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Foreword to revised edition

The objective of this revised edition of C.M. Kauffmann’s *Catalogue of Paintings in the Wellington Museum* (1982) has been modestly to update Michael Kauffmann’s scholarly and pithy entries where relevant new information could be added. We felt it was important to provide this for the public who come to view the outstanding collection of paintings at Apsley House, so generously donated by the 7th Duke of Wellington. Of course, it is vastly easier and quicker to revise a text than to write it in the first place and the approach has been to leave the original as intact as possible. It has been a joy to work with Michael Kauffmann, who has provided inspiration and kind guidance with the great generosity of spirit for which he is renowned.

It is invidious to single out individuals from the long list of people who have offered their help and support, but I must! Marjorie E. Wieseman of the National Gallery, London, author of all the Dutch and Flemish revisions, has been a marvellous collaborator, and has offered many suggestions that have contributed to improving the finished catalogue. Adam Webster, Senior Collections Conservator (Fine Art), who runs English Heritage Collections Conservation Studio at Ranger’s House, has not only conserved many of the paintings, but has also generously reviewed the condition entries in the text. Simon Jervis, contributor to the 1982 catalogue, has provided new scholarly information on the picture frames; Alastair Laing and Gabriele Finaldi have offered editorial comments and William Mostyn-Owen has wrestled hard with the text to iron out errors.

Thanks for support and advice are also due to: Martin Allfrey, Brian Allen, Gerd Bartoschek, Xavier Bray, Charles Beddington, Philippe Bordes, Julius Bryant, Lorne Campbell, Dawson Carr, Peter Cherry, Martin Clayton, Roberto Contini, Elizabeth Emerson, David Ekserdjian, Rupert Featherstone, Jennifer Fletcher, John Gash, Elspeth Hector (and her team at the National Gallery library), Charles Hope, Edward Impey, Paul Joannides, Helen Langdon, Christopher Lloyd, David Marshall, Hamish Miles, Anthony Mould, Gianni Papi, Carol Plazzotta, Alain Pougetou, Dr Martin Postle, Dr Herwath Röttgen, Francis Russell, Xavier Salomon, José-Luis Sancho, Desmond Shawe-Taylor, Richard Spear, Nicholas Tromans, Christoph Vogtherr, Charles Walker, Aidan Weston-Lewis, Lucy Whitaker, Karin Wolfe and Stephen Wood, – and apologies to anyone unconsciously omitted from this list: thanks to you all.

Susan Jenkins
Foreword to 1982 edition

In 1947 the 7th Duke of Wellington, himself a distinguished architect and antiquarian, gave the nation his London residence, Apsley House, and part of its contents, to be opened as a memorial to his illustrious forebear. It was a truly princely gift, consisting of about 200 paintings – many of them originally from the Spanish Royal collection; fine works of silver, sculpture and ceramics; and an important display of the Iron Duke’s uniforms, medals, orders and personalia.

In cataloguing the paintings which formed a central part of the 7th Duke’s gift, the compiler’s first debt has been to the 1901 catalogue of the Wellington collection by Evelyn, Duchess of Wellington. This was and remains a work of monumental thoroughness on which the present catalogue leans heavily.* A debt of a similar kind to be acknowledged is to Sir Ellis Waterhouse’s exemplary *Catalogue of Eighteen Paintings in the Wellington Gift*, the Arts Council exhibition of 1949.

Grateful thanks for patient help are due to the owners, libraries and curators of archives used in the preparation of this catalogue: the 8th Duke of Wellington and the archivist at Stratfield Saye, Joan Wilson; the Prado and the Instituto Diego Velázquez, Madrid; the Art History Institute at The Hague; and, in London, the archives of the National Gallery and the photographic libraries of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes and of the National Portrait Gallery. Much individual help is acknowledged in the catalogue entries concerned, but particular mention must be made of assistance generously given by Enriqueta Frankfort, with whom all the entries on the Spanish paintings were discussed, and warm thanks are also due to Diego Angulo Iniguez, Rocio Arnaez, Allan Braham, Christopher Brown, Mary Cazort, Sir Michael Levey, Juan J. Luna, Hamish Miles, A.E. Perez Sanchez, Ruth Rubinstein, Carl van de Velde, Harold Wethey and Christopher White. Stephen Wood of the National Army Museum gave much helpful advice over problems of uniforms and decorations.

Among colleagues, Graham Reynolds made the original inventory for the Museum, and this catalogue has benefited considerably from discussions with, in particular, Ronald Lightbown, John Murdoch and Lionel Lambourne and from the conservation reports and laboratory examinations of Norman Brommelle, Harry Rogers, Peter Young, Susannah Edmunds and Jo Darrah, present and former members of the Museum’s Conservation Department. The help of Michael Holmes was invaluable on matters of heraldry. Victor Percival, curator at Apsley House from 1948 until 1981, has freely shared his detailed knowledge of the collection and of Wellington’s campaigns. Finally, thanks are due to Simon Jervis for agreeing to contribute his illuminating note on the frames and to Rosie Sutherland and Tina Huntley for their impeccable typing from a barely legible manuscript.

C.M. KAUFFMANN

* The index of the 1901 catalogue is reprinted on pp. 161–71 of the 1982 catalogue, with annotations to show which of the pictures then listed are in the Wellington Museum and which remain in the Duke’s private collection. It has not been reprinted in the present catalogue.
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Visitors to Apsley House in London have the rare opportunity to view a collection of paintings in the house in which they were originally hung. The collection is of extraordinary quality, including a number of masterpieces, such as Velázquez’s celebrated *The Waterseller of Seville*, works by Rubens, a delightful series of copper landscape and figure views by Jan Brueghel the Elder, and a fine pair of hunting scenes by Philips Wouwerman, all of which were originally part of the Spanish royal collection.

The history of the collection

Pictures from Spain

It is usually said that the picture collection of the 1st Duke of Wellington was founded on the battlefield of Vitoria in Northern Spain in June 1813, but there was a prologue to this romantic beginning. For on 15 August 1812, just after Wellington’s victory at Salamanca and triumphant entry into Madrid, the Intendant of Segovia wrote to the Duke:

‘Your Excellency,—If a feeling of delicacy on your part will not admit of your accepting the offer I made you, on behalf of the nation, of such trifles in the Royal Palace of San Ildefonso as might have been most agreeable to you, I cannot overlook the deep obligation of my country to the hero of Great Britain, and the Regent would justly resent any indifference on my part in showing the gratitude due to the Liberator of Spain. As I believe that you take a particular interest in pictures, I take the liberty of presenting to you the twelve best and most artistic pictures which I have been able to find.

In the name of the Spanish Nation and the Government I beg that you will deign to accept this very small offering—the chief object of which is to show the gratitude and recognition of the Nation.

I pray the God of Armies to keep you in perfect health, and beg that you will favour me with the expression of your wishes on the subject.

(Signed) The Intendant of the Province,

Segovia, August 15, 1812

Ramon Luis Escovedo.3

The Palace of La Granja de San Ildefonso, built by Philip V in 1739, was at La Granja in the hills northwest of Madrid, near Segovia.2 Wellington, (at that time known by his Spanish title of Duke of Ciudad Rodrigo) made his army headquarters there from 9 August 1812, and lodged in the palace itself. Although Wellington had initially refused the Intendant’s offer of a gift of works from the collection,
Escovedo persisted, and with the assistance of the general's Spanish aide-de-camp Don Miguel de Alava, twelve paintings in which Wellington had expressed an interest were identified, leading Escovedo to seek approval from the Regency Council to send them to Madrid as a gift to mark the Spanish nation’s gratitude to their ‘liberator’, the Duke.3

The twelve pictures were delivered packed in three crates:

‘List of pictures chosen by (or for) the Great Lord Wellington:

Box No. 1
A Landscape with St Philip the Apostle, baptising an Ethiopian in the middle of a River: by Juan Franscisco Boloniés [sic]4
Another, representing Hercules and Antaeus, transformed into a white bull, by Domingo Zampiene.5
Another, representing St John the Baptist, by Murillo.

No. 2
A painting of Saint John the Baptist: in the first manner of Raphael
Another of Our Lady seated with Christ standing, and St Joseph with a book in his hand, by Annibale Carracci.
Another, a head of a woman, by ‘Huido’.
Another: St Anthony of Padua: by Murillo.

No. 3
A Painting of Our Lord carrying the Cross and St Veronica, by Sisto Badalocchio
Another: St Inés: by ….
Another: a Negress with a gilt clock in her hands: by ….
Another: The Head of St Joseph, by Guido Reni (this catalogue no. 146)
Another: A head of a Nun, by Andrea del Sarto (this catalogue no. 77).6

Of these twelve pictures, only two were identified in the 1901 Wellington Catalogue. This first gift from Spain to the victor of the Peninsular War distinguishes, from the beginning, Wellington’s collection from those of any of his contemporaries.

Wellington’s army moved north from Madrid in September 1812 to take Valladolid, but at Burgos the French held out and forced the British army to retreat to winter quarters at Ciudad Rodrigo near the Portuguese border. It was not until the following May that Wellington returned to the offensive and pursued across northern Spain the army of Joseph Bonaparte – who had been placed on the Spanish throne by his brother in 1808. The final victory, which put an end to French rule in Spain, came on 21 June 1813 at Vitoria, 85 miles from the French border.7

After the battle, Wellington’s soldiers found Joseph’s coach among the masses of captured baggage and equipment. Joseph himself had just managed to escape under the protection of the French cavalry,
but the coach was found to contain not only his state papers, some love letters and a silver chamber pot, but also over 200 paintings - the canvases detached from their stretchers and rolled up - as well as drawings, engravings, books and manuscripts. Wellington arranged for the contents of Joseph’s deep leather trunk (‘imperial’) to be transported to London. He despatched them to his brother William, Lord Maryborough, for safekeeping, noting that they ‘were not thought of any value’ and commenting that some of the paintings had been used as tarpaulins to cover the baggage on the mules.8

Maryborough was fortunate to obtain the services of picture-dealer and restorer William Seguier, who became Keeper of the Royal Picture Galleries in 1820 and later Keeper of the National Gallery, to draw up a catalogue of the principal pictures (see p. 338). In a letter of 9 February 1814 Maryborough wrote to Wellington explaining their importance: ‘A most valuable collection of pictures, one which you could not have conceived’. He goes on:

‘I send you a Catalogue of 165 of the most valuable pictures . . . I have sent with the Catalogue a memorandum which I made Charles Bagot (a tolerable judge of pictures) draw, which will give you some idea of the value of the collection. He has, however, I believe very much under-rated it. Owen, the painter, and West, the President of the Academy, have both told me that the Corregio is certainly worth at least 6000 guineas, and many of the others are inestimable. Upon the whole I think I am within the mark if I say the collection is worth £40,000 . . .’.9

It had become clear that Joseph Bonaparte had appropriated these paintings from the Spanish royal collection and had been about to take them to France.10 There is no obvious answer, however, to the question why, out of all the magnificent works in the Spanish royal collection, the unparalleled series of paintings by Titian and Rubens, for example, and the very large number of works by Spanish artists, Joseph made the selection of which we see the greater part at Apsley House today. Despite the baggage train capture at Vitoria, a group of about twelve pictures reached Paris safely with Joseph Bonaparte, including five Raphaels (which the Duke later had copied by Bonnemaison), a Holy Family by Leonardo and a Guido Reni Madonna, which suggests that he thought he was taking the best.11 A further group of paintings from Spain also escaped capture. ‘The emperor’s gift’ of fifty works selected for Napoleon left Madrid in 1813 at the same time as Joseph and arrived in Paris under the escort of General Hugo.12

When the Duke heard that the captured paintings had in fact been stolen by Joseph Bonaparte he at once insisted that they should be returned to the King of Spain. In a letter to his brother Sir Henry Wellesley, British Minister in Spain, dated 16 March 1814, he wrote:

‘My dear Henry,

The baggage of King Joseph after the battle of Vitoria fell into my hands, after having been plundered by the soldiers; and I found among it an Imperial containing prints, drawings and pictures.

From the cursory view which I took of them the latter did not appear to me to be anything remarkable. There are certainly not among them any of the fine pictures which I saw in Madrid, by Raphael and others; and I thought more of the prints and drawings, all of the Italian school,
which induced me to believe that the whole collection was robbed in Italy rather than in Spain. I sent them to England, and having desired that they should be put to rights, and those cleaned which required it, I have found that there are among them much finer pictures than I conceived there were; and as, if the King’s palaces have been robbed of pictures, it is not improbable that some of his may be among them, and I am desirous of restoring them to His Majesty, I shall be much obliged to you if you will mention the subject to Mons. Lugando, and tell him that I request that a person may be fixed upon to go to London to see them and to fix upon those belonging to His Majesty.

This may be done either now or hereafter when I shall return to England, as may be most expedient.

In the meantime the best of them are in the hands of persons who are putting them to rights, which is an expense necessary for their preservation, whether they belong to His Majesty or not. I’ll get the catalogue of the pictures which I have got copied and will send it to you. It will probably enable the Spanish Government to form an opinion without inspection which of the pictures belong to the King.’

Sir Henry Wellesley duly made representations at the Spanish Court but no reply was received. Consequently the Duke brought the question up again in September 1816 in a letter to Count Fernan Nuñez, Spanish Minister in England. To this letter Count Nuñez replied:

‘Most Excellent Sir,

Esteemed Duke and friend,

I hand you enclosed the official reply which I have received from the Court, and from the same I gather that His Majesty, touched by your delicacy, does not wish to deprive you of that which has come into your possession by means as just as they are honourable. Such is my view of the case, and thus I believe you ought to let the matter rest where it stands and to refer to it no longer. At any rate, whatever may have been your intention, I shall always be ready to act according to your wishes, not alone in this, but in all other matters in which I can be of assistance to you.

Your devoted friend and Affectionate cousin, who salutes you,

FERNAN NUÑEZ’

Evelyn, Duchess of Wellington, identified all but ten of the 165 paintings listed by Seguier and Maryborough in the ‘Catalogue of the principal pictures found in the baggage of Joseph Bonaparte. Made by Mr Seguier on their arrival in London’. Eighty-one of these paintings are now in the Wellington Museum and, thanks to the inventories of the Spanish royal picture collections, we can trace the history of fifty-seven of them. The inventories were regularly compiled at each king’s death by the curator of pictures, who was usually the court painter. In February 1794, for example, the royal palace inventory was signed by Francisco Bayeu, Francisco de Goya and Jacinto Gomez. Attribution, sizes, locations and, at times, valuations, are all given. The earliest painting in the Wellington Museum, the Juan de Flandes Last Supper, is also the earliest
recorded in the Spanish inventories, for it was in the possession of Queen Isabella of Castile (d. 1504).17 Of the small group of sixteenth-century pictures at Apsley House, the *Orpheus enchanting the Animals*, then listed as Titian (here under Padovanino, no. 121), is recorded in the royal collection in 1666 and we know that Philip IV (1621–1665) acquired two of the collection’s masterpieces, Correggio’s *Agony in the Garden* (no. 32) and Elsheimer’s *Judith and Holofernes* (no. 45). Velázquez’s *The Waterseller of Seville* (no. 183) also entered the royal collection in the seventeenth century, and the two canvases by Luca Giordano were painted for the Buen Retiro palace, on the eastern outskirts of Madrid, while he was court painter to Charles II in 1692–1702.18

In November 1734 the royal palace in Madrid, the Alcázar, was burnt to the ground.19 An inventory of surviving paintings made after the fire includes four of the Teniers and three of the Jan Brueghels now at Apsley House. As these are not recorded in the royal palace inventory of 1700, one might conclude that they were acquired between 1700 and 1734, but for the fact that these early inventories were not exhaustive and hence a picture’s first appearance in a particular inventory does not necessarily mean that it was acquired in the immediately preceding reign. The Elsheimer, for example, has not been traced in any of the Spanish royal inventories before 1734, though we know it to have been acquired by Philip IV almost a century earlier.

The new Palacio Real in Madrid was built on the site of the Alcázar. In the 1750s and early sixties it was decorated by leading artists from abroad, including Corrado Giaquinto, Mengs and Tiepolo, and by 1764, when it was once again inhabited by the royal family, it contained the largest part of the royal collection, not only of pictures, but also of sculpture, tapestries, armour and all manner of artefacts.

Meanwhile, the picture collection of the first Bourbon king Philip V (reigned 1700–46), the grandson of Louis XIV of France, and his wife Isabella Farnese was assembled at their palace at La Granja, near Segovia.20 Philip, who had his palace built on the model of Versailles and filled its gardens with French sculpture, collected French pictures, while Isabella preferred those of her native Italy. However, these preferences are only marginally reflected in the representatives of their collections at Apsley House which include, respectively, a Claude and a Guido Reni. Philip’s pictures are marked with a cross and Isabella’s with a *fleur-de-lis*, and the two collections were separately catalogued after Philip’s death in 1746. Most of the pictures concerned remained at La Granja, but some of them reappear later in the century at Aranjuez, Philip II’s palace on the banks of the Tagus, south of Madrid, which was rebuilt by Philip V and Charles III.

Charles III (reigned 1759–88), who had formerly been King of Naples, collected on a considerable scale and his acquisitions included Velázquez’s *Two Young Men eating at a Humble Table* (no. 182) and *Pope Innocent X* (no. 185), both from the collection of the Marquis de la Ensenada.21 Meanwhile, in 1772, his son, the future Charles IV, while he was still Prince of Asturias, was building his country house, Casita del Príncipe, in the grounds of the Escorial on the model of the Petit Trianon. His collection included Italian Old Masters, but he was also known for his patronage of contemporary artists and, in particular, he bought twelve paintings by Claude- Joseph Vernet.22

The fact that a proportion of the pictures captured at Vitoria have not been traced in these inventories may be due to a variety of reasons. Many works, particularly if the artist is unknown or the subject very common, are inherently difficult to identify among the hundreds of paintings listed. Some
inventories may be incomplete and others – for example, the 1794 inventory for the Escorial – have not been traced at all. Furthermore, between 1794 and 1814, there was much movement of paintings, with correspondingly incomplete inventory accounts, so that any paintings acquired in those years would not have been recorded.

Nevertheless, the question is bound to arise: did Joseph Bonaparte also take with him pictures from other Spanish collections? We know that the French took a large number of works of art from Spain. As early as 1809, Vivant Denon, director of the Musée Napoléon, persuaded Joseph Bonaparte to decree that fifty Spanish masterpieces – of which there were none in the Louvre – should be confiscated from loyalist Spanish nobles. The Spaniards managed to delay the process of selection, but ultimately, in September 1813, 250 confiscated pictures finally reached Paris and in the same year Marshal Soult handed over to the Musée Napoléon three of the numerous Murillos he had appropriated in Seville.

Colonel Gurwood, editor of the Wellington dispatches, told an illuminating story concerning the Marshal. When, after the war, he was showing his collection to Gurwood, he stopped before one of them and said: ‘I value that picture very much; it saved the lives of two estimable men.’ An aide-de-camp whispered in Gurwood’s ear, ‘He threatened to have them both shot if they did not send him their painting.’

In his role as King of Spain, Joseph Bonaparte was de facto owner of the royal collection and had no need for such methods of personal aggrandisement. On the contrary, he planned to use the pictures taken from suppressed religious institutions to found a national museum in Madrid. Yet it remains possible that he took some of these sequestered pictures with him on his flight and that not every picture captured at Vitoria was necessarily from the royal collection.

The Duke’s purchase of Old Masters

It was in 1816, after the end of the war, when he had settled in to his new position of Commander of the Forces of Occupation in France, that the Duke bought Apsley House from his brother Richard, Marquess Wellesley. It had been built in the early 1770s by Robert Adam for Henry, Lord Apsley, afterwards 2nd Earl Bathurst (1714–1794), whose son had sold it to Lord Wellesley. Wellington’s agent in the purchase was Benjamin Dean Wyatt, son of the architect James Wyatt. Benjamin Wyatt, himself an architect, had been Wellington’s secretary in India and Ireland and, after the failure of the plan to build a Waterloo Palace, it was he who added the great gallery at Apsley House in 1828–29 in what he called Louis XIV style. The Waterloo Gallery provided Wellington with a magnificent picture gallery in which to display the fruits of his conquests, which rivalled the galleries of his neighbours at Londonderry House and Stafford House and enabled him to entertain on a grand scale. Having acquired Apsley House and received Stratfield Saye, his country house in Berkshire, as a gift from the nation in 1817, the Duke bought French eighteenth-century furniture in Paris and patronized the Sèvres factory to provide furnishings for these new properties.
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It was at this time that he began to extend his picture collection. Paris in the years after 1815 was an ideal place in which to do so. Napoleon’s secularization of religious houses and the turmoil of the war years had dislodged works of art from their homes on an unprecedented scale. Wellington used as his agent the Chevalier Férœl de Bonnemaison, painter, dealer and picture restorer, and his main purchases were at the La Peyrière sale in April 1817, where he bought nine pictures, and at the Le Rouge sale in April 1818, where he acquired twelve. La Peyrière was a speculative financier who had acquired his pictures from recent sales of celebrated collections in Holland and Paris; Le Rouge was himself a picture dealer, but was selling his stock and withdrawing from commerce after the death of his wife. Wellington’s purchases at these sales, which included his great works by Jan Steen and Nicolaes Maes, demonstrate his own personal taste for the realism of Dutch genre painting. The highest prices were paid for Jan Steen’s A Wedding Party (no. 165: £472) and The Physician’s Visit (no. 163: £460), Jan van der Heyden’s Architectural Fantasy (no. 69: £378) and the large Bakhuizen, Soldiers of the Dutch East India Company embarking at the Montelbaans Tower, Amsterdam (no. 5: £880). That year the Duke bought a further group of pictures from Bonnemaison including works by Jan Steen, de Hooch and Duyster.

Dutch pictures had of course always been popular collectors’ items in England. The best collections had their Rembrandts and their landscapes by Ruisdael and Cuyp. But the emphasis on narrative genre was a nineteenth-century taste which is reflected in the growth of the national school of such narrative painting at the time. Wellington was not alone in this taste in 1836, J.D. Passavant recorded several important collections of Dutch pictures including those of Thomas Hope, Sir Robert Peel and Alexander Baring. Above all there was George IV, who acquired some of the best Jan Steens and Teniers in the royal collections from Sir Thomas Baring in 1814 and who personified this taste, which is usually described as bourgeois. It would be misleading to suggest that as a collector Wellington was in the same class as Peel; his main buying period was 1817–18 and, even then, he bought only about thirty Old Master paintings. Equally, he retained an interest in pictures other than Dutch – after all, he had Bonnemaison make copies of four of the Raphaels from Madrid, and bought a large Ascension attributed to Tintoretto (Stratfield Saye). But it remains generally true that of the Old Masters at Apsley House, Wellington himself supplemented the predominantly Spanish, Italian and Flemish pictures from the Spanish royal collection with some of the most splendid Dutch narrative scenes to be seen in London in the early nineteenth century. Their popularity – attested by the constant demand for them to grace the annual exhibitions at the British Institution – was due to what was seen as the faithful realism of Dutch genre paintings, which remained the sole critical assessment of them throughout the nineteenth century. However, in the second half of the twentieth century, new interpretations of the symbolic content of Dutch genre paintings were offered with reference to contemporary emblem books, interpretations which are once again being revised.

At the Congress of Aix-la-Chapelle in October–November 1818, the allied nations agreed to end the occupation of France. This might have signalled the end of Wellington’s active career, but in December he accepted the post of Master-General of the Ordnance in Lord Liverpool’s Tory cabinet and, at the age of forty-six, he embarked upon a second career in politics. It was a stormy time for politicians, a period of economic stress and social unrest to which Wellington and his colleagues replied with fierce repression. In 1819 the massacre of Peterloo – when eleven people were killed and nearly five hundred wounded
when troops fired into a crowd of demonstrators in a field near Manchester – was followed by the Six Acts directed against press criticism and public meetings. Wellington was Prime Minister in 1828–30, but was defeated over Parliamentary Reform and in 1831 Apsley House itself was stoned by an angry crowd.41

His most active years in politics left the Duke little time or inclination to pursue his interest in Old Master paintings, but during the last decade of his life, from about 1840, he bought some fine examples, though not on the scale of his acquisitions in 1817–18. The biggest single group of paintings acquired at this time was Spanish. The *Unknown Man* ascribed to Murillo (no. 114) was bought in 1838, followed by the portrait of Quevedo from the studio of Velázquez (1841; no. 186) and by Mazo’s *The Entry of Prince Balthasar Carlos into Pamplona* (1844; no. 104). They form a coda to the great works from the Spanish royal collection at Apsley House.

**Contemporary paintings**

**Portraits**

Our admiration for the masterpieces by Correggio, Velázquez, Rubens and Jan Steen should not blind us to the fact that sixty-three of the pictures in the Wellington Museum, about a third of the total, are early nineteenth-century portraits. Of course, several are portraits of the Duke himself, but most of these entered the collection after his death. Wellington was more keen to commission portraits of his generals, heads of state of the allied nations and Napoleon and his family than he was to sit for his own portrait, a practice that he despised.42 To this end he commissioned Sir Thomas Lawrence in 1817–18 and subsequently George Dawe to portray his comrades in arms, though the largest number of the portraits of his officers is by the Dutchman Jan Willem Pieneman, from whom Wellington bought the sketches for his *Battle of Waterloo* (Rijksmuseum). These portraits have always hung in the Striped Drawing Room (the ‘yellow drawing room’ in the Wellington Catalogue) where they still are today. Portraits of Napoleon and his family by Lefèvre were bought by the Duke soon after the war and he continued to acquire them to the end of his life: Lefèvre’s *Josephine* was one of his last purchases (from Count d’Orsay), in 1851. The galaxy of full-length portraits of the crowned heads of Europe, hung then as now in the Dining Room, were largely gifts from the rulers concerned, particularly in the years 1818–26. Taken together, these two rooms at Apsley House formed a parallel in miniature to the Waterloo Chamber at Windsor Castle, for which Lawrence was commissioned by George IV to paint over twenty portraits in 1813.43 In this area also the Duke returned to collecting again towards the end of his life: the portraits of Soult, of the Duke of York, of Pitt and of Spencer Perceval were bought in the years 1843–52.

**Contemporary British paintings**

Wellington’s most famous act of patronage, and his most expensive purchase of all, was Wilkie’s *Chelsea Pensioners*, commissioned in 1816 (no. 194). He was introduced to the artist by Lord Lynedoch and the pictures that he saw in the artist’s studio at the time were very much in the manner of the seventeenth-century Dutch painters he so admired. In the same vein, Edwin Landseer’s *Illicit Highland Whisky Still* (no. 84)
was commissioned in 1826 and the Duke returned to Landseer for a version of *Van Amburgh with his Lions* over twenty years later. Other acquisitions were made as purchases from the artist rather than as commissions, such as Burnet’s *Greenwich Pensioners* (no. 24), painted and hung as a pendant to Wilkie’s *Chelsea Pensioners*, and William Allan’s *Battle of Waterloo* (no. 2), which was clearly sufficiently accurate to satisfy the Duke, who was heard to comment ‘Good – very good; not too much smoke’. Prices varied very considerably. In 1818 Lawrence received only £210 for his full-length portrait of the Marquess of Anglesey, whereas Wilkie was paid £1,260 for his *Chelsea Pensioners* when it was finally completed in 1825. Sir Francis Grant received 500 guineas for the *Melton Hunt* (formerly at Stratfield Saye)44 in 1839 and Sir William Allan was paid £600 for his *Battle of Waterloo* when it was exhibited at the Royal Academy in 1843. These were major pictures by some of the leading artists of the time and the prices paid were in line with current levels. Indeed, during a dinner party, when the Duke was spoken of as avaricious, it was Landseer who sprang to his defence, explaining that he had been free to fix his own price for *Van Amburgh with his Lions*. Landseer’s story is told by William Powell Frith: ‘and when in reply to the Duke’s enquiry Landseer told him the price would be six hundred guineas, the Duke wrote out a cheque for twelve. “I could tell you many more instances of his liberality,” said the painter.’45 Concerning the execution of the same picture, one might also quote Richard Ford in 1853: ‘Sir Edwin, however, was compelled to obey orders as strictly as if his R.A. had meant Royal Artillery.’46

Even so, one should not, from Landseer’s touching testimony, overestimate the Duke of Wellington as a patron and collector of contemporary British art. He bought many portraits, a few history pictures and a handful of distinguished genre scenes. It is an important collection as an illustration of British history but it can hardly be seen as embodying trends in British painting of the time. Indeed it was never intended as such, as a comparison with the major collections of the time – Vernon (now Tate Gallery) and Sheepshanks (now Victoria and Albert Museum) – amply demonstrates. Perhaps the most fitting comment on the extent and limits of Wellington’s interest in his collection is contained in the following story told in Frith’s *Memoirs*:

“The great Duke, being human, was no doubt the victim of weaknesses, one of which – a very small one – consisted in the conviction that he could name every picture in the Apsley House collection without reference to the catalogue. So long as the pictures followed in regular sequence, and were named one after another in order, the effort of memory was successful; but if the narrator were called back, by the forgetfulness of the visitor, to any special picture, he was at fault; and without beginning again with the first picture in the room, he could not give the information asked for.

“I beg your pardon, sir; who did you say that was?” said Landseer to the Duke, on the occasion of a visit to Apsley House, at the same time pointing to a half-length portrait of a sour-looking woman in the costume of the time of Elizabeth.

The Duke looked up at the picture, muttered something, and left the room. While the Duke was absent, Landseer studied other pictures, and had pretty well forgotten all about the sour-looking lady, when a voice close to his ear exclaimed, “Bloody Mary!”’47
Arthur Wellesley, Lord Douro (1807–1884), who succeeded as Duke of Wellington in 1852, had been a disappointment to his father and the two had never been on cordial terms. In 1853, for the first time, he decided to open Apsley House to the public for limited periods. This enabled a wider public to view the collection as never before, and to mark the occasion both a guide and a collection of ten lithographs were published, with appreciations appearing in the *Quarterly Review* and the *Athenaeum* in the same year. Meanwhile, the collection continued to grow, both in the 2nd Duke’s lifetime and in succeeding generations. Lawrence’s portrait of the Iron Duke was bequeathed by the Marchioness Wellesley to the 2nd Duke, who also collected in a minor way himself.

Seven pictures in the Wellington Museum were acquired by him, both Old Masters, for example, the small Bakhuizen, and portraits (for example, Reynolds and Leslie).

The 7th Duke’s princely gift to the nation in 1947 was formalised in the Wellington Museum Act of the same year. It included nearly all the masterpieces in the Wellington collection, which were appraised by experts from the National Gallery and the Victoria and Albert Museum and supplemented by two important paintings from the 7th Duke’s collection, Goya’s equestrian portrait of the 1st Duke and the portrait of him by Thomas Lawrence. The 7th Duke, however, made it clear that he was specifically excluding ‘family’ portraits, as he wished to create a museum that celebrated the Iron Duke as a heroic national and military figure. It should also be remembered that in terms of overall numbers, less than half the pictures collected by the family in the nineteenth century are in the Wellington Museum. Of the ‘Spanish’ pictures now at Stratfield Saye, two Claudes, three landscapes by Pillement, a Vernet harbour view and a *St Cecilia* by Matthias Stomer are among those worthy of particular mention, and the collection is rich in early nineteenth-century portraits. The paintings at Stratfield Saye can provide further insight into the Duke’s taste, highlighting, for example, his love of sporting pictures. Yet it is first and foremost from the paintings in the Wellington Museum that a history and appreciation of the great Duke’s collection can be derived.
Notes


3 See note 1, AGP, Histórica, caja 129, document 2.

4 Aterido Fernández 2004, I, p. 290 identifies this painting as Baptism of a Eunuch of the Queen Candace by Giovanni Francesco Grimaldi, from the Maratti sale.

5 Identified (ibid.) as a copy of the original by Domenichino, painted by Maratti.

6 See note 1; AGP, Histórica, caja 129, document 1, copy of an original. Also Aterido Fernández 2004, I, pp. 290, 310, note 192.


13 Wellington authorised his brother William to instruct William Seguier to attend to the preservation of the paintings; see S. Jenkins, op. cit., note 8, p. 120.
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15 C.M. Kauffmann claimed to be able to identify eighty-three of these works; see Introduction to Kauffmann 1982, p. 7.

16 There are copies of the inventories in the Prado, the Instituto Diego Velázquez, Madrid, and the Archives of the Palacio Real and copies of selected inventories in the National Gallery library, London. For a full list of inventories see pp. 34–35. For a discussion of the different inventory markings, see: M. López Fanjul Díez del Corral and J.J Pérez Preciado ‘Los números y marcas de colección en los cuadros del Museo del Prado’, Boletín del Museo del Prado, xxiii, no. 41, 2005, pp. 84–110.


19 See J.L. Sancho op. cit. note 2, pp. 75–137.


25 Quoted in the Quarterly Review, xcl, 1853, p. 464.


27 Even the painted inventory numbers can cause confusion. For example, both the Godoy and the Medinaceli collections had white numbers painted on the front of pictures in the same manner as those in the royal collection (I am grateful to A.E. Pérez Sánchez for this information). For a discussion of inventory numbers see note 16.


29 The drawings by Wyatt and others for the project, formerly in the Duke’s collection, were sold at Sotheby’s, 11 December 1980, and reproduced in the catalogue.

30 Hardy, op. cit., p. 174.
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34 Relatively little is known about the activities of Bonnemaison (see F. Haskell, Rediscoveries in Art, London, 1976, p. 26, note 10, p. 34, p. 35, note 56), although he sold 150 pictures from Prince Vincenzo Giustiniani’s collection to Frederick William III of Prussia in 1815 and Talleyrand’s Dutch and Flemish collection to the dealer William Buchanan in 1817; also see C. Vogtherr, ‘Le acquisizioni di Federico Guglielmo III per i musei di Berlino e per le collezioni reali’, in S. Squarcina, Caravaggio e i Giustiniani: Toccar con mano una collezione del Seicento, exh. cat., Rome, Palazzo Giustiniani, and Gemäldegalerie Staatliche Museen zu Berlin, 2001, pp. 139–44. Eight of the La Peyrière pictures are in the Wellington Museum: Adrian Brouwer, The Smokers (lot 15); Jan van der Heyden, View of a Dutch Town (lot 21); Abraham van Calraet, Cavalier with Grey Horse (lot 29); Willem van Mieris, Cavalier drinking (lot 34); Caspar Netscher, The Toilet (lot 36); Adriaen van Ostade, Peasants playing Shuffleboard (lot 38); Jan Steen, The Physician’s Visit (lot 55); Teniers, A Village merrymaking (lot 58).

35 All twelve of the Le Rouge pictures are in the Wellington Museum: Ludolf Bakhuizen, Soldiers of the Dutch East India Company embarking at the Montelbaans Tower, Amsterdam (lot 37); Jan van der Heyden, The Chateau of Goudenstein, on the River Vecht, near Maasen (lot 20); Nicolas Maes, The Eavesdropper (lot 29) and The Milkwoman (lot 30); Panini, St Paul preaching at Athens and St Paul at Malta (lot 43); Jan Steen, The Wedding Party (lot 53) and The Egg Dance (lot 54); Jan van Huysum, Rape of Proserpine (lot 67); Jan Victors, A Village Scene (lot 68); J. Lingelbach, Landscape with Travellers resting, a pair (lots 70, 71).

36 The British Library copies of these sale catalogues are inscribed with prices. The rate of exchange was about 25 frs. to the £.


40 E. de Jongh and his followers led the way in research in this field; see especially the exh. cat., Amsterdam, Rijksmuseum, Tot Lering en Vermaak, 1976. For a broad survey of the history of moralizing symbolism in Netherlandish genre painting, see P.C. Sutton, Pieter de Hooch, Oxford, 1980, p. 41.


46 Quarterly Review, xcii, 1853, p. 464. It is likely that Richard Ford was the author of this review of the Apsley House pictures as the text is very similar to his introduction to Apsley House and Walmer Castle, illustrated by Plates and Description, London, 1853.

47 Frith, op. cit.

48 Brinsley Ford, loc. cit.
## Chronology of the 1st Duke of Wellington

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7 March 1787</td>
<td>Ensign</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 December 1787</td>
<td>Lieutenant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 June 1791</td>
<td>Captain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 April 1793</td>
<td>Major</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 September 1793</td>
<td>Lieutenant-Colonel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 May 1796</td>
<td>Colonel (India)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 April 1802</td>
<td>Major General</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 September 1804</td>
<td>Knight Companion of the Bath</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 January 1807–Dec 1812</td>
<td>Colonel of the 33rd Regiment of Foot (later the Duke of Wellington's Regiment)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 April 1807</td>
<td>Irish Secretary (resigned April 1809)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 April 1807</td>
<td>Privy Councillor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 April 1808</td>
<td>Lieutenant-General (Portugal)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 July 1809</td>
<td>Marshal-General of the Portuguese Army</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 August 1809</td>
<td>Baron Douro of Wellesley and Viscount Wellington of Talavera</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 1810</td>
<td>Member of the Regency Council in Portugal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 July 1811</td>
<td>General</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 October 1811</td>
<td>Conde de Vimeiro and Knight Grand Cross of the Tower and Sword (Portugal)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 1812</td>
<td>A grandee of Spain, with the title of Duque de Ciudad Rodrigo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 February 1812</td>
<td>Earl of Wellington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 August 1812</td>
<td>Order of the Golden Fleece (Spain)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 1812</td>
<td>Generalissimo of the Spanish Armies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 August 1812</td>
<td>Marquess of Wellington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 1812</td>
<td>Marquez de Torres Vedras (Portugal)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 December 1812</td>
<td>Duque da Victoria (Portugal)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 January 1813–1827</td>
<td>Colonel of the Royal Regiment of Horse Guards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 March 1813</td>
<td>Knight of the Garter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 June 1813</td>
<td>Field Marshal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 May 1814</td>
<td>Marquess Douro and Duke of Wellington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 July–Nov 1814</td>
<td>Ambassador to the Court of France</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 July 1815</td>
<td>Prince of Waterloo (Netherlands)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 October 1815</td>
<td>Commander-in-Chief of the Allied Armies of Occupation in France</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 1818</td>
<td>Field Marshal in the Austrian, Russian and Prussian Armies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 December 1818</td>
<td>Master-General of the Ordnance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 December 1819</td>
<td>Governor of Plymouth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 February 1820</td>
<td>Colonel-in-Chief of the Rifle Brigade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1821, 1831, 1838</td>
<td>Lord High Constable (at the Coronations of George IV, William IV and Victoria)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 December 1826</td>
<td>Constable of the Tower of London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 January 1827</td>
<td>Colonel of the Grenadier Guards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 January 1827</td>
<td>Commander-in-Chief</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 February 1828</td>
<td>Prime Minister (resigned October 1830)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 January 1829</td>
<td>Lord Warden of the Cinque Ports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 January 1834</td>
<td>Chancellor of the University of Oxford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 1834</td>
<td>Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (resigned April 1835)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
On 7 August 1829 Benjamin Dean Wyatt, the 1st Duke of Wellington’s architect, wrote to his patron as follows:

‘I beg to mention to Your Grace that I have seen three very fine old carved oak French Picture Frames, for whole length portraits, suited to the style of decoration intended for the Gallery. Shall I have these things sent to Apsley House for Your Grace to see? One of the Picture frames has the following Inscription upon it, viz. ‘Donné par le Roy aux Juge et consuls de Paris en 1758’. It strikes me that these Frames would do admirably to hang over the 3 Fire places of the Gallery.’

On 11 September 1829 Wyatt wrote thus:

‘With respect to the size of the Picture frames to which Your Grace’s letter of today relates, I beg to mention that if Your Grace has any intention to have the large French frame it would be very possible to increase or diminish its size, so as to suit the size of either of the Pictures described by Your Grace; but of the two it would be much easiest to increase it.’

On 18 September the Duke replied:

‘I find upon enquiry that my picture of Charles 1st is 9 feet 9 inches and a half long by seven feet wide. It is ten inches shorter and fifteen Inches narrower than what is required to fill the largest of the three frames. It is ten inches shorter & one foot narrower than the second size, it is nine inches too long and ten Inches too wide for the 3rd size of frame. The other Pictures that is the Bloody Mary & the Rodolph of Hapsburgh are of the small size of full lengths.’

This exchange is illuminating in several ways. It shows the Duke’s close attention to every detail of the planning of his great gallery at Apsley House, then building. It shows Wyatt, as architect, was concerned that the frames of the paintings to hang in the three principal axial positions above the fireplaces in the Gallery should match its interior decoration in the French style. It shows that, even before the Gallery was complete, the pictures to hang above the fireplaces had been chosen. Since 1980, when the present Duke of Wellington allowed the Museum to buy the portrait of ‘Bloody Mary’ (WM 5–1980), the three paintings have been restored to their original positions in the Gallery. Their frames are not old French ones, as proposed by Wyatt, but new English ones in the French style, almost certainly designed by Wyatt, so congruous is their ornament with his French interior decoration. Fortunately the ‘Bloody Mary’ frame bears its maker’s label as follows:
Thomas Temple (see also Postscript below) is first recorded in Pigot’s London Directory of 1827 as working as a carver and gilder at 50 Great Titchfield Street. Frederick Augustus, Duke of York, died in 1827, leaving incomplete his London palace, of which Benjamin Dean Wyatt had been the architect since 1825, in collaboration with his brother Philip Wyatt. York House (now Lancaster House) was the direct prototype for the additions made to Apsley House in the late 1820s, and there seems every probability that Temple owed his involvement at Apsley to his earlier contact with Wellington’s architect at York House. Great Titchfield Street was also the address of another prominent frame maker, Joseph Crouzet, who worked on occasion for Constable.

Two other labels by Temple have been noted at Apsley House, on the Swebach Encampment (no. 168) and on the Gysels Flemish Village (no. 62). However, bills and correspondence in the archives at Stratfield Saye make it clear that up to his bankruptcy in 1839 Temple was the Duke’s main frame-maker, and that many of the unlabelled frames in Apsley House must be by him. His bill for February to December 1837 amounted to £13.0.0; it included maple frames for engravings and ‘Dec. 13 Making a handsome French frame for portrait of the Earl of Maryborough 6.15.0’. His bill for April to December 1838 amounted to £58.11.6 and included ‘Regilding a carved french frame enlarging do. repairing the carving back lining &c. 12.0.0 … Making 13 Tablets with the names of painters 1.6.0 … Rehanging 8 pictures in the Gallery 5.0 … Removing 2 Cases from Apsley House to Mr Seguier’s and unpacking 7.0 … Making a handsome sweep Frame for Picture by Murillo 10.16.0 … Regilding a Frame for portrait of the Dke of Marlborough 1.0.0.’ Among other frames regilded was that of the ‘pancake Woman’.

The mention of ‘Mr Seguier’ introduces the Duke’s principal man of business and adviser in artistic matters, William Seguier, whom Constable jocularly described in 1833 as ‘a much greater man than the King’. Seguier and his brother John were the Duke’s restorers [see also Postscript below]. In 1842, for instance, they charged for ‘Cleaning and Varnishing 205 Pictures at Apsley House 51.5.0’. A bill of 1845 from John Seguier for ‘Arranging Pictures at Apsley House £1.1.0’ seems to imply advice at a professional level, and letters from William Seguier make it clear that he advised the Duke on which paintings were suitable for hanging at Apsley House, where there was a conscious effort to create a great picture gallery, and which were of lesser importance and therefore to be sent to Stratfield Saye. The aftermath of Temple’s bankruptcy demonstrates Seguier’s role as regards frames. It emerged that before he went bankrupt Temple had finished a number of frames for the Duke and that the rest were ‘in a very forward state’. Temple’s official assignee, George Lackington, proprietor of the Egyptian Hall in Piccadilly, then ordered the completion of the frames and offered them to the Duke. In December 1839 the Duke wrote to Seguier stating that he had only given minor orders to Temple and that Lackington had acted quite improperly in ordering the completion of the frames after Temple’s bankruptcy. From Seguier’s reply
it is clear, although not unequivocally stated, that he had been in the habit of ordering frames for the Duke’s paintings from Temple without consulting the Duke. In the event the Duke agreed to take the completed frames provided they were suitable.

From at least 1843 Temple’s role as the Duke’s main frame-maker seems to have been filled by ‘Robert Thick, Carver and Gilder, 35 Clipston Street, Great Portland Street’, as he appears on his account for January to September of 1843, totalling £18.18.0 and including items for frames and hanging paintings. Thick only opened business at Clipstone Street in 1843 (see also Postscript below). He remained there until 1854. Also at Clipstone Street in 1851 were the cabinet-makers Johnstone & Jeanes, the painter Ford Madox Brown and H.F. & C. Hawkins, carvers and gilders. Thick’s account for 1844 amounted to £120.5.0 and included, as well as items for hanging and sundries, ‘Making & Gilding Rich frame to Wouvermans 9.0.0’, another similar for the companion painting (these must be nos. 198 and 199), ‘Making & Gilding Frame to Pan & Syrinx of Brill 5.14.0, Ditto Magdalen in landscape Spanish School 7.16.0, Ditto Jacob receiving the Blessing Murillo (no. 113) 8.0.0’. In 1944 Miss
Mary Draper presented to the 7th Duke of Wellington a Thick ledger, from which it is clear that he worked for many great collections. It includes work done for the 1st Duke from 1848 to 1852, for example ‘April 12 1852 Making Gilt Frame to Pt. of Wm. Pitt 10.10.0’.

Temple and Thick were, however, not the only frame-makers to work for the Duke. The ‘Caterina Cornaro’ (no. 188) bears the impressed mark ‘SQUIRE MANUFACTURER LISLE STREET LONDON’, as does the companion frame to Doge Marcantonio Memmo (no. 7). Charles Squire was at 38 Lisle Street, Soho, from at least 1846 to 1850, although not before 1843 (see also Postscript below). Also in Lisle Street in 1850 were Reuben Brooks, carver and gilder, James Parry, picture cleaner, and William Anthony, restorer of paintings. In 1851 Squire moved to 20 Old Fish Street, City, and in 1852 the firm became Henry Squire & Co. It is also worth mentioning that in 1853 and 1844 ‘Henry Graves & Company, Printsellers to the Queen, 60 Pall Mall’ submitted accounts for prints and for maple frames for prints.

