first floor. The interior was divided into three wide aisles: a large center aisle, 6 meters in height, with a row of shops on either side, a fireplace, and a private meeting room, with aisles on either side which were accessible from both the exterior (through the side doors) and the center aisle. Most importantly, the building also had a large room on the second floor, 80 meters in length, which allowed the weavers and merchants to display their tapestries unrolled, something previously quite difficult in either private

26 SAA IB 2141, nr. 70/2, SAA Icon P. 13/1d. The longer length was perhaps seen as too long and would have made development around the building more difficult. The narrower width would also have made moving tapestries within the building more difficult.
27 SAA Icon P 13/1c.
28 SAA IB 2139, nr. 58, IB 2154, nr. 30.
29 The number of naves is problematic, because the Tapissierspand is usually shown with four naves in the earliest drawings of the building, most of which appear very similar to those in Virgilius Bononiensis' Map of Antwerp, from 1565 (as seen in the detail shown in figure 24). However, later representations (as seen in figures 25, 26, 27, 28) and façade plans, such as the one shown by architect Pierre Bruno Bourla in the 1820s (figure 29), clearly show six naves. An explanation for this difference is that architectural features were often reduced by one-third to allow space for all of the city's buildings in many sixteenth-century maps; thus the maps would show 12 windows per floor instead of 18 on a large building, or, in this case, four naves instead of six. However, Soly describes the building as "een rechthoekig bakstenen gebouw van ca. 80 meter op ca. 37 meter, voorzien van vier puntgevels." See Soly, Urbanisme, 235.
30 Ibid. 235; SAA IB 2139, nr. 58. With few other places available to display the large pieces, exhibitions of this size had formerly been housed in the Carmelites' Convent or in the Vleeshuis (Denucé, Antwerp Art, xxiii).
shops and galleries, or in the earlier sales hall at the Dominican Church. It is also specified that the two floors as well as the basement level were to be paved with good quality stone. The exterior of the building was very plain—the only aesthetic detail was the alternation of bluestone and brick. Once the structure was built, 3 meter by 3 meter doors were then cut into each of the eastern and western walls to allow easy access for the merchants’ large wares. A large window was above each door, probably for the use of a block and tackle to load multiple tapestries at the same time onto the second floor.

The new building’s total costs came to approximately 17,300 guilders, which can be broken down into the following portions: 36.4 percent for masonry costs, 33.1 percent for carpentry, 13.1 percent for various metal works, 8.3 percent for the construction of the attic, 3.2 percent for the paving of the two floors and the basement, and 5.9 percent for various other components, including windows. Unfortunately, while the building was being completed, the city lacked the funds to pay some of the construction costs and was forced to mortgage the new Pand to Jean Claes on March 9, 1549, with a yearly annuity of 52 guilders.

**Occupation of the Building and Exclusivity of the Pand: Tightening Control**

Along with the construction of the building came strict regulations from the magistracy. To ensure the success of the city’s weavers and merchants, and

---

31 Soly, *Urbanisme*, 236. See also SAA IB 2141, nrs. 70/2, 71, R 1758, fol. 52-54 vo., 147-9, and IB 2180, nr. 10.
32 Soly, *Urbanisme*, 236. A brief discussion of some of these costs is found in SAA IB 2141, nr. 70/1.
33 Donnet, “Documents,” 86. Amazingly, more than 100 years later, the capital of this annuity had not yet been paid when it was sold in 1675 by Daniel Thienpont to Catherine van Leecke alias Ballinck, Raes Brecht’s widow (see SAA SB, fol. 552).
thus lessen the chance of failure for the city’s new Pand, Charles V felt strongly that the nearly completed Pand should be used only by tapestry weavers and dealers, and that they should have a monopoly of the trade. From this point on, no shops relating to the tapestry trade would be allowed to exist outside the Pand,\(^{34}\) as stated in an ordinance from March 8, 1553,\(^ {35}\) nor would the overt sale of goods in one’s home be allowed. The only exception was that a weaver could continue to sell items out of his home—but with the doors and windows shut. Should a weaver choose to sell from his home in this manner, all business relationships with any merchants selling within the Pand had to be severed, making it difficult to obtain supplies, and the weaver was not allowed to rent a stall within the warehouse.\(^ {36}\)

Not surprisingly, several merchants complained, arguing that they already had large, established shops in other areas.\(^ {37}\) After listening to the merchants’ objections, the Emperor issued a new ordinance in April 1553, reiterating that no merchant could continue to sell wares at home or in a private shop while maintaining a stall at the Pand.\(^ {38}\) This second ordinance also stated that the occupants of the building would be responsible for maintaining four guards at the

---

\(^{34}\) The city’s efforts to consolidate all shops into the Pand are not surprising, given how much money it had spent to build the new marketplace.

\(^{35}\) SAA PK 2765, fol. 44.

\(^{36}\) See SAA PK 915, fol. 191. Denucé also notes that dealers and merchants from St. Truiden and Diest who wanted to sell their wares within the Pand were granted a one-year time period to come into compliance with the strict sales policies (Denucé, Antwerp Art, xxii). It should be noted that the issuance of these ordinances suggests that there was a fair amount of “illegal” activity within the industry, which Charles V sought to regulate.

\(^{37}\) SAA IB 2141, nr. 97.

\(^{38}\) SAA PK 2765, fol. 71 vo.-73. The weavers may have worried that a shift from selling in a private workshop or controlled home environment to a much more impersonal and sterile location would reflect poorly not only on the quality of the materials used in their products, but also on the quality and skill of their productions.
Pand (indicating an awareness of the value of its contents), to be paid by a tax levied on each occupant. The individual levies were based on complex calculations that took into account the size and origin of the tapestries being sold in each shop. For example, tapestries from Brussels were taxed at a rate almost double that of the other cities, such as Oudenaarde.39

The tapestry dealers quickly replied to these new provisions with their own opinions on how the new building should be run.40 They were clearly frustrated by the Emperor’s attempts to tightly govern the tapestry Pand when other trades were granted more independence. In fact, many of the dealers’ complaints originated in the guidelines in Charles V’s 1544 statute. Even though, surprisingly, 24 merchants accepted the new ordinances regarding the Pand as early as March 23, 1552,41 others persisted in their protests right up to the opening of the building. The Emperor’s decree on May 12, 1554, stated that all tapestries imported to Antwerp had to be unpacked, stored, and sold exclusively from the new Pand.42 Some dealers expressed their continued distaste for the

---

40 For the “Advijs van den tapissiers,” see Appendix 14; SAA GA 4047.
41 Donnet, “Les tapisseries,” 4. As was frequently found during this research, Donnet provides no archival reference (and Denucé then simply copies Donnet), and searches in the Antwerp archives have not found this document. However, Donnet notes that this document begins by stating that “all concerned” from the tapestry makers’ guild were registered for a shop in the Pand except for a few men (Jacques Van Lierke, Willem de Ram, Robert van Haeften, and Denys Pipeleer). Those signing the document were: “Jan de Kempeneer, Loys and Jan Van Wetteren, Peter van der Goes, the widow of Jan de Stoute, Denys Pypelinck, Anthonis van Copenhole, Balthasar van Vlierden, Troyens de Cruyts, Nicolaus Pleytinck, Jeronimus de Coleneer, Henric van Bernighem [Beeringen], Jacob Hasevelt, Daniel Thienpont, Raes van Brechte, Hector Wijns, Aerdt Spierinck, Jan Mondekens, Jan van de Eede, Dierick van Os, Isaac and Frans van Asperen, Amant Vranckx, Jan Vermeerhagen, Peter Schuddewater, Pater Woytens, Antonis van der Berghen, and Nicolaes de Canter” (Denucé, Antwerp Art, xxii).
42 SAA A 4001, fol. 71 vo.-73; Soly, Urbanisme, 237.
strict guidelines,\textsuperscript{43} and the Emperor again reiterated the rules for the new \textit{Pand} on December 24, 1554, stressing that tapestries must be both stored and sold in the \textit{Pand}.\textsuperscript{44}

The complex series of royal decrees and the dealers’ replies make it difficult to determine an exact date when the \textit{Pand} was first occupied, either partially or completely. We do know, however, that it was in use by the end of 1555. On June 16, 1555, it was announced that a lottery would determine shop locations within the \textit{Pand} and that all interested parties should present themselves to Willem de Kempeneere, the weavers’ representative to the city magistrates. The stalls would be rented for six years at a time at a fairly low cost. The long-term rentals indicate that the success of the industry was expected to continue.\textsuperscript{45} Balthazar van Vlierden, who had signed the first ordinance in 1553 outlining the building’s dimensions, was barred from participating in the lottery because of an “occasionne des troubles sediteux.”\textsuperscript{46} Those participating in the lottery included Henrick Pypelinck, Francois van Asperen, Henrick van Bernighen, Jan van Meerhaghen, Joris vanden Eede, Troilus Decreetz, Niclaes de Cantere, Jan de Kempeneere, Daniel Thienpont, Anthonis van den Berghe, Hans

\begin{footnotesize}
\textsuperscript{43} SAA IB 2176, nr. 37.
\textsuperscript{44} For the December 1554 reiteration of the rules, see Appendix 15. See again SAA PK 915, fol. 191; also, SAA IB 2141, nr. 85. This ordinance would reinforce the rules previously set forth regarding the ability to sell from one’s home or shop: one could sell outside the \textit{Pand}, but would thus lose any claim to a stall in the \textit{Pand}. It also echoes the older guidelines for selling wares in the Dominican \textit{pand}.
\textsuperscript{45} Ironically, this is the same Willem de Kempeneere who was the center of so much controversy in the 1530s regarding fraudulent tapestry practices, as discussed in Chapter 1.
\textsuperscript{46} Donnet, “Documents,” 5.
\end{footnotesize}
Van Wetteren, Loys Dossenhoet, Jacob vanden Haesevelde, Pieter Wuyten, and Isaac van Asperen.\textsuperscript{47}

A document dated July 18, 1561\textsuperscript{48} lists people who were renting stalls in the \textit{Pand} and indicates that each tenant paid about 24 pence per one-third square meter, with a total selling space of 91 square meters for each stall.\textsuperscript{49} This list not only provides us with the names of weavers and merchants, but also indicates that the \textit{Pand} was still successful as of that date. Comparing this list to the names of weavers and merchants cited in documents following the Spanish looting of the \textit{Pand} in 1576 (see Chapter 4) indicates that the \textit{Pand} must have enjoyed a fair amount of success for either the same individuals or their descendants to maintain a stall there. A list of names associated with the \textit{Pand} from 1553-1598 indicates that many people were involved with the \textit{Tapissierspand}. The same list also indicates that proportionally higher numbers of weavers and merchants are recorded during three main events: the opening of the \textit{Pand}, the Spanish Fury, and Farnese’s invasion.\textsuperscript{50}

\textsuperscript{47} \textit{Ibid.} 5. Given the nature of the trade, and that some workshops sold their own products while others used an agent (middleman) or dealer, his list would have included weavers as well as dealers.

\textsuperscript{48} SAA Not. G. van Bossche, 2 Juni, 1620.

\textsuperscript{49} Among the tenants listed were Henri van Bernigen, Henri Hujoel, Daniel Thienpoint, Henri Halewyn, Francois de Neir, Antoine Van Coppenholle, Armand Vrancx, Baudouin Huavick, Peter vander Goes, Medart Vanden Moere, Denis Pypelinck, and Georges Hujoel. Unfortunately, the sources for this document cannot be determined, as this is the instance in which Donnet cites a “Cassa Boeck,” but does not give any other archival references. Denucé later echoes Donnet’s notes, but uses only Donnet’s reference and refers to it as a “cash-book.” See Donnet, “Documents,” 88; Denucé, \textit{Antwerp Art}, xxiii.

\textsuperscript{50} For a list of the names associated with the \textit{Pand} from 1553-1598, see Appendix 16.
Day-to-Day Functioning

By 1555, the tapestry market in Antwerp was now centralized and highly organized, which was crucial in effectively reducing risk. While the regulations may seem quite strict, the Pand served a broad function and thus required specific rules for membership. Its smooth operation impacted not just the finances of the weavers and merchants selling wares in the building, but the finances of the city and the export trade in which it was so heavily involved. The weavers and merchants formed a sort of cooperative organization, annually electing a dean to oversee the building’s operations and preside over disputes. The dean also managed a meeting room; according to Donnet, when the dean chose to convene a meeting, summonses were sent via messenger to the merchants’ homes. The city also doubtless wanted to stem the number of conflicts between the merchants and weavers from different cities and therefore prescribed policies for everyone participating.

Records from the period between the opening of the building and the Spanish Fury are scarce, so speculation is not inappropriate. What records do tell us is that at least at the opening of the building, each stall was approximately 91 square meters. This size results in a roughly 9 meter by 9 meter space, which is quite large. However, given that standard looms were on average about 4.3 meters in width, such a size would indicate that very little actual weaving was taking place on-site. Furthermore, with many tapestries having an average

---

51 Donnet, “Documents,” 89. He does not provide a reference, but this information is found in SAA Not. G. van Bossche, 2 Juni, 1620.
52 For these dimensions, see SAA IB 2139, nr. 58.
height of 5 meters, even more inferences can be made regarding the display of
tapestries within these sales stalls. Because we know that the building included a
large display room on the second floor, measuring the building’s full 80 meter
length, merchants did not necessarily need to display as many pieces as possible
in the confines of their own stalls. Thus, we are left with an image of modern-day
carpet stores: tapestries piled one upon another in large stacks, rolled up in
corners, and propped against walls. The stall’s purpose of storage rather than
display also reflects the types of sales taking place in the mid-1500s: decidedly
fewer sets, and more on spec or smaller pieces that could stand alone.

Records from after the Spanish Fury give us an idea of the types of
tapestries that would have been stored in the Pand on a regular basis, and the
itemized lists of stolen tapestries allow us to reconstruct an idea of stall contents.
Maarten Cordier, a well-known Oudenaarde merchant, reported the contents
seen in Table 7, which shows, in keeping what was seen in the export registers of
the 1550s, a higher concentration of Oudenaarde tapestries (53.7%), and then
next in percentage, Tournai tapestries (10.9%), with a smaller percentage coming
from Brussels (3.7%), and a portion of unknown origin (31.7%), though many of
these were probably from Oudenaarde as well. It is likely that other merchants
selling in the Pand had similar concentrations of tapestries, while the exception
may have been those merchants who focused on Brussels tapestries.

---
53 See Soly, Urbanisme, 235-36.
Table 7. Tapestries by city of origin in Maarten Cordier’s stall at time of Spanish Fury, Nov. 4, 1576

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City of Origin</th>
<th>Number of Tapestries</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oudenaarde</td>
<td>53.7% (44)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brussels</td>
<td>10.9% (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tournai</td>
<td>31.7% (26)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>3.7% (9)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Source: SAA CB, 1577-1578, II, fol. 509)

Quality, Negotiations, Networks: The Expanded Roles of the Pand

The physical building also functioned as far more than just a location in which tapestries could be purchased. The stalls were not a place for display; rather they were uses as a space for negotiations and information exchange. Buyers could perhaps enter a stall and peruse cartoons, select an already-woven piece or commission a new one, or look over raw materials. Along with monetary transactions, ideas, trust, and credit were also exchanged, and negotiations made. Most importantly, the space functioned to increase transparency in the negotiation process and to facilitate informed choices regarding quality. As Brosens states, “the panden allowed [producers] to pass on private information to dealers and prospective buyers while at the same time gathering information
about these players.” 54 Although difficult to quantify, the value of this type of information exchange to the export industry was tremendous.

With a centralized location for the industry, buyers had the opportunity to see for themselves the different types of tapestries available, particularly with regards to quality. While ordinances governing the industry helped to alleviate some of the risk for buyers, nothing could take the place of a buyer physically inspecting pieces himself and beginning to visually see the differences between, for example, a Brussels figural piece and an Oudenaarde verdure. The benefit of this, however, extended to the sellers as well, who as Brosens notes, “understood that central marketplaces provided an excellent opportunity to...demonstrate to potential buyers the various levels of quality, and to learn about customer requirements and demands without having to run the risks entailed in sending samples of their costly and fragile goods abroad.” 55 The sellers could develop relationships with their buyers and become familiar with their customers’ preferences, needs, and buying habits. Because the Pand allowed for an increased degree of trust between buyer and seller—brought about by “repeated and systematic contacts between the tapissiers from Brussels, tapestry merchants from Antwerp and Oudenaarde, and local agents [which] led to informal communication that cost nothing,” 56 which Brosens refers to as a “less tangible

55 Ibid. 12.
56 Ibid. 12.
but equally important”\textsuperscript{57} factor in the successful operation of the \textit{Pand}, the relationships between buyers and sellers were strengthened and thereby facilitated repeat business. As Epstein notes, a major difficulty for many craftsmen was financing raw materials, and that until good repute could be vindicated, it would be impossible to obtain credit—that personal credit without which survival in the urban economy was not to be expected. Few medieval craftsmen and women owned the raw materials which they worked, these being generally provided on trust either by wholesale suppliers or by customers; likewise, sales were commonly made on a credit basis, whether to dealers or private consumers.\textsuperscript{58}

This trust, following repeated positive encounters, would spread, and effectively “minimized uncertainty and risk because it can be transformed into information exchange, mutual financial and organizational aid, and incidental or structural cooperation.”\textsuperscript{59} The increased level of trust also no doubt impacted

\textsuperscript{57} \textit{Ibid.} 12. Brosens further suggests that the \textit{Pand} allowed producers to “pass on private information to dealers and prospective buyers, while at the same time gathering information about these players” (p. 8).


\textsuperscript{59} Brosens, “Quality,” 12, 13, who cites Mark Granovetter, “Coase revisited: business groups in the modern economy,” \textit{Industrial and Corporate Change}, 4 (1995), 93-130; Charles Perrow, “Small firm networks,” in \textit{Explorations in Economic Sociology}, ed. Richard Swedberg (New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1993). 277-402; Brian Uzzi, “The Sources and consequences of embeddedness for the economic performance of organizations: the network effect,” \textit{American Sociological Review}, 61 (1996), 674-98; Brian Uzzi, “Networks and the paradox of embeddedness,” \textit{Administrative Science Quarterly}, 42 (1997), 35-67. The importance of developing networks between buyers and sellers as a way to lessen risk by strengthening information exchange has been studied in depth by S.R. Epstein, see Epstein, “Craft Guilds,” 684-713. Epstein notes that, “It is true that the guilds could help reduce asymmetries of information and promote sales through quality controls. However, in small-scale markets, less formal arrangements could be just as effective. Thus, the bazaar-like bunching together of shops in the same street that was one of the more salient features of urban manufacture in this period allowed local customers to compare wares and prices on the spot. Equally, where industries served foreign markets in which it was crucial to establish and uphold a reputation by signaling the product’s origin, those assurances could be provided just as effectively by city authorities or merchant associations, as the examples of late medieval Douai and Milan attest.” (p. 686, see: Martha Howell, “Achieving the Guild Effect Without Guilds: Crafts and Craftsmen in Late Medieval Douai,” in \textit{Les métiers au Moyen Âge}, eds. P. Lambrechts and J.-P. Sosson, 109-28. (Publications de l’Institut d’Etudes Médiévales, vol. 15) (Louvain-la-Neuve: Université Catholique
negotiations between buyer and seller. The Tapissierpand’s stalls now took on the role of offices for business deals, not just a place for the examination of products.

**A Note on the Levels of Quality: The Development of Discernment**

Although the distinctions between tapestries from the different cities were well known by the mid-1500s, as the number of tapestries being exported (and thus taxed upon export) continued to rise, a buyer’s ability to differentiate between the various levels of quality, and thus have an awareness of the potential taxes their exports might carry, became increasingly important. The customer now had “a greater familiarity with various grades and values, and thus a greater need to define them.” As an example of the multiplicity of choices, the London Port Book of Rates from July 1507 cites three different grades of tapestry:

“Tapestry or verders withowt sylke,” with a value of 5d. per ell; “Tapestry or verders with cades,” at 1s. per ell (a bit more valuable); and finally, “Tapestrye or verderes with sylke,” valued at 1s. 8d. per ell. The Port Book was revised several times during the sixteenth century, notably in 1532, 1545, 1550, 1558 and 1582. The 1558 reissuing—just a few years after then new Pand opened—was important because new categories were added to the description of tapestries:

dep Louvain, 1994). See also Lis and Soly, “Subcontracting,” 81-113. Lis and Soly argue that by subcontracting portions of larger commissions, workshops could develop important networks with regards to both trust and information. See Reinhold Reith, “Circulation of Skilled Labour in Late Medieval and Early Modern Central Europe,” in Guilds, Innovation, and the European Economy, 1400-1800, eds. S.R. Epstein and Maarten Prak (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008), 114-142. Reith argues that the highly developed networks between craftsmen facilitated the transmission of knowledge in terms of both technical skill and trust. See also, Brosens, “Quality,” forthcoming.

60 Thomas Campbell, Henry VIII and the Art of Majesty: Tapestries at the Tudor Court (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2007), 93.

61 For the Port Book descriptions, see N. Gras, The Early English Customs System (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1918), 704; T. Campbell, Henry VIII, 94.
Heare course” (the cheapest available), valued at 8d. per ell, which could be raised to 1s. or 2s. with the addition of wool (“caddas”). Tapestries woven with silk threads were now valued at 3s. 4d. per ell and “Tappestry with Golde called Arras” at 40s. per ell, an extremely high price that was indicative of the manufactory and raw material costs. The buyer’s ability to examine pieces representative of these different levels of quality would then impact his confidence in the seller, once again minimizing the buyer's risk.

Part of the task of assessing quality was lessened by the previously discussed edicts which required city marks to be woven into tapestries as signifiers of their cities of origin.

**City-of-Origin Marks and Stamps of Quality**

The introduction of city of origin marks, however, was not an innovation unique to tapestry (which were physically woven into the design, typically in the bottom border), but rather, one which extended across several of the luxury good markets. Like tapestry, carved altarpieces were also highly regulated, were primarily for export, and therefore needed stamps of quality assurance. Such a development indicates the advanced state of the luxury goods industry in the Netherlands. These stamps or marks were a symbol of the industry’s ability to keep up with the changing demands of urban capitalism in the southern Netherlands. In both the case of the altarpieces and with tapestry, the higher

---

62 T. Willan, *A Tudor Book of Rates* (Manchester: University Press, 1962), 60. According to Campbell, these numbers show that the cost of the various grades of tapestry was kept relatively stable throughout the first half of the sixteenth century. See T. Campbell, *Henry VIII*, 343.

63 Lynn Jacobs, *Early Netherlandish Carved Altarpieces, 1380-1550: Medieval Tastes and Mass Marketing* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998), 8. One way, however, in which the carved altarpieces and tapestries differed dramatically was audience. Although both benefited
level of regulation meant more security for the buyer, but also less reputational risk and thus more employment security for the seller. In both media these regulations served as an indicator to the buyer of a certain level of quality. Without a commission contract in which quality and materials could be specified, these stamps were an important reassurance to the customer.

Although one might assume that the stamps simply indicated city of origin, their purpose was in quite varied. For example, following the edicts of the 1530s, the impetus for the regulation of marks in Brussels arose primarily out of disagreements with regard to standards, and thus the marks served mainly as an indication that the pieces conformed to the standards agreed upon. In Antwerp, where (because of such little production) this was not a primary issue, the marks were more a signal of confidence to the buyer. In these cases the marks (or in the case of the altarpieces, stamps) also served as a seal of good quality to the international buyer, who might be a purchasing agent for a merchant in Germany, for instance, who was reselling the piece back home. In such cases there was no way for the foreign buyer to know the background of a piece bought from standardizations in production, the market for retables was far more limited by the number of churches, for example. While the different levels of tapestry quality available on the market allowed the medium to reach a broader audience within the upper and middle classes, the retables for the most part were not sold to the public in high numbers.

on spec, but the stamps served as a sort of indicator that the piece was in fact of the quality touted by the merchant.65

The same sorts of struggles that the Brussels weavers’ guild experienced regarding who could paint cartoons and what represented the appropriate quality also occurred within the groups working on retables. The struggle between guilds in Brussels, each vying for a larger part of the market, complicated the issue of which group could perform which task, but also may have led to greater confidence on the part of the non-commissioning buyer, thus increasing market sales. For example, the attempt by the painters to gain control over the sculptors was no doubt a power play for dominance of the polychrome market, but it nonetheless illustrates the concerns regarding quality control in the marketplace.66

In specific instances with retables, the stamps—which ultimately resulted in a higher cost for the finished piece—could be dispensed if the buyer felt

---

65 Jacobs, *Early Netherlandish*, 158. J. M. Montias, in "Le marché de l’art aux Pays-Bas, XV et XVI siècles." *Annales Économies Sociétés Civilisations* 6 (1993), 1558, n. 53, agrees that the stamps were mainly for the buyer, but also ties them specifically to the export trade.

66 With regard to the Brussels guild conflicts, Jacobs, (*Early Netherlandish*, 158) notes, “Indeed the complaints raised by the Brussels painters in 1453—at the beginning of their dispute with the sculptors—explicitly link the concerns about quality that engendered the stamping regulations to the marketing of the artworks. The 1453 document explains that because the sculptors are selling works of bad, nondurable wood, “these churches and good folk who have such work made are very badly cheated, and the aforesaid [painters] guild, which thus far has enhanced its status within and outside the land, in markets and elsewhere, is greatly defamed, and the craftsmen of the aforesaid [painters’] guild ... often suffer great damage, shame and disadvantage in their good reliable works.” (the original reads, “die kercken ende goede lieden die alsulcken werck doen maken swaerlic ende zeer bedrogen worden, ende twoirs. ambacht, dat tot heer toe zeer vermeert es geweest binnen ende buten lants, in mercten ende elswaer, groetelich gediffameert, ende die gesellen vanden voirs. ambachte..dicwile lieden aan huere goeden den rechtveerdighen werken daer bij groete schade, schampte ende achterdeel,” quoted from Nieuwdorp, “De oorspronkelijke,” 93.)
comfortable with the piece’s quality before appraisal, suggesting that the stamps were primarily for the buyer’s confidence.

Interestingly, for both tapestry and retables, the stamps and marks were applied to both commissioned and noncommissioned works, even though commissioned pieces typically resulted from a contract in which measures of quality and price were carefully laid out. Thus, in a contracted piece, the mark or stamp was a promise that the tenets outlined in the contract had been observed. For open-market pieces the mark or stamp held still greater significance, as the buyer was purchasing a piece without having made any predetermined demands upon the artist, and this mark was his only guarantee of good quality. A buyer would surely have been less inclined to purchase a tapestry supposedly woven in Brussels, which typically carried the highest price, without some degree of faith in its manufacture.

---

67 For more evidence that some buyers were comfortable with dispensing with the required stamps, see Jan Van der Stock, “Antwerpse beeldhouwwerk: over de praktijk van het merktekenen,” in *Merken opmerken. Merk-en meesterteken op kunstwerken in de Zuidelijke Nederlanden en het Prinsbisdom Luik: typologie en method*, eds. C. van Vlierden and M. Smeyers (Leuven: Peeters, 1990), 133-34.

