



Van Dyck's project for a family portrait of Lord Arundel

Hadrien Rambach

► To cite this version:

Hadrien Rambach. Van Dyck's project for a family portrait of Lord Arundel. The British Art Journal, 2013, XIV (2), pp.21-34. hal-04345836

HAL Id: hal-04345836

<https://hal.science/hal-04345836>

Submitted on 14 Dec 2023

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.



Distributed under a Creative Commons CC0 - Public Domain Dedication 4.0 International License

Van Dyck's project for a family portrait of Lord Arundel

Hadrien Rambach



1 *Lord Arundel and his family* by a contemporary follower of Anthony van Dyck, c1635–1636. Ink and wash drawing, 19.7 x 28.2 cm. Private collection, London. Photo: Hadrien Rambach

[not illustrated, but see Appendix 1 below] 2 *Lord Arundel and his family* by Philip Fruytiers (1610–1666), 1643. Watercolour, 398 x 628 mm. Private collection (Stafford family)

Anthony Van Dyck's portrait of 'The 21st Earl of Arundel surrounded by his family' seems never to have been painted and its compositional drawing is lost. But what appears to be his proposed design has survived through two contemporary copies: one in Antwerp (Pl 5), and an unpublished one presented here and illustrated in this article (Pl 1). This unpublished drawing, pasted on a cardboard mount, is in a London private collection. It is drawn in ink and wash on paper, is inscribed *A Vandyck* bottom right, and was unknown until spring 2001 when it appeared on the art market. This essay is devoted to the context of the creation of these contemporary copies, along with a reflection on their possible provenance.

Sir Anthony Van Dyck (1599–1641) had intended to paint a family portrait of Lord Arundel.¹ This never came to fruition: if Van Dyck had actually embarked upon it, this painting (finished or not) would surely have been documented in contemporary letters or diaries, bills, or such archive documents. But there is no doubt that the artist made some preliminary sketch(es) for it: for example, Philip

Fruytiers (1610–1666) had certainly seen Van Dyck's design when he painted a watercolour and annotated it '*P.H. FRUYTIERS, fect. 1643 An: VANDYKE Inv*' (Pl 2 [note to reader: this picture could not be illustrated but it is listed here as Pl 2 to facilitate the discussion below, Ed.], later copied in oil, Pl 3).² Obviously though, this does not prove that Van Dyck's project actually looked like Fruytiers' version of it.³ Before even considering a major commission such as the family portrait of his principal patron, Van Dyck would certainly have made drawings and sketches: it was Peter Paul Rubens (1577–1640), his master, who had taught Van Dyck this technique of preparing for important paintings by creating several studies beforehand. The first ones would be in pen, brown ink and wash; then he would do studies in black chalk, heightened with white; and he would finish with *modello* drawings. There are examples of such studies for the mural decoration of the Whitehall Banqueting House (c1638),⁴ for the *Mystic wedding of St Catherine* (c1630, Vey 54–55), for the *Chastity of Scipio* (1620–1621, Vey 106–107), amongst others. The technical quality of Van Dyck's drawings



3 *Lord Arundel and his family* by Philip Fruytiers, after 1643. Oil on copper, 40.8 x 55.9 cm. Arundel Castle, Arundel. Photo: Bridgeman Library

4 *Lord Pembroke (Arundel) and his family* by George Vertue (1684–1756), 1743. Ink on paper, notebook. British Museum

5 *Lord Arundel and his family* by a seventeenth-century follower of Anthony van Dyck, 1635 or later. Ink and wash drawing, 20 x 31.1 cm. Stedelijk Prentenkabinet, Antwerp

6 *Lord Arundel and his family*, circle of Anthony van Dyck, 1635 or later. Wash on black chalk, 24.1 x 33.3 cm. British Museum

7 *Lord Pembroke and his family* by Antony van Dyck (1599–1641), 1633/34. Oil on canvas, 330 x 510 cm. Wilton House, Salisbury. Photo: Bridgeman Library



varies widely, and he did some very rough sketches indeed – meant simply to capture the idea of a composition. Christopher Brown has commented that ‘his technical facility was absolute: for some of these portraits preparatory pencil drawings survive, but rarely do they do more than describe the outlines of face and body’.⁵ Oliver Millar similarly remarks that ‘the posture for a new portrait will have been

rapidly sketched in black and white chalk on blue, light brown or greenish-grey paper. Consideration had earlier been given to the attitude in which the sitter was to be presented; and preparatory drawings, in the main, indicated the pose. Very seldom does Van Dyck, in these drawings, do more than suggest a likeness ... From a preparatory drawing the “habile gens qu’il avoit chez lui” (“the skilful people he had with him”) could lay out the figures’.⁶ So what happened to the sketch or sketches for the Arundel family portrait?

George Vertue (1684–1756) saw and copied (Pl 4) a drawing ‘by Vandyke’. This drawing ‘by Vandyke’ (Pl 5) is now in Antwerp, a contemporary copy almost identical to our newly discovered drawing, which may well be the one Vertue refers to when he remarks that ‘also in the Collt. of drawings is just such a drawing with the pen. at Ld Egmondts – possibly the original sketch. by V. dyke’.⁷ Vertue also wrote that the Prince of Wales (Frederick Louis, 1707–1751) owned ‘a little faded’ painting ‘of the Earl of Arundells family’,⁸ but this passage about the Prince of Wales is unclear and seems rather to refer to Fruytiers’ watercolour. These notes by Vertue tell us of several other portraits of Lord Arundel’s family: one painting in the Royal collection, one drawing in the Pembroke collection (Pl 5), and one drawing in the Egmont collection. If the Egmont work is not the unpublished Plate 1, then it could possibly be a drawing in the British Museum (Pl 6), although the attribution of this drawing to Van Dyck has been rejected by Christopher Brown.⁹ The published *oeuvre* of Van Dyck does not include

any other painting or drawing directly related to the sketches seen in Pl 1, Pl 5, the composition of which are rather reminiscent of Holbein.¹⁰ Other ‘great peeces’ include *The family of Lord Pembroke* of 1635/36 (Pl 7) and *The family of Count of Nassau* of 1634 (Pl 8). A sepia drawing (Pl 9), rather close to the Fruytiers watercolour and very close to a painting by Gonzales Coques (1614–1684) in Dresden (Pl 13), depicts

either the Arundel or the Pembroke family, but it is remarkably unattractive and its attribution questionable. While various works by Van Dyck do depict the Earl or his close relatives (e.g., Pls 10, 11, 12),¹¹ none is a family group. However, there is one drawing (Pl 11) which supports the authenticity of the Van Dyck design of an Arundel family portrait (as known by Pl 1, Pl 4). Even though Plate 11 is from a different angle to Plate 1, the Earl's clothes, posture and attributes are so similar that they are both undoubtedly sketches for the same (uncompleted) painting.

The identification of the sitters in the drawing in Pl 1 is quite straightforward. Thomas Howard (1585–1646),¹² and his wife Alatheia Talbot (c1585–1654), are seen facing the viewer, seated in arm-chairs in the centre of the sheet, on a platform which may be at the top of some stairs. The Earl is holding the rod of Earl Marshal in his left hand and he wears the badge of the Garter. In front of the Earl, almost at his feet, is Thomas Howard (1627–1677), future Lord Maltravers (or 'Little Tom' as the Earl used to call him) and eldest child of Henry Frederick (1608–1652), who bows whilst raising his right hand towards his grandfather. Describing the other copy, the Plate 5 Antwerp drawing, John Rowlands concluded that the boy was holding 'a family heirloom, the sword worn by Thomas Howard, Earl of Surrey (later duke of Norfolk), with which he slew James IV of Scotland at the battle of Flodden in 1513'.¹³ On the contrary, we believe that it is the same paper document that can be seen in a painting in which the Earl holds the sword himself (Pl 10), in the British Museum drawing (Pl 11), and in the Madagascar portrait (Pl 12) where the paper shows the motto *Concordia cum Candore* with the family heraldic animals (talbot, horse & lion). As to be expected, several of the Earl's children are also depicted in the portrait.¹⁴ The two young men standing on the left of the Earl are likely to be his second and third sons, as the eldest one had already died. Next to the dog,¹⁵ the woman on the right is probably Elizabeth Stuart (1610–1674), who had married Henry Frederick on 7 March 1626, and the three children next to her must be their second, third and fourth sons: Henry (1628–1684), Phillip (1629–1694), and Charles (1631–1713). The four round portraits in sculpted wooden frames, which hang on the wall, depict the third Duke of Surrey (1473–1554) with his wife, and his son Lord Surrey (1517–1547) with his wife. These are not actual existing paintings, but are inspired by the rectangular portraits of these two men by Hans Holbein the Younger (shown in the Fruytiers watercolour, Pl 2). Such added 'fictitious' family portraits reinforce the distinguished visual lineage in large family pieces, meant to give an impressive and lasting image of the sitter and to justify the importance of Lord Arundel, a man of impressive appearance¹⁶ but known for his particularly plain style of dress,¹⁷ as evident in this drawing (Pl 1). Alastair Laing noted (to Oliver Millar first, and then to



me in a private communication) that the composition of the drawing is surprisingly close to that of the Pembroke portrait (Pl 7), notably in the depiction of the Earl and his wife seated side by side as equals (as they were by lineage). But the drawing is more successful in this regard than the painting, with Arundel's wife looking stiffly frontal but nevertheless stroking one of her grandsons, whilst the unhappily-married Anne Clifford, Countess Pembroke (1590–1676) sits with folded arms, dressed in black, not interacting with anyone (like a funeral effigy of Pembroke's first wife Lady Susan Vere).

We consider that Van Dyck's original project must have commenced, and the sketch drawn, in 1635. Indeed, it is highly probable that the sketch was made *ad vivum* in the castle. As 'Little Tom' looks between five and ten years old, the work must date from 1632–1637.¹⁸ Lord Arundel left England in April 1636 as Envoy Extraordinary to the Imperial Court of Vienna. In spite of the fact that, as Walpole remarked, 'Sir Anthony Vandyck's works are so frequent in England that the generality of our people can scarce avoid thinking him their countryman',¹⁹ Van Dyck's recorded visits to England are from October 1620 to March 1621, March 1632 to March 1634, March 1635 to September 1640, August to September 1641, and December 1641 (when he died). So



8 *Lord Nassau-Siegen and his family* by Antony van Dyck, 1634. Oil on canvas, 292.5 x 265 cm. Private collection (Gage family). Photo: Bridgeman Library

9 *Lord Arundel and his family*, circle of Antony van Dyck, c.1631/32. Sepia on brown paper, 163 x 232 mm. British Museum

10 *Lord Arundel and his grandson Lord Maltravers* by Antony van Dyck, 1635/36. Oil on canvas, 144.8 x 121.9 cm. Arundel Castle, Arundel [photo: Bridgeman Library, no. DON 279050]

this drawing can only have been sketched between 1632–1634 or 1635–1636. Van Dyck had the experience of painting large works with the Royal *Great Peece* in 1632, and those of Pembroke (Pl 7) and Nassau-Siegen (Pl 8) in 1634. We favour the hypothesis that this drawing dates from between spring 1635 and April 1636, which would make it contemporary with Van Dyck's other known painting of the Earl with his grandson (Pl 10).

