The subject of this paper are two hitherto unnoticed and only partially identified paintings from a Warsaw private collection: a winter landscape and summer landscape (figs. 1, 2). The two canvases are clearly a pair, and match each other in size (84 cm × 134 cm), as well as in the compositional scheme. In the extensive landscape, with a twisting river on the right, various works as well as amusements performed respectively in the winter and summer months are depicted, such as slaughtering pigs, threshing and haying, or carnival merrymaking. In the foreground one can see the mythological figure of Janus and in the other painting those of two gods of grain and fertility: Ceres and Apollo. In the first painting Janus, traditionally depicted with two faces, is placed in the middle of the composition, under a leafless tree covered with frost. In the second one Ceres, with a garland of wheat ears on her head, is sitting beneath the tree on the left, with an armful of corn, holding a sickle and cornucopia. She is turning to Apollo, who is standing next to her with a lyre, pointing up to the sky. The pictures are obviously representations of the seasons: winter and summer. The landscape in the second picture is more hilly, while in the Winter it remains flat, and includes a representation of a city’s interior. Its view is framed by ancient ruins.

Both pictures are very diverse, and include various forms of terrain and architecture, smaller and larger figures, animal staffage… Amusing details, such as a dog barking at the carnival procession or a cat running away with a piece of stolen meat, add even more the variety to the composition. The two pictures are very well painted: it is enough to look at the ears of grain in the Summer, rendered with virtuosity with very thin brush strokes, to acknowledge the author’s skill and talent.
Fig. 1. Joos de Momper and Lodewijk Toeput, *Winter landscape (January)*, 1583, oil on canvas, private collection in Warsaw

Fig. 2. Joos de Momper and Lodewijk Toeput, *Summer landscape (August)*, 1583, oil on canvas, private collection in Warsaw
Both paintings originally came from one now unidentified collection, which is proven by similar in style accession numbers on their reverses.¹ Later on they were separated. Probably then, while lacking its pendant based on a similar compositional idea, the *Winter* was over-painted: the figure of Janus was covered and replaced with landscape and architecture details (fig. 3). The thin layer of the over-painting has been removed in the present collection, after the pictures had been put together again.

![Fig. 3](image)

**Fig. 3.** Joos de Momper and Lodewijk Toeput, *Winter landscape (January)* – before restoration, 1583, oil on canvas, private collection in Warsaw

None of the pictures are signed, however, one of them, the *Winter*, is dated: on the ground beneath the red gown of Janus one can see the date “1583” (fig. 4). The date was invisible under the over-painting, and was discovered only after the recent restoration of the picture.

Up until now both paintings have been attributed to Lodewijk Toeput, called Pozzoserrato (1564–1635), active at the time in Treviso. While the figures in the foreground reveal close affini-

¹ Accession numbers of the paintings: 56 and 58.
ties with his other compositions, the landscape, which is clearly the centre of the author’s (or authors’) attention, does not match his style. In the present study we wish, therefore, to argue that both pictures must have been executed in cooperation with Joos de Momper the Younger (1564–1635) during his trip to Italy and his apprenticeship at the workshop of Toeput. The latter, however, can be still recognized as the author of the figures of Janus, Ceres, and Apollo. Meanwhile, small genre scenes and staffage figures of haymakers, travellers, or dressed-up participants of the carnival procession were already painted by Joos de Momper. The suggested authorship and date were confirmed by Dr Klaus Ertz who examined both paintings in August 2006.

The discovered and reattributed works should extend our knowledge of the earliest period of Momper’s artistic activity, namely the one which still remains rather obscure due to a small number of paintings and constant debates on their dating. In addition, through comparative analysis with other compositions by Momper and Toeput the article will provide an insight into the cooperation of the two artists, and may help to define the mutual relations between the Master’s and his assistant’s work.

The second aim of this paper is to present the two paintings as a perfect example of changes occurring in the iconography of the seasons by the end of the 16th century. It is not possible to examine its complexity thoroughly, nor is it the ambition of the author. Nevertheless, the unique conditions of the execution of the paintings in the workshop of a Flemish painter living in Veneto in collaboration with a young artist, but already an independent guild master who had just come to Italy from Antwerp, do not only make it worthwhile analysing the pictures within the context of Netherlandish art, but also comparing their composition with a few contemporary Italian works.

**Joos de Momper’s Italian Journey and the Authorship of the Warsaw Paintings**

Although we do not have any documents which would prove Joos de Momper’s journey to Italy, it is generally accepted that the painter must have travelled
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2 See for example the drawings *Lot and his Daughters*, Frankfurt, Städelisches Kunstinstitut; *Ceres, Venus with Cupid and Bacchus*, National Museum in Warsaw; *Venus with Amor*, Basel, Öffentliche Kunstsammlung.

3 According to Klaus Ertz, many summer and winter landscapes by Joos de Momper were painted in cooperation with other artists, mainly with Jan Brueghel the Elder or the Younger (see i.e. in Klaus Ertz, *Josse de Momper der Jüngere (1564–1634): Die Gemälde mit kritischen Oeuvrekatalog*, Freren 1986, Kat. 321, 322, 324, 327, 333, 400–404). It had been thus doubted whether Momper ever painted staffage scenes by himself. But in the Warsaw landscapes this is the only possibility: plump figures resemble so much Momper’s style in his drawings, and the use of thin brush strokes is so close to his manner of painting trees or grains that attributing them to Toeput is not likely. It would be interesting to reexamine some later works by the artist and reconsider the authorship of staffage attributed to the Brueghels.
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south in the 1580s: between his registration as a master in the Antwerp Guild of St Luke in 1581 and his marriage in 1590. During this journey, Momper stayed for some time at the workshop of Lodewijk Toeput in Treviso. There is only one record which may indicate their teacher–pupil relation. It comes from the inventory of Herman de Neyt’s collection and was made in 1642: “een lantschap van Mompers Meester Lodewyck van Treni.” But despite the scarcity of sources art historians agree about Momper’s apprenticeship at the studio of Toeput. Already in 1936, Charles Sterling observed that “it is enough to see Momper’s painting in Hannover [The Conversion of Paul] to acknowledge his dependence on Toeput, who was influenced by Veronese and Tintoretto.” It is generally accepted that young Momper adapted Toeput’s easy, visionary manner, freely painted brush strokes, as well as his simplified and stylized way of drawing figures. According to Gerszi, who revised the earlier research of Klaus Ertz, among the early works by Momper (either executed in Italy or shortly after his return to Antwerp), we can count seven or eight works: The Ford in the Mountains (Paris, Galerie Birtschansky), Baptism of the Eunuch (German private collection), Rocky Landscape with Flight into Egypt (Mainz, Mittelrheinisches Landesmuseum), The Bridge with Water Mill (Housem, Galerie Fayt), Hercules Seizing the Cattle of Geryon (Amsterdam, Rijksmuseum), Shipwreck at the Greek Fleet at Troy (Stockholm, Nationalmuseum), Fall of Icarus (Stockholm, Nationalmuseum), and Wide Landscape with Travellers (German private collection). This last painting especially, depicting a vast plain, sea gulf, and a town, framed on both sides by Italian-fashioned houses, bears the traces of Momper’s training in Veneto in general and, more precisely, at the studio of Toeput.

Although a stylistic analysis was crucial in recognizing Momper’s apprenticeship at Toeput’s workshop, similarities between some works by these artists have occasionally led to their confusion. A good example is provided by a drawing with a carnival scene from the Fitzwilliam Museum, Cambridge (fig. 5). For a long time it used to be identified as a work of Lodewijk Toeput. Terez Gerszi, however, has pointed to its several features suggesting that, although the general compositional idea came from Pozzoserrato, it was executed by his

4 The debate on Joos de Momper’s Italian journey is thoroughly presented in the artist’s monograph by Klaus Ertz. Ertz, Josse de Momper…, pp. 321–331. According to Ertz, the final argument for this hypothetical trip was provided by Terez Gerszi with the attribution of frescoes in the Roman Church of San Vitale, previously given to Paul Bril, to Joos de Momper. However, the article in which this reattribution was meant to be published, does not finally deal with this problem. Terez Gerszi, Josse de Momper und die Bruegel-Tradition [in:] Netherlandish Mannerism, ed. Görel Cavalli-Björkman, Stockholm 1985, pp. 155–164.

5 Ertz, Josse de Momper… The overview of Joos de Momper’s works in inventories pp. 50–59.


pupil. The detailed rendering of plump figures in the foreground, landscape, and architecture in the background, as well as a highly nuanced use of wash differ considerably from Toeput’s quick, more sketchy manner.

The drawing from the Fitzwilliam Museum yet is very similar to the Winter from the Warsaw private collection. Not only is the subject of the two works the same, but their compositional scheme is also very close to each other. The only major difference is the lack of the figure of Janus in the drawing from the Fitzwilliam Collection. In both cases the composition is divided into two parts. On the right an extensive river landscape stretches; it is flat and peopled in the work from Warsaw, while emptier, closed with the view of mountains in the one from Cambridge. Moreover, in the latter a building on the very right side in the foreground was added. On the left ancient ruins frame a view of a contemporary city, where in a wide street some kind of a bull running is taking place. Both works combine the depiction of carnival merrymaking with labours carried out in winter, although in the Cambridge drawing the carnival scene is exposed, while in the Warsaw painting it remains just an equal part of the staffage.

The drawing from the Fitzwilliam Museum and even more the confusion over its authorship confirm the artistic cooperation of Toeput and Momper or, rather, the latter’s apprenticeship at the studio in Treviso. In both paintings from

Fig. 5. Joos de Momper, The carnival scene, 1583? or later, drawing, Fitzwilliam Museum Cambridge, repr. public domain

Gerszi also argued that the drawing from the Fitzwilliam Museum is probably the earliest known drawing by Joos de Momper. Ibidem, pp. 179–180.
Warsaw we can find further details indicating the place and time of their execution, even if it is already proven by the date in the Winter landscape. On the river in the latter painting one can see gondolas and on the left a bull running among people. Next to regattas, soccer matches, and gang fist-fights these games with a bull were a popular amusement of the Venetian lower classes. We can still find their depictions even in the late 18th-century Venetian vedute. Furthermore, in the summer scene, on the roof of the inn on the right-hand side, one can see a typical Venetian chimney: exactly the same as can be found in paintings by Vittore Carpaccio (The Healing of the Madman, c. 1496, Venice, Gallerie dell’Accademia) or Gentile Bellini (Miracle of the Cross at the Bridge of San Lorenzo, 1500, Venice, Gallerie dell’Accademia). These details (chimneys, gondolas, Venetian architecture) which prove that the images have evident ties to Veneto will reappear much later in Momper’s painting Towed Boat at the Latvian National Museum of Arts in Riga, executed around 1620 with Jan Brueghel the Elder.

However, we can also have a look at the stylistic features of the landscape to establish its authorship. The first indication here can be the way in which the trees are painted: they are high and slender, with thin, bent branches. In the Summer their foliage is not very dense, each leaf rendered with separate brush strokes, and through them one can easily see the blue-grey sky. We will find the same manner in many later summer landscapes with a harvest by Momper, i.e., in the Summer from the Nasjonalgalleriet in Oslo and in numerous paintings from private collections.9 In the Winter from Warsaw the trees remain thin and forked. To emphasize the season, Momper adds single white strokes on their trunks, branches, and the remaining leaves. Such a technique is very close to the way in which he renders ears of grain in his summer landscapes. And the trees themselves can be easily compared with winter landscapes from the Sammlung Vroom in Helmond, Waterman Gallery in Amsterdam, or the Liechtenstein Collection in Vaduz/Vienna. This painting manner differs from Toeput’s style. Furthermore, another hint can be found in the entrance to houses and inns: in later paintings by Joos de Momper they are always made up of two thick wooden poles and an irregular beam clumsily placed on them (see e.g., Mountain Landscape with Pilgrims and Travelling People, 1620s, Karlsruhe, Staatliche Kunsthalle; Village Street with Riders, 1620s, German private collection; Inn on the Country Road, 1620s, Italian private collection; Village in Winter with Horses and Carts, 1620s, London, Richard Green Gallery). The same structure can be seen in the Summer from the Warsaw private collection: in the house in the centre of the composition, just behind the threshing peasants.

Up until now we have indicated mostly compositional details and stylistic features which can prove the suggested authorship of the Warsaw paintings. In the following chapter we will focus on their iconography, providing further evidence confirming our statement.