68 Jacobs (*Early Netherlandish*, 159) also notes that “the very nature of the stamps seems especially appropriate for the market buyer rather than the contractual sponsor, in that the stamps clearly identify the city of origin, something the sponsor would have already known, but the buyer would not have.” She adds in a note, “The identification of the place of origin may well have been considered by buyers as an important sign of quality. In the cloth trade, for example, the Hansa merchants buying Netherlandish cloths required that clothstuffs from smaller centers be tested against a quality exemplar, whereas clothstuffs from the large centers of Ghent and Brussels did not require any control tests” (p. 159, n. 76). See also J. P. Peeters, “De-Industrialization in the Small and Medium-Sized Towns in Brabant at the End of the Middle Ages. A Case Study: The Cloth Industry of Tienen,” in *The Rise and Decline of Urban Industries in Italy and the Low Countries (Late Middle Ages-Early Modern Times)*, ed. H. van der Wee (Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1988), 167-68.
The de Moors: An Example of the Tapissierspand’s Familial and Intra-city Networks

Several case studies shed light on the intricacies of the Antwerp tapestry market. While various records in the Antwerp city archives list names of dealers and weavers involved with the construction of the new Pand or following the Spanish Fury, little information is provided about those individuals. However, there is a fair amount of information available about one prominent family active in the Tapissierspand: the de Moor family, including Jan de Moor the elder and his sons Jan and Jacques de Moor.69 The de Moor family’s involvement with the Antwerp tapestry trade spanned several generations. More importantly, though, it demonstrates that the success of the Pand relied in part on the risk-abating networks created between both families and cities in order to move the tapestries from site of production to site of sales in the most efficient way possible. The new Pand

worked as a magnet for Oudenaarde tapissiers who saw an effective market for their standardised pieces in the new pand; important entrepreneurs from Oudenaarde generally had family members living permanently, or at least semi-permanently, in Antwerp, some of whom were given freedom of the city during the second half of the sixteenth century in order to stimulate trade.70

69 Much of this information has been collected by Erik Duverger in Jan, Jacques en Frans de Moor, tapijtwegers en tapijthandelaars te Oudenaarde, Antwerpen en Gent (1560 tot ca. 1680) (Ghent: Interuniversitair Centrum voor de Geschiedenis van de Vlaamse Tapijtkunst, 1960).
70 Brosens, “Quality,” 15. See also Donnet, “Documents,” 299-303; Vermeylen, Painting, 89; Martine Vanwelden, Productie van wandtapijten in de regio Oudenaarde. Een symbiose tussen stad en platteland (15de tot 17de eeuw) (Leuven: University Press, 2006), 204-13. Brosens notes that a similar, though smaller-scale phenomenon occurs with Brussels tapissiers, and that “several of the most important Brussels workshops directors-producers stayed in Antwerp for some time,” including Jan Raes I (who had relationships with several tapissiers in the Pand, including François Sweerts I, François Sweerts II, and Hendrik Vranckx), François Geubels, and his son, Jacob Geubels (see Koenraad Brosens, “New Light on the Raes Workshop in Brussels and Rubens’s Achilles series,” in Tapestry in the Baroque. New Aspects of Production and Patronage, ed. Thomas Campbell (New Haven: Yale University Press) 20-33; see also Donnet, “Documents,” 285-98; Alfons K. L. Thijs, Van "werkwinkel" tot "fabriek": De
Jan de Moor the elder was born in January 1522 in Oudenaarde, where he later “undoubtedly” became involved in tapestry weaving.\textsuperscript{71} There is good evidence that the family immigrated to Antwerp following the plague that swept through Oudenaarde between 1555 and 1559, in which an estimated 900 shopkeepers were killed.\textsuperscript{72}

Many of the weavers coming from Oudenaarde had gained citizenship in Antwerp in 1563 or 1564, as was the case with Jan de Moor I, who became a citizen on June 30, 1564. De Moor stayed in Antwerp for several decades, becoming an active member of the tapestry trade. In 1576 and 1577 his name appears in documents regarding the siege of Antwerp and the looting of the \textit{Tapijtsierspand}, as well as in documents discussing the seizure of tapestries from his shop.\textsuperscript{73} Jan I is again mentioned in 1579 as being \textit{Meester van der natiën} (master of the corporation) or head of the \textit{Tapijtsierspand} (a position determined through election).\textsuperscript{74} About six months later, de Moor placed Hans de Groote in charge of keeping the sales hall clean and overseeing its day-to-day functioning.\textsuperscript{75}

De Moor is mentioned again a few years later, on January 2, 1581; this time he

\textsuperscript{71} E. Duverger, \textit{Jan, Jacques en Frans de Moor}, 23. See also Jozef Duverger, \textit{Tapijtkunst te Oudenaarde} (Gent: Tentoonstelling Oudenaardse schatten van kunst en geschiedenis, 1952).
\textsuperscript{72} E. Duverger, \textit{Jan, Jacques en Frans de Moor}, 23.
\textsuperscript{73} SAA CB 1577-1578, I, fol. 24, for example, is an account of the seizure of 44 Oudenaarde tapestries, sold by de Moor and Maarten Cordier, aboard wagons headed for Calais.
\textsuperscript{74} E. Duverger, \textit{Jan, Jacques en Frans de Moor}, 25. Unfortunately Duverger does not give an archival reference for this notation, which would have been helpful in adding to knowledge regarding the everyday workings of the \textit{Pand}. Denucé also notes that the term “dean” appeared in 1620 with regard to a Jan van der Goes (Denucé, \textit{Antwerp Art}, xxii; see SAA Not. G. van Bossche, 2 Juni, 1620).
\textsuperscript{75} SAA RB Pk. 657, fol. 1 vo.-2. This document contains a dispute with de Groote, which Duverger summarizes as “Hans de Groote nam het instrument mede naar zijn woning en weigerde het te restituieren vooraleer hij vergoed was voor werk, zes a zeven jaar vroeger uitgevoerd als horlogiemaker van het \textit{pand}” (E. Duverger, \textit{Jan, Jacques en Frans de Moor}, 25, n. 6).
was retiring from the tapestry trade and asking for an administrative position within the magistrates’ office. As he stated to the magistrates, for 20 years he had been “a good and honest citizen” and “loyal to Antwerp.”\textsuperscript{76} For all those years in the tapestry trade, he had sold pieces from Oudenaarde shops, and because the plague had once again swept through Oudenaarde and killed so many people, he felt it was time to stop selling tapestries.\textsuperscript{77}

It is likely that the Jan de Moor mentioned in Antwerp records from the 1580s onward was the son of Jan de Moor I. De Moor the younger ran a successful tapestry shop alongside the other merchants and dealers in Antwerp. Tax records from 1584-1585 show that de Moor II was one of the more successful shop owners in Antwerp, but by the end of the sixteenth century his business had taken a downward turn.\textsuperscript{78}

Jacques de Moor, the son of Jan I and the father of François, was born in Antwerp but, like many others in the 1570s and 1580s, left to settle in Oudenaarde, where he became a citizen in 1586.\textsuperscript{79} Even after Jacques de Moor had left Oudenaarde and returned to Antwerp, he continued to pay annual dues

\textsuperscript{76} SAA RB, Pk. 658, fol. 250 vo.
\textsuperscript{77} SAA, loc. cit.
\textsuperscript{78} In 1598 his debts had grown so large that a settlement had to be reached. The plaintiff, Daniel Steurbout, claimed that part of de Moor II’s financial crisis stemmed from his extravagant lifestyle. When de Moor II had failed to settle these debts by 1609, he then became simply a broker for other merchants in Antwerp and no longer ran his own shop. Despite this crisis he was able to maintain some good business dealings. It is highly likely that he was the same Jan de Moor noted as being a tapestry merchant in Cologne some years later. See E. Duverger, \textit{Jan, Jacques en Frans de Moor}, 27, 325. Here Duverger notes that de Moor II became a broker for Steurbout, Abraham de Hu, Gillis van der Borcht, and others. This fact is of note only because it provides additional names of those involved in the tapestry business in Antwerp and sheds light on the highly developed networks functioning within the tapestry industry.
\textsuperscript{79} Jacques de Moor moved back to Antwerp after marrying the widow of Willem van Coppenolle, and he lived there between at least 1616 and 1621. Duverger describes him as “un homme actif dont les affaires étaient florissantes” (\textit{Ibid.} 325).
to Oudenaarde’s Guild of Saint Barbara and remained in good standing in that
guild. He was also able to maintain good business relations with many of the
weavers in Oudenaarde, including Jan Regelbrugge, Paul van den Broecke, Joost
van den Hende, and Gillis van den Kerkhove. François would later be
instrumental in securing commissions for either the de Moors’ own workshops or
those of their colleagues. Their work was primarily known for religious subjects,
although *verdures* and history scenes were woven as well. The father and son
were able to benefit from the fact that one lived in Antwerp and the other in
Oudenaarde, as Jacques was able to send high-quality raw materials to his son,
who would then send tapestries to Antwerp to be sold. Although this type of
network required the transport of the tapestries from Oudenaarde to Antwerp,
the short distance—69 kilometers—was more than made up for by “the assurance
that the pieces, once in place, would be preserved and displayed in the best
possible circumstances, by family members or reliable contacts.” The higher
quality of materials that were being sent back from Antwerp to Oudenaarde in
turn allowed them to sell their works at higher prices. This branch of the de
Moor family remained successful well through the 1630s, with business
relationships in Spain, France, Portugal, and Germany.

---

82 Brosens, “Quality,” 16.
The Rise of the Tapestry Dealer and Merchant Entrepreneur: Their Role in the Pand

The types of exchanges taking place in the new Pand—primarily on spec—are at one end of what De Marchi and Van Miegroet describe as a spectrum. They suggest that:

makers and buyers meet in exchange relations, which take various forms: commission exchange and gift exchange are at one end of a spectrum, market forms at the other. Both commission and gift exchange involve a more or less unique product, and contact is between one buyer and one seller, often direct, or mediated at just one remove by an agent. Valuation is involved in both these forms, but in neither is the primary motivation of a purchase asset value. In contrast to both commission and gift exchange, market exchange...involves buyers and sellers who are relatively numerous; moreover, valuation takes place via bids and offers for products that, while they may be somewhat unique, are also regarded as reproducible.83

Although it is difficult to determine from extant records all of the dealers working in the Tapissierspand, records following the Spanish Fury on November 4, 1576, indicate that a number of people came forward to file claims for the tapestries stolen that were on deposit in their stalls.84 From this it is possible to surmise

84 See for example SAA CB, 1577, II, fol. 19, vo., and SAA CB, 1577-1578, II, fol. 140, vo. These claims will be discussed in greater detail in Chapter 3. Additionally, in keeping with this dissertation’s theme of the minimization of risk, it is likely that many of these dealers worked in a diverse range of transactions and exchanges. With regard to shopkeepers in Antwerp dealing in painting, De Marchi and Van Miegroet state, “more often than not, paintings were just one line within a broader range of merchandise,” which is likely true of the tapestry dealers as well (De Marchi and Van Miegroet, “The History of Art Markets,” 73). An excellent example of this type of diversification is Pasquier Grenier, a dealer from Tournai active in the late 1400s, about whom Brosens notes, “as the city’s [Tournai] wine importer, he could raise sufficient venture capital to engage in tapestry production and trade on an unprecedented scale. Grenier became one of the key suppliers to the European courts, had stocks in Antwerp and Bruges, and he subcontracted the weaving of sets based on his cartoons to workshop managers in various towns.” See Brosens, “Quality,” 5 and Jean Lestocquoy, Deux Siècles de l’histoire de la tapisserie (1300-1500): Paris, Arras, Lille, Tournai, Bruxelles (Arras: Commission départementale des monuments historiques du Pas-de-Calais, 1978) 71-80. In another example, Antoon Goetkint, the son of an Antwerp
that a large number of dealers were active in the sales hall. The rise of a group
that functioned as dealers or brokers within the tapestry industry is in keeping
with the fact that weavers were not—as a group—wealthy. As the market shifted
from predominantly commission-based to on spec production, an intermediary
group between producer and consumer was needed to provide capital for raw
materials and to absorb some of the risk inherent in such production. This
constraint was not unique to tapestry weaving, either. The silk-weaving industry
in Lyon had similar problems involving capital. A single loom cost approximately
40 days’ pay, which meant that workshops were often beholden to someone else
for start-up costs, and thus were not in control of the production process.85
Although this control was removed from the weavers, dealers and merchant
entrepreneurs helped protect the industry by removing some of the financial risk

85 See Richard Mackenney, Tradesmen and Traders. The World of the Guilds in Venice and
Europe, c. 1250-c.1650. (London: Croom Helm, 1987), 117, who cites Richard Gascon, Grand
Commerce et vie urbaine au 16e siècle: Lyon et ses marchands 1520-1580, 2 vols. (Paris:
the following statistic: by 1564, there were approximately 1200 looms at work in Lyon; of those
1200, “220 of them worked at the say-so of just two merchants. Two others, Voisin and Durier,
were said to employ 800-1000 people.” (Ibid. vol. 2, 622-24). A similar situation is seen with
tapestry production in Oudenaarde: according to the 1541 census, 75% of the city was employed
by either the cloth weaving or tapestry weaving industries. However, only 41 tapestry weavers
(who each employed about 30 workshop employees) employed 1187 apprentices and journeymen,
about 42% of the city’s total workforce. (See Peter Stabel, “Guilds in late medieval Flanders:
myths and realities of guild life in an export-oriented environment,” Journal of Medieval History
from workshops, thereby facilitating continued production and employment for the workshops. By the dealers steering the workshops’ production, the tapestry industry thrived under vertical integration.

Just as familial networks, particularly between cities such as Oudenaarde and Antwerp—as was seen with the de Moor family—were important in expanding the industry, the role of networks between employer and employees was equally important. In this case, the employer was a dealer or merchant entrepreneur, who had the capital needed for raw materials and looms, and then entered into a contractual agreement with one or more workshops. Some of the weaving from Oudenaarde was probably woven in the surrounding countryside by agricultural workers who supplemented their wages with “ad hoc”, fairly low quality tapestry weaving. As Stabel notes, this meant that “commercial networks were put in place to tighten contacts between the countryside and the town of Oudenaarde, and entrepreneurs and merchants also established links with the firms in the gateway-cities of the Low Countries.” The networks between the rural weavers and their urban employers were a tightly-regulated system, in which the merchant entrepreneurs were favored:

They often received only piece-wages...mostly they did not own their own looms, which were leased...[they] had to be members of the urban guild of tapestry weavers, without, however, enjoying the same advantages as the urban master-weavers...[they] were not allowed to have apprentices (and thereby they were robbed of an obvious way of hiring cheap labour...[they] were subordinated to the jurisdiction of the urban guild...working for two

---

86 Stabel, “Guilds in late medieval,” 207.
87 This idea of weaving for supplemental wages supports the idea that most tapestry weavers were not becoming wealthy from weaving, but rather, that the dealers were the ones truly profiting in the industry.
88 Ibid. 207.
entrepreneurs at the same time was forbidden. They could only use the raw materials and designs provided by the entrepreneur...they could not work for their own account.

As business in the Tapissierspand continued to grow, Charles V and later Philip II gave certain privileges to weavers from other cities who decided to settle in Antwerp. In one such instance, dated June 21, 1559, after bestowing privileges on weavers from Oudenaarde, Enghien, and Brussels, the emperor also included several clauses regarding the behavior expected of dealers. The dealers were prohibited from meddling in weavers' affairs, and they could not have tapestries woven for themselves (as opposed to tapestries to sell). Any such tapestries would be confiscated by the city and the dealer would be fined. The dealers were responsible for protecting the sellers, so they could not sell tapestries in their shops at a price higher than that agreed upon and then keep the remainder for themselves. All brokers and dealers working in the Pand had to be citizens of Antwerp, and they were expected to be upstanding citizens in regard to both character and religion. Any tapestries that they wanted to sell in the Pand had to

---

89 Ibid. 207. Additionally, this was not an easy business relationship for the workers, who “depended sometimes for the rest of his career on a particular entrepreneur, because of various debts and financial obligations. Various systems of subcontracting were readily being used: new masters could still carry out work for others as long as all their obligations toward their former employer were fulfilled,” (Stabel, “Guilds in late medieval,” 207). Stabel also notes, however, that “urban and rural industries proved to be complimentary rather than competitive,” which is a reference to the development of the entire industry, and not the clear tension between the rural and urban groups involved; see Peter Stabel, De kleine stad in Vlaanderen. Bevolkingsdynamiek en economische fluctuaties van de kleine en secundaire stedelijke centra in het Gentse kwartier (14de-16de eeuw) (Brussels: Paleis der Academiën, 1995), as quoted by Lis and Soly, “Export industries, craft guilds and capitalist trajectories, 13th-18th centuries,” in Craft Guilds in the Early Modern Low Countries: Work, Power and Representation, eds. Maarten Prak, Catharina Lis, Jan Lucassen and Hugo Soly (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2006), 107.

90 This document, described as an additional three clauses added to the 1544 edict, was discussed in depth by Donnet but cannot be found with the other decrees or guidelines concerning the Tapissierspand in SAA GA 4047 or 4048. However, the strict guidelines for dealers suggest that first Charles V and then Philip II had continued personal motivation to make sure that the Tapissierspand ran smoothly (Donnet, “Documents,” 133).
be measured by the city’s selected staff, and any tapestries imported from foreign workshops had to be completely unpacked, including boxes of bundles containing decorative items such as cushion covers; unopened bundles of tapestry could not be sold. They were also expected to sell only those tapestries that complied with the rules outlined in the 1544 edict, or they would be fined 100 guilders.

Several sections in the additional clauses also applied to weavers selling from the Pand as well. No one could recruit or badger customers as they entered the Tapissierspand; a merchant could speak to customers only when they entered the merchant’s particular stall. The merchants could rent only stalls as big as their inventory required (an indication that at some point there may have been differing sizes for rent), and each person or workshop was allowed to rent only one stall. Furthermore, the merchants could not change stall locations without express permission from the city commissioner (a sign that, while a dean was in charge of the day-to-day operations of the Pand, the building was still largely under the city’s control). Finally, before renting a space in the Pand, all dealers had to agree to these rules as well as all the other stipulations in the 1544 edict. 91

As long as the economic success that Antwerp enjoyed in the mid-1500s continued, the arrival of dealers and agents eager to sell in Antwerp’s markets did not pose a threat to the weavers, as there were plenty of people eager to sell their wares. Moreover, as Bloom notes,
the emergence of merchant-entrepreneurs seems to be related to the complex production process native to tapestry. Unless the beneficiary of a direct commission, most master weavers likely could not have afforded the cost of commissioning the cartoons for a major tapestry set, much less the materials for its execution.92

Thus, as the type of demand for tapestries was changing, the role of the dealer became increasingly more important.93 Dealers frequently had their own sets of cartoons in reserve to give to workshops as needed, and, because the dealers were more in touch with their repeat customers than the weavers would be, the dealers generally had a good idea of what those customers would like.94 If the demand was high enough, the dealers could contract work to several workshops and the commission could be shared across many weavers. There is evidence of several sixteenth-century instances of subcontracting, in which a tapestry manufacturer in Antwerp would sign a contract for a commission and then pass the actual execution of the tapestry to a workshop in Brussels, collecting the difference between the cost to weave the tapestry and the selling price. A good example of this sort of arrangement occurred in 1566, when Jean de Buck, a Brussels manufacturer, and Jean de Ram, an Antwerp manufacturer, both being contracted for specific work, attempt to settle their mutual accounts. Because of difficulties with the contract, a fair amount of money had to be divided for the silk, weaving costs, and salaries associated with a tapestry of the Story of

---


93 For example, already by the mid-1400s, records in Tournai listed more than 70 tapissiers and 40 marcheteurs (dealers). See Thomas Campbell, Tapestry in the Renaissance: Art and Magnificence (New Haven: Yale University Press, 202), 33.

Solomon, measuring 42 ells in length. De Ram’s workshop had woven the figures, while de Buck’s had done the smaller embellishments. 95

On the other hand, if demand fell, dealers would eventually resort to the same techniques employed by Van Schoonbeke to keep costs down. They might use a few master weavers who could then pawn work off on apprentices in their workshops at a much cheaper rate, or they purchased lower-quality and therefore cheaper pieces to sell on the open market. Because the city’s population included so many skilled laborers and craftsmen, the introduction of monopolies into the trade environment eventually led to a citywide revolt. The magistrates were ultimately asked to select “policyemeesters” to oversee or stop “the unregulated monopolies, usuries and other unseemly contracts now made and done in the exchange.”96

Ancillary Services in the Pand

The centralization of the tapestry market allowed new businesses to spring up within the Pand. Along with the weavers and workshop assistants, the tapestry masters, and the dealers, a group of specialized workers operating within the Pand was responsible for packing the tapestries for shipment. By 1669 this group of men was large enough in number to constitute the firm of Jan Nouwelaers, Matheus Cornelis, and Joos Wyckmans.97 The new sales hall also

---

95 Donnet, “Documents,” 279.
96 Soly, “Betrayal,” 43. For this request to the city magistrates, see SAA PK 1396, fol. 39.
97 Denucé, Antwerp Art, xxiv. By 1669 the firm had most likely moved most of its business to Brussels.
served as a bank of credit and investment for its members. Additionally, raw materials and supplies for weaving could be purchased, including silks, looms, patterns, papers, and cartoons, as well as more expensive threads made from gold and silver. Along with various dealers’ or workshops’ wares, there may have been a room in which samples of various dyed fabrics and silks could be tested by weavers or agents acting on their behalf.

While chapter 2 has examined the ways in which the physical building itself was a way for merchants and weavers to operate within the export industry more cautiously, chapter 3 turns to the artistic techniques employed by the workshops to meet the changing demands of the sixteenth century while still reducing risk.

---

98 Denucé, *Antwerp Art*, xxiii. However, as Denucé notes, the city’s records do not contain any documents referring to this early loan office. In addition, other than the repeated citation of this quote from Denucé, no other studies have found another reference to it. However, given the amount of capital often needed to invest in raw materials, weavers may have been grateful for an office facilitating credit. Similarly, dealers frequently needed advances in order to commission or purchase tapestry sets to be sold on spec.

99 This is also a troubling reference: for the sample room, Denucé refers to Jacob van der Sanden’s *History of the old theatrical art in Antwerp*, which he suggests “refers somewhere to the creation of a ‘sample room’ (Staelhof) as having been part of the Hall” (Ibid. xxiv). Unfortunately, no book or pamphlet with that title has been found. While there was a notable author of the eighteenth century named Jacobus van der Sanden, there does not seem to be any other record of the title listed.
Chapter 3: Developments within the Industry: Innovations in Design and Production

Just as the new Tapiessierspand served to mitigate risks for buyers and sellers in the trade, innovations within the medium itself during the sixteenth century reflected a drive to minimize risk. Innovations in tapestry design and production can generally be divided into two types. Some came from the workers in the industry, and are endogenous innovations. Others diffused laterally from other art forms; these are referred to as exogenous innovations. However, in many instances, it is impossible to tell where a particular innovation started. Innovations in production were used to reduce risk, whereas innovations in stylistic technique could be perceived as presenting new risks to the medium; weavers were forced to find a balance between old and new so as to appeal to the customer base. This chapter also will examine why the city of Antwerp, despite its growing identification as a point of sales for tapestry, never became a center of tapestry production during the sixteenth century, and will discuss the various economies of scale taking place both within tapestry production and across other media.

Endogenous Innovations in Design and Production

By the early decades of the sixteenth century, the development of artists’ individual or stylistic personalities was becoming more discernible in comparison to the more uniform and rigid styles of fifteenth-century tapestry. Designers and workshop masters were increasingly known by name, style, and reputation, and it is possible to trace the development, often over several generations, of workshops
that were at the heart of Flanders’ (and specifically Brussels’) reputation for more than two centuries.

Dramatic changes were taking place in tapestry design in the early and mid-sixteenth century. Subject matter and artistic processes were expanded and refined. While representations of the typical mythological and biblical stories persisted, the scope of traditional content for larger figural series—illustrations of biblical, epic, and poetic texts—was enlarged to include the direct, rather than metaphorical illustration of contemporary events, and especially the military exploits of the patron. The impressive series of 12 large tapestries illustrating Emperor Charles V’s campaigns in Tunisia, of which *Battle of Tunis* is shown in figure 30, is a good example of this change.

The discoveries of India and Africa are documented through the depiction of their exotic plants and animals in tapestries, such as the elephant seen in *The Temple of Fame* in figure 31, which were interspersed with more traditional scenes.¹ These changes in taste and subject matter, however, did not reroute the path of tapestry overall or constitute a complete change; rather, they enlarged its corpus. Inventories from the time list a wide variety of subjects and scenes from

---

¹ By the turn of the sixteenth century, the idea of foreign travel and the mystique of exotic animals were popular subjects across art media. Works as early as van Eyck’s *Portrait of Giovanni and Giovanna Arnolfini* (1434) include references to the Orient. It was also becoming more common to see examples of the exotic right at home. Shawn Adrian notes that, with regard to Antwerp, “besides goods from across Europe, exotic products from Africa and Asia could also be purchased there. When the artist Albrecht Dürer visited Antwerp in 1520 and 1521, he was given a variety of products made from Atlantic sugar, colored feathers and porcelain from India, Calcutta cloth and silk, coconuts, and myrobalans (an East Indian fruit) as gifts.” See Shawn Adrian, "Burgundian/Habsburg Mint Policies and World Bullion Flows: A Monetary Interpretation of the Rise and Fall of Antwerp, 1400-1600," *Hilltop Review* 2, 1 (2006), Article 3, 7, which cites Albrecht Dürer, *The Writings of Albrecht Dürer*, trans. William Martin Conway (New York: Philosophical Library, 1958), 100, 103, 113.
most of the major centers of weaving, representing the wide spectrum of tastes, which in turn were often prompted by price.

In the early years of the sixteenth century, tastes remained decidedly fifteenth-century. As the tapestry trade in Antwerp grew, the medieval preferences of costume, background, architectural elements, a flattened, decorative appearance and figural representation in tapestry remained basically unchanged. But through travel and the dissemination of ideas among artists, the styles of Italian Renaissance paintings from the fifteenth century slowly started to influence Flemish tapestry. Between 1500 and the early 1520s, elements from Italian painting were gradually combined with time-tested Flemish tapestry designs. A few figures in an entire scene might be depicted in the Italianate manner—longer, more fluid; or a smattering of Italian grotesque motifs might be depicted within the borders. An excellent example of this blending is The Vices Beset Sinful Man (shown in figure 37), part of the Triumph and Virtues set woven in an unknown Brussels workshop between 1519 and 1524. In a scene filled with many women on either side wearing angular medieval (as opposed to classical, flowing) dress and posing in the typically stiff or rigid, stoic medieval style seen in figure 38, the three women in the center are represented in a decidedly Italian design: their arms and legs are fluid, their dress is classical, and they appear more engaged with their surroundings. The remainder of the tapestry is of standard Flemish style for the period. But even with these gradual

---


3 The three dancing women immediately bring to mind slightly older Italian points of reference, such as Boticelli’s *La Primavera* from ca. 1482.
departures from the norm, tapestry output for the most part remained typical. However, Peter van Aelst’s tapestries would change that.

**Innovations in Design**

Toward the end of the fifteenth century, Maximilian I appointed Peter van Aelst as Court Tapestry Maker in Brussels. A few years later, in 1502, Philip the Fair similarly appointed van Aelst his personal tapestry supplier. By the early 1500s Aelst had become one of the leading designers and weavers of tapestry, and he founded one of the first workshops in Brussels that is known to us by name. Aelst’s reputation was bolstered by his production of two monumental and well-known sets. *The Acts of the Apostles* (of which *The Miraculous Draught of Fishes* is shown in figure 34) was commissioned by Pope Leo X for the Sistine Chapel and based on cartoons drawn by Raphael; it was woven between 1516 and 1519. *Los Honores* (of which *Morality* is shown in figure 35) is an allegorical series woven for Charles V in 1521-1525 and meant to commemorate his coronation as Holy Roman Emperor in 1519. Although both sets are of very high

---

4 A serious problem in discussions of sixteenth century tapestry design and production is the confusion between Peter van Aelst and Peter Coecke van Aelst (now referred to by many art historians as Coecke). Although both would play significant roles in the evolution of tapestries, as will be discussed, their contributions were different.
6 Delmarcel, *Flemish Tapestry*, 72.
8 While Pope Leo X was happy to purchase tapestries drawn from Italian painting, the Habsburgs preferred the German Renaissance styles for obvious reasons. Their choices helped to drive demand for tapestries with German influences (Delmarcel, *Flemish Tapestry*, 70). At the court of Margaret of Austria (1503-1530) in particular, new styles were becoming popular as artists were influenced by both the continued developments in graphic arts and the work being produced in
quality, and designed and woven with much skill, *The Acts of the Apostles* is significant for a much more important reason: it represents a transition between Pre-Renaissance and Renaissance styles in Flemish tapestry. The hallmarks of Italian Renaissance painting—classical architecture, archaic instead of medieval costumes, and very clear compositions—had been fully implemented.

Guilio Romano, an Italian follower of Raphael who assisted with the *Acts* cartoons, worked for the Gonzagas in Mantua and created approximately nine sets for them, including *The Deeds and Triumphs of Scipio*. Around 1535 Francis I ordered a set of the *Scipio* scenes, and the pieces were woven in a Brussels workshop, where Peter Coecke van Aelst may have seen them. The set, which consisted of the classical themes of defeat and victory, was, according to Delmarcel, a “new, dramatic presentation: main scenes worked out on a broad scale and picturesque details added in the foreground or at the sides ... his severe, late style is visible in the monumental figures.” The enthusiasm for Romano’s tapestry designs, following on the coattails of Aelst’s *Acts of the Apostles*,

---

Renaissance Italy. Italian pieces were being imported to the Low Countries, and Flemish artists were beginning to travel more frequently to Italy. The same phenomenon in tapestry, though to a lesser degree, was occurring with German Renaissance art, particularly influenced by the woodcuts of Dürer. His sense of emotion and creation of energetic space is seen in Pieter de Pannemaker’s *Square Passion*, woven in Brussels ca. 1518-1522 for Margaret of Austria. Because Aelst was able to fill commissions according to the tastes of both Charles V and Leo X, he was able to diversify both his tapestries and his customer base.

9 Delmarcel (Flemish Tapestry, 75) refers to the *Honores* set as “mark[ing] an end to the first experiments with Renaissance forms.” Additionally, *The Acts of the Apostles* was not the sole example of a tapestry completely integrating aspects of Italian painting by this date, but it was the first large-scale instance of such integration. *Bearing of the Cross*, also based on a Raphael painting, and woven sometime between 1516 and 1520, is contemporary if not earlier.


indicated that Italianate style would remain in Flemish tapestries for more than just a few years, and now more boldly than just by intermingling elements from old and new. Romano’s style would soon influence Peter Coecke van Aelst’s designs.

Coecke was initially known for his painting, which gained the attention of Mary of Hungary and later Charles V. Like other artists favored by the courts, he benefited tremendously from this favoritism. At some point during the 1520s he spent a year in Italy, and upon his return to Antwerp it was evident that his ideas had been heavily influenced by Italian styles. His inspiration came from a number of sources; along with Italian ideas, he also blended the techniques that he found on an exploratory trip to Turkey in 1530s with his own more modern ones.12

In a clear break from the medieval style of fifteenth-century tapestries, Coecke found inspiration in Guilio Romano’s The Deeds and Triumphs of Scipio, as is evident in his mannerist figures. Coecke also gravitated toward the ideas in Sebastiano Serlio’s writings, where he found inspiration in Italian architecture and grotesques. His tapestry borders echoed those produced at the manufactory at Fontainebleau, and they were filled with classicized figures and Italian architectural elements. Serlio, who ran the first royal tapestry manufactory at Fontainebleau for Francis I between 1530 and 1535, had been among the first to

12When Dermoyen, a well-known weaver from Brussels, sent Coecke on this reconnaissance mission to Turkey, one of his likely motivations was to have Coecke return with new ideas and fresh subject matter that would make Dermoyen’s pieces stand out from others. See Jean Denucé, Antwerp Art Tapestry and Trade (Historical Sources for the Study of Flemish Art, 4) (Antwerp: De Sikkel, 1936), xvii.
lend Italian ideas to the tapestries produced there, and now Coecke’s work was spreading—and popularizing—the new styles. His new approaches were clearly appreciated, and he was tasked with large civic projects throughout the mid-sixteenth century. His patterns and cartoons represented a dramatic change in Flemish tapestry design, and the innovations were so well liked by customers that the city of Antwerp, recognizing his potential to draw buyers to the city’s market, gave him substantial funding to promote the creation, use, and selling of cartoons in Antwerp. He would ultimately have a large impact on sixteenth-century tapestry design.

Following on Coecke’s success with Italianate cartoons, Michel Coxcie, a painter from Mechelen who had already lived in Italy for many years, returned north in 1545 and settled in Brussels, where he would stay for 18 years. Coxcie found work as a pattern and cartoon designer, but instilled the Italianate style into his works with such ease and skill that he was soon dubbed the “Flemish Raphael.” The availability throughout the 1500s of artworks whose styles mimicked Renaissance Italian painting innovations pleased a wide variety of customers, but especially Italian customers, just as the more medieval medallion designs set over a millefleurs background had pleased Italian buyers in the fifteenth century. This sort of specialization helped to maintain a broad customer base associated with specific preferences, which was particularly important.

---

13 Denucé, Antwerp Art, xvii. Among these projects was the Antwerp Giant in 1534.
14 Ibid. xvi.
15 For Coxie, see Cleland, “Christ Appearing,” 106.
16 Delmarcel, Flemish Tapestry, 130-31.
17 This willingness on the part of designers and workshops to produce what they knew customers wanted acknowledges that while tastes and preferences in tapestry styles were in fact changing in
when producing on spec for an export trade while ensuring a minimum of risk that the on spec pieces would not sell.

Based on their design and content, several works previously attributed to the workshop of Bernard van Orley, another well-known Brussels designer, have now been attributed instead to Peter Coecke van Aelst, among them the *Battle of Pavia*, shown in figure 36, and the *David* Series. One possible reason for the misattribution is that Aelst did in fact collaborate with van Orley in 1535 in creating the cartoons for the *Chases of Maximilian*. Aelst also would have designed *The Seven Deadly Sins*, a set of seven tapestries commissioned by Willem de Pannemaker. Similarly, the cartoons for *The Acts of Paul* can be attributed now to Coecke, as well as those for *The Works of Joshua*.¹⁸

Willem de Pannemaker was a well-established weaver who used a number of Coecke’s cartoons and received several state commissions. He was responsible for weaving the 12 famed tapestries depicting the Battle of Tunis that were displayed in the Cathedral of Antwerp when the Order of the Golden Fleece met there in 1555. Among other workshops in Antwerp receiving state funds or incentives was that of Hendrik van Beeringen, who in 1570 was commissioned to weave several tapestries for the bailiff-general of the city of Antwerp, Geerard Gramaye, when his home was visited by Don Frederico, son of the Duke of Alva.