Such in brief is the information about the frames at Apsley House which has so far come to light. Most seem to have been made for the 1st Duke. However others, particularly those for the Napoleonic
portraits and for the portraits of allied sovereigns, may have accompanied these paintings into the Duke’s collection. This seems particularly likely in the cases of the frames of the Lefèvre Napoleon (no. 91) decorated with Napoleonic bees and the Gérard Louis XVIII (no. 50) decorated with fleurs-de-lys. Much more work needs to be done before the stylistic groups which can be more or less clearly discerned are properly disentangled and further conclusions drawn. Nevertheless, it is clear that in general neo-classical frames were thought appropriate for the Dutch paintings, and rococo for the Italian and Spanish paintings. Portraits tended to have plain frames with minor neo-classical or rococo embellishments. To prevent confusion it should be put on record that, when in 1980 the four Bonnemaison Raphael copies which hung in the portico Room under the 1st Duke were returned there, only one, the Holy Family, called ‘La Perla’ (no. 12) had its original frame. This served as a model for modern copies made by Mr Paul Levi for the three Bonnemaisons without frames.

Picture hanging at Apsley House is too complex a subject to be treated fully here. Evidence for the 1st Duke’s approach to hanging includes the illustrations to R. Ford, Apsley House and Walmer Castle, London, 1853 (the Victoria and Albert Museum has recently purchased five of the watercolours prepared for this work: WM 1-5-1981), and Salter’s 1836 view of the Waterloo Banquet. Written descriptions by Ford, Passavant, Waagen and in the 1852 Guide Book are also helpful. The 2nd Duke’s complete rehanging of the Gallery is recorded on hanging cards of about 1880 and the Wellington Catalogue (1901) records the disposition then. Photographs of about that date give a clear idea of the character and detail of the hanging in several rooms, as does a view of the Gallery published in E. Beresford Chancellor, Private Palaces of London, London, 1908. In essentials the scheme of about 1900 seems to have survived until the Second World War, when many of the paintings were removed to the country for safe-keeping.

After the War the 7th Duke’s munificent gift to the nation of Apsley House and its contents included 193 paintings, as compared to the 288 distributed in the rooms comprising the Wellington Museum in 1901. Artistic quality and historic significance seem to have been the criteria for selection, and the reconstruction or preservation of the interiors as they were under the 1st Duke do not seem to have been major considerations. When the Wellington Museum was opened to the public in 1952 the paintings were hung without reference to their original disposition, except in the Dining Room and the Striped Room. Considerations taken into account were school, size, subject and quality. In other words Apsley House was treated essentially on the same basis as, say, the National Gallery. This approach was followed in the various rehangings which took place up to the mid 1980s.

In 1973 John Hardy, of the Department of Furniture and Woodwork, Victoria and Albert Museum, published an article ‘The Building and Decoration of Apsley House’, in an issue of Apollo devoted to the Wellington Museum. The present writer was at that time planning the redisplay of part of the Continental Primary Galleries at the Victoria and Albert Museum which was to include a selection of Mannerist Kunstkammer objects of the late sixteenth century. Dr Charles Avery, then in the Sculpture Department, who had identified the ‘Rodolph of Hapsburgh’ at Apsley House as a work by Hans von Aachen, suggested its inclusion in the new gallery alongside the Adriaen de Vries relief of Rudolph (6920–1860) and the Wenzel Maler wax of Rudolph (1208–1864). The painting was at that time in store at the Victoria and Albert Museum sundered from its magnificent original frame by Thomas Temple, in store at Apsley House. John Hardy then drew the present writer’s attention to the crucial importance
of the painting and its frame to the Gallery at Apsley House, and the proposal to display the painting at the Victoria and Albert Museum was abandoned. This incident gave impetus to the consultations which led in 1976 to the decision of the Director Dr Roy Strong to transfer responsibility for Apsley House from an officer-in-charge under the Director to the Department of Furniture and Woodwork, with its experience of administering country-house ensembles at Ham and Osterley.

Thus a picture and its frame played a major role in encouraging a completely new strategy in the display of Apsley House, namely to return the house, insofar as possible, to its appearance under the 1st Duke of Wellington. The application of this strategy, still in progress, has included not only radical redecoration of many rooms but also the rehanging of its paintings on an archaeological basis, using the evidence mentioned above. Recently, for instance, the Dining Room was rehung. It has always contained the same six paintings but until 1981 they were hung at the wrong height and in the wrong positions—wrong, that is, according to the archaeological criteria now adopted. A more complex project was the rehanging in late 1980 of the Gallery, discussed in articles by John Cornforth in *Country Life* (4 and 11 June 1981) and by the present writer in *Connoisseur* (December 1981). Clearly there are possible tensions between the former approach to hanging at Apsley House, in which considerations of connoisseurship and art history were paramount, and the new strategy, there are gaps in the evidence, and there are fewer paintings in the house than there were under the 1st Duke. Compromises and adjustments are in the circumstances inevitable. But the new strategy has brought with it a minor benefit, that no paintings are now relegated to the store or the basement stairs, the major gain that Apsley House is far less institutional in character. It is now shown as the London palace of a great national hero, the paintings and their frames arranged in the original manner to form, as intended, the richest elements in the ensemble.

I am grateful to the Duke of Wellington for allowing me to consult the archive at Stratfield Saye, and to Joan Wilson, his curator, for making some of the relevant documents available. I also thank the Hon. Georgina Stonor for assistance and advice.

**Postscript, 2008**

The acknowledgments above should have included thanks to Michael Kauffmann for his characteristic generosity in agreeing to the inclusion in his 1982 catalogue of an account of frames, then rarely mentioned in paintings catalogues, and of picture hanging, a subject then even more infrequently treated and, in this instance, approached from an angle more polemical than it would be now, which he may not have found sympathetic. But, first printed over a generation ago, the essay is thus, for all its faults, doubly a thematic incunabulum and, for better or worse, part of both the history and historiography of Apsley House. I am grateful to Susan Jenkins for inviting this ageing intruder into her new *Catalogue*. My final thanks are due to Jacob Simon, whose cardinal exhibition, *The Art of the Picture Frame* (National Portrait Gallery, 1996), was the precursor to an on-line *Directory of British Frame Makers* (www.npg.org.uk/live/framemakers.asp), which is used here to correct and enrich the above account of the 1st Duke of Wellington’s frame-makers.
Thomas Temple (d. 1833), a stationer as well as a frame-maker, was in business in Wardour Street from 1795. From about 1801 he was in partnership with Henry Brookes, a stationer, at 28 Coventry Street. That partnership having been dissolved in 1808 the Temple firm then traded from 1809 to 1839 at 50 Great Titchfield Street as Temple & Son. It was taken over by Thomas Temple’s elder son, Thomas Maxfield Temple (1799–1865), on his father’s death in 1833. It was Thomas Maxfield Temple’s bankruptcy in 1839 which led to the slightly tetchy correspondence between William Seguier and the 1st Duke of Wellington described above. Temple’s stock-in-trade was advertised for sale in his premises in The Times in January 1840. Thomas Temple had been a leading member of the framing trade, and the firm’s clients also included the Duke of Devonshire and the Earl of Suffolk. The relationship with the Seguier brothers was not confined to their dealings with the Duke of Wellington: several paintings in the bequest of Daniel Mesman to the Fitzwilliam Museum in 1834, whose framing was entrusted to John Seguier, have frames labelled by Temple & Son.

Robert Thick (1798–1869) was a potato merchant and a grocer before turning to frame-making in 1839. In 1854, reportedly ruined by excess of work at Windsor Castle, he transferred his business to George Henry Critchfield (c. 1823–1887). The ledger mentioned above reveals that Thick worked for Sir Robert Peel, the National Gallery, and many other rich and prominent collectors and collections, including the British Museum, the Earl of Carlisle, the Dilettante Society, and William and John Seguier. His relationship with the latter two was close, to the extent that Thick would give them a payment for business introduced. Thick’s successor, Critchfield, also worked for the National Gallery.

Charles Squire, evidently a lesser figure than the Temples and Thick, was at 22 Lisle Street, Soho, in 1843, and at 38 Lisle Street from 1844 to 1850. He had also traded at Carnaby Street and St Martin’s Lane. In 1852 he had left his address at 22 Old Fish Street, but the link with Henry Squire & Co. who traded from 20 Old Fish Street from 1851 is not proven.

William Seguier (1772–1843) and his brother John (1785–1856) were the subject of an entry by Lionel Cust in the old Dictionary of National Biography (1897, 17, pp. 1145–6): this is much updated by Alastair Laing in the new Oxford Dictionary of National Biography (2004, 49, pp. 2 82–83). The Seguiers are so ubiquitous in accounts of their period that a fuller study remains a desideratum. William trained as a painter, but marriage in 1797 to a rich fellow Huguenot, Ann Magdalen Clowden, allowed him to establish himself as a restorer, dealer and agent. His clients came to include Henry Hope, Samuel Rogers, Sir George Beaumont, Sir Abraham Hume and Sir Robert Peel, as well as the Duke of Wellington. He was made Superintendent of the new British Institution in 1805, Surveyor of the King’s Pictures in 1820 and Keeper of the new National Gallery in 1824. Constable’s jibe, quoted above, was not undeserved. His brother John, also trained as a painter, was his partner from the mid 1830s and succeeded him as Superintendent of the British Institution on his death in 1843. On 17 June 1808 Joseph Farington dined at Sir George Beaumont’s house in London: ‘Before dinner we looked at the pictures which were to be sent to Cole Orton. They had been arranged by Segar [Seguier], for that purpose, the frames new gilt.’ Reading again through the account above nowhere is it explicitly suggested that William Seguier was chiefly responsible for the arrangement of the pictures at Apsley House for the 1st Duke of Wellington. Here the opportunity is taken to make it clear that this must, almost certainly, have been the case.
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List of inventories

Since the publication of the Catalogue of Paintings in the Wellington Museum in 1982, several more inventories of the Spanish royal collection have been published. This note summarises the most useful surviving inventories, both published and unpublished* (the latter can be found in the archives of the Palacio Real, Madrid and the Museo del Prado, with some copies in the National Gallery library, London). See also bibliography in J. Luna, Las pinturas y esculturas del Palacio Real de Madrid en 1811, Madrid, 1993, pp. 131–35. Please note that, whereas Michael Kauffmann traced references to the Wellington Museum paintings in the inventories that were available to him, this work has not been undertaken for the more recent publications nor the unpublished manuscripts.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>King</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1614–17</td>
<td>El Pardo*</td>
<td></td>
<td>Inventory of paintings and other things</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1636</td>
<td>Palacio Real (Alcázar)</td>
<td></td>
<td>G. Martínez Leiva and A. Rodríguez Rebollo, Quadros y otras cosas que tiene Su Magestad Felipe IV en este Alcázar de Madrid, año de 1636, Madrid, 2007 (includes 1621 and 1623 inventories)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1666</td>
<td>Palacio Real* (Alcázar)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Inventory of pictures, Alcázar Madrid (CMK)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1734 La Granja
Archivo General de Palacio (AGP), Registros, 7.067, described in M. González Cristóbal, ‘Inventario del Real Sitio de S. Ildefonso’, Reales Sitios, XXXVII (144), 2000, pp. 68–69

1734 Palacio Real*
Inventory of paintings that survived the fire (CMK)
(after fire)

1746 La Granja et al.

1772 Palacio Real*
Inventory of paintings (CMK)
Buen Retiro*

1774 La Granja*
Inventory of paintings (CMK)

?1782 Escorial
(Casita de Príncipe)
in J. Zarco Cuevas, ‘Inventario de los cuadros reunidos por Carlos IV siendo príncipe en su Casa de El Escorial’, in Religión y Cultura, 1934, pp. 382–419 (CMK)

1789–90 Palacio Real

1800 Aranjuez

1808 Palacio Real
in J. Sancho Gaspar, ‘Cuando el Palacio era el Museo Real: La Colección Real de pintura en el Palacio Real de Madrid organizada por Mengs, y la descripción des Tableaux du Palais de S.S.C. por Frédéric Quilliet (1808), in Arbor: Ciencia, pensamiento y cultura, Madrid, 2001, no. 665, pp. 83–142

1811 Palacio Real
in J. Luna, Las pinturas y esculturas del Palacio Real de Madrid en 1811, Madrid, 1993

1814 Palacio Real*
Picture inventories
La Granja*
Aranjuez*
Apsley House pictures in Spanish royal collection

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Margaret of Austria</th>
<th>Palacio Real</th>
<th>Palacio Real</th>
<th>Palacio Real</th>
<th>Buen Retiro</th>
<th>Palacio Real</th>
<th>La Granja</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1505, 1516</td>
<td>1666</td>
<td>1686</td>
<td>1701</td>
<td>1701</td>
<td>(after fire) 1734 1746</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Juan de Flandes

'Titian', Orpheus
Correggio

Giordano (2)
Velazquez,
Water Seller

Teniers, 108
Teniers, 791
Teniers, 864
Teniers, 893
Brueghel, 148
Brueghel, 1025 (2)
'Ribera', Carcasse

I. ISABELLA FARNESE
Eglon v. der Neer
Wouwerman, 314
After Rubens, 806
Teniers, Bowls
de Hondt, 531
Murillo, St Francis
Elsheimer
Guido Reni
II. PHILIP V
Claude, 335
Poelenburgh,
Crucifixion

Reprinted from Kauffmann 1982 (pp. 8–9)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Palacio Real</th>
<th>La Granja</th>
<th>Casita de Principe</th>
<th>Palacio Real</th>
<th>La Granja</th>
<th>Aranjuez</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1772</td>
<td>1774</td>
<td>(Escorial) c. 1782</td>
<td>1794</td>
<td>1794</td>
<td>1794</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Van Dyck</th>
<th>Velazquez, Portrait</th>
<th>Velazquez, Two Men</th>
<th>Velazquez, Innocent</th>
<th>Brueghel, 956 (2)</th>
<th>Gysels, 956</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Wouwerman (2)</th>
<th>Cignani</th>
<th>Mengs, Holy Family</th>
<th>Murillo, Isaac &amp; Jacob</th>
<th>'Titian', Portrait</th>
<th>Bril (?)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cofermans</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>d'Arpino, Expulsion</th>
<th>d'Arpino, St Catherine</th>
<th>P.P. Roos</th>
<th>Sassoferrato, Madonna</th>
<th>Vernet, Bay</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mengs, St Anthony</th>
<th>Ribera, St John</th>
<th>Rubens, Nun</th>
<th>Rubens, Man</th>
<th>After Rubens (2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Luini, Madonna 453</th>
<th>Parmigiano</th>
<th>Panini</th>
<th>'Raphael', Madonna</th>
<th>Gysels</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Poelenburgh, Nativity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

37
Lists and descriptions of the Wellington pictures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Author/Source</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1836</td>
<td>J.D. Passavant, <em>Tour of a German Artist in England</em>, I, pp. 166–74 (discusses about twenty pictures in some detail)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1849</td>
<td>P. Cunningham, <em>Hand-book for London</em>, p. 27 (a brief description)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1853</td>
<td>‘Apsley House’, <em>The Athenaeum</em>, 8 Jan. 1853, pp. 49–50 (a brief guide to mark the opening of the house to the public)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1853</td>
<td><em>Apsley House, Piccadilly, the Town Residence of his Grace the Duke of Wellington</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1853</td>
<td>R. Ford, <em>Apsley House and Walmer Castle</em>, illustrated by plates and description (including the lithographs of Apsley House)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1854</td>
<td>(R. Ford), ‘Apsley House’, <em>The Athenaeum</em>, 92, pp. 446–86 (a detailed survey of the collection; Ford’s authorship is suggested by the similarity of the text with the introduction to the previous publication)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1854</td>
<td>G.F. Waagen, <em>Treasures of Art in Great Britain</em>, II, pp. 272–78 (the text is almost identical to that of 1838)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1862</td>
<td><em>A Catalogue of the Pictures at Apsley House</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1965</td>
<td>C.M. Kauffmann, <em>Paintings at Apsley House</em> (54 reproductions)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1973</td>
<td><em>Apollo</em>, September 1973 (whole issue devoted to the Wellington Museum)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1982</td>
<td>C.M. Kauffmann, <em>Catalogue of Paintings in the Wellington Museum</em>, 1st edn</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Explanation of terms

Attribution
The following terms are used:

Ascribed to
indicates an element of doubt in the attribution

Follower of
indicates a work painted within a generation of the artist concerned

After
is used where the precise original is identified

Manner of
indicates a general stylistic relationship; usually a much later work

Replica
a copy attributable to the original artist

Lit.
The bibliographical sections omit some of the nineteenth-century references given in the 1901 Wellington Catalogue where these consist only of lists (see p. 32).

Vara
1 vara = 84.7 cm

Medium
The medium is assumed to be oil unless otherwise stated.

Measurements
These are given in centimetres; height precedes width.

Artists’ biographies
These have, in the main, been kept very brief. The principal monographs are sometimes listed, in particular where they do not appear in the catalogue entries.
CATALOGUE OF PAINTINGS
Hans von AACHEN (1552–1615)

German school

Born in Cologne, he bears the name of his father’s native town. He was in Italy c. 1574–87, influenced particularly by Tintoretto in Venice, and returned to Cologne in 1588. After some time at the Bavarian court in Munich, he finally agreed to accept Rudolf II’s call to Prague and was made court painter by Rudolf on 1 January 1592. He remained a close associate of the Emperor, who raised him to the peerage in 1594 and sent him abroad on several missions. Von Aachen is reckoned among the leading representatives of German Mannerism.


1 The Emperor Rudolf II (1552–1612)

Inscribed lower right: el emperador Rodolfo and on left, inventory no. 415

Canvas, 200 × 121 cm

WM 1509–1948

He wears a laurel wreath, breastplate of steel and gold, with the collar and badge of the Golden Fleece, dark trunks and pantaloons and buff shoes, and holds his crown, which is lying on the table on the right. Rudolf II, the son of Maximilian II, born in Vienna and educated at the Spanish court, became Emperor in 1576. Enormously learned and able, he was an outstanding patron of artists, scientists and mathematicians, and his court at Prague, with its Kunstkammer and festivals, became one of the principal cultural centres of its time. Yet Rudolf was politically unworldly and indecisive, and was ultimately forced to abdicate in favour of his brother Matthias in 1611.

Catalogued as ‘painter unknown’ by Evelyn Wellington, the attribution to Hans von Aachen was suggested by Charles Avery when it was shown in the Baroque in Bohemia exhibition, V&A Museum, 1969 (ex-catalogue), and it has been supported by Dr E. Fučíková (oral opinion) and J. Jacoby (2000, pp. 250–53), although Kaufmann suggested that it was a studio work (1988, p. 154). Certainly, of the three principal court painters – von Aachen, Spranger and Heintz – it was von Aachen and his workshop who produced most of the portraits of the Emperor. WM 1509 is similar, in particular, to the engraving by B. Höfel after a half-length by Hans von Aachen, in which the Emperor also wears a breastplate and a laurel wreath – a reference to a victory over the Turks in 1598 – and holds a baton. The same head appears also in Egidius Sadeler’s more famous engraving after von Aachen of 1603 (an der Heiden 1970, fig. 135). The soft modelling of the face is paralleled in the oil portraits by von Aachen, and from his workshop (e.g. bust portrait, Kunsthistorisches Museum, Vienna; an der Heiden 1970, fig. 132; bust portraits in armour in the Germanisches National museum, Nuremberg, and Donaueschingen; an der Heiden 1970, figs. 133, 136) and is quite different in style from the portrait by Josef Heintz in the
Kunsthistorisches Museum, Vienna (Schwarzenfeld 1961, frontispiece). Final support for the attribution is provided by a drawing from the von Aachen workshop which is closely related to WM 1509 (Szépművészeti Múzeum, Budapest; an der Heiden 1970, pp. 171, 216, no. B.30, fig. 186). Although it is reversed, with the table on the left, and differs somewhat in the Emperor’s costume and posture, it serves to link the composition with the von Aachen workshop. Rudolf’s crown, so prominently displayed here, has been described as the finest achievement of imperial design (Evans 1973, pp. 80, 175). Attributed to Hans Vermeyen, it is based on the mitre crown of Maximilian I, which had been melted down by Philip II, but was known from Dürer’s depictions, both in his portraits of Maximilian and on the summit of his Triumphal Arch. Rudolf’s crown continued to be used as the Imperial Crown of Austria from 1804 until the abolition of the monarchy in 1919 and it is still the centrepiece of the Treasury of the Kunsthistorisches Museum in Vienna (Katalog, 1961, p. 20, no. 55; see also H. Fillitz, ‘Studien zur Krone Kaiser Rudolfs II’, Kunstmuseets Årskrift, Copenhagen, 1950, pp. 79ff., figs. 1–3; idem, Die Österreichische Kaiserkrone, Vienna and Munich, 1959, pp. 22ff., figs. 1–5). It is dated 1602, which provides a terminus post for this portrait. Although the crown is depicted with reasonable accuracy, its narrative scenes are not shown.
CONDITION Paint surface cracked.
PROV. According to Wellington family tradition, the Duke of Alba; Sir Henry Wellesley (afterwards Lord Cowley), brother of the Duke of Wellington, from whom the Duke bought the picture before 1829. In a letter of 14 August 1829 to Seguier, the Duke wrote: ‘I bought some pictures some years ago from my brother, Lord Cowley …. There were among them some good ones … an original of Rodolphe de Hapsburg …. They all came from the collection of the Duke of Alva.’

EXH. Essen, Villa Hügel, Prag um 1600. Kunst und Kultur am Hofe Rudolfs II, 1988 (98)

Sir William ALLAN (1782–1850)
British School

Born in Edinburgh, Allan was an apprentice coach painter before joining Wilkie at the Trustees’ Academy, after which he travelled extensively, including a ten year stay in Russia (1805–14). His early work is dominated by exotic themes derived from his travels, but from the 1820s, under the influence of Walter Scott, he turned increasingly to subjects from Scottish history. He became President of the Royal Scottish Academy in 1838 and was knighted in 1842.


2 The Battle of Waterloo
Signed lower right: William Allan Pinxt, 1843
Panel, 118 × 310 cm
WM 1539–1948
The artist’s own description of the picture is pasted on the back of the panel:

‘WATERLOO. 18th June 1815. Half-past seven o’clock p.m.
The picture represents the last desperate effort of Napoleon to force the left centre of the allied army and turn their position. In the centre of the picture are several battalions of the Imperial Guard, formed into one massive column, led on by Marshal Ney, who, in endeavouring to ascend the rising ground occupied by the British, is received in front by Captain Bolton’s Battery, while General Maitland’s Brigade of Guards attack the French on their right, and General Adams’ Brigade assail their left. This combined attack throws the head of the French column into irreparable confusion, perceiving which, the Duke of Wellington, who, with his staff, is immediately behind Captain Bolton’s Battery, orders the general advance of the allied army, covered by a range of batteries seen on the right and left of the Duke’s position. To the left of the Duke is the village of Mont St Jean and that of Waterloo, of which the church spire is alone visible. In the distance is the forest of Soignies. The farm of La Haye Sainte is seen at the bottom of the slope, close to the road from Brussels to Genappe; a little above the farm-house is the cross road to Wavres, and the hedge-row, where, during the early part of the day, the battle raged furiously, and where Picton fell. In the neighbourhood of the farm, and along the line towards Planchenoit, the French are seen in full retreat. On the extreme left of the spectator, the 23rd Light Dragoons are driving back the French Cuirassiers from their final attempt to silence the guns at the north-east angle of Hougoumont, from whence the smoke is issuing, the Chateau being then in flames. Beyond the smoke is the 71st Regiment, above which is seen the Nivelles road and the Church of ‘Braine La Leude’ in the extreme distance. Napoleon and his staff form the principal group in the foreground, comprising Soult, Bertrand, Drouet, Labédoyère, etc.
(Signed) WILLIAM ALLAN
72 Great King Street, Edinburgh, and 34 King Street, Covent Garden’
(Also printed in exh. cat., Edinburgh, Hill’s Galleries, Exhibition of the Historical and Other Works of the Late William Allan, R.A., 1851, pp. 12–13.)

Contemporary critics admired the work, which The Art Union, 1843, p. 168, suggested ‘is perhaps the most valuable battle picture that has ever been painted, in consequence of the incontrovertible truth of the main features’. In terms of Allan’s history paintings, of which many dealt with early Scottish or oriental themes, this was a near contemporary subject and he took the trouble to obtain copies of the engraved plans of Waterloo from Wellington’s antagonist, the military historian William Siborne (1797–1849), whose History of the Waterloo Campaign, 1844 was among the items in Allan’s studio sale, auctioned by Tait & Nisbet, 1850 (80) (Kennedy 1994, p. 186). The Art Journal (1849, p. 109) recorded that Allan visited the battlefield of Waterloo several times ‘to make sketches of the field of action’, although this is not recorded elsewhere (Kennedy, p. 186). He also used models in his painting, and his collection contained pieces of Waterloo uniform and weaponry (Kennedy, p. 187).

Allan’s The Battle of Waterloo remains a reconstruction, painted in the tradition of panoramic battle scenes under dramatic skies, which can be traced back at least to Altdorfer’s Battle of Issus (1529) in the
Alte Pinakothek, Munich, and it differs from more directly observed military scenes such as Swebach’s *Wagram* (see below, no. 169). However, the picture’s accuracy is attested by Wellington himself, who bought it at the R.A. in 1843 for £600 and was said to have commented: ‘Good – very good; not too much smoke’. *The Athenaeum*, 2 March 1850).

As WM 1539 represents the battle from the French side, Allan painted a companion, seen from the British side, which was his entry for the Westminster Hall competition in 1846 (now Royal Military Academy, Sandhurst). There are preparatory drawings for WM 1539 in the National Gallery of Scotland, including studies of hands (D.4343) and of the fallen horse in the left foreground (D.3414A), and a sketch for the painting was listed in the memorial exhibition at Hill’s Galleries in 1851 (51).

A rather different view of the battle by Félix Philippoteaux, dated 1874, in the V&A collection, is also on display at Apsley House (V&M, *Catalogue of Foreign Paintings*, II, 1973, no. 176).

**CONDITION.** The large and comparatively thin mahogany panel is badly warped, but the paint surface is in good condition, consolidated locally, 2007.

**PROV.** Bought by the 1st Duke of Wellington from the artist for £600 in 1843.

**EXH.** R.A. 1843 (287; reviewed, *The Athenaeum*, 1843, p. 492; *The Times*, 9 May 1843, p. 3); Edinburgh, Mr Hill’s Galleries, 67 Princes Street, *Exhibition of the Historical and other Works of the Late Sir William Allan R.A.*, 1851, p. 13


---

**Giuseppe Cesari, called Il Cavaliere d’ARPINO (1568–1640)**

*Roman School*

He served under six popes and particularly enjoyed the patronage of Gregory XIII and Clement VIII, by whom he was created *Cavaliere di Cristo* in 1600, and he painted extensive series of frescoes in Roman churches and palaces in a late Mannerist style. His cabinet pictures, executed in sharp detail and somewhat similar to those of Jacopo Zucchi and Alessandro Allori, were also highly popular in the early seventeenth century.


3  *The Expulsion from Paradise*

_Copper, 51.5 × 35.3 cm_

_WM 1633–1948_

This is one of several versions of a composition by the Cavaliere d’Arpino, of which the original is in the Louvre (copper, 51 × 38 cm; Röttgen 2002, p. 313; Loire 2006, pp. 90–92; dated c. 1597). The
composition was used again in the vault fresco in the Villa Aldobrandini, Frascati, c. 1602–03, and there is a replica of the Louvre version at Christ Church, Oxford (copper, 46.5 × 35.5 cm), with workshop participation, possibly by Flaminio Allegrini, with variations in the landscape (Röttgen 2002, p. 378, repr., dated c. 1606).

Another, lesser version was sold Christie’s, 9 December 1994, lot 38 (copper, 48 × 35 cm) (previously sold Christie’s, 7 July 1978, lot 219; exh. Trafalgar Galleries, June 1977, no. 4) and other versions have been recorded (Loire 2006, p. 90). Related drawings include one in the Kunsthaus, Zurich, which is a study for the vault of the Villa Aldobrandini, Frascati (Röttgen 2002, p. 341, fig. 105i), whilst the drawing in the Pierpont Morgan Library (J. Pierpont Morgan collection … formed by Fairfax Murray, IV, 1912, p. 161) is a later reworking which shows considerable variations and has the composition of the figures reversed (Loire 2006, p. 92). There are also two sheets in the Nationalmuseum, Stockholm, and the Kunstmuseum, Düsseldorf.

The quality of the Wellington picture and the fact that it contains pentimenti (below the angel’s knee and at Adam and Eve’s legs) suggest that it may well be autograph, but Röttgen (2002, p. 530) ascribed it to Bernardino Cesari (1571–1622), the Cavaliere’s younger brother, and dated it to c. 1606. It is closer to the Christ Church version than to the one in the Louvre, in that it includes a fuller landscape, with flowers in the foreground, and a fig leaf for Adam, but it differs from both in the position of Eve’s hands, leaving one breast uncovered, and in the gesture of Adam’s left hand. The composition is
ultimately based on Michelangelo’s *Expulsion* on the Sistine ceiling, but the mannered, ballet-like postures are characteristic of the Cavaliere d’Arpino.

CONDITION Good, areas of retouching on the angel’s dress and Adam’s face, right, conserved in the English Heritage Conservation Studio, 2007.

PROV. Charles IV when Prince of the Asturias in the Casita del Príncipe de El Escorial (c. 1780 inventory, no. 62); captured at Vitoria, 1813.


**Follower of Giuseppe Cesari, Il Cavaliere d’ARPINO**

4 *The Mystic Marriage of St Catherine*

Inscribed on back on fragment of old paper: Joseph ... Arp ... as /fecit

Walnut panel, 64 x 45.8 cm

WM 1607–1948

Although it had been attributed to Rottenhammer in the Wellington Heirloom catalogue, the old attribution to the Cavaliere d’Arpino was readopted when the inscription on the back was discovered (Evelyn Wellington). The painting was listed as by the Cavaliere d’Arpino in the inventory of the Casita del Príncipe, de El Escorial and it is close to his style, but its weaknesses and lack of crispness in detail endorse Herwarth Röttgen’s judgement (oral opinion) that it is the work of a follower. There is another, smaller version of different composition with half-length figures in the Prado (no. 555).

The mystic marriage of St Catherine is mentioned in hymns from the thirteenth century (see under Parmigianino, no. 125). After refusing to marry in her native Alexandria, St Catherine followed a hermit into the Sinai desert and there, in a church, she was baptized and spiritually married to Christ. The scene was frequently depicted from the fourteenth century and the iconography became standard, only the numbers of attending angels and saints remaining variable (e.g. see repr. in H. Brémond, *Sainte Catherine*, Paris, 1926, pp. 10–32). Nearly always represented is the moment when ‘... our Lord espoused her in joining himself to her by spiritual marriage ... and in token of this set a ring on her finger’ (*Golden Legend*). Among the immediate forerunners of this particular composition are two by Veronese, one in the Galleria Corsini, Rome, which shows St Catherine in identical posture, another in the Dulwich Picture Gallery (no. 239), in which the hovering angel appears. An engraving dated 1595 by Vespasiano Strada (Bartsch 1803–21, XVII, 309, 16) also has a closely comparable composition.
**CONDITION** Damaged area on left of St Catherine’s head; smaller retouched areas on her dress.

**Prov.** Charles IV when Prince of the Asturias in the Casita del Príncipe de El Escorial (c. 1780 inventory, no. 173).

**Lit.** Zarco Cuevas 1934, p. 12; Gaya Nuño 1964, p. 86, no. 280; Pérez Sánchez 1965, p. 221

**Ludolf BAKHUIZEN (1630–1708)**

*Dutch School*

Born in Emden, East Friesland, Bakhuizen came to Amsterdam in 1649–50 and remained there for the rest of his life. He was a pupil of Allaert van Everdingen, but he was most influenced by the seascapes of Willem van de Velde the Younger. After the two van de Veldes went to England in 1672 he was the leading marine painter in Holland.

5  **Soldiers of the Dutch East India Company embarking at the Montelbaans Tower, Amsterdam**

Signed on side of barge on right: Ao L: BAKHUYZEN: F. 1685

Canvas, 109 × 159 cm

WM 1504–1948

The view is of the Oude Schans canal, looking north, with the Montelbaans tower on the left and the docks in the distance. At the foot of the tower, a crowd has gathered to witness the departure of several small boats loaded with figures. Traditionally, the man in the ship bowing in acknowledgement of their salutations (right) was identified as Admiral de Ruyter, but as the Admiral died in 1676, nine years before the picture was painted, this is unlikely. Evelyn Wellington quoted the archivist of Amsterdam, W.R. Veder, as suggesting that the subject is the embarkation of Henry Casimir II, Stadholder of Friesland in October 1684, but this has been rejected on the grounds that his wife, who accompanied him, is not represented here. More plausible is de Beer’s suggestion that WM 1504 depicts the embarkation of sailors, soldiers and dignitaries of the V.O.C. (Dutch East India Company), an event which took place twice yearly from the foot of the Montelbaans tower. Lighters ferried the men to the larger merchant ships visible in the distance.

A closely related pen and wash drawing, apparently preparatory for the painting, is in the Gemeentearchief, Amsterdam; another, showing the same view of the Montelbaans tower and the canal, but without the figures, is in the Rijksprentenkabinet, Amsterdam (inv. A1557).
6  A Warship at Anchor in a Rough Sea

Canvas, 42 × 52 cm
WM 1559–1948

CONDITION Surface worn and abraded.

Prov. Bought by the 2nd Duke of Wellington from Spiridione Gambardella in 1859.

Lit. Hofstede de Groot 1908–27, VII, no. 243
Bassano

Leandro dal Ponte, called Leandro BASSANO (1557–1622)
Italian (Venetian) School

Son of the painter Jacopo dal Ponte, called Bassano from his home city of Bassano del Grappa in the Veneto. Leandro settled in Venice by 1588 and enjoyed a successful career as a portrait painter. His early portraits were influenced by Venetian artists such as Tintoretto, but his later style showed familiarity with the Emilian painting of Bartolomeo Passarotti. Leandro’s biographer Ridolfi (1648) praised his talent as a portraitist, a skill which was acknowledged during his lifetime, culminating in 1595 when he was made a Knight of St Mark for his portrait of Doge Marino Grimani (now in Dresden, Gemäldegalerie.) He also painted subject pictures in the style of his father, turning down the prestigious invitation to become court painter to the Holy Roman Emperor Rudolf II in Prague.

Lit. W. Arslan, I Bassano, Milan 1960

Ascribed to Leandro dal Ponte, called Leandro BASSANO

7 Doge Marcantonio Memmo (1536–1615)
Canvas, 101.4 x 102.6 cm
WM 1544–1948

Formerly catalogued as Doge Pasquale Cicogna by Tintoretto, the identities of the sitter and artist were established upon comparison with an almost identical painting by Leandro Bassano in the Museo Civico at Padua (no. 643). This is inscribed in the upper left corner:

MARCUS ANTO.S / MEMO DUX VENET. / OBIIT. 29 OCTOB. 1615 / AET. SUAE ANO 78. ME. XI / DIE 18. DUCATUS VERO / ANNO III. MEN. III DIE. VI.
(Marco Antonio Memmo, Doge of Venice, died 29 Oct. 1615 aged 78 years, 11 months and 18 days. He was Doge for 3 years, 3 months and 6 days).

This was formerly accepted as the original painting of the Doge by Leandro Bassano (Arslan 1960, p. 266, pl. 335), mentioned by Ridolfi in the seventeenth century (C. Ridolfi, Le Maraviglie dell’arte, Venice, 1648, II, p. 168). More recently, however, it has been viewed as a copy of a lost original (A. Ballarin, Da Bellini a Tintoretto, Padua, 1992, p. 220). The Wellington picture is identical in composition except that it shows less at the bottom – it may have been cut down – and a little less on the left. It is also somewhat smaller than the painting in Padua (101 x 102.5 cm as against 125 x 109.5 cm), but this is accounted for by the reduction in the amount of costume shown rather than by any difference in scale. It lacks the sharpness and precision, particularly in the facial features, of the Padua picture, and it may well be a contemporary copy rather than a replica by the artist.

There are several other such copies/replicas, for instance in Venice, Accademia (no. 229, 114 x 87 cm from S. Giacomo alla Giudecca; Arslan 1960, p. 270, ‘original copy by (?) Leandro of the version
Marcantonio Memmo belonged to a distinguished Venetian family recorded in public documents since 960. He earned a high reputation during his career in public administration on the Venetian mainland and was elected Doge on 24 July 1612 at the age of 75. He died at the end of October 1615. His monument is in S. Giorgio Maggiore; there is a large votive picture devoted to him in the Palazzo Ducale painted by Palma Giovane (A. da Mosto, I Dogi di Venezia, Venice, 1960, pp. 331–36).

Because of the inscription which gives the death date, Venturi (Storia dell’Arte Italiana, IX, 4, 1929, p. 1321), Berenson (Venetian Painters, 1958, p. 24) and Arslan (1960, p. 266) took the Paduan picture to be later than 1615. However, there is no reason to suppose that it was a posthumous portrait; it is more likely that the inscription was added to an extant painting after Memmo’s death. Certainly the inference from Ridolfi (1648) is that Leandro painted the portrait while Memmo was Doge, which would place it in the period 1612–15.

**CONDITION.** Somewhat worn and retouched. Considerable retouching along upper edge, on face, beard and sitter’s right hand. Retouching along whole of lower edge may be an indication that it was cut down at the bottom (see above).
PROV. Bought by Henry Graves & Co. in 1844 from Peter Norton, a dealer of Soho Square, for £30; sold by them in 1845 to E. N. Dennys for 200 guineas (£210); bought back by Graves for the same price a few months later and sold to the 1st Duke of Wellington, still for the same price.

Lit. The original in Padua and the versions in Venice and Frankfurt (but not WM 1544) are discussed by Arslan 1960, pp. 266, 270, 343, pl. 335; A. Ballarin and D. Banzato, Da Bellini a Tintoretto. Dipinti dei Musei Civici di Padova dalla metà del Quattrocento ai primi del Seicento, exh. cat., Padua, Musei Civici, 1991, p. 220

Sir William BEECHEY, R.A. (1753–1839)
British School

He trained as a lawyer before entering the R.A. Schools in 1772, where he studied to become a portrait painter under Zoffany and copied Reynolds’s portraits. He became portrait painter to Queen Charlotte in 1793, was knighted in 1798, became portrait painter to the Duke of Gloucester in 1813, and finally, principal portrait painter to William IV in 1830. In September 1836 his collection and the contents of his studio were sold by Christie’s.


Lt General Sir Thomas Picton G.C.B. (1758–1815)
Canvas, 75.6 × 62 cm
WM 1485–1948

He wears the sashes and stars of the Order of the Bath and of the Portuguese Order of the Tower and Sword, and from his neck hangs the badge of the Tower and Sword and the Army gold cross.

Picton became a lieutenant in 1777 and thereafter spent many years on inactive service. From 1794 he served in the West Indies and, because of his knowledge of Spanish, was made governor of Trinidad, newly captured from Spain in 1797. Replaced in 1803, he was tried in England for excesses of cruelty in his administration of justice and found guilty in 1806. At a retrial in 1808 his name was cleared on the grounds that the use of torture was permissible under Spanish law, current in Trinidad when he became governor. In the same year he was promoted to Major General, and he served with distinction in the Peninsular War 1809–13 and at Waterloo, where he was killed. The story of his rule in Trinidad is dramatically recounted in V.S. Naipaul’s The Loss of Eldorado, 1969.

There is another portrait of Picton, by Martin Archer Shee, in the N.P.G. (no. 126). His two roles in British life, colonial villain and military hero, are neatly contrasted in two representations of him: C. Doyle’s caricature entitled Gen. Thomas Picton cruelly inflicting Torture on Louisa Calderon in the Island of Trinidad (published in 1807), and Sebastian Graham’s marble bust surmounting Picton’s monument in St Paul’s Cathedral. The date of WM 1485 is given by Walker (1985) as 1815, because of the label on the back, apparently copied from an inscription on the canvas before relining: Sir Thomas Picton painted a fortnight bef. his death by / Sir WB RA. There are copies in Welsh private collections
CONDITION. Pronounced bituminous cracking of paint surface.

PROV. Bought by the 1st Duke of Wellington in 1839 from Colnaghi for 20 guineas (£21). According to a letter from Colonel Gurwood to the Duke of Wellington dated 16 Oct. 1839: ‘I have secured the portrait of Sir Thomas Picton by Sir William Beechey. I could not get a bargain in proportion to what Mr Colnaghi gave for it. I gave him 20 guineas for it. Several artists have seen it who think it a good portrait. Sir F. Stovin thinks the likeness excellent.’

EXH. South Kensington 1868 (200)


After BEECHEY

9 Horatio, Viscount Nelson (1758–1805)

Canvas, 136 x 111 cm

WM 1530–1948

Three-quarter length, life-size, age about forty-four. He wears the blue, gold-embroidered coat with gold epaulette and white waistcoat and breeches of a vice-admiral. From his neck hang the Flag Officers’ gold medals for the battles of St Vincent and the Nile. On his chest are the stars of the Bath, of St
Ferdinand and of the Imperial Ottoman Order of the Crescent. He wears the red sash of the Bath and beneath it that of St Ferdinand of the Two Sicilies with the badge of the order at the lower end.

Nelson entered the navy in his twelfth year, under his uncle Captain Suckling. He was given his first command in 1778 and spent the following years, until the outbreak of war with France in 1793, largely on missions to the West Indies. After his victory against the Spanish fleet at Cape St Vincent in 1797 he was made K.B. and promoted to rear-admiral. In July 1797 he lost his right arm at Santa Cruz, Tenerife, but only a year later he won his overwhelming victory at Aboukir Bay against the French fleet on the Nile. He defeated the Danish fleet at Copenhagen in 1801, was appointed commander-in-chief in 1803, and was killed at Trafalgar on 21st October 1805.

Beechey’s original full-length portrait of Nelson is at St Andrew’s Hall, Norwich, and the bust-length sketch for it, which was exhibited at the R.A. in 1801 (125), is on loan to the N.P.G. A three-quarter length version, very similar to WM 1530, formerly in the collection of Commander E. Culme-Seymour, R.N., was bought for the Admiralty in 1970 (124.5 x 96.5 cm). The canvas of WM 1530, before relining, bore what appeared to be a manufacturer’s or importer’s stamp that included the date 1806, which indicates that this replica was painted after Nelson’s state funeral in January of that year.

Hoppner’s full-length portrait of c. 1801 in the Royal Collection is closely comparable in posture and type (Millar 1969, p. 54).

**CONDITION.** Surface badly cracked through paint shrinkage; relined c. 1950.

**PROV.** Bought by or presented to the 1st Duke of Wellington.

**LIT.** Walker 1985, 1, p. 63
Chevalier Féréol de BONNEMAISON (c. 1770–1827)
French School

Educated at Montpellier, Bonnemaison fled to England briefly during the Revolution, but returned to exhibit portraits and other paintings at the Paris Salon from 1796. After Waterloo, when the Duke of Wellington was concerned with the return of the art treasures looted by Napoleon, he commissioned Bonnemaison to restore the Raphaels taken from Madrid and to make lithographic reproductions of them. These were published in 1822 with a text by Eméric David. Bonnemaison continued to be active as a lithographer and as director of restoration of pictures at the Louvre, but by 1817 he had also become an art dealer, acquiring control of the Talleyrand collection of Dutch masters in that year and bidding for Wellington at the Lapeyrière and Le Rouge sales. The sale catalogue of Bonnemaison’s collection, dated 17 April 1827, shows that he owned about 150 paintings of all schools.

10 Copy of Raphael’s Madonna with the Fish
Canvas, 216 × 160 cm

The Archangel Raphael presents Tobias, holding the fish, to the Virgin, while St Jerome reads from his translation of the Bible, thereby upholding the canonical nature of the Book of Tobit. The original painting by Raphael is in the Prado, Madrid (no. 297). It was painted in 1513–14 for San Domenico, Naples, and acquired by Philip IV of Spain in 1645, who hung it at the Escorial.

This is one of four life-size copies made by Bonnemaison for the Duke of Wellington of the Raphaels in the Spanish royal collection which had been taken from the Escorial to Paris by Joseph Bonaparte in 1813 and exhibited at the Musée Napoléon. While in Paris, in about 1814–16, the originals were restored and transferred from panel on to canvas under Bonnemaison’s direction, for which the artist was rewarded with the Légion d’Honneur by Louis XVIII.

The process was described by Passavant: ‘There is little doubt but that these pictures required being cleaned and transferred from wood to canvas; but I have as little hesitation in saying, that they were much injured in the process, and not treated with that care they deserved. In confirmation of this, I remember an anecdote which David, under whose instruction I studied in Paris, always used to relate. On visiting Bonnemaison one day, at his studio, David found him, to his great consternation, with a sponge full of spirits of turpentine in his hand, with which he was most unmercifully rubbing the injured parts; and that to all his remonstrances on the danger of such a proceeding he could elicit no answer beyond, “That’s of no consequence, turpentine is good for them”.’ The copies were delivered to the Duke in 1818, and by November of that year the originals were back in Madrid.

A fifth painting, The Holy Family under the Oak (Prado, no. 303), which was not transferred on to canvas, but otherwise suffered the same fate as the other four, was not, apparently, copied by Bonnemaison.
11 Copy of Raphael’s Visitation, with the Baptism in the Distance
Canvas, 200 x 146 cm

The original painting is in the Prado, Madrid (no. 300). Painted for the church of San Silvestro, Aquila, in the Abruzzi, in about 1519, it was acquired by Philip IV of Spain in 1655. It is now considered to be a workshop product, possibly in part by Giulio Romano. This is one of four such life-size copies made by Bonnemaison for the 1st Duke of Wellington (see above, no. 10).
Bonnemaison

12 Copy of Raphael’s *Holy Family*, called ‘La Perla’
Canvas, 148 × 117 cm

The original painting is in the Prado, Madrid (no. 301), and is dated about 1518–19. Its attribution has been disputed, with some scholars viewing it as the work of one of Raphael’s pupils, conceivably Giulio Romano. From 1627 to 1650 ‘La Perla’ was in England, in the collection of Charles I, but it entered the Spanish royal collection following the king’s execution and the sale of his goods. This is one of four such life-size copies made by Bonnemaison for 1st the Duke of Wellington (see above, no. 10).