9 See Ertz, Josse de Momper…, Kat. 321–331.
Lodewijk Toeput, Joos de Momper, and the Series of the Seasons

In the 1580s and 1590s, Lodewijk Toeput received several commissions to paint series of either the months or the seasons. In his *Meraviglie dell’Arte* Carlo Ridolfi wrote that “nella sala di casa Onigo [a Treviso] fece le quattro Stagioni e in casa de Zigoli i dodici mesi dell’anno”.

Unfortunately, these works have not survived or rather, as suggested by Luciana Larcher Crosato, we do not know any details enabling their identification. However, there are other paintings and drawings by Toeput representing the same subject which we shall now briefly examine.

The only complete cycle of the seasons, preserved in a private collection in Venice, follows the iconographic tradition of triumphal processions. The composition of the four paintings is generally based on woodcuts by Monogrammist A.P. executed in 1536, now at the British Museum. Each season is represented here by a god or goddess sitting on a triumphal car: Flora personifies Spring, Ceres – Summer, Pomona – Autumn, and Janus – Winter. The gods are surrounded by various allegorical and mythological figures. The sky features the zodiac signs depicted appropriately to each season. This allegorical tradition was abandoned by Pozzoserrato in his other series in the Villa Chiericati alla Longa. In the frescoes the iconography of the seasons is combined with the rhythm of life in a suburban villa, its pleasures, and enjoyments. Thus, instead of associating the seasons with specific deities and personifications, the artist depicted them on the example of these human activities which were especially close to the residents of the Villa, giving them a universal, allegorical dimension.

Both above-mentioned works differ considerably from the Warsaw paintings. They do prove Toeput’s interest in the subject and his ability to render it in various manners, but do not show any compositional affinities with our landscapes. This does not mean, however, that such works do not exist. On the contrary, we can point here to at least a few paintings and drawings which are very close to them: *Summer*, Rhode Island, Providence Art Museum; *Winter (Autumn?)*, private collection; *Autumn*, Warsaw, National Museum, *Venus and Amor (Allegory of Spring)*, Basel, Kupferstichkabinett. A tondo with a depiction of autumn or
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12 *Ibidem*, pp. 119–130. In her article L. Larcher Crosato gives a thorough overview of Flemish prints which could have influenced Toeput’s Venetian series.
winter months\textsuperscript{14} is, next to the Fitzwilliam drawing, another work representing the same scheme as the *Winter* from the Warsaw private collection. One more time we can find here the division between the view of a city and a vast landscape. The addition of the figure of Pomona in the foreground, exactly in the centre of the composition, puts this work even closer to our painting which combines the depiction of the labours of the months with the appropriate god or goddess. It also proves that the compositional idea of the Warsaw *Seasons* came from Pozzoserrato. And what is the most important, albeit scattered in three collections, is a set of four drawings representing the four seasons assigned to Toeput constituting a single whole, as evidenced by the size, stylistic treatment, and composition providing the closest analogy to the Warsaw paintings.

*Winter*’s drawing which comes from the Yale University Art Gallery (fig. 6), New Haven (Ct), repr. public domain, shows January and the only difference between the Warsaw painting and this drawing are the differences in staffage to the right of Janus.

![Winter landscape (January)](image)

**Fig. 6.** Lodewijk Toeput, *Winter landscape (January)*, 80’s of the 16\textsuperscript{th} century – about 1590?, drawing, Yale University Art Gallery, New Haven (Ct), repr. public domain

*Summer* comes from the National Gallery of Art in Washington (fig. 7).\textsuperscript{15} It depicts August, with threshing, haying, and bringing in the crop. In the left corner, beneath a tree, we can see Ceres with a cornucopia and an armful of ears of corn.

\textsuperscript{14} An exact identification of the drawing’s subject is difficult, as it combines winter landscape and carnival scenes with the figure of Pomona, goddess traditionally identified with autumn.

The only major difference between the painting from Warsaw and this drawing is the absence of Apollo in the latter work.

Other drawings: the spring month of May from Yale University and the autumn month of October from the Fitzwilliam Museum, Cambridge, are certainly projects of compositions of paintings which, together with the paintings from the Warsaw collection, formed one set of the four seasons.

If we take into account a traditional model of artists’ cooperation and workshop practice, according to which one of them was responsible for the figural scene and/or staffage, and the other for the landscape, it seems highly plausible that the Warsaw paintings formed a part of one of Pozzoserrato’s commissions for a season series. It seems most likely that the artists shared unsold (for unknown reasons) paintings in connection with Joos de Momper’s return to Antwerp. The fact that Joos de Momper brought only two paintings can be proved by a pair of paintings depicting winter and summer, which, although very similar, are a simplified version of the Warsaw paintings. These are two copies by Joos’s nephew Frans de Momper\(^{16}\) executed probably in the 1620s, at the very beginning of his career. It is hardly possible that both Joos and Frans’s pictures of the two remaining seasons disappeared. In comparison with the originals, their repetitions lack mythological figures. Such a change, which we could already see in the drawing from the Fitzwilliam Museum, illustrates the general tendency

in the Netherlandish iconography of the months and seasons at the turn of the 16th and 17th century. Meanwhile, it is worth observing that landscapes by Frans prove that Joos must have taken his paintings back to the Low Countries. Frans himself never travelled to Italy, continuing the artistic education in his Northern Netherlands (1630s–1640s). Thus, his uncle’s studio or home in Antwerp was the only place where he could have seen the pictures.

The fact that the canvases were brought by the artist to Flanders should not actually surprise us. We could indicate at least three reasons why he did or should have done it. Firstly, he could have wanted to keep them in his own collection as a souvenir from the Italian trip, and as a clear evidence of the training in Veneto for his potential clients. Secondly, such a souvenir might have been useful not only in the commercial, but also in the artistic practice. After all, the pictures included beautifully painted mythological figures that could have served for Joos de Momper and his pupils as compositional models. And, finally, both paintings could have been initially intended by Momper for sale in the Low Countries. Such works must have seemed very attractive to local collectors, as they had been executed by two renowned artists representing two different artistic idioms and styles, combining native predilection for landscape with painting qualities of Venetian art. They rendered a popular subject in an unusual manner, which we shall examine closer in the next chapter. Various details taken over by Momper from Toeput, such as the carnival scene, the running of the bull or gondolas, made the pictures even more intriguing.

Until now we have examined drawings of the seasons and months attributed to Lodewijk Toeput. We should thus turn now to some examples of Momper’s works on the same subject, executed after his return to Antwerp, but at least in one case strongly influenced by his Italian journey.

We will start with the Months from the Rijksprentenkabinet in Amsterdam. These are preparatory drawings for prints executed by Adriaen Collaert and published by Phillip Gallé in 1616. As suggested by Gerszi, this series should be regarded as a point of departure for any further study of Toeput and, more generally, Italian influences in the oeuvre of Joos de Momper. In the drawings of the series and the prints executed on their basis one can easily recognize Italian motifs and the artist’s fascination with southern landscape. In January we can find a Venetian bull running and a carnival procession (fig. 8), April and May are represented by amusements of life in a villa, in August (fig. 9) the same architectural motifs as in the painting from Warsaw and the drawing from Washington are used, and September is shown as a month of grape-picking. The reapers in all of the drawings depicting summer months, their composing and
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17 Father of Joos de Momper, Bartholomeus, was both painter and art dealer who from 1565 onwards managed schilderspand in Antwerp. Joos’s connections with the art market were thus particularly strong.

18 Gerszi, Joos de Momper..., p. 177. Gerszi also observed that even though the prints were published in 1616, the drawings could have been and probably were executed during Momper’s stay in Italy or shortly after his return to Antwerp.
positions, resemble the figures in the Warsaw painting, and can thus support our earlier suggestion that Momper did paint staffage scenes in his landscapes. The general idea of this series is a combination of a vast landscape with labours of the months, an allegorical figure associated with each month (e.g., a falconer standing for May, the month of hunting) and a zodiac sign in the sky. In the other works on the same subject Joos de Momper gave up all the symbolical and allegorical elements in favour of a mere depiction of landscape. The most famous example of this can be found in four paintings from the Herzog Anton Ulrich Museum in Brunswick. Dated shortly after 1615 and painted in cooperation with Jan Brueghel the Elder, they can be recognized as a season series only on the basis of landscape characteristics: even the labours of the months are almost absent here or already transformed into a staffage which is usually identified with 17th-century Flemish and Dutch landscapes, such as bleaching of linen. The works of the months are simply no longer necessary to identify each season, as it is enough to have a look at the plants, their growth and species in order to do it. The characterization of each season is further stressed by a colour unity of canvases, which creates their atmosphere, just as it did in the famous cycle by Pieter Bruegel the Elder painted in 1565 for Nicolaes Jonghelinck. The same idea of rendering the subject can be found in other, independent paintings by Joos de Momper: several summer landscapes with hay making and corn

Fig. 8. Joos de Momper, *The month of January*, after 1583?, before 1590?, drawing, Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam, repr. public domain
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harvest\textsuperscript{19} and, on the other hand, winter landscapes with travellers, woodcutters, hunters, or herdsmen.\textsuperscript{20}

Iconography of the Seasons around 1600. The Case of the Netherlands and Italy

The prints by Adriaen Collaert and the paintings from Brunswick were executed at the same time. Yet their iconography could not differ more: the first series combines all possible allegorical means of seasons’ representation with earthly activities, whereas the latter can be described as mere landscape paintings. And when we add to these two examples the works to which we referred earlier in this article, it may lead us to the conclusion that both the \textit{Summer} and \textit{Winter} from the Warsaw private collection illustrate a very peculiar moment of the changes occurring in the iconography of the seasons in Netherlandish art at the turn of the 16\textsuperscript{th} and 17\textsuperscript{th} century. The paintings are closely related to Momper’s drawings and Collaert’s engravings, but include one important difference: instead

\textsuperscript{19} Ertz, \textit{Josse de Momper…}, Kat. 296, 321, 323–325, 327.

\textsuperscript{20} Ibidem, Kat. 389, 399, 400, 424, 427.

The attributes of these personifications were easy to recognize and to associate with each time of the year. Their standardized and more or less fixed reper- tory included flowers for Spring, ears of corn for Summer, grapes and other fruit for Autumn, and twigs, ducks, or hares in the case of Winter. This tradition was rare in the Middle Ages, although it was never completely forgotten. When renewed in the Renaissance, it developed in two directions: some artists, as Maarten van Heemskerck in the cycle of prints executed in 1563\footnote{Maarten van Heemskerck, The Four Seasons, 1563, engraved by Philips Galle. Sets of these prints are at the Amsterdam Rijksprentenkabinet, Die Graphische Sammlung der Albertina in Vienna and in the printrooms in Leiden, Copenhagen and Dresden.} came back to this classical scheme, while others, like Lambert Lombard in his four engravings published by Hieronymus Cock in 1568 chose to depict antique gods and goddesses instead of seasons’ personifications.\footnote{The complete series is preserved i.e. at the Koninklijke Bibliotheek in Brussels.} Between these two modes we can place the already-mentioned prints by Monogrammist A.P. from the British Museum, which, as we have seen, served as a model for another series of the seasons by Pozzoserrato. According to Veldman, these woodcuts are “the earliest Netherlandish example of quartet of personifications.”\footnote{Veldman, Seasons…, p. 156.} The place of honour is occupied by Flora, Ceres, Pomona, and Janus, but the specific classical personifications can still be seen in the crowd surrounding the cars. The artist’s interpretation of the pictorial tradition which he referred to was influenced by both ancient and early modern texts, such as Ovid’s \textit{Metamorphoses} or Francesco Collonna’s \textit{Hypnerotomachia Poliphili}.\footnote{Ibidem, p. 157.} He enriched the iconography of the antique pattern and abandoned its simplicity, just as Heemskerck did in the cycle from 1563. However, the latter chose another source of inspiration: depictions of labours of the months, which first appeared in the 13th century, but had been preceded by late antique / early medieval representations of the months on the example of human activities appropriate to each of them. In the prints Heemskerck selected several of these works: planting of young vines, milking, and hunting (\textit{Spring}), hay making, sheep-shearing and harvesting (\textit{Summer}), grape-picking, harrowing, sowing, as well as the slaughter of livestock (\textit{Autumn}), and, finally, feasting and warming by a fireplace (\textit{Winter}). In this combination of labours of the months with specific personifications Heemskerck’s series is close
to Momper’s drawings and Collaert’s prints, even if in these later works the repertory of human activities is different, and each month is depicted separately. On the other hand, Toeput’s idea to incorporate antique deities in the two Warsaw paintings\(^\text{26}\) owes more to Lambert Lombard’s cycle than to that of Heemskerck. In the four engravings, partially inspired, just like the woodcuts by Monogrammist A.P., by *Hypnerotomachia Poliphili*, spring is represented by Venus with Cupid (exactly as in Pozzoserrato’s drawing in Basel!), summer by Ceres holding a horn of plenty, autumn by Bacchus, while winter by Aeolus and Janus by a fire. In the background of each print one can see activities such as harvesting, picking of grapes and other fruit, making wine, as well as people amusing themselves with ice skating or feasting outdoors.

Although by the end of the 16\(^{th}\) century it was still common to depict months or seasons as mythological figures against simplified landscape backgrounds,\(^\text{27}\) the general tendency which was to begin to dominate in the first quarter of the next century was to represent them only by means of an animated landscape, either with labours of the months as a part of it, or without them, like in the case of Momper’s Brunswick cycle. But even if we compare the two Warsaw paintings with the engravings by Maarten van Heemskerck, Lambert Lombard, or Crispijn de Passe the Elder: the works that could have served as their compositional models, one thing is striking: the difference in the emphasis put on the figures of either the seasons’ personifications or Olympian deities and the landscape. In all of the above-mentioned prints these figures remained central. Landscape backgrounds with labours of the months actually continued the allegorical programme introduced by the personifications. They illustrated specific seasons, but on a universal or rather, symbolical level; they combined particular activities with the appropriate time of the year according to an established iconographical tradition without any attempt to place them at a specific location, such as a Flemish countryside or an Italian villa. In our paintings this situation is reversed: the importance of gods is diminished in favour of a detailed depiction of the landscape. The repertory of labours of the months remains to some extent the same as in the medieval calendars or early modern prints and paintings, but it is enriched with current Venetian motifs (gondolas and chimneys) and local amusements (bull running or carnival procession). The two paintings by Toeput and Momper do include allegorical elements, but they are placed in a specific, though of course not a topographical landscape, depicting realistic elements and scenes taken from (everyday) life. A further comparison with the

\(^{26}\) There can be little doubt that despite the cooperation with young Joos de Momper it was Lodewijck Toeput who designed the composition of both our paintings.

Mirosław Tomalak

copies painted by Frans Momper illustrates this process of “bringing the Four Seasons from their allegorical level back to the earthly dimension.”\(^{28}\) Even more straightforwardly: labours of the months remain, but antique gods are already missing. According to Veldman, the same tendency can be observed in contemporary Venetian art, namely in the paintings of the Bassano family.\(^{29}\) In the Italian Renaissance a cycle of the seasons used to form a popular subject in ceiling decorations\(^{30}\) and did not appear in easel painting until about 1575, when Jacopo Bassano created the first series depicting the Four Seasons.\(^{31}\) More importantly, it was in this cycle that the traditional iconography changed for the first time: the seasons were no longer represented by gods from Olympus, but depicted in the form of vast landscapes with multiple figures performing various agricultural tasks, such as shearing sheep, harvesting, milking goats, picking grapes etc. They also included episodes from the Old and New Testament: Fall of Man was incorporated in the Spring, Sacrifice of Isaac in the Summer, Moses Receiving the Tablets of the Law in the Autumn, and Christ Carrying the Cross in the Winter. Introducing biblical scenes in representations of the months or seasons was not, nota bene, unknown in Netherlandish art, even though this phenomenon has not been widely recognized.\(^{32}\) It is generally accepted that the idea of Bassano’s cycle derived from the North, and was inspired by four prints engraved by Pieter van der Heyden and published by Hieronymus Cock in 1570.\(^{33}\) The preparatory drawings were designed by Pieter Bruegel the Elder (Spring and Summer) and Hans Bol (Autumn and Winter). Depicting labours of the month summarized in four scenes, they are devoid of any kind of personifications, allegories, deities etc. The only motif referring to classical sources of

\(^{28}\) I. Veldman, Waaien met de mode mee..., p. 80.

\(^{29}\) Ibidem, p. 78.

\(^{30}\) See i.e. Seasons by Paolo Veronese in the Sala dell’Olimpo in the Villa Barbaro at Maser (1560–1561) or by Jacopo Tintoretto at the Carnegie Institute in Pittsburgh (1551–1552).

\(^{31}\) Specialists disagree whether the originals by Jacopo have survived. But from our point of view questions of authorship are not of big importance, as it is the invention of new iconography of the seasons in Italian art that matters to us. For the overview of the discussion on originals and copies of the seasons by Bassano see: Bernard Aikema, Jacopo Bassano and His Public. Moralizing Pictures in the Age of Reform, ca. 1535–1600, Princeton 1996, pp. 131–133.

\(^{32}\) I.e. according to Bernard Aikema, “The Northern depictions of the Seasons or the Months […] are almost always devoid of subsidiary religious scenes.” Ibidem, p. 136. To acknowledge the superficiality of this statement it is enough to have a look at prints from the Emblemata Evangelica series by Adriaen Collaert after Hans Bol, executed in 1585: labours of the months and Zodiac signs are here combined with scenes from both Old and New Testament. The connection between these spheres is stressed by Latin inscriptions at the bottom of the prints, which refer to specific chapters of the Bible.

the subject are inscriptions comparing the four seasons to four ages of man and verses quoted from *Anthologia Latina*. Still, none of these elements has its analogy in the image itself. It is very likely that these prints were known in Venice in the 1570s; an inventory of Andrea de Fuschis, an engraver, mentions a series of prints published by Cock, although it does not mention these specific works.

In this regard the case of the Warsaw paintings is much clearer: their iconography was obviously based on Netherlandish prints.\(^3^4\) On the other hand, however, we should not ignore the role contemporary Italian painting played in these and other works by Pozzoserrato. His frescoes in the Villa Chiericati alla Longa followed the traditional patterns of Venetian masters, as well as both series of the seasons and months mentioned by Carlo Ridolfi most probably did.

## Concluding Remarks

In our article we have attempted to show that the paintings from the Warsaw private collection are a confirmation of the cooperation at a specific time (1583) of two Netherlandish artists who settled down permanently or temporarily in Treviso. This cooperation was far from mere teacher – assistant/pupil relation. Stylistic features of the landscape indicate that, although he was influenced by Toeput, Joos de Momper’s own skills and his individual manner were already developed at that time. On the example of these landscapes we can thus finally characterize the early period of Momper’s artistic activity and state that he also painted small staffage figures in his works.

We have referred to several paintings and drawings by both Toeput and Momper whose compositions are closely related to our *Winter* and *Summer*. The works from the Rhode Island Providence Museum, Kupferstichkabinett in Basel, or the National Museum in Warsaw prove Pozzoserrato’s interest and inventiveness in rendering the subject of the seasons, and, what is of the greatest importance for us, his authorship of the discussed paintings’ composition. On the other hand, the comparison with the drawings from the Fitzwilliam Museum, the National Gallery of Art in Washington, or the Yale University Art Gallery, New Haven, and, finally, with Collaert’s prints after Momper’s drawings shows the importance of the latter’s Italian journey: the ideas and motifs he became familiar with in the 1580s would reappear in his artistic practice for a long time. As previously mentioned, we can trace the general compositional scheme of these prints – and of our paintings! – back to Netherlandish printmaking of the 2nd half of the 16th century. The cooperation of Momper and Toeput gave these inspirations an interesting epilogue: the Northern Renaissance iconography of the seasons, reworked by Netherlandish artists in Veneto, was enriched with

\(^3^4\) As mentioned earlier in this article, for the general overview of Toeput’s dependence on Northern prints in his season series see: Larcher Crosato, *Di “Quattro Stagioni”…*, pp. 119–130.
Italian motifs, while developing their native model of depicting the months and seasons by means of animated landscapes. Both Flemish and Italian collectors must have appreciated this *inventio*; unfortunately, we will probably never know who commissioned the Warsaw paintings, and why, under what circumstances, and for whom they travelled north with one of their authors.

* 

At this point, I would like to thank Mrs. Barbara Kamińska for her help and for valuable remarks Prof. Dr. Hab. Antoni Ziemba and Dr. Klaus Ertz.
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