In the mid-1630's, Van Dyck was not only at the peak of his art, but also of his success: the author of around four hundred portraits, he was overloaded with requests and honours. This suggests that the project was undoubtedly commissioned by the Earl, as Van Dyck had no time to spare in which to start works from his own initiative. The reason why the Arundel family portrait was never painted can only be guessed at: maybe it was because the Earl left England in April 1636, or the artist's fees had become excessive.²⁰ In fact, it isn't even clear why Arundel would have commissioned such an expensive painting at all: comparable pieces were usually ordered to celebrate an important event, for example, the Pembroke wedding (as in Pl 7). A commemoration of his favourite grandson's reaching the Catholic age of reason (in 1634) would seem a rather weak reason. Could it have been to anticipate the Earl's departure for the Continent, when he was appointed Envoy Extraordinary?

In any case, for whatever reasons, one must assume that Van Dyck did draw a sketch for an Arundel family portrait, but that its destiny remains a mystery. There seems to be no such work in the collection of the current Duke of Norfolk (heir to the Arundel family), and the family archives do not indicate its sale, nor was it part of the 1720 Stafford auction,²¹ nor of the 1839 purchases by the Duke of Newcastle. The drawing might have been part of the Earl's possessions that were confiscated by Parliament during the Civil War, or it might have taken another hereditary route within the family (it was, for example, Lord Stafford who inherited the 1643 watercolour by Fruytiers, Pl 2). But an interesting detail was noticed by Vertue: Fruytiers never went to England, so he must have worked from a verbal description for his sketch (which would explain the differences in design), or maybe Van Dyck's Plate 1 drawing was in Holland in 1643 – possibly brought by the Earl in 1641. It could also be that the Earl never took possession of the sketch: it could have remained with Van Dyck, who died in England in 1641 with a wife and an illegitimate daughter,²² and he could have shown or given the sketch to anyone during one of his many journeys in Continental Europe (for example, to Fruytiers, as both of them had been pupils of Rubens). With all these possible peregrinations of Van Dyck's drawing, it is no surprise that this unpublished sketch finally surfaces in a small Parisian auction.



11 *Thomas Howard* by Antony van Dyck, 1635. Black chalk with white on blue paper, 48.4 x 35.6 cm. British Museum

12 *Lord and Lady Arundel: the Madagascar portrait* by Antony van Dyck, 1639. Oil on canvas, 139.7 x 212.7 cm. Arundel Castle, Arundel. Photo: Bridgeman Library

13 *Family portrait (a family on the terrace of their house)* by Gonzales Coques (1614–1684), early 1640s. Oil on canvas, 67 x 90 cm. Staatliche Kunstsammlungen, Dresden



John Rowlands commented on the British Museum group-drawing (Pl 6): ‘Turning to the question of the attribution to Van Dyck’s own hand, we are faced with a singular lack of drawings from his English period with which any fruitful comparison can be made, but we find support for the attribution if we examine Van Dyck’s sketches on panel executed in sepia and white’. But, if not Van Dyck, who is the author of the new Plate 1 drawing? In private communications with the author on the basis of poor photographs, Edward Chaney, David Howarth, Nicolas Schwed and Jeremy Wood have rejected an attribution of the unpublished drawing to Van Dyck, and consider this and the one in Antwerp (Pl 5) both to be contemporary copies in another hand of a lost work. Christopher Brown kindly examined the drawing in 2010, and also contested a possible attribution to the master. But certain details can be used in favour of an attribution to Van Dyck, such as the roughly sketched hand of the Countess which resembles in its length those often found in his portraits.²³ Most telling of all, if this is not an autograph Van Dyck, is it not rather strange to have two seventeenth-century copies of such a sketchy piece – and for the original not to have survived?

Van Dyck was an exceptional draughtsman and Bellori noted: ‘Rubens, liking his good manners of the young man and his grace in drawing, considered himself very fortunate

to have found so apt a pupil, who knew how to translate his compositions into drawings from which they could be engraved’. Even after he became a celebrated painter, drawings were often Van Dyck’s best creations, which has led Elizabeth Tarnove to write: ‘production during the England period marked the high point on his career ... He again set up a picture factory, where more and more work was delegated to assistants ... Since a majority of Van Dyck’s paintings were produced in a picture factory – where assistants enlarged the artist’s original sketches to fit the canvas and painted all but the final touches – it is through his drawings alone that we can truly appraise his talent’.²⁴ The discovery of a new drawing by Van Dyck is therefore a matter of some importance. Moreover it must be noted that, to quote Oliver Millar, ‘Van Dyck’s greatness as an artist, as well as a portrait painter, [is] most clearly seen in his double portraits and family groups’.²⁵

Whose portrait could be more interesting than that of Arundel, the sponsor who ‘had introduced Van Dyck into the king’s favour and had been instrumental in bringing him to England’²⁶ after meeting him in Rubens’ studio during the painting of the Countess’s portrait? One of only three Van Dyck paintings done during his first English period (1620–1621) is a portrait of the Earl.²⁷ The court of the Countess in Venice was the first that Van Dyck visited when he arrived in Italy at the end of summer 1622, and he stayed with her until March 1623. And finally, the Earl and his family are amongst Van Dyck’s most recurrent subjects during his second English period (1635–1641). If it had been painted, Arundel’s family portrait would certainly have been one of Van Dyck’s most accomplished works. This newly discovered drawing brings us as close as we can get to the non-existent masterpiece of the *Arundel Great Peece*.

Appendix I

Catalogue of works relating to the 'Arundel Great Peece'

Pl 1 Anthony van Dyck (1599–1641), or contemporary follower, *Lord Arundel and his family*, probably 1635–1636, ink and wash drawing, inscribed 'A Vandyck', 197 x 282 mm

Provenance: ...; possibly collection of John Perceval first Lord Egmond (1683–1748); ...; auction (Paris, Renaud auctioneer, De Bayser expert, 3 May 2001, lot 82, described as 'Ecole du Nord du XVIIe siècle'); private collection (London)

Note: The Van Dyck (?) sketch seen by George Vertue in 1740 in the collection of John Perceval first Lord Egmond (1683–1748) is not part of the 'Egmond Albums' (now at the Yale University Art Gallery). Most of the collections of Lord Egmond probably remained in the family until the fifth Earl, Henry Perceval (1796–1841). But it is not the sixth Earl, George James Percival (1794–1874), who inherited his properties, but his godson's father instead, Sir Edward Tierney (1780–1856), who in turn left them to his son-in-law Rev. Sir Lionel Darrel. A legal fight ensued, which ended in 1863 with the sixth Earl paying £125,000 to Sir Darrel against the recovery of the family inheritance, which then went to his nephew, Charles George (1845–1897). It is so far a mystery when this sketch left the family property.

Pl 2 Philip Fruytiers (1610–1666), *Lord Arundel and his family*, 1643, watercolour, 398 x 628 mm

Provenance: collection of William Howard, Baron Stafford (1718–1749), by descent (according to: John Rowlands, 'Sketch for a family group by Van Dyck', *Master Drawings*, vol 8.2 (1970), p164).

Bibliography: National Portraits, 1866 exhibition, no. 712; Paul Ganz, *Hans Holbein: die Gemälde*, Cologne 1949, p237; Paul Ganz, *The Paintings of Hans Holbein*, London 1950, p252, fig. 31; Royal Academy of Arts, *British Portraits*, Winter Exhibition, 1956–1957, second ed., p172, no. 551; Horst Vey, *Die Zeichnungen Anton van Dycks*, Brussels 1962, pp295–296n; Oliver Millar, *The Age of Charles I*, London 1972, p86, no. 134; Oliver Millar, *Van Dyck in England*, National Portrait Gallery, London 1982, p110n; Nicholas Penny, *Patronage and collecting in the seventeenth century: Thomas Howard, Earl of Arundel*, Oxford 1985, p20n; Christopher Brown, *The Drawings of Anthony van Dyck*, New York & London 1991, p258n; Susan Barnes & Nora De Poorter & Oliver Millar & Horst Vey, *Van Dyck, A Complete Catalogue of the Paintings*, New Haven & London 2004, p437.

Archives: George Vertue (1684–1756), *Note books IV*, Walpole Society, vol 24 (1936), p62. Fol 52v, v. 88: '[...] <a.g. 67> Earl of Arundell. Family. a large limning. [Outline of an empty square, presumably indicating the approximate dimensions of the work in Vertue's original notebook] setting under a Canopy Thomas Earl of Arundel. his Lady Alatheia. setting by him on his right hand by her stands their daughter. Lady Catherin Howard – & 5 Sons. before them the Eldest ... presents the sword to his father. 2d the helmet. <I Henry 2 William> 3. gauntlets 4th. an Antique shield 5t or youngest. a dwarf woman. <this limning done at Amtwerp. this Earl & his Lady and Family went over. Sepbr. 1641 See Letters to Oliver pub by Nicholls 1743> above hangs up a picture Earl of Surry. æta 25. & Tho. Duke of Norfolk æta 66 Temp. H. 8. Ph. Fruytieres fecit 1643. – the Earl & his Lady after Vandyke. others from the Life. the whole neatly limnd and well

drawn (done at Antwerp I suppose) Sr. William Howard <2d Son.> Kt. of the Bath. first created Lord Stafford. at Stafford House St. James's [...]'.

George Vertue (1684–1756), *Note books IV*, Walpole Society, vol 24 (1936), p171. Fol 58r, v. 102, May 1740: 'Orderd by his Grace the Duke of Norfolk to go to Stafford house near the Park. for the Family picture Thomas Earl of Arundell his Lady & children all in one piece – a most curious noble limning. being 22 Inches by 16. square. done first from the design of Sr. Ant Vandyke. and limned most rarely by the curious hands of a famous Mastr at Antwerp. a scholar of Rubens Fruytiers. Ano D. 1643. Van Dyke delin it represents this Noble Earl & his Lady setting together under a State Canopy their Armes embroidered thereon by them stands in blew the Lady Katherin Howard their Grand daughter. before him is represented their five sons of them, the Eldest formost presenting an antient Sword to the Earl his Father the next son presents an helmet another son the gauntlets, the fourth an antique shield painted shield the youngest son in a greenish habit pointing to the shild after or behind them, is a little woman – dwarf standing – playing with a little dog – against the wall is seen hanging the pictures of Hen. Earl of Surry. <that was beheaded in K Hen. 8> and near to on the Wall is also the pictur at ½ length. of Thom. Howard Duke of Norfolk Earl Marshall &c the father of the Earl of Surrey in King Hen. 8. time these two from paintings by H. Holben æta. Earl Surrey 25. the Duke. æt. 66. not yet. Kt. of ye Garter – upon the Ground of the picture adorn'd with Architecture of the Dorick order a prospect of a Landskape upon that is the Horse the Lyon & the hound. alternately. the emblems of that noble family the motto. concordia cum candore. This Limning I have some reason to think it was done in Flanders because the painter of it did live and reside there. I never heard that he was in England. and the date on this peice 1643. agrees with the time that Noble Lord & Lady retired there. from England to avoid the trouble of those times. <I find in Letters to Ol. Cromwell pub. by T. Nicholls 1743 Alatheia Countess of Arundell petition to the State & Oliver Cromwell concerning her Estates being 2000 p Añ. being seized on she desires to be reliev'd and says that she & the Earl of Arundel went from England in Septbr. 1641 from Amsterdam. dated 1650> This curious family peice I am to Engrave done of the same dimensions for his Grace the Duke of Norfolk at his expence there is just such another Family piece of this Earl of Arundell a Coppy from this the same magnitude done in oyl Colours belongs to the Duke of Norfolk and is at his house in St. James Square – another Family peice of the Norfolk Family that Duke that liv'd in K. Charles ye 2ds Time done in small in poses of the Lady Betty Germain at her house in Northampton shire. as she told me her self Lady Germain'.

Pl 3 Philip Fruytiers (1610–1666), *Lord Arundel and his family*, after 1643, oil on copper, 408 x 559 mm

Provenance: by descent (Arundel Castle)

Bibliography: Nicholas Penny, *Patronage and collecting in the seventeenth century: Thomas Howard, Earl of Arundel*, Oxford 1985, p202, no. 11; Arthur Wheelock & Susan Barnes & Julius Held, *Anthony van Dyck*, New York 1991, p292n; John Martin Robinson, *The Dukes of Norfolk*, Chichester 1995, p115; Christopher White, *Anthony Van Dyck: Thomas Howard, The Earl of Arundel*, J Paul Getty

Museum 1996, p4, fig. 4; Susan Barnes & Nora De Poorter & Oliver Millar & Horst Vey, *Van Dyck, A Complete Catalogue of the Paintings*, New Haven & London 2004, p437.

Archives: George Vertue (1684–1756), Note books IV, Walpole Society, vol 24 (1936), pp166–167. Fol 55r, v. 96: '[...] a picture in Water Colours. representing Tho. Earl of Arundell and his Lady setting their Grand Daughter standing by them his sons coming to him. the eldest presenting the sword. (of K of Scotland won at the battle of flodden field) & now in the heralds office Lond (as is said) the second son presenting the helmet the third the gauntlets. and the youngest the antique shield after them stands a little old woman a dwarf there is above hanging on the Wall. 2 portraits in frames. one the Thomas Duke of Norfolk temp H. 8 and 2d his son Earl of Surry. in all 9 persons and two portraits — height of the limning. 16 Inches over 22 Inches in a Gold frame & glass over it this present Duke proposed to have it Engraved <done by GV. > [...]'].

George Vertue (1684–1756), *Note books II*, Walpole Society 1932, vol 20, page 66. Folio 58 verso, v. 67b: 'At the Duke of Norfolks house St. James's Square a large picture. Earl of Arundel setting in his Gallery. Van Somer a Coppy. Lacy the Comedian. M. Wright. Duk Norfolk ½ len VD a Small family peice Earl of Arundell & family a Coppy in oil from a large picture by VD said to be at Stafford house. <a small picture. Family piece in Water Colours by Fruytiers (see) a.q> [...]'].

George Vertue (1684–1756), *Note books I*, Walpole Society, vol 18 (1930), p7. Fol 88r, v. 15, May 1743: '[...] about the same time I became known to his Grace the Duke of Norfolk. who imployed me to Engrave the large plate of the Arundell Family – from a design & limning first Vandyke & Frruitieres both Scholars of Rubens – for this large plate being done to his great Satisfaction I was generously paid – [...] of some other works the collection of Hollars prints 2 Volumn, folio – for his Grace the Duke of Norfolk – and that Collection of Drawings of the portraits Monuments pedigree of the Howard Family from the first Duke of Norfolk to the present in Numbers of Drawings in Water Colours &c. from paintings limnings pictures in print &c. all digested regularly in one fine bound Volumn in folio – for which, it being some year collecting & before completed, his Grace gratified me with a bill of a hundred guineas – this to remain in his Grace Family – hereafter [...]'].

Pl 4 George Vertue (1684–1756), *Lord Pembroke (Arundel) and his family*, 1743 (notebook f. 67v), ink on paper

Provenance: George Vertue (1684–1756); inherited by his widow who sold them for £100 on 22 August 1758; collection of Horace Walpole (1717–1797); bequeathed to Anne Seymour Damer (1748–1828); transferred to the Anne King Dowager Duchess of Waldegrave; inherited by George Edward seventh Earl Waldegrave (1816–1846); 'Strawberry Hill' auction (25 April – 23 June 1842, lot 1110, sold £26); collection of Thomas Rodd (1796–1849); inventory of Thomas Thorpe until at least 1848; collection of Dawson Turner (1775–1858); auction (6 June 1859 and following days, Puttick & Simpson, lot 517); British Museum (Add. Ms. 23072)

Pl 5 Seventeenth-century follower of Anthony van Dyck (1599–1641), *Lord Arundel and his family*, 1635 or later, ink and wash drawing, 200 x 311 mm

Provenance: ...; collection of Charles Jervas (c1675–1739); auction (24 March 1740 and foll. days); collection of Henry Herbert ninth Earl of Pembroke (1693–1749/50); by descent; auction (Sotheby's, London, 5–10 June 1917, lot 359, described as 'sketch of King, queen, children and courtiers'); collection of Charles Fairfax-Murray (1849–1919); ...; Stedelijk Prentenkabinet Antwerp (inv. 563, cat. D.IX.22)

Bibliography: Horst Vey, *Die Zeichnungen Anton van Dycks*, Brussels 1962, p296n; John Rowlands, 'Sketch for a family group by Van Dyck', *Master Drawings*, vol 8.2 (1970), p163, fig. 2; Christopher Brown, *The Drawings of Anthony van Dyck*, New York & London 1991, p258, fig. 4.

Pl 6 Circle of Anthony van Dyck (1599–1641), *Lord Arundel and his family*, 1635 or later, wash on black chalk, 241 x 333 mm

Provenance: ...; collection of D. Kaieman (Brussels); auction (Paris, 26 April – 1st May 1858, Blaisot & Delbergue, maybe lot 639); ...; collection of Jean-François Gigoux (1806–1894); auction (Paris, 20–23 March 1882, Delestre, lot 292); ...; British Museum (inv. 1969-6-14-8)

Bibliography: John Rowlands, 'Sketch for a family group by Van Dyck', *Master Drawings*, vol 8.2 (1970), pl. 52; Christopher Brown, *The Drawings of Anthony van Dyck*, New York & London 1991, p258, n11: 'The drawing in the British Museum published by Rowlands is not, in my view, by Van Dyck'.

Pl 7 Anthony van Dyck (1599–1641), *Philip Herbert fourth Earl of Pembroke (1584–1650) and his family*, 1633/34, oil on canvas, 3300 x 5100 mm

Provenance: Philip Herbert fourth Earl of Pembroke (1584–1650); Wilton House (by descent)

Bibliography: John Smith, *Catalogue raisonné of the most eminent Dutch, Flemish and French Painters*, London 1829–1842, no. 516; Gustav Friedrich Waagen, *Treasures of art in Great Britain*, London 1854, vol 3, p153; Jules Guiffrey, *Antoine van Dyck: sa vie et son oeuvre*, Paris 1882, no. 747; Horace Walpole, *Anecdotes of Painting in England*, London 1888, vol 1, pp325–326; Lionel Cust, *Anthony Van Dyck. An historical Study of his life and works*, London 1900, p280; Emil Schaeffer, *Van Dyck: des Meisters Gemälde*, Stuttgart & Leipzig 1909, p393; *De Reizender De La Corte 1641. 1700. 1710*, Leiden 1928, p100; Gustav Glück, *Van Dyck, des Meisters Gemälde*, Stuttgart & Berlin, 1931 p405; Christopher Brown, *Van Dyck*, Oxford 1982, pp197–201; Oliver Millar, *Van Dyck in England*, National Portrait Gallery, London 1982, p28, fig. 31; Mark Roskill, 'Van Dyck at the English Court: The Relations of Portraiture and Allegory', *Critical Inquiry*, vol 14.1 (autumn 1987), p176, fig. 1; Erik Larsen, *The Painting of Anthony Van Dyck*, Freren 1988, no. 941; Christopher Brown, 'Van Dyck's Pembroke Family Portrait', in Arthur Wheelock & Susan Barnes & Julius Held, *Anthony van Dyck*, New York 1991, pp37–44; Alfred Moir, *Anthony van Dyck*, London 1994, p114; David Howarth, *Images of Rule. Art and politics in the English Renaissance 1485–1659*, London 1997, pp226–228; Emilie Gordenker, *Anthony van Dyck and the Representation of Dress in seventeenth-century Portraiture*, Turnhout 2001, pp65–66; Susan Barnes & Nora De Poorter & Oliver Millar & Horst Vey, *Van Dyck, A Complete Catalogue of the Paintings*, New Haven & London 2004, pp572–573, no. IV1184; Alexis Merle du Bourg, *Antoon van Dyck, Portraits*, Paris 2008, p28, fig. 10; Karen Hearn, *Van Dyck and Britain*, London 2009, p108, fig. 32.

Pl 8 Anthony van Dyck (1599–1641), *Count John of Nassau-Siegen and his family*, 1634, oil on canvas, 2925 x 2650 mm
Provenance: ...; collection of Cornelis Wittert van Valkenburg (1672–1733); auction (Rotterdam, 11 April 1731 & 7 October 1733); ...; collection of Gerard Bicker van Zwieten (1687–1753); auction (The Hague, 12 April 1741); ...; collection of Willem Maurits van Nassau-Ouwerkerk/ d'Auverquerque/ Overkirk (1679–1753); collection of his granddaughter Henrietta van Nassau-Ouwerkerk (1712–1747) wife of William Claving second Earl Cowper (1709–1764); by descent collection of Ethel Anne Priscilla Fane (1867–1952) wife of William Henry Grenfell, first Baron Desborough (1855–1945); collection of her son-in-law Henry Rainald Gage sixth Viscount Gage (1895–1982)

Bibliography: John Smith, *Catalogue raisonné of the most eminent Dutch, Flemish and French Painters*, London 1829–1842, no. 292; Gustav Friedrich Waagen, *Treasures of art in Great Britain*, London 1854, vol. 3, pp16–17; *Art Treasures of Great Britain*, Manchester 1857, no. 615; Jules Guiffrey, *Antoine van Dyck: sa vie et son oeuvre*, Paris 1882, p272, no. 715; Mary Louisa Boyle, *Biographical catalogue of the portraits at Pansbanger*, London 1885, pp153–155; Lionel Cust, *Anthony Van Dyck. An historical Study of his life and works*, London 1900, pp92 & 258, no. 90; Gustav Glück, *Van Dyck, des Meisters Gemälde*, Stuttgart & Berlin 1931, p567, no. 428n; Horst Vey, *Die Zeichnungen Anton van Dycks*, Brussels, 1962, nos 199–200; F W van den Berg, 'Betrachtungen über ein Gemälde', *Siegerland*, vol 51 (1974), pp149–157; Christopher Brown, *Van Dyck*, Oxford 1982, pp153 & 157; Oliver Millar, *Van Dyck in England*, National Portrait Gallery, London 1982, p33, fig. 34; Christopher Brown, *The Drawings of Anthony van Dyck*, New York & London 1991, p242, fig. 1; Christopher Brown, 'Van Dyck's Pembroke Family Portrait', in Arthur Wheelock & Susan Barnes & Julius Held, *Anthony van Dyck*, New York 1991, p38, fig. 3; Erik Larsen, *The Painting of Anthony Van Dyck*, Freren 1988, no. 915; Christopher Brown & Hans Vlieghe, *Van Dyck 1599–1641*, London–Antwerp 1999, French edition, pp268–269, no. 76; Susan Barnes & Nora De Poorter & Oliver Millar & Horst Vey, *Van Dyck, A Complete Catalogue of the Paintings*, New Haven & London 2004, pp336–338, no. III.111.

Pl 9 Circle of Anthony Van Dyck (1599–1641), *Lord Arundel (or Pembroke) and his family*, c1631/32?, sepia drawing on brown paper, 163 x 232 mm

Provenance: ...; collection of Mrs W. Knox-Johnson; donated to the British Museum (inv. 1926.0714.1)

Bibliography: Paul Oppé, 'Sir Anthony van Dyck in England', *Burlington Magazine*, vol 79 (1941), pl. II.D; Christopher White, 'Van Dyck drawings and sketches', *Burlington Magazine*, vol 102 (December 1960), pp510–514; Horst Vey, *Die Zeichnungen Anton van Dycks*, Brussels 1962, p296n; John Rowlands, 'Sketch for a family group by Van Dyck', *Master Drawings*, vol 8.2 (1970), p164, fig. 3; Oliver Millar, *Van Dyck in England*, National Portrait Gallery, 1982, p110n; Christopher Brown & Hans Vlieghe, *Van Dyck 1599–1641*, London–Antwerp 1999, French edition, p83, fig. 62.

Pl 10 Anthony van Dyck (1599–1641), *Portrait of Lord Arundel with his grandson Lord Maltravers*, 1635/36 (before 5 September 1636), oil on canvas, 1448 x 1219 mm

Provenance: collection of the sitter; inherited by his wife; then collection of his son William Howard first Viscount Stafford (1614–1680); collection of the Earls of Stafford by descent; acquired by Edward Howard ninth Duke of Norfolk (1685–1777), collection of the Dukes of Norfolk by descent

Bibliography: 3 January 1655 inventory of Lady Arundel's bequest (no. 561: 'Van Dick, ritratto del sigr conte d'Arondell con suo nipote'); John Smith, *Catalogue raisonné of the most eminent Dutch, Flemish and French Painters*, London 1829–1842, vol 3, pp183–184, no. 629; Jules Guiffrey, *Antoine van Dyck: sa vie et son oeuvre*, Paris 1882, no. 356; Lionel Cust, *Anthony Van Dyck. An historical Study of his life and works*, London 1900, pp131–132, p268, no. 3; Emil Schaeffer, *Van Dyck: des Meisters Gemälde*, Stuttgart & Leipzig 1909, p355; Mary Cox, 'Inventory of the Arundel Collection', *Burlington Magazine*, vol 19.102 (September 1911), p323; Mary Hervey, *The life, correspondence and collections of Thomas Howard, Earl of Arundel*, Cambridge 1921, pp353–355, p391; Gustav Glück, *Van Dyck, des Meisters Gemälde*, Stuttgart & Berlin 1931, p473; F H C Weijens, *De Arundel-Collectie. Commencement de la fin, Amersfoort 1655*, Utrecht 1971, p31, no. 561, pl. V; Christopher Brown, *Van Dyck*, Oxford 1982, p208; Oliver Millar, *Van Dyck in England*, National Portrait Gallery, London 1982, pp64–65, no. 21; David Howarth, *Lord Arundel and his circle*, New Haven & London 1985, pp161–164; Nicholas Penny, *Patronage and collecting in the seventeenth century: Thomas Howard, Earl of Arundel*, Oxford 1985, pp16–17, no. 6; Michael Wiemers, 'Die Seele im Bildniss: Anmerkungen zu einem englischen Porträtgedicht des 17. Jahrhunderts', *Wallraf-Richartz-Jahrbuch*, vols 48–49 (1987–1988), pp261–262; Erik Larsen, *The Painting of Anthony Van Dyck*, Freren 1988, p303, no. 763; Christopher Brown, *The Drawings of Anthony van Dyck*, New York & London 1991, p256, fig. 3; Arthur Wheelock & Susan Barnes & Julius Held, *Anthony van Dyck*, New York 1991, pp291–292, no. 76; John Martin Robinson, *The Dukes of Norfolk*, Chichester 1995, p114; Christopher White, *Anthony Van Dyck: Thomas Howard, The Earl of Arundel*, J Paul Getty Museum 1996, p73, fig. 51; Christopher Brown & Hans Vlieghe, *Van Dyck 1599–1641*, London–Antwerp 1999, French edition, pp300–303, no. 89; Susan Barnes & Nora De Poorter & Oliver Millar & Horst Vey, *Van Dyck, A Complete Catalogue of the Paintings*, New Haven & London 2004, p436, no. IV.9; Karen Hearn, *Van Dyck and Britain*, London 2009, pp100–101, no. 38.

Note: The Duveen Brothers records, 1876–1981 (Research Library, Getty Research Institute, bulk 1909–1964, accession number 960015, series II.A, box 240-2, folder 2 'Van Dyck: Earl of Arundel, Norfolk') preserves a group of 1921–1925 documents relating to the failed attempt to convince the Duchess of Norfolk to sell her painting. It remained unsuccessful, as 'unfortunately the Estate have to find such an enormous sum of money that twenty, or even thirty, thousand would mean nothing to them' (24 April 1924). This may follow the death of the fifteenth Duke, Henry Fitzalan-Howard (1847–1917), in which case the widow-Duchess would be Lady Gwendolen Mary Constable-Maxwell (1877–1945).

Copies: Several copies are known, and many partial ones too. Oil on canvas, 187 x 162 cm, in the Prado Museum since 1926. Oil on canvas, Christie's (London, 27 November

1959, lot 109). Oil on canvas, Christie's (New York, 11 January 1979, lot 148). Oil on canvas, Christie's (London, 14 October 1988, lot 181). Oil on canvas, Weston Park. Oil on canvas, 241.25 x 138.75 cm, MET (inv. 10.58.5), gift of George A. Harn in 1909, from the coll. of Sir Henry Bedingfield. Oil on canvas, formerly in the MET, de-accessioned at Sotheby's (New York, 28 November 1978, lot 154). Oil on canvas, formerly in the collection of Lord Chancellor Clarendon (The Grove Watford). Oil on canvas, formerly in Newstead Abbey.

Pl 11 Anthony van Dyck (1599–1641), *Thomas Howard*, 1635, black chalk studies heightened with white, on blue paper, inscribed 'A. V. Dyck', 484 x 356 mm

Provenance: ... ; collection of Sir Uvedale Price (1747–1829); his estate ; auction (London, Sotheby's, 3–4 May 1854, lot 284, sold £14.14.0); inventory of Walter Benjamin Tiffin (1795–1877); British Museum (inv. 1854.0513.16)

Bibliography: Roger d'Hulst & Horst Vey, *Antoon van Dyck: Tekeningen en olieverfschetsen*, Antwerp 1960, no. 112; Horst Vey, *Die Zeichnungen Anton van Dycks*, Brussels 1962, no. 225; Oliver Millar, *The Age of Charles I*, London 1972, p82, no. 117; Oliver Millar, *Van Dyck in England*, National Portrait Gallery, London 1982, pp110–111, no. 77; Nicholas Penny, *Patronage and collecting in the seventeenth century: Thomas Howard, Earl of Arundel*, Oxford 1985, p20, no. 10; Lindsay Stainton & Christopher White, *Drawing in England from Hilliard to Hogarth*, London 1987, p84, no. 45; Michael Jaffé, 'Review', *Burlington Magazine*, vol 131-2 (1991), p344, no. 81; Christopher Brown, *The Drawings of Anthony van Dyck*, New York & London 1991, pp256–258, no. 81; Karen Hearn, *Van Dyck and Britain*, London 2009, p159, no. 79.

Pl 12 Anthony van Dyck (1599–1641), *The Madagascar portrait: the Earl and countess of Arundel*, 1639, oil on canvas, 1397 x 2127 mm

Provenance: collection of the sitters; collection of the Dukes of Norfolk by descent

Bibliography: Giovanni Pietro Bellori, *Le vite de' pittori, scultori ed architetti moderni*, Rome 1672 (reprinted Rome 1931), p260; John Smith, *Catalogue raisonné of the most eminent Dutch, Flemish and French Painters*, London 1829–1842, no. 627; Gustav Friedrich Waagen, *Treasures of art in Great Britain*, London 1854, vol. 3, p30; Jules Guiffrey, *Antoine van Dyck: sa vie et son oeuvre*, Paris 1882, no. 352; Lionel Cust, *Anthony Van Dyck. An historical Study of his life and works*, London 1900, p268; Mary Hervey, *The life, correspondence and collections of Thomas Howard, Earl of Arundel*, Cambridge 1921, pp418–419; Horace Walpole, 'Journals of Visits to Country Seats, etc.', *Walpole Society*, vol. 16 (1928), p66; Gustav Glück, *Van Dyck, des Meisters Gemälde*, Stuttgart & Berlin 1931, p573; Oliver Millar, *Van Dyck in England*, National Portrait Gallery, London 1982, p99, no. 59; David Howarth, *Lord Arundel and his circle*, New Haven & London 1985, pp168–170; Nicholas Penny, *Patronage and collecting in the seventeenth century: Thomas Howard, Earl of Arundel*, Oxford 1985, p19, no. 9; Erik Larsen, *The Painting of Anthony Van Dyck*, Freren 1988, p302, no. 761; Kevin Sharpe, *The Personal Rule of Charles I*, New Haven & London 1992, p224; Alfred Moir, *Anthony van Dyck*, London 1994, p118; Graham Parry, 'Van Dyck and the Caroline Court Poets', *Van Dyck 350*, Studies in the History of Art 46, Hanover & London 1994, pp253–255;

Christopher White, *Anthony Van Dyck: Thomas Howard, The Earl of Arundel*, J Paul Getty Museum, 1996, p73, fig. 52; Zirka Filipczak, 'Van Dyck's Men and Women in Humoral Perspective', *Jaarboek Koninklijk Museum voor Schone Kunsten Antwerpen*, Antwerp 1999, pp64–67; Susan Barnes & Nora De Poorter & Oliver Millar & Horst Vey, *Van Dyck, A Complete Catalogue of the Paintings*, New Haven & London 2004, p437, no. IV.10.

Copies: Several copies are known. Oil on canvas, 124x202 cm, Vienna, Kunsthistorisches Museum (inv. 6404), from the Imperial Coll., formerly in Schloss Laxenburg. Oil on canvas, Knoke (inv. 203) in the collection of Lord Sackville. Oil on canvas, Swynnerton. Oil on canvas, Christie's (London, 11 Oct. 1957, lot 31). Oil on canvas, Sotheby's (London, 3 Feb. 1971, lot 91). The countess's head only, oil on canvas, Arundel Castle. Early copies were known: e.g. the one sold in 1825 (as by Van Dyck, anonymous London auction-house, lot 52), and the one sold in 1827 and again in 1835 (Thomas & Horatio Rodd, London, canvas 7'2" x 4'5", bought for £35.0 each time).

Pl 13

Gonzales Coques (1614–1684), a.k.a. 'the little van Dyck', *Familienbildniss (Eine Familie auf der Terrasse ihres Hauses)*, early 1640's, oil on canvas, 67 x 90 cm

Provenance: ... ; Staatliche Kunstsammlungen Dresden (inv. 1067)

Bibliography: Eduard Plietzsch, *Holländische und flämische Maler des 17. Jahrhunderts*, Leipzig 1960, fig. 373; Marion Liskén-Pruss, *Studien zum Œuvre des Gonzales Coques (1614/18-1684)*, PhD diss, Bonn 2002, pp217–221, p352, no. 6.

Appendix 2

Georg Swarzenski, *Van Dyck's Bildnis des Earl of Arundel*, Frankfurt 1923, a manuscript on Van Dyck's *Portrait of the Earl of Arundel*

The owner of the unpublished drawing of *The Earl of Arundel and his family*, also discovered and purchased from a book-dealer in Rockville, MD in January 2006 a manuscript article of 20 folio-pages, signed 'Frankfurt a. M. / Dr. G. Swarzenski / September 1923'. It relates to the painted portrait of Thomas Howard now in the J.P. Getty Museum.²⁸

What happened to the painting after having been inherited in 1892 by the fourth Duke of Sutherland remains a mystery (it is not in his 1913 sale). But Swarzenski's 1923 essay informs us that the painting went from the collection of Fritz von Gans (i.e. Friedrich Ludwig von Gans, 1833–1920, Frankfurt) to the inventory of Kurt Walter Bachstitz (1882–1949, gallery in Berlin/The Hague/New York after 1920), and then to an American collection. Daniel Guggenheim (New York) only acquired it in 1929, so there remains an unknown step in the painting's journey. Gans' art collection was sold in 1918 according to a document in the Mannheim city archives.²⁹ Why Swarzenski would write such an essay in 1923 is a mystery, and it does not seem to have ever been published until now.³⁰

Georg Swarzenski (1876–1957),³¹ a Doctor of Jurisprudence and a Doctor in Art History, a student of Adolph Goldschmidt and Henry Thode, first worked at the Berlin Museums and at the Kunsthistorischen Institut (Florence). Aged 30, he was appointed director of the Städtisches Kunstinstitut (Frankfurt), which grew very much

under his influence, some purchases such as Van Gogh's *Portrait of Dr. Gachet* being personally financed by him. His portrait c1921 by Max Beckmann (1884–1950), in black crayon and traces of graphite on yellow prepared paper, is kept at the Ackland Art Museum;³² Beckman would paint in 1923 a double-portrait of Swarzenski's wife and mistress. In 1928 he became director of all museums in Frankfurt. But his involvement with 'degenerate art' led him to resign in 1937, and to flee to the United States where he lectured at Princeton before being hired by the Museum of Fine Arts (Boston). He retired in 1956, and was succeeded by his son Hanns Swarzenski (1903–1985).³³

Georg Swarzenski, 'Van Dyck's Bildnis des Earl of Arundel', Frankfurt 1923

Gegen die Kunst der grossen alten Meister ist man hart kritischer als früher. Während man die kleinen und mittleren Künstler gern mit einem gewissen Wohlwollen betrachtet, ist man gegen die manschen Berühmtheiten der Vergangenheit skeptisch. Es ist nur natürlich, dass je grösser der Rahm und Ruf eines Künstlers ist, desto höher auch die Ansprüche gespannt sind, sobald sein Name vor einem Werke genannt wird. Man fragt sich, ob sein Rahm gerechtfertigt ist, ob nicht ein Teil seines Renommées auf Rechnung äusserer Mittel und frühlicher Umstimmte zu setzen ist; man prüft, ob und in wie weit die Mode des Geschmacks, die Konvention traditioneller Schätzung am Glanze seines Namens Anteil haben.

Entspricht aber der Ruf eines Meisters tatsächlich der Grösse seiner künstlerischen Leistung und der Bedeutung seiner historischen Stellung, dann steigern sich die Ansprüche vor dem einzelnen Werk aufs höchste. Es handelt sich da nicht nur um das Mistrauen und die Vorsicht, die gerade gegenüber den Werken der anerkannten Grossmeister sich einstellen, da man weiss, dass zweifelhafte und unechte Werke schon seit alterster besonders gern gerade auf die klangvollsten Namen gefasste worden, — sondern es ist der andersartige und höhere Standpunkt, dem man vor dem Werk der grössten Künstler unwillkürlich einnimmt: Vor dem Bild eines kleinen oder mittleren Meisters freut man sich, wenn es dem Typus und Charakter der Zeit in treffender oder einmatiger Weise zum Ausdruck bringt, — vor dem Bild eines grossen Meisters ist man enttäuscht, wenn es nicht die höchste Vorstellung, die wir von seinem Genie haben, voll und ganz bestätigt oder sogar bereichert und vertieft. Zum mindesten fragt man sich, ob nicht ein Teil seiner Wirkung nur auf der Suggestion des klangvollen Namens beruht!

Die Qualität eines wirklichen "Meister-Werks" in diesem Sinne beruht weder auf der Grösse des Formats, noch dem subjektiven Reiz der Erfindung, noch auf dem sinnlichen Glanz der Erscheinung, sondern ausschliesslich auf der schöpferischen Kraft der Darstellung, auf seinem rein künstlerischen Gehalt. Ein Meisterwerk in dieser hohen Bedeutung des Wortes ist van Dyck's Bildnis der Herzogs von Arundel, welches aus der Sammlung Fritz von Gans in Frankfurt a. M. in die Galerie Bachstitz kam und zum eine amerikanische Sammlung zierte. Es ist nicht nur das sichere Werk eines Meisters, dessen Ruf durch die Jahrhunderte hindurch trotz allem Wechsel des Urteils und Geschmacks sich gehalten und immer wieder bewährt hat, sondern es zeigt zugleich eine künstlerische Kraft, die man als solche höchsten Ranges empfinden würde, auch wenn man nichts wüsste von den Meister, der es geschaffen hat.

Die Kunstgeschichtliche Stellung van Dycks ist durch sein Verhältnis zu Rubens festgelegt. Obwohl er die erste Lehre bei einem anderen, geringeren Künstler erhielt, ist er Schüler des Rubens und dann sein langjähriger Gehilfe und

Mitarbeiter. Die Einwirkung des älteren Meisters auf den jungen, frühreifen Künstler, der schon mit 19 Jahren Meister der Antwerpener Malergilde wurde, ist entscheidend, und die übermächtige Schaffens- und Lebenskraft des Rubens erklärt es, dass van Dyck oft nur als sein jüngerer Gefolgsmann erscheint. Tatsächlich sind manche seiner Frühwerke von denen des Meisters kaum zu unterscheiden. Trotzdem ist die Kunst van Dyck's keineswegs nur als Nüance oder Ableger von Rubens' Malerei aufzufassen, sondern sehr bald hebt sich ihr selbständiger Character in voller Eigenart von dem mächtigen Komplex des Kunst des älteren Meisters und seinen grössten Ateliers ab. —

In beiden Künstlern treten uns zwei grundverschiedene Naturen entgegen. Wohl bietet die Aussenseite ihres Erdendaseins manches Gemeinsame: Die Gesicherte, weltmännische Existenz, die Gewandtheit des Auftretens, der Verkehr mit der Aristokratie des Blutes und des Geistes, die fürstliche Lebenshaltung. Auch die Leichtigkeit des Schaffens, der Umfang der Produktion, die Raschheit und Grösse des Erfolges ist beiden Meistern gemeinsam. Vergleichbar ist schliesslich die internationale Verankerung ihrer Malerei, — die kosmopolitische Breite ihrer Kunst, in ihren Wurzeln und ihren Wirkungen, — die Internationalität ihres Publikums. Rubens und van Dyck, die grössten Antwerpener Meister, sind zugleich europäische Grössen, und sie sind es, durch die die vlämische Kunst wieder zu europäischer Bedeutung gelangte.

Alle dem gegenüber fällt die fundamentale Verschiedenheit der Meister sogleich auf. In ihren Naturen und in ihrer Konstitution sind sie Gegensätze. Neben der ungeheuren Kraftnatur eines Rubens mag van Dyck, der nur 41 Jahre alt wurde, als der schwächere Mensch, das zartere, fast weibliche Temperament erscheinen, — aber er ist darum nicht ein schwächlicher Künstler! Denn auch künstlerisch tritt die Verschiedenheit und Eigenheit seiner ganzen Veranlagung gegenüber Rubens mit aller Kraft hervor: Dies markiert sich schon darin aus, dass Rubens vor allem als Historienmaler, van Dyck dagegen als Porträtmaler gewirkt hat und gefeiert wird, wenn auch der Unterschied hiermit durchaus nicht erschöpfend charakterisiert ist!

Es ist immer bedenklich, Grössen von so absoluter, schöpferischer Originalität gegeneinander abzuwägen; aber es ist doch gerechtfertigt, wenn man die besten Porträts van Dycks über die des Rubens stellt, und sogar in Historienbild, der eigentlichen Domäne seines Lehrers, van Dyck eine durchaus selbständige Stellung einräumt.

Entsprechend der Verschiedenheit seiner ganzen Veranlagung erhält das religiöse Geschichtsbild, obwohl gerade hier die Urkraft eines Rubens am überwältigendsten sich äussert, durch van Dyck einen neuen geistigen Gehalt, einen neuen Gefühlston und Ausdruck, der für das Empfinden der ganzen Epoche entscheidende Bedeutung hat. Die Verfeinerung der sinnlichen Empfindung, die Neigung zum Sentiment und zum Zarten, die man gegenüber Rubens gern als "mädchenhaft" bezeichnet, ist nicht nur seine persönliche, zufällige Qualität, sondern wird zugleich charakteristisch für eine grosse, neue künstlerische Strömung. Diese selbstständigkeit und Ursprünglichkeit seines Künstlerischen Genies ist nurso mehr zu bewundern, als er, der sensitive, schliesslich kränkliche Mensch, zwar 22 Jahre jünger ist als Rubens, sein schaffen aber durchaus noch in die Lebenszeit seines robusteren Meisters fällt. In diesem Sinne ist er nicht sein Nachfolger, sondern sein jüngerer Zeitgenosse: Rubens starb 1640, van Dyck 1641.

Für die geschichtliche Stellung von van Dyck's Kunst, die

über Rubens hinaus ein neues wichtigstes Element im Werden der Barock-Kunst wird, sei nur noch daran erinnert, dass er gleichaltrig ist mit Bernini, dem grossen Meister des römischen Barocks, und dass im gleichen Jahre, 1599, auch Velazquez geboren wurde, der grösste Porträtmaler dieser Zeit im Süden!

Es wäre unrichtig, van Dyck nur als Porträtisten zu bewundern, aber es sind doch vor allem die Bildnisse, die seinen Weltraum verbreitet und lebendig erhalten haben. In besonderen Masse gilt dies für seine englischen Porträts. Zwar ging er ursprünglich nicht etwa als eigentlicher Porträtmaler nach England, aber seit seiner definitiven Niederlassung als Hofmaler Karls I. im Jahre 1632 stand sein Schaffen fast ganz unter dem Zeichen der Bildnismalerei. Es ist interessant, dass schon der grösste Maler, der vor van Dyck einst in England Fuss fasste, Hans Holbein d. j., zugleich einer der grössten Porträtmaler war, und dass es gerade das Bildnis ist, das nachmals der grösste Stolz der national-englischen Malerei wurde.

Die Reihe der englischen Bildnisse van Dycks ist unvergleichlich als lebendige Verkörperung einer bestimmten gesellschaftlichen Kultur und Rasse. Die Leistung ist so gewaltig, dass es fast pedantisch erscheint, ihr gegenüber zu konstatieren, dass die Konflikte, die eine erfolgreiche, berufsmässige Porträtmalerei so oft der künstlerischen Moral bietet, auch hier ihre Spuren zeigen. Der beispiellose Erfolg führte van Dyck zu einer ungeheueren Steigerung der Produktion, die Zahl der Aufträge und Verpflichtungen zwang oft zu raschen oder flüchtigen Arbeiten, zu Wiederholungen und zur Beteiligung von Gehilfen. Die Anforderungen und gesellschaftlichen Verkehrs wirkten oft zerstreuend und verflachend, und der Hof und die Mehrzahl seines vornehmen Publikums verlangten im Bildnis zumeist nur die Darstellung der äusseren Repräsentation und eine gefällig konventionelle Wirkung. So manches, äusserlich bestechende Bildnis van Dycks aus dieser Zeit steht nicht auf der vollen Höhe seines Künstlertums und trübt die Vorstellung, die wir von seiner Begabung haben.

Das Bildnis des Grafen Arundel, dem diese Zeiten gelten, ist frei von solchen Schwächen. Bei aller Wirkung ist es frei von äusserlichen Effekten, es zeigt nichts von der routinierten, raschen Erledigung einer geschäftlichen Bestellung, sondern das Bild eines Menschen, der in seiner Bedeutung mit eindringlicher Psychologie und voller Vertiefung in sein Wesen erfasst ist, — in seiner charaktervollen Erscheinung zur höchsten Lebendigkeit gebracht.

In schlichter, aber bestimmter Haltung, die dem vornehmen Manne natürlich ist, sitzt der Dargestellte im Lehnstuhl; das Beiwerk ist beschränkt auf den Vorhang und die Landschaft, die dem bedeutenden Kopf als Folie dienen und ihn betonen, das Minimum von Aktion in der fast unbewussten Tätigkeit der Hände beruhend, die die charakteristischen Attribute des Ordens und eines Schriftstücks halten. Trotz der grössten Zurückhaltung ist das Bild ein Meisterwerk der Charakteristik, und so einfach es erscheint, ist es ein Meisterwerk der Komposition. Wie ist das Widerspiel der Feinheit und Zartheit des geistigen Menschen zu der selbstbewussten Energie des Tatmenschen zum Ausdruck gebracht! Wie vollkommen die rhythmische Lage aller Formen! Wie harmonisch setzt der Vorhang die Diagonalbewegung des Körpers fast, — wie ruhig betont das kleine Stück des unter der Landschaft sichtbaren Brustungsprofils die horizontale Mitte des Bildes, während die am meisten sprechenden, hellen Formen des Kopfes und der Hände der Länge nach durch die Bildmitte verteilt sind! Allein schon durch seine gehobene Lage in der Bildfläche ist der Kopf

als stärkster Träger des geistigen Ausdrucks zur Dominante des Bildes gemacht. — Das ist grosse Kompositionskunst, obwohl auf dem Bilde gar nichts "vorgeht" und es sich um nichts anderes handelt, als um die Darstellung einer einzelnen Figur, — Kunst der rhythmischen Verteilung und Abwägung, die um so grösser ist, als sie, trotz höchster Bewusstheit aller Mittel, nicht errechnet und konstruiert wirkt, sondern auf dem feinsten Gefühl und Takt beruht.

Der geistigen und künstlerischen Höhe der ganzen Auffassung und Anlage des Bildes, entspricht die Qualität der malerischen Behandlung. Die farbige Erscheinung baut sich auf dem Kontrast des Schwarz der vornehmen Kleidung — es war die Modelfarbe der Zeit — zu der hellen Fleischfarbe, die bei der geschlossenen Tracht nur im Gesicht und in den Händen spricht; dazu tritt das abgetönte Weiss der Wäsche als Accent und Vermittlung. Die Lokalfarben im Beiwerk und Hintergrund sind die — dem Klang zu Liebe tonig gedämpft, um in die Hell-Dunkel-Wirkung des Ganzen eingewoben zu werden. Die klare Lichtführung, die alle Kontraste vermeidet und die einzelnen Teile malerisch ausgleicht, entspricht der ruhigen Gehaltenheit des Ganzen und betont mit dem Einfall des Lichts von oben rechts die Bewegungsrichtung der Figur. Trotz der koloristischen Zurückhaltung wirkt die Malerei erstaunlich farbig durch das reiche Leben des Pinsels, der in seiner mürben Weichheit und Feinheit in jedem Zug die eigene Hand des Meisters verrät.

Die künstlerische Persönlichkeit van Dyck's tritt in diesem Bilde zwingend hervor. In der Wirkung zugleich intim und packend, vereint es in seltener Weise Schlichtheit und Grossartigkeit, Zartheit und Männlichkeit. Wie verschieden erscheint der Meister hier von Rubens; man vergisst fast, dass er einstmals sein Lehrer war! Wie verschieden aber auch von Velazquez, der sein grösster Konkurrent wäre, wenn ihre Bahnen sich gekreuzt hätten! Es wäre lockend, einen Vergleich nach diesen beiden, so extremen Seiten hin zu ziehen. In ihrer Distinktion und Sachlichkeit erinnert die Auffassung vielleicht mehr an Velazquez als an Rubens. Aber auf dem Bilde liegt, in der Auffassung und Materie, ein Hauch sinnlicher Wärme, der dem Grossmeister des spanischen Hofes fremd ist. Hierin zeigt sich, trotz aller individueller Gegensätzlichkeit, die Wesensverwandtschaft der beiden Antwerpener Meister: Blutsverwandtschaft bei grösster Verschiedenheit der Temperamente und des Geschmacks!

Während van Dyck zu der Kunst seines grossen spanischen Zeitgenossen keinerlei Berührungspunkte zeigt und der Einfluss seines Lehrers kaum noch fühlbar ist, tritt in dem Stil des Bildes der Einfluss einer älteren, anderen Kunst hervor, deren Studium den Meister zweifellos mächtig angezogen und beeinflusst hat: die grosse Bildnismalerei der Venezianer des 16. Jahrhunderts, vor allem: Tizian!

Van Dyck hat mehrere Jahre in Italien gelebt (1622–1625), er hatte schon vorher im Atelier von Rubens italienische Bilder kopiert und hatte vor allem bei seinen Gönnern und Freunden reiche Gelegenheit, immer wieder solche Werke zu sehen. Gerade die Sammlung des Königs Karls I. barg eine unvergleichliche Fülle der bedeutendsten venezianischen Meisterwerke. Der Eindruck, den sie auf den Künstler machten, ist in diesem Bilde besonders deutlich zu erkennen. —

In einem Masse, wie es gerade bei den englischen Porträts van Dyck's nur selten der Fall ist, hat man vor diesem Bildnis den Eindruck, dass es gleichsam am seiner selbst willen gemalt ist. Die rein künstlerische Absicht ist weder durch Rücksichten auf den Besteller und Dargestellten, noch durch gewisse menschliche Schwächen des Künstlers getrübt. Zwar hat van Dyck das Bild wohl gewiss nicht für sich selbst nur

gemalt, aber ersichtlich konnte er es in voller, ausschliesslich künstlerischer Selbstbestimmung schaffen. Man möchte annehmen, dass der Künstler und der Dargestellte, der doch gewiss zugleich der Auftraggeber war, beim malen die gleichen künstlerischen Ansprüche stellten; man möchte voraussetzen, dass zwischen beiden eine tiefe Verwandtschaft oder Identität des künstlerischen Empfindens und Verstehens bestand. Die Klippen der Porträtkunst, Concessionen und Gefallsucht, waren hier ausgeschaltet! Wir kennen den Dargestellten, und seine Persönlichkeit bestätigt diesen Eindruck. Er stand nicht nur in reger, langjähriger Beziehung mit van Dyck, sondern eine so markante Erscheinung, dass seine Bekanntheit dem Bilde noch einen besonderen Reiz geben wird.

Thomas Howard, aus einem der ältesten englischen Geschlechter, vierter Earl of Arundel and Surrey, wurde im Jahre 1586 als Sohn des Herzogs Philipp von Norfolk geboren. Zunächst nur mit dem Titel eines Lord Maltravers, kam er 1603 in den Besitz der alten Besitztümer und Titel der Familie, zuletzt —im Jahre 1644— als Herzog von Norfolk. Er wurde nach dem Fall des Herzogs von Buckingham ein besonderer Günstling des Königs Karl I. und bekleidete hohe staatliche Aemter und Funktionen, Schon 1621 wurde er Earl Marshall of England, wirkte dann als Gesandter, wurde 1639 General und schliesslich Lord High Steward. Infolge der politischen Unruhen verliess er 1641 England und starb 1646 in Padua, der alten Universitätsstadt und Heimstätte der humanistischen und archäologischen Studien.

Graf Thomas Arundel war einer der grössten und ernstesten Kunstliebhaber der Zeit, ein besonderer Kenner des klassischen Altertums und spielt eine grosse Rolle in der Geschichte des Sammelwesens. Er lebte viele Jahre in Italien und entwickelte hier seinen künstlerischen Sinn, der ihn zu einem der grössten Sammler von Kunstwerken und Altertümern werden liess. Besonders berühmt wurde seine Antikensammlung, die vor allem sein Beauftragter, Sir William Petty seit 1624 in Italien, Griechenland und Kleinasien zusammenbrachte. Diese Antikensammlung kam 1627 in London an und wurde in dem ehemaligen Arundelhouse (nahe beim Strand, wo noch heute verschiedene Nebenstrassen an das alte Geschlecht durch ihre Namen erinnern) aufgestellt, zum Teil auch als Schmuck der Gärten. Das Haus war infolge der unruhigen politischen Verhältnisse oft verlassen, und so wurde vieles schon bei Lebzeiten des Grafen beschädigt und gestohlen. Interessant sind die späteren Schicksale der Sammlung! Als beim Tode des Grafen Thomas die Sammlungen geteilt wurden, kamen die Marmorinschriften an den ältesten Sohn, und der Enkel, the Hon. Henry Howard, nachmals Herzog von Norfolk, stiftete sie 1667 der Universität Oxford. Es sind dies die sogenannten Arundelian oder Oxford marbles, unter denen sich die berühmte Marmorchronik von Paros befindet, eines der wichtigsten und häufig besprochenen Dokumente für die alte griechische Geschichte seit der frühesten Zeit. Von den übrigen Antiken, die verkauft wurden, ist merkwürdiger Weise noch ein anderer Teil kennt in Oxford: die Statuen, die beim Verkauf von Arundel House Sir William Fermor erworben hatte und die im Jahre 1755 als Geschenk in die dortige Universität kamen. Die berühmten Gemmen und Kameen sind dagegen leider zerstört; sie kamen in den Besitz der Marlboroughs, blieben hier bis vor wenige Jahrzehnte und sind jetzt in verschiedenen Sammlungen zu finden, zum Teil als sehr bewunderte Objekte.

Als in neuerer Zeit, vor bald hundert Jahren, und fast zweihundert Jahre nach dem Tode des Grafen, eine der ersten und bedeutendsten kunsthistorischen Gesellschaften gegründet wurde, konnte sie mit keinen glücklicheren und würdigeren Namen belegt werden, als mit dem des Earl Arundel: die "Arundel-Society for promoting the knowledge of art". Die Gesellschaft liess seit 1849 Publikationen, farbige Reproduktionen und Gipsabgüsse herstellen, besonders aus wichtigen kunsthistorischen Gebieten, die damals noch wenig bekannt und studiert waren. Sie hat dadurch Generationen von Kunstforschern unschätzbare Dienste geleistet und zahllosen Kunst-Freunden Belehrung und Genuss bereitet. Die Arundel-Publikationen werden auch heute noch benutzt als wertvolles kunsthistorisches Material und erinnern die künstlerische Welt immer wieder an die Persönlichkeit des geistigen Patronen der Gesellschaft.

Zu van Dyck hatte Graf Thomas Arundel enge Beziehungen. Er war Zeit seines Lebens ein begeisterter Verehrer seiner Kunst und vermutlich sein erster hoher Gönner. Schon ehe der Ruf van Dyck's allgemein war, im Jahre 1620, bemühte sich Graf Arundel durch seinen Antwerpener Agenten darum, den blutjungen Künstler nach England zu ziehen; einige Jahre später treffen wir den jugendlichen Meister als Begleiter und künstlerischen Führer der Gattin des Grafen in Italien, —in Venedig, in Mantua, u. s. w. Im folgenden Jahrzehnt, als van Dyck in England lebte, zeugt eine ganze Anzahl von Werken für die Dauer dieser Beziehung.

In diesen Jahren war der Künstler mehrfach für Graf Arundel beschäftigt. Noch heute befinden sich in Arundel Castle, im Besitz des Herzogs von Norfolk, von der Hand van Dyck's, abgesehen von einem Bildnis des Königs Karls I., eine Anzahl Familienbilder: Ausser dem Brustbild des Lord Howard finden wir hier unseren Grafen selbst in einem kleinen Ovalbild und vor allem in den beiden grossen Doppelporraits mit der Gräfin und mit dem Enkel (1639). Dazu kommen einige Bilder in fremden Besitz: ein Einzelbildnis der Gräfin beim Duke of Richmond und Gordon, ein bescheidenes Brustbild des Grafen in der Sammlung A. J. Roberts und sein ganzfiguriges, stehendes Bildnis in Feldherrntracht beim Earl of Clarendon. Ihnen reiht sich in voller Eigenheit der Auffassung das bedeutende Stück an, dessen Würdigung hier versucht wird und dessen Schönheit schon oft bewundert worden ist.

Gerade gegenüber jenen grossen Repräsentationsstücken, die eben genannt wurden, empfindet man in unserem Bilde, welches aus der Sammlung Orléans stammt und im Besitz des Herzogs von Sutherland war, die feinen geistigen Züge betont, die wir bei diesem ungewöhnlichen Manne erwarten und die so ganz der Vorstellung entsprechen, die wir aus der Kenntnis seines Lebens und Wirkens gewinnen. Besonders der Kunstfreund, den Graf Thomas Arundel vor allem wegen seines historischen Rufs als Sammler und Kenner interessiert, wird in dem Bilde eine Bewunderungswürdige Charakteristik des künstlerischen, feinfühligsten Menschen finden. Van Dyck hat gerade in diesem Bildnis den Grafen von dieser Seite seines Wesens aus psychologisch meisterhaft erfasst, — nicht nur als den grossen Aristokraten, mit dem er nur in äusserlicher Beziehung stand, sondern als den Träger einer besonderen Geistigkeit, auf der die innerliche Verbindung des grossen Künstlers mit dem grossen Kunstfreund beruhte, und deren Verkörperung dieses Bildnis zu einem der grossen Meisterwerke macht.

1 We decided to follow the recommendation of Alan Ross that 'The Earl of

- P– should be spoken of and to as Lord P–' ('Linguistic class-indicators in present-day English', *Neuphilologische Mitteilungen*, Helsinki, vol 55 (1954), pp113–149, quoted in *Noblesse Oblige*, London 1956, p15).
- 2 The identification of these two pictures with the works listed in the 1655 inventory of Lady Arundel's estate (in Nicholas Penny, *Patronage and collecting in the seventeenth century: Thomas Howard, Earl of Arundel*, Oxford 1985, p20) does not convince us.
 - 3 According to Christopher Brown, the composition is too messy to be ascribed to Van Dyck: 'It has been claimed that the composition is shown in a watercolour of 1643 by Philip Fruytiers, but it is unlikely that Van Dyck was responsible for such a clumsy composition' (*Van Dyck Drawings*, London 1991, no. 81). According to Nicholas Penny, 'the naïve quality of this arrangement of figures, the way the Earl totters on the edge of the dais and the botched perspective of the tester suggest the faltering of a far lesser artist' (Penny, op cit n2). And Alastair Laing commented: 'For whatever reason Arundel dropped the idea (of a family portrait) – or failed to get Van Dyck to execute it – he was presumably tempted by it again when he went into exile in Antwerp – but perhaps one look at Fruytier's oil-sketch was enough to convince him that it was a bad idea!' (private communication with the author, 26 July 2007).
 - 4 *The Grand Procession of the Order of the Garter*, a royal commission for a tapestry, sold in 1650 for £5 by order of Oliver Cromwell, was accepted in 2001 in lieu of £3.5 million in taxes on the estate of the tenth Duke of Rutland. The sketch is now in the Ashmolean Museum, Oxford.
 - 5 Christopher Brown, *Van Dyck*, catalogue of the 1990 exhibition in Japan, p19.
 - 6 Susan Barnes & Nora De Poorter & Oliver Millar & Horst Vey, *Van Dyck, A Complete Catalogue of the Paintings*, New Haven & London, 2004, p420.
 - 7 Vertue indicated that this drawing depicted the Pembroke family, but this was probably to please the owner of the drawing. George Vertue (1684–1756), *Note books IV*, Walpole Society, vol 24 (1936), pp185–186. Fol 67v, v. 121: 'a sketch very slightly done. of a Family peece, by Vandyke. sold in Mr Jarvis sale – <bo>. by Ld Pembroke> on a half sheet of paper by me supposd to be the first thoughts for the great Family peece of the Earl of Pembroke. much differing from that as is painted' – also in the Collect. of drawings is just such a drawing with the pen. at Ld Egmondts possibly the original sketch. by V. dyke. here the Earl and Lady are setting. on the right side, some of their children introducing and on the left some others over their heads four pictures (rounds.) for portraits – of ancestors a Lord & a Lady a Lord & Lady. before on the ground. a large grey hound – by this sketch I have an Idea. such another might be made by Vandyke for the Earl of Arundells Family peece done afterwards in water colours by. Friutiers. [...] these portraits [?] [?] might be 1 [?] [?] Pembroke 2 [?] [?]. 3 Henry. [?] Pembroke 4 Mary Lysney 5. Philip E. Pembroke 6. Susan. [?]. George Vertue (1684–1756), *Note books I*, Walpole Society, vol 18 (1930), p9. Fol 89v, 16 June (1749): 'following his Royal Highness ordered his Secretary to write to me to Enquire about some Tapistrys that did belong to his Majestye King Charles the first, and were Sold abroad or pawnd. in the Times of the Usurpation – which now were offerd to be Sold to his highness also to wait on his highness at Carlton house – after dinner, were when I came I was immediately introduced to their Highness's who had just dined both setting still at their Table. waiting their Fruit & desert. – being brought in – and their stood near them waiting, their two Eldest young princes their sons. prince George & prince Edward – having each a little knapkin on their armes. they staid for some time and his Royal highness was so kind as to mention to them who I was and that he would show them some of my curious works. there was there also Sr Luke Schaub standing by his highness in great Conversations. about his Royal pictures and other Curiosities and in turn his Highness spoke to me concerning such things, and after some time, said to me I have sent for you to shew you such Curiosities I have now here, that you would not expect to see, and I want you to Explain or inform me of some particulars relating there unto. So rising from Table come come along Sr Luke & my self. Follow into my Closet, where his Curious limnings & valuable pictures &c. – are kept, see here, is the limning of the Earl of Arundells family I have Got, which you mentioned to me. (you know whose I meant) see how rare and admirable. pray who are the persons herein, Mentiond (by the way I think this limning is a little faded – but go on – as I had engrav'd a print from it, some time past for his Grace the Duke of Norfolk – upon that the names are added & printed. yet he desird much I should Explain the storys of the persons there represented which I did – to his highness satisfaction –<the prince also pointed to me to a book of Drawings calling it his drawing book. a thick large folio. Containing drawings of most of the Cittys of Europe plans fortifications, many of his own hand very neat & curious done as he said in his young dayes & studies>– then he had also procured the fine shield painted with several Roman storyes of heroes. Formerly belonging to the Howard family –<also now in posses of Ld Stafford. Howard both these> and presented to the renowned Earl of Surry. Temp. Hen. 8 – then shewing & pointing to several Curious miniatures Enamells & pictures in his Closett. he returnd to finish his desert at Table with the Princess who sat still waiting for him – her Royal Highness obligeingly spoke to me and ask'd how well I liked some of these Curious pictures in the Closet and spoke to me severally about them, whilst his highness was conversing with Sr Luke [...]'. The rebuilt Carlton House was the town residence of the Prince Regent from 1783; the preceding building had been sold in 1732 to Frederick Louis Prince of Wales (1707–1751), who used it to keep his collections. The children to whom Vertue refers are the future King George III (1738–1820) and Edward Duke of York (1739–1767).
 - 9 Christopher Brown, *The Drawings of Anthony van Dyck*, New York & London, 1991, p258, n11.
 - 10 *Thomas More and his family* by Hans Holbein the Younger (1497/8–1543), 1527. Pen & black ink on paper, 388 x 524 mm. Presented to Erasmus in 1529. Kupferstichkabinett, Basel, inv. 1662.31.
 - 11 For example: *Thomas Howard*, 1632/33, oil on canvas, 73.7 x 62.5 cm, Arundel Castle (by descent). Many more works 'by Van Dyck' represent the Earl, such as the *Portrait of the Earl Arundel with the Earl of Surrey* (21 July 1821, Harry Phillips, London, lot 98, sold by G. Kneller, bought in at £22.1; reoffered on 15 August 1822 and bought-in again at £27.16), the *Bust of the celebrated Earl of Arundel painted with great truth and boldness of pencil* (13 May 1826, Christie's, London, lot 11, sold by Admiral Lord Radstock, formerly in the collection of the Duke of Aremberg, bought by Tredcroft for £32.11), the *Earl of Arundel* (18 February 1815, Christie's, London, lot 51, sold by Taster, bought by Dellan for £4.4), the *Earl of Arundel* (12 May 1817, J.D. Herbert, Dublin, lot 84), the *Portrait of Lord Arundel* (23 March 1819, Harry Phillips, London, lot 60, sold by John Knight, either sold or bought in for £60.18), the *Thomas Howard Earl of Arundel half length* (2 March 1820, Christie's, London, lot 75, sold by John Thane, bought by Kellett for £3.3), the *Thomas Howard Earl of Arundel* (2 March 1820, Christie's, London, lot 76, sold by John Thane, either sold or bought in for £2.17), the *Thomas Howard Earl of Arundel with his Countess Alethea* (2 March 1820, Christie's, London, lot 77, sold by John Thane, either sold or bought in for £5.5), the *Portrait of the Earl of Arundel* (16 May 1821, John Robins, London, lot 22), the *Head of the Earl of Arundel* (8 June 1825, Edward Foster, London, lot 46, with another head, sold by Adams, bought by Herman for £1.0), the *Portrait of the Earl of Arundel* (23 April 1831, George Squibb, London, lot 43, sold by George James Cholmondeley, bought by Norton for £44.2), the *Small Head of Thomas Howard Earl of Arundel* (1831, Thomas & Horatio Rodd, London, lot 140, canvas 20" x 14", bought for £3.3), the *Portrait supposed of Lord Arundel* (5 May 1835, Edward Foster, London, lot 4, sold by Sir William Beechey, bought in at £5.5), the *Portrait of Lord Arundel* (style of Van Dyck, 13 May 1815, Christie's, London, lot 26, sold by Samuel Woodin, bought by John Thane for £2.12), the *Portrait du comte d'Arundel* (copy after Van Dyck, 26 December 1820, Coutelier, Paris, lot 17, bought for 3.75 francs), the *Portrait of the Earl of Arundel* (after Van Dyck, 28 January 1828, Christie's, London, lot 16, sold by Michael Bryan, bought for £0.5) (non exhaustive list. from the Getty Provenance Index).
 - 12 Thomas Howard, first Earl of Norfolk, twenty-first Earl of Arundel, fourth Earl of Surrey, seventeenth Baron Segrave, sixteenth Baron Mowbray, eleventh Baron Maltravers, and brother-in-law of the fourth Earl of Pembroke. He was admitted at the Privy Council in 1616, and then became Earl Marshal in 1621 ('the next and immediate Officer under Us for Determining and Ordering all matters touching Armes, Ensigns of Nobility, honour and Chivalry' as later declared by the King). Finally, King Charles I granted him in 1644 with the title of Duke of Norfolk. He was only able to become an active collector after his wedding to the rich daughter of Gilbert, seventh Earl of Shrewsbury. His taste for the art and literature had been developed by his mother Anne Dacre, and by John Lord Lumpley who left him part of his collections in 1617. A passionate collector of books and manuscripts, paintings, drawings and prints, the Earl was a great admirer of the Antiquity, leading Horace Walpole (1717–1797) to describe him as 'the Father of Vertue in England', and the discovery of his collection by Peter Paul Rubens (1577–1640) in 1629 led the painter to qualify him as 'one of the four Evangelists and great upholder of our art'. His importance cannot be underestimated as not only did he influence Henry Prince of Wales and therefore King Charles I, or help artists such as Inigo Jones (1573–c1652) and Daniel Mytens (c1590–1647), but he also used to be surrounded by scholars such as Sir Robert Cotton (1571–1631) or William Harvey (1578–1657), and Franciscus Junius (1545–1602) was the Earl's librarian when he was writing his *De Pictura veterum* (Amsterdam 1637). On the life and career of the Earl, see: Mary Hervey, *The Life, correspondence and collections of Thomas Howard Earl of Arundel*, Cambridge 1921, p370; Francis C. Springell, *Connoisseur and Diplomat: The Earl of Arundel's Embassy to Germany in 1636 as recounted in William Crowne's Diary, the Earl's letters, and other contemporary sources...*, London 1963; David Jaffé, *The Earl and Countess of Arundel: Renaissance Collectors*, London 1995. On the history of the Arundel collection after the Earl's death, see Lionel Cust & Mary Cox, 'Notes on the collections formed by Thomas Howard', *Burlington Magazine*, vol 19.101 (August 1911), pp278–286; Mary Cox, 'Inventory of the Arundel Collection', *Burlington Magazine*, vol 19.102 (September 1911), pp323–325; Sam Dudok van Heele, 'De kunstverzamelingen Van Lennep en de Arundeltekeningen', *Jaarboek Amstelodamum*, vol 67 (1975), pp137–175. On the fate of his library, see Linda Levy Peck, 'Uncovering the Arundel Library at the Royal Society: Changing Meanings of Science and the Fate of the Norfolk Donation', *Notes and Records of the Royal Society of London*, vol 52.1 (January 1998), pp3–24.
 - 13 The third Duke of Surrey (1473–1554) killed King James IV of Scotland in 1513 at the battle of Flodden; his son the Earl of Surrey (1517–1547) received a precious pageant shield from the Grand-Duke of Tuscany.
 - 14 James Howard Lord Maltravers (1607–1624), Henry Frederick Howard

- future twenty-second Earl of Arundel & second Earl of Norfolk & Baron Segrave-Mowbray-Maltravers (1608–1652), William Howard first Viscount Stafford (1612–1680), Charles Howard (1614–1619), Gilbert Howard (1616–1628), and Thomas Howard (1619–1628).
- 15 The presence of a dog is no surprise as Van Dyck seems to have had this habit when depicting children. Dogs appear, for example, in *The King's three eldest children* (1635, Royal collection), in *The King's five eldest children* (1637, Royal collection), and in the Pembroke family portrait (Pl 7). According to Hans Vlieghe, 'dogs, like dwarves and jesters, were well established as the companions of royalty and aristocrats, but the animal could also symbolise the prince's filial piety and ability to model his behaviour on that of his parents' (in Christopher Brown, Hans Vlieghe, Judy Egerton et al, *Van Dyck 1599–1641*, London 1999, p236). 'The presence of [the] greyhound contributes to [the sitter's] informality. ... The inclusion of a large devoted hound in portraits of great men has precedents which go back to at least a century, to Titian's Charles V with a Hound of 1553' wrote Judy Egerton (ibid) about the *Portrait of the Duke of Lennox and Richmond*. Actually, the poor quality of the drawing of the dog in the sketch Pl 9 (and its race) is actually one of various elements that lead us to reject its attribution to Van Dyck. The elegant silk cape of Henry Frederick, elegantly draped on his shoulder, reminds us of Lord Wharton's portrait (1632, Washington) or of the double portrait of the Lords Stuart (1637, National Gallery, mezzotint interpretation by Richard Thompson c1683). In fact, the general composition is traditional, and reminds of a Titianesque *Sacred Conversation* that Van Dyck admired (according to John Rowlands, 'Sketch for a family group by Van Dyck', *Master Drawings*, vol 8.2 (1970), p163); it conforms to the classical rules: the family is represented below the portraits of glorious ancestors (symbols of its prestige and age), whilst the Earl is depicted with the attributes of his power and wealth. The Earl's humanist interests are not depicted (but antiquities or works of art would belong to individual portraits and not to familial elegies) which allows the artist to play instead with looks: the Countess and her eldest-alive son stare at the viewer; his mother and eldest uncle look at 'Little Tom' who bows respectfully in front of his grandfather who also looks at him; a small child gazes into the ceiling, whilst one of his brothers is more interested by his grand-mother dress. Does the fourth child look at the viewer or at the dog? And does the dog look at his own backside, or at a something happening outside of the room?
 - 16 Sir Edward Walker (1612–1677), who had met Arundel during his embassy in Germany, describes him in 1636 as follows: 'He was tall of Stature, and of Shape and proportion rather goodly than neat; his Countenance was Majestical and grave, his Visage long, his Eyes large black and piercing; he had a hooked Nose, and some Warts or Moles on his Cheeks; his Countenance was brown, his Hair thin both on his Head and Beard; he was of a stately Presence and Gate, so that any Man that saw him, though in never so ordinary Habit, could not but conclude him to be a great Person, his Garb and Fashion drawing more Observation than did the rich Apparel of others; so that it was a common Saying of the late Earl of Carlisle, Here comes the Earl of Arundel in his plain Stuff and trunk Hose, and his Beard in his Teeth, that looks more like a Noble Man than any of us' (*Historical Discourses upon Several Occasions*, London 1705, pp221–223, 7 June 1651).
 - 17 The Earl was 'a conservative in dress' according to Robin Blake, who links this to the Earl's despising of *parvenus* (Robin Blake, *Anthony Van Dyck, a life 1599–1641*, London 1999, p125).
 - 18 The technique of dating a work by the age of the depicted children was suggested by Hind and Rowlands. Arthur M. Hind, *Catalogue of drawings by Dutch and Flemish artists preserved in the British Museum*, vol 2 (1923), vol 4 (1931). John Rowlands, 'Sketch for a family group by Van Dyck', *Master Drawings*, vol 8.2 (1970), pp162–166.
 - 19 Quoted in: Paul Oppé, 'Sir Anthony Van Dyck in England', *Burlington Magazine*, vol 79 (1941), p186.
 - 20 The artist's enormous requests were the reason why the commission for the wall decoration of Whitehall was cancelled. Also, by 1640, the Earl's debts amounted to an incredible £103,234.3.11 (Edward Hyde Earl of Clarendon, *History of the Great Rebellion*, Oxford 1702, vol 1, p44).
 - 21 The catalogue is so summary and undetailed that it is difficult to identify almost anything (*A catalogue of...; being part of the old Arundel Collection, and belonging to the late Earl of Stafford*, London 1720).
 - 22 Van Dyck's will (written on 4 December 1641 and now at The National Archives in Kew) split the bulk of his assets between his wife and his daughters. His illegitimate daughter, Maria Theresa, married Gabriel Essers and had a son (Gabriel Franciscus Essers, b. 1642). His wife, Mary Ruthven (d. 1645), had given him a legitimate daughter Justina (b. 1641, married to Sir John Stepney), but all the paintings left in the studio were taken as payment by Richard Andrewes against the debts of Sir Richard Price (Mary Ruthven's second husband).
 - 23 Christopher Brown, op cit n5, p19, refers to 'his ability to flatter his sitters by elongating their features and their hands to make them seem even more elegant and remote than they were in life'.
 - 24 Elizabeth Tarnove, *The drawings of Van Dyck*, Alhambra 1976, introduction, pp1–2.
 - 25 Oliver Millar, *Van Dyck in England*, National Portrait Gallery, London 1982, p27.
 - 26 Giovanni Petro Bellori, *Le vite de' pittori, scultori et architetti moderni*, Rome 1672, pp253–264. See also David Howarth, 'The Arrival of Van Dyck in England', *Burlington Magazine*, vol 132 (1990), pp709–710.
 - 27 *Thomas Howard*, 1620/1621, oil on canvas, 1028 x 794 mm. From the collection of Thomas Howard Earl of Arundel; possibly offered to George Villiers first Duke of Buckingham; ...; collection of Philippe Duke of Orléans; inherited in 1723 by Louis Duke of Orléans; inherited in 1752 by Louis-Philippe Duke of Orléans; inherited in 1785 by Louis-Philippe-Joseph Duke of Orléans (d. 1793); ...; collection of François-Antoine Robit; auction (Paris, 6 December 1800, lot 55, unsold); auction (Paris, 14 May 1801, lot 36, sold 3600 francs to Jean-Baptiste-Pierre Lebrun); collection of Michael Bryan; auction (6 November 1801, lot 92, sold 400 Guineas); collection of Francis Egerton third Duke of Bridgewater; inherited in 1803 by George Granville Leveson-Gower first Duke of Sutherland; inherited in 1833 by the second Duke of Sutherland; inherited in 1861 by the third Duke of Sutherland; inherited in 1892 by the fourth Duke of Sutherland (but not in his 1913 sale); ...; collection of Fritz Gans in Frankfurt; ...; inventory of the Kurt Walter Bachstiz gallery (The Hague); ...; collection of Daniel Guggenheim (New York) from 1929 onwards; inherited by his wife; collection of Robert Guggenheim (Washington) from 1950 onwards; collection of Mrs David Guggenheim in New York; ...; collection of Mr and Mrs Francis Lenyon (Washington) in 1980; ...; collection of John A. Logan (Washington) in 1980; collection of Rebecca Pollard Logan; auction (Christie's, London, 8 July 1983, lot 92, bought by Agnew's); collection of Jamie Ortiz Patino (Switzerland); purchased by Agnew's for the J.P. Getty Museum in 1986 (inv. 86.PA.532). One known copy: oil on canvas, 72.5x58 cm, Lempertz (Köln, November 1961). The author did not have access to Elizabeth Ellen Hunt's MA thesis on Van Dyck's Arundel Family Portrait (autumn 1994, University of California Santa Barbara).
 - 28 *Thomas Howard*, 1620/1621, oil on canvas, 102.8 x 79.4 cm, J.P. Getty Museum, inv. 86.PA.532.
 - 29 Nachlass Fritz Wichert, Allgemeine Korrespondenz, Berlin, 206, Schriftwechsel mit Kohlenhandler Johannes Noll, 'Enthält u.a.: Verkauf der Sammlung Fritz Gans in Frankfurt a.M.'.
 - 30 We are grateful to Sanne Rishoj Christensen for typing this text from the manuscript.
 - 31 See Oswald Goetz, ed, *Essays in Honor of Georg Swarzenski. Beiträge für Georg Swarzenski*, Chicago and Berlin 1951, bibliography, pp261–267; Perry Rathbone, *Bulletin of the Museum of Fine Arts*, vol 55.301 (autumn 1957), pp53–55; Ulrike Wendland, *Biographisches Handbuch deutschsprachiger Kunsthistoriker im Exil*, Munich 1999, vol 2, pp677–683.
 - 32 The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, inv. 84.12.1.
 - 33 Five boxes of manuscript documents by them were given to the Berlin Staatsbibliothek Handschriftenabteilung in 1993/94 by Dietrich Kötzsche.