However, the changing styles of tapestry were not inflexible, nor were they quickly accomplished; weavers and designers were not constrained to using only

---
¹⁸ Denucé, *Antwerp Art*, xviii.
one method. Bernard van Orley is an excellent example of an artist capable of switching between styles in order not only to best suit a particular design, but best suit a variety of customers, thereby reducing risk. Some of this ability was probably the result of experimentation in search of what could work together. As he and others attempted to find the best combinations, as Campbell notes, “The result was a period in which several design trends coexisted and cross-fertilized in the leading ateliers of Brussels and Antwerp.” Some of van Orley’s designs appear more modern, such as the *Hunts of Maximilian* series (of which *June* is shown in figure 37), while others, such as those commissioned by Willem de Kempeneer (a Brussels dealer), marked a return to the earlier designs of the late fifteenth century. Van Orley’s designs for the *Passion* series and the *Lamentation*, all woven by Pieter de Pannemaker, clearly show the influence of both Dürer and Raphael with regard to utilization of space, dynamism, and figural depiction. The figures in the *Passion* series, for example, are positioned in the foreground of the scene, have mass, and appear more realistic. But van Orley is perhaps best known for the 12 cartoons that he designed for the monumental set *The Hunts of Maximilian*. As with the *Passion* figures and the figures in *Romulus gives Laws to the Roman People* seen in figure 38, the figures here are dynamic, weighty, and more fluid than those in earlier tapestry designs.

---

19 For van Orley, see Grazzini, “*Pomona Surprised,*” 99.
22 Van Orley, like the others, would probably have seen the Raphael cartoons while they were in Brussels. Additional, Dürer may have been a houseguest of van Orley during the time when the cartoons for the *Passion* series would have been designed.
Collaboration as Innovation

Van Orley’s contemporaries began to work with his innovations in various ways.  Peter van Aelst, for example, experimented with changing points of view and atmospheric perception. In addition, new elements from Italian design, such as *maniera*, began to appear in pieces in Brussels, thanks to artists working at the Italian courts. Many of these changes in the early 1500s belong to what has been termed a more “painterly” style in tapestry design. In conjunction with these changes, however, the collaborative nature of tapestry must be noted, as it involved weavers, cartoonists, and painters. Before 1476, weavers in Brussels were allowed to design and implement their own cartoons. As discussed in chapter 1, however, the guilds’ desire to protect their artistic purview continued to cause strife. Prior to 1476, the weavers were also free to purchase cartoons from artists stopping in Brussels while traveling. This practice, in combination with the weavers’ use of their own cartoons, enraged the St. Luke’s Guild in Brussels to a point where the city stepped in to protect the artists’ profession. The city ruled that only painters could create tapestry cartoons, the exception being *millefleur* and *verdure* scenes (considered less difficult and therefore not as

---

26 Eichberger also suggests that it was understood in Brussels that workshops could borrow each others’ cartoons, but that the cartoons were not to leave the city so as to prevent competing cities from duplicating their designs. In perhaps an overzealous attempt at protecting its artistic property, the Brussels magistrate burned several cartoons that had been copied from Roger van der Weyden’s *Justice* panels. See Eichberger, “Tapestry Production,” 36, and Sophie Schneebalg-Perelman, “Die Brüsseler Teppichwirkerei zur Zeit Philipps des Guten,” *Rogier van der Weyden—Roger de la Pasture, Stadtmaler von Brüssel, Porträttist des burgundischen Hofes*, exh. cat. (Brussels: Maison du Roi, 1979), 108.
prestigious), for which weavers could still design cartoons on their own. Thus guild regulations played a large part in changing the nature of tapestry design, as weavers possessed the technical skill to execute complex designs while painters could create designs that mirrored the richer, more brightly colored designs of panel painting. This collaboration of skills, together with improved dyeing techniques for silk threads developed in the late fifteenth and early-sixteenth centuries, created tapestries that were rich in color, had advanced perspective and depth, and contained improved techniques for pattern designs, hatches, and shading.

The Innovation of Standardization: Filling Demand

An important characteristic of Pre-Renaissance tapestry designs was the reliance on *staffage*. By filling the tapestry with figures whose identities were not necessary to the story, the designers were able to easily add and replace figures as they chose or needed to; in addition, this device allowed them to reuse figures as often as they wanted—why waste time redesigning unimportant figures? As long as the main figures, or those representing the patron, were appropriate, the other faces certainly did not need to be recognizable. Thus, many tapestries seem to be filled with cookie-cutter people who show little expression or action in the scene. However, it is precisely this aspect of reusable figures that allowed the tapestry trade to commodify itself; while the more expensive commissions might still specify all the figures in a scene, less expensive pieces could be produced with relative ease by using predesigned figures (with no need for a completely new

---

cartoon) at a reduced cost.\textsuperscript{28} The apparent preference for primitive styles, long debated in Flemish art history, argues for the use of certain older, less stylistically advanced techniques and aesthetic tastes (which, as described above, was not always true, but rather a reliance on what was known to sell so as to avoid risk). \textsuperscript{29} But in the case of tapestry it also allowed for rapid expansion of workshop production. As with the carved altarpieces produced in the 1500s in the Low Countries, tapestry production reflected the impact of standardization as well as the realization that certain older techniques and styles allowed for greater output. Thus many tapestries produced well into the late sixteenth century still reflect the preferred styles of much earlier tapestries, and this choice cannot be interpreted as strictly a reflection of the workshop’s technical capability, primarily because there are instances in which, for example, we see new perspective techniques or

\textsuperscript{28} A similar phenomenon was seen in painting several decades earlier than in tapestry. Prak notes that “painters in Brabant and Flanders had also pioneered labor-saving techniques, such as the repeated use of the same design, cut-outs for standard elements, and collaboration between specialist workshops.” See Prak, “Guilds and the Development,” 237-38, who cites J.M. Montias, \textit{Artists and Artisans in Delft: a socio-economic study of the seventeenth century} (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1982), 456-57. In a discussion of the prolific output of many Antwerp painters, Prak comments that “to attain such levels of productivity, new working methods were called for. Painters in Antwerp had already developed ways of standardizing their work, or part of it…Van Goyen, for example, became famous for his sketchy landscapes that used only a limited range of colors…He applied very little detail, thus saving significantly on production time” (Prak, “Guilds and the Development,” 238).

\textsuperscript{29} A similar process is seen in the market for paintings in Antwerp from 1550 to 1650, where there was, as De Marchi and Van Miegroet note, “a remarkable demand for derivative imagery involving various media and supports….value was imparted by deriving images from familiar subject-matter attributable to famous masters,” (in Neil De Marchi and Hans J. Van Miegroet, “Uncertainty, family ties and derivative painting in seventeenth century Antwerp,” in \textit{Family Ties: art production and kinship patterns in the early modern Low Countries}, eds. Koenraad Brosens, Leen Kelchtermans, Katlijne van der Stighelen (Turnhout: Brepols, 2012), 63). As in tapestry, there was security to be found in reproducing designs which were known to sell, or for which there was still broad appeal. See also M. Burry, “On some engravings by Giorgio Chisi commonly called reproductive,” in \textit{Sixteenth-Century Italian Art}, Blackwell Anthologies in Art History, 3, ed. M.W. Cole (Somerset, NJ: Blackwell, 2006), 275-290. The reliance on buyers’ recognition reflects the importance of both copies and standardization to workshop practice and therefore growth and sustainability; see Neil De Marchi and Hans Van Miegroet, “The History of Art Markets,” in \textit{Handbook of the Economics of Art and Culture}, eds. Victor A. Ginsburg and David Throsby (Amsterdam: Elsevier, 2006) 72.
different methods of creating texture. In this sense, it may be that tapestries relied on standardization earlier than the carved altarpieces did.

One significant part of the process of standardization in tapestries involved the borders. It was not unheard of to reuse the pattern of a set of borders woven for a different, perhaps commissioned tapestry by simply tacking them on to another piece. But by the mid-sixteenth century, with on spec sales increasing, it made sense for weavers to take advantage of any shortcuts available, such as using the *staffage* figures mentioned above. The reuse of borders, however, sometimes resulted in mismatches—borders whose iconography did not match that of the tapestry—that clearly failed to observe the original designer’s intentions. For example, the borders from two of Raphael’s famed *Acts of the Apostles* pieces, *The Sacrifice of Lystra*, shown in figure 39, and *The Blinding of Elymas*, which encompassed the four cardinal and three theological vices, were all created with Raphael’s awareness of the central images’ iconology and how light hit the walls of the Sistine Chapel at various points in the day.30 When they were reused on two tapestries from a series about Mercury and Herse, woven by Willem de Pannemaker in 1550, that meaning was lost.31

---

31 Edith A. Standen, “Some Sixteenth-Century Flemish Tapestries Related to Raphael's Workshop,” *Metropolitan Museum Journal* 4 (1971): 115-18. Standen also suggests (p. 118) that the cartoons for the *Acts* tapestries arrived separately from Raphael’s workshop, with no instructions, and that for this reason Peter van Aelst was not able to get all the placements right. Standen further notes that the disconnect between border and center would not have bothered Flemish weavers as much because they “would have been accustomed to similar discrepancies in the borders of manuscripts and contemporary printed books. A striking example is the frontispiece to Erasmus’s New Testament of 1519, where the text of Leo X’s letter to him is surrounded by Venus, Cupid, Apollo pursuing Daphne, and other pagan figures” (p. 118).
Some speculation about how borders may have contributed to the on spec trade seems appropriate at this point. Because the reuse of specialized or personalized borders would not always work on tapestries woven for the on spec market, it would have been easiest for workshops to weave neutral, simple borders in the styles of the bulk of their productions—such as verdures, geometric designs, or other nondescript filler—that still related to the luxuriousness of the piece, like the borders seen in figure 40, rather than cheapen its appearance. Because the workshops would not have sold these rolls of continuous border pattern independently, except perhaps to other weavers, it is not surprising that no mention of them has been found yet. But, given the state of the art produced at this time for export in Antwerp, it is very likely that as much standardization as possible would have been adopted by the weavers as well.

**Smaller Devotional Tapestries as a Starting Point for Some Speculations**

One significant innovation in tapestry aside from style and standardization was size. Smaller devotional tapestries (all less than two square meters, and some smaller than 60 square centimeters) became popular between the last quarter of the fifteenth century and the first quarter of the sixteenth century (around 1470-1525) and then fell out of favor. Nevertheless, the smaller pieces represent significant changes in function and style for tapestries. While small devotional paintings had a much longer history as well as a wider audience, the careful stitches, dimensional qualities, and silk, gold, and silver threads used in
the tapestries instantly lent a sumptuous, glamorous quality to one’s devotional prayers.

Little information exists about ownership, cost, weaver, or even date for the still-extant examples of these smaller devotional pieces. However, royal inventories are filled with references to smaller pieces, and in some instances the descriptions are very similar to the items surviving today. These similarities can have two explanations: either the piece described in records and the actual surviving piece are one and the same, or the descriptions sound very similar because the iconography, materials, and dimensions of both objects reflected popular tastes at the time. The second explanation would suggest that far more objects were produced than just those mentioned in inventories.

The smaller tapestries functioned very differently than standard-sized tapestries, and they were also distinct from other small-sized pieces of “tapestry”

33 For example, Isabella of Castile had no fewer than 25 small tapestries listed in the inventories taken after her death. Although some tapestries were gifts, many were purchased for her by her factor, who routinely purchased large quantities (Ibid. 116).
34 Cleland suggests that, among the pieces referenced and those extant, three primary iconographic styles emerge: (1) allegorical stories not related to religious depictions, (2) scenes from the Passion and the Infancy, and (3) saints (see “Small Scale,” 119-20). A 1547 inventory of Henry VIII’s possessions lists “one lytle pece of Arras of Christ in our Ladies armes cont. one yarde one naile square by tharrisman [the royal arras maker]” and “one square pece of Arras of Christe and one geving him grapes & our Ladie standing by iij quart of a yarde square by tharrisman.” Campbell argues that these descriptions sound very similar to those of a group of smaller devotional tapestries from around the beginning of the 1500s, purchased no doubt as a result of the strong religious faith of both Henry VIII and his wife Katherine. See T. Campbell, Henry VIII, 124-25, who cites David Starkey, ed., The Inventory of Henry VIII: Society of Antiquaries MS 129 and British Library MS Harley 1419. The Transcript, transcribed by Philip Ward (London: Harvey Miller Publishers for the Society of Antiquaries of London, 1998), nos. 12027, 12029. Additionally, because similar entries are found in the collections of ladies at the Burgundian and Spanish courts, it seems likely that Katherine of Aragon may have brought the continental taste for smaller devotional tapestries with her to the Tudor court, thus encouraging the royal weavers to emulate this style. See Elizabeth Cleland, “ ‘The Blood of the Grape’: Tapestries as Tools of Private Devotion During the Renaissance,” Bulletin of the Metropolitan Museum of Art (New York), in press.
that are often noted in the export logs for Antwerp (e.g., tablecloths like that seen in figure 41, bedcovers (shown in figure 42), door covers, chair pillows or bolsters (figure 43), cushions (figure 44), and curtains). The devotional tapestries, although not necessarily commissioned works, were intended to create an intimate, personal atmosphere for the viewer, just as their panel painting counterparts did. Even though the devotional tapestries were very different in function from the decorative woven items listed above, they had one major factor in common: size. Although the devotional tapestries fell out of favor by the 1530s, they nonetheless are a starting point for thinking about changes that were responses to an evolving market.

If smaller pieces (generally defined as less than two square meters in area, but usually much smaller than that) were sold on the open market, it was most likely in response to rising demand and in an effort to attract customers. A coarsely woven piece to hang above one's mantle was still more luxurious than a panel painting and conveyed more of a sense of achievement for the customer. After all, the buyer was getting a miniature version of what the Emperor had bought. And, although still well beyond the reach of the middle class, the smaller tapestries would be decidedly within range for someone with a bit more means, but not enough to purchase a larger piece. The smaller devotional pieces were truly luxurious not only in that their prices were proportional to those of the larger ones, but also in their materials and craftsmanship. Even though the weaving area was smaller (it would be woven on a one-person loom), the time

35 Although all of these pieces were woven, they were typically of verdure patterns, poorer in quality, and used standard materials so as to last longer in everyday life.
needed to handle thinner warps and greater number of threads per centimeter required to create the depth of a larger tapestry may have actually resulted in a slower production rate. When dealers needed more and more pieces to sell to foreign merchants, weavers were forced to make a decision about whether to remain true to their current standards or raise production by favoring quantity over quality.\footnote{Erik Duverger, \textit{Antwerpse wandtapijten} (exh. cat.) (Antwerp: Provinciaal Museum Sterckshof, 1973), 40.} If they chose to create smaller tapestries to be sold in quantity on the open market, this decision may have resulted in a faster turnaround time, thereby bolstering a merchant’s available stock. The smaller pieces, along with the various curtains, tablecloths, chair pillows, and the like, would also offer something to sell while merchants waited for customers looking for much larger pieces. If a merchant knew, however, that he would not be able to sell the decorative items and fabrics at home, or if he preferred to stay within the realm of trading in wall hangings, the smaller tapestries would offer a balance between a desire to purchase additional items to ship home and the frightening financial implications of buying too many larger pieces without specific buyers in mind. Merchants knew that tapestry sold well, and the smaller ones could have broadened a merchant’s customer base beyond just the wealthiest patrons, reducing the risk attached to investing in the on spec productions.

\textit{Increasing Individualization of Tapestries}

As the number of tapestry exports skyrocketed, the differences between cities and even workshops in the appearance of the tapestries themselves became even more pronounced. The quality of a piece had an obvious correlation to price,
but subject matter was also a factor in purchases, and weavers from certain cities were known for excelling in certain genres or styles. For example, by the 1530s the number of valuable commissions from courts across Europe encouraged greater specialization by Brussels cartoonists and weavers, encouraging technical and artistic innovation and development. In a parallel to the developments in the tapestry industry, Prak surmises that “during the sixteenth century a mass market of works of art developed in Antwerp, where painters diversified in subject, style, and price, and produced substantial numbers of paintings for export markets.”

At the same time, workshops were continuing to proliferate in the southern Netherlands. Although a cursory examination of surveys regarding Flemish tapestry might lead to the conclusion that Brussels was a leading center of high-quality, very expensive tapestries and that other cities produced less expensive and poorer-quality wares, this would be a flawed supposition. The proximity of cities such as Tournai, St.-Truiden, Lille, Brussels, Oudenaarde, Enghien, Bruges, and Paris to one another leaves no doubt that the workshops in Oudenaarde, for example, were aware of the types of production underway in St.-Truiden. As early as the late 1300s and early 1400s, although cities were beginning to establish their own distinctive types of production, there was still

---

considerable overlap between cities; their tapestries often overlapped in style, technique, and quality.\textsuperscript{38} The degree of specialization that would develop later among the various cities, and that eventually led to the establishment of a distinctive tapestry market in Antwerp in the 1550s, was the result of a growing awareness that specialization could set one’s workshop apart from others and safely achieve more sales.\textsuperscript{39} Competition to corner more of the market invariably led to a wider selection of products. As De Marchi and Van Miegroet note, “for all that the groups [referring here to painters] maintained a separate identity, their engagements with each other as competitors issued in mutual borrowings and adaptations of each other’s subject matter, techniques, formats and supports. The result was increased variety…and products available at every level of price.”\textsuperscript{40} Cities such as Oudenaarde made a conscious decision to focus on bulk production of less expensive and easier-to-weave tapestries, with the result that their production, as seen in chapter 1, constituted the bulk of exports from Antwerp.

That does not mean, however, that they were incapable of producing high-quality


\textsuperscript{39} In his discussion of the emerging centers of tapestry production in the Low Countries, Campbell (\textit{Tapestry in the Renaissance}, 32) states that “Cavallo’s reappraisal was a healthy challenge to the traditional view and is unquestionably relevant to the vast majority of medieval production, which, being of a mundane and mediocre character, could indeed have been produced more or less anywhere. His vision of a diversified and relatively undifferentiated production throughout the Low Countries does not apply entirely, however, to the part of the industry that produced large numbers of big, high quality tapestries. Productions such as Philip the Good’s \textit{Gideon} tapestries or the \textit{Story of the Trojan War} sets that Pasquier Grenier supplied to leading patrons between 1472 and 1493 were not the product of an ad hoc cottage industry.” Additionally, James Bloom notes a similar phenomenon in painting: “The dynamic growth of the Antwerp economy and the steady increase in the demand for painting precipitated both the advent of individual art dealers and the phenomenon of specialization, in which painters began to focus on the execution of discrete pictorial genres as a means to ensure their success in an increasingly competitive environment,” in “Why Painting?” in \textit{Mapping Markets for Paintings in Europe, 1450–1750} (Studies in European Urban History (1100-1800) 6), eds. Neil De Marchi and Hans J. Van Miegroet (Turnhout: Brepols, 2006), 19.

\textsuperscript{40} De Marchi and Van Miegroet, “History of Art Markets,” 80.
works. Conversely, Brussels weavers could produce the same types of pieces as Oudenaarde, but found its niche in the higher-quality, lavish designs.

**Antwerp as a Production Center**

An examination of this type of conscious specialization on the part of the cities, however, leads to the question of why Antwerp itself failed to become a center of production for tapestries during the 1500s. The answer lies in an understanding of the city’s economics and a cost-benefit analysis. Vermeylen has suggested that Antwerp had six factors that at first glance would have made the city very appealing as a site for weavers:

- Preexisting commercial infrastructure
- Access to a major port for shipping
- Access to imported raw materials
- Access to a large number of international customers
- The city’s efforts to recruit with favors
- A loose regulatory environment for guilds

However, while there was already a strong historical precedent for tapestry production in the smaller cities around Antwerp, there was no such weaving tradition in Antwerp in the late fourteenth and fifteenth centuries. By the time Antwerp’s international market had developed enough that there was sufficient export demand for tapestries in Antwerp, Brussels had already become known as a center of high quality, highly skilled weaving, while Oudenaarde and St.-Truiden had earned reputations as centers of less expensive, high volume weaving. Therefore, when tapestry exports began to increase in the early 1500s,

---

41 I am grateful to Filip Vermeylen for a copy of his unpublished paper, “The Economics of Tapestry Making,” presented at the symposium *Tapestry in Chicago*, at the Art Institute of Chicago, October 31, 2008.
the bulk of production was coming from those satellite cities such as Oudenaarde. Even though Antwerp did make efforts to lure weavers to the city, mainly through the extension of special privileges, the disadvantages of setting up a workshop in Antwerp probably outweighed those benefits. While tapestry workshops were not necessarily expansive operations in terms of physical space, the size of looms (roughly 4.3 meters wide) and the necessary workforce did mean that workshops needed a minimum amount space to run efficiently and properly. At a time when rents were quite high, leasing space in Antwerp would have cost far more than the same amount of space in one of the outlying cities.42

Furthermore, weaving was very labor intensive, and larger workshops carried a substantial workforce. Housing and related living costs would have been significantly higher in Antwerp, and workshops would have needed to be able to absorb the additional costs in the advantages gained by moving their operations to Antwerp. Additionally, the longer traditions of weaving in the other cities also meant that there was a well-established system for apprenticeship in the industry, which was not true of Antwerp—there was far less guarantee for successful training and gainful employment in a city such as Antwerp. At a time when minimizing risk by taking advantage of simple economies of scale was paramount, the safest option—that is, the least risky—for most workshops was no doubt to remain in their home cities and send representatives to Antwerp to act on their behalf. This arrangement has some interesting similarities with the

42 A painter’s workshop, for example, could be set up in comparatively far less space, which no doubt was a factor in the proliferation of painters in Antwerp in the sixteenth century as compared to relatively few weavers.
development of painting sales and production in Antwerp. The same set of factors—“Guild openness, civic encouragement, widespread dealing, plus specialization and division of labor...as well as a marketing and exporting orientation”\textsuperscript{43}— that helped Antwerp to become a center of both painting sales and production helped the city to become a center of tapestry exports. De Marchi and Van Miegroet argue that “Antwerp was complemented in the production of paintings by its near-neighbor Mechelen.”\textsuperscript{44} The differences in scale and cost between painting and weaving workshops no doubt contributed to the lack of tapestry production in Antwerp.

**Exogenous Innovations**

Design and production were also heavily influenced by the expanding market for tapestries, which brought increased demand and the need for more standardized designs or components within a tapestry, at a time when other luxury art forms were undergoing similar changes. Thus, not all innovations that influenced tapestry were created strictly within the medium of tapestry. It is difficult to determine which art form introduced new methods of production first, but it is likely they drew from each other, via lateral integration, in order to meet production demands. Carved altarpieces created for on spec sales in Antwerp, about which there are plentiful extant records, are a good model of how the tapestry industry likely responded to the growing market.\textsuperscript{45} The creation of

\textsuperscript{43} De Marchi and Van Miegroet, “History of Art Markets,” 89.

\textsuperscript{44} Ibid. 89.

\textsuperscript{45} This type of response by producers fits into what Prak deems “almost perfect market conditions, with demand and supply reinforcing each other to generate marvelous results.” See
pieces that would appeal to a wide variety of customers on the open market was a challenge, but one for which both art forms were well suited. Artists learned to recognize that certain subjects, for example, were more appropriate for certain clientele than others. In addition to the city marks discussed in Chapter 2, other assurances were shared by both tapestries and altarpieces. As there was no initial meeting between artist and customer, which would be typical with a commissioned piece, an indication of quality and good faith was necessary to reassure the on spec customer. Both industries were easily able to adapt to this need, though it was perhaps a bit easier for tapestry given its long history of responding to the Emperor’s demands for quality and of combatting fraudulent practices. For tapestries, the reassurance of quality would remain paramount to maintaining sales.

Carved Altarpieces as an Example of the Lateral Diffusion of Innovation

Four major factors at play in Antwerp’s art market in the 1500s influenced the sale of luxury goods on the open market: (1) the buyer’s ability to customize a standardized or on spec piece by adding selected borders or other features to make it appear more personalized; (2) the role of seals or city of origin marks as a signal of both quality and good faith; (3) an awareness that the cost of a commissioned piece might be greater, for relatively simple or common subject matter, than that of a nearly identical piece available on the open market; and (4) the ability of an on-spec piece to appeal to a wide, nonspecific audience.

The well-documented mass production of carved altarpieces provides a good model for understanding the production of tapestries. Carved retables, like tapestries, attracted an international market rather than a primarily domestic customer base. Jacobs argues that “the Netherlandish carved altarpiece established its market niche by defining itself to contrast with other market competitors” both domestically and from abroad.46 The same argument can be made for the economies of scale taking place within the city of Antwerp with regard to tapestry sales: different cities and production centers were able to differentiate their products in both quality and subject matter, and over time Antwerp became a center for sales rather than for production itself.47

One of the most distinctive features of the Netherlandish carved altarpieces is that they were sold primarily from stocks of premade pieces, unlike their counterparts from Germany, Italy, and Spain, which were primarily made for commissions. Although “in none of the other main centers of altarpiece production from the fourteenth through the sixteenth century, not in Germany,

---

47 While we know that many foreign weavers immigrated to Antwerp and set up workshops, less is known about domestic Antwerp workshops. Although by the 1540s, with Peter van Aelst’s help, Antwerp’s domestic production of tapestries had increased, it still fell short of the production seen in nearby Flemish towns. Braudel’s identification of Antwerp as a “bring and buy” center once again comes to mind; see Fernand Braudel, Civilization and Capitalism, 15th-18th Century: The Wheels of Commerce (New York: Harper and Row, 1984), 34. By the 1550s, weavers from various cities were known for the style and quality of their products, and this type of specialization may have been the simple product of an economy of scale; as each city mass-produced what it could best make, costs would be driven down. This pattern might explain why production from weavers of Antwerp origin did not noticeably increase. Looking at what other items were being produced and or exported from Antwerp may shed some light on this question; for example, if paintings were already being mass-produced in Antwerp, one would expect less desire to increase domestic production of tapestries, because of the city’s comparative advantage in producing paintings that sold well on the market versus the comparative disadvantage of producing another item such as tapestry. Not until the next century would Antwerp truly become a center of production rather than sales, by which point the entire industry would have undergone irreversible changes.
Italy, nor Spain, were altarpieces commonly sold on open-market outlets,”\textsuperscript{48} art functioned in a different manner in the markets in the Low Countries. Thus artists and workshops in the southern Netherlands, and particularly in Antwerp, were able to take advantage of both the increasing international demand for the items and the well-developed market. The growth of the capitalist market in Antwerp allowed artists to peddle their wares to a much broader audience of people who had already come to purchase all kinds of other items in bulk.

With regard to the carved altarpieces, their ability to convey religious beliefs while being aesthetically pleasing, in order to appeal to a wide audience and thus justify their sale on an open market, are not two completely separate features but, rather, were dependent on one another for a successful sale.\textsuperscript{49} In order to be successful, at least when marketed on a non-commission basis, as was the case with tapestries, the altarpieces had to both please a wide range of potential buyers stylistically and limit their content to scenes that would have mass-market appeal. A biblical scene of specific importance for one family would not necessarily appeal to many others; instead, the altarpieces generally stuck to fairly simple iconographic themes such as the Passion, the Nativity, or the Resurrection.\textsuperscript{50} The selling of tapestries on the open market would no doubt have followed a similar pattern; specific designs created, for example, for a particular family’s heraldic crest, could not then be reused for other patrons buying on spec,

\textsuperscript{48} Jacobs, \textit{Early Netherlandish}, 19.
\textsuperscript{49} Ibid. 19.
but more generic pieces with allegorical themes, biblical imagery, or plainer *verdure* scenes could appeal to a wide variety of customers.

But the tapestries and other luxury items being sold on the open market also worked to shape the tastes of the on spec customers; while these buyers had some degree of choice among the items being offered, if they wanted to purchase something without a commission they were forced to make a selection from the available stock. As these pieces became more widely disseminated, demand may have increased simply because more people were now seeing the objects.\(^{51}\)

However, the altarpieces, unlike tapestries, were not being purchased in one centralized location, and thus could not take advantage of the information networks available at the *Tapissierspand*. At the *Tapissierspand*, a buyer was faced with all of the available options, whether on spec or commissioned. The on spec tapestries could guide buyers’ taste to some extent, but they were largely responding to a previously established taste rather than forming the buyer’s preferences completely; they served more as an acknowledgment of established preference than as a way of creating it. One of the main reasons why the *Tapissierspand* worked was that outlines of preference were very clear based on what was still being commissioned, thereby greatly reducing the risk of on spec production.

Central to understanding the market for tapestries and other luxury goods is understanding an individual artist or workshop’s style. While tapestries being sold without commission needed to please a wide audience, they also needed a

small spark of originality, perhaps in color palette, that was just large enough to
differentiate them from the other patterns available; otherwise, once a customer
had bought one tapestry, he would have no desire to purchase any others. At the
same time, the on spec tapestries were also a mirror of popular taste—workshops
would have produced what sold, and discontinued what did not. However, the
nature of a tapestry’s wide appeal does not mean that every commissioned
tapestry was then requisitely different. In fact, commissioned pieces may have
actually echoed popular pieces of the time. Aside from very specific or personal
stipulations in a commission, a patron may very well have also wanted a
representation of the Resurrection or a scene from the history of Joseph—just a
higher-quality or more extravagant version.

**Commissioned and On Spec Sales of Tapestries**

The standardization of carved retables’ parallels tapestry’s on spec
production in Antwerp. These tapestries had to appeal to a wide audience
base, and thus had to conform to certain standards of mass-appeal. The presence
of much overlap in both style and imagery in tapestries produced in the same
period—regardless of whether they were commissioned—indicates that there had
to be some inherent advantage in commissioning a piece instead of buying it
ready-made. That advantage would be that the buyer was in control of the theme,

---

52 That numerous weavers might be producing very similar products, in instances where no
identifying mark or signature was included, would most likely make the problem of identifying
individuals or shops almost impossible to solve. However, if these tapestries could be viewed as
part of an overall visual culture, the fact that individual identification might be impossible would
only reinforce the intended nature of the tapestries.


54 Ibid. 161.
size, materials, figures, and other factors. These highly personal aspects of commissioned work insured that on-spec marketing could not fully replace commissioned pieces.

But along with standardization in terms of visual appearance and thematic approach came another type of standardization within many trades in the sixteenth century: the increasing development and application of techniques that reduced both labor and production costs. As discussed above, cost-saving advantages in tapestry could be achieved through the use of patterns that were simple to reproduce (in the case of tapestries, the easier-to-weave *verdure* scenes rather than intricate figures) and through a reduction of expensive materials.

Additionally, luxury items created for the open market without a guaranteed buyer would inherently be less demanding to the workshop in terms of cost and labor, and they could be priced less expensively on the market in

---

55 While the patron could certainly commission a piece that was similar to the standardized pieces, there was little point in commissioning a piece and then waiting many months for its creation if an identical piece was readily available, particularly when the primary motivation in commissioning a piece was to obtain an item not readily available to the public (Jacobs, *Early Netherlandish*, 161). Tapestries would certainly take many months longer to be completed than other commissioned items, making this consideration even more important. Montias discusses the relative advantage and disadvantage of the commissioner, noting that there must be a commensurate advantage to cause a buyer to commission a new piece. See J. M. Montias, "Le marché de l'art aux Pays-Bas, XV et XVI siècles," *Annales Économies Sociétés Civilisations* 6 (1993): 1545-46. For example, if the buyer wanted a Passion scene, it was often cheaper to purchase a ready-made one rather than spend additional and unnecessary money on an unpersonalized commission piece.

56 Jacobs, *Early Netherlandish*, 162.

57 While the reduction of more expensive materials may have meant that a workshop could produce more items for sale on the open market, it also meant that it was increasingly difficult for a customer to find very expensive tapestries for sale on spec. It is difficult to determine whether some workshops continued to produce more expensive pieces with the hope that they would attract a non-commissioning buyer or if these pieces increasingly only became available through a contract, but the production of such pieces on spec would certainly have placed a burden on any workshop.
order to lure an on-site buyer. Montias argues that, alongside the cheaper priced ready-made items, the commissioned items with their higher costs would eventually balance out the economic equation for the workshop. While the noncommissioned pieces were at a disadvantage in that they would not necessarily appeal to a specific buyer, this disadvantage could be overcome by offering wealthier purchasers a commissioned piece. Thus the workshop could make a profit from more than one type of sale.

It is difficult to determine where tapestry production fit on the spectrum between sales based wholly on commission and the creation of pieces for on spec sales. This is one instance in which the carved altarpieces differ greatly from tapestries. The altarpieces were an industry that did not allow for any “idiosyncrasy” but rather flourished under the guidelines of standardization. Van Miegroet and De Marchi argue that, as more works became available on the open market, artists were forced to find new ways to draw attention to their wares. This allowed artists within their own trades to establish themselves as specialized creators of various types and styles within a broader group, such as painting. Although in many ways this was an economically risky approach, if

---

58 If workshops tried to produce cheaper tapestries for on spec buyers but priced them higher than cheaper commissioned pieces, they would have priced themselves out of the market. Likewise, even as workshop staffs improved in skill and technique and the owner of the workshop was able to turn a significantly higher profit, the workshop might choose not to increase wages proportionally in order to maintain this higher profit margin.


60 Jacobs, *Early Netherlandish*, 162. She theorizes that the relative consistency of altarpieces may have been because “the nature of the product, an altarpiece for a church rather than the largely secular products sold by the Dutch for home decoration, might have required more adherence to established formulas. When buyers purchased art for churches, rather than their homes, they had to select a work that would be displayed to a public audience (not just to their family and friends) and that would not offend any religious traditions. Hence, such buyers may have been more inclined to stick to the typical, rather than seeking more unusual examples” (p. 163).
successful it ensured that the weaver or workshop would be sought out by customers who wanted to find a certain style without having to commission an artwork.\textsuperscript{61}

While with a contract, the weaver was guaranteed a certain price for his work and might even be advanced some of that money in order to pay for raw materials, there was no such guarantee that a piece created on spec could sell for a predetermined price. Since the workshop had to cover material and labor costs up front,\textsuperscript{62} securing cheaper materials and reduced labor costs became important. This type of sale can also be economically advantageous only when artists are certain that buyers exist for the types of products they hope to sell and that the market in which they are selling their products is strong enough to support such specialized sales. The success of such markets depended on the artist’s ability to have a readily available stock on hand at all times from which to sell.\textsuperscript{63} While buyers who wanted something highly personalized or specialized still had to resort to commissions, pieces made on spec allowed workshops to drastically expand their sales base and target a broader clientele. The distinction between on spec and commissioned sales could become confusing when a customer

\textsuperscript{62} Tapestry workshops creating on spec pieces were frequently beholden to the dealers or merchants selling them, both in terms of what the dealer wanted for his customers and in terms of funding. It was not unusual for a workshop to receive a loan from a dealer in order to create a piece.
\textsuperscript{63} Montias, “Le marché,” 1545.
sought to customize a piece and thus became much more involved than the average on spec buyer.\textsuperscript{64}

It is hard to assess specifically which tapestry workshops may have functioned in this manner, aside from general thoughts that certain cities were known for producing certain types, styles, or levels of qualities of tapestry. In a large enough market, the presence of commissioned and non-commissioned pieces could each bolster the sale of the other. Commissioned works could lead a non-commissioning customer to purchase a piece similar to his friend’s, while ready-made pieces could serve as visual models for the contractual customer, suggesting what sorts of individualizations he might want in his own piece or what styles were available. The premade pieces could serve as points of departure for the commissioning buyer, and patrons might even travel to a workshop in order to see the models.\textsuperscript{65} Additionally, it is also conceivable that the price of commissioned pieces could vary considerably, as they could in some cases be of lower quality and cost than the inspiring, much more expensive,

\textsuperscript{64} Jacobs, \textit{Early Netherlandish}, 194. As an example, Jacobs refers to the sale of an altarpiece in 1524. When “the abbey of Averbode ‘bought from Laureys Keldermans ... an altarpiece ... which was in Antwerp in the Our Lady \textit{Pand}’ (tegen Laureys Keldermans ... gecocht een outaer tafel ... die tot Antwerpen in Onser Vrouwen pandt stond), the buyer included a number of conditions that mirror the kind of concerns, and the language found in commission contracts.” (p.194-95); see also P. Lefèvre, “Textes concernant l’histoire artistique de l’abbaye d’Averbode,” \textit{Revue belge d’archéologie et d’histoire de l’art} 5 (1935): 53. Thus, the interaction between buyer and artist was not always merely of a mercantile nature, but rather the buyer could sometimes be more involved.

\textsuperscript{65} This is certainly not a new component of Northern Renaissance art. Van Eyck’s \textit{Ghent Altarpiece}, for example, was probably composed of both older panels (most likely designed for an organ) and newer panels created specifically for the patron. For the use of models as examples for commissions, see Jacobs, \textit{Early Netherlandish}, 193: “Even if the use of ready-made models was mainly motivated by the concerns for quality ... such commission practices promoted relations between preexistent works and commissioned ones that could transcend issues of quality to encompass broader artistic features. No doubt the retable ateliers were aware of this situation and displayed ready-made works in the \textit{pand} or in their shops, not only in hopes of obtaining direct sales income but also in order to promote commissioned sales.”
higher-quality pieces made for the open market.⁶⁶ And finally, as noted, some pieces combined elements of both styles, such as the tacking on of premade borders to a commissioned piece, or the reverse process of attaching very ornate borders to a common scene made for the open market in order to give it a more elaborate or personalized feeling.

This sort of hybrid approach to sales could then result in a corpus of commissioned and non-commissioned works that were similar in appearance but with subtle differences, thus making it difficult to distinguish between pieces woven for the open market and those (not including pieces with specific identifying information) produced on commission.⁶⁷ This issue is particularly problematic in instances where tapestries were woven in satellite cities and then sold in Antwerp, with little information preserved regarding their origin (other than city mark) or workshop. Unless identifying marks are present that might indicate the family, it is not always easy to determine what sort of customer the patron may have been.

Of course, whether with tapestries or carved retables, a patron would anticipate his expectations of both quality and price to be met. In almost every surviving contract, the patron specified guidelines for price and the quality of both the finished product and the raw materials to be used. It was not unusual to require a critical appraisal of the finished work, in order to ensure that the quality of the piece was as promised.⁶⁸ Similarly, many contracts also stipulated that the

---

⁶⁶ Ibid. 203.
⁶⁷ Ibid. 192.
⁶⁸ Ibid. 177.
product be of good craftsmanship as well as of high quality. Included in these stipulations might be who in a workshop could work on the piece; in some instances the patron did not want apprentices working on the commissioned item or specified that the piece must be exclusively the work of the master.

One way in which the production and sale of the carved altarpieces differed greatly from tapestry is that the customer bases were very different. While tapestries were purchased by a wide (though universally wealthy) spectrum of customers, altarpieces were primarily purchased by the church, both in commissioned and noncommissioned sales. Private customers constituted only a small percentage of the consumer body. Specific groups, such as confraternities or guilds, were much more inclined to purchase a commissioned work that could have specific meaning with regard to the group’s patron saint or purpose within a city.

Aside from this important difference about clientele, other points regarding the benefits and disadvantages of commissioned and non-commissioned pieces do apply to tapestry. The customer was faced with a number of choices when deciding whether to purchase from an artist’s stock or to commission a piece, such as how quickly the piece was needed and what sort of iconographical program or style appealed to the patron. For example, a patron wishing to commission a piece for a private chapel dedicated to a particular saint may not have been able to pick a suitable item from the artist’s available stock, while the customer merely needing something to hang in the dining room may

69 Ibid. 198.
have been less picky and could easily find a variety of appropriate, premade scenes. If the piece was needed for display at next month’s party, a commission was not practical or possible.\textsuperscript{70}

Price was, of course, another important factor. For members of the upper levels of society, a commissioned tapestry did not impose as great a financial burden as it would on upper-middle-class buyers. For the patron with somewhat less money but who still had a taste for high-end artworks, luxury goods for sale on the open market were typically cheaper, as discussed above with regard to smaller tapestries. That is not to say, however, that the quality of the cheaper pieces was always significantly below that of the commissioned pieces.\textsuperscript{71}

Although items in the markets were often of lower quality, these items were typically priced accordingly.\textsuperscript{72} An artist could not hope to sell a piece of much lower quality for the same price as a commissioned piece without angering his customers. This is particularly true in the case of tapestries, whose raw materials and labor costs far exceeded that of other items for sale. The discerning customer may have had more trouble finding what he wanted among the stock available. For example, in 1530, the king of Portugal’s ambassador complained that he

\textsuperscript{70} This balance of choices is discussed in depth by Montias, “Le marché.”

\textsuperscript{71} Jacobs, \textit{Early Netherlandish}, 200. Jacobs adds that “of the documents dated from 1436 to 1524 that appear to record payments for some thirteen sculpted retables sold on the market, the costs for the carved retables range between 6 and 15 Flemish pounds: most fall between 9 and 12 Flemish pounds, an amount that represents over a year’s salary for an Antwerp laborer. Similarly, the prices noted in fifteen purchases of works (dating between 1414-1511), whose commissioned status is indeterminate, but primarily are market examples, fall mostly in the 9- to 15-pound range, with a few works priced significantly lower, at 4 to 6 pounds, and a few significantly higher, around 25 pounds (one even reaching 46 1/2 pounds)” (p. 200).

\textsuperscript{72} \textit{Ibid.} 201.
could find nothing worthwhile in the markets and had to resort to commissioning
tapestries to find the quality he desired.\textsuperscript{73}

But market works had to maintain some degree of quality in order to
attract customers, despite the lure of lower prices. The on spec works had to
tread a careful line: they could not be of such poor quality that customers would
not be interested, nor so standardized as to lose appeal. Thus workshops were
forced to find a difficult balance between high-end, highly specialized
commissions and more reasonably priced pieces for market sale. The market
pieces had to meet enough of the customer's needs so as to make a commission
unnecessary.\textsuperscript{74}

Although smaller cities with large output shipped their wares to Antwerp
for sale in order to reach a larger customer population, it was more difficult for
the smaller cities to rely on specific commission purchases. While workshops in
Brussels, where fairs were heavily attended and where the city had an established
reputation for high quality, might still have seen enough foreign traffic to depend
on commissions, smaller cities like Oudenaarde had less of this type of security.\textsuperscript{75}
Although it might seem that a decreased commissioned demand in the smaller
cities (as compared to Brussels, for example) would therefore indicate less overall

\textsuperscript{73} For the Portuguese ambassador, see Sophie Schneebalg-Perelman, “Importance économique de

\textsuperscript{74} In the case of tapestry, foreign merchants who may have been disinclined to negotiate a
contract without a prearranged buyer might have been tempted by less expensive and less
customer-specific pieces, allowing workshops to sell more pieces than they otherwise would have
sold, without taking a loss from expensive raw materials.

\textsuperscript{75} See Jan Crab, Het brabants beeldsnijcentrum Leuven (Leuven: De Vrienden van het Museum
Leuven, 1997), 15.
demand, and make on spec production more risky as discussed in chapter 1, cities like Oudenaarde flourished under this type of specialization, exporting far more yardage than any other center of tapestry. Lower commission rates did not correlate to lower overall demand rates, and they could, in fact, rely on the need for a cheaper, lower-quality type of tapestry. Oudenaarde produced cheaper tapestries than most other cities, but was able to produce them in such bulk that they accounted for a high percentage of overall sales. Furthermore, Oudenaarde’s commissioned pieces would not corner Brussels’ niche of the market, so they were not a detriment to Brussels’ production.

Standardization of tapestries often required collaboration among workshops, with one weaving the figures, for example, and another the background. This type of production was not unusual within luxury trades. The division of labor and the standardization of parts had long been a part of the creative process for ivories, enamelware, and even buildings. However, Jacobs’ argument regarding standardization, in which the southern Netherlandish tapestry industry is presented as highly industrialized, contains the striking claim that “the tapestry makers produced en masse fabric with repeating foliage designs, called verdure, to be sold on the market; a buyer could have a piece cut from the premade rolls to fit his or her intended room.” Unfortunately, there is

---

76 Jacobs, Early Netherlandish, 208.
77 Ibid. 235.
78 Ibid. 202, who cites Raymond De Roover, The Rise and Decline of the Medici Bank 1397-1494 (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1963), 144-45. But there is no mention of rolls of tapestry from which pieces could be cut: De Roover in fact only states that, “There were apparently two kinds of tapestries which differed both in kind and quality. Those of the cheaper sort were called verdure (greenery) because they were covered with foliage of a simple design. Since the same pattern was repeated over and over again, these tapestries could be cut to fit the shape of any
little documentary evidence to support this claim. One hint at the possible existence of such premade fabrics appears in export registers where the word “tapestry” is often linked with listings for chair covers, tablecloths, door hangings, pillows, and the like. Entries for the values of these exports distinguish traditional wall-hanging tapestry from the domestic goods. As for efforts to standardize, it may have been that tapestry workshops instead offered buyers a selection of available cartoons that could be produced according to the buyer’s desired size and that a particular workshop was well versed in making, thereby reducing production time and labor costs.79

For merchants visiting the annual fairs, ready-made pieces allowed for faster purchases, and in larger quantities. For those merchants not visiting the fairs, the bulk export of ready-made pieces allowed for purchase and resale at the point of import.80

Artists began to industrialize steps of their creative processes (far ahead of the Industrial Revolution) in order to decrease production costs and use less room, like wallpaper today. They were a staple article of export and were consigned to foreign dealers in the usual way. The same was not true of the more expensive tapestries a personnages of special design which were always made to order, often according to cartoons prepared by Italian artists.” De Roover’s second type of tapestry is unsupported by known evidence; some of the most beautiful pieces sold in the Tapissierspand would have been produced in Brussels for on spec purchase.


80 De Roover, Rise and Decline, 143-44. De Roover indicates that goods for export were typically not exported presold because the buyer preferred to inspect the items before purchase. He also notes, however, that this theory does not apply to figural tapestries, which were typically made to order—most likely because of the high cost associated with weaving figures and the challenges in anticipating which figures a buyer might like.
labor while speeding up completion time. Van Uytven gives the same example as Lynne Campbell, citing altarpieces that, whether painted or carved, could be made or assembled from both newly commissioned pieces and preexisting pieces either from an older object, or pieces that were intended for a previous project but were either never used or repurposed. It was fairly easy for the artist to use either pieces from another project or stock pieces, and then to customize remaining sections according to the patron’s wishes. The use of repeated figures or patterns within a piece, with small differences added to each, meant that a workshop could drastically cut down production time and cost by relying on repeating images drawn from a library of compositions. Printing and engraving, which now allowed for multiple copies to be produced in a much shorter period of time, was yet another manifestation of the need to increase production while decreasing time and cost.

**Tapestry versus Linen Painting: Economies of Scale and Targeting Niche Markets**

While tapestry benefited from cross-collaboration between crafts, as did the carved retables, the medium of linen painting was able to respond to the marketing of these items by capitalizing on a niche not served by other mediums. Tapestry, like many luxury goods, was available only to the upper classes. By mimicking tapestry, linen paintings opened a new avenue of availability to the

---

81 For example, van Eyck’s *Ghent Altarpiece* (1432) contained wood panels from a variety of earlier planned projects, including pieces for an organ.
middle classes, while not actively competing for the same set of customers and thereby limiting profit. Similarly, while the market for retables was limited mainly by the number of churches looking to purchase them, the market for linen paintings comparably had a much broader audience. Beyond differences in cost, raw materials and size, linen (as opposed to panel) paintings also differed from tapestry in terms of ostentation. Tapestries were commissioned to reflect the patron’s grandeur, whereas linen paintings were a more affordable and less boastful medium. The function of painting on fabric is similar to that of a tapestry, but undoubtedly reflects the fabric’s significantly lower cost. Unlike tapestries, which could take several years to complete, the paintings had the benefit of a fairly fast production time and thus did not require so much advanced planning. While tapestries were sometimes moved outdoors and hung in tents at special events, canvas paintings were much more easily transported. This portability made the paintings especially popular for export; unlike panels, they could easily be rolled up, and the weight of one tapestry when shipped could equal that of numerous linen paintings.84

All of these factors were reflected in a linen painting’s price. For example, one document from Brussels in 1505 recorded that “the city official Cornelis Haveloes owned seven paintings on linen; a small tapestry was valued at 40 sous, a small panel at 40 sous, and a long canvas at 8 sous. Other linen paintings were priced between 3 and 6 sous.”85 The different expectations reserved for paintings
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84 Wolfthal, Beginnings, 20.
85 M. Schayes, “Extraits des comptes et inventaire de la maison mortuaire de Corneille Haveloes auditeur ordinaire de la Chambre des Comptes en Brabant, dressés en 1505,” Bulletin de la
on linen and tapestries are also apparent in their costs; tapestries were created to last a long time, given the amount of time and money required for their manufacture and the value of their raw materials, whereas the relatively low cost of linen paintings lent the medium to less ostentatious purposes, such as being hung in one’s home, for temporary events, or for sporting events. Nonetheless, despite these differences, the paintings were in many cases purchased in lieu of selecting more expensive and complicated tapestries.86 That is not to say, however, that linen paintings were enjoyed strictly by the middle classes. By the late 1400s, the Medici—despite being able to afford the more expensive tapestries—had amassed a collection of over twenty linen paintings at their home in Careggi.87

With regard to the display of linen paintings, there were some similarities to tapestry, but on a smaller scale. In the Renaissance home, the pieces were typically hung over the bed, on the chimney, or above other complementary scenes (such as a Resurrection above a Trinity). The paintings may have also been used for religious purposes in cases where the donor or church either did not want or could not afford to purchase a panel painting.

86 As James Bloom notes, “there is considerable evidence to suggest that the medium of cloth painting was expressly involved in an aesthetics of substitution during the fifteenth century.” See James Bloom, “The rise of the painted panel in early modern Netherlandish art or how Antwerp stole the idea of popular culture,” Ph.D. Dissertation, Duke University, 2002, 88.
Some linen paintings that were used as cartoons for tapestry weavers also became valuable art objects in their own right once their primary use was finished. A prime example of this use on linen is one such cartoon painted by Jaques Daret, one of Rogier Campin’s students. The tapestry had a complicated program, with the Resurrection at the center, seven other figures on the sides, and coats of arms along the bottom, along with appropriate inscriptions. The cartoon was meant to be an exact pattern for the weavers, and therefore it measured 9 by 27 feet. Once it had served its purpose for the weavers, the cartoon itself was hung on display. Obviously the tempera-on-linen image was considered enough of an art object to not only be retained, but also actually displayed. However, because linen paintings seem to lack the appeal of panel paintings, and because they tended to be created on inexpensive or poor quality mounts that have not lasted over time, even those of the highest quality are often overlooked by art historians and scholars.

By finding a customer base that along with other patrons also included some but not all of tapestry’s customers, linen painters were able to take advantage of customers’ changing tastes and mass produce comparatively inexpensive objects that appealed to a wide audience without having to compete for sales. Just as tapestry weavers minimized risk by adapting production with

88 For Jaques Daret, see J. Lestocquoy, “Le Role des artistes tournaiens a Arras au XVe siecle,” Revue belge d’archeologie et d’histoire de l’art 7 (1937): 212, 220-21, 227, and H. Loriquet, Notes sur les tentures de hautelisse possédées par l’abbaye de Saint-Vaast (Arras, 1884), 3-5, 11-12, cited in Wolfthal, Beginnings, 14. Additionally, the purchase and use of a canvas painting were quite different from the use of a tapestry cartoon painted on fabric; it was not unheard of for nobility to use the cartoons as placeholders for their tapestries, but not on a year-round basis.
89Wolfthal, Beginnings, xiii.
regard to style and size, the linen painters adapted the style of tapestries with the technique of painting to create a product that held broad interest.
Chapter 4: An End to the Boom: The Spanish Fury and Years of Decline

While the first three chapters have discussed the development and function of the Antwerp Tapissierspand, and the tapestry industry’s changes during the sixteenth century, this chapter examines the Tapissierspand’s decline and the events that took place following the Spanish Fury in 1576. Although this chapter does not focus primarily on the abatement of risk, the narrative described in Chapter 4 shows the determination of the merchants to reclaim their stolen goods in the face of financial ruin, which brings the story of the Tapissierspand’s role in revolutionizing an inherently risky industry full circle.

Although Antwerp’s economy had started to decline by the late 1560s and early 1570s because of the Habsburgs’ poor financial decisions and unceasing religious persecution of Protestants, the tapestry market remained vibrant. A few remaining records show that merchants were still renting stalls in the Pand; many of them had signed the initial agreements back in 1553 and 1555. But the rumblings of discord in Antwerp were already well in place. Following Charles V’s abdication in 1556, the political climate in the southern Netherlands began to change dramatically. Philip II’s campaign to root out Protestantism led to revolt throughout the provinces. When the Duke of Alva and scores of Spanish troops were dispatched to quell the opposition, many cities suffered greatly. Then, when the Spanish finally invaded Antwerp, the city was ravaged, as seen in Hogenberg’s The Sack of Antwerp (figure 45). Fires, looting, and murder like that seen in Collaert’s depiction of The Spanish Fury in Antwerp (figure 46), took place over
four days in November. The *Tapissierspand* was stormed, and a well-planned program of identifying and removing the most valuable tapestries first was executed. A few of the tapestry merchants were taken to Spanish officials’ houses and told to sort bundles of the stolen tapestries into sections based on their value and city of origin. Several merchants also provided accounts of what was taken from their shops, leaving a record of the types of tapestries being sold in the *Pand* and what quantities might have been there on a regular basis.

Following the Fury, the Spanish attempted to ship their stolen goods out of Antwerp as soon as possible. As news of tapestries appearing in other cities began to circulate, a few ambitious dealers began to track them down—a process that, in some cases, took years. The Fury would ultimately leave many dealers and weavers decimated and unable to recover financially from their losses. In the following years, many moved north to other cities of production and sales to open new workshops and establish new networks. The *Pand* remained empty for a time because the merchants could not afford to pay their rents. Antwerp, hoping to see the *Pand* recover, offered leniency but the subsequent French Fury in 1583 and Farnese’s invasion soon after that presented two more hardships. By the mid-1580s, in response to religious persecution and the danger of invasions, many of the city’s foreign merchants moved to safer ports, taking their international trading with them. Although some foreign communities chose to stay, there was no longer the confluence of items and merchants that had made Antwerp the city it was. The balance began to shift toward Amsterdam as the new center of commerce and finance.
The *Tapissierspand* remained open through the end of the sixteenth century and into the seventeenth. Although a few merchants who remained quite successful chose to stay on, the sale of tapestries was migrating to Brussels. By the 1640s, Brussels merchants began to complain that their sales were suffering because customers looking to buy tapestries were unwilling to make a separate trip to Antwerp for them. In 1655 the Brussels weavers and dealers were finally granted permission to open their own *pand*, which would fully replace Antwerp’s. The Antwerp *Tapissierspand* was repurposed several times, as barracks, stables, and a theater. Because of Antwerp’s financial decline, the loss of foreign communities, the shift in exporting patterns, and the migration of workers involved in the industry, the city simply could not hold on to its tapestry market.

**The Spanish Invasion**

When Charles V abdicated and leadership passed to his son Philip II in 1556, the political climate in the Low Countries began to shift and discord among the provinces grew. Philip II’s inability to relate to his Netherlandish subjects was apparent in the language barrier, his preference for Spain, and his religious intolerance toward Protestantism. These factors, aggravated by continued and heavy taxation to fund military campaigns, led to revolts throughout the 1560s. When persecution grew to include Anabaptists and Calvinists, the reformers took action and carried out the Great Iconoclasm (as seen in Hogenberg’s *The Iconoclastic Fury in the Church of Our Lady in Antwerp*, figure 47) in 1566. The Habsburgs’ quick response was to dispatch Fernando Alvarez de Toledo, Duke of Alva, as the new Governor-General of the Netherlands. Alva would soon become
famous for bringing a “reign of terror” to Antwerp.\(^1\) By 1567, Alva had set up his Council of Troubles, which sought to punish rebels. A year later, however, the Pope took a tougher line, announcing that he considered all three million citizens of the Netherlands, with few exceptions, to be heretical.\(^2\) Alva was once again called on to deal with this problem. Although Spain managed to quell much of the opposition by 1570, there was a resurgence in 1572 following the Dutch rebels’ capture of Brill. From that point on, Spanish troops worked more violently, and often opportunistically, to suppress the growing Dutch opposition; by the end of Alva’s six-year reign his troops had killed thousands. Nevertheless, he left the Netherlands in 1573 in disgrace, blamed for not successfully ending the rebellions much earlier.

Dutch fears abated briefly with Alva’s departure and the decline of his Council of Troubles (which Dutch citizens referred to as the “council of blood”), which operated until 1576 under his replacement, Luis de Requesens y Zúñiga. Requesens died in 1576, and Philip II appointed his half-brother Don Juan de Austria as Requesens’ replacement.\(^3\) Phillip II, however, failed to notify Don

---
\(^2\) For this period in Antwerp’s history, see Guido Marnef, Antwerp in the Age of Reformation: Underground Protestantism in a Commercial Metropolis 1550-1577 (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1996).
Juan for several months, giving the soldiers, whose salaries had not been paid, time to grow both resentful and restless.\(^4\)

During the 1570s various cities in the Low Countries suffered tremendously at the hands of Spanish soldiers. The revolts had brought upheaval to most towns, made worse when the Spanish soldiers led targeted massacres and lootings. In 1576 the soldiers were angry enough to invade Antwerp under the leadership of Sancho d'Avila. The city fought back, and soon the situation in Antwerp had grown so unstable, and the opposition so fierce, that the troops retreated to the fortified citadel that Alva had built a decade earlier.\(^5\) For a while the reformers in Antwerp thought they had succeeded in opposing the invasion, but the soldiers were biding their time inside the citadel; on November 4, 1576, they launched a surprise attack on the unsuspecting city. For ten days the troops looted, set fires, and killed an estimated 7,000 civilians.\(^6\) One of the motivating factors for the soldiers’ decimation of Antwerp was Spain’s inability to pay its troops. (This was not the first instance of troops looting when unpaid; in 1527, Charles V’s imperial troops had similarly looted Rome in protest.)

**The Tapiessierspand and the Spanish Fury**

Unlike many of the other cities invaded during the Eighty Years’ War, Antwerp provided unique opportunities for the soldiers, particularly those of high

---

\(^4\) When Philip II finally notified Don Juan de Austria of his new position, Don Juan began traveling through France to the Netherlands, dressed as a Moorish slave to avoid attention. He did not arrive until after the Spanish Fury, and the States-General refused to acknowledge him as Governor-General unless he would agree to expel all Spanish troops. Thinking he deserved a better reception, Don Juan did not agree to these terms until early 1577. See George Edmonson, “William the Silent,” in *Cambridge Modern History Planning by the Late Lord Acton* (London: Macmillan, 1902-1912), 246.

\(^5\) Voet, “Antwerp, the Metropolis,” 16.

rank and authority. The bustling markets in Antwerp and their associated marketplaces were easy targets where the soldiers could line their pockets with the money that they felt they were owed. In addition to the prizes available from all of the other valuable trades in Antwerp, the Tapissierspand was a one-stop, high-yield location where they could achieve considerable gains with minimal effort.

Several facts about the looting of the Pand indicate that the attack was planned well in advance. First, it was carried out systematically, beginning with the most valuable tapestries. Second, the troops returned a few days after their initial plundering to go through the inventories of the most lucrative shops. Moreover, tapestries were removed from the city hall before much of the city was burned, indicating that the troops were aware of their value. Finally, most of the records that likely existed regarding the Pand have not been found, indicating that the Spaniards might have destroyed or otherwise removed them from the Pand in an effort to make it harder for the merchants to recover or claim stolen tapestries, or prove their losses.

As Donnet remarked, the year 1576 is recorded in letters of blood in the history of Antwerp. The city was thoroughly sacked, and the tapestry salesroom was no exception. Choice examples of tapestry were taken, primarily those highest in value. But, unlike much of the rest of the city, the Tapissierspand was

---

not burned. The great concentration of tapestries in a single building and the existence of records of what was stored there—treasure maps for the greedy soldiers—were major factors guiding the Tapissierspand’s dismantling. Quite simply, the Spaniards knew where to look and what to look for.

**Using the Spanish Fury to Understand the Pand**

Many weavers had dealers in Antwerp with whom they could deposit tapestries to be sold on their behalf. These dealers frequently gave the weavers advances, indicating their confidence that the tapestries would find buyers.⁸ Records from some of these dealers provide insight into how the Tapissierspand operated and what types of tapestries were sold there. The best insight, ironically, comes from the actions taken by these dealers, together with many weavers, after the Spaniards’ sack of the Pand.

When Spanish troops arriving from Bruges and Mastricht joined their compatriots who were already living and established in Antwerp, their subsequent actions clearly demonstrated advance planning motivated by greed. Although the pillage was violent and destructive, the Spaniards’ primary motivation was to secure the best tapestries. Even the magnificent (and valuable) tapestries hanging in the state room of the city hall were removed from the walls, rolled up, and taken away before much of the city was in flames.⁹

Our knowledge of the looting’s course of events comes primarily from eyewitness accounts given by workers in the Pand. The statement taken from

---

⁹ Jean Denucé, *Antwerp Art Tapestry and Trade* (Historical Sources for the Study of Flemish Art, 4) (Antwerp: De Sikkel, 1936), xxv.
Andries de Moor,\textsuperscript{10} age 54 and a porter at the Pand, gives us a sense of the planned nature of the attack. According to his recollection, on November 4, 1576, troops entered the sales hall under the direction of Captain Caldron and a man named Pedro Yanes. They asked immediately for the stalls of the best-known merchants, and then specifically for the highest-quality and most valuable pieces. The first target was François Sweerts’ stall, and specifically, a large tapestry by François Geubels that had been contracted to Sweerts for sale. Luckily for both Sweerts and Geubels, the tapestry had been removed from the Pand several days earlier. On November 5 the same group of Spaniards returned, this time accompanied by more soldiers, Francisco de Ontoneda (the man in charge of the looting of the Tapissierspand), and a Spanish tapestry merchant from Bruges. This time they again systematically started with those shops containing the best merchandise, which they stripped bare, and then moved on to the smaller shops, from which only some pieces were taken. Among the shops suffering the most looting were those of Peter vander Goes, Joos van Herselle, Armand Vrancx, François Spierincx, Jan van Londerzeele, and Martin Cordier.\textsuperscript{11}

The process of removal appeared streamlined. All the smaller and less valuable items were packed for shipment directly to Paris, while the rest of the tapestries were taken to a staging area at the front of the Pand, where they were cleaned and carefully packed. They were then loaded onto waiting wagons, under

\textsuperscript{10} The entirety of de Moor’s statement is found in SAA CB, 1577-1578, II, fol. 501. De Moor’s account is supported by similar statements given by several merchants who were also present in the Pand during the looting, including Gossart Chimay, age 32, François Sweerts, 33; Daniel Steurbout, 29; François de Neeve; 42; Philip van Mettechoven, 36; and Nicolaes Pleytinck, 50 (see SAA CB, loc. cit., vo.).

\textsuperscript{11} Donnet, “Les tapisseries,” 7.
the careful watch of Ontoneda, Caldron, and Yanes, and delivered to the house of
Señora d’Aranda, Francisco de Ontoneda’s stepmother, in the Dryhoeck area of
Antwerp.\textsuperscript{12} Once at the house, the tapestries were hidden in the cellar, under
beds, and anywhere else that could provide some cover.\textsuperscript{13}

To add to the weavers’ and merchants’ rage, the Spanish expected many of
them to assist in packing and shipping the stolen goods. Testimony from
Gheerde vander Linden, Peter Zeghers, Lucas de Keyser, Peter Steurbout, and
Willem Jacobs, all from Enghien, Oudenaarde, or Brussels, states that they were
brought to d’Aranda’s house, where, under the watch of de Ontoneda, they were
put to work for three days following the pillage. Their primary task was to unload
large wagon loads from the Pand.\textsuperscript{14}

One of the most informative sources on the pillage is the testimony of
Daniel Steurbout, a dealer whose statement would be instrumental in following
the trail of the stolen pieces. Steurbout claimed that he was brought to the house
of Diego Alonzo de San Vitores, located along the Meir, to evaluate some stolen
tapestries. He recalled that the group consisted of eight or nine pieces of very
good quality, which he suspected were from Brussels, along with a few others of
lesser quality. San Vitores demanded a valuation of the pieces, which Steurbout
gave. He was then taken to the home of Martin de Chavaria, where he was shown
ten pieces of good quality and two poorer ones, and again asked for a valuation of
each piece so that they could be sold quickly to waiting buyers. A few days later,

\textsuperscript{12} SAA CB, 1577-1578, II, fol. 501.
\textsuperscript{13} SAA CB, loc. cit., fol. 20.
\textsuperscript{14} SAA CB, loc. cit., fol. 501. See also Donnet, “Les tapisseries,” 12.
Yanes and Ontoneda took Steurbout to d’Aranda’s house and again asked him to look at tapestries. This time, however, the task was a bit more challenging, as Steurbout was asked to sort tapestries from Brussels and Enghien into groups of similar quality and value. He sorted the pieces, which he attested had been stolen from the Pand, into eight large groups according to quality. From there, he was brought to the house of Diego de Rojas, where he was asked to evaluate eight Brussels pieces for a possible trade with one of de Rojas’s friends.15

Steurbout’s work provided several dealers with an idea of where some of their stolen pieces were. When he was again taken to d’Aranda’s house and ordered to group pieces by origin and value, he was able to examine many of the pieces being stored there, as well as to note their subject matter and city of origin. He grouped the tapestries into large bundles, with 22 or 23 pieces in each one. Among these, he recalled, were eight very high-quality tapestries depicting the History of Hannibal, several verdures depicting the twelve months, a History of Cyrus, and several other very fine pieces from Brussels. All of these had originated from François Spierinxc’s stall in the Tapissierspand. Steurbout also recalled approximately 28 pieces from Brussels that bore the mark of Leon van Heyque, as well as several others from Brussels belonging to Daniel Thienpont and Jehan van Londerseel. All the tapestries from Brussels and Enghien were sorted into two large bundles. Steurbout then created 11 or 12 bundles of tapestries only from Oudenaarde. His actions give us a good idea of how quality

versus quantity was represented in sales at the Pand, and what most of the items sold there were like.

Ironically, Yanes and de Ontoneda paid Steurbout for his hard work—his reward was twenty-four ells of Enghien tapestry. He further testified that he was told not to reveal what he had done, or who had asked him to do it, on pain of death. They claimed they would cut Steurbout’s throat themselves if he revealed his task to anyone. Steurbout, however, did not have to worry about keeping the secret, because several other persons had also been brought to d’Aranda’s house by Yanes and de Ontoneda. Maarten van Tieghem and Michel de Man were asked to come to the house to repair a very fine series from Brussels depicting the History of Troy (belonging to Marten Reymbout), as well as a set of the History of Cyrus. While there, both saw Steurbout as well as his son Antoon.

Merchants Try to Reclaim Stolen Goods

Immediately following the Spanish Fury, merchants began trying to trace their stolen wares. No doubt the tremendous value of many of the tapestries was a strong motivator. The detailed lists of the stolen wares that they provided give a more specific view of the inventory of the Pand at that time, which was probably representative of the building’s typical stock.

---

16 It is clear that the tapestry would not have been given to Steurbout had the Spanish thought that it had any value.
17 See SAA CB, 1577-1578, II, fol. 510 for Steurbout’s account.
18 Although it cannot be known with certainty, most likely the tapestries in need of repair were damaged during the raid and subsequent transport.
19 SAA CB, loc. cit., fol. 510.
Many of the soldiers were eager to transport their loot through Mastricht or Lier and then to Germany before the property could be reclaimed. François Sweerts and François de Neve were among the first to attempt brokering deals with the soldiers in an effort to buy back their goods, certainly an indication of their desperation. After several attempts to convince the soldiers to lower their inflated prices, Sweerts and de Neve were finally successful in buying back several of their tapestries. These deals only further incited Yanes, who, upon learning of them, became enraged over the low prices that they had accepted from Sweerts and de Neve for such valuable items.

Along with Sweerts and de Neve, other merchants described in detail the items that they had lost. A list provided by Maarten Cordier, a merchant in the Pand, details the numerous pieces that were stolen from him:

- Nine pieces of *verdure*, measuring 3 ells in height and 138 ells in length, total, from Ghilain Marote the Elder
- A set of three pieces, consisting of images of David, measuring 4 ells in height and 60 ells in total length, from Jehan van Uymersele
- A five-piece set consisting of five pieces, of the *History of Jacob*, measuring 3 1/2 ells in height, and 105 ells in total length, collectively, from Arnt Cabeliau
- A three-piece set consisting of three pieces, of the *History of Abraham*, measuring 60 ells in length total, from Josse Cabeliau
- Three pieces, consisting of images of David, measuring 4 ells in height and 60 ells in total length, from Loys Marotes

---

21 SAA CB, 1577-1578, II, fol. 509. Cordier’s testimony is supported by that of Daniel Steurbout, one of Cordier’s workers, and Paul Maes, who also had a shop in the Pand.
– A three-piece set, consisting of images of Diana, measuring 29 1/2 ells

– Two pieces of the *History of Scipio*, measuring 16 and 24 ells, from Rasse de Carlier

– A six-piece set consisting of six pieces, of the *History of Elbora*, measuring 120 ells total in length, from Loys Bloenart

– Ten pieces of [unspecified] images, measuring 12 ells, from Gerart van Moelenbroeck

– One piece, an [unspecified] image, measuring 15 3/4 ells, from Jacques de Vos

– Four pieces consisting of images of Abraham, measuring 74 ells total, from Josse de Carlier

– Four door coverings of *verdure*, each 8 3/4 ells, totaling 35 ells, from Jehan de Lanou

– Two pieces of [unspecified] images, measuring 12 ells, from Jehan de Bacquer

– Two pieces of [unspecified] images, measuring 12 ells, from Hans Erbaut

– Seven pieces of images of David, 4 1/2 ells in height and 18 ells in length, and one piece, an image, measuring 15 3/4 ells, from Loys Marote

– Two pieces of [unspecified] images, each measuring 12 ells, from Hans Hujoel

– Ten pieces of [unspecified] images, measuring 15 3/4 ells, from Peeter Steurbout

– Five pieces of *verdure*, height measuring 3 1/2 ells in height and 87 1/2 ells in total length, from Jan de Lannoy
It was later learned that all of the pieces stolen from Cordier’s shop had been taken to d’Aranda’s house and packed into several bundles for shipping. Paul Maes also claimed to have lost a tapestry belonging to Loys Marote, a piece measuring 25 ells and depicting the *History of Absalom*, in addition to a room of 8 *verdure* tapestries measuring 225 ells in total length. François Spierininx stated that several of his pieces had been stolen, including a room of tapestries woven in Brussels that depicted the *History of Troy.*

Because many of the tapestries in the *Pand* were being sold by merchants on consignment from weavers or other dealers, the chain of ownership, and therefore the claims were often a bit complicated. For example, Gillis Stichelbout, a weaver in Oudenaarde, had sent 8 *verdure* pieces, totaling 205 ells in length, and at a price of 28 stuivers per ell, via an Oudenaarde dealer to the shop of Anthonis van Coppenolle, where they were to be sold on consignment. Van Coppenolle sold the pieces to Jan de Ram, a tapestry merchant in Antwerp, who, because he was away at the time, left the pieces in van Coppenolle’s stall in the *Tapissierspand*, from which the Spanish stole them. Peeter Steurbout, a dealer from Oudenaarde, had tapestries on display in Maarten Cordier’s stall as well, including a room depicting the *History of Ahab and Jezebel*. The series had been sold to another dealer, Pedro Molyn, just a few days before the looting, but it was still in Cordier’s shop on display when the Spanish soldiers stole it.

---

22 SAA CB, 1577-1578, II, fol. 510.
26 SAA CB, 1577, II, fol. 19, vo.
Reynaldi, also a dealer, had similarly purchased six pieces of Oudenaarde verdure from the weaver Joris Hujoel that were stolen as well.27

Once news began to circulate that all of Maarten Cordier’s stolen pieces were at the d’Aranda house, François Sweerts and Jan de Moor declared that all the stolen tapestries were at the same house, where de Ontoneda and Yanes were currently living, and that they were the ones responsible for the looting.28 Merchants wanted to reclaim their property, and several persons who had been called upon by the Spanish came forward to corroborate the others’ stories. In one instance, Cornelis Hugghe and Willem Lauwers, both of Antwerp, came forward and attested that on one night, about one month after the looting, they too had been called by Yanes to d’Aranda’s house, where they were told to carry various packages out from the house, load them onto wheelbarrows or carts, take them to another house (described as “die dryye croonkens”), and bring the packages inside. Like Sterbouts, they were paid and told to leave. Both attested that they did not know the contents of the packages.29 These covert movements, carried out at night, led Donnet to speculate that the Spanish were beginning to grow afraid of Antwerp’s angry merchants and thought that they needed to hide as much of the stolen tapestry as possible.30 This theory seems likely, because the Spanish had already begun to sell pieces to whomever they could, or were attempting to move them out of the city.

28 SAA CB, 1577-1578, II, fol. 510.
29 SAA CB, loc. cit., fol. 104.
In several instances, the rightful owner had a difficult time reclaiming his wares once they had been sold to someone else by the Spanish. There was little coverup to try to persuade people that these items were not stolen. De Ontoneda, for example, was able to sell a series representing the *History of Troy*, which had been stolen from Spierincx’s shop, to a Spanish merchant named Diego de Rojas. As soon as Spierincx learned of the transaction, he attempted to convince de Rojas to return the stolen pieces, but de Rojas refused on the grounds that he had already promised to send them to his mother in Spain, and that she did not want to give them up even though they were stolen goods.\(^{31}\) In another case Jan Helduwiere, a broker, was asked by an Italian dealer if he was in the market to purchase tapestries. Helduwiere was not looking to make any purchases at that time, but he went to the dealer’s home anyway and was shown two good-quality Turkish rugs. When he inquired as to the rugs’ provenance, the dealer could not provide any. Several days later, the dealer admitted that they had been stolen from Jan van Londerseele’s shop in the *Pand*.\(^{32}\)

The stolen tapestries were not limited to those looted from the *Pand*. Four pieces woven with gold thread were taken from the Hotel de Ville by soldiers and sold to two Spaniards, Pedro Peys and Jeronimo Loupes. Upon learning this, the city assigned two citizens to repurchase the tapestries, which they were successfully able to do.\(^{33}\)

\(^{31}\) SAA CB, 1577-1578, II, fol. 504. For an account of this transaction, see Donnet, “Les tapisseries,” 15.

\(^{32}\) This is described in SAA CB, 1577-78, II, fol. 113.

\(^{33}\) For the tapestries taken from the *Hotel de Ville*, see Donnet, “Les tapisseries,” 16.
Sadly, the Pacification of Ghent in November of 1576, signed just four days after the Fury, did not bring much relief for the merchants and weavers. Instead, it only served to hasten the Spaniards’ shipments as they tried to remove all stolen goods from Antwerp as quickly as possible, either to Germany via overland routes or via seized ships heading for Spain. By the end of the month, residents had grown worried enough that they petitioned the city to request that all looted goods be returned to their rightful owners and that all exported goods be checked at the border to ensure that no additional items left the city. But the Spanish remained undeterred; even when they finally left Antwerp’s citadel in March 1577, they still took what remaining stolen goods they had with them.

Antwerp’s merchants did, however, find some support in the wake of the siege. In 1577, the city magistrates had returned to full operations and made a request to the magistrate of Liège that all items coming from Antwerp be seized so that their provenance could be checked. Philip II proclaimed the legitimacy of all claims for stolen goods in September 1577. But the support for the Pand’s merchants who had suffered great losses also posed a great threat to foreign merchants, including some Spaniards, who had had no involvement in the looting but who were in legitimate possession of tapestries and other items that they had purchased in Antwerp. With uncertainty clouding their potential sales and causing hesitation among prospective buyers, it was difficult for merchants to convince anyone that their wares had been fairly obtained. The city rectified

---

34 Ibid. 19.
this problem by distributing certificates confirming that the possessor had not acquired the goods by participating in the looting of Antwerp.

Not surprisingly, the merchants’ drive to recover their goods only intensified as the Spanish left the city, in part because many items had now entered other countries. Spierincx remained one of the most active in attempting to repossess his stolen property. Upon learning that de Ontoneda and his associates had met in secret with a man named Peter L’hermite, in front of a notary, to discuss the transport of stolen tapestries to Paris, Spierincx appealed to the city magistrates, asking that the notary, Gillis van den Bossche, be compelled to tell them the details of the secret meeting. 35 Spierincx’s request was granted in May 1577, and he soon traveled to Paris and Mastricht to recover tapestries stolen from Antwerp. 36 In Mastricht, Spierincx tracked down Martin de Riveira, a Spanish dealer who had lived in Antwerp and participated in the looting, but who had left when the Spanish troops retreated. De Riveira admitted that he was in possession of several tapestries stolen from Spierincx’s shop, and Spierincx demanded that de Riveira return his set of tapestries depicting the History of Troy or, at the very least, offer the set back to Spierincx for purchase. De Riveira refused and, in turn, threatened Spierincx if he chose to pursue the matter. 37 The threats did little overall to dissuade Spierincx, who remained in Mastricht and was soon joined by Jehan van Londerzeele, a fellow merchant. Together they were able to track down Yanes and Caldron. Although they quickly learned that

---

35 SAA RB, 1578-1579, fol. 23. Donnet (“Les tapisseries,” 20) discusses this instance but incorrectly cites the location as SAA RB, 1578-1579, fol. 24.
37 SAA CB, 1577-1578, II, fol. 511.
many of their tapestries had already been shipped through Lorraine, Spierincx and van Londerzeeele were able to buy back six pieces measuring over 200 ells in total. When the merchants did not have enough money to pay the prices asked by Yanes and Caldron, they were forced to borrow money from Diego de Rojas.\textsuperscript{38} The two merchants then turned their attention to de Ontoneda, who was also in Mastricht. Needless to say, de Ontoneda was equally unwelcoming to them.

Spierincx’s primary hope was to recover the valuable *History of Hannibal* series that de Ontoneda had taken from his shop. De Ontoneda, however, told the men that he had sent all the stolen tapestries to Middelburg over a month earlier, undoubtedly intending to have them shipped on to Spain, but that they had all been seized at the border because of the complaints that Spierincx had made to the Antwerp magistrate. In de Ontoneda’s opinion it was thus Spierincx’s own fault that he could not recover his property from de Ontoneda! Amazingly, de Ontoneda further complained that Spierincx’s loud protests had forced him to flee from Antwerp. His quick retreat, he lamented, had resulted not only in bankruptcy but in the seizure of his property as well, causing him a distinct loss of honor in all his affairs.\textsuperscript{39}

While Spierincx was busy tracking down his stolen pieces, other merchants were less eager to attempt to repossess stolen goods on their own. A solution was reached in 1577 when a number of merchants, dealers, and weavers met and agreed to pass their interests on to a few chosen people who could act on

\begin{footnotesize}
\item[38] See Donnet, “Les tapisseries,” 21 for a breakdown of the prices per ell requested by Yanes and Caldron.
\item[39] SAA CB, 1577-1578, II, fol. 100 vo.
\end{footnotesize}
their behalf. The agreed-upon representatives were Spierincx and Henri Vrancx, both of Antwerp, and a French merchant living in Paris named Florent Dargondes. The three men would then act on behalf of the following merchants and weavers: 40

From Brussels: Armand Vrancx, Nicolaes Hellinc, Leon vanden Hecque, Jacques Leniers, Chrestian de Vischer, François vanden Steene, Nicolas van Hove, Jehan van Londerzeele (who had previously assisted Spierincx), and Hubert de Maecht

From Antwerp: Corneille Olivers, Daniel Thienpont, Henri Pyn, Alyt Delens (wife of Josse van Herseele), and Bartholomew Zanoli

No city listed: Philippe vander Cammen, Nicolas Dobbeler, Jan vander Cammen, and Quentyn Flascoen

As Donnet notes, Spierincx, Vrancx, and Dargondes were tasked with “pursuing, chasing, claiming, detaining, reappropriating ... each and all of the tapestries the assigned have affirmed and attested were stolen from the tapestry weavers’ Pand in this city of Antwerp, during the sacking of this city, on the day of November 4, and all the days following.” 41 Under this authority they succeeded in repossessing six large bundles of tapestry sent by de Ontoneda to Paris. Unfortunately, in order to do so they were forced not only to purchase the tapestries but to pay an additional ransom as well. Still, for many of the merchants involved, even these conditions were better than the complete loss of their property. Spierincx and Dargondes were also granted permission by the city magistrate to apprehend and arrest de Ontoneda, Yanes, and Caldron if possible, acting on their own behalf as

40 SAA CB, loc. cit., fol. 551.
well as that of the merchants and weavers of Antwerp, Brussels, Oudenaarde, Enghien, and other cities.\textsuperscript{42}

In June 1577, Jehan Fernando de San Vitores, a Spanish dealer perhaps related to the San Vitores whom Daniel Sterbout had encountered, joined Spierincx in Mastricht. Together they began to look for a set of eight Brussels tapestries stolen by the soldiers and believed to be still in their possession. Once some of the suspected soldiers were found, they told Spierincx that they had in fact taken the tapestries in question, but had then sold them to Pierre Rodrigues de Gualnenda and Diego Alonso de San Vitores. Spierincx probably doubted their story, because upon further investigation he found another soldier, Alicanti, who claimed that he remembered selling the tapestries to an Italian merchant living in Antwerp, named Jehan Jacomo Fiesco, for a hefty sum.\textsuperscript{43}

**Difficulties for Export Merchants**

The Antwerp magistracy continued to seize potentially stolen goods at border crossings, causing significant trouble for many merchants. In one

\textsuperscript{42} SAA CB, \textit{loc. cit.}, and RB, 1578, fol. 178, of which Donnet provides the following slightly different transcription segment: “Remonstre en toute humilité Florent Dergouges (sic) marchandt de Paris et Franchois Spierinck, marchandt de ceste ville tant en leur propre nom comme eguallement pour et au nom des aultres tapissiers d’icelle ville, Bruxelles, Audenaerde, Engien et aultres viles ... que Fran(co) Ontoneda, Fran(co) Caldron et Pedro Yanes espaignols, le iiij de novembre, accompanez d’alcuns soldats espaignols dentrer par force et a bras armé au pand des tapissiers de ceste ville, et ayans le fermé la porte audict pands, après ils ont ouvert aucuns boutiques hors desquels ils ont prins et fait porter les biens et marchandises des tapissiers de ses suppliants montant à grand somme dargent, lesquelles tapisseries, argent et marchandise les susdits Ontoneda, Caldron et Yanes ont fait porter à la maison de la veusve Jehan Daranda ayant à icelle fin et pour mieux couvrir leur fait employé et mis en oeuvre plusieurs ouvriers à cacher les biens et marchandises desdits suppliants dans ladite maison tant en la cave dessoubs les bois que dessoubs leur lict ... ensuite ont fait mener et transporter lesdits biens sousbs la protection et conduicte de soldats espaignols et leurs hardes ou bagaiges hors de ceste ville jusques Maestricht là ou lesdits Ontoneda, Caldron et Yanes aussy se sont trouvés et ont demeuré jusque à la ...” (“Les tapisseries,” 22-23, no. 3).

\textsuperscript{43} Donnet gives a brief description of this encounter, but does not provide an archival reference. See \textit{Ibid.} 22.
instance the shipments delayed en route were items that Maarten Cordier had
sold to a Spanish merchant, Diego Fernando de Miranda. De Miranda’s packages
were seized in Rouen; surprisingly, de Miranda indicated that he understood the
action, given the current political tensions.44 Like others, de Miranda was
eventually able to obtain a certificate from the magistracy that allowed him to
transport his goods. Another of Cordier’s shipments, in conjunction with Jan de
Moor I of the aforementioned de Moor family, was stopped en route to Calais.
Forty-four pieces of Oudenaarde tapestry were found aboard the carts of Filips
Spruyt and Maillart Hermans, intended for delivery to a Pieter de la Pena in
Calais.45

In more complicated cases it became difficult to determine the rightful
owner. In one instance Spierincx believed that he had seen a set of stolen
tapestries in Mastricht that was later found aboard shipments within Flanders.
The rightful owner, a merchant named Jan Baseler, was forced to rely upon the
testimony of friends, associates, and his own staff to gain permission to ship his
goods. Both Jan de Moor and François Sweerts swore that Baseler was in fact the
rightful owner. Baseler claimed to have purchased the tapestries in a shared deal
with Jan de Ram, another merchant. Baseler’s servant then testified that Baseler
had owned the tapestries for several years and that they were in no way the

44 SAA CB, 1577-1578, II, fol. 542. Donnet provides a complete list of all items contained in de
Miranda’s shipment, which (aside from the seven tapestries purchased from Cordier) fall beyond
the scope of this study, but which consisted primarily of at least 30 other art objects (see Donnet,
Les tapisseries,” 25). De Miranda’s case is a good example of the widespread seizures that took
place across Flanders and in surrounding cities. The seizures were not limited strictly to
tapestries suspected stolen, but also included shipments or packages of books, paintings, wooden
altarpieces, fabrics, articles of clothing constructed from expensive materials, and money.
product of the Pand’s looting. Only after all this testimony was Baseler able to obtain a certificate from the magistrates that gave him permission to transport his wares.\footnote{SAA CB, 1577-1578, II, fol. 554, 554 vo.} Baseler’s experience was not unique; Peter van der Goes and Jean-Baptiste Varre, among others, had similar difficulties.\footnote{Donnet cites SAA CB, 1577-1578, I, fol. 24 for van der Goes’s case and SAA CB, loc. cit., fol. 96 for Varre’s case. See Donnet, “Les Tapisseries,” 24-25.}

**Tapestries Hidden in Antwerp**

In some instances, even Spierincx’s perseverance abroad to reclaim tapestries fell short. Unbeknownst to their rightful owners, several of the missing tapestries had never even left Antwerp. In the best known example, during June 1577 a dealer from Oudenaarde, Ghileyn Marote, attested to the magistracy that just a few days earlier he had been in the home of Diego Alonzo de San Vitores, located on the Meir. As Marote went down the home’s staircase to exit, he passed an open door through which he saw a number of tapestries that he described as most likely of Oudenaarde origin, particularly those depicting *verdure* scenes. The tapestries’ rightful owners, two weavers named Janne van Londerzeele and Leon vanden Hecke, came forward very quickly to reclaim them.\footnote{SAA CB 1577-1578, II, fol. 574 vo.}

As Maarten Cordier knew all too well, this was not the first seizure at San Vitores’ home. A year earlier, Cordier had been alerted that many of his missing tapestries might be at this location.\footnote{See SAA RB, 1577, fol. 103 for the account of Cordier’s discovery.} When he determined that they were in fact from his shop, the tapestries were seized by a representative of the magistracy. This case is particularly important because the other records of tapestries being

\footnote{\textit{SAA CB}, 1577-1578, II, fol. 554, 554 vo.} \footnote{Donnet cites SAA CB, 1577-1578, I, fol. 24 for van der Goes’s case and SAA CB, loc. cit., fol. 96 for Varre’s case. See Donnet, “Les Tapisseries,” 24-25.} \footnote{SAA CB 1577-1578, II, fol. 574 vo.} \footnote{See SAA RB, 1577, fol. 103 for the account of Cordier’s discovery.
repossessed do not mention a third party designated by the magistracy to take responsibility for the actual removal of the tapestries. Additionally, this case suggests that some victims, such as Spierincx, had been given the authority to seize such tapestries, but that others had not and were forced to rely on the magistrate or its representatives for seizure. It also seems likely that Spierincx, Vrancx, and Dargondes had the authority to do so only on behalf of those who had signed the earlier agreement.⁵⁰

The case is doubly informative in that Cordier’s tapestries, upon seizure, were taken to a governmental storeroom where they temporarily fell under the control of the magistracy. Had Cordier simply been able to claim his property from the storeroom, the case would be less interesting, but, in fact, a record dated eight months later reveals that he still had not received his items. A very angry Cordier had sent a letter to the magistracy, stating that its failure to release his property had potentially caused him significant problems; due to their storage in less than ideal conditions with regard to weather and cleanliness, he feared that the tapestries had by that point suffered from dampness, become stained, or received potential holes from rodents or other vermin. He demanded that his property be released promptly; one month later he was allowed to take possession of the tapestries.⁵¹ It is likely that other seized tapestries had endured a similar fate in the magistracy’s storeroom.

⁵⁰ For the agreement of representation, see SAA CB, 1577-1578, II, fol. 551.
⁵¹ SAA RB, 1577, fol. 103 vo.
Lord de Thiant: Copycat Plunderer

In a few instances the ransacking was not limited to the Spaniards. Others took advantage of the chance to pillage as well. When the 2,000 Walloon troops who had been enlisted to help with the invasion returned to Aalst, they brought numerous tapestries with them. Most of the stolen pieces were from Maarten Cordier and Gaspard Charles’s stalls in the Tapissierspand. When the mayor of Aalst, Lord de Thiant, discovered the crimes, he demanded that the soldiers return their loot. However, when Thiant confiscated their plunder, instead of returning the tapestries to Antwerp he kept them for himself. The merchants were enraged upon hearing this news. Following a long series of discussions, it was finally ruled in June 1582 that Thiant should return the stolen tapestries. But it would not be easy for the merchants to recover their property.

In 1583 François, Duke of Anjou and the new Governor-General of the Netherlands,\(^{52}\) hatched a plan to recapture Antwerp and William I, Prince of Orange. The Duke brought his troops to Antwerp, left them outside the city walls, and went to meet with the Prince about a supposed Joyous Entry that he wanted to plan.\(^{53}\) William I was instantly suspicious. As a few soldiers entered the city, the Antwerpers heard shouts of “The Town is Won! Long live the Mass! Kill! Kill!”\(^{54}\) Thus began the French Fury. With the Spanish Fury still fresh in their minds, the Antwerpers were ready to fight back. Within hours they were

---

\(^{52}\) The Duke of Anjou was elected in an attempt to gain French support for the Spanish troops.

\(^{53}\) For the Duke’s plan to distract William I with discussion of a Joyous Entry, and the subsequent fallout, see A. Gielens, “De Kosten van de Blijde Intrede van der Hertog van Anjou,” *Antwerpen’s Oudheidkundige Kring* 16 (1940): 93-105.

\(^{54}\) For this quotation, with no archival reference, see Fernand Donnet, “Documents pour servir a l’histoire des ateliers de tapisserie de Bruxelles, Audenarde, Anvers, etc.,” *Annales de la Société d’Archéologie de Bruxelles* 10 (Brussels, 1898): 79.
able to subdue the invasion, leaving almost 2,000 dead, including 250 lords or other nobility who had joined the troops. Thiant was among them. His plans went awry when he made one major mistake: instead of following the rest of the troops toward the center of the city, Thiant took the small group of soldiers under his charge and began walking along the city’s ramparts toward the Schuttershoven and the Tapijspand. The only possible reason why Thiant would have taken his group of soldiers there was to repillage the Pand. Unfortunately for him, at the same time the other troops were being pushed out from the city center by Antwerpers, toward the city walls. Thiant and his group were quickly spotted, and, once he realized that capture was imminent, he and many of his soldiers jumped off the ramparts in an attempt to escape. The civilians saw Thiant and the other soldiers and began firing, and soon, most of them were dead.

Once Thiant was dead, Cordier and Charles acted quickly to reclaim their property. The men authorized Georges Bosschaert, a fellow merchant from Antwerp, to join Pierre de Tissier, head of Thiant’s house in Aalst, to make an inventory of the many pieces that Thiant was said to have hidden and then bring them items back to their rightful owners. Bosschaert quickly left for Aalst, after securing a letter of reference from the Prince of Orange to prove his mission to those in Aalst. When the inventory was completed, Bosschaert and Tissier

determined that in addition to the pieces hidden by Thiant, several other men in Aalst had also hidden pieces. At Captain Tutelaire’s house, “La Rose,” they found the following: 57

- In a long iron trunk, four pieces
- In cabinets, six [unspecified] pieces
- In another trunk in the kitchen, 12 verdure pieces, and five figural pieces
- In a room at the front of the house, in a wardrobe, three verdures and one figural piece
- In the room at the top of the steps, in a trunk, three [unspecified] pieces
- five [unspecified] pieces

Then, at the home of Gerard de Horne, the former Sergeant-Major of Thiant’s troops, Gerard de Horne, they found one tapestry hidden in a cypress trunk, along with a great deal of silk thread used to repair damaged tapestries. 58 Ultimately, Charles and Cordier recovered their stolen tapestries.

57 See SAA CB 1584, fol. 92: “en ung coffe feré d’un long fer quatre pièches de bahut ayans des chasteauxx aux armoiries avec six aultres pieces de tapits.// En ung aultre coffer en ladite cuisine 12 pièces de boccaiges et cinq pièches à figures.// En la chamber de devant audit logis en une garde robe, trios picches de boccaiges et une pièche de figure.// En une chamber de haut venant sure le marché en ladite maison en certain coffer trois pièches.// En une aultre petite chamber audit logis en ung coffer 5 pièches.”
58 Ibid.: “en ung coffer de cypress unge pièche.// …une quantité de fillet pour les pièches imparfaictes.”
Aftermath of the Fury and Decline of the Pand

The Pand Stays Open

Even though many merchants and weavers were still searching for their lost items, once the dust in Antwerp settled following the Spanish Fury, the city tried to return to business as usual. For the Pand, this meant an effort to continue operating. It also meant that annual rent was still due from stallholders; without these funds the city itself would fall behind financially. When their payment date was approaching in 1577, the merchants and weavers (pandtmeesteren van den tappiserien pandt deser stad) who relied on stalls in the Pand for much of their business and livelihood sent a letter to the magistrates, pleading for additional time to pay their rent.\(^59\) In their plea the shopkeepers related the dire straits into which many of them had fallen: with the Tapissierspand virtually closed for business—and even if it were open, many of them had little or nothing left to sell—financial ruin was not far off. Some merchants had lost everything that they had kept at the Pand, while others had filed for bankruptcy. Despite the depressing nature of their situation, they asked merely for a 12-month delay in payment, rather than to be let out of their leases. The magistrates granted this request, and many of the merchants were eventually able to operate their businesses with some success. While some weavers were completely ruined (mainly those from the smaller and less lucrative production centers), the city magistrates attempted to ease financial strains for the weavers

\(^{59}\) SAA RB, 1578-1579, fol. 71. The above-mentioned “pandtmeesteren” (as the document was signed) included François Sweerts, Armand Vranx, François de Neve, Daniel Thienpont, Phillip van Mettecoyen, Jan de Moer, Pauwel Maes, Jan van Londerzeele, Maarten Cordier, Claes Pletinex, Dierick van Os, and Henrick van Bernigen.
and merchants by purchasing 50 tapestries from the firms of Peter van der Goes, Frans Sweerts, Joos van Hersele, Thierry van Os, and Nicholas Pleytinck. But this support was short-lived, as the Pand would be emptied once again during the city’s war with Alexander Farnese.

**The Second Siege: 1584-1586**

In 1579, Phillip II tasked Alexander Farnese, Duke of Parma, with the recapture of Flanders and Brabant. Following his successful campaigns in Ghent, Tournai, Maastricht, Bruges, and Breda, Farnese marched into Antwerp in 1584. The Antwerpers put up a strong fight against him, even attempting to stop the construction of a dam-like bridge across the Scheldt that he built in order to cut the city off from its seaport. Even though Farnese had 60,000 troops compared to Antwerp’s 20,000, he still worried that it would be difficult to fully capture the city because of Antwerp’s fierce opposition to the Spanish troops in 1576. One year later, however, on August 17, 1585, starving and cut off from all resources, the city was forced to surrender fully to the Spanish troops. The city’s Protestants were given two years to leave the city, and many of them decided to migrate north. The city that had once hosted a population of 100,000 around 1560 was left with only 40,000 people by 1589.

---

62 See Voet, “Antwerp, the Metropolis,” 16.
63 For the dramatic population differences, see Herman Van der Wee, The Growth of the Antwerp Market and the European Economy, (The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1963), vol. 2, 261. The conditions in Antwerp, however, did not mean financial ruin for all. Some firms were in fact able,
An End to Prosperity

The city’s economy had been in decline since as early as 1557, when Spain was forced to declare bankruptcy. Because of the influx of silver from the Americas, and because Europeans thought the supply would be unending, Charles V had been given larger and larger lines of credit that the monarchy ultimately could not pay back. That financial failure marked the beginning of a downward slope for the city’s economy, and by 1586 Antwerp had already lost many of its foreign merchants. The population of foreign merchants in Antwerp had decreased by almost 80% from 1550 to the 1630s, as seen on Error!

Reference source not found. For those remaining, faced with Farnese’s plan of starvation, and given the loss of trading dependent on sea routes following the Scheldt’s blockade, there was little to keep them there once they could leave. As the German, English, and Hanse merchants departed, the city’s international market and its reputation as a center of commerce and finance suffered a huge

with some tenacity and flexibility, to work around the situation in Antwerp. For example, as Ball notes, the della Faille firm (involved in the trade of silks) was able to continue a successful enterprise: “The special conditions created by the siege of Antwerp from 1584 to 1585 revealed the resilience of the firm’s policy. After 1584 they transformed the organisation of their overland transport, ceasing to put it into the hands of a specialist firm, but organising it themselves. Although this involved a great expansion in administrative work in correspondence with transporters all along the route through Germany and north Italy, and the disbursement of money in small quantities in many places, the savings in cost seem to have been considerable, and goods were also transported direct from the place of purchase, avoiding Antwerp...they were one of the firms employing advanced business techniques which were still not universal in late-sixteenth-century Antwerp.” See J.N. Ball, Merchants and Merchandise: The Expansion of Trade in Europe 1500-1630 (New York: St. Martin’s Press, 1977), 118-119.

blow. With only the Portuguese, Italians, and Spanish merchants remaining, Antwerp could not maintain its bustling trade. As more merchants migrated north in search of safety and better trade environments, Amsterdam experienced an influx of money, which prompted the city to build a new financial exchange. Amsterdam had many of the amenities that had made Antwerp so successful: proximity to common shipping routes, a growing international market, and substantial freedom for merchants. Its friendly attitude toward foreign trade resembled the strategy Antwerp had once used to attract merchants.

---

65 Voet, “Antwerp, the Metropolis,” 17.
Table 8.  Estimated numbers of merchants in Antwerp

![Bar chart showing estimated numbers of merchants in Antwerp.]


Even in a rapidly declining economy, Antwerp could maintain its key position in the sale of drapery and reestablish a market for artworks. But that was ultimately not enough, and by the mid-seventeenth century many of the city’s former resident artists, merchants, and others involved with the tapestry trade had emigrated to more prosperous cities. This was the final straw for the city’s economy. By the end of the seventeenth century, Antwerp had been completely passed over as a site for tapestry sales in favor of Brussels.67

---

67 Voet, “Antwerp, the Metropolis,” 17.
**Debt and Disillusionment**

Following the siege of 1584-1586, the municipal treasurers decided to let the merchants and weavers use stalls in the Salesroom for no charge until St. John’s Mass of 1587, provided that they kept it in good repair. But for some there was no turnaround, and even well into the 1580s many had not yet regained their financial stability. Philip van Mettecoven, one of the signers of the initial plea for leniency, was never able to regain his footing and found himself in the throes of complete financial ruin by 1588. Unable to pay a debt of about 50 pounds owed to Daniel Thienpont, he was forced not only to sell his shop, but then to turn over all remaining goods to Thienpont to cover the debt. Additionally, van Mettecoven agreed to work in Thienpont’s own shop for six years, promising that he would bring in extra money for Thienpont by finding customers interested in renting tapestries for banquets or weddings (presumably this was previously a significant portion of van Mettecoven’s business). In turn, van Mettecoven would receive a small percentage of these sales, which would then be deducted from his remaining debt to Thienpont. When the debt was finally paid in full, it accounted for only one-quarter of the profits that van Mettecoven would formerly have earned in rents and sales over the same time period.

Unfortunately, Van Mettecoven was not alone. As foreign merchants began to move to more profitable and thriving cities, weavers and dealers inevitably emigrated as well. The number of weavers in Antwerp dwindled from

---

68 Denucé, *Antwerp Art*, xxvi, and SAA *Collegiaal Actenboek, 1585-1588*, p. 100, 6 May, 1586.
20 in 1584 to just five in 1610.\textsuperscript{70} François Spierincx, for example, was a well-known and well-regarded tapestry weaver in addition to a dealer, but after years of tying to recover tapestries stolen by the Spanish, he eventually gave up hope of regaining the successful business that he had once enjoyed in Antwerp. He ultimately relocated to Delft, where he opened a highly successful workshop that operated from 1580 to about 1626.\textsuperscript{71} Spierincx’s workshop used many cartoons drawn by Karel van Mander, who had also emigrated in search of more prosperous surroundings. Jan de Maecht emigrated from Brussels to Middelburg in the mid-1590s, and by the late 1580s many weavers from Oudenaarde were resettling in Gouda or returning to Oudenaarde. Lists of Oudenaarde weavers residing in Oudenaarde in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries show a dramatic shift from Antwerp to Oudenaarde as place of residence, as seen in the lists provided in Appendices 18 and 19.\textsuperscript{72} Not all of these new workshops would find as much success as that of Spierincx. Without a centralized marketplace at which to sell their tapestries, many workshops had to revert to working on a commission basis. Additionally, in relocating to new areas not necessarily known for certain types of tapestry manufacturing, the families and workshops had to build new reputations and networks in their new settlements. While the weavings that they had completed in their original locations would surely give


\textsuperscript{72} Delmarcel, \textit{Flemish Tapestry}, 209.
credibility to their new workshops, the weavers nonetheless never regained the financial stability that they had once experienced when selling through Antwerp.

Because some trade, particularly in art, did remain in Antwerp, the Tapijsterspand remained open perhaps longer than it should have.\(^\text{73}\) Some of the city’s most successful merchants had decided to stay because of what Duverger refers to as their pride—in the art market that had developed in Antwerp, in their knowledge of the art with which they worked, and in their extensive international client lists and networks.\(^\text{74}\) However, available lists of people involved in the tapestry trade in Antwerp in the seventeenth century, such as the list of negociants, merchants, and weavers of Antwerp from 1600-1696 provided in Appendix 20, do not distinguish between those actively working in Antwerp and those, for example, who stored their tapestries in the Pand. Some names of those who stayed are known through a document dated June 2, 1620, in which several merchants and weavers stated that, in 1619, they had elected Jean van der Goes the younger as dean. With assistance from Robyns and Sweerts, he had managed his office (in which stall rentals were assigned), convened several meetings with members of the Pand, and relayed information to all the renters. The document was signed by Daniel Steurbout, Laurent de Smit, Simon Bouwens, Pierre Robyns, and Abraham de Hu.\(^\text{75}\)

\(^{73}\) For the drawn-out last years of the Tapijsterspand, see Augustin Thys, Historiek der straten en openbare plaatsen van Antwerpen (Antwerp: C. de Vries-Brouwers, 1973), 453-54, and Amand De Lattin, Evoluties van het Antwerpsche stadsbeeld, geschiedkundige kronijken, 6 (Antwerp: Uitgeverij "Mercurius," 1940), 103-14.


\(^{75}\) See Donnet, “Documents,” 89 for this document, where he only cites [SAA] Minutes du notaire G. Van den Bossche.
Some of those who stayed were able to remain successful there, despite the diminished size of the tapestry market in Antwerp. The dealer Simon Bouwens, for example, purchased 100 sets of tapestries between the years 1643 and 1645 to be shipped abroad, with a total value of 55,000 guilders. Among the pieces that he commissioned, *Garden Landscape with Children Playing* depicts the Antwerp city arms on the left and “Cura Simonis Bouwens” woven inside a cartouche on the right, which Delmarcel notes as an indication that the piece was subcontracted for production. François Sweerts, Jan Raes, and Laurent de Smit also maintained continued sales in Antwerp. However, even as Antwerp grew as a center of tapestry production, a drop in the amount of foreign trade supporting the market still meant that sales steadily decreased in the *Pand*, to the point where it was a shadow of its 1550s self. Its last hurrah was Ferdinand’s Joyous Entry in 1635, when he came to Antwerp and visited the building because he knew of its (former) reputation, along with making trips to the *Officina Plantiniana* and Rubens’ house.

As a final blow, the Treaty of Munster in 1648 declared that the Scheldt was to be permanently closed to seabound traffic. The *Tapissierspand*, however, remained open until the 1650s, despite the movement of most trade to Brussels. Because the building was still in use as a depository and point of sales for tapestries, Brussels weavers complained that most of their pieces were in Antwerp even though their chances for sales were in Brussels. After several

---

petitions, the Brussels weavers were finally allowed to open their own
*Tapiissierspand* in 1655. The new *Pand*, which included weavers from
Oudenaarde and Antwerp as well, was located in the city hall. By 1658, it
reported having tapestries worth a total of 150,000 guilders waiting to be sold. 79
Additionally, perhaps to assist with the problem of purchasing raw materials
before weaving, the *Pand* also allowed weavers to consign tapestries, for which
they were paid two-thirds of the tapestry’s value in advance. 80 However, rising
import taxes (particularly in France), in combination with the prohibitive cost of
tapestries, prevented the export market in Brussels from matching the degree of
success previously experienced in Antwerp.

Unable to compete with Brussels, Antwerp’s *Tapiissierspand* was
completely empty by the end of the seventeenth century, and by 1705 it was being
used as a barracks, with some sections used to stable horses. Three years later, it
was given to the city’s opera and theater groups. After Antwerp’s devastating
fires in 1746, the building was rebuilt with new sections added in the center, seen
in the models by Timothy de Paepe shown in figures 48 and 49. That building

79 Delmarcel, *Flemish Tapestry*, 214. I am also grateful to Koenraad Brosens for conversations
regarding the Brussels *Pand* on March 28, 2008, and April 16, 2009. See also M. Houdoy, *Les
tapisseries de Haute-Lisse: Histoire de la fabrication lilloise du XIVe au XVIIe siècle et
documents inédits concernant l’histoire des tapisseries de Flandre* (Paris: Aubry, 1871), 148;
tapisseries de haute et de basse-lisse de Bruxelles* (Brussels: Culture et civilisation, 1871, reprint
1973), 227.
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survived until 1829, when it was finally torn down and became the site of the Théâtre Royal.\textsuperscript{81}

\textsuperscript{81} E. Duverger, \textit{Antwerpse Wandtapijten}, 38.
Conclusion

This dissertation began with the question of how a building specifically for the sale of tapestries in Antwerp in the mid-sixteenth century successfully allowed weavers and merchants to minimize risk, and why a reduction of risk was so important. The answer emerges from a multidimensional examination of the historic precedent for tapestry production in the southern Netherlands and therefore sales, the feeling of hyper-vigilance in Antwerp in light of repeated stresses, and the risks inherent in both weaving and tapestry sales.

One can argue that the success of the Tapissierspand, and by extension the tapestry export market in Antwerp, was heavily influenced by the many steps taken to minimize risk. Thus, in Chapter one, we saw that imperial edicts and ordinances were created expressly to protect the industry and its output. Additionally, the path of tapestry sales from fairs to smaller panden to a site expressly for tapestry sales worked to streamline the industry while setting the stage for the new Tapissierspand. On a broader level, the city of Antwerp took steps to ensure that its many foreign merchants were happy and would therefore stay and sustain the valuable tapestry trade. Chapter two examined the ways in which the physical building functioned to lower risk by becoming a site for the exchange of knowledge, assurances of quality, and the developments of networks and trust between buyer and seller. It also looked at the growing group of tapestry dealers who effectively removed risk from the workshops for on spec
production by reducing the amount of capital workshops were forced to invest in on spec weaving.

The “genius” in the way that foreign merchants, local merchants and the city government came together, however, was that steps taken to minimize risk were not so drastic so as to completely stifle creativity and entrepreneurial spirit. Thus, Chapter three discussed the ways in which workshops were able to implement both endogenous and exogenous innovations in order to reach a broader audience of customers, standardize and therefore increase production, and diversify production types. New styles in conjunction with standardization allowed workshops to create pieces both more quickly and that would appeal to a broader audience, which was crucial for successful on spec production. Innovations across crafts, as well as the development of specialization, further allowed the industry to grow.

Chapter four, through a narrative describing the final decades of the Pand, provided archival examples of the financial risks inherent in the industry, despite the many improvements seen in the Tapiessierspand. While the city of Antwerp would not regain the success it had enjoyed for tapestry exports in the sixteenth century, the model provided by its Tapiessierspand would continue to be used by weavers and merchants in Brussels.

***

The dominant theme in this economic and historic analysis of the Tapiessierspand has been the reduction of risk. By the mid-fifteenth century, the Burgundian Netherlands were identified as an area rich in tapestry production,
and to which royal patronage funneled a large amount of money into the fine arts. Without this early concentration of both production and consumption, Antwerp would never have become a centralized location for the export of tapestries. The domestic consumption created a climate that demanded innovation in order to lower financial risk, and drove workshop production to the point where there was large enough international interest to drive wide-scale export and more standardized production.

The dynamics of Antwerp’s tapestry market, and how it grew from a small marketplace in the Dominican Pand into a high-functioning international market in the Tapissierspand, were the result of several factors that were part of the prelude to the opening of the Pand. The influx of merchants, increased efficiency, and geographic location drove the market for tapestries so that sales needed to be moved from the Domican Pand to De Vette Hinne, a location devoted exclusively to tapestries. This first move represents the changing nature of the market in response to demand. After the Tapissierspand opened, increased demand for luxury goods continued to drive production, which forced the development of faster, less expensive and more proficient methods of weaving. The increased demand represents a shift from primarily royal patronage to a much broader customer base, particularly through the sale of on spec pieces. This shift, however, also carried a significant risk for the weavers: without financing for raw materials secured through a commission, the burden for workshops was tremendous. The emergence of the dealer as a distinct entity from the artist was a factor that further advanced the tapestry trade by allowing
workshops to focus on expanding production, rather than on financing their projects. Although several weavers did maintain their own shops in the *Tapissierspand*, dealers were more willing and able to take on the sale (and risk) of on spec pieces rather than relying solely on commissioned pieces. This change also represented a shift for the city of Antwerp—dealers, merchants, or weavers from other cities who came to Antwerp to sell their tapestries had to find housing, and their rent was an investment in Antwerp. These people, and their customers, represented a great deal of disposable income, which nurtured the market and ensured its continued export sales. In turn, Antwerp was eager to keep the merchants satisfied so as to keep their investments within the city.

Antwerp also benefited early on from some practical thinking and a high degree of foresight by the weavers and merchants. Although, for instance, the tapestries that brought the highest value were produced in Brussels, the tapestries being produced and exported in the highest quantities were coming from Oudenaarde, and thus it did not make sense in terms of risk-abatement to base a singular tapestry market in any one city of production (of which Antwerp was not), but rather, in a city where there was already an established international market, and where buyers did not have to travel far out of their way to find tapestries—it is not too great of a leap in thinking that exporters would be persuaded to ship tapestries home as well if they could buy them in the same city as most of their other export purchases.

The tapestry industry in Antwerp expanded and thrived there because Charles V and Mary of Hungary strongly supported the industry, and understood
its potential for profit. In terms of risk to both buyer and seller, they also understood that the production and sale of tapestries had to be tightly regulated. Many of the strictest rules were created to protect the reputation of Flemish tapestry, and thus its continued demand on the market. For example, by specifying that tapestries could only be sold in the newly constructed Tapissierspand, Charles V and Mary also concentrated the market within a specific area. This ensured that it would be easier to observe and enforce the royal decrees. The sheer size of many tapestries argued for a business model with concentration of production and commerce in a limited geographical region.

In an effort to support the lucrative export trade, the city of Antwerp actively encouraged weavers to resettle there, and facilitated their immigration by making it easy to obtain citizenship, and in some cases, by offering special privileges. But along with those incentives, the city was also keenly aware of the need for urban expansion as its booming international markets continued to grow. The weavers and—more frequently—workshop representatives who came to Antwerp needed places to live and work, and found those places in the newly built neighborhoods in either revitalized areas or in previously undeveloped parts of the city. The city was aware that a sense of safety and security was crucial to keeping its foreign merchants, particularly following Maarten van Russom’s attempted attack in 1542. If the city magistrates could not complete full building campaigns to build better and larger sales spaces and more fully-developed neighborhoods in which to house the foreign merchants, they were happy to pass along leadership to entrepreneurs who could realize those ambitions. Antwerp’s
willingness to let entrepreneurs such as Gilbert Van Schoonbeke design these new residential areas was yet another indication of the city’s desire to keep the industry successful.

Van Schoonbeke’s success as a monopolistic builder probably could not have occurred in a place where there was perhaps more city-derived capital but less actual demand. It was the city’s realization that there was such a demand for larger salesrooms and more housing within its walls (also rebuilt by Van Schoonbeke) that allowed it to get the buildings it needed. The more foreign merchants were convinced that it was lucrative to remain in Antwerp, the longer the city could maintain its position within Europe as an economic powerhouse, and the longer all parties enjoyed financial success.

The golden age of Antwerp’s tapestry market is bracketed in time by two events that unequivocally changed the nature of the industry: the edict of 1544, and the Spanish Fury in 1576. The edict had two major effects. First, it settled a number of disputes within the craft of weaving and laid out a broad vision to organize the market, and the entire industry in an effort to promote quality and therefore the buyer’s confidence. Second, it outlined specific details of the daily operations of the marketplace. The edict crystallized the organization of Antwerp’s tapestry market, but it also laid the groundwork for the market’s ascendancy to a mature market, one that dominated international trade. The extraordinary detail presented in the edict indicates that Charles V understood the economic importance of tapestry to Flanders and the southern Netherlands, as well as the concepts of management that could best protect the industry,
namely through micro-specifications of how the industry and, ultimately, the 
*Tapissierspand* should be run. The size of the *Tapissierspand* is itself unusual. 
Thirty-seven by eighty meters made it one of the largest buildings in Antwerp in 
the 1550s. By consolidating the export industry into one large building, day-to-
day functioning was forced to become organized and thus more efficient. With 
the relatively small size of each stall in relation to the typically quite-large 
commissioned sets traditionally produced, we can make inferences that the role 
of the shop was less for display of such sets and more as a site for the sale of 
smaller one-off pieces produced on spec, and as the site of dealings and 
negotiations, which echoes the developments seen in the industry that effectively 
minimized risk for the producers and sellers. The consolidation of the industry 
into one location also minimized risk for the buyer by becoming a site where one 
could compare and recognize the different levels of quality available, and also 
where one could develop relationships with the different sellers.

A continued royal following during the tapestry market’s golden age, as 
well as commissions from the papacy and nobility, coupled with the new sales of 
on spec pieces on the commercial market allowed weavers and dealers to tap into 
all possible sources of customers, who then further fueled demand. The climate 
of innovation in the arts—spurred on by increased demand—during the sixteenth 
century fostered an environment in which ideas and methods could be shared 
across art forms. Weaving benefited greatly from the developments of 
standardization in other art media, and in particular, the carved altarpieces that 
were being exported from Antwerp during the same period. It is also logical that
there would have been the cross-development of new marketing strategies as the market changed.

The adaptive and adoptive standardizations and innovations made it easier for dealers to find buyers in the on spec market, while the attention to quality and detail seen in workshop commissions not only maintained a loyal following among royals, but also encouraged courts to send representatives to the Antwerp market in search of new pieces to expand their collections. Innovations in design, and some degree of standardization were products of the realization that most export purchases were likely not commission-based, but rather either created on spec, or a compromise of the two. The expanding market in Antwerp allowed for those realizations, and most likely impacted the types of works being produced in different workshops. But it was the early efforts of those workshops that established their good reputations, and thus, had there not already been a strong historical precedent for tapestries in the region, there would have been no demand for increased production through standardization.

The Spanish Fury of 1576 changed everything. Although Antwerp's overall economy was already in decline, the Fury dramatically accelerated the Pand’s demise and was the beginning of the market’s denouement—all of those same things that had allowed the Tapiossierspand to exist and flourish slowly unraveled. The Pand’s ransacking, and the financial difficulties it meant for the weavers and merchants, shined a bright light on the risks that the Tapiossierspand had worked to combat. The invasion and subsequent ransacking of the city showed that the city was unsafe, meriting a return to the hyper-vigilance of the
early 1500s, and highlighted the fact that Antwerp was suffering financially. Foreign merchants were reluctant to conduct business in a dangerous city, and industries that depended on international trade suffered greatly. For example, by the mid-1580s, the once-booming cloth trade with England had effectively died out because English merchants were reluctant to spend time in Antwerp. The market for many of the more lucrative trades would gradually move to Amsterdam, and Antwerp could not regain a foothold as an economic powerhouse. With the departure of foreign merchant communities, Antwerp’s export trade in all products suffered, and it seemed unlikely that only one international export market—that for tapestries—could survive. Because of the amount of capital invested in each on spec tapestry, the tapestries stolen by the Spanish represented financial ruin for many weavers and dealers in the Pand. Although some spent years trying to find and reclaim their stolen goods, many dealers simply could not recover financially. Aware of the city’s rapidly declining state, many chose to relocate to safer and more prosperous cities, while others remained intent on recovering their stolen wares. The marketplace remained open through the seventeenth century, but never recovered—too many of the things that had created and supported the Pand’s thriving business were gone.

***

The story of the Tapiessierspand is about an enlightened group of buyers and sellers who were highly cognizant of their environment and who wanted to decrease their personal risk in a business that required a large amount of initial capital, a high degree of confidence on the part of the buyer, and the tenacity and
flexibility of workshops to develop and employ new weaving techniques and marketing strategies.
Appendices

Appendix 1: A description of Antwerp’s fairs and marketplaces.

The fair which is held here is the largest in the whole world, and anyone desiring to see all Christendom, or the greater part of it, assembled in one place can do so here. The Duke of Burgundy comes always to the fair, which is the reason why so much splendour is to be seen at his court. For here come many and diverse people, the Germans, who are near neighbours, likewise the English. The French attend also in great numbers, for they take much away and bring much. Hungarians and Prussians enrich the fair with their horses. The Italians are here also. I saw three ships as well as galleys from Venice, Florence and Genoa. As for the Spaniards they are numerous, or more numerous, at Antwerp than anywhere else. I met Merchants from Burgos who settled in Bruges, and in the city I found also Juan de Morillo, a servant of our King.

As a market Antwerp is quite unmatched. Here are riches and the best entertainment, and the order which is preserved in matters of traffic is remarkable. Pictures of all kinds are sold in the monastery of St. Francis; in the church of St. John they sell the cloths of Arras; in a Dominican monastery all kinds of goldsmith’s work and thus the various article are distributed among the monasteries and churches, and the rest is sold in the streets. Outside the city at one of the fates is a great street with large stables and other buildings on either side of it. Here they sell hackneys, trotters and other horses, a most remarkable sight, and, indeed, there is nothing which one could desire which is not found here in abundance. I do not know how to describe so great a fair as this. I have seen other fairs, at Geneva in Savoy, at Frankfurt in Germany, and at Medina in Castille, but all these together are not to be compared with Antwerp.

Fruosino to Giovanni de’ Medici, Bruges, June 22, 1448

Respected Sir and Honored Superior. A few days ago I wrote and informed you how I had got here, by God’s will, and then went to Antwerp to the fair, where I looked for what you had commissioned me to get, a tapestry cloth+, and that I had found nothing I thought would meet your purpose, and told you what I had found, a wall covering with the story of Samson, very well executed but so large it would be a chore to stretch it in your big room, and so I didn’t think that was what you wanted. Also I told you I didn’t like the subject, because there was a great quantity of dead people in it, and I thought it was just the opposite of what one would want for a chamber, and besides, I thought it was too fine, for it would cost about seven hundred ducats. Besides, I told you there was another, with the tale of Narcissus, and I think the measurement would fit in with your aims, and if it had worked a little more richly I would have taken it, which would have cost about a hundred and fifty ducats. There was and is nothing that would fit your needs because all those that want a better than average work have it done to order, and I therefore suggest to you, if you are not in too great a hurry, send me the measurements and the story or tale you want in it, and I’ll have it made by the best master that can be found: you can just send me the measurement and the story you want.

Yours, Fruosino in Bruges
Appendix 3: “Discussion of a dispute between the St. Lucas Guild and the Dominicans over the use of the old and new panden.”
Transcribed by F.J. van den Branden in Antwerpsch Archievenblad (2nd ed.) 21(1931): 165.

5 October 1479
Opte geschillen geport tusschen den denkenen ende goeden mannen van Sinte Luycasgulde inder stad alhier, ter eenre zyden, ende den Prioer ende convente vanden Predickeeren inder selver stad, ter andere, seggende ende voer hen nemende deselve van Sinte Lucasgulde dat zy, onlancx geleden, tegens den Prioer des voers. Godshuys gehuert hadden eenen nyeuwen pant, die nu nyeuwelinge inden selven godshuyse gemaect es, ende at zy dien pant, ende oic denouden pant die zy van voeren oce gehuert ende bestaen hadden, bruycken ende besegen souden, ended at dad huer meyninge altyt geweest was doen zy denselven nyeeuwen pant huerden, etc.; die vanden godshuyse voers. de contrarie daeraf houdende seggende dat de meyninge vanden Prioer nocht convente voers. Noeyt en was dat zy beyde de voers. Pander hebben ende bruiken souden dan alleene den nyeuwen pant die zy hen verhuert hadden. ended at zy mits dien vanden cenen pande afstant doen souden; met meer woerden, etc., Wart by Burgermeestynen Scepenen ende Raid geappointeert, soeverre de Prioer ende een deel vanden ouwers des voiers. Godshuys nemen Dorsten op hueren eed ende by hueren priesterscapen, dat huer meyninge nooyt en was nochte noch en is dat de voers. vander gulden beyde de panden broken ende besegen souden doen zy hen den nyeuwen pand verhuerden, soe souden de voers. vander gulden afstant doen vanden eenen pande, sonder die beyde te moeten hebben oft te bruiken. Welken eed de Prioer ende ouwers voers alsoe presenteeren te doene, die hen byden voers. vander gulden verdragen wart. Dit was gedaen opten vyfsten dach van October int jaer Ons Heeren als men screef
M CCCC ende negentse ventich.
Appendix 4: Ordonnantie op de Antwerpsche Tapijtwevers.
Transcribed by Jean Denucé in Antwerp Art Tapestry and Trade
Source: SAA Oud Register metten berderen, fol. 22

(juli 1415)

Dit was gheordineert bi Heren Philipse vander Couderborch, Scoutete, ende bi Burgemeesteren, Scepenen ende Raide vander stad van Antwerpen, anno XV in de maent van Julio ende gheconsenteert den goeden cnapen vanden Tapijtwerksambachte.

Overmids dat de goede cnapen vanden Tapijtwerkers ende vanden Linenweversambachte deen vanden anderen ghescheiden syn ende elc een ambacht op hem selven wessen sal, Soe begeren de goede cnapen vanden Tapijtwerkersambachte alsulke cueren ende punten alse hier na volgen.

Yerst dat haer ambacht ghernegan sal werden met eenen Deken, want harer luttel es.

Item soe wie meester vanden vors. ambachte wesen sal ende meesterie houden, dat die drie jaer lane voer gheleert sal moeten hebben ende den ambachte gheven van incommene III oude scilde ende eene ghelte wyns, den regeers vanden ambachte ende Onser Vrouwen een pand was.

Item meesters wittighe kinderen selen gheven VI grote.

Item leernapen selen gheven eenen halven ouden scild ende den regeers II ghelten wyns, ende de meester sal gheven twegeghelten wyns ende de leernapen selen III jaer leeren thalven loene.

Item soe wie ghecalengiert worde van den regeers vanden ambachte dat hi oncubair werc wrachte, dat die verbueren soude alsoe dicke alse dat bevonden worde, 1 ouden scilt te bekeerne in drien te weten es een derdendeel den ambachte.

Item dat men gheven sal den cnapen van werkene voir haren arbeyd ghelyc van outs ghecoustumeert es dats te wetene vanden tapyte II grote, van eenen stucke tyken v 1/2 yngelschen, item van spinnene van elcken stucke 1/2 groten ende van kaerdene van elken stucke eenen yngelschen, op de peyne van XII grote tsambachts behoef.

Item wie van den voirs. ambachte des anders cnape ontsmeecte oft onderhuerde, hy en ware eer van sinen meester ghescheiden, dat die verbueren soude III oude scilde, te bekeerne in drien alsoe voirs. es, alsoe dicke alst ghescheide.
Ende op dese voirs. ordinancie ende cueren, soe sullen de voirs. goede
cnapen vanden Tapytweversambachte hare voirs. neeringhe hanteren ende doen,
ende selen deselve cnapenstaen te scote ende te lote metter poirterien ende als
poirtiers van der stad, toter tyt toe datter anders op gheramt sal worden ten
proffite ende orbore van der voirs. neeringen. Sonder argenlist.
Appendix 5: Rekwest van Jan Collaerd, Brusselsch patroonschilder, aan de stad Antwerpen (1560).
Source: SAA GA 4048.

Aen Borgmeesteren, Schepenen, Tresorier, Rent-meesteren ende Raidt der stad van Antwerpen.

Verthoont in alle goetwillicheyt Jan Collaerd, nu ter tyt ingeseten der stad van Brussele, hoe dat hy, suppliant over langhe jaeren hem geneert heft gehad met te schilderen ende te maecken patroonen voer tapissiers, leghwerckers, borduerwerckers, gelaesbackers ende andere gelycke ambachten die op patroonen moeten wercken, gelyck die suppliant op de ure van nu patroonen te schilderen ende te maecken heft voer tapissiers ende oyck van andere steden als van Oudenaerden, Endenghen, Mechelen ende andere, in welcke uwer Eerw n stadt van Antwerpen alsoe die tapissiers ende leghwerckers zeer beginnen te comen ende dagelycx meer ende meer te vermeerderen ende noch meer geschapen zyn te multipliceren midts hen doening ennich behulp ende voerdeel, soe soude die suppliant oyck wel van sinne wesen tot voerderinghe van deselve met huyavrouwe ende huysgesin zyn domicile te transporteren vuyt die voerscreven stad van Brussele binnen die voerscreven stad van Antwerpen ende binnen die selve stad van Antwerpen te houden ende te blyven houden zyn huys ende domicile ende aldaer te wercken ende patroonen te maecken voer die voerscreven ambachten zyn leeffdage lanck, indien uwe. Eeren van der stads wegen hem suppliant ennich voerdeel ende gratuitleyt wilden doen als die suppliant wel van doen soude hebben, soo voor die oncosten van obbrecken, van te verhuysen ende van allen instrumenten ende huysraaidt te vervueren ende te herstellen als voer die huyshuere die tot Antwerpen vele dierdere is dan tot Brussele, besundere daer die suppliant groote huysinghe nootelyckhen behoefht tot zynen neeringhe ende tot hanghen van den voerscreven patroonen gelyck die suppliant tegenwoerdelyck bewoone ende moet bewoonen binnen die stad van Brussele het groot huys van den geere van Keystergate, voer alle welcke oncosten, indien uwe Eer en den suppliant wilden gunnen dryhondert gulden eens gerechts gelts voer den tyt van zesse jaeren ende naede expiratie van deselve zesse jaeren zyn leeffdage lanck ende soo langhe al shy binnen Antwerpen woonen ende patroonen maecken soude, vyfftich gulden tsjaers, soude die suppliant in meyninge wel wesen hebbende tselve voerdeel te verhuysen ende aldaer tot Antwerpen te comen woonen ende wercken ende soude hopen sonder
beroeminghe gesproecken deur middele van zyne conste ende experientie int maecken van de voerscreven patroonen day hy, suppliant, daermede ongelyck meer proffyts soude der voerscreven stadte innebrengen soo aen heure accysen, neeringe als anderssints dan die voerscreven penningen souden moegen beloopen, is daeromme des suppliants versueck ende bidden dat uwen Eer en believe hem suppliant te gunnen die voerscreven dry hondert gulden eens gereets gelts voer zesse jaeren ende voerts daernae een pensioen van vyftich gulden tsjaers zyn leeffdage lanck, ende daer voere is die suppliant bereet te verhuysen, te comen woonen ende te wercken binnen die voerscreven stadte van Antwerpen ende hem daertoe aen de voers. stadte te verbinden zyn leeffdage lanck ende te stellen tot borge Jannen Cools, des suppliant te verberuren ende op den voers. borge te verhaelen, indien die suppliant van zynen wege nyet en come te voldoen; dwelck doende etc.
Appendix 6: “Verzoekschrift Van De Antwerpe Tapijtwevers Aan De Stads-Magistraat.”
Source: SAA RB Pk. 632, fol. 65 vo.

1564, 12 Juni. – Verzoekschrift Van De Antwerpe Tapijtwevers Aan De Stads-Magistraat/

Dekens van de tappissiers aen myne here etc.
Geven in alder oytmoet te kenn de dekens ende cooplieden hen geneerende mette coopmanscape in den tapissery pant uwe goetwillighe porters ende ingesetene deser stadte hoe dat al eest zoo dat nyemanden geoorlooft en is tsy van binnen deser stadte oft van buyten deser stadte willende alhier negotieren enige ordonnantien oft statukyten te maeckene ende besundert als dye prejudiciabel zyn ende ten achterdeele oft verachtinghe van der jurisdiction van uwe Eerw. Soo eest nochtans dat Anthjoine van Coppenhole, Boudewyn Hoevicx, Jand de Moor, Dierick Maes ende Anthoenius Stuerbout, ingestenen deser stadte, hen generende in den voors, pandt met maeckelaerdye hoewel zy alle nyet en hebbe eedt gedaen van de ordonnatie deser stadte, gemaect hebben met Geeraert Ruyllens, eken, Aert Roze, Roeland vanden Hoeve, Aernout Vsnelier, Peeter Hoevicx, Loijs de vos ende Lauwereyns van Coopenhole metten gemeynen supposten ende cooplieden der neeringhe van tapisserye tot Oudenaerde zekere pretense, ordonnantie die zy willen alhier onderhouden hebben binnen deser stadte ende pande voorseyt hieraene gehecdht; dwelk de suppleanten dunct te zyne nyet alleene tegens de jurisdictie van uwe Eerw. maer oyck tegens d’ordonnansien by uwe Eerw. den suppleanten verleent. Bidden daeromme de viors. Suppleanten dat uwe Eerw. gheleiven wille de voirs ordonnantien hireraene gehecht te vercleren nul, machtelooz ende van onweerden als sonder auctoriteit van uwe Eerw. gedane zynde ende oft anderssins den suppleanten hierinne te voirsie als uwe Eers. ten meesten profyyte van uwe Eerw. ten meeste profyyte van den suppleanten ende den privilegien deser stadte ende conservative van uwe Eerw. jurisdictie zelen bevinde behoirende dwelcke dienende etc. Vranx. Syn by mynen heeren Burgemeester ende Schepenen deser stadte gecommitteert heer Jan vander Werve, riddere, scepen ende Mr Alexander Grapheus, secretaries deser stadte, ten eynde zy hen volcommelyck informeren up d’inhoudt van desen ende mettern suppleanten van als desen aengaende communiceren ommme tlevelande gedaen ende van als gehoirt het rapport van de voirs. Commissarissen voorts
geapprobeert ende geodonneert te wordene zoo behoiren zal. Aldus gedane XIIe
juny XVe jaere ende LXIII.
Appendix 7: Introductory instructions regarding fraudulent tapestries, in a letter from Mary of Hungary to her inspectors Pierre du Fief and Charles Tserraerts.


Source: ARAB Papiers d’Etat et de l’Audience, no. 1233

Bruxelles, 28 janvier 1539 (n.s)

Instruction pour maestres Charles t’Serraerts conseiller ordinarie et Pierre du Fiel, procureur general en Brabant, commissaries deputes par la Royne Régente, de ce qu’ilz auront affaire en la ville d’Anvers et allieures sur la charge et inquisition des abus commis au stil et train des tapisseries qui se font et vendent es pays de padeça.

Premiers ferone visitacion des tapisseries que ilz trouveront en la dite ville d’Anvers et allieures appartenans `a Guillame de Kempeneere. Regardarony et feront regarder pas gens `a ce entenduz sy autrement y est verse ou usé que suyyvant les ordonnances faites depuis 15 ans ench sur l’edit stil.

2. Item informeront des tapiz que le dit Guillaume a vendu depuis le dit temps mesmes depuis ung au ença `a qui quelles et icles tapisseries sont esté et de quell prix avec toutes circonstances possible et raisonnables faisant d’icles se faire le peult, et ells soient en ladite vill o `u pardeça visitacion au commodieusement l’on les peult reconvrir et la fin que dessus.

3. Item sy lesdits commissaries trouvent aulcuns des dits tapiz ou aultres de cuy qu’ilz soient venuz esqueiz abuz soit commis les metteront en arrest de la part de l’emoerur tant que leur rapport ouy autrement en sera ordonné.

4. Item parce que l’on entend que non seullemnet ledit Guillaume ains plusieurs autres tant résidez en la ville de Bruxelles, Oudenarde Enghien que allieures ont abuse et abusen journelyment en leur dit stil et marchandise de tapisseries les paindent et taindent de couleurs indeines, les dits commissaries font debvoir de visiter les tapisseries qu’ils scauront ou trouveront audit Anvers venans des dits lieux et excéndans en valeur ou pris de XV patars l’anse et s’ilz y trouvent abuz procederont par arrest comme dessus se infomeront des maistres ou marchans a quy telz tapiz seront et de ceux qui auront abuse.

5. Item les dits commissaries font tout bon debvoir pour bien entender les dits abuz avecq le peril,dommaige et interest que y gist le tout toutefvoies au moindre bruct et le plus settlement que faire pourront. Avec telle discharge que a
l’exonération des parties abusantes scauroit ou pourroit en temps future par eulx ester allégué. Afin de par ce moyen éviter multiplication et longueur de process et débat.

6. Et au suplus se conduiront et front telz debvoirs et diligences en cest endroit ses circumstances et dependences comme ilz trouvent ester requiz et nécessaire tant `a l’honneur de l’emoereur que le bien publicque de la justice et plice de la tapisserie. Et de leur besoingnye front rapport à sa Réginalle majesté pour après en aster fait et ordonné comme de raison. Ainsi ordonné par sa Majesté à Bruxelles le 28 e jour de janvier 1538.
Appendix 8: Mary of Hungary’s Edict Regarding the Seizure Policies for Confiscated Tapestries.
Source: ARAB Papiers d’Etat et de l’Audiense. No 891, t. I, I fol. 15

Bruxelles 4 mars 1539

Main levee de plusiers pieces de tappisseries qu’estoient arrestées.
Sur les poursuyters faictes par plusiers marchans et tapisssiers residens es pays de pardeça afin d’avoir main levee de leurs pieces de tapisseries arrestees en Anvers pour les abuz et faultes y trouvées. La royn par deliberation de Conseil a ordonné et ordonne par ceste que auparavant accorder ladite main levée les marchands et tapisssiers estans presentemment en ladite ville d’Anvers seront tenuz comparoir par devant les commissaries ordonnez par ladite dame Royn pour en leur presence et d’aucuns wardains qui a ce seront depute recognuees et redigées par escript au verbal desdits commissaires lesdites pieces leur seront dèlivrées pour en faire leur prouffit, moyennant caution fideiussoire que lesdits marchans bailleront dester a droit ou icelles sa Majesté (eulx ouz) ordonnera et d’y furnir le jugie.

Que ceulx qui affirmeront ny povoir furnir ladite caucion fideiussoire passeront la donnant juratoire. Quant aux marchans qui ne se trouveront presens audit Anvers estans d’Audenaerde, d’Enghien et d’ailleurs, les faultes seront aussi visitées par lesdits commissaries appelle les deutez des villes estans presentemment icy si presens y veullent ester et en presence desdits wardains don’t verbal sera fait et s/en baieller a main levee comme dessus moyennant caucion fideiussoire telle que dit est qui se baieller par devant la loy de leur residence ou ilz ont accoustumé livre leurs tappis avant qu’il soit esdits marchans de la donner et sinon passeront en donnant caucion juratoire aux lieux dessus dits. Aussi pour remedier que pendant le temps que l’on procedera contre les delinquans et que l’on pourra adviser de faire quelque bonne ordonnance pour l’advenir semblables abuz ne se commettent, la Royn fera desmain publier certains placcarts qui s’entretiendront par provision et jusques autrement en sera ordonne, fait a Bruxelles le 4 jour de mars XV C XXVIII
Appendix 9: The van der Molens communicate with customers regarding delays caused by the Edict of 1539 policies. Transcribed by Jean Denucé in Antwerp Art Tapestry and Trade (Historical Sources for the Study of Flemish Art, 4). Antwerp: De Sikkel, 1936, 8. Source: SAA IB 2030

Fol. 63 1539, 1 Marzo. Cibo etc.

Quanto ale sette dapoi non ne habiamo piu venduto li tapezieri de Bruselles hano auto gran questione chontra la corte che li signor li volevano confiscare le tapezarie fine, per cauxa che uno gentilomo savea lamentato ala corte esser stato inganato da certi tapezeri in tapezarie fine avea comprato noi non sapiamo la cauxa del ditto gentilhomo questi tapezieri tutti ne dichono che ditto gentilhomo ha torto: li signori han visitato alsi qui tutte le tapezerie fine coxi di Bruselles chome alter. A Bruselles darano la sentencia, dichono che prestone harano la fine, per quanto intendiamo hi vora costar qualcosa sarebbe stato meglio al principio havesseno data per ristoro al ditto gentilhomo Duc. mille che pagarne davantogio in questo modo, che sono cauxa de grandissima diffama ale tapezieri de Bruselles, et ne sono de gia interessati assai pur se suol dire un disordine consa un ordine, e pensiamo doravanti li farano sigelare e qualche bon ordine. Chome sarano qui de ritorno faremo di vender piu che se potra delle vostre sette e coxi ad altri et non si fara altro che a constant del seguito vi daremo avixo.

Fol. 64 vo. 1539, 1 Marzo. Azoretto.

Delle sete di Venezia dapoi non nabiamo verduto k³ᵃ, questi tapezeri de Brusselles sono in lite chontra la Corte che li volevano confiscare tutte le tapezarie fine de s. 10 in 15 lala. per cauxa che alchuni se havevan lamentato ala Corte, esser inganati de ditte tapezarie dicevan non esser lavorate second l'ordine de Bruselles. Faremo di vender le sete per giornata ad altri tapezerie, sono mᵃ longa.

Fol. 67 vo. 1539, 29 Marzo. Moro

Per lultima vi dicemo che li singiori di bruselles dovean partir de qui fra 2 ou 3 di, coxi fu ma dapoi sono retornati fin qui, et hanno confiscato assai tapezarie di Bruselles et no di Oudenarde, a queli di Bruselle
rafermon li statute primi con pena de corpo e beni chi contrafara, a quelli d'Oudenarde farano statute novi che per Avanti non ne hano autti, et se dice che alle tele d'Olanda e Fiandra se fara alzi qualche ordine per la largeza e longeza elle tele. Li nostril rapezeri sono stati qui quest settiman passata et non hano protat che quell sono atorno le 2 balette. El resto dicono sara per lottaua dapò pasqua et chome vedete le verdure non habiamo potuto aver mancho de d. 22, li parchi per no esser che4 porti se hano per d. 26.
Appendix 10: Request van der Stad Antwerpen aan den Raad des Konings Betreffend het Keizerlijk Edikt op de Tapitserij van 1544 (1553).

Also transcribed by Jean Denucé in *Antwerp Art Tapestry and Trade* (Historical Sources for the Study of Flemish Art, 4). Antwerp: De Sikkel, 1936, 20, with slight variations.
Source: SAA GA 4047

Eerweerdige, Edele, Wijse, Voorsienige Heeren. Wy gebieden on sin alder reverentie inde goede gratie van uwen Eer., der selver adverterende hoe dat wy hebben tot noch toe uytgestelt binnen der stad van Antwerpen te laten publiceren ende vercondigen d’ordonnantie by wylen hooger memorien de Keiserlycke Maiestyt gemaect op tfeyt ende exercitie van den ambachte ende neeringe vande tapisserye in dese Nederlanden die ons geleverd is alleenlyken by copie van zekere ander copie ende de welcke wy uwen E. hier mede besloten overseynden, mits dyen wy bevonden hebben dat eenige artikelen, daermede eenen meester is verboden eenige vrempde werckgesellen te aanveerden om te wercken te stellen, zy en hadden certificatie vanden ambachte oft van der stad daer zy lestmael gewrocht zouden hebben dat zij haeren lestné meester zouden voldaen hebben. Dwelck zoude causeren de geheele destructie van de selver neeringe binnen Antwerpen, aldaer men luttel snapen gecrygen can eeners constenaers dan vrempden, ende die van andere landen ofte steden aldaer commen, die welcke willende vertrecken van andere steden naer Antwerpen en souden van den ambachte ofte van den lestné stiel qualyck een certificatie connen gecrygen om hen vertreck te beletten. Ten anderen dat ock de meesters den snapen ende gesellen dicwils soe vele gelts geven opde hant dat zy tselve nameraels nyet meer machtich en syn te verdienen oft te restitueren, houdende by dien middele de selve zoe verbonden dat zy herwaerts over egeen andere meesters en moegen suecken, daer deur de selve geoiraect worden uyt dese Nederlande te vertrecken ende de conne in andere landen te transporteren. Uyt welcken respecte van die van de stad van Ghent hebben ock gedileyeert gesien de voirs. ordonnantie binnen Ghent te vercondigen tottertyt toen by vonnisse inden Secreten Raede gewees den lestné septembris anno 1553, daer af wy uwe E. ock copie omme overseynden. Hen is toegelaten dat die meesters aldaer moegen aenveerden deghene die tselve ambacht cunnen mits doende behoirlicke proeve, zonder dat hen moet blycken by certificatien dat die voers. snapen dryejaeren by eenen vryen meester geleert hebben oft denselven voldaen. Ende al eest zoe dat by denselven vonnisse den meesters toegelaten is den knapen ende werckgesellen te moegen leenen op huerlieder toecommend werck de somme van zesse car. guld. sonder meer om te moegen verhalen uyt crachte van deselve ordonnatie op
de nyeuwe meesters, zoe bevinden wy dat tzelve oick grootelyck zoude prejudicieren de voirs. neeringe binnen Antwerpen ende beletten dat gheen meesters vrempe knaap en gesellen die zy nae exigencie vande wercken behoeven, in grote getale souden derven aenveerden van vresse te vallen in de pene in de voers. ordonnantie begrepen ende daertoe van noch te betalen de voers. zesse geleende car. guld. van elcken geselle, dwelck ons oock dunct onder correctie onredelyck te zyn, maer behoirt die leste meester tselve verhaal te hebben op dengenen die in hem gehouden is ende metten welcken hy heeft gecontracteert ende nyet op eenen derden die daerbij noch anen en is geweest, noch daeraff genyet noch geproffydt en heeft gehadt noch oyck daarroffe en weet te spreken. Boven desen bevinden wy by en bescheede hiermede oyck by copie overgeset dat in den jare dusent IIIe XXII den XXIIen dach in Septembris alsdoen de neeringe van de tappytleggers zeer groot was binnen Antwerpen, by Borgermeesteren, Scopen ende Raide derselver stad is geordineert onder andere dat gheen meester zynen knaap hooger en wermach beleenen dan tot twee scellingen groote toe, op de pene van eenen halfven ouden schildte ter neering behoefve; dwelck also ontwyffelyck is geordonneet geweest op dat men de knapen soude houden int werck ende gheen oirsake geven te gaan drinken ende dwerck te verlaten, zonder dat de nyeuwe meesters ter causen van ‘t aenveerden van den cnaap by derselver ordonnantie ergens inne gehouden zyn aen de leste meesters. Soe dat ons dunct onder correctie dat men den meesters binnen Antwerpen behoirt te laeten in huere oude liberteyt van alle werckgesellen te moegen aenveerden ten minste onder behoirlycke provee, sonder ter oirsake van ‘t aenveerden van denselven cnaap in eenigen voirderen last gehouden te zyne den lestten oft voirgaende meester zyn verhaal. altyt op denselven cnaap van tgene hy wilt pretenderen, daer dieselove cnaap in hem soude gehouden zyn; gemeret de meesters van de tapytleggers binnen Antwerpen ons hebben vercleert dat zy wel tevreden zyn dat die nyeuw meesters in andere steden oyck ongehouden (?) zyn hen te moeten opretchen ende te betalen tgenne dat hun knapen oft werckgesellen hen nyet voldaen en hebben, denwelcken zy nochtans somtyts tot hunnen last ende perikel alleene leenen, versueckende daer omme dat der Ma(t) van den Co. oft uwen E. gelieven wilde de voirs. ordonnantie ende pointen voirs. voir soe vele die stad van Antwerpen aengaet te modereren ende te limiteren in der vueghen voirseyd, te meer de selve pointen egheenssins en concerneren de abusen ende falsiteyten te eviteren die van Bruessele versocht hebben dat men binnen der voirs. stad van Antwerpen de voirs. generale ordonnantie soude publiceren, Zynde berredt tselve gedaen de voirs. ordonnantie te doen vercondigen ende onderhouden in allen anderen haren pointen ende articulen, Behoudelick dat de penen ende brutecken die byder voirs. ordonnantie nyet en worden bekeerd tot behoeve van der stad, gemerct dat de neeringe van den tapytleggers is een van de
notabele leden van der gulden van den wollewercke ende daer onder altyt heeft gesorteert, daer aff die voirs. stadt van wylen hooger memorien hertoge Jan [inden Jare 1428 des sondaechs voir Ste Katlyne dach] om die menichfuldige getrouwe diensten, die de voirs. stadt hem ende zynen voirderen menichwerven gedaen hadden, ende nairmaels noch doen mochten, heeft gecocht ende gecregen de geheele gerichticheyt van alle boeten, penen ende fourfaiten die ter causen van den neeringhen die onder de voirs. gulden resorteren, souden moghen vallen te behoeve inder gulden oirboir, gelyck den scepenen van Antwerpen dat soude duncken oirboir ende prouffyt, ende daertoe heeft de voirs. gulden te moghen stellen penen, keuren ende boeten, ende die te meerderen ende minderen, zoe de scepenen der selver stadt souden vinden ende duncken oirboirlyck te zijn, alleenlyck behouden hebbende lyff ende leth, gelyck oyck zedert dien tyt over menschen gedenckenisse tot op den dach van heden die penen, boeten, keuren onder die voirs. gulden zijn gevallen, tot die stadt oft gulden oirboir zijn geemployeert geweest, ende onder tdexsel van dese generale ordonnantie in hare particuliere gerichticheyt ende previlegien deur haeren menichfuldigen getrouwen dienst vercregen nyet en behoirt vercort te worden, Begeerende dat uwen E. als beschermers vande privilegen ende gerechticheden van den steden ende Lande van Brabant, by der Ma(t) van den coninck besworen te onderhouden, de voirs, stadt toe en late quyetelyck de voirs. heure privilegien ende gerichticheden, ende oyck dese aengaende de voirs. generale ordonnantie te veranderen, oft te interpreteren, in welcken gevalle sullen ons bereedt vinden de voirs. publicatie te doen doen, ende de voirs. ordonnantie in alle andere poincten te doen onderhouden, dewelck wy voir de voirs. moderatie, limitatie oft veranderinge als voire van oudts weghen uyt en hebben vermoghen te doen, als gesworen hebbende te onderhouden de previlegien, gerichticheden onde costuymen, vrydommen ende herbrengen vader voirs. stadt, Tghene is, Eerwerdige, Edele, wyse, voirsienige Heeren, wy uwen E. desen aengaende hebben weten te scryven, Versueckende tselve int goede te nemen, ende de voirs. stadt voir gerecomandeert te houden, mits welcken dese eyndende, bidden God almechtich uwen E. in salichededen te willen gesparen Gescreven desen XX.
Appendix 11: Requeste van deser stadt tegens de Tapitsiers Ordonnantie, dat d’Ordonnantie soude moghen worden gemodereert (1553).
Source: SAA GA 4047

Aen den Coninck
Geven te kennen in alder oidtmoet Borgemeesteren, Scepenen ende Raidt der stadt van Antwerpen, hoe dat zij supplianten van in Julio lestleden uwer Majesteyt hebben gepresenteert gehadt requeste ende daer by versocht dat zekere ordonnancie bij wijlen hoogher memorien onsen heere die keijser uwer Majesteyts heere vader, op het feijt ambachte ende negotiatie vander tapijserijen binnen desen uwer Majestijts Nederlanden gemaect ende bij uwe majestijt geconfirmeert ende binnen uwer Majestijts vorsijde stadt van Antwerpen onlanx gepubliceet soude in sommige aticulen worde gemodereert ten minsten gelijck die selve ordonnancie in Vlaenderen ten versuecke van uwen Majesteyts secreten Raide gemodereet geweest op den lesten dach van septembri in den jaere XVe drij ende vijftich, op welcke der supplianten requeste is den thiensten dach van Julio lestleden geappoincteert geweest, dat die vorsereven ordonnancie soude wordden gerecouvreet die stucken supplianten ende dat die selve ordonnancie soude zijn gemaect geweest, om die gesien voirts geordonneert te worden als behoiren soude, ende hoe wel die supplianten diligentie gedaen hebben soo aen ennige secretarisen als aen ennige heeren van uwer Majestijts secreten Raide eentsamelycken oyck vanden Raide van Brabant om die voirscreven stucken te recouveeren soo en hebben die supplianten nochtans die selve nyet weten te vinden inder vuegen dat die supplianten daertoe nyet meer en weten te doen dan uwe Majestijt te bidden midts overgevende alleenlijcken die voirscreven ordonnantie hen supplianten te willen accorderen hen versueck; bij hunne voirscreven requeste versocht, dwelck doende....(transcription ends here)
Appendix 12: List of Foreign Merchants exporting goods to the Iberian Peninsula.
Compiled by Léon Van der Essen in *Contribution à l'histoire du port d'Anvers et du commerce d'exportation des Pays-Bas vers l'Espagne et le Portugal à l'époque de Charles-Quint (1553-1554).* Antwerp: Secelle, 1921, 10-16.

| Spanish and Portuguese | Alonso de Abreo | Alvaro de Abreo | Luys Alonso | Martin Alonso | Antonio Alvarez | Juan de Aranda | Miguel de Aranda | Diego Alvarez | Gaspar Alvarez | Salvador Andres | Francisco Diaz | Juan de Doypa | Geronimo de Espinosa | Antonio Fernandez | Juan Fernandez | Diego Fernandez | Henrique Fernandez | Ambrosio de Fleytas | Zacones de la Franca | Cristoval Garcia | Juan Angelo de Ononi | Francisco Estevan | Angel de Aranda | Juan de Atricada | Francisco de Avyla o Dias | Diego de Ava | Christoval Belzar |
|------------------------|-----------------|-----------------|-------------|---------------|----------------|----------------|------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------|---------------|----------------|------------------------|---------------------|-----------------|-------------------|-------------------|---------------------|---------------------|-------------------|------------------|-------------------|------------------|-------------------|---------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|-------------------|-------------------|
|                        | Juan Battista et| Francisco Balde | Juan de Saldaria | Juan Camrena | Fernando Lopez del Campo | Diego Ortega de Carrion | Afonso Castim | Antonio de Castro | Gonzalo de Chabarri | Juan Cortis | Juan de Cuellar | Andres Diaz | Ortuno de la Rea | Diego de Lerma | Lorenzo de Lermia | Miguel de Libano | Alvaro de Lima | Antonio Lopez | Jorge Lopez | Martin Lopez de Herrera | Martin Lopez de Lisarra | Fernand Luys | Antonio de | Magellanes | Manuel Alfonso | Andres Manrique | Juan Martinez | Andres Marts(?) | Juan Mastel | Ortega de Melgosa | Diego Mendez | Ruy Mendez | Bonaventura Miguel | Juan de Monsel | Diego Lopez Montero | Francesco de Montesa | Pablo Nores | Bernal Nuñez | Juan Nuñez | Juan de Gaula | Fernando de Gerita | Antonio Gomez | Gonzalo Gomez | Martin Gomez | Ruy Gomez | Alonso Gonzales | Christobal Gonzales | Pedro Gonzales | Simon Gonzales | Tomé Gonzales | Henrique de Goya | Antonio et Thomas de Guzman | Pedro Fernandez de Herrera | Pedro de Horosco | Juan Ivan | Antonio Jorge |
Salvatore Nuñez  
Juan de Oyachola  
Andres de Oyardo  
Diego de Osma  
Antonio Pablos  
Christobal Paez  
Rodrigo Paez  
Alonso de Palma  
Diego de Palma  
Juan de Palma  
Antonio Paris  
Domingo Paris  
Francisco Paris  
Benedito de Parmento  
Francesco Permenta  
Francesco Perez  
Pedro de Poca  
Antonio de Polanca  
Nuñez de Porto  
Pedro de Ramires  
Fernando de  
Rebolledo  
Geronimo Revelasco  
Antonio de Rio  
Nuñez de Rituerto  
Antonio Rodriguez  
Cosme Rodriguez  
Marcos Nuñez (o  
Mallar)  
Duarte Rodriguez  
Fabian Rodriguez  
Gaspar Rodriguez  
Juan Rodriguez  
Nicolas Rodriguez  
Alonso Ruiz  
Antonio Ruiz  
Simon Ruiz  
Alonso Sanchez  
Francisco Sanchez  
Geronimo de  
Salamanca  
Diego de Santa Cruz  
Martin de San Urse  
Gonsalo de Siebra  
Bastian de Suleta  
George de Suri  
Martin de Tardajos  
Domingo de Torraspe  
Alonso de la Torre  
Enrique de Tovar  
Goncalo Vaes  
Cristobal de Valencia  
Diego de Vides  
Diego de Villegas  
Pascual de Villamonte  
Sancho de Villamonte  
Miguel de Vitera  
Juan de Vitorio  
Miguel de Vuesela  
Rodrigo de Xerez  
Francisco Ximenez  
Andres de Yserardi  
Juan Marsyses  
Juan de Vazella  
Francisco de Aguilar  
Francisco de Bejar  
Pedro de Ynerri  
Juan de Marge  
Vincente de Huraco  
Francisco de Merris  
Ortuño de Stuniga  
Ortuño de Bilbao  
Pedro de la Mata  
Pedro de Ysunsa  
Daniel Yedar  
Juan de la Cama  
Gaspar de Zamora  
Miguel de Zuraya  
Juan de Tardajos  
Antonio de Fonseca  
Gomez Perez  
Fernando de Matanca  
Juan Lopez de Ayala  
Juan del Hoyo  
Geronimo Corseco  
Michel de Sant Martel  
Fernandez Diaz  
Martin de la  
Carbonera  
Francesco de San  
Vitores  
Alonso Perez  
Juan de Licama  
Juan de Goyas  
Gomez Perez  
Juan et Domingo de la  
Torre  
Juan de Villaviziosa  
Juan de Goiri  
Juan de Salinas  
Gregoire de  
Reconverts  
Gregoire de  
Escanabusa  
Jacop Viscayno  
Jacques de Aguinarba  
Martin Francesco de  
Sarra  
Gregoire de  
Escanabusa  
Leonardo Espinosa  
Juan Zeroso  
Luis Alonso Medina  
Francisco de Baños  
Andres de la Peña  
Gaspar Zapata  
Francisco de Bejar  
Sancho de Ugarte  
Juan de Very
Andres de Losyre  
Marin de Plaze  
Jaspar de Rias  
Pedro de Bilbao  
Fernando de Orsina  
Mathias de Aldani  
Pedro Olivari  
Domingo de arrioba  
Miguel de Cardona  
Juan de Amasaruy  
Estaban de Percasi  
Laurencio de Monreal  
Pedro Bostudy  
Fernan Lopez Gallo  
Fernando de Matute  
Sebastian de Busorina  
Aparizio  
Juan Duarte  
Juan Rates  
Sebastian del Puerto  
Juan de Leya(?)  
Domingo de Aky  
Francisco de Arrieta  
Inigio de la Rea  
Fernando Yanes  
Fernand Ines  
Sancho de Incarry  
Martin de Ufigerra  
Jacques de Synara  
Martin de Barroby  
Benedito Rodriguez  
Diego de Camargo  
Martin de Urtau  
Antonio de Vergara  
Les héritiers de  
Francesco Montesa  
Martin de Abueta  
Manuel Caldera  
Pero Gomez  
Bernardo Garcia  
Bernando de Galdanes  
Santos de Anaya  
Augustin de Prata  
Bras Fernandez  
Luis Sanchez  
Luis de Sevilla  
Luis de Quesada  
Guillen de Ysasti  
Antonio de Vides  
Juan de Vazur  
Juan Perez de Oa  
(San) Juan de la Rea  
Martin de Casalla  
Cristobal Calvete  
Francisco de Ugarte  
Rodriganens (?)  
Rodrigo, Alonso et  
Antonio Yanez  
Antonio Estevan  
Gonzales Perez  
Alvaro Bras  
Juan Lopez de Ayala  
Pedro de Areste  
Juan de Areste  
Pedro de Xeres  
Juand de Sonate  
Jaspar de Zorrita  
Juan Gonzales Rascon  
Miguel de Modoya  
Alonso Jorge  
Alvaro Yanes Paris  
Francisco Piesilde  
Manuel Awares  
Lorenzo Mendez  
Jop Vola (?)  
Melchior de  
Gamburca  
Juan de Yrun  
Juan de Alquarint  
Martin de Galaca  
Pedro de Arbieto  
Hieronimo Lopez  
Juan Perez de  
Returbio  
Juan de Ayala  
Antonio de Avyla  
Francisco de Tranco  
Pedro Sanchez  
Baltasar Nuñez  
Pero Fernandez  
Vincent Grimal de  
Durace  
Luys Lopez  
Pedro Jamesmez el  
Moco  
Esteven Albo  
Francisco Bueno  
Jaun de Vousel  
Italians  
Bonvisi  
Juan Battista Affaitadi  
Francesco Cachopin  
Jaun Albert Camosyn  
Benedetto Capriano  
Juan Battista Gondi  
Juan Batista Grimaldi  
Jacques Vedone  
Vincenzio de Grimaldi  
Galeotto Magalotti  
Gregorio Pita  
Leonardo de Spinola  
Giovan Antonio de  
Grimaldi  
Anotnio Bugiro  
Silvestre Cataneo  
Duarte Cardoso  
Marco Anotonio  
Tarafe
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Germans</th>
<th>Low Countries</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Fuggers</td>
<td>Jan Andries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bonaventure</td>
<td>Jacop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bodecker</td>
<td>Anenon/Haneron?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Guillaume Rubin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Magdelena</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adriaenssen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Willem Bart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jacques Bernuy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hans Boudaen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Michel Breedestam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pieter Brielman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Roger le Buque</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nicolas Carrete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alexis Grimel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hendrick de Hane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Willem de Hane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pieter Hansmans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dierick Hendricks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jacques Hendricks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Juan Jakes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jan Jacops</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nicolas Lapostole</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jacques Lenert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bartolomé Lins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gérard de Chièvres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Aureuni Claëssen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Charles Cockier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Aert Coggen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gerard Corbau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Olivier Corbau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gérard Corbet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dierick Deyns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jan Deyns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jaspar de Escart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Laurent Foquette</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jacques Fanam/Van Ham?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cornelis Ghijsbrechts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frans Gillis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jacop Gillis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Balthasar de la Rue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Henrick de Runen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Beltram de Rute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Schets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pieter Scurfoete/Scorhoote?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Juan de Selle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Walfranc Smerpont</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jan Snoeck</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gilles de Sorbrecht</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pieter de Sorbrecht</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Willem De Spaerpot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hans Struyve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jean de Terreus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hans Sunders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Robrecht van Aken</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Michiel van Aramuyen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gheert van Brugge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pieter van der Linde</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hans van der</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Quertborne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Joseph van Dorne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jacop van Espen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Joris van Gemal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Robert van Haften</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Willem van Kielsdam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jacques van Lyke</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gaspar Loscart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nicolas Mahu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Louis Malapert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gérôme et Gaspar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Menart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jean Menart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>APierre Monel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Michel Mulier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jacop Pels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jacques de Persijn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Erasmus le Petit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hector Pinson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jacques le Prieur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nicolas Provost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jan de Ridder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lancelot de Robiano</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Joris van Surke</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jacquew van</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tongerloo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Henrik van Vissel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Henrik van Vlissinghe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jorge van Wasen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gilles van Winden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Henrik Viringhes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Henrik de Wale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Aert Wickman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jacques Molenart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Joris Estequer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dirik Regal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Aert aruzart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Willem van Huque</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lieve de</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Slagemule</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nicolas Dumas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pieter Dames</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pauwel Gheertssen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Joseph van Aken</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jacques Brun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Michel Breksteen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Willem Ullense</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>La veuve de Pieter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Arnouts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jan Andres</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Willem Arbau  Arniaen van Pontram  Cornelis
Jacop van Pee  Charles de Suyper  Ghijsbrechtssen
Hannes van Pele  Jacques de Hasa  Adam Ariaenssen
Arnaud de Amiens  Jennin de Beaulieu  Hans van Loon
Willem van  Francois Codijn  Willem Janssen
Smaldonck  Nicolas Antoine  Steven van den Hove
Henrik de Pan  Jan van Rikelberge  Veuve Salvador Fenix
Huch ‘Cornelis  Henrik van Onse  Pedro de Nieulijv
Jacques Van Laet  Simon Roxe  Herman Pieters
Casyn de la Bocant  Jacop Denys  
Jan Mattheeus  Pieter van den Water  
Hendrik van Aken  Jaspar Roquetes  
Francois Stevenart  Charles de Cordes  
Wichman Harmans  Lenart Broke  
Jehan de Moir  Jan vanden Broeke  
Jan van den Put  Lucas Debre  
Henrick Hetmans  Balthasar Charles  
Hector le Moine  Jan Aelbrechts  
Jacop Carele  Herman Janssen  
Janvan Bassa  Joos Helegeert  
Laurent Mulier  Frans Wouter  
Gaspar Mosel  Nicasius Venant  
Frans Hughens  Gilles Henricks  
Jan Torvier  Jan Moreau  
Gerard de Aquiens  Francois Man  
Jacop Sterke  Jan Turier  
Cornelius van den  Hendrick De Decker  
Brande  Claes Bouwens  
Jan Cole  Claes de Nieuwelandt  
Jacques ‘ballinck  Pedro de Armentières  
Joseph de Vrancke  Gilles Raet  
Aert ‘Beniquema  Hans  
Jan de Wynt  Beernaertshuysen  
Joris van Gememde  Gomez Van Aken  
Jacques van  Augustin Gentil  
OOosterwyck  Cornelis de Mayere  
Hubrecht de Bruyne  Giles Hockx  
Martin de Louvaye  Gaspar Conete  
Hanrik van Halle  Bartholomé Du Bois  
Jan de Broke  Willem Jacops  

Appendix 13: Printed Form for a Contract.
Source: Archives du Musee Plantin-Moretus a Anvers. Handel en Scheepvaart Varia, K 10741

Je ........................................ Maistre après Dieu de la navire nommée ................................ du port de .......tonneauls ou environs de la vill .......... ancrée á present devant...............pour avecques le premier temps convenable que Dieu donnera, suivre le voyage i usques au devan de la ville..........lá o users ma droicte décharge, confesse avoir recue dedans ladicte miene Navire dessoubs le Tillac de vous............... .......... Les marchandises ensuivantes nombrées et marquées au nombre et marquee cy dehors mis, le tout sec et bien conditionné a scavoir ..............................................................

lesquelles marchandises je promects delivrer...............ou á son commis, facteur ou entremetteur saulf les périlz et fortunes de la Mer de quoy Dieu nous gard. Et pour l’accomplissement de ce que dict est j’ai obligé et oblige par ceste ma personne, mes biens et ladicte mienne Navire fraict et appareilz en me monstrant un de ces conoissemens et sera ledict............... tenu de me payer pour mon fraict desdites marchandises la somme de ..................aveques les Avaris et Devoirs accousteméz. En témoignage de vérité Je .................... ay signé de mon signe manuel les conoissemens d’une mesme teneur desquelz l’un accompli l’autre sera de nulle valeur.

Faict........le ..........jour de mois de ............Anno........ .
Appendix 14: Adviejs van den tapiissiers (1554).
Also transcribed by Jean Denucé in Antwerp Art Tapestry and Trade (Historical Sources for the Study of Flemish Art, 4). Antwerp: De Sikkel, 1936, 25, with slight variations.
Source: SAA GA 4047

Inden iersten dat alder ghene dy commescap van tapisserie doen ende daer mede vorstaen ende vercoepen oft oyck kerpetten ende tafelclieren, dy seullen moeten poeter sijn, tsij bij gheboerte oft coepe, dy hierde stad woennen, alstghenoech blyckt beijden tweeden artikel op de tapisserie ghemaectt beyder keyserlycke Majesteyt anno 44.
Item den beuten coepman oft tapiissiers gyen poerters wessende, tsij van Brussel, Enghen, Giesberghen, Gent, Oudenarde, Brugge et., dy en seullen ghien camers van tapisserie moeghen ontsortteren oft scheidjen in vercoepen, het tsij van 5 oft 4 elt dyepe oft oyck ienighe spalieren daen al ghesoerttet te vercoepen, te wyeten de vijf elt dijepe van 40 oft 30 elt nerwerts met haer poerten tsy twe van 12 elt, oft twe van 9 elt, oft twee poerten van 6 elt, ende de vier ellen dijepe van 32 oft 24 nerwerts al ghesoertert met haer poerten als voer, sonder ienighe sticken wt te moeghen vercoepen im waet manieren dat het tsy, oft oyck ienege poertens te snijden oft eene poerte alleijne te vercoepen, ende de cussens nit min daen met dossynen, noch oijck ienege rabatten nit min daen met half dossyn sticken, allyene in het groesse den beuten coepman oft tapiissier, noch oyck nyemant anders wt heurlyder naem, al waert sake dat hij poeter waer, daer den beuten coopman oft tapiissier sijn goet aen sint om te vercoepen, alst ghenoch blyckt beyder ordijnantie, bijden Keyser Majesteyt ghemaectt anno 44, in het 86 artijkel, ende in het 90 artijkel daer in staet vanden dijsponeren ende te ordijneren bij dij vander weet.
Item den beuten coepman oft tapiissier tsy van Diest ende van Sintruyen gien poeters wessende, dy en seullen nit min moeghen vercoepen, daen met twelf sticken teffens, tsy XII sticken van XII elt oft XII sticken van 9 elt, oft XII van 6 elt ende de cussens nit min daen met hiel dossynen, ende Thinsche, Pelecaensche cussens oft bancclieren nit min daen met hiel dossijn sticken, al in het groesse, noch oyck iemant anders wt heur lyder naem, al waert sake dat hy poeter waer, daer den beuten coepman syn goet aen sint, op der pene van

Item den beuten coepman dy met Werfvicxe, Gensche kerpetten ende tafelclieren om gaet, ende ghijen poeter wessende, dij en seullen nit min moeghen vercoepen, daen met drij dossijnen teffens tsij kerpetten oft tafelclieren, al in het groesse, noch oijck iemant anders wt heurlijder naem, al waert sake dij hij poeter waer, daen den beuten coepman sijn goet aen sint om te vercoepen, op der pene van
Item de tapiessiers oft coeplijden poeters wessende, dij inden pant voerstaen met tapiisserije ende tafelcliern oft keretten, dy seullen alle onghesorterde stucken van tapiisserye, keretten, ende tafelcliernen moeghen coepen ende vercoepen oft onsoert tert met stucken seulx als hun dat belyeven sal, tsij van fine oft slechte tapiisserije ende cussens, ende oijck van keretten ende tafelcliernen, met een oft twee teffens al als poeters neringh ghelijck den wtsne vande lakens, seijde ende leyde laken.

Item dat den beuten coeplman, tapiessiers, legwerckers oft werckmiesters van tapiisserije, gien poeters wessende ende de kerpetlyens tsij van Wervick oft Gent, dy hier te mert coemmen wt ieneghe ghepreveligerde steden oft vrijheijden van dese Nederlanden, tsij van Brussel, Enghen, Giesberghen, Gent, Brugghe, Oudenarde, Wervick, etc., daer men tapiisserije ende kerpetten oft tafelcliernen maeckt, dat dij tapiessiers ende kerpetlyens al tsamen haer tapiisserije ende kerpetten oft tafelcliernen, seullen moeten bringhen inde nyeuwen tapiessiers pant, ende daer vercoepen ende ontpacken ende nyevers elders en seullen sijlijns moeghen thonen om te vercoepen, daen inde tapiessiers pant [nota het 86 ende het 90 artikel opde tapiisserye ghemaekt by der Keyserlycke Majesteijt anno 44]

Item dat ghien coeplman oft tapiessier, dy met tapiissyere omgaet ende vercoept, tsij fijne oft slechte tapiisserie, nit en sal moeghen thonen oft voertdoen ieneghe tyckens van tapiisserye oft keretten ende tafelcliernen wt hanghen oft voert doen, waer bij men moecht mercken datter tapiisserije te coepe waer, tot sijnen huysse oft packhuijssen daen inden nueuwen pant.

Item soe waet coeplman oft tapiessier tot synen huysse begert tapiisserije te vercoepen, dat sal hy moeghen doen met besloeten deuren oft viensters, op dat men van op de strate ghien tapiisserye en syen, ende sonder ieneghe tyckens van tapiisserye oft keretten ende tafelcliernen wt te hanghen oft ieneghe ander tyckens van schilderye oft scr fate, waer by men moecht mercken datter tapiisserye te coepe waer, op der pene van

Item soe waet coeplman oft tapiessier dy met tapiisserye omgaet ende tot synen huysse tapiisserye begeert te vercoepen, dy en sal ghyen winckel oft plaetsse inden tapiessiers pant moeghen hebben noch oijck ieneghe companye oft heymeleck verstant met ieneghe tapiessiers moeghen hebben, dy inden tapiessiers pant voertstaen.

Ende zoe ghemerckt dat alder tapiisserije dy in Antwerpen compt ende de kerpetten ende tafelcliernen, dy in dyversche steden oft vryheyden ghemaekt woerden, neu tertyt compt in handen van 7 oft 8 perssoenen, want elck stadte dy heeft hier wonende 3 oft 4 facteurs, dy noch poeter syn, tsy by gheboerte oft coepe, ende den beuten coeplman oft tapiessier, dy en ploecht hier voertys, noch over XX jaeren, maer inde vry mertten te commen dy neu daeghelecx hier leet ende vent sy goet met stucken onghesoert tert als poeters neringhe ghelic laken
seyde ende lyne laken, seulx dat de poeters dy hier ghehuyst ende gehoest syn
gien neringhe en hebben dy hen met tapiasserye syn ghenerende, maer dy poeters
syn hiel en al verdruct, doer den beuten coepman oft tapiissier, doer dat sylies
zoe wt vercoepen met sticken ende ontsoertteren haer camers vantapisserye, soe
dat de hyeren hier in behoeren te versien ende tselve te remedyeren.
Appendix 15: Van den nyeuwen tapitziers pant.
Transcribed by Jean Denucé in Antwerp Art Tapestry and Trade (Historical Sources for the Study of Flemish Art, 4). Antwerp: De Sikkel, 1936, 24-25.
Source: SAA PK 915, fol. 191

Geboden ende vuytgeroepen by Adame van Berchem, Onderschouteth, Burgemeesteren, Scepenen ende Raide der stadt van Antwerpen opten XXIIIen dach van Decembri XVe ende LIII.
Van den nyeuwen tapitziers pant.

Alsoe dese stadt onlanx tot huieren ende swaren coste gemaect heeft, opte erve vanden ouden schuttershoven alhier, eenen nyeuwen tapytptant, omme aldaer te hebbene ende te doene de neeregen van tapitserye met des dien aencleeft, ende tot dien eynde vercregen ende veworven van onsen Genadigen Heere den Keysere, sekere openen brieven oft placcaet, daermede syne Majesteyt beveelt, intediceert, ende verbiedt, dat nymant vanden tapitsiers tsy van buyten luyden oft van den ingesetene onser stadt voordane eenigen openen winckele, packhuys oft andere plaetse en hebbe, noch en houde daer inne hy eenige tapitserye oft carpetten thoone oft vercoope, noch ten dien eynde eenich voerbert oft andere tecken, daer vuyt men soude moegen weten oft verstaen, dat hy aldaer tapitserye oft carpetten te coop hadden, daer voor en hange, opte pene in de selve brieven begrepen, maer dat een yegelyck hem sal moeten comen geneeren openbaerlyck in den voors. nyeuwen pandt, blyckende naerdere by de voors. brieven, die alhier ter puyen aff, syn gepubliceert geweest, den vijfsten Aprilis lestleden, ende oyk dat de gecommitteerde vander fortificatien deser stadt den voors. pandt tSint Jansmisse lestleden verhuert hebben, voer een deel eenigen tapitsiers, op condicie dat de stadt nyet en sal gedaen oft laten gedaen, desen Kersmisse overstrekren synde, contrarie den voors. placacate eenichsins gedaen te woerdene, oft dat anderssins de huere soude syn doot ende als nyet gedaen, desen nochtans al nyettegenstaende, soo vanteren oft voirderen hen eenige ommegaende ende hen geneerende met tapitserye oft carpetten, contrarie den voors. placcate te done, dwelck in dien tselve nyet en worde versien, comen soude tot grooten achterdeele ende schade, deser stadt, ende soude daer duere de huere by ennigen als voors. is gedaen, expireren ende doot syn mits den welcken op dat nyemant daer aff ignorere men van sHeeren ende vander stadte wegen, waerschout ende insinueert eenen yegelyckren, ommegaende ende hem geneerende met tapitserie oft carpetten, hem van nu voortane te vugene ende te regulerene, navolgende de voors. oepenen brieven ons genadichs Heeren sKeysers, ende dat nyemant wye hy sy, eenichsins contrarie denselven en doe, oft eenigen oepene
winckele, packhuys oft andere plaetse en hebbe noch en houde, daer inne hy
eenige tapitserye oft carpetten thoone oft vercoope, noch ten dien eynde eenich
voerberct oft andere teecken daer vuyt men soude moegen weten oft verstaen, dat
hy aldaer tapitserye oft carpetten te coope hadde, daer vore en hanghe, opte pene
in de selve bieven begrepen
Appendix 16: Names associated with the Pand, 1553-1598.

1553  Daniel Thienpont, Jean de Ram (merchant), Pierre Van der Moten, André Van Yperen, Armand Ghestelinck, Jacques de Melandere, Armand Osten, Hans Witternbrost, Jean Van der Moten and Louis Van Spière
1556  Marik Vos, Noël Escouilleffore
1558  Georges Blomaert, Baudin Henrick, Jacques Blomart, Jacques Haesevelt, Roland Van der Hamayede (cartoonist), Josse Rampart
1559  Pierre Van Opinen
1561  Jan Van Culenbrock
1564  Roland Mussche
1566  Thierry Maes, Mathieu Dryckers, Michel de Bosch, Ambroise and Augustine de Colenaire
1576  Joos Van Herselle, Amant Vrancx, François Spierninck, Jan Van Londerzeele, Martin Cordier, Philippe Van Mettechoven, Ghossart Chimay, François Sweerts (merchant), François, Neve, Daniel Steurbant, François Van der Steene, Christien de Vicher and Nicolas Van Hove (Brussels), Corneille Olivers, Bartholomew Zanoli, Henry Pyn (English agent), Alyt Dielens (wife of Joos Van Heerseels), Leon Van den Hecque, Jacque Leyniers, Hubert de Maecht and Nicolas Hellinc (Brussels), Nicolas fr Dobbeleer, Jehan Van der Cammen, Phillippe Van der Cammen, and Quentyn Flascoen
1578  Cornielle Olivers
1581  Gilles de Carlier
1584  Laurent and Daniel Bos, Wynante rowue, Jean Pels, Adrien Van Oudenaerden, Herman de Huyge, Étienne Sterlippens, Jacques Stalpaert, Josse de Herseele, Antonio Ancelmo, Gilles Hoffman, Henry Vael, Pankuys, Gaspard Charles, Saniel Runtfles, Diego Pardo, Gaspar de la Pena, (The last
Eight were mostly merchants)
1586 Jean de Herseel, Jean Daniel, Laurent Bosch
1587 François Sweerts
1597 Hans boumans, Samson de Hlicort
1598 Van der Planken, François Witspaen
Appendix 17: A Copy of the Broker’s Oath.
Transcribed by Fernand Donnet in “Documents pour servir a l’histoire des ateliers de tapisserie de Bruxelles, Audenarde, Anvers, etc.,” Annales de la Société d’Archéologie de Bruxelles 10 (Brussels, 1898): 136.

Eedt vande maechelaers vande coopmanschappen van tapiissiers.
Op heden den sestiensten dach van julio, anno XVc achentachentich is gecompareetn in propren person voor joncheer Henrick Tserrarts schouteth van Antwerpen ende Marchgrave tslandts van Ryen G.I. : maeckelaer vande coopmanschappe vande tapiissiers, de welck geexhibeert ende ghethoont hebbende aen den selffven here marckgrave het bescheet van zyne poorterye in date den vierden july inden jaere vyftheinhondert sevenentachentich, heft daer near in synen handen solemnelyck met opgherechte vingerne aen Godt ende zyne lieve heyligen ghe sworn dat hy strickelyck scherpelyck en punctuelyck onderhouden zal alle de puncten ende articulen by heer Jan van Schoonhooven eertyden schouteth deser stadt ende marchgrave slandts van Rhyen midtsgads by burghemeesteren schepenen ende raede deser stadt ghemaeckt by maniere van ordonnantie ende previlegien op den tweelfsten dach maye int jaer XVe vierenvyftich ende oyck hem te reguleren achtervolghened de previlegien ende ordonnantie by hoochloffelycker memorie den keyser Caerle de vyffde van dyen den tapiissiers verleent op den sesthiensten van meye anno XVc vierenviertich, ende oyck te onderhouden het placcaet vanden selffven Keyser van date den derdden aprilis anno XVc dryenvyftich dear toe de voorschreven ordonnantie deser stadt is relayff ende besondere dat de voors G van nu voortaene egheen tapiissyere en zal maechen ofte doen maecken coopen ofte lateen coopen voor hem selffven paert oft deel ofte heymelyck verstant hebben met eenigen meestre oft andere die eenich wreck zouden hebben aengebracht noch addresseren in eenigher manieren alwaer de voors G. oyck vrye meeestere uit voorschreven ambacht ende zoo langhe al shy met maeckelaerdye ommegaen sal opde pene vande weerden vande tapiisserye die hy alzoe souden hebben gecocht doen maecken oft daer inne heymelck vorstant zoude hebben te verbeurren tot prouffyte vanden heer. Aldus ghedaen binnen der stadt van Antwerpen ter date als boven.

1539 Jean Scuddematte, Willem Spigghe, Chrétien Lautius, Adrian Mys, Simon Caudyser
1540 Pierre de Waghenere, Paul Van Coye, Jasper Huevick, Pierre Rombaudt, Pierre de Rycke, Paul de Rycke
1540-59 Pierre de Carlier
1541 Pierre Scaepcoman, Pierre Badaen, Pierre Van Meullebruock
1542 Pierre Splier, Pierre de May, Pierre Elyas dit Van Huddeghen, Adrien Modekins
1546 Conrad Thienpont
1547-66 Michel Van Orley, Josse Huevick
1547-52 Josse Weytius
1551 Gilles de Wendere, Ghislain Maroten
1552 Conrad Mescoten
1553 Pierre Van der Moten, Armand Ghestelinck, Jacques de Melandere, Armand Osten, Hans Willebroet, Jean Van der Moten, Louis Van Spiere
1558 Georges Blommaert, Hilaire Cabiran, Martin de Vroede
1559 Pierre Robbins, Steven Van Quickelberghe, Josse de Pape, Adrien Blommaert, Gaspard de Moor, André Van Ypère
1559-66 Antoine Van de Kerchove
1561 Jan Van Cuelenbrock, Jean Steurbant
1562 Jan Copenoit, Adrien Van Ypré, François Noitte, Herman de Cordes, Bauduin Huveck, Georges Rombault
1563 Thierry Maes, Antoine Van Coppenollen, Vanderghelyn, Jean Wytens, Antoine Laurent, Jacques de Vos, Arnout Cabellau, Josse Oveling, Roger Leerts, Jean de bock, Arnoud Cebont, Georges Rombaud, Martin de Cordier, Jean de Carliet
1566 Jacques Blommaert, Gilles Stichelbaut, Jacques Ghelyns, Adrien Huppaert, Gilles Van den Broecke, Roland Van der Moten, Pierre Backereel, Josse and Jacques de Vries, Merchants
1566-81 Jean Robbins
1569 Roland Van den Hove
1569-1618 Gaspard Robbins
1579 Pierre Grenier, merchant
1581 François de Neve, Philippe de Carlier
1581-87 Pasquier Van der Kerchove
1585  Jean Van den Ecke
1585-7 Jean de Pape, Jean Van der Kerchove
1585-1626 André Van den Hende
1585-1613 Jacques de Moor
1587-1620 Jacques Ghuys
1595  Pierre Robyns, Georges and Arnout Coppenolle
1596 François de Visschere
1598 Michiel Van der Beck, Jacques de Cassel
1596-1625 Antoine Robbins
1600-20 Joris Ghuys
Appendix 19: Weavers in Oudenaarde during the seventeenth century.

1600-20 Joris Ghuys
1601 Pierre Robbins or Rubens, Gilles Carlier, Jean de Moor
1603 Antoine Van der Kerchove
1606 Jean Van Linthout
1607 François Inghels, François de Smeit, François Hoste, Jeremie Van der Baken
1611 Pierre Rombaut
1612 François Moens, Jean Robbins
1613 Jacques Van den Kerchove, Jean voet, Henri Vrancx, Pierre de Gaddere
1616 Adrian de Vroelick, Pierre Brandt
1616-32 Jean Herbaut
1616-20 Paul Van der Broeck the elder
1616 Pierre Van Kerchen
1617-36 Jeran Blommaert
1619 Georges Van Coppenol
1620 Vincet van Quickelberghe
1620-25 Antoine Blommaert
1621 Lauren Valck, Gaspar Van der Westyne
1621-48 Phillip Robbins
1625-58 Jean Van Coppenole
1625 Pierre de Caluwe, Godfrey Lerman, Luc Van den Broeck
1625-54 Josse Van den Hende
1625-55 Daniel Van Coppenole, father
1625 Peter Van Coppenole
1633-56 Gaspard Van Caeneghem
1633 Gilles Van der Kerchove
1637 Adrian Wackens, François Robbins
1641-67 Josse de Vriese, Jean Van den Kerchove
1650 Daniel Van Coppenole, son
1654 Simon Delvael, Jean Simoens, Peter Doren, Louis Van der Perre, J. Van der Mersch
1654-56 Antoine Van Coppenole
1655 Francis de Moor, Jean dek Holislaghere
1657-88 Jacques Van den Kerchove
1658-67 Jacques Van Reghelbrugghe
1658-1705 David Brandt
1658-79 André Blommaert
1658-75 Antoine blommaert
1658-75 Jean Blonmaert
1658-67 Jacques Van Coppenole
1658  Jean Baert, Jean Van Verren
1658-93 Jean Van der Stichelen
1658-67 Jacques de Bock
1660-61 Paul Van den Broeck, young
1660  Paul Van Verren, Philip de Vos
1660-99 Abel Van Reghelbrugghe
1661-91 André Van Regelbrugghe
1663  Joris Van den Broucke
1663-7 Francis Van der Kerchove
1663-1722 Peter Van Verren
1667-9 Jacques Van der Roost
1667-79 Jean Baptist Van Coppenole
1667-1709 Antoine de Bie
1667  Danierl Maillé
1666  Josse de Vriese
1669-1700 Jean Van Verren
1669-76 Joris Blommaert
1669-1719 Louis Blommaert
1669-1737 Antoine Brandt
1669  Peter Van Coppenole
1669-95 Josse Van der Kerchove
1669-79 Jean de Vriese
1675  Caesar de Moor, Jean /Cabilliau
1675-93 Francis Van der Stichelen
1675-79 Gilles de Vriese
1676  Cristian Wauters
1679  Jean Van Regehelbrugghe
1679-93 Stephen Van Coppenole
1679-99 Francis Van Verren
1679-93 André Van der Kerchove
1683  Macaire Gimbercy
1675-93 Jean Baert
1683  Alexander Baert
1689-99 Jean de Bock
1691 Jean Ban der Stichelen, Francis Van Reghelbrugghe
1691-1700 Jean Brandt
1692 François Baert
1692-1731 Ferdinand Brandt
1693-1741 Jean Baptiste Brandt
1693 Jacques de Vriese
1693-1705 Jean de Vos
1693 Jean Van Coppenhole
1693-1727 Joris François Van Reghelbrugghe
1695 Josse Inghels
1699-1729 Jean Van Verren
1700 J.F. de Vriese
1700-8 Jean Van der Kerchove
Appendix 20: *Negociants*, merchants, and weavers of Antwerp, 1600-1696.

(Includes Oudenaarde and Brussels merchants; does not distinguish those with store rooms in Antwerp and who worked elsewhere from those who worked only in Antwerp)

1601  Daniel l'Hermite, *negociant*
1602  Joos de Carlier, Gerard Van der Linden, tapisser, Augustin de Bie, tapisser, Jacques de Moor, *negociant*, Adrien Franck, tapisser
1603  François Sweetz and Corneille Wyce, merchants
1604  Phillippe de Bie, tapisser
1607  Adrien Van Welden, Wilhelmine Rycquart, widow of Abraham de Hu, tapisser
1612  Herman de Rosne, Abraham de Hu (son), Henri Franken, Simon Bauwens, merchant-tapisseries
1614  Henri Franck, Daniel Steurbant, agent, Jean robins, Jean Raes and François Sweerts the younger, merchant-tapisseries, Antonio Bono, *negociant*, Jean de Boon, Paul Brouwere
1616  Jean Van Wellen, tapisser
1617  Joos Van der Beken, tapisser
1618  Nicolas de Cousttre
1619  Laurent Smit, merchant-tapisser, Jean Van Welden, Oliver de Haen Jacques Santel, Elie de Beekere, Josse Van Ceulenbroeck, Jacques Van de Vyvere, François Oste
1620  Guillaume de Cau, merchant
1625  Jean Pelhan, English agent for tapestries
1628  Widow of Jean Van Welden
1629  Michel Op
1637  Simon de Witte, tapisser, Jean Van Oostenden, Laurent Schaep, tapisser, son of David Schaep, tapisser, Anntoine Van Sautvoort
1639  Dominique Schoof
1640  Leonard Basn Welteren, tapisser
1641  Jean Bosch
1643  Jean Vecquemans, Daniel Fourment, merchant (deaths)
1649  Jacques Firens, André Schellinck
1654  Philippe Van den Vaert, tapisser
1660 Pierre Van Quickelberge, tapissier, Ascanio Martini, negociant
1662 Paul and François Rogiers, tapissiers, Jacomo de Vigenes, Gerad van der Necken, Jean Van Leefdael
1669 Jean Nouwelaerts, Matthew Corneliss, Joos Wyckmans, tapestry-workers
1676 Denis Poleau, merchant
1677 Nicolas Nauwelearts, merchant, Jean Van der Goten, tapissier, Pierre Wauters, tapissier
1678 André Van Boetsel, Jean Van Werren, merchant, Marie de Smit, merchant,
1680 Steffano de Andrea, agent
1683 Noël Fontani, merchant
1688 David Lorenzo, merchant
1693 J. Ph. Cornelissen
1694 Martin de Bisthoven, Armand Dap, tapissier
1696 Odenaert Baert, tapissier, Notelaer, merchant
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