PROV.; EXH.; LIT. As above, no. 10

13 Copy of Raphael’s *Christ carrying the Cross*, called ‘Lo Spasimo di Sicilia’
Canvas, 311 × 223 cm

The original painting is in the Prado, Madrid (no. 298). It was painted in 1516–17 for the monastery of Santa Maria dello Spasimo in Palermo and became popularly known as ‘Lo Spasimo di Sicilia’. It is in Raphael’s late, dramatic style of the period of the tapestry cartoons and is generally considered to have been partly or wholly painted by pupils. This is one of four such life-size copies made by Bonnemaison for the 1st Duke of Wellington (see above, no. 10).

CONDITION Detached from its stretcher and in a much damaged condition.
PROV.; EXH.; LIT. As above, no. 10

14 BREENBERGH (formerly attributed to) see POELENBURCH
**Paul BRIL (c. 1553/54–1626)**  
*Flemish School; worked in Rome*

Bril was probably born in Breda, but after a brief stay in Lyons from 1574 he settled in Rome. From 1600 he was strongly influenced by Elsheimer and his landscapes mark the transition between the detailed treatment of the sixteenth century and the broader, more naturalistic concept of the seventeenth century.


15 *Landscape with St Eustace and the Stag*

Signed on stone, centre foreground: PA—BRIL

Canvas, 36 × 45.7 cm  
WM 1623–1948

The figure at lower left has been variously identified as St Hubert or as St Eustace; representations of the two saints are often confused. St Hubert was out hunting when he saw Christ on the cross between the antlers of a stag. As a result of his vision he became converted to Christianity and subsequently became Bishop of Liège, where he died in 727. The scene of his vision is commonly depicted from the fifteenth century onwards. St Eustace, born Placidus, a Roman general of the second century AD, experienced a similar vision which also caused him to convert to Christianity. Kauffmann (1982) proposed St Hubert as the likelier alternative for WM 1623, in part because Hubert, Bishop of Liège, is the more popular of the two in Netherlandish painting. However, St Eustace would have been more appropriate for an artist resident in Rome; this identification is supported by the figure’s garments, which evoke Roman military garb, and by the spear on the ground beside him.

Another version of the scene by Bril was in the Wetzlar collection, Amsterdam, but it is not similar in composition. He frequently placed saints in the corners of his landscapes – St Jerome, for example, in a painting in the Galleria Borghese, Rome, and St John in one in the Louvre. The relatively broad treatment indicates a date in the latter part of Bril’s career, after c. 1615.

Condition: Pronounced craquelure; retouched upper edge, but condition good on the whole.

Prov. Spanish royal collection, acquired for Queen Isabel (Elisabetta Farnese), 1759–66; possibly to be identified with a *Vision of St Eustace*, ‘Flemish school’, of similar size, listed in the Buenavista Palace inventory of 1766 and the Royal Palace inventory of 1772, no. 90 (in the *Gabineto colgado de verde*); captured at Vitoria, 1813.

Exh. N.G.L., *Dutch Landscape, The Early Years: Haarlem and Amsterdam 1590–1650*, 1986 (2; as St Eustace); Tokyo 1990–91 (22)

The appearance of Master Betty, an infant prodigy capable of arousing mass adulation, known by the name of ‘the Young Roscius’, was the main event of the London theatre season of 1804–05. From the time of his debut, as Selim in Barbarossa, at Covent Garden on 1 December 1804, through his roles as Romeo, Hamlet, Richard III and Young Norval in Home’s Douglas in 1805–06, he had London at his feet. But his prominence declined almost as quickly as it had risen. In 1808 he retired from the stage to enter Christ’s College, Cambridge, and his attempt to make a comeback in 1812 was unsuccessful.

During the period of his fame, at the age of thirteen to fifteen, he was portrayed by the leading portrait painters of the time, including Harlow (N.P.G.), Northcote (Shakespeare Memorial Theatre and Petworth), and Opie (Garrick Club and N.P.G.), as well as by theatrical illustrators and caricaturists. WM 1552 is not very similar to any of the principal images. It was catalogued as ‘attributed to Lawrence’ by Evelyn Wellington (1901), but the link with Lawrence is too tenuous for such a description and the very cursory execution defies attribution to any of the better known artists.
CONDITION. Tendency to flaking in the background, particularly round the face.

PROV. Bought by the 2nd Duke of Wellington in 1871 from W. Gardner, Conduit Street, for £25.


**British School, c. 1850**


Canvas, 126 × 100 cm
WM 1563–1948

The sitter was the younger brother of Sir Charles James Napier, commander of the army in Bengal. He served with distinction in the Peninsular War, of which he wrote a history, and was made General in 1859. His white hair and beard suggest an age over sixty and hence a date c. 1850. A comparable portrait of him by Spiridione Gambardella is in the private collection of the Duke of Wellington, and a marble bust by G.G. Adams, 1855, is in the N.P.G. (1197).

CONDITION. The canvas is much damaged and in need of extensive repair and relining.

PROV. Bought by or presented to the 2nd Duke of Wellington.

LIT. *Dictionary of British Portraiture* 1979, p. 155
Adriaen BROUWER (c. 1605/06–1638)
Flemish School

Born in Oudenaarde, he moved to Holland in about 1621 and spent the next decade in Amsterdam and in Haarlem, where he was a colleague of Frans Hals. In 1631 he became a master of the Antwerp Guild of St Luke, but two years later he was in prison, probably for debt. Brouwer's innovative and expressive scenes of peasant life had a profound influence on the development of low-life genre painting in both the northern and southern Netherlands.


18 The Smokers

Signed on bench-end on right: Brav…
Oak panel, 41 × 37.4 cm
WM 1522–1948

Three men are seated, two of them smoking pipes; a woman holding a tankard is speaking to another who is looking in at the window. The broad and fluid manner and the elimination of superfluous detail indicate a late work: Bode (1924) and Knuttel (1962) agree in dating it c. 1635–38. There is a replica in Budapest (panel, 40.7 × 39.3 cm; Ember and Urbach (ed.), 2000, II, p. 28), and a copy in the Sinebrychoff Art Museum, Helsinki (inv. A376); another copy in the Akademie der Bildenden Künste, Vienna, was destroyed in World War II (R. Trnek, Gemäldegalerie der Akademie der Bildenden Künste in Wien: illustriertes Bestandsverzeichnis, Vienna, 1989, p. 23).

Smokers appear frequently in Brouwer’s tavern scenes, though at this time smoking was still a relatively new occupation. Introduced in the Netherlands in the 1580s by sailors returning from the New World, it quickly became associated with disreputable and dissolute behaviour, particularly among the lower classes. Although arguments were made for the various medicinal benefits of tobacco (e.g., as a prophylactic against plague), more widely publicized and decried were its supposed narcotic and stupefactory effects, which induced a condition akin to drunkenness. Tobacco smoking (or ‘sipping’) was a popular activity in taverns, and became a subject of comedy in art and literature (see Ivan Gaskell, ‘Tobacco, Social Deviance, and Dutch Art in the Seventeenth Century’, in Holländische Genremalerei im 17. Jahrhundert (Jahrbuch Preussischer Kulturbesitz: Sonderband 4, 1987, pp. 117–37).

Additionally, the elusive quality of the smoke itself was often interpreted as an allegory of the transitory nature of human life and earthly vanities. This is underlined in a painting by Brouwer’s follower, Joos van Craesbeek, in which a man holds a skull in one hand and a pipe in the other, and also in an engraving by Hendrick Bary of a smoker inscribed (in Dutch): ‘While I diligently smoke … so flies the world away’ (Amsterdam 1976, figs. 7c, 7d).
**CONDITION** Convex warp to panel at upper right; small paint loss on right of central head and minor damage bottom right edge of panel. Cleaned in 1951.

**PROV.** Gerret Braamcamp sale, Amsterdam, 31 July 1771, lot 37 (500 frs. to Fouquet); Randon de Boisset sale, Paris, 27 Feb. 1777 and ff., lot 53 (2,400 frs. to Chariot); C.J. Clos sale, Paris, 18 Nov. 1812, lot 1 (1000 frs. to de la Roche); Lapeyrière sale, 14 April 1817, lot 15, bought by Féréol de Bonnemaison for the 1st Duke of Wellington for 2,401 frs. – about £96.

**EXH.** B.I., Old Masters, 1818 (25); Guildhall, Loan Collection, 1903 (152); B.F.A.C, Winter Exhibition, 1927–28 (28)


**Jan BRUEGHEL I (1568–1625)**

_Flemish (Antwerp) School_

Born in Brussels, the son of Pieter Bruegel the Elder, he worked mainly in Antwerp. From 1590 he was in Italy, in Rome c. 1592–94, returning to settle in Antwerp in 1596, where he became Dean of the Guild of St Luke in 1602. He painted mainly small-scale landscapes, originally under the influence of Paul Bril and Gillis van Coninxloo, and flower pieces.
There were six paintings by Brueghel from the Spanish royal collection in the 1st Duke of Wellington’s possession, of which five are in the Wellington Museum (no. 64 remaining in the ducal collection), and also three by his follower, Peeter Gysels.


19 River Scene with Boats and Figures
   Signed lower left: BRVEGHEL 16 (?06)
   Copper, 28.6 × 42 cm
   WM 1574–1948

River scenes with a village and figures standing on the river bank are frequent in Brueghel’s work. Klaus Ertz (1979) has classified this as one of several types of landscapes which employ wedge-shaped forms to create spatial recession within the composition. Dated examples of this type cover the period 1603–16 and Ertz cites in particular two autograph variants of WM 1574 in the Galleria Sabauda, Turin, and in the Toledo Museum of Art, Ohio, dated 1603 and 1604 respectively (Ertz 1979, nos. 95, 106, pl. 23), as well as other variants. WM 1574 itself appears to have served as a model for several nearly identical versions attributed to Brueghel, for example at L. Koetser (spring exh. 1965, no. 12) and Sotheby’s, 10 Dec. 1975, lot 63.
The deep recession shows Brueghel’s precociously naturalistic treatment of landscape. On the other hand, the fairyland atmosphere engendered by the bright green tonality is emphasized by the presence of a huge yet almost ethereal church in the small village on the left.

**CONDITION** Small areas of damage upper right and left, otherwise good. Cleaned in 1949.

**Prov.** Spanish royal collection; probably one of a group of four paintings by Jan Brueghel listed under no. 1025 in the 1734 inventory of pictures saved from the fire in the Alcázar. Some of these are described individually in the Royal Palace inventory of 1772, and WM 1574 may perhaps be identified with ‘1025; River landscape with ships; in the foreground a child being handed to a gentleman’ which was hanging in the Infanta’s dining room, although the motif of a baby being passed to a man in a boat does not occur in this picture; captured at Vitoria, 1813.


### 20 Road Scene with Travellers and Cattle

Oak panel, 24.5 x 38 cm

WM 1639–1948

This is a recurrent theme in Brueghel’s oeuvre. Ertz described the group to which WM 1639 belongs under the rubric ‘woodland roads’, in a subsection of the ‘recessioned road scenes’, which is his third
basic landscape type. This particular composition is based on a drawing in the Berlin Kupferstichkabinett (inv. no. 763, Ertz 1979, pl. 166; Winner 1961, p. 215, fig. 22), which contains the basic features of road, houses and trees, but hardly any figures. Several of the animal and figure groupings are sketched out in a drawing in the Nationalmuseum, Stockholm (Ertz 1979, ill. 164). WM 1639 is an autograph replica of a painting in Zurich (Kunsthaus, Stiftung Betty und David M. Koetser, inv. KS–8; Ertz 1979, no. 232, pl. 169), which is painted on copper and dated 1611, and it may probably be placed in the same period. Another, less accomplished, replica on copper is in the Hermitage, St Petersburg (Ertz 1979, no. 242, pl. 168).

CONDITION Cleaned in 1949. Foreground well preserved, but distant landscape abraded.

PROV. Spanish royal collection; probably to be identified with no. 148 in the 1734 inventory of pictures saved from the fire in the Alcázar, and in the 1772 Royal Palace inventory (hanging in the room of the Infante Xavier). . . . ‘landscape with a cart with figures’; captured at Vitoria, 1813.


21 Entry of the Animals into the Ark

Signed lower right: BRVEGHEL 1615; inscribed centre foreground in white (oxidized) with inventory no.: 956

Copper, 26.3 × 37.5 cm

WM 1637–1948

Brueghel used two biblical scenes of Paradise to provide a raison d’être for what are essentially pictures of animals in landscape, The Garden of Eden and Entry of the Animals into the Ark, and the two are very similar in his work. An example of the Garden of Eden dated 1612 is in the Doria Pamphilj Gallery, Rome (inv. FC 341); there is another, dated 1615, in the Royal Collection (RCIN 405512; see White 2007, p. 71, no. 10) as well as a version in the V&A (Catalogue of Foreign Paintings, I, 1973, no. 51; attributed by Ertz to Isaac van Oosten; 1979, pl. 321). As to Entry of the Animals into the Ark, WM 1637 belongs to a compositional type of which the earliest secure example, dated 1613, is in the J. Paul Getty Museum, Los Angeles (Ertz 1979, no. 273, pl. 307). It became an extremely popular composition and there are numerous versions, of which only WM 1637 and the picture in the Szépmûvészeti Mûzeum, Budapest (Ertz 1979, no. 274, pl. 311) are accepted by Ertz as autograph. Among the other versions, attributed by Ertz to Brueghel’s workshop or followers, are: (1) Dessau, Gemäldegalerie (1929 guide, p. 39, no. 266; K. Ertz, Jan Brueghel der Jüngere (1601–1678): die Gemälde mit kritischem Öuvrekatalog, Freren, 1984, no. 99); (2) Baltimore, Walters Art Museum, no. 37.1988 (Ertz 1979, pl. 319); (3) Earl of Verulam coll. (exh. Flemish Art, R.A., 1953–54, no. 398); (4) Madrid, Museo del Prado, no. 1407 (by Jan Brueghel the Younger?); (5) Madrid, Fundación Lázaro Galdiano, no. 819; (6) Milan, Castello Sforzesco (by Jan Brueghel the Younger; Ertz 1984, no. 94); (7) Pau, Musée des Beaux Arts, no. 39.1.1; (8) Utrecht, Genootschap Kunstliefde (formerly on loan to the Centraal Museum, no. 1366); (9) sale, Martin & Martin, Versailles, Feb. 1976 (Connoisseur, May 1976, p. 86, fig. 19); and (10) sale Sotheby’s, London, 20 Apr. 1994, lot 83.

WM 1637 differs from all of these and from the original painting of 1613 in showing the horse standing on the right and facing left, rather than in the centre facing right, and in the disposition of some of the
animals. The animals are clustered more closely together than in the larger Getty and Budapest versions.

Several of Brueghel’s animals were inspired by Rubens: the horse, which also appears in the Garden of Eden pictures, is derived from Rubens’ Riding School formerly in Berlin, where it faces right (c. 1609–13; G. Glück, Rubens, van Dyck und ihr Kreis, Vienna, 1933, p. 37, cf. figs. 21 and 25), and the two lions were adapted from his Daniel in the Lions’ Den (c. 1614/16; Washington, D.C., National Gallery of Art, inv. 1965.13.1), of which there are drawings in the National Gallery of Art (inv. 1969.7.1) and in the British Museum (J.S. Held, Rubens: Selected Drawings, New York, 1986, p. 106, no. 93).

There is no reason to accept the suggestion made in the Wellington Catalogue that J. van Kessel collaborated on WM 1637. Hieronymus (Jerome) van Kessel (1578–after 1636), Jan Brueghel the Elder’s brother-in-law, was essentially a portrait and figure painter; his son Jan van Kessel was a pupil and follower of Jan Brueghel the Younger and also painted paradisical landscapes, but was only born in 1626.

CONDITION. Good condition and well preserved.

PROV. Spanish royal collection; Royal Palace inventory of 1772, one of eight paintings by Jan Brueghel described under no. 956 as hanging in the Infanta’s dining room; captured at Vitoria, 1813.

EXH. R.A., Exhibition of Belgian and Flemish Art, 1927 (241); Arts Council 1949 (9); Brod Gallery, Jan Brueghel, 1979 (32); Tokyo 1990–91 (23)

22 Travellers on a Country Road, with Cattle and Pigs

Signed lower left: BRVEGHEL. 1616; inscribed in white (oxidized) with inventory no.: 956
Copper, 25.7 × 37 cm
WM 1634–1948

WM 1639, Road scene with travellers, has several of the ingredients of a common type of composition involving roads in Brueghel’s work. However, as Klaus Ertz points out, the country road in this instance is wider than reality would allow, so much so that the composition is in many ways closer to the flat landscape compositions. Ertz places it in a separate compositional group of ‘country roads’, together with Flooded country road of 1614 in the Alte Pinakothek, Munich (inv. 1896; Ertz 1979, no. 279, pl. 42) although this differs in having a windmill as the focal point. A version or copy of WM 1634 was in a sale at Lepke, Berlin (16–17 May 1933, lot 312). Ertz (1979, p. 81) discusses the realism of Jan’s treatment of cows and pigs and suggests that the trotting horse in the foreground is, like the white horse in WM 1637, derived from Rubens’s Riding School, formerly in Berlin (c. 1609–13).

CONDITION Cleaned 1949. Surface somewhat abraded.
PROV: Spanish royal collection; Royal Palace inventory of 1772, one of eight paintings by Jan Brueghel or his followers described in general terms under no. 956; captured at Vitoria, 1813.
E XH. N.G.L., *Dutch Landscape, The Early Years: Haarlem and Amsterdam 1590–1650*, 1986 (8); Essen 1997–98 (67)

Lit. Winkelmann-Rhein 1968, p. 85, fig. 19, col. pl. 13; Baumgart 1978, p. 53, col. pl. 4; Müllenmeister 1978, pp. 42f., no. and pl. 75; Ertz 1979, p. 608, no. 306, pp. 69f., 81f., 89, pl. 43, colour

23 Country Road Scene with Figures: A Man Praying at a Shrine

Copper, 21.5 × 32.3 cm

WM 1640–1948

There is a pen drawing for this composition, with variations in the dispositions of the figures, in the Musée des Beaux Arts, Brussels (no. 484, 16.9 × 28.5 cm; Winner 1961, p. 210, fig. 19; Ertz 1979, p. 146, pl. 152); another version, ex-Rudolf collection, Alfred Brod Gallery, *Old Master Drawings*, Jan. 1964, no. 59, repr.

A painted copy, attributed to Pieter Brueghel the Younger, is in the Prado (no. 1456); a studio variant, more closely related to the drawing, was formerly in the Wachtmeister collection, Wanås, Sweden (sale Sotheby’s, London, 5 Dec. 2007, lot 2; Ertz 1979, no. 152, pl. 151); another was in the possession of David Koetser, Zurich (Ertz 1979, no. 223, pl. 150); and a third is in the Mansion House, London (Harold Samuel Collection; see P.C. Sutton, *Dutch & Flemish Seventeenth-century Paintings: The Harold Samuel Collection*, Cambridge, 1992, no. 11, pp. 42–43). A variant, with St Martin dividing his cloak in the foreground, was at Christie’s, London (14 May 1965, lot 84, repr.).

Winner tentatively dated the drawing c. 1619, but Ertz places it and the oil paintings c. 1610 on the grounds of their compositional similarity with the *Country road with wagons* in Munich, which is dated 1610 (inv. 2860; Ertz 1979, pl. 18). However, the Wachtmeister variant is dated 1607 and its copper support is
marked with a stamp used c. 1606, suggesting that WM 1640 may also have been painted c. 1606–07.


Although its surface is rubbed, it remains clear that WM 1640 differs from the other landscapes by Jan Brueghel in the Wellington Museum in its brown tonality and, in particular, in the greenish-brown colour of the grass. These are the colours of late summer, as opposed to the deep blue-greens usual in Brueghel’s paintings.

**CONDITION** Dent top right corner; surface rubbed throughout. Cleaned 1949.

**PROV.** Spanish royal collection; 1734 inventory of pictures saved from the fire in the Alcázar; 1772 Royal Palace inventory, probably one of a small group of paintings by Brueghel described in general terms under no. 1025 (’1025. Pair. Metal. Group of People travelling in carts, on foot, and on horseback.’); captured at Vitoria, 1813.


**John BURNET, F.R.S. (1784–1868)**

**British School**

Born in Musselburgh, he studied at the Trustees’ Academy in Edinburgh, where he was a contemporary of William Allan and David Wilkie, before coming to London in 1806. He began his career as engraver for Britton and Brayley’s *England and Wales*, and he exhibited five paintings at the R.A. from 1808 to 1823. However, apart from the fame of the Apsley House *Greenwich Pensioners*, Burnet’s reputation rests on his engravings and his writings on art.

24 **The Greenwich Pensioners commemorating Trafalgar**

Signed lower left: Jno. B/Oct.21/18 (sic).

Panel, 97 × 153 cm

WM 1556–1948

A group of Greenwich Pensioners and others are assembled on the hill overlooking Greenwich Hospital in the direction of the Thames, on the anniversary of Nelson’s victory at Trafalgar.

Burnet had engraved several of Wilkie’s paintings, including the *Chelsea Pensioners* (see no. 194), and decided to paint a companion to it, apparently without a commission. He ‘set up his easel at Greenwich itself amid the living models of the Hospital’ (*Quarterly Review*, xcii, 1853, p. 455) but the composition is clearly based on Wilkie’s. By June 1835 the painting was sufficiently far advanced for Burnet to write to the Duke of Wellington, apparently at the suggestion of William IV, asking if he would like to see it, and adding that the engraving was also nearing completion (Wellington 1901). The Duke finally bought the picture in 1841, and on 29 March Burnet wrote to thank him for the honour: ‘I beg to assure Your
Grace that nothing could be more gratifying to my feelings; and by it now being placed in the same
collection as Sir David Wilkie’s inimitable picture of the Chelsea pensioners, you have stamped a value
and consequence on the work, which no other collection could confer’.

Burnet made oil studies of the heads of nine Greenwich Pensioners (National Maritime Museum),
several of whom may be tentatively identified with the figures in the finished picture. These are, from
left to right: Hanlayson (extreme left), Tom Allen (between the women’s arms), Joe Brown (carrying
the child), Joe Miller (centre, under the raised hat) and Sam Wilks (extreme right of central group). There
are also two watercolour sketches related to the group on the right in the National Maritime Museum,
an oil sketch of the whole composition in the National Gallery of Ireland, Dublin (no. 378; 43 × 73 cm)
and a watercolour copy by S.P. Denning in the National Maritime Museum (44.5 × 71 cm).

Burnet also planned a composition of ‘A Tale of Trafalgar’, showing pensioners examining Turner’s
painting, but only watercolour studies remain (National Maritime Museum).

CONDITION. There are two horizontal cracks in the panel but the condition of the paint surface is good.
PROV. Bought for the 1st Duke of Wellington in 1841 by Messrs Hodgson and Graves, to whom he paid £525.
EXH. B.I., 1837 (112); Japan-British Exhibition, 1910
Quarterly Review, xcii, 1853, p. 455; P. Campbell, ‘Pictures of the Waterloo Era: Wilkie and Burnet at Apsley
Abraham van CALRAET (1642–1722)
Dutch School

Born in Dordrecht, where he spent most of his life, he was probably a pupil of Aelbert Cuyp. Calraet was apparently also active as a sculptor, although none of these works have survived.


25 A Cavalier with a Grey Horse
Signed top right: AC
Canvas, 32 × 38.7 cm
WM 1490–1948

A cavalry trooper, wearing the buff leather jerkin typical of seventeenth-century military garb, adjusts the bridle of his horse. Beyond is an encampment with numerous soldiers and in the distance a church. The AC signature both on paintings of this kind and on still lifes was generally accepted as being that of Aelbert Cuyp, and it was as Cuyp that this picture was catalogued by Evelyn Wellington and by
Hofstede de Groot (1908–27, II, no. 555). In 1916, Bredius ascribed the still-life paintings with the AC signature to Calraet – a proposition which led to a lively controversy with Hofstede de Groot in the pages of Oud Holland (1915–16, i, pp. 90, 143, 186, 241, 293, 314, 386; also Bredius in The Burlington Magazine, xxx, 1917, p. 172). For the group of AC pictures of horses a further stage was reached when the Horses in a stall in the Museum Boijmans van Beuningen, Rotterdam (inv. 1395), was found to bear the signature of APvK, which was read as Abraham Pietersz van Kalraet. Hofstede de Groot (Thieme, Becker 1926) accepted that if this was indeed the correct reading, it followed that a whole series of related paintings with the AC signature – including the one in the Wellington Collection – would have to be given to Calraet. This argument was endorsed by J.G. van Gelder, who singled out a painting virtually identical to WM 1490 in the Alte Pinakothek, Munich (no. 879), as definitely by Calraet, on the grounds of its similarity to a painting in St Petersburg which in turn could be firmly linked with the Rotterdam Calraet (Kunsthistorische Mededelingen, i, 1946, pp. 7ff. repr.). The Munich version, which lacks the arrangement of bones at lower left, remains identified as by Calraet and the Wellington picture must be given to the same artist. His indebtedness to his master can be demonstrated by the similarity with Cuyp’s Cavalry Trooper decorating his Dappled Grey Horse in the Royal Collection (canvas, 116.8 x 148.5 cm; White 1982, p. 34).

CONDITION Wrinkling in foreground; otherwise good. Cleaned by Horace Buttery, 1949.

PROV. Lapeyrière sale, Paris, 14 April 1817, lot 29 (as by Aelbert Cuyp), bought for the 1st Duke of Wellington by Férél de Bonnemainson for 794 frs. (£32).

EXH. B.I., Old Masters, 1818 (96); R.A., Old Masters, 1890 (114) (reviewed in The Athenaeum, 1 Feb. 1890)

LIT. Hofstede de Groot 1908–27, II, no. 555 (Cuyp); Hofstede de Groot in Thieme, Becker 1926, XIX, p. 483 (as ‘returned to Calraet’); C. White, The Dutch Pictures in the Collection of Her Majesty the Queen, Cambridge, 1982, p. 34

Francesco Buoneri, called Cecco del CARAVAGGIO (active c. 1590–c. 1630)
Italian School

Little is known of him except that he was listed by Mancini (Considerazioni sulla pittura, c. 1620, edn 1956–57, I, p. 108) as ‘Francesco detto Cecco del Caravaggio’ among the followers of Caravaggio. ‘Cecco’ is a nickname for Francesco; ‘del Caravaggio’ implies a close follower of that artist. In a contemporary document he is recorded to have lodged with Agostino Tassi at Cardinal Montalto’s Casino at Bagnaia (now the Villa Lante) in 1613, where he worked on the decorative scheme, together with numerous Frenchmen (Salerno 1960). His stylistic links with northern Caravaggisti such as Finson and Ducamps have hitherto suggested a Flemish or French nationality, but Papi (1992) believes him to have been an Italian, possibly from Bergamo. Cecco is also referred to in the travel diary of Richard Symonds, c. 1650, as ‘his [Caravaggio’s] servant or boy that laid with him’, and as the model for Caravaggio’s Victorious Cupid (Berlin, Gemäldegalerie; Gash 1998).

The traditional title of *Conjurer* for this picture was based on the opinion that the man has a ball in his mouth and a coin in his hand. Richard Spear (1971), however, suggested it is a whistle he has in his mouth and a clacker in his hand, which, together with the tambourine in his right hand and the prominence of the violin on the table, can be taken as evidence that he is more probably a musician. A version of this painting with variations in the figure in the National Gallery, Athens (117 × 98 cm; Papi 2001, repr. p. 68), is entitled *The Musical Instrument Maker*. This seems unlikely, for want of any tools and for the man’s elaborate dress, but even without a firm identification of all the objects on the table – they seem to include cases for instruments, a mirror and a telescope – *Musician* is a more plausible title than *Conjurer*.

‘Caravaggio’ was the generic name for all such genre scenes and figures with strong *chiaroscuro*, and it was as Caravaggio that WM 1547 was described in the Wellington Catalogue. Subsequently various Caravaggio followers were suggested, including Louis Finson, to whom a similar painting of a young man playing a recorder in the Ashmolean Museum was originally attributed (*Catalogue of Paintings*, 1961, p. 55, pl. 49). The Ashmolean picture was ascribed to Cecco del Caravaggio by Longhi (*Proporzioni*, I, 1943, p. 27) and WM 1547 was given to Cecco by Luigi Salerno (1960) on the grounds of its similarity with the *Expulsion of the Money Changers from the Temple* (Berlin, Gemäldegalerie), which was described as by Cecco in an epigram by Silos as early as 1673 (J. M. Silos, *Pinacotheca*, 1673), and on which traces of the signature *BUON* have recently been found. The case for a firm attribution to Cecco has been argued by Richard Spear (1971), who suggested a date of c. 1610 and compared it with the *Money Changers* in Berlin, with a *Narcissus* (private coll., Rome), and with a *Martyrdom of St Lawrence* in the Oratory of the Filippini in the Church of Sta Maria in Vallicella, Rome. Apart from demonstrating close similarities in the detailed treatment of the dress and the still life, Spear pointed to the characteristic feature that some elements in the composition, in this case the open drawer, extend to the lower edge of the composition. The attribution to Cecco has been accepted by Carlo Volpe (1972), Benedict Nicolson (1979) and Gianni Papi (2001), who suggests a date of 1612–15.

**CONDITION** There are several *pentimenti*, particularly round the tambourine, which was originally further to the left. There is an added strip about 10 cm wide at the top, perhaps original. Good condition generally, some signs of wear, particularly in the light costume.

**PROV.** Burland, Liverpool (as Velázquez); bought by the 1st Duke of Wellington for £367 10s. from Messrs Henry Graves & Co. in 1845.

**EXH.** Cleveland Museum of Art, *Caravaggio and his Followers*, 1971, (23), repr. (R. Spear)

Carlo CIGNANI (1628–1719)

*Italian (Bolognese) School*

Born in Bologna, he was a pupil of Francesco Albani and subsequently came under the influence of Guido Reni and Guercino. His first important commission was in 1658 for frescoes in the Sala Farnese of the Palazzo Pubblico in Bologna. In 1662 he accompanied Cardinal Girolamo Farnese to Rome, where he painted frescoes in Sant’Andrea della Valle. He returned to Bologna in 1665 to take his place...
as one of the leading artists of the later Bolognese school, and was elected director for life of Bologna’s first academy of art in 1709.


Ascribed to CIGNANI

27 Venus and Adonis

Inscribed with inventory no. in white, lower right: 213

Canvas, 126 x 188 cm

WM 1612–1948

Adonis, a huntman, holds the lead of his dog, while his right arm encircles Venus. This painting was described as by Cignani in the Spanish royal palace inventories of 1772 and 1789. The attribution was presumably not known to Lord Maryborough, to whom the 1st Duke of Wellington had sent the pictures captured at Vitoria for safe keeping, for in a letter dated 9 February 1814 he speaks of it as by Domenichino. This appears to have been the attribution suggested by Benjamin West and the other connoisseurs to whom Lord Maryborough had shown the collection. Subsequently, Cignani’s name was again given (Wellington 1901) and the attribution was accepted by Pérez Sánchez (1965) and Mary Cazort Taylor (oral opinion). However, it must be admitted that precise parallels in Cignani’s documented work are hard to find and
the picture is not mentioned in the most recent study by Buscaroli Fabbri (2004). L. Peruzzi (Paragone, 1986) attributes the painting to the Flemish artist and pupil of Guido Reni, Michele Desubleo (1602–1676), with which A. Cottino agrees, arguing that it is an elegant work dating from the artist’s Venetian stay in the 1650s (2001, pp. 106–07, no. 30). Other scholars also argue for an attribution to Desubleo, including John Gash and Dr Roberto Contini (written opinions, 2008). Nevertheless, the painting shows close stylistic links with Cignani; the figure of Cupid, for example, is paralleled by the angels in his Sant’Andrea della Valle frescoes (Roli 1977, pl. 6A), and the traditional attribution has also been recently tentatively supported by Richard Spear (written opinion, 2008). Since Cignani made extensive use of assistants, one source listing sixty-four pupils, it is possible that it was executed by one of these.

CONDITION. Prominent area of damage running vertically down the centre.

PROV. 9th Duke of Medinaceli, no. 15 in inventory on his death in 1711; Marquis de la Ensenada, bought for the Spanish royal collection in 1768; Royal Palace Madrid 1772 inventory (hanging in the passage to the Infante Don Luis’s apartment), 1794 inventory (in the ‘Green Room with fireplace’); captured at Vitoria, 1813.


CLAUDE Gellée, called Le Lorrain (1600–1682)
French school; worked in Rome

Born in Chamagne (Vosges), which was in the then independent Duchy of Lorraine, he went to Rome in c. 1613, where he worked under Agostino Tassi. He visited Naples c. 1618–20, returning to his home country in 1625, thereafter settling in Rome. His fame as the greatest exponent of pastoral landscape was still further spread by his Liber Veritatis, a series of drawings he made of his paintings as a safeguard against forgery and imitation.


Ascribed to CLAUDE

28 Pastoral Landscape with the Ponte Molle, Rome
Inscribed in white, lower left, with inventory number: 335, and, on right, with the cross of Philip V
Canvas, 47 × 67 cm
WM 1599–1948
The Ponte Molle (Ponte Milvio) across the Tiber, north of Rome, was built in 109 BC and remodelled in the fifteenth century by Nicholas V, who added the watch towers. It is shown here in an ‘idealized but fairly accurate’ setting (M. Kitson, *The Art of Claude Lorrain*, exh. cat., Arts Council, 1969, no. 19).

This is a version of the painting once in the Ashburnham collection, now in the City Art Gallery, Birmingham (Roethlisberger 1961, fig. 170), which is dated 1645 and recorded as no. 90 in Claude’s *Liber Veritatis* (ed. M. Kitson, 1978, p. 109f., pl. 90). In the Wellington picture the round tower on the left has become crenellated, as opposed to roofed, the houses are different, a wooded hill has been added behind the buildings on the left and the two figures, which form the focus of attention in the foreground of the Birmingham painting, have been omitted. In each of these details, both the Wellington version and another in a Norwegian private collection (74.5 × 99 cm, formerly Earl of Normanton; Roethlisberger, fig. 405) are more closely similar to a preparatory drawing in the Louvre (M. Roethlisberger, *Claude Lorrain, the Drawings*, 1968, no. 578; cf. also the other preparatory drawings, nos. 579, 581), and it would appear that both paintings are derived from the Louvre drawing rather than from the Birmingham picture. The two versions are not, however, sufficiently close to indicate that they were copied from each other. A third painting also related to the Birmingham picture, but without the bridge, is in an English private collection (Arts Council 1969, no. 20). In general terms, the composition is related to those of the *Pastoral Landscape* in the Royal Collection and of another in the Prado, Madrid (both of 1644–45; Roethlisberger 1961, figs. 157, 162, LV 83, 85), but this is the clearest rendering in Claude’s work of the Ponte Molle.

WM 1599 was accepted as autograph by early authorities, but Roethlisberger (1961) described it as an ‘old, small and simplified version’ of the Birmingham picture, and Cecchi (1975) lists it as a copy.
CONDITION. Large areas of retouching in the sky and centre foreground; slight wearing on thinner foliage over sky, otherwise good.

PROV. Spanish royal collection. The cross of St Andrew on the right was the mark of Philip V (reigned 1731–46) and the painting is recorded in La Granja in 1725 (Aterido Fernández 2004, II, p. 423, no. 626); in La Granja inventory of 1746 (no. 335) and in the Aranjuez inventory of 1794; captured at Vitoria, 1813. EXH. Birmingham Society of Arts, 1831


Claudio COELLO (1642–1693)
Spanish School

Born in Madrid, he was a pupil of Francisco Rizi and, apparently, also of Carreño. After copying pictures in the royal collection, he remained influenced in particular by Titian, Rubens and Van Dyck. He was made pintor del rey in 1684.


29 Saint Catherine of Alexandria
Inscribed on wheel, lower right: CLAUD.COELL.FA.PICT.REG.ANNO 1683 (last numeral indistinct) Canvas, 122 × 94.6 cm
WM 1578–1948

St Catherine is shown three-quarter length, crowned, holding in her left hand the martyr’s palm and in her right a sword, the instrument of her martyrdom. A small part of the spiked wheel on which she was tortured is visible on the right.

This is generally considered to be one of Coello’s finest paintings of saints and, indeed, Gaya Nuño (1957) went so far as to describe it as ‘the most perfect of the thousand and one saints painted in Spain at this period’. Although the depiction of female saints in ecstasy is a commonplace in Baroque art, the Wellington St Catherine has been seen as reflecting the influence of Van Dyck. In particular, there is a version of Van Dyck’s St Rosalie in the Prado which Coello could have seen in the Escorial, where it hung in the seventeenth century (Trapier 1957; Sullivan 1979).

Palomino (1724) described a painting of St Hyacinth hanging as a pendant to the St Catherine in the chapel of Santo Domingo in the Church of El Rosario, Madrid, but this is no longer extant. Coello painted one earlier version of the St Catherine in the 1660s; it is now in the Meadows Museum, Southern Methodist University, Dallas, Texas (Sullivan, 1979). The posture of the head and the ecstatic glance may be compared with the Santa Rosa of Lima (Prado), which was also formerly in the Church of El Rosario (Gaya Nuño, pl. 20), but the Wellington picture is a much more sensuous representation of a female saint.

PROV. Spanish royal collection. Chapel of San Domingo in the church of El Rosario, Madrid (Palomino 1715–24; Ponz 1772–94); captured at Vitoria, 1813.

EXH. Grafton Galleries, Spanish Old Masters, 1913–14 (158); R.A., Spanish Painting, 1920 (12); N.G.L., El Greco to Goya, 1981 (38)

Marcellus COFFERMANS (active 1549–1578)
Flemish (Antwerp) School

Coffermans became a master in the Antwerp painters’ guild in 1549 but little more is known of his life. He painted small panels, mostly for export to Spain, in an extremely archaic manner. In the period of Pieter Bruegel and Frans Floris, he continued to work in the style of Rogier van der Weyden and Hans Memling; many of his compositions are based on the prints of Dürer and Schongauer.


30 Two Wings of a Triptych: The Virgin and The Angel of the Annunciation
Oak panels, 30.6 x 9.9 cm (each); 32.6 x 24.2 cm (overall)
WM 1649–1948

The inscription on the vase – containing lilies, roses (both symbols of the Virgin), pinks (symbol of Christ’s passion) and pansies (symbol of the Trinity) – reads M (Mater) Jhs (Jesus) A (Angelus or Ave).

These panels can reasonably be related to an entry in the 1772 Royal Palace inventory or, more precisely, in the appendix to this inventory dated September 1773, describing the pictures stored in
a vault of the palace: ‘An ancient painting on panel, originally a portable altar-piece, containing on the principal panel the Nativity and on the two panels forming the doors the Annunciation’. The size given (more than one and a third vara high, one vara wide) is about 30 × 21 cm, which fits well with that of the two wings, which, in turn must have been equal in size to the centre panel. Evelyn Wellington also identified these panels with an ‘Annunciation, school of Dürer’ listed as being in the king’s private oratory in the 1794 inventory. This would indicate that the wings had already been detached from the Nativity before that date.

There are several similar compositions of the Annunciation by Coffermans or his workshop, including one in the Burrell Collection, Glasgow, and another in the Prado, Madrid (no. 2723). Both of these show the scene on a single panel. The Annunciation on two panels, nearly identical in composition to WM 1649, forms the wings of a triptych of which the centre panel is a Nativity, with the Adoration of the Shepherds (sale, Palais Galliéra, Paris, 11 June 1971, lot 54, repr.; 20.5 cm high). As the wings are so nearly identical, the centre panels were probably also related, and it is likely that the Paris Nativity reflects the appearance of the lost centrepiece of the Apsley panels.

Much of the composition, including the bed behind the Virgin, is derived from Rogier van der Weyden’s St Columba altarpiece in Munich (Alte Pinakothek, inv. WAF 1190). However, Coffermans has reversed the positions of the Virgin and the angel; it is relatively unusual to have the angel approaching from the right. Other examples of this reversed composition are those by Dieric Bouts (Richmond, Virginia Museum of Fine Arts; M.J. Friedländer, Early Netherlandish Painting, III, 1968, no. 78, pl. 88) and by the Master of Liesborn (N.G.L., inv. NG 256).

The style, like the iconography, is wholly archaic, based on the period of van der Weyden and Memling a full century earlier. Only the dragon bedpost adds a mannerist feature to what is, in character, a fifteenth-century painting.

**CONDITION** Vertical crack in the Virgin panel; otherwise good. Cleaned by English Heritage Conservation Studio, 2007–08. Silverpoint underdrawing is visible with infrared, notably in the angel’s robe. Mordant gilding in the bed hangings and halo surrounding the dove. Smalt used in painting the Virgin’s garments has faded; her robe would originally have been blue.

**PROV.** Royal Palace, Madrid, 1772 and 1789 inventories (1789 as ‘school of Dürer’); captured at Vitoria, 1813.

John Singleton Copley, R.A. (1737–1815)
Anglo-American School

Born probably in Boston, he became the leading painter in the American colonies. He came to England in 1774 at the invitation of Benjamin West and settled here in the following year. His considerable popularity was due to his depictions of contemporary history, such as the Death of Chatham (Tate Gallery).


31 William, King of Holland (1792-1849), when Prince of Orange
Canvas, 100 × 69 cm
WM 1542–1948

Half-length, life-size. He wears the uniform of an aide-de-camp with blue stand-up collar and gold aiguillettes, and a cocked hat. The Army Gold Medal hangs on his chest.

The son of William I, William spent his youth in England owing to the French invasion of the Netherlands. From the age of 19 he served as aide-de-camp to Wellington in Spain, in 1811–14, and in 1813 was appointed Major General in the British Army. During the campaign of 1815 he commanded the Dutch and Flemish contingents and was wounded at Waterloo. He succeeded to the throne of Holland on the abdication of his father in 1840 (see below, no. 115).
According to Walker (1985, p. 562), this portrait is a copy of the original in the Dutch Royal Collection (Palace of Het Loo), which is signed and dated 1813. There is another version, three-quarter length, in the Royal Collection, Buckingham Palace (127 x 115 cm); Prown 1966, fig. 671; Millar 1969, p. 20, no. 713, as ‘after Copley’), and the figure reappears, showing the Prince as Wellington’s ADC, mounted but in comparable posture, next to the Duke of Wellington in Copley’s Battle of the Pyrenees, Wellington 1901 (Museum of Fine Art, Boston; Prown, fig. 673). The portraits have been dated c. 1812–13, and a terminus ante is provided by Charles Turner’s engraving of WM 1542, which is dated 4 December 1813. They are therefore among Copley’s last works before his death in 1815, painted at a time when he was old and infirm.

According to tradition (Wellington 1901, p. 313), WM 1542 was painted for Princess Charlotte, daughter of George IV, who was considering marrying William at this period; she was, however, dissatisfied with the portrait. The couple became engaged in December 1813, but the engagement was broken off in the following year when it became clear that William was returning to live in Holland. It is not known when or how the Duke of Wellington acquired the portrait. There is an oil sketch of William by Thomas Heaphy in the N.P.G. (1914/20).

CONDITION. Paint surface badly wrinkled and buckled.
PROV. Bought by or presented to the 1st or 2nd Duke of Wellington.
EXH. Amsterdam, Rijksmuseum, Orange-Nassau Exhibition, 1898

Antonio Allegri, called CORREGGIO (?1489–1534)
North Italian School

Born in Correggio in Emilia, he came to maturity under the formative influences of Mantegna and Costa, successive court painters at Mantua, and then under those of Leonardo and Giulio Romano. He worked mainly at Correggio and Parma, where the frescoes in the cupola of the Cathedral are his most famous work. He enjoyed an enormous reputation both in the sixteenth century and subsequently, and has been seen as the precursor of baroque church decoration.


The angel appears to Christ, while the Apostles Peter, James the Greater and John are asleep on the right Panel, 40 x 42.2 cm
WM 1585–1948

This picture has been described as ‘one of the most famous High Renaissance paintings in the country’ (Gould 1950) and it was certainly one of the most highly prized treasures of the 1st Duke of Wellington’s
collection. Its highly honoured place in art literature may be traced back as far as Vasari (2nd edn. 1568):

‘And in the same city [Reggio Emilia] a small picture about a foot in size, the rarest and most beautiful of his productions with small figures; in which is Christ in the Garden, a picture with an effect of night, where the Angel, appearing to him, illumines Christ with his splendour – the whole thing so true to life that it is impossible to imagine or express it better. Down at the foot of the mount we see the sleeping Apostles, on whom the shadow of the mount falls where Christ prays, and this gives unheard-of force to the figures. And further on, in the distant landscape, the dawn is breaking and we see soldiers coming in from the side with Judas; and within its limited dimensions this scene is so well realized that it would be impossible to equal the patience and application displayed.’

Not long after Vasari, the picture was described by Lomazzo (1590) as having been given by Correggio in payment of a paltry debt of 4 or 5 scudi to an apothecary, while a few years later it was sold for 400–500 scudi to Count Pirro Visconti of Milan. The history of the picture can then be followed in the description of Francesco Scannelli (1657), from whom we learn that it had recently been sold by Count Pirro Visconti (a descendant of the earlier Count Pirro) to the Marquis of Caracena, Governor of Milan, for 750 doppie. Caracena was acting for Philip IV of Spain, and the painting is regularly recorded in the inventories of the Royal Palace, Madrid, from 1666 until 1794. Its provenance for the time from Pirro Visconti to Philip IV and his successors is therefore fully documented. For the period before 1590, the picture may be tentatively identified with the Agony in the Garden by Correggio mentioned in a letter of 1584 from Fulvio Rangoni to Alfonso II d’Este of Ferrara, who referred to the owner at that time as Francesco Maria Signoretti of Reggio, which would fit with Vasari’s description of it as being in that city. The fact that Signoretti was a member of the College of Medicine may perhaps be relevant to Lomazzo’s story that Correggio sold the picture to an apothecary, even though this sounds more like a legend.

After its entry into the Spanish royal collection, the picture was singled out for particular praise by many writers, and in particular there is a lengthy analysis by Mengs (see Ponz 1772–94). When it reached England after Vitoria, it at once took up its pre-eminent position in the Wellington collection. Lord Maryborough wrote to the Duke on 9 February 1814: ‘Owen, the painter, and West, the President of the Royal Academy, both told me that the Corregio is certainly worth at least £6,000 guineas (sic) … West said that the Corregio and the Julio Romano ought to be framed in diamonds, and that it was worth fighting the battle for them.’ (Wellington 1901, p. 164). By October 1814, West seems to have changed his mind, as he commented that the Duke’s picture was ‘in a state so much more imperfect than that of the same subject belonging to Mr Angerstein, which was formerly in the Palace of the King of Sardinia, that He wd. rather have the latter picture, than a “Cart load of the former”…. The Spanish picture was probably the first painted, but is thick in the execution, on the contrary the latter picture has all the facility and grace which resulted from the Painter having nothing to compose but only to execute’ (The Diary of Joseph Farington, 1984, pp. 4600–01; Angerstein’s picture is the copy now in the National Gallery, London). From Benjamin Robert Haydon we know that the original was one of the Duke’s personal favourites: ‘He (Colonel Gurwood) told me that the Duke keeps the key of the glass of his Correggio,
and when the glass is foul, dusts it himself with his handkerchief. He asked him once for this key, and
he replied: ‘No I won’t’.

In 1949–50, the picture was cleaned with unexpected results, as details such as Christ’s cross and
crown of thorns became legible. Before cleaning, it was so blackened that the right-hand side was indeci-
pherable. The removal of the overpaint in this area led to the reappearance of a fully-lit apostle on the ex-
treme right, apparently cut down at the edge, and another in the middle ground to the left of him, as well
as the partial body of a third almost hidden by the one on the extreme right. Ekserdjian (1997, p. 161) argues
that the now-revealed apostles were originally unfinished, but then completed with small differences by
Correggio himself. In 1949–50 the tiny figures of Judas and the soldiers on the right were shown to be later
additions and were removed. Thus the picture differs both from the engravings by Bernardino Curti (1640)
and Giovanni Volpato (1773), and from the old copy, probably seventeenth century, in the National Gallery,
all of which show tiny figures of Judas and the soldiers in the right background. This also fits with Vasari’s
description quoted above, and it is probable that these figures disappeared when the picture was cut down
on the right. There is evidence that it had already suffered damage by the seventeenth century, for Sebastiano
Resta (d. 1714) stated that he had learnt from the painter Tanga that the picture had been ‘ruined by a lamp
standing in front of it’ (‘la pittura sia rovinata affatto da una lampada che la sta davanti’). An engraving by P.E.
Moitte (1722–1780) of the copy of the painting – then in the collection of Count Brühl, and now in the
Correggio

Hermitage (Gould 1950, fig. B) – shows it as an upright, with Christ and the angel only, which supports the view that the original was damaged on the right by the time these early copies were made. Cecil Gould, who put forward the arguments in detail (1950), suggested that the alteration of the figures in the restoration – particularly the painting in of Judas and the soldiers in an area where they had not been before – indicated a time lag between damage and restoration, which led the restorer to replace damaged figures without a precise knowledge of their original position.

The painting is close in style to another of Correggio's night scenes, the Nativity (La Notte) in Dresden (Gould 1976, pl. 107–08). Both were painted for Reggio in the 1520s. The Notte was commissioned in 1522, but as the chapel in San Prospero, Reggio, for which it was intended was not in use until 1530, it may not have been delivered until that date. The Agony in the Garden was dated to 1520/24 by Ricci, to c. 1526–28 by Gronau (1907) and Bevilacqua (1970), slightly earlier, in the mid 1520s, by Gould and c. 1523–24 by Ekserdjian (1997, p. 163). There is a drawing of the figure of Christ in the British Museum (Di Giampaolo, Muzzi 1988, no. 88) which has on the verso a study for the School of Love in the National Gallery, which Gould also places in the mid 1520s, and Ekserdjian to between 1522 and 1524.

The composition represents a synthesis of the accounts given in the different Gospels. Only Luke (22: 39–46) mentions the angel, while the number and names of the Apostles are given only in Matthew (26: 36–47) and Mark (14: 32–42). All three stress the fact that the action takes place at night. The angel is nearly always shown in illustrations of the scene; in the Middle Ages he appears in a cloud (e.g. Prayer Book of St Hildegard, Regensburg, 12th century, Munich National Library, Clm. 935) but from the fifteenth century he is shown in a more realistic fashion, hovering above Christ’s head. The scene was frequently illustrated both with and without the approach of Judas and the soldiers; in either case it was, from the sixteenth century, commonly shown as a night scene. A near contemporary sketch by Valerio Castello at Holkham Hall is close to the Correggio in the frontal posture of Christ, but the closest comparison may be drawn with Titian’s composition in the Escorial (H. Tietze, Titian, London, 1950, pl. 262), probably influenced by Correggio, which in turn influenced the El Greco in the National Gallery (no. 3476, c. 1580).

Of the numerous copies, those in the National Gallery; in the Hermitage, St Petersburg; in the Castello Sforzesco, Milan (attributed to Fede Galizia); in the Prado, Madrid; and a variant by Bartolomeo Cesi in San Girolamo della Certosa in Bologna, can be located today.

**CONDITION.** Cut down on the right after damage from a lamp some time in the later seventeenth century, and subsequently re-enlarged with new apostles painted in, that were later painted out; cleaned by S. Isepp in 1949 when Correggio’s apparently unfinished first version of the sleeping apostles was again revealed (see above).

**PROV.** Probably F.M. Signoretti, Reggio; before 1590, Pirro Visconti, Milan; before 1657, sold by another Pirro Visconti to the Marchese di Caracena, Governor of Milan, acting for Philip IV of Spain. Royal Palace, Madrid (Alcázar) inventories, 1666 (no. 640), 1686 (no. 190), 1701 (no. 41); new Royal Palace, inventories 1772 (passage to the King’s pew) and 1794 (first room of the new wing); captured at Vitoria, 1813.

**EXH.** B. I., Old Masters, 1854 (12); R.A., Old Masters, 1887 (131); R.A., Italian Art, 1930 (183)

Laurent DABOS (1761–1835)

French School

Born in Toulouse, he exhibited at the Salon from 1791 – principally genre scenes, historical subjects and portraits.

33 Napoleon Bonaparte (1769–1821) as First Consul

Canvas, 59 x 46.4 cm

WM 1517–1948

Bust portrait, life-size, aged about thirty-five. He wears the double-breasted, gold-embroidered scarlet uniform of First Consul (1799–1804). The face and costume are similar to Ingres’s full-length portrait of him as First Consul in the Musée des Beaux-Arts, Liège; the dress in Gros’s portrait of him as the First Consul, 1802, Musée de la Légion d’Honneur, Paris, is different, as the jacket is open at the neck.

The charming story of the Duke’s acquisition of this picture is set out by Evelyn Wellington (p. 262):

‘Mr. Martin in his MS notes respecting the Apsley House pictures, says:

“… (A) Mr Fleming … received by mistake an invitation to dinner, intended by the Duke for another gentleman of the same name. The messenger, discovering his error, requested the return of the card, but the receiver declared that, mistake or no mistake, he had accepted the invitation, and meant to avail himself of it. He came at the time appointed, was received by the Duke, and on the following day sent the picture of the ‘First Consul’ as an amende honorable.’

Dabos
Mr Fleming (the unbidden guest above referred to) writes to the first Duke of Wellington as follows: '104 Gloucester Place, May 17, 1824. Mr Fleming presents his respectful compliments to the Duke of Wellington, and sends for His Grace’s inspection the picture of Buonaparte which he had the honour of mentioning to him yesterday. As Mr F has been assured by some who have had an opportunity of seeing the Chief Consul about the time when this portrait was taken, that it is an exceeding good likeness, he hopes His Grace will do him the honour of accepting it and giving it a place in his Collection. The enclosed certificate was sent to Sir G. A. Robinson by the painter along with the picture.”

“Je certifie que le portrait qui fut remis à Monsieur Robinson, étoit original et d’une telle Ressemblance qu’à l’époque où je le fis, le Gouvernement me chargea d’en faire une copie en pied, pour être placée dans la Salle du Conseil de l’Hôtel de Ville de Paris. – DABOS.”

Another of Dabos’ portraits of Napoleon was engraved by A. Aubert.

**CONDITION.** Paint surface worn, particularly on the costume. Cleaned in 1950.

**PROV.** Sir G. A. Robinson; Mr Fleming, who gave it to the 1st Duke of Wellington in 1824.

**Giuseppe Cesari, called il Cavaliere D’ARPINO see d’ARPINO**
George DAWE, R.A. (1781–1829)
British School

He trained at the Royal Academy Schools, 1796, as an engraver, took up painting in 1801, at first mainly historical and mythological subjects, and from 1813 almost entirely portraits, which he exhibited at the R.A. 1813–18. In 1818 he visited the Continent with the Duke of Kent, painting portraits at Brussels, Cambrai and Aix-la-Chapelle (Aachen) – at the Congress of the Holy Alliance. From 1819 until 1828 he was court painter in St Petersburg, having been summoned there by Alexander I, for whom he painted a series of half-length Russian notables (333 out of a total of 349) for the ‘War Gallery of 1812’ in the Winter Palace.

34 General Miguel Ricardo de Alava (1771–1843)

Signed lower left: Geo. Dawe RA Pinxt Brussels 1818
Canvas, 90 × 69.5 cm
WM 1477–1948

Waist-length, life-size, aged about forty-seven. He wears the uniform of a Spanish officer; dark with gold buttons and a gold-embroidered collar, enveloped in a brown cloak. From his neck hangs the badge of a knight Commander of the Bath; on his chest he wears the red cross of Santiago.

As a naval officer, Alava joined the patriots when Napoleon placed his brother Joseph on the Spanish throne. In 1811, when the Cortes decided to give the chief command of the Spanish army to Wellington, Alava was attached to his staff and served with distinction in that capacity until the end of the war, and again
attended Wellington at Waterloo. His liberal politics brought him into conflict with Ferdinand VII and, at Wellington’s invitation, he lived in London from about 1824 to 1834. On the accession of Isabella II to the Spanish throne in 1834, Alava returned home, but he was soon afterwards appointed ambassador to England.

Dawe was in Brussels in 1818 to paint Prince William Frederick of Orange before going on to Cambrai for the memorial review of the Allied armies. There is a replica of WM.1477 in the Hermitage, St Petersburg, also dated 1818 (91 × 71.5 cm; 1958 catalogue of paintings, no. 4832, fig. 368). Alava is also the subject of a portrait by Pieneman at Apsley House (see below, no. 138).

CONDITION Sound.

PROV. Bought by the 1st Duke of Wellington.

EXH. National Army Museum, Patriots and Liberators. Anglo-Spanish co-operation during the Peninsular War (1808–1814), 1986; Madrid, Museo Municipal, La alianza de dos monarquías. Wellington en España, 1988 (3.5.11)

LIT. Exh. cat., Madrid, Museo Municipal, La alianza de dos monarquías. Wellington en España, 1988, p. 344

35 Alexander I, Emperor of Russia (1777–1825)

Signed lower right: Geo. Dawe RA 1825 pinxt

Canvas, 80 × 56.5 cm

WM 1528–1948
Full-length, frontal, aged forty-eight. Alexander wears the undress uniform of a Russian field-marshal. He wears the star of St Andrew and beneath it the Sword of Sweden, the badges of St George of Russia and Maria Theresa of Austria, the Iron Cross of Prussia, and the 1812 War medal.

For Alexander I see under Gérard.

The pose and the landscape setting are based on Gérard’s portrait, of which there is a version at Apsley House. Painted in Russia, this is a reduced version of Dawe’s portrait in the Royal Collection painted in 1817; there are two replicas in the Hermitage, St Petersburg, one signed and dated Geo Dawe Pinxit S. Petersburg 1824 (238 x 152.3 cm), the other signed (242 x 156 cm); one in the Londonderry collection (279 x 152.3 cm) and another was in the Ranfurly sale, Christie’s, 21 June 1929, lot 23 (bought by Stanley Baldwin). A three-quarter-length version of the composition was engraved by Thomas Wright in 1826.

CONDITION Generally sound.

PROV. Bought by or presented to the 1st Duke of Wellington.


36 Field-Marshal August Neidhardt, Count of Gneisenau (1760–1831)

Canvas, 72.7 x 57.8 cm

WM 1535–1948

Head and shoulders, life-size, aged about fifty-five. He wears the dark double-breasted uniform of a Prussian general, with red-gold embroidered collar, gold aiguillettes and gold buttons. Round his neck he wears the badges of St John of Prussia and Maria Theresa of Austria. He also wears the Vladimir of Russia, the Iron Cross, and, on the left breast, the star of the Black Eagle and beneath it a second Iron Cross.

Gneisenau was in the Austrian army 1780–86 and joined the Prussian army in 1786. He took an active part, under Blücher, in the campaigns against Napoleon in 1812–15 and is famed as a military reformer, championing the virtues of a conscript army fired by patriotism. He was created a field-marshal in 1825. This portrait was presumably painted in 1818, when Dawe attended the memorial review of the Allied armies at Cambrai. There is a comparable half-length, frontal, portrait of Gneisenau by F. Kruger, lithographed by Schall.

CONDITION Sound.

PROV. Bought by the 1st Duke of Wellington from Colnaghi in 1843, together with the portraits of Blücher (WM 1536) and Barnes (WM 1537), for 75 guineas (£78 15s. od.).

37 Field-Marshal Prince von Blücher (1742–1819)

Canvas, 72.5 x 58 cm

WM 1536–1948

Head and shoulders, life-size, aged about seventy-five. He wears the dark double-breasted uniform of
a Prussian general, with heavy gold aiguillettes and gold buttons. The badge hanging from his neck is probably that of St John of Prussia; beneath it is the Iron Cross and the Prussian medal for 1813–14. On his left breast he wears the stars of the Bath, the Iron Cross and two other orders. Over his shoulder he wears the sash of the Black Eagle and over the ribbon hangs a miniature of George IV.

Gebhard Lebrecht von Blücher, born in Rostock, joined the Swedish army and fought with the Swedes in the Seven Years’ War. Taken prisoner by the Prussians, he subsequently joined their army and rose to the rank of captain. He commanded the centre of the Allied army when Prussia entered the coalition against Napoleon, distinguished himself at Lutzen and Leipzig and entered Paris in 1814. In 1815 Blücher, at the head of the Prussian army, was defeated by Napoleon at Ligny on 16 June, but by a masterly flank-march joined Wellington at 5 pm on 18 June, in time to secure the final defeat of the French at Waterloo.

There is a full-length portrait of Blücher dated 1814, very similar to WM 1536, by Lawrence in the Royal Collection (Millar 1969, no. 886, pl. 192) and a marble bust by C. Rauch (1815) in the Wellington collection, Stratfield Saye.

**CONDITION Sound**

**Prov.** Bought by the 1st Duke of Wellington from Colnaghi in 1843, together with the portraits of Gneisenau (WM 1535) and Barnes (WM 1537), for 75 guineas (£78 15s. od.)

38 **Lt-General Sir Edward Barnes G.C.B. (1776–1838)**

Canvas, 72.5 x 57.5 cm

WM 1537–1948
A study, unfinished in the costume and in details of the Orders and decorations. Head and shoulders, life-size, aged about forty. He wears a black stock and round his neck the ribbon and badge of a Knight-Commander of the Bath, the star of which is sketched on his chest. Below it is the large Army gold medal. He wears the scarlet uniform and gold aiguillettes of a major general.

Sir Edward Barnes joined the army in 1792 and commanded a brigade at the battles of Vitoria, the Pyrenees, Nivelle, Nive and Orthes. He served as adjutant-general in 1815 and was severely wounded at Waterloo. He became a lieutenant-general in 1825 and Governor and Commander-in-Chief in the East Indies in 1831. This portrait was probably painted in 1818, when Dawe portrayed a whole series of generals (see nos. 34, 36–37), as well as Wellington himself. There are two watercolour sketches of Barnes of 1813–14 by Heaphy in the N.P.G. (1914 (2) and (3)) and a full-length painting by John Wood in the Army & Navy Club. He is portrayed in William Salter’s Waterloo Banquet (Wellington family collection, on loan to Apsley House), for which there is an oil sketch in the N.P.G.

**CONDITION** Needs consolidation and surface cleaning.

**PROV.** Bought by the 1st Duke of Wellington from Colnaghi in 1843, together with the portraits of Blücher, (WM 1536) and Gneisenau (WM 1535), for 75 guineas (£78 15s. od.).

**LIT.** Dictionary of British Portraiture 1979, p. 13; Walker 1985, 1, p. 24

**DUBBELS and van de VELDE** see van de VELDE
Karel DU JARDIN (1626–1678)
Dutch School

Born in Amsterdam, he was, according to Houbraken, a pupil of Nicolaes Berchem, though this cannot be proved. Following a trip to Lyons and Paris, from 1651 he lived mostly in Amsterdam. He went to Italy (Rome) in 1675, and died in Venice. Although he also painted portraits, histories, and genre scenes, Du Jardin is best known for his idealized Italianate landscapes in the manner of Nicolaes Berchem.


39 The River Bank: Landscape with Figures and Cattle
Signed indistinctly lower left: (?) K.D.
Canvas, 33 × 24.5 cm
WM 1573–1948
The number 181, recorded in the Wellington Catalogue as painted in white in the lower right, is no longer visible. Kilian (2005, p. 239) dates the painting to c. 1672; works of this period, such as the Arcadian Landscape, signed and dated 1672 (sale, Sotheby’s, London, 5 April 1990, lot 240A), are characterized by the use of strong chiaroscuro and accents of unmediated local colour. The worn condition of the work prevents certain attribution, however; for that reason, and because the swaying shepherdess bears a closer resemblance to figures by Berchem, Kilian tentatively rejects WM 1573 from du Jardin’s oeuvre.

**CONDITION** Paint surface very worn, especially on the rocks in the middle ground. Cleaned by Isabel Horovitz (The Painting Conservation Studio, London), 2006.

**Prov.** Spanish royal collection (not identified in the inventory); captured at Vitoria, 1813.


### Gainsborough DUPONT (1754–1797)

**British School**

A portrait painter and mezzotint engraver, he was the nephew and pupil of Thomas Gainsborough, in whose style he worked.

**40 William Pitt the Younger (1759–1806)**

Canvas, rectangular in oval frame, painted in simulation of stone, 76 × 63.5 cm  
WM 1557–1948

William Pitt, second son of the 1st Earl of Chatham (William Pitt the Elder), precocious from childhood though dogged by ill-health, was called to the Bar in 1780 but left it when he was elected to Parliament in the same year. He soon became Chancellor of the Exchequer in the administration of Lord Shelburne, which was displaced by the Fox-North coalition in 1782. In the following year, when Pitt was still only twenty-four, George III appointed him First Lord of the Treasury (Prime Minister) and Chancellor of the Exchequer. Except for a short interval in 1801–04, at the time of the Peace of Amiens, he remained Prime Minister until his death in 1806, and he is best remembered as a war leader against revolutionary France and Napoleon.

The ascription to Gainsborough Dupont is authenticated by the labels on the back of the stretcher: (i) An Original Portrait of the Right Honble Wm Pitt and for which he sat at Walmer Castle Sepr. 1792 Gainsborough Dupont., and at the side: Left by Will of Sir James Sanderson Bart to his friend Brook Watson June 1798. (ii) This picture of the Rt Honble Wm Pitt by Gainsborough Dupont Mr Pitt sat for at Walmer in the year 1792 to oblige Sir James Sanderson Bart who by his Will bequeathed it to me, Brook Watson.

There is no reason to doubt the statement that the picture was painted in 1792. We know that Pitt was a patron of Dupont, and it may conceivably have been painted from the life. However, Pitt was rarely at leisure to sit for his portrait (Anthony Mould, written communication, 2008) and it does not differ
perceptibly from the standard portrait of Pitt established by his uncle Thomas Gainsborough in 1787. That picture – one of two that Gainsborough painted of Pitt – was a three-quarter length, painted for the Marquess of Buckingham (W. T. Whitley, Thomas Gainsborough, London, 1915, pp. 271, 290, 339f.), possibly completed by Gainsborough Dupont and engraved by J. K. Sherwin in 1789. It can no longer be identified with certainty among the thirty versions that exist. Most of these are now attributed to Gainsborough Dupont, others are still labelled Gainsborough.

Waterhouse (1953) lists ten versions of the three-quarter length (270 × 115 cm), of which those in the Iveagh Bequest, Kenwood, and the Burrell Collection, Glasgow City Art Gallery, are the most readily accessible, and a further twenty of the bust-length type akin to WM 1557, measuring (76 × 63.5 cm). Of these, the one formerly belonging to Earl Amherst (Sotheby’s, London, 27 June 1962, lot 3) is now in the Yale Center for British Art, New Haven, and there is another in the Fitzwilliam Museum, Cambridge. Gainsborough Dupont also painted a portrait of Sir James Sanderson, Lord Mayor of London, the first owner of WM 1557, which was exhibited at the R.A. in 1793.

Prov. Sir James Sanderson, 1792; Sir Brook Watson, 1798; bequeathed to Thomas Aston Coffin, Robert Coffin, 1842. Bought in 1843 by the 1st Duke of Wellington, at the suggestion of Lord Fitzroy Somerset (Wellington 1901, p. 85), from Robert Coffin, for 100 guineas (£105).

Willem Cornelisz DUYSTER (1599–1635)
Dutch (Amsterdam) School

Born in Amsterdam, where he is recorded in 1625, 1631 and 1632. Duyster’s surviving works, which are relatively rare, are mainly merry companies, guardroom scenes and portraits similar to those of Pieter Codde (1599–1678), with whom he was well acquainted.


41 A Musical Party
Signed and dated on the viola da gamba, lower left: WCD (in monogram) A. 1634
Oak panel, 48.6 x 80.7 cm
WM 1524–1948

Elegantly dressed couples are disporting themselves in a room fashionably decorated with green embossed leather wall-coverings. The man on the right is holding up his hands in astonishment at the lovemaking of the couple in the foreground. Three musical instruments, a lute, a violin and a viola da gamba, are shown, but in fact no one is playing them.

Duyster’s is the earliest of several Dutch pictures in the Wellington Museum which illustrate the close connection between love and music; there are others by Pieter de Hooch (cat. 73) and Jan Steen (cat. 164). It is an ancient link, which became popular in the visual arts in the fifteenth century when, for example, the natives of the planet Venus were depicted as lovers and musicians, and musicians peopled the garden of love [A.P. de Mirimonde, ‘La Musique dans les allegories de l’Amour; i, Venus’, Gazette des Beaux-Arts, 68, 1966, pp. 265–90; ii, ‘Eros’, ibid., 69, 1967, pp. 319–46; R. van Marle, Iconographie de l’art profane, allegories et symboles, 1932, e.g. p. 428, fig. 456.] In the sixteenth century Venus frequently appears as an allegory of music (e.g. Lucas Cranach, Munich, Alte Pinakotheek), and at the same time musical instruments take up a prominent place in scenes of fêtes champêtres (e.g. ascr. to Titian, Musée du Louvre). The symbolism of music as the food of love was adapted for interior genre scenes by seventeenth-century Dutch artists; indeed, it became one of the most popular and versatile of all themes, expressed in images drawn from all levels of society and exploring parallels between love and music that ranged from the noble and edifying to the raucous and frankly sexual (see E. Buijsen, L.P. Grijp et al., The Hoogsteder Exhibition of Music & Painting in the Golden Age, exh. cat. The Hague and Antwerp, 1994). The convivial and elegant companies painted by Duyster and his contemporaries also reflect the fact that intimate musical gatherings were a common and accepted way of arranging social contact with members of the opposite sex (D.J. Balfoort, Het Muziekleven in Nederland in de 17de en 18de eeuw, The Hague, 1981).

Duyster himself returned to this subject on more than one occasion; a smaller picture with only two figures is in Berlin (Jagdschloss Grunewald; see Amsterdam 1976, no. 21, with iconographical
parallels). The former attribution to Le Duc was corrected by Hofstede de Groot before 1900. There is a copy of the two figures on the left in a private collection (Christie’s, 15 December 1978, lot 111, as Pieter Codde).

In the course of painting WM 1524, Duyster extended the composition to the right by joining another panel (about 15 cm wide) at the right side, shifting the figures of the man and woman to the right to create a void between the two groups. A *pentimento* of the earlier position of the man’s right leg is discernible to the naked eye. X-rays show a change in position of the right hand of the standing man just behind; he may originally have rested his hand on the shoulder of his seated companion. The main panel is prepared with a dark grey underpaint, while the added portion has a pale, creamy ground, which gives a warmer tonality to the paint in this area.

**CONDITION** Vertical crack where two panels joined together 15 cm from right. Damage at woman’s eye on left. Cleaned and restored by V&A conservation studio.

**PROV.** Bought for the 1st Duke of Wellington by Féréol de Bonnemaison in Paris, 1818.

**Exh. B.I., Old Masters, 1821 (141, as Le Duc); R.A., Dutch Art, 1929 (73)**

Sir Anthony van DYCK (1599–1641)
Flemish School

Painter of portraits and figure subjects, he was, after Rubens, the most important artist of the seventeenth-century Flemish School. Born and trained in Antwerp, he worked with Rubens in about 1618–21 and lived in Italy 1621–27. He again left Antwerp in 1632 for London, where he became court painter to Charles I and where he remained intermittently for most of the rest of his life.


42 St Rosalie crowned with Roses by Two Angels
Canvas, 117.2 x 88 cm
WM 1651–1948

In April 1624, Van Dyck sailed from Genoa to Sicily at the invitation of Emmanuel Philibert of Savoy, Viceroy of Sicily (M. Vaes, ‘Le séjour d’Antoine Van Dyck en Italie … 1621–1627’, Bulletin de l’Institut historique Belge à Rome, IV, 1924, pp. 163–230, esp. pp. 214ff.). In the summer of that year Palermo was swept by the plague, and on 14 July in a cave on Monte Pellegrino, above the city, fragments of a skeleton were discovered which were identified as the remains of St Rosalie. She had lived as a recluse on Monte Pellegrino – where she had been guided by two angels – in the mid-twelfth century until her death in about 1160. In 1292 an altar was dedicated to her in Palermo Cathedral and there are early representations of her by Francesco Traini and Antonello da Messina (Collura 1977, figs 2, 5). Her popularity as the patron saint of Palermo dates from the Counter-Reformation. The discovery of her remains at the height of the plague in July 1624 was seen as God’s intervention; they were translated to Palermo Cathedral and the saint’s protection was invoked by the hard-pressed population of the city.

Between July 1624, and the end of the plague quarantine, in September 1625, when he left Palermo, Van Dyck painted six different compositions of St Rosalie, each represented by several extant versions. The Wellington picture, characterized by its broad, free treatment, from which its expressiveness derives, appears to be a preparatory version of a larger painting in the Menil Collection, Houston (165 x 138 cm, inv. 68–01 DJ; Barnes et al. 2004, cat. II. 16). It may have served as a presentation modello for the Houston picture, which, as a major altarpiece commission, would have been subject to a lengthy approval process. In composition, the two are identical except for minor details: the book and the skull have been moved to the right in the Houston picture, and there is a difference in the posture of the second angel. More significantly, the saint’s face has been made rounder, more youthful, and the transparent veil softening her plain garment eliminated – alterations presumably made to refine the iconography of the newly popular saint (Barnes et al. 2004, p. 160). A third version of the composition, in the Museo Nazionale, Palermo, appears to be a contemporary copy of the Houston picture (Collura 1977, pl. 14); and a half-length copy was formerly in the collection of Harry Axelson Johnson, Stockholm. Another half-length version, without the angels, attributed to Van Dyck, is in the Museo del Prado (no. 1494;
Van Dyck


Van Dyck’s St Rosalie crowned by Angels is related to his composition of St Rosalie interceding for the City of Palermo, which also shows the saint standing on Monte Pellegrino (Fundación Luis A. Ferré, Museo de Arte, Ponce, Puerto Rico, no. 60.158; Barnes et al. 2004, cat. II. 51). The former is barely distinguishable from scenes of Mary Magdalen’s life as a hermit and, indeed, the Wellington picture was at times taken to represent the Magdalen (1794 inventory).

CONDITION Pentimenti visible above the head; considerable areas of paint loss and retouching along edges and in dark area lower right. Cleaned, 1977 and 1988.

PROV. Royal Palace, Madrid, 1772 inventory, ‘St Rosalie, in passage to king’s pew’; 1794 inventory, ‘Magdalen crowned with roses, in the king’s dressing room’; captured at Vitoria, 1813.

EXH. Madrid, Museo Municipal, La Alianza de dos monarquías: Wellington en España, 1988 (7.1.5); Tokyo, 1990–91 (25)

LIT. Ponz 1772–94, VI, p. 46; Cumberland 1787, p. 85 (passage room in Royal Palace); G. Glück, Van Dyck (K.d.K.), Stuttgart, 1931, pl. 156; G. Sterling, ‘Van Dyck’s paintings of St Rosalie’, The Burlington Magazine,

After van DYCK

43 Charles I (1600–1649) on Horseback with M. de St Antoine

Canvas, 295 × 213 cm
WM 1498–1948


WM 1498 is an old, probably seventeenth-century, copy of the equestrian portrait painted by Van Dyck for Charles I in 1633, now in Buckingham Palace (Millar 1963, no. 143; Barnes et al. 2004, no. IV. 47). It has been reduced at the top and on the left – the original is 368 × 270 cm – and is without the top of the arch and the shield with the royal coat of arms on the left which are prominent features of the original picture. The original was probably designed for the end of the gallery at St James’s Palace, where it made a considerable impression, and hence it is noteworthy that the Duke placed his copy over the mantelpiece of the Waterloo Gallery rather than at either end.

The composition of this equestrian portrait originated with Rubens’s Duke of Lerma of 1603 (Prado, Madrid, inv. 3137; M. Jaffé, Rubens: Catalogo Completo, Milan, 1989, no. 36), and it was commonly used by Van Dyck with different backgrounds for example, for his portraits of Cornelius de Wael (Antwerp, Koninklijk Museum voor Schone Kunsten, no. 892) and Antonio Giulio Brignole-Sale (Genoa, Galleria di Palazzo Rosso, no. PR48; Glück 1931, no. 200). There are many copies. Millar (in Barnes et al., 2004) lists at least a dozen large early copies in which parts of the composition are simplified or truncated, including two in the Royal Collection (nos. 173, 174) and others formerly at
Hamilton Palace, and in the Middle Temple, at Warwick Castle, at Petworth House and at Corsham Court. Other versions set the figure(s) against a plain landscape setting or omit the figure of the equerry; still others reproduce the composition on a smaller scale. The portrait was engraved by Baron in 1741.

Pierre Antoine Bourdin, Seigneur de St Antoine, had been sent by Henri IV of France to James I in 1603 with a present of six horses for Henry Prince of Wales. He remained in the service of Henry and later of Charles I as riding master and equerry. The identification of the equerry as the Duc d’Epernon, accepted in the Wellington Catalogue, was, according to Millar, due to an error made in the eighteenth century.

**CONDITION** Painted on three pieces of canvas joined by seams running (a) across centre and (b) 40 cm from lower edge; folding line below (a). Some wear, especially in sky and dark areas; retouched damage on horse’s nose. Retouched tear about 50 cm long from horse’s left flank to equerry’s red robe.

**PROV.** Sir Henry Wellesley, G.C.B., afterwards Lord Cowley (according to family tradition originally from the Duke of Alba’s collection); bought by the 1st Duke of Wellington from his brother, some years before 1829.

**LIT.** Passavant 1856, I, p. 171 (repetition at Apsley House); Waagen 1838, II, 298 (an old copy of the van Dyck at Windsor); Waagen 1854, II, p. 277; J. Guiffrey, Antoine van Dyck, Paris, 1882, p. 261; Glück 1931, p. 559, no. 372; O. Millar, The Tudor, Stuart and Early Georgian Pictures in the Collections of H.M. The Queen, 1963, p. 94; Barnes et al. 2004, p. 464, under cat. IV. 47
Anton EINSLE (1801–1871)
Austrian School

Born in Vienna, he was a portrait painter in Prague and Budapest before returning to Vienna in about 1838 and becoming court painter there. He became very popular in the reign of Franz Joseph, being appointed official portraitist and painting many portraits of him.


44 Francis II, Emperor of Austria (1768–1835)

Canvas, 232 × 158 cm
WM 1541–1948

Full-length, life-size, aged about sixty-five. He wears the uniform of an Austrian Field Marshal: a long grey greatcoat, with red and gold collar and cuffs, a white coatee embroidered with gold, a gold and red sash round his waist, red breeches and high black boots. The Golden Fleece hangs from his neck and he wears the star of Maria Theresa. The rather stiff neo-classical setting is reinforced by the pedestal and vase on the right and the stone balustrade in the background. A sketch for this work has been identified, executed in 1841 (Sadofsky 1987, pp. 51–52, no. 128).
Francis II succeeded his father Leopold II as Emperor in 1792, but in 1806 he renounced the titles of Holy Roman Emperor and King of Germany to become Francis I of Austria. He fought the French from 1792 until the Peace of Campo Formio in 1797 and again from 1799 until the Peace of Lunéville, 1801. War started again in 1805 and was intermittent until his defeat at Wagram in 1809, when a marriage between Napoleon and the Emperor’s daughter Marie Louise was arranged as part of the peace treaty. In 1813 Francis joined Russia and Prussia against France and was present with the Allied armies until the end of the war.

As this portrait dates from 1841, six years after Francis’s death, there can be no question of its having been painted from life; indeed Francis never sat to Einsle, who did not return from Budapest to Vienna until about 1838. In fact the features and posture are derived from Friedrich von Amerling’s half-length of 1832–33 (painted for the gallery in Laxenburg Castle; engraved by Benedetti). In 1841, however, Amerling left Vienna for Italy and Einsle became the natural choice to paint the portrait of Francis desired by the 1st Duke of Wellington.

The origin of the commission is explained in the Emperor Ferdinand’s letter, dated 12 January 1842, to the 1st Duke of Wellington:

‘Mon cher Duc de Wellington,—Mon Ambassadeur en Angleterre m’ayant fait connaître votre désir de posséder un portrait de feu mon Père de glorieuse mémoire, j’éprouve une véritable satisfaction en Vous l’envoyant par le Prince Esterhazy. Il ne saurait être mieux placé que dans l’habitation paisible de l’homme de guerre qui vous maintenant ses conseils et son expérience à Sa Souveraine et à son pays après avoir rendu de si grands services militaires à la cause de l’ordre et de la paix en générale, but constant du règne de l’Empereur François: il ne saurait être mieux gardé que par Votre famille, qui contera parmi tant de glorieux souvenirs celui de l’estime et de l’amitié particulière dont Vous a toujours honoré feu Mon Père. Héritier de ces mêmes sentiments, je forme les meilleurs voeux pour votre conservation, et je suis,
Mon cher Maréchal,
Votre bien affectioné,
(Signed) Ferdinand,
Vienne, le 12 Janvier, 1842.’

Prov. Given to the 1st Duke of Wellington by Ferdinand, Emperor of Austria, in 1842.
Lit. Waagen 1854, II, p. 278 (‘a specimen of the most prosaic and tasteless conception possible’); Thieme, Becker 1913, X, p. 425; Sadofsky 1987, p. 52 (no. 129)

Adam ELSHEIMER (1578–1610)
German School; worked in Rome

Born in Frankfurt, where he was a pupil of Philip Uffenbach, he travelled to Venice in 1598, where he was associated with Hans Rottenhammer, and settled in Rome in 1600. His landscapes show the in-
Elsheimer

fluences of Altdorfer and the Danube School, and of Paul Bril, whom he knew well in Rome. He painted primarily small cabinet pictures, usually on copper, with dramatic figure subjects in idyllic landscapes, which were already much admired at the time of his early death. His slow work-rate led him to be imprisoned for debt for a time shortly before his death. Rubens wrote on hearing of Elsheimer’s death: ‘For myself, I have never felt my heart more profoundly pierced by grief than at this news, and I shall never regard with a friendly eye those who have brought him to so miserable an end’ (Klessmann, in London 2006, p. 38).


45 Judith slaying Holofernes

Painted fleur-de-lis lower right

Tinned copper, 24.2 × 18.7 cm

WM 1604–1948

The story is taken from the apocryphal book of Judith (13: 7–9). The action takes place in the tent of the Assyrian general Holofernes, which is lit by two candles. The Jewish widow, Judith, and her maidservant, Abra, saved the besieged city of Bethulia by crossing enemy lines and killing the Assyrian leader. Above the entrance to the tent is a hanging in the form of a frieze, with putti and a leopard, symbolising the helplessness of the powerful who give in to love, whilst the precious vessels with wine and fruit pay tribute to Holofernes’s hedonistic lifestyle (Frankfurt 2006, p. 19). The object above the meticulously painted still-life on the right is difficult to identify in its present state; it is presumably a piece of armour or a shield.

Elsheimer painted almost exclusively on copper; during his thirteen-year career, twenty-six out of his twenty-seven surviving paintings were on that support (Komanecky 1998, p. 187). He frequently used a sheet of copper that was coated with a silver-coloured alloy, probably tin or tin-lead. This coating was resistant to corrosion and helped to enhance the painting’s luminosity (Andrews 1977, Appendix, p. 169; Komanecky 1988, pp. 67–68). This is one of four paintings by Elsheimer owned by Rubens; it was apparently acquired by him some time after June 1626 and sold after Rubens’s death in 1640 to Francisco de Rochas, who bought it for Philip IV of Spain, along with two other works by Elsheimer, for 1,350 florins (Andrews 1973; documents in Weizsäcker 1936, II, p. 219 and Muller 1989, pp. 20, 102). Rubens expressed his appreciation of Elsheimer in a letter dated 14 January 1611: ‘In my opinion he had no equal in small figures, landscapes, and in many other subjects’ (Belkin, Healy 2004, p. 98). Rubens chose the same moment in the story for his own rendering of the theme, seen in his pen and wash drawing in the Städelisches Kunstinstitut, Frankfurt (Frankfurt 2006, p. 82). Keith Andrews compared the half-naked figure of Holofernes to that of Aeneas in the Burning of Troy (Munich, Alte Pinakothek; Andrews, pl. 31) and suggested a date c. 1601–03, early in the artist’s Roman period. It is one of Elsheimer’s few interior scenes and, like the somewhat later Philemon and Baucis in the Dresden Gemäldegalerie, it derives dramatic impact
from its closed-in atmosphere and confined space. This is the artist’s first depiction of an interior scene using artificial light, in which the violence and drama of the event is enhanced by the strongly localized flickering candlelight and is contrasted with the domesticity of the interior.

Judith is a popular figure in the history of art, but she is usually shown holding Holofernes’s head or placing it in the sack. Nevertheless, the beheading scene itself does occur occasionally from Carolingian times and becomes quite common in Baroque art (e.g. Artemisia Gentileschi, Uffizi, Florence; Jan de Bray, 1659, Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam). It has been argued that Elsheimer’s composition derives from a lost original by Caravaggio (Oldenbourg 1922; Grossmann 1949), but there is little evidence for this, and in fact the surviving picture by Caravaggio (c. 1599, Galleria Nazionale d’Arte Antica, Rome; Andrews 1973, fig. 2) is different in composition and conceived on more blatantly violent lines. Klessmann suggests that Elsheimer’s composition was inspired by Maerten van Heemskerck’s engraving of 1564 (Frankfurt 2006, pp. 19–20, fig. 22), but his depiction of Holofernes raising his leg in his death agony is an innovative dramatic ingredient often used by subsequent artists, including Rubens (only surviving in the form of an engraving after him by Cornelis Galle I), (Frankfurt 2006, p. 211, fig. 25). A larger copy was listed in the 1660 inventory of Don Camillo Pamphilj (Brown, in London 2001, p. 310) and a copy with variations by an unknown artist appears in a painting by William Haecht II (Rubenshuis, Antwerp; Andrews 1973, p. 207, fig. 1).
CONDITION. Generally good; area of retouching lower right corner and perhaps on the face of the servant in the background and on the object above the jug.

PROV. Peter Paul Rubens (inventory at his death, 1640, no. 35); bought from his estate by Don Francisco de Rojas for Philip IV of Spain; La Granja inventory of Isabella Farnese, 1746; La Granja inventory, 1774; Aranjuez, 1794, no. 642; captured at Vitoria, 1813.


Spiridione GAMBARDELLA (?1815–1886)
British School

He exhibited genre scenes and portraits at the R.A. and B.I. 1842–68. During this period he is recorded as living in London and in Liverpool. There were seven of his portraits in the Wellington collection.

46 The Rt Hon Charles Arbuthnot, M.P. (1767–1850)
Inscribed on the back: The Right Honble. Charles Arbuthnot in the 83rd year of his age 1849 by S. Gambardella
Canvas, oval painted surface, 71 × 92 cm
WM 1–1971

Charles Arbuthnot, diplomat and politician, was Ambassador Extraordinary in Constantinople 1804–07 and Joint Under-Secretary at the Treasury 1809–23. Both he and his wife Harriet were close friends
of the 1st Duke of Wellington, and Arbuthnot lived at Apsley House after the death of his wife in 1834 until his own death in 1850.

Lit. E. Longford, Wellington, Pillar of State, London, 1972, fig. 36

47 The 1st Duke of Wellington (1769–1852) (after Lawrence)
Canvas, 240 × 150 cm
WM 1534–1948

He wears a long cloak over a blue uniform and holds a telescope in his right hand. This is a copy of the portrait painted by Lawrence for Sir Robert Peel, 2nd Bt, exhibited at the R.A. in 1825 (71), mezzotint by S. Cousins, 1847. That work was acquired by Wellington College, Crowthorne, Berks, after the Peel sale on 25 November 1909 (190) (251.5 × 139.8 cm; Garlick 1989, pp. 280ff.; repr. Longford 1972, fig. 14). The present copy was made at the request of the 2nd Duke of Wellington. In a letter to the Duke (1860) Gambardella suggested that by means of slight alterations he could make an excellent original picture of it. In the event, however, he painted a very faithful copy, though it differs slightly in size.

Prov. Bought by the 2nd Duke of Wellington from the artist in about 1860.
Baron François-Pascal-Simon GÉRARD (1770–1837)
French School

Born in Rome, he returned with his family to Paris at the age of twelve. In 1786 he entered the studio of David and became his favourite pupil. He made his reputation with a series of large-scale history paintings (Musée de Versailles) but it is as a portrait painter that he remains best known. In spite of his work for the Bonaparte family, he was made premier peintre du roi by Louis XVIII after the Restoration in 1814. His early portraits are characterized as much by their psychological insight as by their technical assurance, but from about 1818 there is a marked decline in quality as studio assistants undertook an increasing amount of the work. Gérard’s portraits were engraved and published as a series by Pierre Adam in 1826 under the title Collection des Portraits … de M. le Baron Gérard (2nd edn by H. Gérard, 1852–57).

48 Joseph Bonaparte, King of Spain (1768–1844)

Signed lower left: F. Gérard
Canvas, 64 × 48 cm
WM 1630–1948

Bust, nearly life-size. He wears a green uniform with an orange plastron (probably of the Chasseurs Napolitains à cheval). Round his neck hangs the order of the Golden Fleece; on his chest, the badge and sash of the Legion of Honour and the new Royal Order of Spain.

Joseph was the eldest son of Charles Bonaparte and the eldest brother of Napoleon. After taking a
legal degree at Pisa in 1787, he became a lawyer and then a judge at Ajaccio at the time of the Revolution. In 1794 he married Julie Clary at Marseilles. Elected deputy in 1797, he was then made ambassador to Rome by Napoleon and in 1800 he negotiated peace with the United States and with Austria. Installed by Napoleon as King of Naples 1806–08, he carried through financial reforms and earned a reputation for good government, but his period as King of Spain, 1808–13, was marred by the success of Wellington’s campaigns. He was forced to leave Madrid in 1812 and lost the whole kingdom at the battle of Vitoria on 21 June 1813. After Waterloo, he retired to the U.S. under the name of Comte de Survilliers and later lived in England (1832–37) and Florence (1841–44), where he died in 1844.

This picture is based on the official full-length portrait painted by Gérard in 1810 when Joseph was forty-two. A closely related bust portrait is in the Museo Napoleonico in Rome, where it is attributed to Lefèvre. A second full-length, with the palace of Aranjuez in the background, attributed to François-Joseph Kinson, is in Schloss Wilhelmshöhe, Kassel. For another portrait of him in the Wellington Museum see under Lefèvre (WM 1520).


**Prov.** Joseph Bonaparte, in Spain; captured at Vitoria, 1813.


49 Alexander I, Emperor of Russia (1777–1825)

Canvas, 241 × 160 cm

WM 1462–1948

Full-length, life-size, aged about forty. He stands in a landscape, wearing the undress uniform of a Russian field-marshal. He wears the sash and star of St Andrew (the star interlaced with the Garter of Great Britain), beneath which is the star of the Sword of Sweden, and above it are the badge of St George, the Iron Cross, the badge of Maria Theresa of Austria, the silver 1812 medal and the badge of the Order of William.

Alexander I became Tsar after the murder of his father Paul I, in 1801. He joined the Allied coalition against France in 1805, but two years later made peace with Napoleon, which lasted until the invasion of Russia in 1812. After the war, Alexander was instrumental in the formation of the Holy Alliance with the Emperor of Austria and King of Prussia.

This portrait is a version of one painted in 1814. However, the letter from Count Nesselrode (see below) shows this portrait to have been made in 1817 ‘by or under the immediate supervision’ of Gérard himself. Closely related versions, with minor variations in the landscape background, are at Versailles, Helsinki University and Malmaison. Gérard’s portrait served as a model for George Dawe’s, also in the Wellington Museum (WM 1528) and for Lawrence’s full-length of 1818 in the Waterloo Gallery at Windsor Castle.

The correspondence concerning this picture is reproduced by Evelyn Wellington:

‘In a letter dated Paris, May 15, 1817, General Pozzo di Borgo, Russian Ambassador in Paris, encloses to the Duke of Wellington the following communication received by him from...’
Count Nesselrode, Chancellor of the Russian Empire:

“St. Petersbourg, le 5/17 Avril, 1817.

Monsieur le GENERAL,—L’Empereur a été informé du désir que Mr. le Maréchal Duc de Wellington vient de manifester à Votre Excellence à l’effet d’obtenir l’autorisation nécessaire pour faire tirer une copie du portrait de S.M. Impériale peint par Gérard. Une demande semblable ne pouvait qu’être agréée par Notre Auguste Maître qui se plaît à y trouver une preuve de la justice que Mr. le Maréchal rend à ses sentiments. S. M. Impériale vous confie, Monsieur le Général, le soin de faire cette copie par l’artiste habile, auteur du tableau original, ou du moins sous ses auspices immédiats, l’intention de S.M. Impériale étant, que ce don ait une valeur analogue à la spontanéité qui le motive.

L’Empereur y met une condition, celle de recevoir en retour le portrait de Mr. le Duc de Wellington, et Votre Excellence est chargée de lui en faire la demande au nom de Sa Majesté. J’ai l’honneur d’être.

Le Cte. de Nesselrode.”

**CONDITION Good.**

PROV. Presented to the 1st Duke of Wellington by Alexander I of Russia and sent over from Paris in 1817.

Full-length, life-size, aged about sixty-eight. In full regal robes. He wears a short ermine cape over which are the collars of the St Esprit and the Golden Fleece. Under the cape he wears a purple velvet cloak lined with ermine and embroidered with gold fleurs-de-lis. He wears the Garter below his left knee. He holds his sceptre, the other end of which rests on a book which lies on a table to the left, together with another sceptre and a crown.

Louis XVIII, comte de Provence, brother of Louis XVI, fled from Paris during the Revolution and ultimately settled in England. He was placed on the throne by the Allies in 1814 and finally, after Waterloo, in 1815. Gérard painted several portraits of him in full regal robes: the more common composition shows him seated, in three-quarter profile (for example Musee des Augustins, Toulouse). The costume and posture of the Wellington picture are standard for French royal portraits – closely comparable in nearly every detail, for example, with Antoine Callet’s Louis XVI of 1779 in the Musée de Versailles. In general terms the concept does not differ from Rigaud’s portrait of Louis XIV in the Louvre.

The date of the picture, unfinished at Louis XVIII’s death in 1824, and the details of Charles X’s gift to the Duke of Wellington are recorded in the correspondence between the Prince de Polignac, the French ambassador in London, later Charles X’s prime minister, and the Duke:
‘Portland Place, ce 16 Novembre, 1824.

Monsieur le Duc,—N’ayant pas eu l’honneur de vous rencontrer à votre Hôtel je m’empresser de m’acquitter d’une commission que j’eusse préféré faire verbalement auprès de vous. Le Roi, mon auguste maître, ayant appris que j’avais fait prendre quelques informations dans le but de savoir si le Portrait qui vous avait été destiné par le feu Roi, Monsieur le Duc, était bientôt achevé, m’a chargé par l’intermédiaire de son Ministre des Affaires Etrangères de faire savoir à votre Excellence qu’il en faisait presser l’exécution, et que de plus il avait donné l’ordre de faire faire son propre portrait, que Sa Majesté compte vous offrir comme un témoignage de son amitié. Je me félicite, Monsieur le Duc, d’avoir à vous faire connaître cette nouvelle preuve des sentiments que vous porte Mon Souverain, et qui s’accordent si bien avec les souvenirs glorieux qui se rattachent à votre personne.

Recevez, etc.,

(Signed) Le Prince de Polignac.’

In a letter dated Stratfield Saye, November 17, 1824, the Duke thanks the Prince for the trouble he has taken with regard to the picture promised him by the late King, Louis XVIII, and begs him to thank the present King, Charles X, for his promise of a picture of himself.

Then follows a second letter from the Ambassador:

‘Portland Place, ce 4 Juillet, 1826

Monsieur le Duc,— Je m’empresse de transmettre à votre Grace le Portrait du feu Roi que Sa Majesté Charles X m’a envoyé pour vous être remis; j’attends sous peu celui du Roi actuel et je ne perdrai pas un moment à vous le faire savoir aussitôt qu’il sera arrivé. J’éprouve une vraie satisfaction à être en cette occasion, Monsieur le Duc, l’organe des sentiments d’estime et d’amitié de mon Souverain à votre égard. J’ai l’honneur, etc.

(Signed) Le Prince de Polignac.’

Prov. Presented to the 1st Duke of Wellington by Charles X in 1826 in accordance with the wishes of Louis XVIII, who died before the completion of the work.

Lit. Passavant 1836, I, p. 173 (erroneously attributed to Lefèvre); Waagen 1854, II, p. 277

51 Charles X, King of France (1757–1836)

Canvas, 254 × 179 cm

WM 1465–1948

Full-length, life-size, aged about sixty-seven. King Charles X wears his coronation robes, including an ermine cape and a red velvet note trimmed with ermine at the bottom, which is embroidered with gold fleurs-de-lis. Over his shoulder are the collar and cross of the St Esprit. In his right hand he holds his sceptre, the other end of which rests on a cushion, where sit another sceptre and a crown.
Charles X, comte d’Artois, brother of Louis XVI and Louis XVIII, fled from Paris during the Revolution and settled in England in 1795. Already in his brother’s reign he was the leader of the Ultra royalists, the party of extreme reaction. When he came to the throne in 1824, he assumed an autocratic rule, upheld by his belief in the divine right of kings: ‘I would rather hew wood than be a king under the conditions of the King of England.’ His reactionary policies led to the convening of the Assembly and ultimately to the Revolution of 1830, when he abdicated in favour of his remote cousin, Louis-Philippe, and fled to England.

Gérard was commissioned by the Ministère de la Maison du Roi to paint a portrait of the new king, Charles X, in his coronation robes, which was successfully exhibited at the 1825 Salon. The original prototype of the painting is now lost, but the artist painted several versions of the portrait, of which this is one. Other versions include the portrait at the Bowes Museum, Barnard Castle, which is identical except for minor differences in the building in the background. The version at Versailles is similar but does not have the view on to the exterior, while the Louvre portrait is of head-and-shoulders only (although there are three copies there after Gérard of the full-length portrait). Charles X offered both the portrait of Louis XVIII and this one of himself to the 1st Duke of Wellington in November 1824 (see previous entry), and Gérard’s letter of November 1825 to the 1st Duke fixes its date reasonably firmly. Evelyn Wellington’s summary of the correspondence is as follows:
‘On the 24th of the following November, M. Gérard writes to the Duke from Paris, saying that he has not forgotten that it was the Duke’s wish that the picture of Charles X should be painted by him, and that he has tried to make the picture worthy of its destination, adding that it will soon arrive at the French Embassy, if it is not already there. He then says: ‘Je serai très heureux, Monseigneur, que votre Grâce fût satisfaite de cet ouvrage; ne pouvant en changer la figure puisque c’est celle agréée par le Roi pour la manufacture des Gobelins, et pour la gravure en taille douce, que le Gouvernement fait exécuter, j’ai cherché du moins à jeter quelque variété dans l’effet et dans la disposition du fond, ce qu’on pourrait reconnaître en comparant ce tableau avec les deux autres dont j’ai été également chargé pour l’Ambassade et pour Lord Salisbury.’

On 5 December 1826 the 1st Duke writes to M. Gérard and thanks him for the pains he has taken with the picture. He tells him that he has already received an excellent picture of the King from the Ambassador, which had been sent by mistake to Lord Salisbury, but that, as in his letter of the 24th of November M. Gérard mentioned his efforts to alter the effect and disposition of the background, and as it was the Duke’s desire to possess the picture intended for him by the King, he had sent M. Gérard’s letter on to the Ambassador. He now begs M. Gérard to explain to the Secretary of the French Embassy (M. de Flavigny) the changes that had been made in the picture, with a view to ascertaining whether or not he possessed the portrait the King intended him to have. To this M. Gérard replies, expressing regret that the picture intended for the Duke should have, in the first instance, been sent to the wrong person, adding that he has written to inform M. de Flavigny that the picture in question has a sky background, and that it should have arrived first.

Prov. Presented to the 1st Duke of Wellington by Charles X in 1826.

After GÉRARD

52 Napoleon Bonaparte (1769–1821)
Canvas, rectangular, framed as oval, 73 × 59 cm
WM 1515–1948

Bust portrait, life-size; Napoleon wears the uniform of a colonel of the Foot Grenadiers with a white *plastron* showing a white waistcoat and a portion of the red sash of the Legion of Honour. He wears gold epaulettes and the Grand Cross of the Legion of Honour. The *croix d’officier* of the same order and the Italian Iron Crown hang from one of the button-holes of his coatee.
Wellington was given at least one portrait by Gérard of Napoleon during his stay in Paris in 1815. Correspondence between William Richard Hamilton in Paris and Lord Bathurst dated 24 August 1815 refers to ‘a copy of the portrait of Bonaparte that Gérard sold to Sir Charles Stuart or a facsimile of it given to the Duke of Wellington’ (British Library, Bathurst Loan 57/10).

This painting was acquired, and catalogued in the Wellington collection, as by Lefèvre. The face evokes Gérard’s portrait of Napoleon as First Consul of 1803 (Musée Condé, Chantilly; other versions at Malmaison and the Musée des Beaux-Arts de Besançon). It is identical in all details, except for the background, to Gérard’s oval portrait from the collection of Empress Marie-Louise, now in a Swiss private collection (see exh. cat., Paris, Grand Palais, Napoléon, 1969, no. 489, repr.).

Prov. Bought by or presented to the 1st Duke of Wellington before 1830.

**GERMAN**

*German School, c. 1810–15*

53 *Frederick William, Duke of Brunswick (1771–1815)*

Canvas, rectangular, framed as oval, 73.7 x 59.7 cm

WM 1553–1948

He wears a deep-collared coat with bars of black braid and, on his chest, the star of the Black Eagle.

Frederick William was the son of Charles William Ferdinand of Brunswick (Braunschweig-Wolfenbüttel) and brother of the persecuted Queen Caroline of England. He fought in the Prussian army against revolutionary France and became a bitter opponent of Napoleonic domination in Germany. In 1809, after Wagram, he fled to England and fought in the Peninsular campaign. He returned to Brunswick to raise fresh troops in 1813 and died fighting at Quatre Bras in June 1815.

This picture was bought by the 1st Duke of Wellington from a Mr Henry Hayter and the Wellington Catalogue enshrined the tradition that this was probably the name of the painter (‘Henry Hayter (?)’). However, there is no mention of such an artist in any of the reference books and indeed, to judge from the picture’s style, characterized by a hardness and detailed treatment of the face which is silhouetted against a plain background, it is more likely to be Continental than English. It is interesting to note that this was the assumption of the writer on the Apsley House collection in the *Quarterly Review* in 1853, where the portrait was described among a group of ‘foreign pictures’, without further attribution. The likelihood is that the picture is by a German painter working under French influence, and that it dates from the period 1813–15, when Frederick William was back in Brunswick. In posture, facial features and hairstyle it is close to the engraving by F. Muller after J.F. Schmidt (repr. in Hemming’s *Deutscher Ehren*...
Tempel, Gotha, 1824). It should be noted, however, that Henry was the name of the eldest son of (the later Sir) George Hayter (1792–1871), who in 1815 was appointed ‘Painter of miniatures and portraits to the Princess Charlotte’. It is not impossible that she should have asked him to make a posthumous copy of some portrait in oils or miniature of her uncle, that he subsequently passed on to his son.

PROV. Bought by the 1st Duke of Wellington 1851 from ‘Henry Hayter’ for 25 guineas (£26 5s. 0d.)
LIT. Quarterly Review, xcii, 1853, p. 459

German School, c. 1830

54 Frederick William III, King of Prussia (1770–1840)
Illegible signature, centre foreground
Canvas, 267 × 175 cm
WM 1565–1948

Frederick William wears the star of the Black Eagle and above it the Iron Cross, the badge of Maria Theresa of Austria, the badge of St George of Russia and two war medals, partially hidden. He is considerably older than in the portrait by Herbig at Apsley House (see below, no. 68) and a date c. 1830 may be proposed for this painting. Dr Bartoschek suggests the portrait is painted by a follower of Franz Krüger, after a lost original by Gérard, formerly in Schloss Charlottenburg, Berlin (written communication, 2008).
Luca GIORDANO (1634–1705)
Italian (Neapolitan) School

Son and pupil of Antonio Giordano, he was also greatly influenced by Ribera. He worked mainly in Naples but also in Rome, Venice and Florence, as well as Madrid. Known as ‘Luca fa presto’ from the speed at which he worked, his output was enormous even allowing for the fact that he must have employed assistants for his major decorative schemes.

Lit. O. Ferrari and G. Scavizzi, Luca Giordano: L'opera completa, Naples, 1992

55 Hagar and Ishmael in the Desert (Genesis 16: 7)
Inscribed in white with inventory no.: 897.
Canvas, 67 × 156 cm
WM 1638–1948

Luca Giordano was invited to Madrid by Charles II in 1692 and remained as court painter until his return to Naples in 1702. Palomino says that among his official commissions was a group of paintings of biblical subjects in diverse sizes for the Buen Retiro palace (particularly a series of Old Testament scenes for the Hermitage of St John) and for the Palace of the Queen Mother (Pérez Sánchez 2002, p. 202). The Hermitage of St John in the Retiro gardens was the official residence of the governor, used as a retreat, and complete with chapel and decorative paintings and sculpture (Brown and Elliott 2003, pp. 81–82 and fig. 50).

Ferrari and Scavizzi suggest that the series of paintings for the Buen Retiro palace was made up of fourteen canvasses, including two from the story of David and nine from the story of Solomon (Ferrari, Scavizzi, 1992, I, p. 135).

Both the Hagar and Ishmael and the Samson and Delilah (see next entry) are described in the Buen Retiro inventory of 1701: ‘The slave of Abraham with her son Ishmael in the desert and the angel pointing out where she will find water’, and ‘Another picture over the window … of Samson asleep and Delilah cutting off his hair’ (Bayton 1975ff., II, p. 348, nos. 895, 898, valued at 1,200 reales each).

Both pictures were painted to hang over windows, as were five others in the series: Abraham showing God the Twelve Tribes (whereabouts unknown), God and Abraham (Prado; inscribed no. 894), Abraham and the Three Angels (Prado; inscribed no. 895), Samson and the Philistines (Burgos Museum) and Lot and his Daughters (Prado). The series is reproduced by Ferrari and Scavizzi (1992, II, p. 768, figs. 714–16). Three other scenes from the life of Samson – Samson burning the Philistines’ Harvest (Madrid, Palacio Real, inscribed no. 890), Samson fighting the Lion (Prado), and Samson in the Temple (Escorial; Ferrari, Scavizzi 1992,
figs. 711–73) were hanging as overdoors in the same room. The two Apsley House pictures are, however, painted in a broader, more sketchy style than the others and this led Ferrari and Scavizzi to argue that they never belonged to the Buen Retiro series. Works in this broader style do not occur earlier in Giordano’s oeuvre than the frescoes of the Casón del Retiro (c. 1697), and Ferrari and Scavizzi placed the Wellington pictures c. 1700 rather than c. 1696, when the biblical paintings for the Buen Retiro were produced. Yet the descriptions and sizes in the Buen Retiro inventory of 1701 fit the Wellington pictures precisely and the admitted difference in style could readily be explained by the time lag of a year taken to complete the decorative scheme.

The importance of the Buen Retiro Palace as a royal residence declined in the eighteenth century and these paintings, among others, were transferred to the Palacio Real in Madrid, which was built from 1738 to 1764.

The composition follows the standard seventeenth-century iconography – compare, for example, the painting by P.F. Mola at Dulwich – but it has had to be squeezed into a narrower oblong shape.


PROV. Hermitage of St John, Buen Retiro (1701 inventory no. 895); Royal Palace, Madrid, Infanta’s antechamber (1772 and 1794 inventories); captured at Vitoria,1813.

56 Samson and Delilah (Judges 16: 19)
Inscribed in white with inventory no: 900
Canvas, 56 × 147 cm
WM 1631–1948

See previous entry.

The composition, showing Delilah cutting Samson’s hair while he lies in her lap and the soldiers approach with ropes, is fairly standard in the seventeenth century (cf. Guercino, Christie’s, 21 April 1967, lot 74). Another version of the subject attributed to Luca Giordano (advertised in The Burlington Magazine, Nov. 1970) is different in shape. Ferrari and Scavizzi (1992, I, p. 341, A571) note that an untraced Samson and Delilah was a pendant to Lot and his Daughters, which is marked in white with the inventory number 899 (measuring 58 × 154 cm) as an overwindow in the Hermitage of St John in the gardens of the Buen Retiro Palace.

PROV. See previous entry.

James W. GLASS (1825–1857)
American School

Born and trained in New York, he settled in London in 1847 and exhibited at the R.A. and B.I. 1848–55. Having gained a considerable reputation as a painter of horses and military life, he returned to New York shortly before his death.
His Last Return from Duty

Signed lower right: JW (monogram) Glass 1853
Canvas, 81.3 × 123 cm
WM 1562–1948

The 1st Duke of Wellington is shown riding from his office at the Horse Guards for the last time as commander-in-chief, not long before his death in September 1852. He has just emerged on to the Horse Guards’ Parade. His horse, known as ‘the Brown Mare’, was led in the procession at his funeral.

There are two oil sketches, one formerly in the Duke of Wellington’s collection inscribed 26 July 1852 – The Duke saw this sketch at Apsley House on the above date and seemed pleased (Wellesley, Steegmann 1935, p. 12), and another belonging to the Duke of Sutherland (19.8 × 30.3 cm). According to the Wellington Catalogue, the first finished oil was in the collection of the Earl of Lonsdale and another replica was painted for Queen Victoria, but there is now no record of such a painting in the Royal Collection.

It appears that the Duke was persuaded to sit to Glass through the mediation of Abbot Lawrence, American Minister in London (The Athenæum, 23 October 1852). The last sitting was on 23 July and it was reported that the Duke said to the artist: ‘You had better take all your sittings now, I may not be here in the spring’ (The Athenæum, 20 November 1852). Glass also painted a portrait of Wellington, seated, with his secretary Algernon Greville (exh., R.A., 1853; Wellesley, Steegmann 1935, p. 12). There is an engraving by James Faed.

Prov. Bought by the 2nd Duke of Wellington from Messrs Colnaghi.
Francisco de GOYA (1746–1828)
Spanish School

Born in Fuendetodos, near Zaragoza, he was a pupil of Francisco Bayeu in Madrid in 1766. He visited Italy in 1771, settled in Madrid by 1775 and, at the instigation of Mengs, began to paint cartoons for the royal tapestry works. He was appointed court painter in 1789 and first court painter (primer pintor de cámara) in 1799. A severe illness left him totally deaf at the age of 47 and from that period the mood and subject-matter of his pictures became more sombre. In 1824 he fled from the autocratic regime of Ferdinand VII and settled in Bordeaux. His fame rests on his etchings as much as on his paintings and he exerted considerable influence on French painting from Delacroix to Manet.


58 Equestrian Portrait of the 1st Duke of Wellington (1769–1852)
Canvas, 294 x 241 cm
WM 1566–1948

Wellington is wearing civilian dress, which was his customary battle dress; the sabre and sash are of a Spanish type and are probably fanciful additions by Goya. The baton may have been omitted for diplomatic reasons (Wilson-Bareau in Marqués 2008, p. 275). The execution is very sketchy; considerable areas have been laid on with a palette knife and numerous alterations are visible. It is now generally accepted that this portrait was painted in the three weeks between 12 August 1812, when Wellington entered Madrid, and 2 September, when it was exhibited at the Real Academia de San Fernando (MacLaren 1947). Although it is possible that Goya painted it from life, given the large size of the canvas that had already been used. Wilson-Bareau (2008, p. 275) suggests that it was probably painted using the National Gallery half-length as a model. An announcement in the Diario de Madrid of 1 September 1812 refers to it as ‘the equestrian portrait … of Lord Wellington … which has just been executed by … D. Francisco Goya’. In a letter Goya himself writes: ‘Yesterday His Excellency Sr. Willington [sic], Duke of Ciudad Rodrigo, was here. A plan to exhibit his portrait in the Royal Academy [of San Fernando] was discussed, about which he showed much pleasure’ (letter in Fundación Lázaro Galdiano, Madrid; Spanish text in Wellesley, Steegmann 1935; translations in MacLaren 1947; Braham 1966).

Clearly the speed with which the picture was produced would account for its sketchiness, while an X-radiograph published by Allan Braham (1966, fig. 28) shows conclusively that Goya painted the Duke’s head over that of an earlier sitter. The X-radiograph reveals that this sitter wore a large curved hat, a circular star on his chest and a sash over his right shoulder. Goya painted Wellington’s face over
the hat, hence giving him a taller and broader body than the original figure.

As Braham points out, this change accounts for the faulty anatomy of the shoulders, right arm and back, and also perhaps for the fact that a victorious general was painted as a civilian. The alternative explanation, that Goya merely painted over an earlier version of the Duke’s head, is unlikely; the face looks different and a change of sitter is also indicated by the over-painting of the star and sash. Braham suggests that the original sitter was perhaps Joseph Bonaparte, whose portrait was painted over when Wellington entered Madrid, thereby providing ‘a perfect symbol of the altered political situation in Madrid’. On the other hand, Xavier de Salas suggests that the original sitter was Manuel Godoy, Prince of Peace (Salas 1969). His argument is based on a comparison of the facial features and the overpainted decoration, as well as on a consideration of the position of the horse, which is based on Velázquez’s portrait of Philip IV (J. López-Rey, Velázquez, London, 1963, no. 209) and is closer to Goya’s equestrian portraits of the 1790s than to the later equestrian portraits painted during the war, in which the horse is usually placed diagonally to the picture plane. This identification has been supported more recently by Isadora Rose-de Viejo (2001) on similar grounds. Unfortunately the face in the X-radiograph is insufficiently clear to provide evidence that would clinch the argument either way.

There are two other portraits of Wellington by Goya: (1) a bust portrait in the National Gallery (64.3 x 52.4 cm; formerly collection of the Duke of Leeds; see especially A. Braham, ‘Goya’s portrait of the Duke of Wellington in the National Gallery’, The Burlington Magazine, cviii, Feb. 1966, pp. 78ff., fig. 28). Braham suggests that although the portrait was begun in 1812 it was not finished until 1814, when the depiction of the decorations was brought up to date. (2) Half-length, wearing cloak and hat, in the National Gallery of Art, Washington (105 x 88 cm; Beruete 1922, pl. 47). The face is more closely based on the drawing in the British Museum (see below) than either of the other two paintings.

There are also two preparatory drawings, both bust length: (1) British Museum, red chalk (Braham, The Burlington Magazine, Feb. 1966, fig. 30; exh. cat. Goya, R.A., 1963–64, no. 145, pl. 45). This differs from WM 1566 and the National Gallery painting in details of the face, particularly in the prominence of the front teeth, and was probably drawn from life. The suggestion first put forward by MacLaren (1947) that it was made for a projected etching that was never executed has not been widely accepted (exh. cat. Goya, R.A., 1963–64; MacLaren, Braham 1970, p. 22, no. 19; cf. the portraits discussed by de Salas, The Burlington Magazine, cvi, 1964, pp. 14ff.). (2) Hamburg, Kunsthalle, black chalk (Braham 1966, fig. 29). This is closer in facial features to the oil portraits, and it has been suggested that it is a copy (MacLaren, Braham 1970, p. 21).

According to an anecdote of doubtful veracity current in the early nineteenth century, the portrait led to a dispute between artist and sitter mainly because Wellington insisted that he had been made to look too heavy (MacLaren, Braham 1970, p. 22, no. 16), and certainly the Duke kept it rolled up at his country house, Stratfield Saye. The fact remains that Wellington was the only Englishman – and one of only a few foreigners – ever to sit to Goya.

**CONDITION.** Retouching on centre part of sky at top right corner and on horse, next to the sitter’s knee; some cracking of paint on the Duke’s jacket; surface cleaned and striplined by E.H. Conservation Studio, 2007.

**PROV.** Painted by Goya for the 1st Duke of Wellington; at Stratfield Saye until 1948 and not, therefore, included in the Wellington Catalogue.

Antiveduto della GRAM(M)ATICA (c. 1571–1626)

Italian School; worked in Rome

Born in Siena (?), he lived in Rome from 1578, when he was the pupil of Giovanni Domenico Angelini. He was patronized by Cardinal Francesco Maria del Monte and Marchese Vincenzo Giustiniani and became a member of the Academy of St Luke in 1593. In the mid 1590s he was associated with Caravaggio, but from the little that is known of his work it appears that he only adopted a Caravaggesque style in the following decade.


Ascribed to GRAMATICA

59 Card Players
Canvas, 87 × 116 cm
WM 1635–1948

This painting was catalogued as Caravaggio in the Wellington collection and was included as such in the first exhibition of the Magnasco Society in 1924. It therefore has an honourable place in the Baroque revival in England, though the attribution to Caravaggio himself has not found acceptance. In the Wellington Museum it was labelled ‘follower of Caravaggio’ and no more precise attribution was forthcoming until Carlo Volpe’s suggestion that it was by Gramatica (1972). This attribution was tentatively accepted by Benedict Nicolson (1979; recorded as ‘uncertain attribution’, with which John Gash agrees, written opinion to author, 2008). Gianni Papi originally attributed this work to Simon Vouet, but revised his opinion and now believes it to be an important work by Gramatica (1995), although Riedl does not include it in his catalogue raisonné (1996).

There is a copy ascribed to Gramatica in the Fondazione Roberto Longhi (Florence) and a similar scene exists of Soldiers playing Cards, attributed to Cecco del Caravaggio, from the Del Taia collection (Pinacoteca Nazionale, Siena). The costume suggests a date c. 1620, which would fit with Gramatica’s chronology, for it is only in his mature work that he fully exploits Caravaggesque naturalism and chiaroscuro (see R. Longhi, Questi caraveggeschi in Opere complete, IV, 1968, pp. 138f., pls. 193–207).

The subject of card players reached Rome, along with the fortune-tellers, money-changers and kindred scenes, from earlier sixteenth-century Flemish genre painting and was taken up by Caravaggio in the 1590s (see W. Friedlaender, Caravaggio Studies, Princeton, 1955, p. 81). Caravaggio’s The Cardsharps of c. 1595 (Kimbell Art Museum, Fort Worth) was widely popular at the time and set the fashion for such paintings in Italy (see K. Christiansen, A Caravaggio Rediscovered. The Lute Player, exh. cat., New York, Metropolitan Museum, 1990, pp. 11–19). Indeed, it was painted for Cardinal del Monte, who was also Gramatica’s patron (Friedlaender 1955, p. 153; on del Monte, see Z. Wázbinski, Cardinal del Monte, Florence, 1994, and Storia dell’Arte, 9–10, 1971, pp. 5ff.). For recent studies of the subject see G. Feigenbaum (Washington 1997), H. Langdon (London 2001) and G. Papi, Il genio degli anonimi Maestro caravaggeschi a Roma e Napoli, exh. cat., Milan, Palazzo Reale, 2005, pp. 33–49, the ‘maestro dei giacatori’.
CONDITION. Irregular surface; some general wearing, but on the whole in good condition.

PROV. Spanish royal collection (not identified in inventory); captured at Vitoria, 1813.

EXH. Agnew’s, First Magnasco Society Exhibition, 1924, no. 31 (as Caravaggio; see Osbert Sitwell, ‘The Magnasco Society’, Apollo, lxxix, 1964, p. 382)


Giovanni Francesco Barbieri, called GUERCINO (1591–1666)

Italian (Bolognese) School

Guercino (‘little squint eyed’) was born in Cento, near Bologna. Largely self-taught, though apprenticed in 1607 to the Centese painter Benedetto Gennari the Elder (d. 1610) and influenced by Ludovico Carracci, he was active from 1613 in Cento and Bologna. He was called to Rome in 1621 when his patron Cardinal
Alessandro Ludovisi became Pope Gregory XV, but after Gregory’s death in 1623 Guercino returned to Cento. Upon Guido Reni’s death in 1642, he moved to Bologna and became head of a large workshop.


60 Mars as a Warrior

Canvas, oval painted surface on rectangular canvas, 112.7 x 85 cm
WM 1508–1948

On 23 February and 17 and 26 March 1630 Guercino received sums amounting to 125 scudi from Lorenzo Fioravanti for a painting of Mars, together with its companion Venus and Cupid, which can probably be identified with these two Wellington pictures (the account book is printed in Malvasia, with a recent edition revised by B. Ghelfi). There is a similar composition showing the three figures on one canvas, with Mars appearing frontal and Venus reclining full-length, in the Galleria Estense, Modena (Horton 1960, fig. 2; Salerno 1988, pl. 22). This painting dates from 1634, when Guercino sold it for 126 scudi. As Anne Horton has pointed out, the Wellington pictures are in a more baroque style, with a fuller use of chiaroscuro and diagonals, than the painting at Modena, and she compares them with the Guardian Angel of 1628 in the Galleria Colonna, Rome (Salerno 1988, p. 185). The warrior recurs in the Martyrdom of St Lawrence of 1629 in Ferrara Cathedral (Salerno 1988, p. 215), and again, with his right arm raised to strike (c. 1628) at Tatton Park, Cheshire (National Trust; Salerno 1988, p. 216). Mahon and Turner (1989, p. 30) point out that the preparatory drawings mentioned by Horton of Mars in the Allen Memorial Art Museum, Oberlin, Ohio, and two related drawings of warriors in the Witt Collection, Courtauld Institute (Horton, figs. 1, 5, 6), relate to a different and later composition. In addition, the drawing of a warrior in the Kunsthalle, Hamburg (Gernsheim photo, no. 16859) is now held to be an eighteenth-century forgery (Salerno 1988, p. 225).

Concerning the warrior’s armour: the helmet and sword are both characteristic of the early seventeenth century, but the body armour, presumably intended to appear Roman, is purely imaginary (information supplied by Claude Blair).

Condition. Some retouching in background; otherwise good. The original shape appears to have been oval.
Exh. Tokyo 1990–91, with cat. 61 (4 and 5); N.G.L., Guercino in Britain, Paintings from British Collections, 1991, with cat. 61 (30 and 31)
Paired images of Mars and Venus were popular from at least the fifteenth century and celebrated the love affair between Mars, the god of war, and Venus, goddess of love and wife of Vulcan. Whilst Mars brandishes his sword and gestures as if departing, Venus appears to remonstrate with him, whilst her son Cupid points his bow out of the picture, aiming an arrow at Mars.

A drawing of Venus and Cupid, probably a study for this painting, with Cupid on the left of the composition, drawing an arrow from his quiver, is in the Royal Collection, Windsor (Mahon, Turner, 1989, p. 30, no. 55, fig. 57). Mahon and Turner suggest that, since the drawing was conceived for a horizontal composition, it could be a study for the painting at an early stage, before the vertical format had been decided upon.

**Condition.** Some wear, e.g. hair and shadow near Venus's right breast, otherwise good. The original shape appears to have been oval.
Peeter GYSELS (1621–1690/01)
Flemish (Antwerp) School

Born in Antwerp, where he was a pupil of Jan Boots and, according to Houbraken, of Jan Brueghel the Younger, he became an independent master in 1650. In composition, many of his small landscapes and village views are nearly indistinguishable from those of Brueghel, though the handling is drier and more mechanical. Gysels also painted still lifes in the manner of Jan Weenix.


62 A Flemish Village: The River Landing Stage
Signed lower centre: p. gijseels. Inscribed in white, lower left, with inventory no.: 956
Copper, 28 × 35.8 cm
WM 1646–1948
This and the following two paintings are typical of Gysels’s work in the style of Jan Brueghel. A very similar village scene with landing stage by Gysels was formerly in the Gemäldegalerie, Dresden (copper, 16 × 22 cm; H. Ebert, Kriegsverluste der Dresdener Gemäldegalerie: vernichtete und vermisste Werke, Dresden, 1963, p. 105, no. 1154, ill.); it combines the features of this painting and of WM 1636. Another similar scene, with a wider river, was in the Vanderkar Gallery, London (advertised in Apollo, June 1972); more elaborate compositions are in the Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam (no. SK-A-126) and Gemäldegalerie, Augsburg (no. 2501), the latter signed and dated 1680.

**CONDITION** Generally good, with scattered losses (inpainted) in sky, right. Cleaned in 1950.

**Prov.** Royal Palace, Madrid, 1772 inventory, one of eight paintings by Brueghel or his school inscribed with the number 956; others now in the Wellington Museum are nos. WM 1636, Gysels, and WM 1634 and 1637, Brueghel.

**Lit.** Gaya Nuño 1964, no. 161

63 A Flemish Village with a River View

Signed right centre foreground: Petrus Geysels. Inscribed in white with inventory no.: 956, lower right.

Copper, 29.1 × 36.6 cm

WM 1636–1948
Picturesque villages situated on the bank of a winding river and peopled by figures engaged in a variety of activities predominate in Gysels’s oeuvre, directly inspired by the work of Jan Brueghel (compare WM 1574).

**CONDITION** Good, with scattered minor losses. Cleaned in 1950.
**Prov.** Royal Palace, Madrid, 1772 inventory, one of eight paintings by Brueghel or his school inscribed with the number 956; others now in the Wellington Museum are WM 1646, Gysels, and WM 1634 and 1637, Brueghel. 1794 inventory, apparently one of a pair hanging with WM 1646 in the King’s first cabinet, entered as ‘956 and 957 . . . “Passing a River” and a “Waterside piece with buildings: Men on horses etc.,” style of Brueghel’. The size is given as a half by a third vara, i.e. 28 × 42 cm; captured at Vitoria, 1813.
**Lit.** Gaya Nuño 1964, no. 159

64 *Landscape with Figures crossing a Brook*
- Signed indistinctly lower right: p. gijels
- Copper, 28 × 36 cm
- WM 1572–1948

The source for basic elements of Gysels’s composition appears to be Jan Brueghel’s *Wooded Landscape* dated 1605 in the Alte Pinakothek, Munich (copper, 25.4 × 36 cm, inv. 1880; K. Ertz, *Jan Brueghel der Ältere*.)
Die Gemälde, Cologne, 1979, no. 112). Several closely related works are known: a pen, brown ink and watercolour drawing in the Fitzwilliam Museum, Cambridge, differs from WM 1572 only in minor details (24.9 × 38.5 cm, inv. PD.202–1963, as ‘imitator of Jan Brueghel’). Almost identical painted versions were in the Tollemache collection (sold, Christie’s, 26 November 1971, lot 75; panel, 39.4 × 57.2 cm); with John Mitchell, London, 1957 (25 × 36 cm, as A. van Stalbemt); and on the Dutch art market, 1961. Others, with minor differences in details and lacking the horse-drawn cart and two figures with baskets in the foreground, are (or were) in the Musée des Beaux-Arts, Valence (27 × 35 cm); and on the art market, Berlin in 1932 (panel, 21.3 × 33 cm).

**CONDITION** Cleaned in 1950.

**PROV.** Royal Palace, Madrid, 1794 inventory, apparently one of three hanging with WM 1636 and 1646 in the King’s first cabinet, entered as ‘956 and 957 … “Passing a River” and a “Waterside piece with buildings: Men on horses etc.”’ style of Brueghel’. The size is given as a half by a third vara, i.e. 28 × 42 cm; captured at Vitoria, 1813.

**LIT.** Gaya Nuño 1964, no. 159

**James HALL (1797–1854)**

*British School*

A Scottish advocate as well as an amateur painter, he was a student at the Royal Academy and a friend of Wilkie. He exhibited portraits – including one of the 1st Duke of Wellington – and landscapes at the R.A., 1835–54.

**65 Colonel John Gurwood C.B. (1790–1845)**

Dated on the back: 1837

Canvas, 126 × 89.6 cm

WM 1467–1948

Three-quarter-length, life-size, aged forty-seven. He wears the uniform of esquire to the 1st Duke of Wellington, as Knight of the Bath. This consists of a round, soft black hat, a round frill collar and a white sleeveless coat over a red silk undercoat. In his right hand he holds the Duke’s banner, and he is wearing the Waterloo medal on his chest.

John Gurwood joined the army in 1808 and subsequently served as a lieutenant in the 52nd Light Infantry throughout the Peninsular War, receiving a severe wound in the head at Ciudad Rodrigo in 1812. He also fought in France and was again wounded at Waterloo. After the war he was for many years private secretary to the 1st Duke of Wellington, and edited the Duke’s orders and a selection from his dispatches under the title of the Wellington Despatches, in 1837–44.

A preparatory pencil drawing for this portrait, showing the head and shoulders only, in identical posture and inscribed Col. Gurwood / 1837 / 6 January / 7 Jan.y is in the collection of the Duke of Wellington.
(66 × 54 cm). There is also a marble bust of Gurwood by Samuel Joseph at Apsley House, dated 1840. He was included in William Salter’s Waterloo Banquet at Apsley House, 1836 (Duke of Wellington private collection on loan to Apsley House), and there is a sketch of him for this painting in the N.P.G. (3719).

**Prov.** Bought by the 1st Duke of Wellington.

**Exh.** South Kensington 1868 (411)

**Lit.** Walker 1985, I, p. 230

**John HAYTER (1800–1895)**

British School

Younger brother of Sir George Hayter, he was known chiefly as a portrait draughtsman in chalks and crayons, exhibiting mainly portraits and historical scenes at the R.A. and B.I. from 1815 until 1879.


Signed on the back: *John Hayter pinxit, 1839*

Canvas, 141 × 110 cm

WM 1531–1948
He is represented in the uniform of Colonel of the 1st Life Guards — red coatee, cuirass, white breeches and jackboots — standing in front of his charger, which is being held by a trooper of the same regiment. From his neck hangs the large Army gold cross and he also wears a General Officer’s Army Gold Medal.

Combermere, the second son of Sir Robert Salusbury Cotton, Bt, entered the army as a Second Lieutenant in the Royal Welsh Fusiliers in 1790. He took part in the Netherlands campaign of 1793–94, becoming a Lieutenant-Colonel at the age of twenty-one in 1794, and served with distinction in India, 1795–1800, and in the Peninsular War, 1808–14. At Salamanca he was second in command under Wellington. He was raised to the peerage in 1814 and was Governor of Barbados 1817–20, and then successively Commander-in-Chief in Ireland and in India, where he attained the rank of General and successfully besieged the fortress of Bhurtpore (Bharatpur, Rajasthan) in 1826. He returned to England in 1830.

Combermere obtained the honorary appointment of Colonel of the 1st Life Guards, with its attendant duties at court (see Mary, Viscountess Combermere, Memoirs and Correspondence of Field-Marshal Viscount Combermere, 1866, II, p. 227) in September 1829 when he was fifty-five and it is likely that this portrait refers to that appointment, even though it is itself dated 1839. Certainly the sitter appears to be nearer fifty-five than sixty-five, and a preparatory pencil drawing, showing the trooper holding the horse,
George Peter Alexander HEALY (1813–94)
American School

The son of an Irish ship’s captain, Healy was born in Boston, where he established himself as a largely self-taught portrait painter at the age of eighteen. He came to Europe and settled in London, 1838–43, and then in Paris, where he was a pupil of Gros and Couture. In 1855 he returned to the U.S., and settled in Chicago until 1866, when he went back to Paris and to Rome. He was very popular for both his portraits and his history paintings.

Lit. M. de Mare, G.P.A. Healy, American Artist, New York, 1954

67 Marshal Nicolas Jean-de-Dieu Soult, duc de Dalmatie (1769–1852)

Inscribed on the back of the canvas: Maréchal Soult, Duc de Dalmatie, by G.P.A. Healy, to his Friend J.S. Lucet aîné

Canvas, 75 x 62 cm
WM 1555–1948

Head and shoulders, life-size, aged about seventy. The sitter wears a dark, gold-embroidered uniform of a French Field Marshal with gold epaulettes. He wears the star, the small badge and the sash of the Legion of Honour.

Soult joined the Army in 1785, served with conspicuous skill in the campaigns of the 1790s and was made marshal in 1804. He took part in the campaigns of Napoleon and commanded the French armies in Spain, 1808–13, when he made a notable collection of Spanish paintings. After the war he was at first a supporter of Louis XVIII, who made him Minister of War, but then declared for Napoleon and was his chief of staff at Waterloo. Subsequently exiled, he returned to France in 1819 and was ultimately restored to the peerage and made Minister of War by Louis-Philippe. He represented France at the coronation of Queen Victoria in 1838, when he was the guest of the 1st Duke of Wellington.
The picture was painted from life in 1840 at the suggestion of General Lewis Cass, American Minister in Paris, and the artist was awarded a gold medal for it at the Paris Salon of that year. Soult himself considered it so good that he regretted it was not full-length, whereupon Healy painted a full-length version and gave the original to Lucet, a professor of literature. Correspondence in the Wellington archive (see Wellington 1901, p. 248) concerns Lucet’s offer of the painting to the Duke of Wellington in 1841 and the Duke’s repeated refusal to accept the gift. When Lucet sent the Duke the picture in spite of this refusal, Wellington replied:

‘However desirous of possessing permanently the portrait in question of Marshal Soult, I feel great repugnance to receive a present of an article of value from a gentleman with whom I have not the honour of being acquainted. There I leave the matter, and I request that you will send for the portrait or leave it where it is, as you may think proper. I will have marked upon it if you should leave it – “Sent to Field Marshal the Duke of Wellington in the year 1841 by Mons. J.S. Lucet, then residing no. 39, Foley Place, Portland Place, London”.

Wellington ultimately bought the picture for 50 guineas in 1849.

PROV. Originally presented in 1841 to, and then bought, by the 1st Duke of Wellington in 1849 from J.S. Lucet for 50 guineas (£52 10s. od.).
LIT. de Mare 1954, pp. 8ff.
Born in Berlin, where he studied at the Academy, of which he became a member in 1829 and deputy director in 1845. He painted battle scenes based on his own experiences in the Napoleonic wars, as well as portraits and figure subjects.

68 Frederick William III, King of Prussia (1770–1840)

Signed at foot of balustrade, lower left: Herbig pint.

Canvas, 233 × 158 cm

WM 1461–1948

Frederick wears the uniform of a Prussian Field Marshal: dark double-breasted coatee with silver buttons, red facings embroidered with silver, a silver sash with tassels round his waist, silver epaulettes, dark breeches and high black boots. On his chest is the star of the Black Eagle, and from a button hang the Iron Cross, the badge of Maria Theresa and that of St George of Russia.

Frederick William III succeeded to the Prussian throne in 1779. In 1805 he declared war on France and was forced to flee from Berlin during the French occupation 1806–09. The country suffered further during
Heyden

the campaign of 1812–14, but under his rule, after the war, Prussia took a leading place in German affairs.

This portrait may be compared with the full-length by Lawrence painted in 1814–18 for the Waterloo Chamber at Windsor Castle (K. Garlick, *Sir Thomas Lawrence: A Complete Catalogue of the Oil Paintings*, Oxford, 1989 p. 279, no. 805(c)). There is a similar composition in the Examination Schools at Oxford; for a portrait of the King at a later age, see above, under German school (no. 54).

The Duke of Wellington’s desire for a portrait of Frederick William and the King’s reply are set out in a letter from him to the Duke dated 18 August 1818:

‘MONSIEUR LE MARÉCHAL, –J’ai appris que vous aviez témoigné le désir de posséder mon portraït en pied. J’ai vu dans ce désir flatteur un moyen de vous donner une nouvelle preuve de tous les sentiments que je vous porte, et qui vous sont dus à juste titre. Je saisirai toujours avec le plus grand empressement toutes les occasions de vous exprimer mon attachement sincère et ma reconnaissance pour les grands et immortels services que vous avez rendus et que vous rendez tous les jours à la cause de l’humanité. Je souhaite, Monsieur le Duc, que mon portrait que je vous envoie, vous rappelle quelquefois celui qui ne cessera jamais d’être avec une parfaite considération et une véritable estime,

Monsieur le Maréchal,
Votre très affectionné,
FRÉDERIC GUIILLAUME

Au Maréchal Duc de Wellington,
Berlin, ce 18 Août, 1818.’

PROV. Given to the 1st Duke of Wellington by the King of Prussia in 1818.

LIT. Passavant 1836, I, p. 173; Waagen 1854, II, p. 277 (wrongly attributed to Gérard); Thieme, Becker 1923, XVI, p. 449, (wrongly identified with the portrait exhibited in Berlin in 1828)

Jan van der HEYDEN (1637–1712)
Dutch School

Born in Gorkum (Gorinchem), he lived mainly in Amsterdam, where he was one of the leading specialists in town views. From the end of the 1660s he was also engaged in projects to improve street-lighting and fire-fighting.


69 Architectural Fantasy, with the Old Town Hall, Amsterdam

Signed on wall, lower centre: *VHeyde f i66–* (last digit of date not legible)

Oak panel, 47.7 × 59 cm

WM 1500–1948
This is an architectural fantasy containing buildings from different parts of Amsterdam. The house in the left foreground with the small five-sided gothic oriel is the St Elisabethgasthuis; the portico behind it is the old Town Hall, which burnt down in 1652. In the background, the dome of the new Town Hall, which was built to replace the one destroyed, is visible behind the bridge. Such architectural fantasies of eclectically derived buildings placed in invented settings form a distinct group in van der Heyden’s work; thirty-seven are catalogued by Helga Wagner. Views of Amsterdam canals were particularly subject to the creative reshuffling of familiar landmarks, yet manage to maintain a plausible semblance of reality.

Although the last digit of the date is not clearly legible, WM 1500 probably dates to the end of the 1660s. Stylistically, it is broader in treatment and more atmospheric than the early works, and Helga Wagner links it with a number of pictures of the period c. 1667–72, including the Westerkerk in the Wallace Collection and the Oude Kerk in the Mauritshuis, The Hague (Wagner 1971, nos. 7 and 6 respectively). She does not accept the tradition that the figures are by Adriaen van de Velde (Hofstede de Groot 1908–27; Wellington 1901). There is contemporary evidence to confirm that Adriaen van de Velde painted figures for van der Heyden, but this is not to say that each figure in all his paintings is by him. Van der Heyden’s drawings for his Brandspuytenboek show that he could draw figures, though their style is derived from Adriaen van de Velde. His own figures in his paintings are also in the style of van de Velde, but they are plumper and more squat.
**Heyden**

CONDITION Slight paint loss in sky top left; otherwise good. Pentiments at the roofline indicate alterations in the positions of some buildings; bollards at the edge of the foreground quay are visible as under-drawing.

PROV. Lapeyrière sale, Paris, 14 April 1817 (lot 21); bought by Féréol de Bonnemaison for the 1st Duke of Wellington for 9450 frs. (about £378).

EXH. B.I., Old Master exhibitions, 1818 (64), 1835 (6); 1843 (78; reviewed, *The Athenaeum*, 10 June 1843), 1847 (4); 1856; R.A., Old Masters, 1886 (52; reviewed, *The Athenaeum*, 30 Jan. 1886); Arts Council 1949 (2)


70 The Chateau of Goudestein, on the River Vecht, near Maarsen

Signed on river bank, mid right: JvD Heijden/1674.

Canvas, 55.6 × 71.8 cm

WM 1501–1948

Van der Heyden’s pictures of country houses are among the earliest examples of precise topographical accuracy in this field. The banks of the Amstel and the Vecht River near Maarsen provided the most popular sites for the country houses of the richer citizens of Amsterdam. The powerful Huydecoper family acquired title to the Goudestein property in 1641 and also secured the lordship of neighbouring Maarsseveen and Neerdijk. Joan I Huydecoper and his son, Joan II, were instrumental in developing the environs of Maarsen as a bucolic aristocratic retreat, and undoubtedly paved the way for van der Heyden’s many ‘portraits’ of these estates.

Van der Heyden painted several different aspects of Goudestein (Wagner 1971, nos. 125–30; also Schwartz 1983, pp. 197–220), of which the dated compositions cover the years 1666 to 1675. In 1674, the year in which WM 1501 was painted, Joan II Huydecoper repaired and extensively renovated the existing house; van der Heyden’s brother Nicolaas assisted with surveying the estate and its plantings. The Goudestein depicted by van der Heyden was pulled down and rebuilt in 1754.

It is not certain that WM 1501 was painted for Huydecoper or was ever owned by him, but it certainly served to promote a grand estate and its lord. An engraving of this view of Goudestein adorned a map of Maarsseveen engraved by Philbertus Bouttats and published by Huydecoper in 1691 (Schwartz 1983, figs. 9–10); in 1677, van der Heyden made a print based on WM 1501 to use as an advertisement for a small fire-hose he designed and manufactured (L. de Vries, *Jan van der Heyden*, Amsterdam, 1984, p. 85, fig. 48). The tradition that Adriaen van de Velde painted the figures in this picture (Waagen 1854; Hofstede de Groot 1908–27) was laid to rest when the date 1674 was revealed, for van de Velde had died two years earlier.


PROV. Jan Tak sale, Souterwoude, 5 Sept. 1781 (lot 15; fl. 2105 to Delfos); Diderik van Leyden (Amsterdam) sale, Paris, 15 Nov. 1804 (lot 42, as with figures by A. van de Velde; 3620 frs., withdrawn); J.A. Paillet sale, Paris, 9 Dec. 1811 (lot 53, as with figures by A. van de Velde; 4200 frs., to Louis Jamard); Le Rouge; bought
for the 1st Duke of Wellington at the Le Rouge sale, Paris, 27 April 1818 (lot 20) by Féréol de Bonnemaison for 5410 frs., about £216 (not 3400 as in Wellington 1901).

Exh. B.I., Old Masters, 1821 (117), 1829 (50); R.A., Old Masters, 1887 (63); V&A, 1947 (4); Arts Council 1949 (i); Paris, Musée des Arts Decoratifs, La Vie en Hollande au XVIIe siècle, 1967 (46, pl. 13)


Lambert de HONDT (c. 1620–before 1665)

Flemish School

He worked in Malines (Mechelen), where his widow remarried on 10 February 1665; but little is known about him. He was probably responsible for the camp and battle scenes, with figures in the manner of Teniers, signed L.D. HONDT, but there is some confusion with the work of another L. de Hondt who made designs for tapestries in c. 1700.
71 An Encampment with Soldiers playing Cards

Signed left of centre: L.D. HONDT. F
Inscribed in white with *fleur-de-lis* (lower right) and inventory no.: 531 (lower left)
Canvas 30.5 × 43.8 cm
WM 1632–1948

Both the style and the subject are very similar to two battle scenes in the Gallery at Schleissheim and in the *Surprise Attack* in the Städelisches Institut, Frankfurt (signed L.D. HONNT F; repr. J. Sander and B. Brinkmann, *Netherlandish Painting before 1800 at the Städel*, Frankfurt, 1998, fig. 45). The same sketchy technique reappears in these paintings and it is most probable that they are by the same hand. This artist is usually identified as the Lambert de Hondt who died before 1665. To judge from the costume, this picture can be dated c. 1660.

The white *fleur-de-lis*, and the coat of arms formerly on the back, indicate that the painting was in the collection of Isabella Farnese, wife of Philip V, and in the 1746 inventory of the palace at La Granja it is listed as one of a pair by de Hondt. The whereabouts of the companion picture, which showed a battle scene with a Moor on horseback, is unknown.

**CONDITION** Good; cleaned and relined in c. 1950.

**PROV.** Isabella Farnese (the coat of arms originally stamped on the back, repr. Wellington 1901, p. 210, was obliterated when the picture was relined). La Granja inventory 1746, no. 531 (*Dos Payses origles*
en Lienzo, da mano de Hondt; el Uno repta 'Tiendas de Campaña junto a ellas muchos Soldados: El otro unos Moros á Cauallo en accion de acuchillarse. Tienen a tercia de alto, y media vara de ancho. Marco dorado lisos … 2'); captured at Vitoria 1813.
Lit. Gaya Nuño 1964, no. 180 (mistakenly as Abraham de Hondt); Aterido Fernández 2004, II, pp. 60, 407, no. 491

**Pieter de HOOCH (1629—after 1684)**
Dutch (Delft, then Amsterdam) School

Born in Rotterdam, he is recorded in Delft from 1653 and in Amsterdam from 1661, where he remained until his death in 1684. In the 1650s he was one of the pioneers of the new style of realistic genre painting with which Carel Fabritius, Nicolaes Maes and, above all, Johannes Vermeer are also associated.


72 The Intruder: A Lady at her Toilet, surprised by her Lover
Signed lower left on rail of table: P.D. Hooch
Canvas, 54.5 × 63 cm
WM 1571–1948

This is one of several scenes of couples in interiors painted by de Hooch in the 1660s and 1670s. Both Valentiner (1930) and Sutton (1980) compared it with a painting of c. 1663 in the Germanisches Nationalmuseum, Nuremberg, which fits well in style and costume (Sutton 1980, no. 55; pl. 38). But, as Sutton points out, the composition is more closely comparable with the Morning Toilet in Lord Barnard’s collection (Sutton 1980, no. 69, pl. 72), in which the view through the open door, the bed on the right and the picture, partially covered by a curtain, all recur. In the Barnard painting the picture on the wall is less fully curtained and clearly shows a recumbent nude woman, probably Venus, which is doubtless also the subject of the one in WM 1571, and which occurs frequently to underline the meaning of scenes of this kind (e.g. Valentiner 1930, pp. 91, 103, 107–09; the last also half-curtained). The Morning Toilet in Lord Barnard’s collection is dated 1665, and such a date also seems reasonable for WM 1571. At this time de Hooch’s pictures had become more anecdotal in subject and more elegant in setting than the earlier work of his Delft period – a reflection of the great prosperity of Amsterdam at this time.

**CONDITION.** Cleaned in 1950–51; paint surface worn at the woman’s right hand and bodice.

**PROV.** H. Mulman sale, Amsterdam, 12 April 1813 (201 fl., Ryers); W. Ryers sale, Amsterdam, 21 Sept. 1814 (205 fl., Nieuwenhuys); Le Rouge sale, Paris, 16 Jan. 1816, lot 7 (2617 frs.); bought by Férel de Bonnemainson for the 1st Duke of Wellington (and not, as in Wellington 1901, and elsewhere, captured at Vitoria).

**EXH.** B.I., Old Masters, 1821 (138); 1852 (reviewed, *The Athenæum*, 26 June 1852); Guildhall, Loan Exhibition,
A Musical Party
Signed indistinctly above chair on left: P.D. HOO(GE)
Canvas, 106 × 137 cm
WM 1487–1948

This is a late work, usually dated c. 1675 (Valentiner 1930, 1675–80; Sutton 1980, c. 1675–77). The room and its occupants are typical of de Hooch’s elegant patrician interiors and mirror his clientele in Amsterdam, so different from the more homely genre scenes of his Delft period in the 1650s. There are in fact only one musician and two singers in an interior with twelve figures, and the emphasis is on love rather than music. (For a discussion of the link between the two see under Duyster, above.) Above the fireplace, the painting – based on Rembrandt’s etching the Small Lion Hunt – was one which de Hooch introduced into several of his compositions (Sutton 1980, p. 44, pls. 95, 113). The coats of arms to the left (or, a fess gules; azure, 3 mullets argent), too simple to convey the complexity of
seventeenth-century armorial bearings, are probably fanciful but nevertheless convey the patrician character of the household. The portrait hung nearby similarly suggests a distinguished genealogy.

De Hooch painted several musical parties of this kind in his mannered, refined style of the 1670s, but this is the fullest and most elaborate composition. His later paintings are often criticized for their weak execution, but, in the use of light emanating from the open window and from a point on the spectator's left to model the figures, de Hooch has here recaptured some of the subtlety and monumentality of his earlier work. Among the comparable scenes are those in the Academy of Arts, Honolulu (Sutton 1980, 108); in the Royal Museum of Fine Arts, Copenhagen (Sutton, 109); the Deder collection (Sutton, 112); the Philadelphia Museum of Art, Wiltach collection (Sutton, 114) and the Indianapolis Museum of Art (Sutton, 116). Sutton rejects Pelinck's suggestion that WM 1487 could have been the companion piece to the Jacott-Hoppesack family portrait of c. 1670 now in the Amsterdams Historisch Museum (Sutton, 92, pl. 95).

**CONDITION** Good. Cleaned by Horace Buttery, 1951. A paint loss at bottom left was restored in 1988. The painting was relined by Richard Watkiss in 1992, and surface cleaned in 1995. Pentimenti around the viola show a change in the composition.

**Prov.** Probably J. van der Linden van Slingeland sale, Dordrecht, 22 Aug. 1785, no. 189 (bought by Beekman, 70 fl.); bought by Féréol de Bonnemaison, Paris, 1818, for the 1st Duke of Wellington.

**Exh.** B.I., Old Masters, 1821 (86); 1829 (181); 1847 (118); 1856 (reviewed, The Athenaeum, 14 June 1856); R.A.,
Winter Exhibition, 1888 (53; reviewed, The Athenaeum, 11 Feb. 1888); R.A., Dutch Art, 1929 (328)


John HOPPNER R.A. (1758–1810)
British School

Hoppner’s father came from Germany to act as physician to George II, and he grew up in St James’s Palace. He entered the R.A. Schools in 1775 and obtained a gold medal in 1782 for an illustration to King Lear. He achieved considerable success as a portrait painter and was appointed court painter to the Prince of Wales in 1793.


Canvas, 75 x 62 cm
WM 1471–1948
Sketch, waist-length, life-size. He wears a black stock, white frill and the uniform of the 3rd Guards: scarlet with blue facings, and epaulettes. Rooke joined the 3rd Guards in 1798, served in Holland in 1799 and 1813 and was Assistant Adjutant-General at Quatre Bras and Waterloo.

WM 1471 was catalogued as ‘Painter Unknown’ by Evelyn Wellington and attributed to Hoppner by Graham Reynolds. The attribution has been generally accepted. A date c. 1805–10 is likely; in the sketch by William Salter for the Waterloo Banquet at Apsley House of 1836 (N.P.G. 3747) the sitter looks considerably older.

Prov. Bought by or presented to the 1st Duke of Wellington.

75 William Pitt, M.P. (1759–1806)
Canvas, 141 × 111 cm
WM 1554–1948

This is one of over twenty recorded versions of Hoppner’s three-quarter-length portrait of Pitt, the original of which was commissioned by Lord Mulgrave, painted in 1805 and exhibited at the R.A. in 1806 (108; Lord Cowdray coll.), a sketch for which was sold from the collection of the Earl of Rosebery (Christie’s, 3 August 1979, lot 14; Wilson 1984, p. 53). Other portrait versions are at the N.P.G. (no. 697), Trinity College, Cambridge, and the Inner Temple, and there are full-length versions in the Landesgalerie, Hanover (von der Osten 1961, fig. 215; engr. T. Bragg, 1810), and Grocers’ Hall. The original was
engraved in mezzotint by G. Clint in 1806, in stipple by H. Meyer, 1809, and on numerous occasions subsequently (McKay, Roberts 1909, p. 206).

An illuminating comparison can be drawn between Hoppner’s portrait and that of Lawrence, his great rival, which was painted after Pitt’s death and exhibited at the R.A. in 1809 (Lord Rosebery, and Royal Coll., Windsor Castle; see K. Garlick, Sir Thomas Lawrence, London, 1954, pl. 63). The two are very similar in composition; Lawrence’s is more fully modelled and expressive, whereas Hoppner’s is coolly classical and linear.

For another portrait of Pitt at Apsley House and a note on his career, see above, under Gainsborough Dupont, no. 40.

**CONDITION.** Retouching in the background below curtain upper right; otherwise good.

**Prov.** Painted for Pitt’s President of the Board of Trade and Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster, Sir Charles Jenkinson, Bt, Baron Hawkesbury, 1st Earl of Liverpool (1729–1808), or for his son, Robert, 2nd Earl of Liverpool (1770–1828), successively Pitt’s Foreign Secretary (1801–04) and Home Secretary (1804–06), and eventual Prime Minister; by inheritance to his half-brother, Charles, 3rd and last Earl of Liverpool (1784–1853); his posthumous sale, Christie’s, 5 April 1852, lot 49; bought by the 1st Duke of Wellington for 130 guineas.


**Jan van HUYSUM (1682–1749) and Nicolaas VERKOLJE (1673–1746)**

**Dutch School**

Van Huysum was born in Amsterdam and spent most of his life there. Although he painted some idealized landscapes, the bulk of his work consists of paintings of flowers and fruit, for which he achieved considerable fame.

**Lit.** S. Segal et al., The Temptations of Flora: Jan van Huysum 1682–1749, exh. cat., Delft, Museum Het Prinsenhof, and Houston, Museum of Fine Arts, 2006–07

Pupil of his father, Johannes Verkolje, Nicolaas was an especially versatile painter, producing genre and historical scenes, portraits and decorative ceiling paintings and working in a range of styles to suit the subject. His finely painted works were highly prized by collectors. Although born in Delft, he was active in Amsterdam from 1700.

**Lit.** J.R. Brozius et al., Nicolaas Verkolje en de ‘beminders der konst’, exh. cat., Hoorn, Westfries Museum, 2001
The Rape of Proserpina

Oak panel, 80.7 x 62.8 cm
WM 1492–1948

Proserpina (in Greek, Persephone), daughter of Jupiter and Ceres, was gathering flowers in her native Sicily when Pluto appeared in his chariot and, struck by her beauty, carried her off to the nether regions.

The earliest recorded mention of the painting (1796) describes it as a collaborative work by Nicolaas Verkolje and Jan van Huysum. The painting is not signed and there is no contemporary documentation to confirm the attribution, but the stylistic evidence would seem to support it. Known primarily as a painter of flowers, van Huysum also produced a number of Arcadian landscapes similar in composition and atmosphere to WM 1492 (on van Huysum as landscapist see Segal 2006–07, pp. 101–04, 278–304). However, the figures in these scenes are uniformly smaller and slighter than the relatively large and robust figures seen here; moreover these figures distinctly resemble the idealized figures in Verkolje’s historical compositions (cf. Europa and the Bull, c. 1735–40, Amsterdam, Rijksmuseum, no. SK-A-4967; or Dido and Aeneas, Los Angeles, J. Paul Getty Museum).

The treatment of the subject, showing Proserpina struggling in the chariot, is traditional in classical and renaissance art, although comparatively rare in Dutch art. Both for the vigorous gestures of the women and in the forest setting, van Huysum and Verkolje have followed a pattern known in Netherlandish paintings from the sixteenth century; but rather than aiming for the more lifelike rendering of Rembrandt (Berlin, Staatliche Museen zu Berlin, Gemäldegalerie, inv. 823; J. Bruyn et al., Stichting Foundation, Rembrandt Research Project, A Corpus of Rembrandt Paintings, I, no. A39) or Rubens (Museo del Prado, Madrid), their composition reflects the more refined classicizing tastes of the early eighteenth century. A very close comparison can be drawn with the composition by Jan Soens in the Museum at Valenciennes (S. Béguin, in Oud Holland, LXXI, 1956, pp. 217f., fig. 1).

Condition
The panel is cradled, with a slight convex warp. Slight split in panel upper edge, 15 cm long; otherwise good.

Prov.
E. Hooft (widow of Wouter Valckenier) sale, Amsterdam, 31 Aug. 1796, lot 41 (as by N. Verkolje and Jan van Huysum; fl.240, to Brentano); Le Rouge sale, Paris, 27 Apr. 1818, lot 67 (as by Verkolje and ‘Jean van Ruisum’); bought for the 1st Duke of Wellington by Féréol de Bonnemaison for 1267 frs., about £500.

Exh.
Tokyo 1990–91 (21)

Lit.
Wellington 1901 (as collaboration); Paintings at Apsley House, 1965, pl. 43; Kauffmann 1982 pp. 75–76 (as by van Huysum)
The attribution to Andrea del Sarto in the Wellington Catalogue is clearly unacceptable on grounds of both style and quality. Indeed, the hard outlines against a plain background are more reminiscent of Bronzino and his imitators. A date in the mid-sixteenth century remains likely.

The hand and the cross are executed in a different, broader technique and could conceivably have been added later. The Maltese cross, which has an image of the Crucifixion at its centre, could signify that the sitter was a member of the Hospitaller Sisters of St John of Jerusalem, who were linked to the Order of the Knights of Malta, but this form of cross was also used as the insignia of several other orders (see F. Bonanni, Catalogo degli Ordini Religiosi della Chiesa militante, Rome, 1707, II, nos. 75, 94, 96).
CONDITION. General wear of paint surface, particularly in the flesh and light areas; the halo has been much rubbed. Paint losses round cracks in panel, particularly on right side.

PROV. Spanish royal collection, La Granja; presented to the 1st Duke of Wellington, with eleven other pictures, on behalf of the Spanish nation, by the Intendant of Segovia, 15 August 1812 (see cat. 146), when it was described as ‘Una Cabeza de una Monja: su Autor Andrea del Sarto’ (Palacio Real Archives, Madrid, AGP Historica, box 129).

**Italian School, c. 1600**

**78 The Virgin and Child**

- Inscribed lower left with inventory no. 394
- Copper, 49 × 34.3 cm
- WM 1622–1948

The church in the background appears to be a sixteenth-century building and in general terms the composition is Correggesque (cf. the Campori Madonna in Modena: C. Gould, *The Paintings of Correggio*, London, 1976, pl. 26A). The attribution to Lavinia Fontana (1552–1602) in the Wellington Catalogue is difficult to justify, though a date c. 1600 – when the use of copper as a support had become widespread – is conceivable.
**Italian School**

**79 Portrait of a Man**

Poplar panel, $42 \times 33.5$ cm  
WM 1551–1948

The sitter wears a black cap and a brown coat with a fur collar; the background is green. ‘Painter unknown’ was the verdict of the Wellington Catalogue, though the frame bore the inscription *Par Gaspard Becerra*. Becerra (c. 1520–1570) was a Spanish artist who studied in Rome and painted religious and mythological subjects in the manner of Michelangelo, and it is difficult to see why his name ever became attached to this portrait (C.R. Post, *A History of Spanish Painting*, Cambridge, MA, 1966, XIV, pp. 148–80). A possible French origin was suggested by Graham Reynolds (V&A files) but the costume militates against this view (information from the late Mme A. Dubois de Groër), even allowing for the fact that the picture may well be a copy. The poplar panel strongly indicates an Italian origin, and there are faint reminiscences of Bronzino (see, for example, the Bronzino imitation reproduced by E. Bacceschi, *L’opera completa del Bronzino*, 1973, pl. 107), though the fur collar is more common in
Northern Italy (see exh. cat., Bergamo, G.B. Moroni, 1979, e.g. no. 81). In any case, it appears to be a copy of the seventeenth or eighteenth century.

CONDITION. Several cracks running vertically down the face; small areas of damage.

PROV. Bought for the 1st Duke of Wellington by Féréol de Bonnemaison, Paris, 1818.

George Francis JOSEPH, A.R.A. (1764–1846)
British School

A painter of historical and literary subjects and genre as well as portraits, he first exhibited at the R.A. in 1784. From 1813 he concentrated on portraiture.

80 Spencer Perceval (1762–1812)
Canvas, 75 × 62.5 cm
WM 1558–1948

Spencer Perceval, second son of the Earl of Egmont, was known as a successful barrister when he entered Parliament in 1796. He became Solicitor General in 1801, Attorney General a year later, Chancellor of the Exchequer in 1807 and Prime Minister in 1809. On 11 May 1812 he was assassinated
in the House of Commons by John Bellingham, a man of disordered mind.

Joseph made both frontal and three-quarter profile portraits of Spencer Perceval. Both were painted from a mask taken after his death by Joseph Nollekens, who himself in 1813 made a marble bust, which is also in the Wellington Museum. The frontal type is represented in the N.P.G. (1031). A version almost identical with WM 1558 but inscribed with the sitter’s name and the date 1812 is also in the N.P.G. (no. 4; 76 x 63 cm), and there are several others (e.g. Christie’s, 12 Dec. 1930, lot 73, catalogued as Beechey; C. Austin coll., Cobham, Surrey). The type was engraved by Charles Turner and published 1 August 1812.

**Prov.** Bought by the 1st Duke of Wellington at Christie’s, 5 April 1852, lot 29, for £43 1s.

**Lit.** *The Athenæum*, 10 April 1852, p. 410 (‘This portrait confirmed the popular notion that the mild Mr Perceval was in look extremely like the unmild Mr Robespierre’ [sic]). Walker 1985, 1, p.386.

**JUAN de Flandes (b. c. 1465; d. before 1519)**

*Netherlandish School; worked in Spain*

As the name implies, Juan was a Flemish artist; he was in the service of Queen Isabella of Castile from 1496 until her death in 1504. He is then recorded in Salamanca in 1505 and, from 1509, in Palencia.
Campbell (1998) associates him with the illuminator Jean de la Rue (Jan van der Straet in Flemish), but Pilar Silva disagrees (2006, p. 34). His style was influenced by the miniaturists of Ghent and Bruges of the last quarter of the fifteenth century. In particular, his figures are close to those of the Master of Mary of Burgundy. The altarpieces in Salamanca and Palencia Cathedrals and the panels discussed below are his main surviving works.


Workshop of JUAN de Flandes

81 The Last Supper, with the Institution of the Eucharist and Christ washing the Disciples’ Feet

Oak panel, 21 × 15.8 cm
WM 1603–1948

There is a thin gold framing line on all sides except the top; nail holes at the corners and in the middle of each side, the centre right edge still has its original nail. The reverse of the painting is stained brown, obscuring any original marks. Two red seals and labels postdate the picture’s arrival in England: ‘H65L’, ‘S’, ‘65–BLACK’ (Ishikawa 2004, p. 78).

The Last Supper is depicted at the moment when Christ blessed the bread and wine and gave it to the disciples (Matthew 36: 26). This scene appears occasionally in the early medieval period, e.g. in the Codex Aureus Escorialensis, (Cod. Vitr. 17, Echternach, 1045–46), but is relatively rare in the high middle ages. Its renewed popularity in the second half of the fifteenth century – perhaps due to the influence of the Speculum Humanae Salvationis – is splendidly exemplified by Dirk Bouts’s altarpiece of 1468 at Louvain, although this shows only Christ’s blessing and not the actual communion of the Apostles.

A closer comparison can be made with the Last Supper in the Breviary of Queen Isabella (British Library, Add. 18851, f. 100), in which the Washing of the Feet – here seen in a chamber in the background – is also shown occurring at the same time in a side room. Indeed the composition is very similar, except that it shows Judas receiving the sop (John 13: 21–30) and not, as here, Peter receiving the sacrament. There are other, even closer, compositional similarities between the Juan de Flandes panels and the Breviary – in particular, the Temptation of Christ and the Entry into Jerusalem are almost identical – and it is possible that Juan actually knew this manuscript. This is not unlikely; it was produced in about 1490–95 in Bruges for the Spanish diplomat Francisco de Rojas, who gave it to Isabella probably in 1497, at the very time when Juan was working for the Queen.

This panel is one of a series of forty-seven small panels painted with subjects of the New Testament and the life of the Virgin, recorded as having been the property of Queen Isabella of Castile (d. 1504) in the castle of Toro, Zamora. In a list of 23 February 1505, thirty-two of them, including the Last Supper, were acquired by Margaret of Austria, Regent of the Netherlands and sister of Isabella’s son-in-law (in
whose collection they were seen by Albrecht Dürer). Dürer noted in his diary: ‘And on Friday Lady Margaret showed me all her beautiful things, and among them I saw about forty small pictures in oils, the like of which for cleanness and excellence I have never seen’.

In 1530 Margaret bequeathed twenty of the panels (including *The Last Supper*, which she had set into a small diptych), to her nephew, the Habsburg Emperor Charles V (1500–56), who sent them back to Spain. Fifteen have remained in the Royal Palace, Madrid, and a further twelve have been identified in other collections. The full list of the twenty-seven surviving panels is given in the MacLaren and Braham National Gallery catalogue (1970, p. 45).

It has usually been accepted that these panels originally formed an altarpiece of many compartments, probably a private devotional altarpiece commissioned personally by Isabella, which was never completed (Ishikawa 2004, p. 23). They are recorded in the earliest document (Feb. 1505) as ‘en un armario’ which is now interpreted as meaning that they were literally in a cupboard (Davies 1990; MacLaren, Braham 1970). Campbell (1998) argues that the paintings were intended to be handled singly or in small groups, as aids to private devotion. When she first acquired them, Margaret of Austria kept thirty of the panels loose in a wooden box in her bedroom for private devotion, whilst displaying her
two panels by Michel Sittow in a devotional diptych covered in leather. In 1527, however, she mounted twenty of the panels in a diptych, set in a silver-gilt frame and fastened with gold latches (Ishikawa 2004, p. 14). It was at this point that the nail holes (extant on the Wellington panel) were required. The diptych was then transferred from Margaret’s bedroom to a cabinet of treasures.

Two of the panels (the Ascension of Christ and the Assumption of the Virgin) are documented in the inventory of 1516 as the work of Master Michiel, that is, Michel Sittow (1469–1529), who was in the service of Queen Isabella 1492–1502. The Coronation of the Virgin is obviously by the same hand. The author of the rest of the panels, which are in a style distinct from Sittow’s three paintings, is not mentioned in any of the documents, but they have been attributed to Juan de Flandes from the time of Crowe and Cavalcaselle (The Early Flemish Primitives, 1857, pp. 284ff.), on the basis of a comparison with his altarpiece in Palencia Cathedral. The attribution of the whole series to Juan de Flandes was accepted by most authorities, including Carl Justi (in Jahrbuch der Königlich Preussischen Kunstsammlungen, 1887, pp. 157–67), Friedrich Winkler (1926), Hulin de Loo (Trésor de l’art flamand, Memorial de l’Exposition de l’art flamand à Anvers, 1930, 1937, I, pp. 49ff.), Elisa Bermejo (1962, p. 11) and Chiyo Ishikawa (2004, pp. 45–69). In his publication of 1930, however, Sánchez Cantón distinguished between a larger group of superior quality which he gave to Juan, and a smaller, inferior one, by an assistant. This division was, to a large extent, accepted by MacLaren, who went on to distinguish two further hands. Allan Brahm (MacLaren, Brahm 1970, p. 46, no. 26) lists six panels as belonging to a weaker group, coarser in handling, including Christ on Galilee, Christ in the House of Simon, The Betrayal, Christ before Pilate and The Mocking (all in Madrid), and the Apsley House Last Supper. The question of attribution to the hands of assistants cannot be settled until the surviving pictures can be reassembled. The Last Supper is of relatively good quality – in particular the faces are expressive and finely individualized – but it is true that the highlights are more sketchily rendered than in the rest of the panels. It is also possible that the panels formed more than one series, as Martin Davies points out that the Christ appearing to the Virgin in the National Gallery (the only one painted on chestnut) practically duplicates the subject of the picture in the Gemäldegalerie, Berlin. Campbell (1998) also considers it disturbing that there is no scene of the Resurrection, and suggests that one or more pictures from the set might have gone missing before the inventory was taken at Toro.

**CONDITION.** Surface deeply pitted in several places. Examined at the National Gallery in 1995 (Campbell 1998, p. 266), when infra-red reflectography revealed no underdrawing, but traces of a gilded border could be seen.

**PROV.** Isabella of Castile (d. 1504), Toro, inventory of February 25, 1505, as ‘la cena de xpo’; sold to Diego Flores, Toro, inventory of 13 March 1505, as ‘la Cena’; Margaret of Austria (d. 1530), Malines, inventories of 17 July 1516 and 1524, no. 11, as ‘comme Nre Sgr fist sa Sayne’; bequeathed to Charles V; Isabella of Portugal, Philip II; Madrid inventory of 4 July 1600, no. 44, as ‘La cena de chisto con los Apostoles’; captured at Vitoria, 1813. The paintings are not listed in any of the forty-one inventories between 1555 and 1834 (except that of 1600), when only fifteen are mentioned and they are attributed to Albrecht Dürer (Ishikawa 2004, p. 80).

**EXH.** B.F.A.C., Winter Exhibition, 1927–28 (12); Malines [Mechelen], Palais de Justice, Margareta van Oosterijk en Haar Hof, 1958 (37)

**LIT.** W.H.J. Weale, quoted in Wellington 1901, p. 219 (as belonging to the series); C. Justi, Miscellaneen,
Knibbergen


Frans van KNIBBERGEN (c. 1596–in or after 1665)
Dutch School

Landscape painter active primarily in The Hague, where he joined the painters’ guild in 1629. His paintings are relatively rare. Early works include rocky landscapes in the style of Allaert van Everdingen; later paintings, mostly wooded river scenes and panoramic views, are reminiscent of works by Jan van Goyen.


82 Landscape with deer

Signed in white, lower right: F. KNIBBERGEN; inscribed in white with inventory no.: 107.

Oak panel, cradled, 44.5 × 60 cm

WM 1577–1948

This is one of the very few signed paintings by Knibbergen. Comparable wooded river views occur occasionally in his work (Basel, Öffentliche Kunstsammlung, no. 391) but more often he painted flat landscapes (Rijksmuseum, no. SK-A-2361) or views of castles or towns (Pommersfelden, Schönborn coll.). The rather humanized deer in WM 1577 are directly based on the hind and stag in Paulus Potter’s Wild Boar and Deer in a Landscape, 1650 (collection Willem Baron van Dedem). Though attributed by H. Gerson and S. Gudlaugsson to Potter himself (letter of Jan. 1965), the animals are more likely to have been painted by Knibbergen, copied either directly from Potter’s painting or from (lost) preparatory studies. WM 1577 is likely to have been painted around 1650 or shortly after.

Examination of the painting in 2006 revealed that the artist made several changes to the composition which were subsequently painted out: there was originally a figure holding a bow (still visible) behind and to the right of the foreground deer; and to the left of the deer, two figures – one standing, one reclining – by the riverbank.


Prov. Spanish royal collection (not identified in inventory); captured at Vitoria, 1813.

John Prescott KNIGHT (1803–1881)
British School

Born in Stafford, he came to London and studied with Henry Sass and George Clint 1823–24. He became one of the most popular portrait painters of his time, best known for his group portrait of the Heroes of Waterloo assembled at Apsley House, 1842 (coll. Marquess of Londonderry, on loan to Apsley House).

83 General Sir George Murray, G.C.B. (1772–1846)
Canvas, 89 × 69 cm
WM 1538–1948

Three-quarter-length, seated, life-size. The sitter wears a black frock coat and waistcoat, over which is a red sash of the Grand Cross of the Bath. The star of the Bath is on his coat. Born in Perthshire, Murray joined the Army in 1789, served in Flanders 1793–95, and subsequently in the West Indies, Ireland and
In 1809 he was promoted to colonel and appointed quartermaster-general to the forces in Spain and Portugal. At the end of the Peninsular war he was made Governor-General of Canada, and returned to Flanders just too late to be present at Waterloo. In 1828–30 he was Secretary of State for the Colonies in Wellington's administration and then Master-General of the Ordnance from 1834 to 1846. He was the editor of *The Letters and Despatches of John Churchill, first Duke of Marlborough, 1702–1712* (1845).

In a letter dated 11 April 1842 (formerly in the possession of Mr S.G.P. Ward) Murray wrote to General Sir Robert Gardiner to say that he could not sit for Knight at any particular time, but perhaps Knight might care to make a copy of a portrait by Lawrence. However, none of the three portraits of Murray by Lawrence (listed by K. Garlick in *Walpole Society*, 1962–64, p. 148) appears to have served as the basis for Knight’s portrait, which clearly shows the sitter in old age, at any rate some years after 1830, when Lawrence died. It therefore seems likely that Murray relented and agreed to sit for Knight after all. The portrait was exhibited at the R.A. in 1843 (206). There is also a whole-length portrait of him by William Pickersgill in the Scottish N.P.G. (c. 1832), and drawings by Linnell and Heaphy (c. 1814) in the N.P.G. (respectively nos. 1818, 4319, all reproduced by Ward 1980).

*Provenance* Bought by the 1st Duke of Wellington from the artist in 1847 for 60 guineas (£63).
*Exhibitions* R.A. 1843 (179); South Kensington 1868 (532)
Sir Edwin LANDSEER, R.A. (1802–1873)
British School

Born in London, the third and youngest son of the engraver John Landseer, he was a pupil of B.R. Haydon before entering the Royal Academy Schools in 1816. From the first his animal paintings were widely acclaimed, and he received the praise of leading Romantic artists, including Fuseli and Géricault. His first visit to Scotland in 1824 expanded his range of subjects. He was elected A.R.A in 1826, at the earliest age of 24, and R.A. five years later. In 1855 he was awarded the Gold Medal of the Universal Exposition in Paris, but bouts of mental illness from 1858 clouded his later years.

84 The Illicit Highland Whisky Still
Panel, 80 x 101.5 cm
WM 1532–1948

The picture was commissioned by the 1st Duke of Wellington in 1826, possibly on the recommendation of Sir Walter Scott (Lennie 1976, p. 37). The distiller is seen working in his hovel. The tools of his trade, a still and tub, are visible behind him; on the right is a second still, used to bring the liquid to the necessary stage of refinement, while the raw material, a tub of malted barley, is at his feet. In the foreground an old woman talks to a customer, a huntsman seated on a dead stag, while a young boy – holding a snared black grouse behind his back – and girl, presumably the distiller’s children, stand and watch.

In a letter dated 4 April 1829 to the 1st Duke of Wellington, Landseer informs the Duke of the picture’s completion and points out that, as three years had elapsed since it was commissioned, ‘…Your Grace may possibly not immediately recollect the circumstances or the subject of the Picture. I therefore take the liberty of reminding Your Grace that it represents the “Illicit Highland Whiskey Still” (Wellington archive, Stratfield Saye). Wellington accepted the delayed delivery of the painting and later commissioned a second work from Landseer, Van Amburgh with his Lions (c. 1848, Yale Center for British Art, New Haven).

Landseer’s first visit to Scotland, in the company of C.R. Leslie, had made a deep impression on him and, indeed, provided a turning point in his career. In general terms the vogue for romantic Highland scenes was fuelled by Walter Scott, whom Landseer visited at Abbotsford on more than one occasion, but whisky distilling in particular was much under discussion at this period. Illicit distilling had been on the increase and had become widely accepted with the steep rise in excise imposed at the end of the eighteenth century. Consequently, in 1823, Parliament repealed all the old legislation, abolished the high rate of duty and replaced it by a flat licence fee and low duty. This encouraged distillers to take out a licence and to trade within the system, with the immediate result that the consumption of tax-paid whisky rose rapidly, preparing the ground for the introduction in 1831 of the continuous operating still, the basis of modern distilling (see D. Daiches, Scotch Whisky, 1969; M. Brander, A Guide to Scotch Whisky, 1975, p. 19). The subject of the illicit still was therefore very topical in the years 1826–29 when Landseer was planning and painting this picture. Doubtless he intended it to be situated in the time before the reform of 1823, but there is no apparent reason why it should be ‘set fifty years back’, as has been suggested (Hill 1973, p. 24).
In his choice of this subject Landseer followed David Wilkie, who had painted a *Scottish Whisky Still* for Sir Willoughby Gordon in 1819 (private coll., Scotland). However, Wilkie’s was a legal still, well swept and orderly, quite different to the picturesque disorder of Landseer’s composition, which emphasizes the illicit nature of the still, in a remote rural setting far from the prying eyes of excisemen. Yet a decade later Wilkie produced his *Irish Whisky Still* (R.A., 1840; now National Gallery of Scotland; see Edinburgh 1975), which in turn shows the influence of Landseer’s ideas.

Numerous sketches, drawings and other versions of the subject are recorded in the sale of Landseer’s studio in 1874 (Christie’s, May 8, 9, 11–15, 1874, lots 14, 74, 103, 372, 396), but they are not described in any detail in the catalogue. Among the oil sketches still extant, one is freer, more sketchy in technique (private collection, Scotland, 43 × 53 cm, photograph in National Gallery of Scotland); another is very close to the finished picture (Mrs Maud Robinson coll., exh. Belfast Art Gallery, *Pictures from Ulster Houses*, 1961, no. 159, 63.5 × 76 cm). The composition was engraved by Robert Graves, 1842, and by James Stephenson; the girl alone by W.H. Simmons under the title *Rustic Beauty*, 1849.

**Prov.** Bought by the 1st Duke of Wellington from the artist in 1829 for £350.


Sir Thomas LAWRENCE, P.R.A. (1769–1830)
British School

Born in Bristol, he was an infant prodigy, drawing portraits at the age of ten which were much admired. He entered the R.A. schools in 1787, but was almost entirely self-taught. Lawrence enjoyed a rapid success as a portrait painter, becoming A.R.A. in 1791, R.A. in 1794, and P.R.A. in 1820. He became King’s Painter in Ordinary on the death of Reynolds in 1792 and was knighted in 1815.


85 Arthur Wellesley, 1st Duke of Wellington (1769–1852)
Canvas, 91.5 x 71 cm
WM 1567–1948

Standing, half-length. He is wearing Field Marshal’s uniform, with the Garter star and sash, the badge of the Golden Fleece, and a special badge ordered by the Prince Regent to be worn from 1815 by Knights Grand Cross of the Military Division of the Order of the Bath who were also Knights Companion of the Order of the Garter. (Thanks to Stephen Wood for this written communication.)

Garlick (1989) records seven portraits in oil by Lawrence of Wellington. The two men were exactly the same age and, although Wellington disliked sitting for his portrait, he sat to Lawrence in his studio, returning after the artist’s death to retrieve the sword that he had carried at Waterloo (Jenkins 2007). Lawrence’s two earliest portraits of the Duke, both full-length, were painted in 1814; one belongs to the Marquess of Londonderry (on loan to Apsley House), the other, exhibited at the R.A. in 1815 (109), belongs to H.M. the Queen and is in the Waterloo Chamber at Windsor Castle (Millar 1969, no. 917, pl. 195). WM 1567 clearly shows the sitter wearing the Grand Cross of the Bath, and as Wellington was not made G.C.B. until 1815 the picture must have been painted after that date. Its quality suggests that it was painted from life, and if this was the case it was presumably painted after Waterloo, as Wellington
left England early in 1815 for Vienna and Brussels. Accordingly, the picture's date may be taken to be c. 1815–16 (Garlick 1989). There is a copy, said to be by Rembrandt Peale, in the Museum of Fine Arts, Boston, and an enamel copy by William Essex was in the collection of the Duke of Beaufort (see Arts Council 1949). For a copy of the 1822 portrait by Lawrence, see no. 89.

Prov. Bequeathed by Marianne, Marchioness Wellesley née Caton to the 2nd Duke of Wellington, 1853, it subsequently hung at Stratfield Saye and was therefore not included in the Wellington Catalogue. Exh. South Kensington 1868 (199); Manchester, Royal Jubilee Exhibition, 1887 (496); Arts Council 1949 (3); N.P.G., Sir Thomas Lawrence (catalogue by Michael Levey), 1979 (30)


Canvas, 236 × 146 cm
WM 1473–1948
Thomas Graham, M.P. for Perthshire in the Whig interest, 1794–1806, joined the Army in 1794 and served at Mantua, 1796, Minorca, 1798, and Messina, 1799. He became a Major General in 1809, commanded a brigade at the Walcheren expedition, and served with distinction throughout the Peninsular war. Created Baron Lynedoch in 1814 and promoted to full General in 1821.

Full-length, life-size, against a landscape background (‘a fortification, perhaps the fort of St Sebastian’, according to the Morning Herald, 6 May 1817). Lynedoch is in Lieutenant-General’s uniform, with drawn sword (the curved shamshir – a Turkish sword – presented to him by the 90th Perthshire Volunteers, a regiment that he founded in 1794, who captured it from the Cairo arsenal in 1801; this sword is now in the National Museums of Scotland, Edinburgh; see Belsey 2007). He wears the badge, star and sash of the Grand Cross of the Bath (conferred as KB in 1812) and inside his collar is the gold Peninsular cross.

Lawrence painted five portraits of Lynedoch (see Garlick 1989, p. 231):

(1) Standing, half-length, probably 76.2 x 63.5 cm, whereabouts unknown: engraved by T. Blood for The European Magazine, 1 October 1811.
(2) Standing, three-quarter-length, looking left, 127 x 101.5 cm, probably exhibited at the R.A., 1813 (7), private collection, last recorded at Christie’s, 15 November 1996, lot 35.
(3) Standing (the original version of WM 1473, according to Belsey 2007), 1815–17, 266.7 x 177.8 cm, Perth Museum and Art Gallery, Scotland, transferred from County Buildings, exhibited R.A. 1817 (68).
(4) WM 1473, commissioned 1817, replica of (3), completed after 1830.
(5) Standing, 236.2 x 147.4 cm, c. 1820, United Services Club – which Lynedoch helped to found (c/o The Crown Estates Commissioners).

According to Belsey (2007), Garlick (1989, p. 231) wrongly identified WM 1473 as the prime version of the portrait and explained its awkward composition by suggesting that it might have been trimmed. It was recorded in Claims of Works of Art, Books etc. under the Estate of the late Sir Thos. Lawrence: ‘The Duke of Wellington/ Port. of Lord Lynedocke/ 105–52–10’ (V&A, NAL pressmark 86.FF.17, f.376). It was one of four portraits commissioned from Lawrence by Wellington in 1817/18, and declared by the artist to be ‘among my autographs’, but which the Duke was only able to collect after the artist’s death in June 1830. The other three were of the 1st Marquess of Anglesey (no. 87); Viscount Beresford (no. 88) and a head-and-shoulders of the 3rd Earl Bathurst (Stratfield Saye).

There are also oil paintings of him by Pompeo Batoni, 1772 (Yale Center for British Art, New Haven), and by Sir George Hayter (N.P.G. 1037). WM 1473 was engraved in mezzotint by Thomas Hodgetts in 1829.

**CONDITION.** Good; cleaned by Vallance in 1959.

**PROV.** Commissioned by the 1st Duke of Wellington from the artist in 1817 for 200 guineas (£210) and delivered by Lawrence’s executors in 1830 (see Garlick 1964, Appendix IV, no. 376).

**EXH.** South Kensington 1868 (199)

Full-length, life-size, against a cloudy sky background. He wears the uniform of the 7th Hussars and the sashes of the Royal Hanoverian Guelphic Order and the Bath cross on his chest. From his neck hang the badges of the Orders of Maria Theresa of Austria, St George of Russia, and of the Military Order of William of Holland, and he also wears an Army Gold Medal and the Waterloo medal. The stars of the R.H.G.O. and of the Bath are on his slung pelisse.

Henry William Paget, eldest son of the Earl of Uxbridge, was M.P. for Carnarvon 1790–96 and afterwards for Milborne Park. He joined the army of the Duke of York in Flanders in 1794, was promoted Lieutenant-Colonel in 1796 and served in the expedition to Holland as Commander of the cavalry brigade in 1799. Obtaining the rank of Lieutenant-General in 1808, he served with distinction at La Coruña and again at Waterloo, where he commanded the whole of the cavalry and horse artillery, and lost a leg in the battle. He was created Marquess of Anglesey in July 1815 and became Master-General of the Ordnance in 1827–28 and Lord Lieutenant of Ireland 1828–29 and 1830–33, during which period his relations with the Duke of Wellington became strained. He was made Field Marshal in 1846.
WM 1474 is a replica commissioned by the 1st Duke of Wellington from Lawrence in 1818 of a portrait exhibited at the R.A. in 1817 (Marquess of Anglesey, Plas Newydd; 236.2 × 147.3 cm). It was engraved in mezzotint by C. Turner, 1828, M. Mason, 1831, J.R. Jackson, 1845, and there was a copy by Sir William Ross in the United Services Club. Wellington described the origin of his commission to Lawrence in a letter dated 15 December 1832 to the Hon. Berkeley Paget: ‘I was making a collection of the pictures of the principal officers whom I had the honour of commanding during the War, and I asked Lord Anglesey to allow Sir Thomas Lawrence to paint a picture of him for me. My plan has been but imperfectly carried into execution, principally on account of the difficulty of getting Sir Thomas Lawrence to finish his pictures. But he did finish some pictures, among others that of Lord Anglesey.’

Anglesey had originally hoped that Lawrence would let him have a version of his portrait of the Duke, but this never materialized (for the full correspondence see Wellington 1901, pp. 273ff.), and he commissioned one from John Lucas in 1840–41 instead.

For another portrait of Anglesey at Apsley House see under Pieneman (no. 133). He is also portrayed in William Salter’s *Waterloo Banquet at Apsley House* (1836; Duke of Wellington coll.) and there is a sketch of him for this picture at the N.P.G. (3693). At Plas Newydd there are also portraits of him by John Hoppner and Sawrey Gilpin, 1798, R.B. Davis, 1829–30, and F.X. Winterhalter, c. 1840, and a marble bust by Sir Francis Chantrey (plaster model in the Ashmolean Museum, Oxford), and there are drawings of him by Chantrey and by James Stephanoff in the V&A.

**CONDITION.** Some wear in background; otherwise good.

**PROV.** Commissioned by the 1st Duke of Wellington from the artist for 200 guineas (£210) in 1818, and delivered by Lawrence’s executors in 1830 (see Garlick 1964, Appendix IV, no. 377).

**EXH.** South Kensington 1868 (205)

**LIT.** Gower 1900, p. 110; Armstrong 1913, p. 109; Garlick 1954, p. 25; Garlick 1964, p. 20; *Paintings at Apsley House* 1965, pl. 50; Garlick 1989, p. 138


Canvas, 236 × 146 cm

WM 1480–1948

Full-length, life-size, standing on high ground traversed by the Alcantara aqueduct (Garlick 1989). He wears the uniform of a Portuguese Field Marshal with the sashes and stars of the Bath and the Portuguese Order of the Tower and Sword. Although he lost the sight of an eye in a shooting accident, Beresford, who entered the Army in 1785, obtained rapid promotion, becoming a captain in 1791. He took part in the British expedition to Corsica in 1793–94 and in the Indian Campaigns of 1799–1803, where he commanded a brigade. After serving with distinction at La Coruña he was made commander of the Portuguese army, which he reorganized and led throughout the Peninsular War. He was raised to the peerage in 1814 and subsequently resumed his command in Lisbon until 1819. A strong supporter of the 1st Duke of Wellington, he was made a General in 1825 and Master of the Ordnance, 1828–30 (see C. Willis, ‘Wellington and Beresford: Portugal and Brazil’, *34th Annual Report and Review of the British Historical Society of Portugal*, 2007, pp. 89–116).
Commissioned by Wellington in 1818, this is one of two portraits painted by Lawrence of Beresford; the other, completed by Richard Evans is in the UK Government Art Collection (G.A.C. no. 695; Garlick 1989, p. 150). There are also portraits of him by Sir William Beechey, c. 1814, and Richard Rothwell, c. 1831, in the N.P.G. (1180; 300) as well as a caricature drawing, *A Political Riddle*, 1829, in the B.M.

**CONDITION.** Tendency to flake on lining of cloak, minor marks on forehead, otherwise good.  
**PROV.** Commissioned by the 1st Duke of Wellington from the artist in 1818 and delivered by Lawrence’s executors in 1830 (see Garlick 1964, Appendix IV, no. 375).  
**LIT.** Gower 1900, p. 110; Armstrong 1913, p. 114; Garlick 1954, p. 27; Garlick 1964, p. 33; *Dictionary of British Portraiture* 1979, p. 19; Garlick 1989, p. 150
After LAWRENCE

89 Arthur Wellesley, 1st Duke of Wellington (1769–1852)
Canvas, 79 × 61 cm
WM 1564–1948

Half-length, wearing a dark cloak over a black coat, white neckcloth and yellow waistcoat.

This is a slightly enlarged copy of the portrait painted by Lawrence for Charles Arbuthnot, M.P., begun in 1820 and exhibited at the R.A. in 1822 (73.7 × 61 cm; Wellesley, Steegmann 1935, pl. 25; Garlick 1989, p. 279). It subsequently belonged to the Earl of Rosebery, followed by Mrs W.V. Goodbody, and was bought by a private collector at Christie’s, 22 November 2006, lot 32. A studio variant is also recorded by Garlick (Christie’s, 13 June 1913, lot 123).

Although it is only a mediocre copy, some interest attaches to this picture on account of its provenance, for it was given to the 2nd Duke of Wellington by Charles Patrick Mahon, better known as The O’Gorman Mahon (1800–1891), an Irish politician of note. At the back of the stretcher is the inscription: ‘Aguinaldo al Ilmo. Princepe Snr. Don Arturo Ricardo Duque de Wellington V.C./de la parte de su Amigo Milesiano Snr. Coronel – The O’Gorman Mahon/Día de Año Nuevo 1862’ (New Year’s present to the most illustrious Prince Arthur Richard Duke of Wellington V.C. from his Irish friend, Colonel The O’Gorman Mahon, New Year’s Day 1862).

Mahon was both an active politician – M.P. for Clare, 1830, and for Ennis, 1847–52 – and a colourful character, widely travelled, who was on friendly terms with Louis-Philippe in the 1830s and with Bismarck in the 1860s. He fought for the Union in the American Civil War and in various revolutions in South America, not to mention countless duels.
Hippolyte LECOMTE (1781–1857)
French School

A pupil of Regnault in Paris, and son-in-law of Carle Vernet, he specialized in genre, history and, above all, battle-scenes. The Empress Josephine bought work by him, and in 1819 he was commissioned to paint the Galerie de Diane at Fontainebleau. There are about thirty of his battle scenes at Versailles.

90 The Duke of Wellington visiting the Outposts at Soignies
Signed lower right: Hte Lecomte.
Canvas, 37.5 x 46.5 cm
WM 1568–1948
Soignies, between Waterloo and Brussels, was the site of the British camp in June 1815, so the event depicted was presumably shortly before the battle. The Duke is shown riding a white charger, pardonable artistic licence to mark the central figure, for in fact he rode Copenhagen, a chestnut charger, at Waterloo. Lecomte specialized in such romanticized, slightly naive, views of contemporary history (e.g. Josephine at Lake Garda, Malmaison, repr. Paris 1974–75, p. 194, pl. 118).

PROV. Bought by the 3rd Duke of Wellington, 1887, for £8 from Henry Samuel, Oxford Street.
EXH. Vienna, Congress Exhibition, 1896–97

Robert LEFÈVRE (1755–1830), known as ROBERT–LEFÈVRE
French School

He was a pupil of Regnault in 1784 and exhibited at the Salon from 1791. In his early years he painted allegorical and mythological subjects, but concentrated increasingly on portraiture and was employed as a portrait painter by both Napoleon and his family and by Louis XVIII. Although he is still highly regarded for his attention to detail of costume and setting, his posthumous reputation has not been maintained at the height fixed by his contemporaries, who placed him on the same level as David and Gérard.

LIT. G. Lavalley, Le Peintre Robert Lefèvre, Caen, 1902

91 Napoleon Bonaparte, Emperor (1769–1821)

Signed lower left corner of pedestal supporting the column: Robert Lefèvre ft.1812
Canvas, 216 x 156 cm
WM 1491–1948

Full-length, life-size, aged about forty-four. Wearing the blue uniform with red facings, gold epaulettes, white waistcoat and white breeches of a French General, and black Napoleon boots. He wears the sash and star of the Grand Cross of the Legion of Honour and the croix d'officier of the same Order, together with the Iron Crown of the Order that he had established in 1805, which hangs from his buttonhole.

This type of full-length portrait of Napoleon with neoclassical accoutrements was fixed by Ingres’s portrait Napoleon as First Consul in 1804 (Musée d’Art Moderne de la Ville de Liège, on deposit at the Musée d’Armes, Liège), but perhaps the best-known image is David’s painting Napoleon in his Study, 1812 (National Gallery of Art, Washington).

The book beside Napoleon’s left hand is the Code Napoléon, the French civil code, drafted by four jurists and established under Napoleon in 1804.
Lefèvre’s first version of this composition, dated 1809, is in the Musée Carnavalet, Paris. Another version, after Lefèvre, which is identical with the Apsley House picture, but with a sculpture gallery in the left background, was sold at Sotheby’s, 8 July 1992, lot 162. This version was engraved by Levachez (no. 244) and Thomas Lupton (see J.T. Herbert Baily, *Napoleon*, 1908, p. 113). A half-length version, dated 1814, was in a sale at the Hôtel Drouot (27 May 1960, lot 13).

**CONDITION** Good.

**PROV.** Bought by the 1st Duke of Wellington before 1820.

92 *Joseph Bonaparte, King of Spain* (1768–1844)

Canvas, 67.3 × 49.5 cm

WM 1629–1948

Bust, life-size. He wears a green uniform with a yellow plastron and gold epaulettes. From his neck hangs the Golden Fleece; on his chest are the badge of the Legion of Honour and the badge and star of the Order of the Two Sicilies.
On Joseph Bonaparte see above, under Gérard (no. 48). Another portrait of Joseph by Lefèvre is in the collection of Lord Rosebery at Dalmeny, and there is a copy of WM 1629 at Stratfield Saye.

Prov. Joseph Bonaparte in Spain; captured at Vitoria, 1813.

Pope Pius VII (1742–1823)

Signed and dated on right: Robert Lefèvre ft. 1805 à Paris

Canvas, 73 × 57.7 cm

WM 1520–1948

Head and shoulders, life-size, aged sixty-three. The Pope wears a small white skull-cap and a gold-embroidered red velvet ermine-fringed cape.

Gregorio Barnaba Chiaramonti, Pope Pius VII, was born at Cesena in 1742 and succeeded Pius VI in 1800. He saw his main task as the restoration of the position of the Church after the events of the French Revolution, and in 1801 he succeeded in negotiating a concordat with Napoleon which re-established the Church in France. He was in Paris to meet Napoleon and to negotiate a modus vivendi for the Papal states in 1804–05. Nevertheless, in 1809 Napoleon proclaimed the end of the temporal power of the papacy;
Pius VII was arrested and spent the next five years in exile, only to return to Rome in triumph in 1814. It was during his diplomatic mission to Paris in 1805 that he sat to David and Lefèvre. David’s frontal portrait is in the Louvre, and there is an identical version of WM 1520 in the Detroit Institute of Arts.

**CONDITION** Painting degraded, requires work.

**PROV.** Bought by or presented to the 1st Duke of Wellington.

**94 Pauline Bonaparte, Princess Borghese (1780–1825)**

Signed right centre above sofa: Robert Lefèvre ft. 1806

Canvas, 80.6 × 63 cm

WM 1519–1948

Nearly life-size, half-length, seated on a sofa, she wears a white semi-transparent gown and a white and gold headdress. A jewelled fillet is attached across her forehead and her dress is fastened by opal plaques at the shoulders.

Marie Paulette, called Pauline, celebrated for her beauty, was Napoleon’s second (and favourite) sister. She went to Santo Domingo with her first husband, General Leclerc (d. 1802), whom she had
married in 1797. Returning to France, she married the rich Prince Camillo Borghese in 1803, who was a supporter of the French cause in Italy. They were soon separated, and Pauline lived most of her life apart from her husband. In 1815 she took refuge in Rome and finally died in Florence. She remained loyal to Napoleon and helped him during his exile on Elba.

There are several portraits of her by Lefèvre. A bust-length version of WM 1519 is in the Museum at Versailles; another was in a New York sale in 1936 (Bonaventura sale, American Art Association, 8–9 May 1936, lot 334, repr.). A half-length portrait, also dated 1806, showing her in the same posture but with a different dress, is in the Versailles Museum and a small oval is at Malmaison. A related full-length, dated 1808, recently reappeared in a collection in Jersey, having been looted by Prussian troops from the palace of Saint Cloud in 1815 (C. de Salis 1976, fig. 3).

**CONDITION** Generally sound.

**Prov.** Bought by or presented to the 1st Duke of Wellington.

The Empress Josephine (1763–1814)

Signed on column left: Robert Lefèvre/ft. 1806
Canvas, oval, 64 x 54 cm
WM 1550–1948

Rather less than life-size. A diamond and opal ornament, in the form of a Spartan diadem, crosses the forehead and hair in front, a small band of jewels passes over the centre of the head and behind it the hair is fastened by a diamond comb. She wears a low white linen Directoire gown, V-shaped at the back and edged with a gold band.

Born Marie-Joseph-Rose de Tascher de la Pagerie in Martinique, Josephine came to Paris where she married first Alexandre de Beauharnais, who was executed, and, in 1796, General Bonaparte. She bought the château at Malmaison in 1799 and became an important patroness of the arts. In 1804 she was crowned Empress, but as she bore him no heir Napoleon divorced her in 1809. She retired to Malmaison and died there in 1814.

Josephine was portrayed by a wide variety of painters and sculptors, because of her position as Empress and her personal interest in the arts. Her distinctive facial features – the slightly clenched mouth and pursed lips, round cheeks and pointed chin – are fairly constant, though WM 1550 would appear to be a flattering portrait for a woman of forty-three. Portraits of her by Guillaume, called
Guillon Lethière, 1807, and Baron Gros, 1809 (Musée Masséna, Nice), for example, show that the youthful image was presented throughout the decade. In the facial features, posture and headdress, if not in dress, WM 1550 is derived from Lefèvre’s full-length portrait of 1805 (Aachen, Rathaus). There is also a closely related version of the bust portrait, dated 1805, in the collection of Lord Rosebery at Dalmeny House, Scotland.

CONDITION Generally sound.
PROV. Bought by the 1st Duke of Wellington from Count Alfred d’Orsay for £100 in 1851.

96 A Lady in Court Costume, said to be the Empress Josephine (1763–1814)
Canvas, oval, 72.4 × 58 cm
WM 1516–1948

Head and shoulders, turning towards the right, wearing a Spartan diadem with a large ruby in the centre and a band of pearls round the upper edge.

Both this portrait and WM 1550 (see previous entry) were acquired by the 1st Duke of Wellington as being of the Empress Josephine, but it is hard to believe that they represent the same person. This portrait was framed and hung as a pair with the oval portrait of Napoleon (WM 1515; see no. 52) but it is quite different in execution, being unusually sketchy for Lefèvre. It is conceivable that the plump lady with the full mouth represents a later view of the slim, youthful figure of WM 1550, which, as a type, clearly
Leslie originated at an earlier date than the portrait of 1806. WM 1516 is not very similar to any of the paintings of Josephine but a comparison can be drawn with the realistic-looking sculpture by Joseph Chinard, 1805, at Malmaison. If WM 1516 is not a portrait of Josephine, it remains equally difficult to identify the sitter among Napoleon’s sisters or sisters-in-law or any other ladies of the Imperial court.

**CONDITION.** Damaged and retouched on forehead and nose.

**PROV.** Bought by or presented to the 1st Duke of Wellington.

**Charles Robert LESLIE, R.A. (1794–1859)**

**British School**

Born in London of American parents, he returned to the U.S. in 1799 to be educated. He came back to England in 1811, studied under Benjamin West and Washington Allston, and entered the R.A. schools in 1813. Elected A.R.A. in 1821 and R.A. in 1826, he was a successful painter of genre scenes illustrating standard authors, as well as the biographer of Reynolds and Constable.

97 *The 1st Duke of Wellington looking at a Bust of Napoleon*

Canvas, square, framed oval, 39.7 × 34.5 cm

WM 1569–1948

He is wearing evening clothes with the star of the Garter and the red ribbon of the Golden Fleece round his neck (although the ribbon for the badge of the Knights Grand Cross was the same colour). This portrait was painted, apparently from observation, at a party given by Baroness Burdett-Coutts, the philanthropist, at her house in Piccadilly. Leslie’s study for this painting in pencil and watercolour (35.8 × 17.2 cm) is in the British Museum (1860-4-14-447). There is a companion picture showing the Duke in identical posture, but looking at a bust of George Washington, belonging to the Duke of Wellington at Stratfield Saye. Of similar size, it differs from WM 1569 in being more finished and, in particular, less sketchy in the painting of the table and bust.

There is no reason to doubt that the figure of Wellington was painted from life, at a party, although such portraits showing the sitter with a marble bust belong to a pictorial tradition of long standing. Portraits of humanists with classical busts were common in the work of Rubens and his followers, for example Rubens’ portrait of Caspar Gevartius (Koninklijk Museum voor Schone Kunsten, Antwerp) engraved in 1644, and in the eighteenth century Reynolds’s *Self-portrait with a Bust of Michelangelo* (1773; Royal Academy; E.K. Waterhouse, *Reynolds*, London, 1940, pl. 150) underlines the fact that a special bond always links the living personage and the bust. The cognate tradition of the sitter actually contemplating the bust is exemplified, above all, in Rembrandt’s *Aristotle contemplating the Bust of Homer*, of
1653, in the Metropolitan Museum, New York (J.S. Held, Rembrandt’s Aristotle and other Rembrandt studies, Princeton, 1969, pp. 21ff., where the theme is discussed at length). There can be no doubt that Leslie was aware of this tradition, and indeed he invokes it, in painting two versions with different busts.

CONDITION Good.
PROV. Bought by the 2nd Duke of Wellington.

Johannes LINGELBACH (1622–1674) and Jan WIJNANTS (active 1643–1684) Dutch School

Born in Frankfurt, he grew up in Amsterdam and then worked in Rome c. 1644–50, before returning to settle in Amsterdam. His work is influenced by that of Philips Wouwerman and of the Dutch Bamboccianti painters in Rome, particularly Pieter van Laer, ‘Il Bamboccio’.


Wijnants was born in Haarlem and mostly painted scenes of the dunes around that city. In 1660 he moved to Amsterdam. He collaborated frequently with other artists; the figures in his landscapes were contributed by Lingelbach, Adriaen van de Velde, Dirck Wijntrack, and others.


98 Landscape with Travellers Resting
Signed lower right: LB (monogram)
Oak panel, 21 × 25.7 cm
WM 1489–1948

However unlikely it might seem for two artists to have collaborated on so small a panel, this does appear to be the case for WM 1489 and its companion (WM 1488). Lingelbach and Wijnants worked together on numerous occasions, with the former painting the figures – typically rustic peasants or hunters – and the latter the landscape setting; it is not always clear which of the two might have instigated a given undertaking (on aspects of their collaboration, see Eisele 2000, pp. 88–89). Although Burger-Wegener (1976, p. 293) suggested the Wellington paintings were ‘possibly wholly by Lingelbach’,
a view supported by Kauffmann (1982, p. 89), Eisele (2000, p. 89) observed that the structure of the craggy foreground terrain in the Wellington pictures is particularly characteristic of Wijnants. Indeed, WM 1488 and its companion compare closely to the only painting known to be signed by both artists, Landscape with Peasants in the Louvre (inv. 1438; Eisele 2000, no. A1). Similar paintings (wholly) by Lingelbach include Landscape with Hunters (Florence, Uffizi, 1297); and Landscape with Riders, Hunters, and Peasants (Amsterdam, Rijksmuseum, SK-A-700). The discrepancy in scale in both WM 1488 and 1489 between the figures and the horse, and between seated and standing figures, is typical of Lingelbach. Although Wurzbach questioned the monogram on WM 1489, a similar one appears on Landscape with Hunter and Peasants (Amsterdam, Rijksmuseum, SK-A-227).

The different grounds used in preparing the individual panels (WM 1488 and 1489) suggests they were brought together as pendants at a later date.

**CONDITION.** The (cradled) panel is prepared with a red/brown ground. There is a vertical split about 9.5 cm from the left-hand side; earlier flaking along this line has been retouched. While the man on a donkey was painted over the sky, a reserve was left for the white horse. A pentimento documents a change in the contour of the tree trunk.

**Prov.** Le Rouge sale, Paris, 27 April 1818, lot 71 (as by ‘Vinans et Linguelbach’), bought for the 1st Duke of Wellington by Féréol de Bonnemaision for 800 frs.
Landscape with Travellers Resting, and a Couple on Horseback

Oak panel, 21 × 25.7 cm

WM 1488-1948

Companion piece to WM 1489 (see previous entry).

Condition The panel is prepared with an orange/beige ground. Scattered losses, mostly at the edges of the panel.

Prov. Le Rouge sale, Paris, 27 April 1818, lot 70 (as by ‘Vinans et Linguelbach’); bought for the 1st Duke of Wellington by Féreol de Bonnemaison for 785 frs.


Lit. Burger-Wegener 1976, p. 293, no. 138 (as possibly wholly by Lingelbach); Eisele 2000, pp. 89, 199 no. A3 (as by Lingelbach and Wijnants)
Bernardino LUINI (c. 1480/5–1532)
Italian (Lombard) School

At first influenced by Bramantino and Pordenone, he later worked in the manner of Leonardo, who had been in Milan c. 1482–99. He painted mainly frescoes of religious subjects in the churches of Milan and its vicinity, and of Lugano.


Ascribed to Bernardino LUINI

100 The Virgin with the Standing Child
Inscribed lower right with inventory no.: 453
Poplar panel, 74 × 51.5 cm
WM 1615–1948

This has always been considered to be a replica of Luini’s Virgin of the Columbine in the Wallace Collection
Luini

(no. 10; panel, 73.4 × 55.2 cm; Ottino della Chiesa 1998, no. 88, fig. 96). It was held to be autograph by Beltrami (1911) and included by Berenson in the first edition of his North Italian Painters (1907), but Ottino della Chiesa (1956) describes it as a ‘good studio copy’. However, Ingamells (1985, p. 309) suggests rather that the Wallace painting is a replica of the Wellington painting. There are other versions in the Hermitage, St Petersburg (Ottino della Chiesa 1998, no. 77); ex-Czernin collection, Vienna (Ottino della Chiesa 1998, no. 246,) and the Gallarati Scotti collection, Milan (Ottino della Chiesa 1998, no. 165).

The columbine (aquilegia columbina; the name derives from its shape, which resembles four doves) first appears as a symbol of the dove of the Holy Ghost and of the Virgin in the late fourteenth century and is a common attribute in fifteenth-century painting, particularly in Germany and the Netherlands (R. Fritz, ‘Aquilegia …’, Wallraf-Richartz-Jahrbuch, 14, 1952, pp. 99–110; Levi d’Ancona 1977, pp. 105–08). The plant is, typically, near to, or held by the Christ Child (Fritz 1952, figs. 80ff.) and it appears in this context elsewhere in Luini’s paintings (Ottino della Chiesa 1998, pl. 97).

**CONDITION.** Tendency to flake down centre of panel, corresponding to worm tunnelling visible on reverse; large areas of retouching below Virgin’s left wrist and on Child’s drapery. Cleaned by S. Isepp in 1949.

**PROV.** Royal Palace, Madrid (1794 inventory no. 453, in the King’s dressing room, as Andrea del Sarto, but Ponz has it as ‘in the style of Leonardo’); captured at Vitoria, 1813.

**EXH.** New Gallery, Early Italian Art, 1893–94 (178)


Follower of Bernadino LUINI

**101 The Holy Family with the Infant St John**

Inscribed lower right with inventory no.: 364

Silver fir panel, 51 × 47 cm including a strip 8 cm wide added on the left

WM 1621–1948

The composition is a truncated and adapted version of the Holy Family by Luini in the Prado, Madrid (no. 242, panel, 100 × 84 cm.; Ottino della Chiesa 1956, no. 102, fig. 114) in which the Children are shown full length. This painting is strongly under Leonardo’s influence (Luini owned the Leonardo cartoon now in the National Gallery, London) and there are several versions of the two Children embracing which are still attributed to Leonardo (H. Bodmer, Leonardo, K.d.K., 1931, pls. 80ff.; the Prado picture is repr. pl. 82). WM 1621 is not strictly a truncated copy, for the composition has been altered by bringing the Children much closer to the Virgin’s face, in order to fit the subject into a reduced area without unduly diminishing the size of the figures. It appears to be a sixteenth-century work.
Maes


Prov. Spanish royal collection (not identified in the inventories); captured at Vitoria, 1813.


Nicolaes MAES (1634–1693)
Dutch (Dordrecht) School

Born in Dordrecht, he was probably a pupil of Rembrandt in Amsterdam in about 1650. He was back at Dordrecht before 1654 and remained there until 1673, when he settled in Amsterdam. He painted genre scenes in his early years, but from 1660 he confined himself to portraiture.


102 The Eavesdropper

Signed on paper hanging below the shelf in the inner room: N. MAES. P

Canvas, 57.5 × 66 cm

WM 1503–1948
The woman is tiptoeing down the stairs, her forefinger raised to her lips to indicate silence, while she listens to a lovers’ tryst in the room beyond. Maes painted six variants of this theme: two are dated 1655, one in the Royal Collection (Sumowski 1986, no. 1349; Krempel 2000, no. A4) and one in the Mansion House (Harold Samuel collection), London (Sumowski 1986, no. 1353; Krempel 2000, no. A5); another in the Wallace Collection is dated 1656 (Sumowski 1986, no. 1357; Krempel 2000, no. A16); and a fourth, belonging to the Instituut Collectie Nederland, on loan to the Dordrechts Museum, bears the date 1657 (inv. NK2560; Amsterdam 1976, no. 34; Sumowski 1986, no. 1370; Krempel 2000, no. D14). The Wellington picture also originated at this period, probably about 1655–56. Two drawings in the Museum Boijmans van Beuningen, Rotterdam – one of the woman, the other of the whole scene but with a man coming down the stairs – may be connected with this composition (R.63, R.64; Sumowski 1984, nos. 1770, 1873x respectively).

The motif of the index finger raised to the lips to indicate silence occurs occasionally in the Middle Ages (e.g. Psalm 141 in the ninth-century Stuttgart Psalter), and more frequently from the sixteenth century, when it appears, for example, in the illustration to Silentium in Alciati’s Emblemata (1531) and as an attribute of Harpocrates, god of silence (see K. Langedijk, ‘Silentium’, Nederlands Kunsthistorisch Jaarboek, xv, 1964, pp. 3–18; Amsterdam 1976, for further lit.). It was common especially in compositions of cupids and satyrs spying on lovers, and Nicolaes Maes has used it in the same sly context while changing the setting from classical mythology to contemporary genre. Identified as the mistress of the house by the weighty keys hanging from her waist, the woman descends the stairs from a small book-lined office, where she has presumably been seeing to the household accounts. In contrast, the
young maidservant at right is distracted from her child-minding duties by her lover’s ardent caress. With her gentle smile and direct outward gaze, the eavesdropper draws the viewer into the narrative and presents a moral choice between industry and idleness, between domestic virtue and sensual abandon. The use of light comedy to stress a moral lesson is common in Maes’s genre paintings, though never so ribald as in works by Jan Steen.

Maes’s broadly theatrical appeal to the viewer is also reminiscent of Victorian narrative painting, and, not surprisingly, the eavesdropper was a popular subject in the nineteenth century: an example of a similar scene by Hubert van Hove is in the V&amp;A Museum (no. 1540–1869; Catalogue of Foreign Paintings, London, 1973, II, no. 110).

The first record of WM 1503 and its companion (WM 1506) describes them (respectively) as ‘Hearing’ and ‘Sight’ from a series of the Five Senses. Although this ‘series’ may have been assembled well after the paintings were made, Krempel’s (2000) proposed reconstruction merits consideration: in addition to the Wellington pictures, Woman plucking a Duck (‘Taste’; Philadelphia Museum of Art, 44-9-4; Krempel 2000, no. D32), Couple on a Terrace (‘Smell’; Oxford, Ashmolean Museum, WA1917–1; Krempel 2000, no. D31) and The Naughty Drummer (The Family of the Artist) (‘Touch’; Madrid, Museo Thyssen Bornemisza, 1930.56; Krempel 2000, no. D27). All are similar in size and approximate date. Allegories of the senses were enormously popular in the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries; with the rising popularity of genre painting during the period they were often presented in the guise of merry companies, with elegant couples enacting the distinguishing features of each sense, or in low-life genre scenes emphasizing the baser aspects of each (see H. Kauffmann, ‘Die Fünfsinne in der niederländischen Malerei des 17. Jahrhunderts’, in Kunstgeschichtliche Studien zu Dagobert Frey, Breslau 1943, pp. 133–57). Maes’s paintings tread a determinedly moderate path, focusing on the quiet sensory pleasures of the domestic realm; at the same time they accommodate other interpretations as well (on the Ashmolean painting as an allegory of Spring, see Robinson 1996, pp. 195–203).

Maes’s intricate paintings of Eavesdroppers of 1655–57 are among the earliest in Dutch art to show views into other rooms containing part of the narrative. Pieter de Hooch was experimenting on these lines in Delft at about the same time, but there are no dated pictures by him before 1658 and it is possible that it was Maes who pioneered this ambitious compositional device.

**Condition** Generally good, with some paint loss at edges. There is an old tear or crease about 8 cm long below the eavesdropper’s extended foot; and a small horizontal tear in the floor of the room to the right. Cleaned 1977.

**Prov.** J.F.X.A. Baelemans de Steenwegen sale, Louvain, 2 Sept. 1816, lot 71 (‘l’Ouie’ [Hearing], from a series of the Five Senses: 75 frs.); Nieuwenhuys; Le Rouge sale, Paris, 27 April 1818, lot 29, bought by Fériel de Bonnemaison for 1600 frs. (£64) for the 1st Duke of Wellington.

**Exh.** B.I., Old Masters, 1821 (97); R.A., Old Masters, 1888 (52); Guildhall, Loan Collection, 1903 (177); B.F.A.C., Winter Exhibition, 1928 (34); R.A., Dutch Art, 1929 (282); Arts Council 1949 (4); Hull, Ferens Art Gallery, Scholars of Nature, 1981 (32)

The Milkwoman

Signed lower left: N. MAES

Canvas, 57.5 x 66.6 cm

WM 1506–1948

Companion to the Woman listening (WM 1503, see previous entry) and dating from the same period, about 1656. It belongs to a group of compositions with saleswomen in front of houses painted by Maes at this time, many of which depict milkwomen. There is a Woman Selling Milk in the Mansion House, London (Harold Samuel collection; Krempel 2000, no. D23) and another one in the Anthony de Rothschild Collection at Ascott (The National Trust; Krempel 2000, no. D10). All have the large central figure typical of Maes’s genre compositions of the mid- to late 1650s. The gateway in the street on the left is the St Joris Poort at Dordrecht, where Maes lived until 1673; a woman from the countryside enters, her yoke hung with milkjug and pail.

As Krempel has noted, the earliest mention of WM 1506 identifies it as ‘Sight’ from a series of the Five Senses (see previous entry). The bespectacled old woman’s careful examination of each grudgingly tendered coin is matched by the milk-vendor’s expectant gaze, emphasizing the importance of visual examination in a market transaction.

There are several related drawings of milk sellers, of which the one in the Kupferstichkabinett, Staatliche Kunstsammlungen, Dresden (Sumowski 1984, no. 1868x) is the closest. Two drawings in the Fitzwilliam Museum, Cambridge (inv. 3045A, 3045B; see Sumowski 1984, no. 1788) are more closely related to the Ascott painting, showing the housewife standing in front of the door instead of behind it.

Condition Some filled losses at left edge and other small losses in the milkwoman’s arms and sleeves. Cleaned 1978.

Prov. J.F.X.A. Baelemans de Steenwegen sale, Louvain, 2 Sept. 1816, lot 73 (‘la Vue’, from a series of the Five Senses; 110 frs. to Robions); Le Rouge sale, Paris, 27 April 1818, lot 30; bought by Féréol de Bonnemaison for 885 frs. (£36) for the 1st Duke of Wellington.

Exh. B.I., Old Masters, 1821 (116); R.A., Old Masters, 1888 (50); Whitechapel Art Gallery, Dutch Exhibition, 1904 (144); B.F.A.C., Winter Exhibition, 1927; R.A., Dutch Art, 1929 (287); Arts Council 1949 (5)
Juan Bautista Martínez del MAZO (c. 1611–1667)

Spanish School

He was a pupil of Velázquez, whose daughter, Francisca (d. 1653), he married in 1633. After Velázquez’s death in 1660, he was appointed Pintor de cámara in his place. Documented works by him are extremely rare.

104 The Entry of Prince Balthasar Carlos into Pamplona

Canvas, 55 × 90 cm

WM 1549–1948

The painting probably depicts the entry of Prince Balthasar Carlos into Pamplona, the capital of Navarre and the principal fortress in northern Spain, for the ceremonial swearing of loyalty to the crown, which
took place there on 3 May 1646 (Cherry 1990, p. 517). The two royal coaches approach Pamplona’s city gate, which can be seen in the middle distance. Spectators in local Navarrese dress line the road. On the left, men and women perform the traditional Basque dance, the *aurresku*, holding white handkerchiefs (Trapier 1963). The arms of Navarre are displayed in the sky. The painting was called a *descripción* or map, on account of its topographical accuracy, for which it was much admired.

Mazo was commissioned by Prince Balthasar Carlos to paint at least two large works; a *View of Zaragoza* (Prado, 181 x 331 cm) and a *View of Pamplona* (Alcázar, 1686), which were probably completed after the prince’s death in October 1646. Peter Cherry (1990) believes WM 1549–1948 to be the small view of Pamplona listed in the inventory of November 1653, made on the death of Mazo’s wife, (no. 34, one vara high and 1/4 wide, 56 x 84 cm) and valued at 200 reales (p. 524).

This reduced version of the picture was probably completed by Mazo in his Madrid workshop, and kept there to facilitate copying. Writing in praise of this picture, Palomino (1715–24, III, p. 372) was enthusiastic about the treatment both of the figures and costume and of the scale and distance. The original large painting, apparently no longer extant, was recorded in the Alcázar, together with the companion *View of Zaragoza* in the Spanish royal inventories of 1686 and 1701, where its size was given as ‘4 vara wide, a little less high’ (340 cm wide). There are also two other versions, one in the collection of the Marquis of Casa Torres (of the central section only), the other in the Fundación Lázaro Galdiano in Madrid. The Wellington version was listed as a Velázquez by Curtis (1883), but subsequent authors have described it as either a sketch for, or a reduced replica of, the painting by Mazo formerly in the royal collection. (The *View of Zaragoza* was also formerly held to be the product of a collaboration between Velázquez and his son-in-law).

Trapier (1963) demonstrated the influence of Callot’s etchings on the panoramic composition.

**CONDITION** Some wear in the sky; large area of retouching in the middle ground in the centre of the picture.
Anton Raphael MENGES (1728–1779)
German School

He was born in Aussig (Osek), Bohemia, the son of the painter Ismael Mengs, by whom he was trained in Dresden. He was in Rome in 1741–44, but returned to Dresden in 1745 to become court painter to the Elector Augustus II of Saxony. He was in Rome again, 1747–49 and 1752–61; in 1761 he was summoned to be court painter to Charles III in Madrid, where he remained until 1770, and again from 1775–76. Mengs was greatly influenced by Raphael, and by the neoclassical theories of Winckelmann.


105 The Holy Family with the Infant St John

Signed and dated on footstool on right: ANTONIUS. RAPHAEL. MENGES. SAX. FACEB. MDCLXV
Canvas, 178 x 128 cm
WM 1592–1948

Mengs painted this picture for Charles III of Spain in 1765. D’Azara (1780) described it as ‘the first painting which Mengs painted in oil in Madrid’ – presumably as distinct from the frescoes in the Royal Palace which he began in about 1762. There are, however, several portraits of Charles III and members of his family which predate this painting (Honisch 1965, esp. nos. 135ff.).

Both style and composition are derived from Raphael, the principal influence on Mengs in his early years,
although the artist was also inspired by Murillo, whom he wished to reinstate with his contemporaries in Spain (Roettgen 1993, p. 96). The colouring is Raphaelesque; the composition and, in particular, the facial type of St Joseph recall Raphael’s *Holy Family under the Oak Tree*, now in the Prado, which Mengs probably knew in the Spanish royal collection. However, the intimate mood and landscape view also recall Murillo’s *Holy Family* (Prado). There is a pen drawing by Mengs in the Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York, which is clearly a study, in reverse, for the Apsley House picture (11.3 × 7.7 cm, squared in black chalk, Roettgen 1999, I, p. 76, 44,VZ2). In addition, the Gabinetto dei Disegni at the Uffizi, Florence, has a double-sided sheet with sketches for the composition in chalk and ink (Roettgen 1999, I, pp. 76–77, 44,VZ1). Another drawing, in the same direction as WM 1592, inscribed as being preparatory for this painting, is in the collection of the Condesa de Yebes, Madrid (14 × 12.2 cm; Madrid 1980, no. 45, repr.). It is possible that Mengs reversed his original composition under the influence of Raphael’s painting.

**CONDITION** Small paint losses to right of Child’s head; retouched scratches above Virgin’s head.

**Prov.** Royal Palace Madrid, 1772 inventory: passage to the King’s sleeping chamber, where it was seen by the authors listed below in the 1780s; 1794 inventory: Segundo Gabinete; captured at Vitoria, 1813.


St Anthony of Padua was born at Lisbon in 1195 and entered the Franciscan order in 1220. He became famous as a preacher in Morocco and France and spent the last years of his life in Padua (1227–31). The popular legend of the Infant Christ appearing to him first occurs in the fourteenth-century Liber Miraculorum. One day when his landlord passed his room he was surprised to see a bright light, and when he looked through a crack in the door he saw the Infant, bathed in light, before the saint. In the seventeenth century this scene was by far the most popular of all the depictions of St Anthony (B. Kleinschmidt, Antonius von Padua in Leben und Kunst, Dusseldorf, 1931, pp. 74ff.).

Mengs painted this picture for Charles III of Spain, probably in about 1765 (Honisch 1965), and from 1780 it is described in published sources as one of a pair – the other was an Immaculate Conception (Patrimonio Nacional, Spain; see C. Díaz Gallegos and J. Jordán de Umés de la Colina, ‘La Inmaculada
Concepción de Mengs para la devoción de Carlos III’, in Reales Sitios, año XLIV, no. 173, terzer trimestre de 2007, pp. 42–49) – which the King always took with him on his travels. J.-L. Sancho (1997, p. 528) describes how these works were hung one above the other on the left side of the bed in the royal bedchamber at the Palacio Real. According to Sancho (2004, p. 37) they were among ten religious works by Mengs installed there by 1769 at the latest and subsequently admired daily by the King (for a plan of the picture hang see Roettgen 1999, II, p. 242). They helped to give the bedchamber a tone of extreme religious devotion, although they were surrounded by colourful tapestries woven in the Royal Factory of Santa Barbara in Madrid. Adjacent to this pair hung another pair of paintings by Mengs, St John in the Desert and The Penitent Magdalene, which also entered Wellington’s collection (Stratfield Saye).

The picture is nearly monochrome in tone and derives as much from the seventeenth-century Spanish school – in particular from Murillo – as from Correggio, the principal influence on Mengs at this period. The composition is also based on seventeenth-century Spanish models: there is a well-known comparable version of the subject by Ribera in the Real Academia de San Fernando, Madrid (Kleinschmidt 1971, fig. 170), while Murillo and his followers returned to the subject at least eighteen times (Kleinschmidt 1971, p. 207; some of the principal types are repr. in A.L. Mayer, Murillo, K.d.K., 1913, pls. 40, 89, 132, 148, 189, 190). Closer than any of these, particularly for the posture of the saint and the Child, is the composition by Valdés Leal (repr. Apollo, XCV, 1972, p. 136; Archivo Español de Arte, CLXXVIII, 1972, p. 232, pl. 1) which in turn owes much to the etching by Giulio Carpioni (Bartsch 1803–21, XX, 185,11). The Infant hovers over the book which had been St Anthony’s earliest attribute, while the lily – originally a symbol of the chastity of the Virgin, but linked with St Anthony from the fifteenth century – is held by the angel on the left.

The painting was engraved in 1808 by Manuel Salvador Carmona, following the copy by Pedro de la Cruz, according to an announcement in the Gazeta de Madrid, 1 November 1808, p. 1410 (Carrete Parrondo 1989, p. 217, no. 429; Jordán de Urríes 2000, p. 82, note 18).


**PROV.** Royal Palace, Madrid, 1794 inventory, in the King’s bedchamber, captured at Vitoria, 1813.

**EXH. R.A., Goya and his Times, 1963–64 (14); Madrid, Royal Palace, Ilustración y liberalismo en España y América 1788–1814, 2008 (139)**

Adam Frans van der MEULEN (1632–1690)
Flemish School; worked in France

Born in Brussels, where he was the pupil of Pieter Snayers, he became a master of the painters’ guild in 1651. In 1664 he entered the service of Louis XIV of France (1638–1715) and specialized in topographical views and battle scenes. He travelled in the company of the king during his campaigns in the Netherlands and depicted many of these battles and sieges. He became a member of the Académie Royale in 1673.


107 French Generals arriving before a Town
Signed lower left: F. V. MEULEN 1678
Canvas, 52.5 × 62.5 cm
WM 1495–1948

Evelyn Wellington identified the central figure as Louis XIV. He is wearing a richly embroidered coat, but it would be unusual for the King to be shown from the back, and the way in which this rider clutches
his hat suggests that he has just ridden up to the other two. The ambiguity itself makes it unlikely that the King is represented; nor is there any evidence to support the identification of Condé made in the Wellington heirloom catalogue (Wellington 1901, p. 36). The town in the background is probably Maastricht, based on the similarity of the townscape and some of the foreground figures to Meulen’s views of the town (Stephen Wood, oral opinion, 2008, and see Richefort 1998–99, pp. 190–91, 225).

CONDITION Paint surface considerably worn, particularly in the sky.
PROV. Bought by or presented to the 1st Duke of Wellington.

108 Louis XIV at a Siege
Canvas, 52.5 × 62.5 cm
WM 1494–1948

Louis XIV, mounted on a dun charger, is in the centre of the foreground, surrounded by officers. The city under siege is not depicted with sufficient clarity to be readily identified, but it is similar to views by van der Meulen of Oudenarde, Courtrai or Maastricht. The event depicted could relate either to the War of Devolution, 1667–68, or to the Dutch War, 1672–78, during both of which van der Meulen accompanied the King on his campaigns in the Netherlands. It is conceivable that this picture was painted as a companion to WM 1495, in which case it could be dated c. 1678, but nothing is known of their provenance or early history.
CONDITION Five vertical strips of retouched paint loss in the middle of the picture, otherwise good.

PROV. Bought by or presented to the 1st Duke of Wellington.

109 The Colbert Family
Canvas, 97 × 129 cm
WM 1497–1948

The eight riders in the foreground all wear the same uniform: a purple tunic, the upper part of the sleeves of which is striped horizontally with gold and white fur, and over the tunic a sleeveless, red, flowing silk robe, lined with white. On the left, a carved escutcheon on a pedestal displays a snake surmounted by a coronet and an archbishop’s hat.

It was John Wilson Croker (1780–1857), well known both as a politician who served in Wellington’s administration of 1829–30, and as an essayist, who identified the Colbert family as the subject of this painting. In a letter to the Duke dated 6 June 1835, he identified the escutcheon as that of the Colbert family and suggested that the riders were all members of the family, who were Grand Treasurers of the Order of the Saint Esprit at various dates between 1680 and 1701 (quoted in Wellington 1901). Subsequently, the identification was confirmed by the Director of the Louvre in a letter to the Duchess of Wellington (1894), though he described the uniform simply as ‘costume de cour’.

The central figure is clearly the ‘great Colbert’, Jean-Baptiste Colbert (1619–1683). Born, like the rest
of his family, in Reims, he entered government service in 1640, worked for Cardinal Mazarin in the 1650s and bought the fief of Seignelay in 1658. After the death of Mazarin in 1661, he became the principal minister of Louis XIV and attempted during his period in office, nothing less than the financial, commercial, industrial and naval modernization of France. It was Colbert also, advised by Le Brun, who nominated van der Meulen court painter in 1664. He was usually depicted with a moustache and a rather round face, particularly in the early portraits (e.g. Nanteuil’s engraving after Philippe de Champaigne, 1662) but there are later portrayals showing him with an oval face and bushy eye-brows akin to those of the central rider in this painting (e.g. Pississo’s engraving after Mignard).

The prelate on the balcony is probably Colbert’s second son, Jacques-Nicolas (1655–1707), who became Archbishop-Coadjutor of Rouen in 1680 (sole-prelate, 1691) and for whom the coat of arms would suggest that the picture was painted. But the other riders are more difficult to identify. To the right of Colbert, and shown in an almost equally prominent position, is probably his brother, Charles, marquis de Croissy (1629–1696). He was ambassador to England in 1668–74 and Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs from 1679. An engraving by J. Jones (1792) after a portrait of c. 1680–90 (N.P.G. files) supports this tentative identification. Among the other prominent riders, the one on the far right is probably Colbert’s eldest son, Jean-Baptiste-Antoine (1651–1690), who assisted his father in government service and himself became a minister. The full, high wigs indicate a date c. 1680–90, which may be narrowed down to c. 1680–83, the year of Colbert’s death. A family tree may serve to indicate the likely and less likely candidates from which to pick the remaining riders:

Oudart I Colbert = Marie Coquebert

Jean = Marie Bachelier

Oudart II = Marie Fouret

sieur de Villacerf

Nicolas Colbert, = Marie Pussort

Conseiller d’Etat

Jean-Baptiste (1619–1683),*

sieur de Seignelay

(‘le Grand Colbert’) = Marie

Charon de Ménars

Charles

(1626–1696),*

marquis de Croissy

Nicolas

(1628–1676),

Bishop of Auxerre

François-Édouard

(1613–1693), comte de Vandières and Maulévrier, lieutenant-général

Édouard (1628–1699),

marquis de Villacerf,

Surintendant des Bâtiments du Roi

Jean-Baptiste-Antoine

(1651–1690),*

marquis de Seignelay,

ministère de la Marine

Antoine Martin

(1659–1689),

soldier

Jules Armand,

(1663–1704)

marquis de Blainville,

lieutenant-général

Louis

(1665–1745),

abbé, then

comte de Linières

Charles-

Édouard, (1670–1690)

comte de Se Sceaux

Jean-Baptiste

(1665–1748),

marquis de Torcy, secrétaire d’Etat

Charles-

Joachim

(1667–1738)

Bishop of Montpellier

Antoine

(1655–1707),

Archbishop

of Rouen

[An asterisk indicates a member of the family certainly, or almost certainly depicted.]

CONDITION Blistering badly and considerably retouched in central area.

PROV. Bought by or presented to the 1st Duke of Wellington.

EXH. Tokyo 1990–91 (27)
Willem van MIERIS (1662–1747)
Dutch (Leiden) School

Son and pupil of Frans van Mieris the Elder (1635–1681), he painted mainly genre subjects (especially shop scenes) in his father’s style. He lived in Leiden, where he became dean of the painters’ guild in 1699. Towards the end of his life he became blind; there are no dated pictures after 1736.


110 Interior with a Cavalier drinking and a Couple embracing
Oak panel, 42 × 32.3 cm
WM 1526–1948

There are many similar scenes by Willem van Mieris, and the dried plaice hanging over the edge of the table is almost his hallmark. It occurs – among many such examples – in a tavern scene dated 1690,
recorded as belonging to P. de Boer in 1961 (Hofstede de Groot 1908–27, X, no. 268); in a painting of an organ-grinder in a tavern at Dresden (dated 1694; inv. 1766); in a tavern scene dated 1703 (sold Sotheby’s, New York, 28 Jan. 2000, lot 74); and in paintings of trumpeters in Dresden Gemäldegalerie (dated 1700; inv.1769) and Leiden (dated 1708; inv. 1201). WM 1526 probably dates to about 1700 or slightly earlier. Smoked or salted fish was a common accompaniment to wine and beer, believed to counteract the effects of over-imbibing and add spice to lovemaking (see G.J.M. Weber, “t Lof van den Pekelharingh”. Von alltäglichen und absonderlichen Herings-stilleben’, Oud Holland, cl, 1987, pp. 126–40). The large wine glass, wine bottle, clay pipe and tobacco are all symbols of indulgence, a theme reiterated by the lovers embracing in the background of this tavern scene.


**CONDITION.** Good condition.

**PROV.** Choiseul-Praslin sale, Paris, 18 Feb. 1793, lot 69 (751 livres to Desassart) (Ch. Blanc, Trésors, II, p. 161); Gamba sale, Paris, 17 Dec. 1811, lot 33 (921 frs., withdrawn); Dufresne sale, Paris, 26 Mar. 1816, lot 33 (1380 frs., to Pérignon); Lapeyrière sale, Paris, 14 April 1817, lot 34, bought by Féréol de Bonnemaison for the 1st Duke of Wellington for 2501 frs.

**EXH.** B.I., Old Masters, 1819 (23); 1829 (174)

**LIT.** Smith 1829–43, I, p. 82, no. 82 (under ‘Francis Mieris’); Hofstede de Groot 1908–27, X (German edn only), no. 247

**Anthonis MOR (Antonio MORO) (1517–1576/7)**

*Netherlandish School*

Born in Utrecht, where he was a pupil of Jan van Scorel, he settled in Antwerp in 1547. Starting with the patronage of Cardinal de Granvelle, he became painter to the Spanish court both in Brussels and in Madrid. He was in Rome in 1550, in Portugal in 1552 and in England in 1554, returning to settle in the Netherlands in the following year. His portraits combine the realism of the Netherlandish tradition with the elegance of the Italian mannerists.

**LIT.** G. Marlier, Anthonis Mor van Dashorst, Brussels, 1934; T. Coppens, Antonius Mor: Hofschilder van Karel V, Baarn, 1999; J. Woodall, Anthonis Mor: Art and Authority, Zwolle, 2007

**After Anthonis MOR**

**111 Queen Mary I of England (1516–1558)**

Inscribed lower left: *La Reyna d’inglatiera Maria* and with inventory nos.: +333+ and 409

*Canvas, 208 x 122 cm*

WM 5–1980
Mary was the only surviving child of Henry VIII and Catherine of Aragon; she was separated from her mother on Catherine’s divorce in 1532 and was declared illegitimate in the following year. She was, nevertheless, proclaimed Queen on the death of Edward VI in 1553, and thereafter worked for the restoration of Catholicism. She married Philip II of Spain in July 1554.

According to Van Mander, Mor was sent to England by the Emperor Charles V in order to paint Mary for her prospective bridegroom; a recently discovered document indicates that the artist did not leave Brussels for England before November 1554 (see Woodall 1989, II, p. 43). Roy Strong (1969, I, p. 212) has suggested that the large pendant stone at her throat may be identical with that sent by Philip to his prospective bride, along with other jewels, in June 1554.

The primary version of Mor’s portrait of the Queen, dated 1554, is in the Museo del Prado, Madrid (inv. 2108); other versions are in the collection of the Marquess of Northampton, Castle Ashby (exh. cat., London, Tate Gallery, Dynasties: Painting in Tudor and Jacobean England 1530–1630, 1995–96, no. 16), and the Isabella Stewart Gardner Museum, Boston (inv. P2122; P. Hendy, European and American Paintings in the Isabella Stewart Gardner Museum, Boston, 1974, pp. 165–68, as ‘studio of Mor’).

These all portray the Queen three-quarter length and seated, and this was also the type of the engraving by Frans Huys, 1556, and numerous versions and copies. As Woodall (1991) has demonstrated,
the pose and iconography of the Prado type present Mary as a Hapsburg consort, rather than as an independent English sovereign. The Apsley House picture, which appears to date from the seventeenth century, is ultimately derived from the same source, but the curious dress suggests that the unknown artist may have been working from a head-and-shoulders likeness only. Although the rust-coloured partlet covering her chest and shoulders is appropriate to the mid-sixteenth century, the doublet-style bodice is more frequently seen in the late sixteenth century, the overall silhouette of the gown (bodice and skirt) roughly follows fashions of the 1630s, and the sleeves – short oversleeves covering pinked yellow ones – recall Spanish gowns worn at the beginning of the seventeenth century (information communicated by Dr Emilie Gordenker, Mauritshuis, and Susan North, V&A, July 2008). The author of WM 5 seems to have been influenced by the polished courtly style of Gerrit Honthorst.

The portrait is also allied to a variant tradition in which Mary is likewise shown full length, standing. Other examples of this type are at Schloss Ambras, Innsbruck, and St James’s Palace (nineteenth century; see O. Millar, Tudor, Stuart and Early Georgian Pictures in the Collection of H.M. The Queen, London, 1963, p. 67, no. 55).

CONDITION There are numerous old damages, with discoloured retouching. Glazes in the red drapery have become transparent.

PROV. Counts of Altamira, Palace of Morata de Tajuña (see M. López- Fanjul Díez del Corral and J.J. Pérez Preciado 2005, p. 101); (?) Duke of Alba; Henry Wellesley, Lord Cowley (in a letter to Seguier dated 14 Aug. 1829, the 1st Duke of Wellington wrote: ‘I bought some pictures some years ago from my brother, Lord Cowley … there were among them some pretty good ones … and the original of Mary Queen of England, wife of Philip 2nd, of which the copy is at St. James’ Palace …. They all came from the collection of the Duke of Alba’). It was argued in the Wellington Catalogue that this picture was in the collection of Charles I, but it has not been possible to find evidence for this hypothesis in the published inventory (Walpole Society, XLIII, 1970–72). Bought by the 1st Duke of Wellington from Lord Cowley before 1829, and by the V&A from the 8th Duke of Wellington in 1980.

LIT. Stirling Maxwell 1848, I, p. 218 (as by Mor); M. López-Fanjul Díez del Corral and J.J. Pérez Preciado, ‘Los números y marcas de colección en los cuadros del Museo del Prado’, Boletín del Museo del Prado, 41, 2005, pp. 84–110, see p. 101 and note 93

Bartolomé Esteban MURILLO (1617–1682)
Spanish (Seville) School

Born in Seville, where he was a pupil of Juan de Castillo (d. 1640), he went to Madrid c. 1648 to study
the pictures in the royal collections. His subsequent work shows the influence of Rubens, Van Dyck and Velázquez. He spent the rest of his life in Seville, where he had many assistants and followers.


112 St Francis receiving the Stigmata

Inscribed in white with fleur-de-lis and inventory no.: 637.
Canvas, 56.3 × 48.2 cm
WM 1605–1948

St Francis is believed to have received the stigmata on Mount Alverna in 1224. Legend has it that a seraph appeared to him; between its wings he could see Christ on the cross and he then received the marks of wounds on his hands and feet and at his side. This is traditionally the most important event in the Saint’s life and it was frequently depicted, particularly in Italian art, from the thirteenth century. The iconography is fairly standard from the time of the fresco cycle in the Upper Church at Assisi: St Francis kneels at the hillside, the palms of his hands upturned to receive the stigmata, in the form of rays of light
emanating from the figure of Christ within the seraph (see B. Kleinschmidt, S. Franziskus von Assisi in Kunst und Legende, 1911, pp. 92–101).

This painting appears to be a broadly executed oil sketch of a kind unusual in the oeuvre of Murillo and it has therefore not always been accepted as autograph. Acquired as Murillo by Isabella Farnese, it is recorded as hanging in her palace at La Granja in 1746. Ponz (1787) also saw it there but he described it as ‘in the style of Murillo’. For Isabella Farnese’s collecting of Murillo, particularly during her five-year stay with Philip V in Seville (1729–33) see Seville 1996. In the nineteenth century it was published as autograph by Stirling Maxwell (1848), on whose authority it found its way into Champlin’s and Bryan’s dictionaries. It was then ignored by subsequent authorities such as C.B. Curtis and A.L. Mayer, but it was firmly reinstated by Diego Angulo Iñiguez (1974 and 1981), who published a closely related drawing by Murillo in the Alcubierre Collection, Madrid, and dated the painting c. 1650. The drawing shows the saint in a slightly more frontal position but is otherwise very similar – even the curious deformation of the right hand has its source in the drawing – and Angulo Iñiguez is in no doubt that both drawing and oil painting are autograph works. A related, though reversed, composition formerly attributed to Murillo is in the Capuchins’ church in Cadiz (A.L. Mayer, Murillo, K.d.K., 1913, pl. 239).

CONDITION Paint surface much worn, but otherwise reasonably good. Cleaned in 1949–50.
PROV. Isabella Farnese collection, La Granja (fleur-de-lis mark; La Granja inventories 1746, in the ‘pieza donde se dice misa’; 1766 in the ‘piezas del despacho’; 1774, no. 637); 1794 Aranjuez, as no. 631 ‘como borrón, pieza del oratorio y otras sueltas’; captured at Vitoria, 1813.

EXH. Madrid, Museo Municipal, La alianza de dos monarquías: Wellington en España, 1988 (7.1.6)


113 Isaac blessing Job (Genesis 27: 18–29)

Canvas, 91 x 155 cm
WM 1652–1948

The action takes place in the room of a humble cottage, from which a figure in a further room is visible through an open door. Half the composition consists of landscape, with a woman holding a laundry basket, approaching the cottage, in the centre. Evelyn Wellington (no. 253) identified this picture with one of three paintings of this subject by Luca Giordano recorded in the 1772 Royal Palace inventory (no. 955) but not now in the Prado. Yet it was listed as Murillo in the Wellington heirloom catalogue (1841) and there is no firm evidence for the identification with Luca Giordano. Indeed, WM 1652 is closely related to Murillo’s Isaac blessing Jacob in the Hermitage, St Petersburg (Gaya Nuño 1978, no. 204). This is one of a series of four large paintings of the life of Jacob for which, according to Palomino,
Ignacio Iriarte was to have painted the landscape, but after an argument as to who should paint first, Murillo decided to do the landscape himself (this story is discussed by Gaya Nuño 1978, loc. cit.). Be that as it may, such extensive landscapes are rare in Murillo’s work. The Hermitage picture has a very similar composition to WM 1652, though reversed with the cottage on the right. However, WM 1652 is coarser and more sketchy in execution, and it has not always been accepted as autograph in the standard reference books (Mayer 1913, not mentioned; Gaya Nuño 1978, listed under ‘other works attributed to Murillo’; Angulo Iñiguez 1981, II, p. 102, ‘not completely sure that this is by Murillo’). There is a similarly treated landscape in the Prado (Catálogo de las Pinturas, 1972, no. 3008, as Murillo) but this is not widely accepted as autograph either (Gaya Nuño 1978, no. 339).

Nevertheless, in view of the close compositional relationship of WM 1652 to the St Petersburg picture, the attribution to Murillo should be allowed to stand, even though there are no precise parallels to the treatment of the landscape in his work.

Isaac blessing Jacob was a popular subject in seventeenth-century painting in both Italy and the Netherlands, and the central group of Isaac sitting up in bed, blessing Jacob and feeling his hand (which his mother had covered with goatskin to trick Isaac into thinking that it was that of his older brother Esau, on whom their father wanted to confer his blessing), while his mother Rebecca stands to the side, is fairly standard. Murillo’s composition is unusual in making the main group of figures a subsidiary part of the whole, rather than showing them in close view as was customary.

**CONDITION** Small paint losses in upper right part of the room, on the dark wall; otherwise good.

**Prov.** Spanish royal collection (not identified in the inventories); captured at Vitoria, 1813.

**Exh.** Tokyo 1990–91 (12)

**Lit.** Stirling Maxwell 1848, III, p. 1415 (Murillo); C.B. Curtis, Velázquez and Murillo, London, 1883, p. 118.
Ascribed to MURILLO

114 An Unknown Man
Canvas, 121 × 99 cm
WM 1546–1948

Shown three-quarter length, the sitter is wearing a sleeved waistcoat of yellow brocaded silk, a black cloth doublet partly unbuttoned to show the waistcoat, and a sleeveless surcoat, black, with black brocade turned-back lining.

This is one of the few Spanish paintings at Apsley House to have been bought by the 1st Duke of Wellington. It did not, therefore, derive from the Spanish royal collection, and the attribution to Murillo has been questioned, most recently by Diego Angulo Iñiguez (1981). However, it was accepted in the catalogues of both Mayer, 1913 (‘a certain work by Murillo’) and Gaya Nuño, 1978 (‘A splendid portrait,
Painted by Murillo with simplicity and elegance … the most European of seventeenth-century Spanish paintings). According to Aileen Ribeiro, based on an assessment of the costume, the portrait dates from the late 1640s, and could be either Spanish or Italian. The sitter’s elegant and expensive costume of Italian silk, but with a Spanish collar, possibly suggests a sitter in Italy in an area with Spanish influence. Dawson Carr has recently tentatively suggested an attribution to Fray Juan Rizi (oral opinion, 2008). In style and costume, the picture can be compared with the portrait of the Marquis of Legarda at Vitoria (Gaya Nuño 1978, no. 60).

CONDITION. Tear on right from sitter’s hair extending down to his hand, ground visible around hair; otherwise good. Cleaned by J. Hell in 1951.

PROV. Said to have been bought by Lord Cremorne around 1800, from ‘a reduced Spanish gentleman’, letter from Mrs Hicks to the 1st Duke of Wellington, 10 Aug. 1838; Mrs Hicks (great-niece of Lord Cremorne), 1838; bought by Messrs Yates & Son for the Duke of Wellington, 1838, for 120 guineas (£126). EXH. B.I., Old Masters, 1837 (60); Grafton Galleries, Spanish Old Masters, 1913–14 (140).


François Joseph Navez (1787–1869)
Belgian School

Born in Charleroi, he was a pupil of J.L. David in Paris, 1813–16, and then lived in Rome as a student of the Brussels Academy, 1817–21. In 1822 he settled in Brussels, painting mainly portraits, and became Director of the Academy in 1835.


115 William I, King of the Netherlands (1772–1843)

Signed lower right: F.J. Navez, 1823
Canvas, 220 × 164.3 cm
WM 1463–1948

Full-length, life-size, aged about fifty. He wears uniform: a dark coatee with red facings embroidered with gold, gold epaulettes, a yellow sash round his waist, white breeches and high black boots with spurs. On his chest is the star of the Military Order of William. In the foreground and on the table are books and papers alluding to the king’s activities to promote industrialization and trade in the Kingdom of the Netherlands; the busy port beyond is a reminder of Dutch maritime trade. To the right are two busts.

William Frederick, son of William IV, Prince of Orange, commanded the Dutch army during the
French invasion of 1793. He served in the Prussian and Austrian armies against the French, distinguishing himself at Jena and Wagram, and, after an insurrection in his favour in 1813, was proclaimed Sovereign Prince of the Netherlands. In 1815 he became King of the United Kingdom of the Netherlands, combining the Netherlands and Belgium, but the union only lasted until 1830, when Belgium achieved independence. In 1840 he abdicated in favour of his son. The two busts to the right represent two of William’s illustrious ancestors: the venerable tradition of relating sitter and bust in such portraits is discussed under Leslie’s Wellington, no. 97 above. In this instance the first bust represents William the Silent (1533–1584), founder of the royal Orange dynasty and hero of the Dutch war of independence; and the second his son, Prince Maurits (1567–1625) (and not, as suggested in Kauffmann 1982, two busts of William the Silent). A date of c. 1580 for the likeness of the former is suggested by the costume, and the facial features may be compared, for example, with the engraving of William by William Jacobsz Delft after Adriaen van de Venne (E.A. van Beresteyn, Iconographie van Prins Willem I van Oranje, Haarlem, 1933, fig. 14). He wears the Order of the Golden Fleece. The likeness of Prince Maurits, wearing armour, can be compared with Michiel van Mierevelt’s portrait of 1607 (Museum het Prinsenhof, Delft). The relief on the pedestal below the bust of William represents Freedom crowning Prosperity, with the Dutch lion holding the royal coat of arms and the name of the king: Guillaume. The other relief is only partially visible, but appears to be Victory riding on a chariot (identification of sculptures by Ms Marieke Spliethoff, curator of paintings, Paleis Het Loo, Apeldoorn, 2008).
Navez received the commission to paint the king in 1823 and had several lengthy sittings with him (Charleroi 1999, pp. 63–64). Two versions of this portrait are known. In addition to WM 1463 a full-length portrait also signed and dated 1823 (canvas, 215 x 161 cm; Stichting Pallandt van Keppel, Laag Keppel, NL) shows the king in an interior setting, lacking the view to a harbour, with the table now positioned to the right and a differently styled chair to the left. Only the first bust on the right, of William the Silent, is included.

**CONDITION** The painting is not lined. Pronounced craquelure, showing pale ground beneath in places. A tear at upper left and a puncture at lower right were repaired in 1980; there is another old tear at upper right.

**PROV.** Presented to the 1st Duke of Wellington by William I of the Netherlands in 1824 (letter dated February 24, 1824, from the Baron de Nazelle in Wellington archive).

**LIT.** Waagen 1854, II, p. 277

---

**Aert van der NEER (1603/04–1677)**

*Dutch School*

He appears to have lived in Gorinchem before he moved to Amsterdam. His earliest dated picture is of 1635, by which time he was probably already in Amsterdam, where he lived until he died, in poverty, in 1677. Moonlit landscapes and winter scenes form the bulk of his production.

**LIT.** W. Schulz, *Aert van der Neer*, Doornspijk, 2002

**116 River View: Evening**

Signed left foreground: *AV DN* (in two monograms); inscribed in white with inventory no.: 345, lower right

*Canvas, 47.5 x 61.5 cm*

*WM 1576–1948*

Van der Neer’s river landscapes with moonlight effects are his most characteristic works. The earliest of these, such as the moonlight scene dated 1643 in Schloss Friedenstein, Gotha (inv. 36; Schulz 2002, no. 346, fig. 97), have a muted, almost tonalist palette; subsequent works explore more unusual – if also limited – colorations. Van der Neer’s compositions are traditional; his innovation lies in using the coloured light of the moon or the setting sun to shape the land and water, minimizing local colours and creating an atmosphere of silence and mystery. Luminous effects are doubled by watery reflections.

The generally poor condition of WM 1576 makes certain attribution to Van der Neer difficult, particularly as his work was much imitated even in the seventeenth century. Schulz (2002) questioned the attribution, proposing instead an attribution to Johannes (Jan) Meerhout (before 1630–1677). The painting’s composition relates most closely to Van der Neer’s river nocturnes of the mid-1640s.
CONDITION Surface very worn and damaged generally. In certain areas, the reddish-brown ground forms part of the painted composition, typical for the artist.

PROV. Spanish royal collection (not identified in the inventories); captured at Vitoria, 1813.

EXH. Tokyo 1990–91 (14)

LIT. Hofstede de Groot 1908–27, VII, no. 57; Schulz 2002, p. 235 no. 418 (not by van der Neer)

Eglon Hendrik van der NEER (1634(?)–1703)

Dutch School

Son and pupil of Aert van der Neer, he was born in Amsterdam and worked mainly in Rotterdam (until 1679), Brussels (1679–89) and Düsseldorf (1690–1703), where he was court painter to the Elector Palatine, Johann Wilhelm. He painted mainly genre scenes.

LIT. P. Hecht, De Hollandse Fijnschilders: van Gerard Dou tot Adriaen van der Werff, exh. cat., Amsterdam, Rijksmuseum, 1989, pp. 130–54
Boys with a trapped Bird

Signed on base of birdcage: E. van der Neer; inscribed in white with *fleur-de-lis*, lower right, and inventory no.: 20, lower left

Oak panel, 25.5 × 20.4 cm

WM 1587–1948

The birdcage is open; one bird is sitting on top of it, another has been caught by one of the boys below. Such pictures prominently figuring birds can often be appreciated on two levels – as the genre scenes they depict, and for their more hidden meaning, in which the bird can be interpreted in various ways, most commonly as a symbol of love in one or other of its manifestations (E. de Jongh, ‘Erotica in Vogelperspectief’, *Simiolus*, III, 1968–69, pp. 22–74). Birds in cages can symbolize love as imprisoning men and women, or as maidenhood which is shown as lost when the bird has flown. There are examples of both interpretations in seventeenth-century Dutch paintings by Jan Steen (Leiden), Willem van Mieris (Hamburg), Pieter van Noort (Zwolle) and Pieter de Hooch (Cologne) (De Jongh, *op. cit.*, figs. 19, 21, 23–24). Van der Neer’s example is closest to representations of Cupid as a birdcatcher in seventeenth-century emblem books. In Daniel Heinsius, *Emblemata Amatoria*, 1608, no. 21, under the Petrarchan heading *Perch’io stesso mi strinsi* (Because I bound myself), Cupid watches while the bird he had helped to bind flies into its cage (reprint, Scolar Press, 1973, no. 21; De Jongh, *op. cit.*, fig. 20; A. Henkel and A. Schöne, *Emblemata, Handbuch zur Sinnbildkunst des XVI und XVII Jahrhunderts*, Stuttgart,
The bird-cage hanging from the tree reappears in identical form in Van der Neer’s painting and the composition as a whole is clearly linked with the emblem. Cupid as a birdcatcher also occurs in another emblem book, Crispyn de Passe, *Thronus Cupidus*, Amsterdam, 1620, no. 2 (Henkel, Schöne, op. cit., 757).

But birds did not function exclusively as symbols of love; in images of children, parrots often symbolized docility and a willingness to learn. An emblem of a caged parrot appears in Jacob Cats’s *Proteus* (Rotterdam, 1627), with the motto ‘dwane leert sanck’, (caged birds sing better) or (discipline is the best teacher) – the apparent antithesis of Van der Neer’s mischievous urchins and free-flown birds (see J.B. Bedaux, *The Reality of Symbols: Studies in the Iconology of Netherlandish Art, 1400–1800*, The Hague, 1990, p. 119).

Eglon van der Neer usually painted scenes of elegant genre and only rarely pictures of children (Hofstede de Groot 1908–27, VII, nos. 111–19). Comparable paintings of boys with a cat and/or birds are in the museums of Karlsruhe, St Petersburg, Stockholm (dated 1664) and Schwerin (dated 1679).

The composition of WM 1587 must have proved popular: there are three versions known – in the Portland collection (Hofstede de Groot 1908–27, VII, no. 119; R.W. Goulding, *Catalogue of the Pictures belonging to … the Duke of Portland*, Cambridge, 1936, p. 211, no. 524); in the Castle Museum, Nottingham; and sold Sotheby’s, 9 Dec. 1992, lot 142, all without the cage. A signed painting in the Herzog Anton Ulrich-Museum, Brunswick (inv. 320) situates the same figures in a different landscape setting. The central figures were engraved in reverse in 1768 by William Walker (Boydell’s *Catalogue of Historical Prints, 1787*, II, no. 32, as by Netscher).

**CONDITION** Cleaned by Vallance, 1951. The reverse of the panel is very roughly hewn.

**PROV.** Isabella Farnese collection, La Granja (*fleur-de-lis* mark); La Granja inventories 1746 and 1766 (unattributed), no. 20; in Aranjuez inventory 1794, no. 20; captured at Vitoria, 1813.

**LIT.** Hofstede de Groot 1908–27, v, no. 114; Gaya Nuño 1964, no. 198

---

**NETHERLANDISH School, 1596**

**118 Self-portrait of an Unknown Painter**

Dated above sitter’s ear on right: 1596; inscribed in white with inventory no.: 359

Canvas, 54 × 41.3 cm

WM 1628–1948

The sitter, who appears to be in his thirties, holds a palette and brushes. He was identified as ‘T.H. Zucchero’ in Seguier’s list and as the Dutchman Cornelis Ketel (1548–1609) in the Wellington Catalogue. The attribution to Taddeo Zuccaro can be excluded as he died in 1566, thirty years before this picture was painted, but it is of interest in showing that this was thought to be an Italian work. The attribution to Ketel was not accepted by Stechow (1927) and it does not bear close examination: the portrait is not similar to the engraving of Ketel in Van Mander’s *Schilderboek* (reprint of 1617 edn with German translation, 1906, II, p. 171; for a list of other portraits of Ketel, see H. van Hall, *Portretten van Nederlands
Beeldende Kunstenaars, Amsterdam, 1963, p. 166), and in any case the dates do not fit. WM 1628 is dated 1596, at which date Ketel was forty-eight, but the sitter looks appreciably younger. The engraving of Ketel in Van Mander shows a much older-looking man in the costume of the 1590s than the one appearing in the Wellington picture, which has most recently been described as ‘Anonymous, Flemish(?), with the proviso that ‘the possibility that it is Italian cannot … be excluded’ (Delft and Antwerp 1964). Comparable Italian self-portraits are reproduced by M. Masciotta, Autoritratti, Milano, 1955 (pls. 41ff., esp. pl. 66), but a Netherlandish origin remains most likely.

As a result of the improved status of artists, there was a rapid increase in the numbers of self-portraits produced for collectors in the second half of the sixteenth century. WM 1628 is typical of them in showing the artist with his palette and brushes, the insignia of his craft (for recent discussions and bibliographies, see exh. cat., Hamburg, Kunsthalle, Das Bild des Künstlers, 1978, and Herzog Anton Ulrich-Museum, Brunswick, Selbstbildnisse und Künstlerporträts, 1980).

**CONDITION.** Quite thinly painted and worn; several minor retouches have discoloured.

**PROV.** Spanish royal collection (not identified in the inventories); captured at Vitoria, 1813.

**EXH.** Delft, Stedelijk Museum, and Antwerp, Koninklijk Museum voor Schone Kunsten, De Schilder in Zijn Wereld, 1964–65 (2)

**LIT.** W. Stechow in Thieme, Becker 1927, XX, p. 219
Caspar NETSCHER (1635/6–1684)
Dutch School

Born probably in Heidelberg, he was a pupil of Gerard ter Borch at Deventer in 1655 and settled at The Hague in 1662. Until the late 1660s he painted predominantly genre scenes of upper-class life somewhat in the manner of ter Borch and Metsu, after which he specialized in portraits of the ruling class.

Lit. Hofstede de Groot 1908–27, V, pp. 146–308; M.E. Wieseman, Caspar Netscher and Late Seventeenth-Century Dutch Painting, Doornspijk, 2002

Studio of Caspar NETSCHER

119 A Lady at her Toilet

Signed lower right: G Netscher f
Oak panel, 44.5 x 35.5 cm
WM 1523–1948

A maid is arranging the ribbons in the lady’s hair, while a page is bringing a salver on which are a round silver vessel and a spoon – possibly a brandewijnskom, a small bowl used to serve up a toast to a betrothed couple (Wieseman 2002, p. 63).

This is a version of a composition by Netscher in the Gemäldegalerie Alte Meister, Dresden, dated 1665 (inv. 1348; panel, 43.5 x 34 cm), probably produced in Netscher’s studio at about the same time or slightly later. The Dresden picture is identical in composition and size (however, the panel is actually arched, rather than finished by an illusionistically painted arch at top) and differs only in the expression of the lady. The format of the signature at lower right of WM 1523 is not characteristic of the artist. Several other copies of the composition are known (see Wieseman 2002, pp. 196–97).

Condition Generally good apart from a few slight abrasions; cleaned by Vallance in 1951.

Prov. Possibly collection Michiel van Hoecken, The Hague, 1734 (J.C. Weyerman, De levens-beschryvingen der Nederlandsche Konst-schilders en Konst-schilderessen, The Hague, 1729–69, III, p. 135); possibly van Hoecken sale, The Hague, 1 May 1742, lot 3 (205 fl., to Boetens); possibly sale Amsterdam, 25 Sept. 1743, lot 9 (91 fl.); Saint-Maurice sale, Paris, 16 May 1797, lot 21 (588 livres, to Paillet); Verdier sale, Paris, 13 March 1816, lot 56 (1400 frs., withdrawn); Lapeyrière sale, 14 April 1817 (lot 36), bought by Féréol de Bonnemain for the 1st Duke of Wellington for 901 frs. (£36).

Exh. B.I., Old Masters, 1819 (28)

Lit. Smith 1829–43, IV, p. 164, no. 67; Waagen 1854, II, p. 277 (‘an excellent picture … of his earlier period’); Hofstede de Groot 1908–27, V, p. 179, no. 90 (a replica by the artist); Wieseman 2002, p. 196, no. 444
Adriaen van OSTADE (1610–1685)
Dutch (Haarlem) School

Adriaen van Ostade, the elder brother of Isack, was born in 1610 in Haarlem, where he spent most of his life. According to Houbraken he was a pupil of Hals at the same time as Adriaen Brouwer (c. 1626–27), but there is no other evidence for this. He entered the Haarlem guild in 1634, and became its dean in 1662. Influenced by Brouwer, and from 1640 by Rembrandt’s chiaroscuro, he painted mainly peasant genre scenes, of which he also made some fifty etchings.


120 The Courtyard of an Inn with a Game of Shuffleboard

Signed on wooden frame of ball court on left: A v Ostade 1677
Oak panel, 33.7 × 47 cm
WM 1521–1948

Shuffleboard, or more correctly shoveboard, is a game known since the early sixteenth century, in
which a coin or other disk is driven by a blow from the hand along a highly polished floor or table. The table at which the two men are playing appears to have been about 5 metres long, placed under a specially constructed shelter in the courtyard. Adriaen van Ostade frequently included board games, bowls and skittles in scenes of this kind, but this detailed representation of shuffleboard is unusual. In the foreground at the left is a court where pall mall, a forerunner of croquet, was played with sticks and large wooden balls. Ostade’s lively scene of peasants drinking, smoking, relaxing and gaming in the courtyard of an inn would have been construed by contemporary viewers as an amusing but moralizing depiction of idle time-wasters. The smoker in the foreground was a well-known symbol of laziness; a scythe which should be being used in the fields at the harvest hangs conspicuously unused above his head.

There are several related drawings: a highly finished watercolour in the British Museum, signed and dated 1677 (25.8 × 38 cm, inv. 1847-43-26-6; Schnackenburg 1981, I, p. 134 no. 266; II, fig. 266) was probably conceived as an independent work of art. A preparatory sketch for the watercolour, indented for transfer, is in the Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam (pen and ink and wash, 25 × 37.6 cm, no. A.621; Schnackenburg 1981, I, p. 134 no. 267; II, fig. 267). These drawings differ from the Wellington picture only in including a dog by the seated revellers at the left. In addition, Schnackenburg notes three drawn copies of the composition: in the Teylers Museum, Haarlem (pen and ink and wash, 25.5 × 37.5 cm, Mappe P. no. 72; Schnackenburg 1981, I, p. 134 under no. 267); the British Museum (including the dog and therefore linked with the watercolour rather than with the painting; pen and wash, 25 × 37.5 cm;
Il Padovanino


**CONDITION** Good condition; minor losses to paint surface at top and bottom edges, right of centre.

**PROV.** Duc de Choiseul (engraved in the Choiseul Gallery, no. 17); his sale, Paris, 6 April 1772, lot 41 (4600 livres, to Boileau); Prince de Conti sale, Paris, 8 April 1777, lot 310 (4999 livres, to Donjeux); Chevalier Lambert sale, Paris, 27 March 1787, lot 65 (4200 livres, to Leval); Coclers sale, Paris, 9 Feb. 1789, lot 38; P. Smeth van Alphen sale, Amsterdam, 1–2 Aug. 1810, lot 72 (fl. 1200, to de Vries); H. Croese sale, Amsterdam, 18 Sept. 1811, lot 61; Lapeyrière sale, 14 April 1817, lot 38, bought for 5450 frs. (£218) by Féréol de Bonnemaison for the 1st Duke of Wellington.

**EXH.** B.I., Old Masters, 1818 (68); 1845 (41); R.A., Winter Exhibition, 1886 (101); Whitechapel Art Gallery, 1904 (352); R.A., Dutch Art, 1929 (214); V&A, 1947 (10); Arts Council 1949 (6); Rotterdam, Museum Boijmans van Beuningen, and Frankfurt, Städelisches Kunstinstitut und Städtische Galerie, *Senses and Sins: Dutch Painters of Daily Life in the Seventeenth Century*, 2004–05 (33)


**Alessandro Varotari, called Il PADOVANINO (1588–1648)**

**Italian (Venetian) School**

Born in Padua, he settled in Venice in 1614 and received many commissions for frescoes in Venetian churches. His style is based on early Titian, and he helped to pass on the colouristic tradition of the ‘great period’ to Venetian artists of the seventeenth century. He also made copies of Titian’s works (e.g. of the Aldobrandini pictures, in the Accademia Carrara, Bergamo).


**Ascribed to Il PADOVANINO**

**121 Orpheus enchanting the Animals** (Ovid, *Metamorphoses*, XI, Chapter I)

Canvas, 143 × 111 cm

WM 1582–1948

In its colours – in particular the deep red of the cloth and the pale reddish sky – its soft handling and use of coarse herring-bone canvas, this is a Titianesque picture; indeed, it was attributed to Titian in the Wellington collection in the nineteenth century. Its history is complicated by the fact
that there is another, almost identical, version in the Prado (no. 266; 165 x 108 cm) which was in the collection of Elisabetta Farnese (Queen Isabella of Spain) The Prado picture has fewer animals – it does not contain the dog on the left, which is very like the one in Titian’s Venus of Urbino (Uffizi, Florence, c. 1538; H. Tietze, Titian, London, 1950, fig. 107) – or the birds which appear at the top of the Apsley House painting. A third version, closer to the Apsley House picture in that it contains the dog and the birds, was formerly in the Horny collection, Vienna, where it was attributed to Titian (W. Suida, Tiziano, Rome, 1938, p. 158, pl. 118, 153 x 104 cm). However, the Prado picture has long been catalogued as by Padovanino, and already in 1877 Crowe and Cavalcaselle recognized that this is a reasonable attribution for the Apsley House painting. Apart from general stylistic similarities, a close comparison can be made with the Three Graces attributed to Padovanino in the Bucharest Museum (Kauffmann 1973, fig. 3), which contains a bird similar to those in the Apsley Orpheus and, like them, probably derived from Netherlandish naturalism of the Jan Brueghel period, c. 1600. Padovanino has remained a somewhat shadowy figure, and the attribution to him has not found universal acceptance (Wethey 1975) but it remains plausible (Ruggeri 1988).

The figure of Orpheus himself is derived not from Titian but from a figure of Apollo playing the lyre in a musical contest with Marsyas in a North Italian painting of c. 1530 in the Hermitage,
Il Padovanino

St Peters (Tietze, Tietze-Conrat 1936). The artist’s immediate source was probably an engraving dated 1562 by the Venetian Giulio Sanuto after the Hermitage painting (Kauffmann 1973, figs. 4. 5). A.E. Popham suggested that the ultimate source of the figure lies in one of the ignudi in Michelangelo’s Sistine Chapel ceiling (A.E. Popham, Coreggio’s Drawings, London, 1957, pp. 21–27).

Orpheus enchanting the animals was frequently depicted in the time of the Roman Empire, when Orphism was a popular religion (Kauffmann 1973, fig. 6) and it remained common in the Early Christian period when Orpheus, with his power of ending discord with music and eloquence, became the principal model for the representation of Christ. Relatively rare between the sixth and fourteenth centuries, the scene owed its revival in the pictorial arts to the writings of Christian commentators who interpreted pagan myths in Christian terms. In the Ovide moralisé (c. 1300) Orpheus is again interpreted as Christ and his song represents the preaching of the divine word by which the souls of men are drawn away from damnation. The modern tradition of representing the scene began with the illustrated Ovide moralisé manuscripts of the fourteenth century, and it is at this period that the animals and birds to be found in the Wellington picture – including the lion and the unicorn – first appear (Kauffmann 1973, fig. 7). The unicorn has no textual basis in the Orpheus story, but it was known as the traditional enemy of the lion. The appearance of the two animals side by side in the context of Orpheus is due to the traditional hostility between them and strikingly illustrates the power of Orpheus to enchant the wildest animals and to reconcile the deepest foes. For the same reason, the two are often shown together in scenes of Paradise or of the Creation of the Animals.

CONDITION. The canvas appears to have been cut at the bottom, which may account for the fact that the painting is shorter than the Prado version. There is some general wear, especially in the dark areas, and an old tear in the canvas 20 cm from the top edge downwards, near the top right corner.

PROV. Spanish royal collection, perhaps to be identified with the painting attributed to Titian (2 × 1'2 vară, equivalent to 168 × 126 cm) in the early inventories: Royal Palace, Madrid (Alcázar) 1666 inventory, no. 692; 1686 inventory, no. 865; 1701 inventory, no. 487 (the Wellington Catalogue attribution to Bassano is due to a confusion with a picture of the same subject by Bassano listed in this inventory and elsewhere); 1734 inventory, pictures saved from the fire in the Alcázar, no. 24. (The Prado version is listed in the 1746 La Granja inventory, and was probably acquired by Isabella Farnese.) Captured at Vitoria, 1813.

Born in Piacenza, he studied architectural painting, perspective, and architecture, before leaving in 1711 to attend the drawing academy of Benedetto Luti in Rome. He did much decorative painting of Roman villas and palaces, and made many paintings of architectural capricci, capricci of Roman ruins, festival scenes, etc., for a succession of French envoys and ambassadors to Rome, cardinals and Grand Tourists. He had many imitators, in Italy and in England.


122 A Festival in the Piazza di Spagna, Rome, 1727

Signed on enclosure of wine fountain: I. P. Panini Placentus Romae 1727

Canvas, 46 x 100cm

WM 1641–1948

This painting was commissioned by Cardinal Cornelio Bentivoglio (1668–1732), who from 1726 was Minister Plenipotentiary at Rome, to record the festivities celebrating the birth of the Infante Luis Antonio Jaime, last son of Philip V, born on 25 July 1727 (information from Gabriele Finaldi). The festivities took place on 23 September 1727, outside the embassy in the Piazza di Spagna (Arisi 1991). The work may have entered the Spanish royal collection as a gift from the cardinal (David Marshall, written opinion, 2008). The Spanish embassy on the far side of the square is decorated with two coats of arms, presumably those of Spain and of the Cardinal ambassador, Cornelio Bentivoglio, though they are insufficiently clear to be firmly identified. On the left, the artificially constructed rock may be identified from the inscription on a print by Filippo Vasconi (Rome 1959, no. 1814) as the ‘macchina per fuoco artificiato’ (fireworks machine) designed by the painter Sebastiano Conca (Gori Sassoli 1994, pp. 177–78, no. 130). The sketch for Conca’s painting of the macchina is in the Prado, Madrid (P2869). On it, Thetis is consigning her infant son Achilles to the centaur Chiron to instruct him and to direct him to the Temple of Glory above. The allegory is clearly of the Kingdom of Spain and of the youngest member of its royal family.

In the left foreground of the picture, a small crowd is gathering round the wine fountain. This was a common feature on such occasions – an infallible method of persuading large numbers of citizens to join in the festivities of the great (Arisi 1986). The procession of carriages is headed by a gilt one with a cardinal, presumably Cardinal Bentivoglio himself.

This is the earliest painting by Panini to show such festival macchina. The precise and detailed delineation of the architecture contrasts with the broad, sketchy treatment of the figures and shows the influence of Gaspare Vanvitelli (1653–1736).

A slightly larger copy of this painting (54 × 99.7 cm) was sold by Semenzato, Milan (23 November
1989, lot 25) with its pendant, which shows the piazza the following year, 1728, for the double marriage of Ferdinand of Spain to Maria Barbara of Portugal, and Joseph of Portugal to Maria Anna Vittoria of Spain, looking towards the Trinità dei Monti (Arisi 1991, p. 23 and David Marshall, written opinion, 2008).

CONDITION. Some wear in sky, otherwise good. Cleaned by S. Isepp in 1950.

PROV. Spanish royal collection (not identified in the inventories); captured at Vitoria, 1813.

EXH. Agnew’s, First Magnasco Society Exhibition, Nov. 1924 (19) (see O. Sitwell, Apollo, lxxix, 1964, p. 381); Rome, II Settecento a Roma, 1959 (408); Tokyo 1990–91 (7)


123 St Paul at Malta, grasping the Viper

Signed on top stone of the base of the pedestal, right: I.P.P. 1735

Canvas, 76.2 × 63.5 cm

WM 1502–1948

Companion piece to WM 1505: St Paul at Athens.

After suffering shipwreck on the way to Rome, St Paul landed on the island of Malta and, on lighting a fire, ‘there came a viper out of the heat, and fastened on his hand …. And he shook off the beast
into the fire and felt no harm’ (Acts 28: 3–6). This subject, though commonly depicted in the seventeenth century, is relatively rare in the eighteenth. Panini uses it to people a typical composition of classical ruins. This is a replica with variations, including the addition of the statue of Hercules on the right, of a painting in the possession of Carlo Sestieri, Rome (73 × 61 cm, dated 1731; Arisi 1986, p. 339, no. 214) and there are two preparatory drawings for figures in the foreground in the Berlin Kupferstichkabinett (no. 17542, figure leaning against pillar, centre foreground; no. 17556, young man right foreground). A large version of this painting (262 × 218 cm) with variations, not included in Arisi, but authenticated by him and dated to c. 1735 (just after WM 1502) was recently sold from a private collection (Chaucer Fine Arts, London, 2008).

**CONDITION.** Pronounced craquelure; tear with attendant paint loss on plinth of column on right, repaired 1981.

**Prov.** Le Rouge sale, Paris, 27 April 1818, lot 41, bought for the 1st Duke of Wellington by Féréol de Bonnemaison for 701 frs. (£28) the pair.

**Lit.** Voss 1924, p. 633 (Panini); M. Labo in Thieme, Becker 1932, XXVI, p. 201; Brunetti 1964, p. 194; Arisi 1986, p. 348, no. 234
124 St Paul preaching at Athens

Signed on fragment of column, centre foreground: I.P.P. 1737
Canvas, 76 × 63.7 cm
WM 1505–1948

Companion piece to WM 1502: St Paul at Malta.

‘Then Paul stood in the midst of Mars’ hill, and said, Ye men of Athens, I perceive that in all things ye are too superstitious …’ (Acts 27: 22). Nearly all compositions of this theme were influenced by Raphael’s tapestry cartoon of this subject (V&A), though Panini’s is a more independent rendering than most. For example, a comparable near-contemporary painting, Sebastiano Ricci’s at Toledo, Ohio (J. Daniels, Sebastiano Ricci, Hove, 1976, no. 420, fig. 133, dated 1713) is much closer to the Raphael cartoon.

This is a replica, with variations, of a painting in the collection of Carlo Sestieri, Rome (73 × 61 cm, dated 1731; Arisi 1986, p. 338, no. 213). It is curious that it was painted in 1737, whereas its pendant is clearly dated 1735.

Prov. Same as WM 1502.

Lit. Same as WM 1502; Arisi 1961, p. 150, no. 104; Arisi 1986, p. 348, no. 234
Girolamo Mazzola, called IL PARMIGIANINO (1503–1540)

Italian School

His name ‘IL Parmigianino’ derives from his place of birth, Parma. He was in Rome from about 1524 to 1527, and then in Bologna, and from 1531 in Parma. Influenced by Correggio, Raphael and Michelangelo, he was one of the most brilliant exponents of Italian Mannerism.


After IL PARMIGIANINO

125 The Mystic Marriage of St Catherine

Inscribed in white with inventory no.: 450
Canvas, 75.5 × 57 cm
WM 1601–1948

Although this painting was in the Spanish royal collection as by Il Parmigianino, it is now generally accepted to be one of several early copies of what was clearly a very popular composition. It can be identified with a work in the collection of the Italian sculptor Pompeo Leoni (1533–1608), who died in Madrid (Finaldi 1994, p. 111). The original panel (74.2 × 57.2 cm), which was in the Borghese Gallery, was engraved by Camillo Tinti in 1771 (Freedberg 1950, fig. 54), and came to England before 1814, when it was engraved by J.S. Agar in the collection of W. Morland, M.P., and was in the collection of successive Earls of Normanton from 1832 until 1974, when it was acquired by the National Gallery (Christie’s, 29 Nov. 1974, lot 40). It has been dated by Freedberg c. 1525–56, in Il Parmigianino’s Roman period, between the more Raphaelesque Madonna in the Galleria Doria Pamphilj, Rome, and the more fully mannerist Vision of St Jerome in the National Gallery (1525–27). Ekserdjian agrees with this dating (2006, pp. 9, 76), although Gould (1994, p. 98) and Giampaolo and Fadda (2003) have argued that it was painted slightly later, in Parmigianino’s Bolognese period.

The unusual figure of an old man with a halo, lower left, is Joseph (Ekserdjian 2006, p. 76) and the two figures in the background are the Virgin’s parents, Joachim and Anne. WM 1601 is all but identical with the National Gallery Mystic Marriage of St Catherine in size and composition and has been considered by some to be the autograph version, most recently by Ghidiglia Quintavalle (1970, p. 8). However, it is slightly less free and fluid in treatment and there are points of difference in detail: for example, St Catherine’s dress is more firmly painted over the bosom, and Joseph’s eye is more prominently shown. It remains close to the original in quality and feeling, and is doubtless a sixteenth-century work – ‘Una bella copia antica’, in the words of Giovanni Copertini (1932).

Three other early copies were recorded in inventories of the sixteenth–seventeenth centuries: (1) Parma, San Giovanni Evangelista, a copy bequeathed in 1586; (2) Parma, Farnese collection, recorded in 1708 as a copy; (3) Palais Royal, Paris 1786, later in the Westminster collection, until 1924. The latter,
like the Wellington picture, laid claim to the status of original, but is generally considered inferior both
to it and to the National Gallery painting (Freedberg 1950, p. 172–73). Freedberg lists a total of ten copies,
and the popularity of the composition is further attested by the numerous engravings, of which those
by Bonasone (Freedberg 1950, fig. 53), Marcantonio school (Bartsch 1803–21, XV, 511, Master of the Name
of Jesus), and Camillo Tinti are the best known.

Of the related drawings for the composition (Vaccaro 2002, p. 154) Ekserdjian suggests that the
drawing in the Real Academia de San Fernando, