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A donkey with a black hat, white ruff and expensive fur-trimmed cloak; an ostrich with a horseshoe in its beak wearing top boots; a boar dressed in a grey cloak and a white cap holding a bottle of brandy in its trotters. These weirdly garbed animals are examples of the colourful menagerie we encounter in a remarkable album bound in calfskin with the title Regtspleging van Oldenbarnevelt (The Trial of Oldenbarnevelt) on the spine. It is held in the Rijksmuseum and contains a collection of thirty-eight watercolour drawings on parchment with explanatory notes written on paper, made in the first half of the eighteenth century, probably between 1710 and 1720.

The drawings recall a black page in the history of the Netherlands. On 12 May 1619, in what was later described as a political show trial, Land’s Advocate Johan van Oldenbarnevelt (1547-1619) was condemned to death by a specially appointed court. The following day the elder statesman was beheaded in the Binnenhof in The Hague. This execution was the culmination of a conflict between Oldenbarnevelt and the stadholder Prince Maurice (1567-1625) that had been dragging on for a very long time. In this struggle, which had a religious component, Oldenbarnevelt had sided with the Remonstrants (Arminians) known as the ‘moderates’, while Maurice aligned himself with the Gomarists or Counter-Remonstrants (the ‘strict’). Orthodox Calvinism prevailed at the Synod of Dordrecht (1618-19) and the Remonstrant clergy were removed from office. The conflict between the Land’s Advocate and the stadholder was also or, more accurately, predominantly about the relationship between church and state, foreign policy and the question of where sovereignty in the Republic lay: with the States (Oldenbarnevelt) or with the stadholder (Maurice) as the representative of the Generality.

At the heart of the collection are cartoons of the twenty-four judges (figs. 1a to 1x), the two fiscals and the provost who were involved in the trial – all in the guise of animals. The other drawings, with one exception, are based on well-known pamphlets that appeared after the execution, including an illustration of Oldenbarnevelt’s beheading in the Binnenhof by Claes Jansz Visscher (1587-1652) and famous cartoons such as The Arminian Funeral (1619) and The Arminian Serpent (1623) (figs. 2, 3).

Although it is an expensive collection – the fact that the drawings are painted on parchment in itself attests to this – remarkably, the album in the Rijksmuseum is not unique. At least two very similar collections have survived and in all likelihood there were various other, now unknown, versions in circulation. This raises
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the specific question as to why, more than a century after the execution of
the Land’s Advocate, the judges who pronounced the fatal verdict still worked
so strongly on the public imagination that they were remembered in albums
like this. Following a detailed description of the Amsterdam album and the
broader eighteenth-century album tradition in which these albums must
be placed in terms of both content and form, we begin by reflecting

on the enduring public interest in
Oldenbarnevelt’s judges that existed
from the time of his execution. We
then place the satirical depiction of the
judges as animals in the wider tradition
of animal allegories as a vehicle for
political criticism. Finally, we return to
the question as to the circles in which
the eighteenth-century album probably
circulated and how it was used: for
whom and how did it function within
the remembrance culture at the time?
An Eighteenth-Century Album Tradition

As we have said, the nucleus of the Rijksmuseum album is made up of satirical images of the twenty-four judges who pronounced sentence on Oldenbarnevelt. The design of the images is very similar in each case. One of the subjects is depicted in the guise of an animal, surrounded by a garland and usually accompanied by some significant attributes. The subject’s name is revealed in a cartouche below the drawing. For some members of the court – such as Reinier Pauw (1564-1636), whose name means peacock – the association with a specific animal is present in their name, but the connection between judge and animal is usually less obvious. Once or twice the animal representation harks back to familiar prints in emblem books, as in the cases of Rink Aitsma (c. 1575-c. 1625), who is...
shown as an ostrich with a horseshoe in its beak (fig. 11), and Volkert Sloot (?-c. 1625), who appears in the shape of a skeleton on a crocodile (figs. 4, 5). The rich pamphlet tradition seems to have been another source of inspiration. For instance, we find the sword-carrying dog, the bespectacled donkey and the cap-wearing tiger in a political cartoon dating from around 1656 on the subject of the Northern War (fig. 6). In most cases, however, we have not been able to discover any direct iconic examples for the animal judges.

The textual notes to the cartoons always have the same structure: the name of the subject and a brief sketch of his position are followed by a concise elucidation of the image, in which the association between animal and judge and the significance of the attributes are explained. The text relating to the delegate to the States of Holland, Geraard Beukels van Santen (1575-1635), for instance, tells us that he is portrayed as a ‘Calvarian boar’, fattened on brandy (fig. 1j). The tusks refer (figuratively?) to the large teeth with which he was apparently blessed (‘this is why he was

---

**Fig. 4**


**Fig. 5**

popularly known as the man with the teeth’ and his waistcoat had ‘a red Prince inquisition lining’. The swine sits up in front of Maurice, begging for a drink, which also explains the bottle of liquor in his trotter.

The last section of the notes always recounts the fate that befell the ‘shirkers’ after sentence had been pronounced – entertaining tales that add weight to the satirical nature of the collection. In Beukels van Santen’s case, for example, it states that he had to pay dearly for the blood money he got for his seat on the bench (the judges each received a fee of 2,400 guilders). Rumour had it that he was so plagued by his constantly nagging conscience that he eventually tried to drown himself. Although he was narrowly saved from a watery grave, the pneumonia he contracted as a result ultimately proved fatal. Not for a moment could he succumb to his deathbed, because he imagined that Oldenbarnevelt’s executioner would come and behead him. Things did not turn out much better for the Dordrecht sheriff Hugo Muys van Holy (1565-1626) (fig. 1h). It states in the album that he wears a hat of ‘Maurice’s inquisition’ with an orange plume. He has drawn the sword that is the symbol of his position as bailiff and dike grave, ready to ‘chastise the Arminian peasants’. Muys van Holy had to pay heavily for his misdeeds: he ‘died from such wretched diseases that the worms crawled out of his suppurating body in countless numbers when he was still warm’.

As far as the relationship between text and image in the album is concerned, it has to be said that this is
relatively arbitrary. In most cases, there is little if any explanation as to why the chosen animal applies to the specific judge. Now and then, there is a fairly general negative description of the beast—a bleating sheep, a lout or a perfumed goat—but that is about the sum of it. The text then turns to the clothes and the attributes, which do have a very specific political, anti-Orangist connotation. Even in the cases of the ostrich and the crocodile, which owe their appearance to the emblem books, there is no reference to the complex symbolic interpretation in these works. Not a word about the horseshoe in the ostrich’s beak—a reference to the belief that these creatures could eat iron, which in the emblem books was cause to associate the bird with perseverance, resistive force or the virtue that overcomes all difficulties (fig. 11). The ignoring of this emblem tradition in the text is even more blatant in the depiction of Volkert Sloat: a very unambiguous and striking image of a crocodile ridden by a skeleton holding an hourglass and the dart of death (see figs. 4, 5). In his very popular Sinne- en minnebeelden (1627), Jacob Cats explains that this reptile continues to grow throughout its life until death alone puts an end to it. To Cats, the animal stands for ever-strengthening love or growing virtue, but he also refers to ambitious and avaricious folk who always want more and never have enough. The accompanying note in the album says no more than that the picture shows death on a ‘man-devouring’ crocodile. The author simply makes the connection with a rhyme that was going the rounds: ‘Volkert Sloat leikt de magere dood’ (Volkert Sloat is like emaciated death).

There are at least two surviving albums that follow the same pattern. Rotterdam City Archives holds a manuscript with thirty-four loose watercolour drawings on parchment. The collection dates from the first quarter of the eighteenth century and may have been created in the circle of the Remonstrant minister Cornelis van Arckel (1670-1724). In the National Library collection in The Hague, there is an interleaved manuscript, bound in a dark brown leather binding with gold stamping, which contains thirty-seven watercolour and pen-and-ink drawings of the trial and was probably compiled between 1740 and 1750. This copy may have been commissioned by descendants of Arent Meindertsz Fabricius (1547-1624), one of the judges. Be that as it may, the album was still in the family in the nineteenth century. An owner’s note dated 3 February 1887 reads ‘Property of Clara Anna Elisabeth Fabricius v Heukelum’ (1853-1927).

At first sight, the great similarity of the collections is what strikes one. For instance, the Amsterdam burgomaster Reinier Pauw is pictured in all three collections as a gaudy peacock proudly flaunting its feathers (figs. 7a-c). The differences are confined to the presentation: where in the Rotterdam and Hague versions the image is contained in a simple circle with a sober cartouche, in the Amsterdam album it is placed in an elaborate garland. The judge’s name is also spelled differently in each one (Amsterdam: ‘Reynier Pauw’; Rotterdam: ‘Rynier Pavw’ and The Hague: ‘Reynier Pavw’). Aside from spelling variants, the written notes are identical in the three albums.

Despite this obvious connection, it is not evident that any of the surviving albums served as a direct example for the others. The albums differ from one another particularly in the extent and composition of the additions (see Appendix). Aside from the portraits of Oldenbarnevelt and Maurice and The Arminian Serpent, the additional drawings in the Rijksmuseum album are missing from the Rotterdam and Hague versions. All the additional images in the Rotterdam collection are, though, present in the Hague album. The latter also has three more
supplementary drawings that were most probably made especially for the album and (so far) have not been found anywhere else. The divergent nature of the Rijksmuseum album is confirmed in some of the representations of the judges. The poses of Albrecht Bruynick and Arent Meindertsz Fabricius are not the same, and a different animal altogether was chosen for the picture of Hugo Muys van Holy. While the Dordrecht regent is portrayed in the Rotterdam and Hague albums as a spaniel, in the Rijksmuseum album he is a mouse (figs. 8a-c). Remarkably, the accompanying text still refers to ‘a noble Dordrecht spaniel’. This metamorphosis from dog to mouse is thus a change that was made later. As a result, we can rule out the possibility that the album in the Rijksmuseum is the first version in the series.

And yet these observations do not solve the genealogical puzzle. From other comparisons between the cartoons of fiscal Laurens de Sylla, depicted as a cat, and the aforementioned Geraard Beukels ‘the boar’ van Santen, it is clear that the relationship between the Rotterdam and Hague collections is less straightforward than it would appear at first sight. Although the framing and cartouche underline the kinship between the Rotterdam and Hague albums, what strikes one most in the portrayal of the animals is the
similarity between the Amsterdam and Hague albums (figs. 9a-c, 10a-c). It would appear that the albums cannot be directly traced back to one another, and that there must have been still more variants in circulation that may have acted as links.

Public Fascination with the Judges
It might seem remarkable that more than a century after Oldenbarnevelt’s conviction, the judges who pronounced the death sentence were still the subject of a lively pictorial tradition. In fact, though, they had never been out of the public memory since that fatal day in 1619. The controversial execution of the Land’s Advocate had proved traumatic for the young Republic and caused deep divisions in the country for decades thereafter. The way the judgement was reached was a point of bitter contention. The Land’s Advocate, after all, was not, as was customary, brought before the local or provincial court, but was tried by a specially constituted so-called generality court. From the outset, the legitimacy of this court was contested. Oldenbarnevelt himself said in his defence that only the Court of Holland had the sovereign power to try him. In 1620, Jan Francken (?-1664), the Land’s Advocate’s servant, described the trial as ‘improper proceedings’ and stated that Oldenbarnevelt had always regarded most of the
judges as his worst enemies. In the flood of pamphlets that appeared after the execution, the deciding role the judges had played was increasingly criticized. Oldenbarnevelt’s sympathizers described them as the puppets of Maurice, who wanted to get rid of his opponent at all costs.

One of Oldenbarnevelt’s best-known and most influential defenders was the Amsterdam poet Joost van den Vondel (1587-1679). In the decades following the execution, Vondel published various satires and lampoons in which he savagely criticized Maurice and his supporters. The poet portrayed the Land’s Advocate as a martyr in the cause of freedom and the innocent victim of the power-mad Maurice. It began with his allegorical tragedy Palamedes oft vermoorde onnooselheyd (1625). Although the play was about a classical hero who was unjustly convicted and executed, it was clear to everyone that Palamedes in fact stood for the innocent Oldenbarnevelt, who had been murdered by Maurice and his partisan judges. Its publication made Vondel both famous and notorious at a stroke. It nearly saw the poet, as he told his biographer, facing a charge at the Court of Holland, which he had no hesitation in laying at the door of the aggrieved Amsterdam pensionary Adriaan Pauw (1595-1653), son of Oldenbarnevelt’s judge Reinier Pauw. Some twenty years later, in his famous poem ‘Het stockske van Johan van Oldenbarnevelt, vader des vaderlant’ (the stick belonging to Johan van Oldenbarnevelt, father of the father-land, 1657), he lashed out again at the infamous court with devastating effect. In 1619, when ‘violence dared bend the law’, the peace-loving Land’s Advocate became the victim of the ‘bloody court’s bitter vengeance’.

In the decades that followed, Vondel’s scathing verses proved to be a catalyst for growing public disgust with the judges. The sudden death of Stadholder William II (1626-1650) ushered in the First Stadholderless Era (1650-72) in which the States faction took back political control. Now that the former opposition no longer had to fear censorship, the old struggle between the Orangist and States factions flared up again. The States side started a campaign to rehabilitate the Land’s Advocate. The presses of the Remonstrant publisher Johannes Naeranus (1609-1670) of Rotterdam, who had close ties to Vondel, were a major driver behind the distribution of propaganda in both word and image, with Oldenbarnevelt presented as a Republican champion and martyr for the State. In the late sixteen-fifties he published a series of prints in which Oldenbarnevelt’s portrait was combined with a paeon to this ‘States martyr’ and a list of the names of the judges who had condemned him to death (fig. 11).

In 1670 Naeranus brought out a revised and considerably enlarged
biography of Oldenbarnevelt, which expatiated at length on what had happened to the judges after they had pronounced their disastrous verdict. Vondel’s prophetic verses had come to pass. The Waarachtige historie described in detail (and with unmistakable satisfaction) how the judges were perpetually pursued by pangs of conscience and eventually met terrible ends. The book was a great success. The mostly graphic descriptions of the judges’ last years would be repeated (usually verbatim) for decades. Geeraert Brandts’s (1626–1685) unprecedentedly popular Historie van de rechtspleging gehouden in den jaaren 1618 en 1619, which relied heavily on Naeranus’s biography, contributed to their dissemination. The handwritten explanatory texts in the albums also draw almost literally on Brandts’s descriptions.

That the judges – whose names were now widely known to the public at large – were a permanent element of Republican historiography and the public memory in a more general sense, is also clear from the imbroglio surrounding a (fictitious) statue to Oldenbarnevelt. As early as 1654, Joachim Oudaen (1628–1692) – for a long time the proud owner of Oldenbarnevelt’s ‘Stokske’ – had written a poem in which he argued for the erection of a ‘statue for the
Father of the Fatherland. When the Second Stadholderless Era (1702-47) dawned at the beginning of the eighteenth century – and once again there was scope for open criticism of the Orangist party – an anonymous artist worked Oudaen’s description up into a print. It was published in 1710 in the inflammatory collection of political satires and lampoons Nederduitse en Latynse keurdigten (fig. 12). It shows a triumphant Oldenbarnevelt, freedom hat and privilege in his hand, trampling the fallen Prince Maurice and the personification of Envy underfoot. The sculpture is borne by the decapitated heads of the judges (‘a wrought trestle of twenty-four heads’) who, Oudaen’s verses stress, were compelled to carry this heavy burden. While the printmaker reflected Oudaen’s words almost literally in images, he permitted himself one significant addition: he placed the decapitated heads of the judges on square blocks showing their animal guises (fig. 13). In so doing, the anonymous printmaker reinforced Oudaen’s description with another tradition that had grown up around the judges: their ‘dehumanization’ and portrayal as animals.

Fig. 12
Anonymous, Allegorical Statue for Johan van Oldenbarnevelt, Executed in 1619, from Pieter van der Goes, Nederduitse en Latynse keurdigten, Rotterdam 1710. Etching, 278 x 191 mm. Amsterdam, Rijksmuseum, inv. no. rp-ob-80.897.

Fig. 13
Detail of the statue with the heads of the judges and their animal guises (fig. 12).
The Judges as Animals

Not only had these twenty-four judges been a fixed element in the polemics around Oldenbarnevelt for nigh on a century, the way that they were depicted – as animals – also had a long history. Tales in which animals portrayed human virtues and vices were popular back in Classical Antiquity. These fables, usually in the tradition of the Greek poet Aesop, increasingly assumed a political character in the Early Modern Era.\(^\text{24}\) In the sixteenth century animal allegories began increasingly to appear in politically slanted prints. During the Revolt, for instance, there were various prints in which Holland was pictured as a cow that was being milked dry by foreign rulers or as a roaring lion protecting its court against the wild Spanish boars that were trying to lay waste to the country.\(^\text{25}\) The animal associations were certainly not always erudite or sophisticated, but fell back, for example, on trite coincidences such as spelling similarities: Catholics became cats, Calvinists calves, and parsons parrots.

The earliest animal allegories in which Oldenbarnevelt figures, as Marianne Eekhout recently made clear, date from the time of the disputes during the Twelve Years’ Truce (1609-21).\(^\text{26}\) One of the first examples came from the Catholic side. It is a panel depicting the Synod of Dordrecht above a satirical verse by the probably fictitious Bruges priest Michael van Marisal (fig. 14). In the foreground we see Discord feeding her child beside Oldenbarnevelt’s decapitated body. Surrounding them are animals and a ‘rock’. All the animals, save for the rock-solid Spanish king, chatter and imitate the king of England, the Republic’s most important Protestant ally.

It was in Remonstrant circles, though, that the animal satire enjoyed the greatest popularity. They saw it as an effective means in difficult times of expressing criticism (albeit somewhat veiled) of religious and political opponents. Probably as early as 1621, for instance, the painter Cornelis Saftleven (1607-1681) was commissioned by the prominent Remonstrant philologist and antiquarian Petrus Scrivierius (1576-1660) to make a painting in which the delegates to the Synod negotiations were caricatured as animals. Saftleven’s preliminary sketch (fig. 15) and an enclosed letter listing the identifications have survived: the owls surrounding the open book of the Synod represent delegates from the provinces and the States General; Johannes Bogerman, the president of the Synod, is the ‘Cock that crows revolt and persecution’; the calf’s head on the wall refers to Calvin, and the ‘cat or mouser’ on
the windowsill stands for Hugo Muys van Holy. ¹⁷ We do not know whether Scrivierius’s painting was ever actually made, but in the decades that followed, Saftleven established his reputation as a painter of animal satires and went on to paint an iconic animal satire on Oldenbarnevelt’s trial later in his career. ²⁸

First to appear, however, was the notorious title print of Vondel’s *Palamedes*, engraved by Salomon Savery (1594-1683). ²⁹ It shows the protagonist, as described in the play’s last act: an honourable old man praised by Themis, the personification of justice – and looking very much like the Land’s Advocate – exhausted by ‘forty years of struggle’ for national politics, yet defying the threat of the savage ‘animal pack’ with ‘proud courage’ (fig. 16). Vondel’s biographer, Geeraert Brandt, reports that both the play itself and this title print caused a sensation among the public, who had no difficulty recognizing it as a direct reference to Oldenbarnevelt’s trial. ³⁰

Saftleven took his inspiration from this title print in 1663, when he made a painting of the trial of the Land’s Advocate, probably again as a commission from the Remonstrant side (fig. 17). ³¹ Against the background of the gates of hell, the painting, like the title print, shows an old man surrounded by a group of menacing animals. A separate portrait medallion could be hung over the greybeard’s
face to reveal his true identity: it was a portrait of Oldenbarnevelt (fig. 18). And then the significance of the animals that surround him so intimidatingly is instantly clear: they are the judges who condemned him to death. This time, it is not a pack of anonymous beasts, as it is in the title print; here each animal – and this is a significant iconographic innovation – represents a specific judge. That Saftleven was very familiar with his Classics, or rather his Vondel, is clear from the prominent graffito on the wall behind the old man: *Trucidata Innocentia*, the Latin translation of ‘Vermoorde onnooselheyd’ (murdered innocence), the subtitle of *Palamedes*. Despite – or perhaps because of – its daring, the work went down well with the public: there are at least two surviving works that followed Saftleven’s canvas, and there may well have been others in circulation (fig. 19).

---

**Fig. 17**

**Cornelis Saftleven,**

*Satire on the Trial of Johan van Oldenbarnevelt*, 1663.

Oil on canvas, 63 x 86 cm.

Amsterdam, Rijksmuseum, inv. no. SK-A-1588; gift of G. de Clercq, Amsterdam.

**Fig. 18**

**Attributed to Cornelis Saftleven,**

*Portrait of Johan van Oldenbarnevelt*, in or after 1663.

Oil on silver, 4.7 x 3.7 x 0.4 cm.

Amsterdam, Rijksmuseum, inv. no. SK-A-4204; gift of G. de Clercq, Amsterdam.
Saftleven’s painting emerged at a time when debates about the political future of the Republic were raging. In 1662-63 the Orangists and the States faction engaged in a heated pamphlet war about the ideal form of government and the role of the stadholder (hereditary or otherwise) within it. The leader of the States party, Grand Pensionary Johan de Witt (1625-1672), was explicitly coupled with his predecessor Oldenbarnevelt.34 This analogy became all the more pertinent in 1672, shortly after William III returned as stadholder. Johan and his brother Cornelis were arrested in The Hague, and not much later lynched, just a stone’s throw from the spot where Oldenbarnevelt had been beheaded more than fifty years before. The explicit linking of Johan van Oldenbarnevelt and Johan de Witt gave a significant boost to Oldenbarnevelt’s enduring popularity and the disdain for his judges, and also influenced the meaning and extent of the animal allegories. This is amply illustrated by a tobacco box that the Rotterdam silversmith Hendrik van Beest (1680-1772) made in 1707. It is not just any little casket; it probably held one of the most controversial patriotic relics: Johan de Witt’s tongue.35 On the inside of the octagonal lid there is a small ivory plaque commemorating the tragic shared fate of the murdered Land’s Advocate and Grand Pensionary (fig. 20). In the centre stand Oldenbarnevelt and Prince Maurice together carrying a cask bearing the image of a stork, the symbol of The Hague, the seat of government. They look at one another, it is true, but each wants to take the cask in a different direction. The scene is framed by twenty-eight medallions. The four large ones contain the likenesses of Oldenbarnevelt, Maurice, and Johan and Cornelis de Witt. The smaller ones are filled with our old friends the twenty-four animals that symbolize Oldenbarnevelt’s judges. Here their import is more general:
publications in which the Land’s Advocate featured followed hard on one another’s heels. As well as the various editions of Brandts’s *Historie van de rechtspleging gehouden in den jaaren 1618 en 1619*, several editions of Vondel’s *Palamedes* appeared and his *Hekeldichten* were published as a collection. A group of related paintings of the judges as animals made around this time may have been connected to this renewed interest in *Palamedes*. Thematically, these paintings are very similar to Saftleven’s 1663 canvas (inspired by Vondel), but they differ considerably in composition. In all probability, the paintings in this new series were based on a work that has been in the Six Collection since the eighteenth century (fig. 22). This time, the stage is a classical interior with portraits of the two protagonists, Maurice and Oldenbarnevelt, on the wall at the back. The Land’s Advocate himself stands in the centre and the animals sit on a platform around the sides of the room. Saftleven’s scene at the mouth of hell has made way for an

they can be directly compared to the violent mob that lynched the De Witt brothers and thus in a way symbolize all the opponents of the States faction. This image also circulated more widely. Museum Flehite in Amersfoort has an undated variant, likewise on ivory (fig. 21).36

In the second decade of the eighteenth century, the number of

---

**Fig. 20**

*Hendrik van Beest,* *Silver Tobacco Box with an Image of the Murder of the De Witt Brothers, 1707.* Silver and ivory, 2.9 x 9.2 x 11.9 cm. The Hague, Haags Historisch Museum, inv. no. 1870-0001-000.

**Fig. 21**

*Anonymous, Plaque of Maurice and Oldenbarnevelt, each wanting to go his own way, c. 1700.* Ivory. Amersfoort, Museum Flehite, inv. no. 0002-756. Photo: Lydia Edelkoort.
actual court of law, and this time the animals are tricked out in clothes, headgear and other accessories. There are also several known variants of the Six painting, as well as a number of preliminary studies for and drawings of this composition.37

Concealing and Revealing: The Eighteenth-Century Albums as Keys

From the outset, the popularity of the images of the judges as animals was closely associated with a game of concealment and revelation. Solving the puzzle was a light-hearted and appealing aspect of scenes like this and viewers always proved keen to identify the figures.39 In a way, Vondel’s Palamedes set the tone here, too. Very soon after the allegorical tragedy appeared, various handwritten keys or legends identifying the principal figures began to circulate.40

A similar tradition likewise grew up around the images of the judges as animals. Saftleven’s famous 1663 painting had numbers corresponding to an accompanying explanation that helped viewers identify the animals.41 Just how much the identification of animals as specific judges exercised minds is evident from the handwritten notes that several contemporary readers made on pamphlets about the judges that were circulating.
There are, for example, surviving copies of the lists of names that the Rotterdam publisher Naeranus issued, on which readers had noted down which animal represented a particular judge (figs. 23, 24). In some cases, the key to one work had even been erroneously transposed to another. In a 1652 copy of Vondel’s *Palamedes*, for instance, the key to the Saftleven painting – which does not correspond – had been added beside the title print (fig. 25).42

This key tradition persisted into the eighteenth century, for at least two of the three surviving albums of animal

---

judges had certainly been in the vicinity of one of the paintings referred to above. The Hague album contains a note by an owner in which the album was directly linked to a painting: ‘Deze bovenstaande op het Schilderij berustende op het kasteel van Heukelum – geschilderd op paneel door Saftleven’ (The above on the painting kept at Heukelum Castle – painted on panel by Saftleven). As well as the album, the castle also housed the painting inspired by Saftleven that is now in the Frans Hals Museum (see fig. 19). In the case of the Rijksmuseum album, the relationship between the drawings and an associated painting was even closer. In the estate sale catalogue of Willem Six’s widow, Dorothea van Assendelft, in 1740, the album (no. 2) is immediately followed by a painting (no. 3) ‘depicting in an entertaining way the trial of Jan van Oldenbarnevelt with twenty-four judges’. 43 This painting is most probably the work that is still in the Six Collection. The painting and the album were originally kept together by the Six family and only separated later – in 1928 to be precise.

It is therefore obvious that the Rijksmuseum album also acted as a key. The animals in the Six painting correspond one-to-one with the menagerie in the album. In the centre of the painting, for instance, we see a fully dressed monkey on a throne, with a bonnet on his head, a lace collar around his neck and a trumpet in his paw (fig. 26). He is pictured in
the same way in the album, and identified as the judge Hendrik van Essen (figs. 27). According to the album text, this ‘ape of state’ on an elevated throne was the ‘first inquisitor of Maurice’s bloody court’. He wears a ‘Spanish jabot of gravity and a calotte of authority on his head’. In his paw he holds a trumpet ‘to sound the procession’. The elephant’s attributes are also explained in detail in the album. The pachyderm represents the Zeeland judge Adriaen Mandemaker. His name means basket maker and the basket around his neck contains ‘secret instructions’ from Maurice. In his trunk he brandishes a Prince’s flag with an owl and the words ‘Victory for Orange’, ‘and bestrides Zeeland like a rebellious

Fig. 27
ANONYMOUS, Cartoon of Hendrik van Essen, first half of the 18th century. Watercolour and ink on parchment, 235 x 190 mm. Amsterdam, Rijksmuseum, inv. no. NG-1983-5-3.
plunderer and drives out the friends of the innocent Palamedes for his master. And in this way all the animals and their characteristic objects are accurately explained. This makes the album much more than a key to the identification of the animals – which animal refers to which judge – it also unveils the painting’s iconographic programme.

A Remonstrant Tradition?
The reason why poets and painters chose to cast their message in allegorical form would seem to be self-evident. Aside from the playful element – it is fun to solve the puzzle – the prevailing political repression and censorship provide an obvious explanation for the decision not to shout one’s criticism of the incumbent rulers from the rooftops. It was downright dangerous to dismiss the judicial proceedings involving Oldenbarneveld as dishonest and prejudiced, particularly when Maurice himself was still alive – as Vondel almost found to his cost.

Yet that is not the whole story. When Saftleven painted his animal allegory in 1663, there was no longer any direct political threat. The stadholder had been sidelined and it was Oldenbarneveld’s political supporters who called the shots now, so there was no danger of persecution. And this was equally true of the paintings like the one in the Six Collection and the albums that saw the light even decades later, in the Second Stadholderless Era (1702-47). The States party regents ruling at that time placed themselves very deliberately in the tradition of Oldenbarneveld and De Witt and would not have dreamt of banning such works. So what can have been the reason for continuing to opt for an allegorical form?

As we have seen, Saftleven played his game of concealing and revealing at different levels – as well as the animal satires of the judges there was the separate portrait medallion of Oldenbarneveld that could be hung over the old man’s face. In other words, the game almost seems to have been a goal in itself. The same applies to the Six painting, which could be hidden behind a flower still life, and to a lesser extent also to the albums with the animal judges in their neutral bindings that were quietly unobtrusive in a bookcase until they revealed their controversial contents when they were opened. The concealment itself appears to be part of the memorial culture and the group identity that existed in the Remonstrant circles in which many of these works were made and used.

The explanation for this has to be sought in the eventful history of the Remonstrants in the Low Countries. After their condemnation and banishment by the Synod of Dordrecht and the subsequent establishment of the Remonstrant Brotherhood in Antwerp in 1619, the Remonstrant community was compelled to redefine itself. It did so by strongly emphasizing moderation and tolerance on the one hand and creating a new group identity around two important themes, persecution and escape, on the other. After the disastrous events of 1619, they constantly stressed in their writings how they were persecuted by their opponents in the Republic and compared this with the oppression of the early Christians, the Reformation and the Revolt. There was, however, one problem with this self-identification as martyrs: apart from Eduard Poppius, who died while he was imprisoned in Loevestein Castle in 1624, no other Remonstrant clergy had actually died for their faith. The Remonstrants consequently cultivated not so much the ultimate self-sacrifice, a martyr’s death, as the successful avoidance of or escape from persecution.
Garden path. This disguise cult culminated in the figure of Passchier de Fijne, one of the Remonstrant ministers who returned to the Republic almost immediately after he fled to Antwerp to continue his preaching in secret. De Fijne soon gained a reputation as a master of disguise. He clearly enjoyed employing clever tricks to put the authorities on the wrong track. Standing on a sledge on the frozen River Gouwe, wrapped in a blue scarf, he addressed his followers, who skated behind him. When things nevertheless got too hot for him, he

Fig. 28
JOHANNES JELGERHUIS (DESIGN) AND GOVERT KITSEN (PRINTMAKER), Monument for the Remonstrants, 1790-1810. Etching and engraving, 568 x 460 mm. Amsterdam, Rijksmuseum, inv. no. RP-P-AO-28-98.
could easily escape his enemies over the ice. This earned him the nickname ‘IJsvogelke’ – literally ‘ice bird’ – the Dutch word for kingfisher. His disguises were so effective that even the Leiden bailiff Willem de Bont, a notorious Remonstrant hunter, did not recognize him when he was sitting right in front of him. De Fijne was so bound up in his masquerades that he even got the painter Michiel van Mierevelt to make him up as a drunken old pastor so he could play a trick on his friends. De Fijne’s disguises and escapes were made much of in Remonstrant literature.49

This self-image of a minority that constantly managed to avoid persecution by clever concealment was not confined to the first decades of the Remonstrant Brotherhood, but remained part of their group identity until well into the eighteenth century. The print Monument to the Remonstrants, which appeared around 1800, illustrates this persistence (fig. 28). Alongside portraits of Oldenbarneveldt, Grotius and all the important Remonstrant ministers there are figurative scenes showing the oppression of the Remonstrants in the seventeenth century: their condemnation by the Synod of Dordrecht, their banishment and the persecution of the various ministers. And on the right-hand side there are vignettes of the ingenious escapes: Hugo Grotius and his chest of books, De Fynze preaching on his sledge, Sapma’s escape in women’s clothes, the ministers’ flight from Loeweinstein and so on.

This emphasis on concealment as a fundamental element of the Remonstrant identity also touches on the heart of the success of the artworks depicting the judges as animals, which mask the political message at several levels. Even though they were made at a time when the Remonstrants no longer had to fear persecution, they nevertheless referred to a still current self-image in which the themes of persecution and escape remained central. Viewing these works was a way of revealing the true meaning to like-minded people by hanging the portrait medallion, sliding aside the concealing painting or studying the albums with the satirical keys to the animal images. Their popularity did not, therefore, arise out of direct political necessity, but can be explained by the fact that they served as a vehicle for strengthening a group identity and supported an activity through which they ‘unlocked’ their shared past together.

The Rijksmuseum’s History Department holds a remarkable early eighteenth-century album titled Regtspleging van Oldenbarneveldt (The Trial of Oldenbarneveldt). The album contains a collection of thirty-eight watercolour drawings on parchment with written explanations on paper and deals with the infamous trial of the Land’s Advocate. At its heart are cartoons of the twenty-four judges who signed Oldenbarneveldt’s death warrant, with the judges depicted as animals. The Rijksmuseum album is similar to albums in the National Library of the Netherlands and Rotterdam City Archives. In this article we show that Oldenbarneveldt’s judges continued to be subjects of general interest for more than a century. We locate the satirical portrayal of the judges as animals in the broader tradition of animal allegories used as a vehicle for political criticism, and explore the function of the album. It probably served as a key to a painting – not Cornelis Saftleven’s famous work Satire op de berechting van Johan van Oldenbarneveldt (Satire of the Trial of Johan van Oldenbarneveldt) in the Rijksmuseum, but a later composition by an anonymous artist now in the Six Collection. Finally, we come to the conclusion that the album is part of a game of concealment and revelation that is typical of the Remonstrants’ memorial culture.
With thanks to Judith Pollmann for her feedback on an earlier version of this article, Marianne Eckhout for the informative conversations we had in the run-up to our publications and intern Samuel Nyaku, who contributed to opening up the album.

The Rijksmuseum acquired the album on 16 February 1983 at a sale at auctioneers A.L. van Gendt in Amsterdam (no. 851). It had previously been part of the collection of the Amsterdam family doctor and book collector Bob Luza. The first time the album showed up at a sale, to the best of our knowledge, was more than two centuries earlier. On 27 August 1740, part of the collection of (politically engaged) papers belonging to Dorothea van Assendelft (1671-1736), widow of Willem Six (1669-1712), went under the hammer at Frederik Muller, the Haarlem book and paper seller Jan van Lee; see Catalogus van een Uyttenmende en noyt soo een Compleete by een gevunde versameling van Nouvelles van den Jaaren 1574 tot 1700 … Waarin mede te vinden zyn de saaken van J. Van Oldenbarneveld en J. En C. Die Dit alles nagelaaten by wyle Vrouwe Dorothea van Assendelft. Wed. van de Heer en Mr. Willem Six. Dewelcke verkogt zullen werden te Haarlem, ten huysen van Jan van Lee, boek en Papier Verkooper op de groote Markt/ Op Zaterdag den 27 Augustus 1740 d' Morgens ten 10 uuren Precys. Lot number 2 comprised ‘Een fraye en noyt so gevonde Versameling van 39 curieue Sinnebeeldige Watervervige Tekeningen/ en met de Pen geschrebe uytlegginge’ (A fine and never thus found collection of 39 curious symbolic watercolour drawings and explanations written in pen). On the basis of the description of the individual drawings, this collection can be identified with a degree of probability bordering on certainty as the album now in the Rijksmuseum. There is just one discrepancy: as the last in the summary, the sale catalogue lists an additional drawing: ‘een wonderlyke aardige begraaffenis seer fray en uytvoerig met waterverwe getekent’ (a wonderfully ingenious funeral drawn very fairly and extensively in watercolour), which is currently missing. As announced in the catalogue, lot numbers 1 to 7 were sold ‘in one purchase’. The whole batch went – as often happened at sales of the Six collection – to a member of the family. It was not until the twentieth century that the collection left the family. On 18 October 1928, the drawings and written explanations went under the hammer at Frederik Muller in Amsterdam as no. 343, see Manuscrits – dessins – libres – estampes provenant de la collection-Six. Vente aux enchères publiques les 17 et 18 octobre 1928 … Amsterdam, Frederik Muller & Cie. They were put together in the half-calf leather portfolio – probably made later – in which they still are now (‘Dans un portefeuille demi-veau, in-4.’). According to the annotated copy of the sale catalogue in the Rijksmuseum Research Library’s collection, the lot number was acquired – for 525 guilders – by a certain ‘Lobo’ and eventually, probably by a circuitous route, came into Luza’s possession.

On the basis of the watermark (a lion enclosed in a double circle bearing the words ‘Pro Patria esjusque Libertate’) and the countermark (‘tv’, i.e. L. van Gerrevink) in the paper on which the explanation is written, we date the collection to between 1710 and 1720. This corresponds to the historical revival in interest in Oldenbarnevelt we examine later in this article. Cf. Raymond Gaudriault, Filigranes et autres caractéristiques des papiers fabriqués en France aux xviiie et xixe siècles, Paris 1995, fig. 789 and p. 141; Henk Voorn, De papiermolen in de provincie Noord-Holland, Haarlem 1960 (De geschiedenis der Nederlandse papier-industrie, vol. 1), no. 104. The calfskin album itself is, in all probability, of later date.

Much has been written about Oldenbarnevelt’s trial; see e.g. Jan den Tex, Oldenbarnevelt, 5 vols., Haarlem 1960-72; Wilfried Uitterhoeve, De zaak Oldenbarnevelt. Val, proces en executie, Nijmegen 2019.

The additional drawings include, among other things, drawn copies of The Execution in the Binnenhof (1619), Clare Afbeeldinghe, ende T’Samen-Spreeckinghe Tusschen een Boer genaemt Kees, ende syn Land-heer (1623) and The Arminian Serpent (1623) and the portraits of Oldenbarnevelt and Prince Maurice. The accompanying texts are always taken virtually verbatim from the pamphlets. The album also contains some loose drawings, including triumphal arches for Maurice and Oldenbarnevelt, whose provenance we have been unable to ascertain. They may have been devised especially for the collection.

For examples of emblems with the ostrich and horseshoe and the crocodile and skeleton see the Emblem Project Utrecht: https://emblems.hum.uu.nl/ (consulted 30 September 2020).

‘daarom wierd hij in de wandelingen genaamd de man met de tanden’; ‘een roode
Prince inquisitie voering'. Explanatory text accompanying the drawing of Geraard Beukels van Santen, NG-1983-5-12A.

7 ‘kastyden van de Arminiaansche boeren’; ‘door sulk en eldenzi ziekten aan zijn Eynde dat de wormen doen hynoch warm of lauw was in een ontelbaar getal uyt syn versworen Lichaam kropen’. Explanatory text accompanying the drawing of Hugo Muys van Holy, NG-1983-5-10A.

8 Rotterdam City Archives, inv. nos. 33.01/217 and 2218. The collection was gifted to the archives in 1882 by the then chairman of the archive committee, alderman C.E. Viruly. For a detailed description, including its location in the circles around Cornelis van Arkkel, see J.G.B. Nieuwenhuis, *Catalogus van de handschriftenverzameling*, Rotterdam 1970, inv. nos. 2217, 2218. There is little that can be said with certainty about the collection and its provenance. According to Frederik Muller, the drawings were ‘waarschijnlijk door [Jan] Stolker te Rotterdam gemaakt’ (probably made by [Jan] Stolker in Rotterdam) and should be dated to around 1720, see Frederik Muller, *Beredeneerde Beschrijving van Nederlandsche Historieplaten, Zinneprenten en historische Kaarten. Supplement, Aanhangel en Algemeen Register*, vol. 4, Amsterdam 1882, no. 1375A, pp. 401-02. This attribution is highly unlikely: Jan Stolker was not born until 1724. Heinz Hofmann has already pointed out that the location in Van Arkkel’s circles was posited solely by Nieuwenhuis and there is no conclusive evidence for it, see Heinz Hofmann, ‘Cornellus van Arkkel und sein neulateinischer Freundeskreis im Holland des ausgehenden 17. und beginnenden 18. Jahrhunderts’, *Humanistica Lovaniensia: Journal of Neo-Latin Studies* 35 (1986), pp. 169-218, esp. pp. 196-97, note 68.

9 The Hague, National Library of the Netherlands, inv. no. 135 A 26. As well as the images of the twenty-four judges, and associates, the album contains some supplementary drawings and texts (esp. fol. s 5 to 9), which were probably added later. Among these texts there is a copy of the poem that Balthazar Huydecoper wrote in 1744 to the sword with which Oldenbarnevelt was supposedly murdered and which was owned by Frans Greenwood in the seventeen-forties. On Greenwood’s album see Lieke van Deinsen and Jan de Hond, ‘The Sword and the Album: Material Memories and an Eighteenth-Century Poetic Account of the Execution of Johan van Oldenbarnevelt (1619)’, *The Rijksmuseum Bulletin* 66 (2018), no. 3, pp. 204-34, esp. p. 221. The whole thing was in all likelihood bound around 1750. The binding is attributed to a workshop with the name of convenience Pentateuch Bindery. With thanks to Jeroen Vandommele, Ad Leerintveld and Rens Top. In the collection documentation of the National Library of the Netherlands it is stated that art historian J.W. Niemeijer suggested that the drawings may be by Taco Hajo Jelgersma (1702-1795). This attribution seems unlikely on stylistic grounds. With thanks to Robert-Jan te Rijdt.

10 For the owner’s note see [21]. The National Library acquired the album in 1961 from A. Baron van Heeckeren van Brandenburg, a direct descendant of Clara Anna Elisabeth, ‘een Dortsche Patrijs Hond van adel’.

11 ‘onbehoorlicke proceduren’; ‘De vierentwintich rechtens syn meest alle myne vyanden geweest’ (the twenty-four judges have almost all been my enemies). Warachtige historie van de ghevanckenisse, bekentenisse, leste woorden ende droevighe doot van wylen heer Johan van Oldenbarnevelt, Amsterdam 1620, pp. 67-68.


15 ‘gewelt het recht dorf buigen’; ‘s bloetraets bittren wrock’.


17 *Historie van het leven en sterven van heer Johan van Olden-barnevelt*, Rotterdam 1648.
(second, enlarged edition 1658). For the dating (and redating) of these prints see Maureen Warren, Politics, Punishment, and Prestige: Images of Oldenbarnevelt and the States Party in the Dutch Republic, 1618-1672, Evanston 2015 (unpubl. diss. Northwestern University), chapter 4. Warren makes a plausible case that these prints were not published immediately after the execution, as is often assumed, but only after 1656, during the First Stadholderless Era.


20 The publication went into a fourth reprint that same year.

21 The first edition of Brandt’s Historie was published posthumously in 1708 by the Rotterdam printer Barent Bos. In 1710, 1721 and 1723 enlarged versions appeared (the 1723 edition was an unchanged reprint of the 1721 edition with a new title page).

22 ‘praalbeeld voor den Vader des Vaderlands’.


24 Paul J. Smith, Het schouwtoneel der dieren. Embleemfabels in de Nederlanden (1567-ca. 1670), Hilversum 2006. Animal satires obviously occurred in other genres, too; Van den Vos Reynaerde (The Tale of Reynard the Fox) was one of the earliest and most popular in the Low Countries.


27 ‘Haan die oproer ende vervolging kraayt’. The text of this letter is reproduced in its entirety in Cornelis Hofstede de Groot, ‘Een spotteekening van Cornelis Saftleven op de Dordtse Synode’, Oud Holland 15 (1897), no. 2, pp. 121-23. For this drawing see also Wolfgang Schulz, Cornelis Saftleven 1607-1681. Leben und Werke mit einem kritischen Katalog der Gemälde und Zeichnungen, Berlin/New York 1978, pp. 78-79; Eekhout 2018 (note 26), p. 152. The letter, and consequently the drawing too, is dated 16 April 1621. This is problematic because Saftleven would only have been thirteen years old at the time. It has therefore been suggested in the literature that this date cannot be correct and it must be a later work.

28 On Saftleven as a painter of animal satires see also Ineke Wolf, ‘From Fox to Donkey: A Hidden Political Satire on Oliver Cromwell by Cornelis Saftleven’, Oud Holland 132 (2019), no. 2/3, pp. 87-100.

29 Brandt 1682 (note 14), pp. 22-23.


31 For the provenance of this canvas and the copies made of it see Schulz 1978 (note 27), no. 530.


33 On the relationship between Vondel’s Palamedes, Savery’s title print and Saftleven’s painting see also Raupp 1984

A note found in the box, in an eighteenth-century hand, reads ‘Dees doos/ bezit het Wonder lit/ van Jan de Witt’ (this box contains the wonderful tongue of Jan de Witt). On this and other patriotic relics see Wim Vroom, Het wonderlied van Jan de Witt en andere vaderlandse relieken, Amsterdam/Nijmegen 1997.

Warren suggests that this plaque may be the work of Clemens Nachtgeaal (c. 1685–after 1729), who engraved several portraits of 17th-century politicians on similar ivory supports. Warren 2015 (note 18), p. 196.

The RKD – Netherlands Institute for Art History, The Hague, holds a photograph of a painting in private hands (Anonymous, De rechtspleging van Oldenbarnevelt, 18th century. Oil on panel. The Hague, private collection) and in Museum Flehite, Amersfoort, there are two preliminary studies on paper (inv. nos. 1002-866 and 1002-867).

Six Collection Inventory, inv. no. s100. See also Eekhout 2018 (note 26), p. 156.

For the popularity of rebuses and puzzles in art in the late Middle Ages and Early Modern Era see Jos Koldewey, Rebussen, van duvels tot Bosch. ‘Wat baat kaars of bril, als de uil niet kijken wil’, Nijmegen 2019.

See e.g. the copy of Palamedes in the University of Amsterdam library, inv. no. Vondel 2 E 45 (4), fol. BIV.

Adding explanatory lists was not a one-off occurrence. When Saftleven’s painting entered the Rijksmuseum collection in 1892, it came with a list in a 19th-century hand explaining the identities of all the animal figures (RP-P-OB-77:314).


‘Verbeeldende op een potsige manier het regtgeding van Jan van Oldenbarneveld met 24 regters’; Catalogus 1740 (note 1). With the painting there was also a ‘geschreven uytlegging’ (written explanation), probably a short key to the identities of the animals.

Aap van staat; ‘eerste inquisiteur vanden Mauritiaensche bloedraad’; ‘Spaansche bef van Graviteit en een kalotje van gezach op de kop’; ‘om den opocht te bazuinen’.

‘Secrete instructien’; ‘Victorie voor Oranje’; ‘en loopt zo als een muitzicke plunder Zeeuw en verdrift voor zijn meester de vrienden van den onschuldigen Palamedes’.

This is not to say that such paintings were always and only collected by supporters of the States party and the Remonstrants. The political and religious affiliations of the first owners can no longer be precisely pinned down. The painting in the Six Collection was sold at the estate sale of Dorothea van Assendelft, widow of Willem Six (see note 1) in 1740. There is no evidence as to whether they were the first owners. Nor have we been able to discover if this couple had Remonstrant sympathies. We were, though, able to establish that their granddaughter, Dorothea Albertina Six (1728–?), married Pieter Burman Jr (Petrus Burmannus Secundus), professor, poet and a known adherent of the States party and the Remonstrants. Burman staged notorious anti-stadholder gatherings at his Santhorst estate when national heroes like the De Witt brothers and Hugo Grotius were revered as martyrs for freedom. Oldenbarnevelt was also commemorated at one of these Santhorst meetings. Burman translated two of Vondel’s odes to the statesman into Latin for the occasion.


Het leven en eenig byzondere voorvallen van Passchier de Fyne, in zijn leven predikant onder de remonstranten tot Haarlem, s.a. [1713], esp. pp. 105–08.
## APPENDIX

Overview of the Contents of the Three Surviving Albums

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject of the Drawings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Portrait of Johan van Oldenbarnevelt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extra portrait of Johan van Oldenbarnevelt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portrait of Prince Maurice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 judges in animal form</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two fiscals in animal form</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The provost in animal form</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The execution in the Binnenhof</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cartoon of the exodus of the Remonstrants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cartoon showing Oldenbarnevelt’s decapitated head in the clouds and caricatures of some of the judges in animal form</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cartoon ‘The Arminian Serpent’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cartoon showing seven monkeys around a donkey at the Binnenhof</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cartoon ‘Conversation between Kees, the Peasant, and the Lord of the Manor’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Triumphal arch with the likeness of Maurice in armour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cartoon ‘The Crossing of Prince Maurice in Charon’s Boat’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Triumphal arch with ‘Dits vaderland, uw vader…’ in a cartouche</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cartoon of the monkey (Bogerman) seated on the throne, shaking out a moneybag before three judges, while the lion in its cradle is lulled to sleep by a fox (Maurice)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cartoon of the dragon from hell ridden by a furious devil (Maurice) preceded by two and followed by three dead people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cartoon of the animals’ banquet to celebrate Oldenbarnevelt’s death</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cartoon of a room with the Dutch lion on a throne and a platter with Oldenbarnevelt’s decapitated head on the ground in front of him</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three allegorical female figures with an eagle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design for an ornament with a head of Medusa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ornament print with architectural elements and coats of arms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam (NG-1983-5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
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</tbody>
</table>
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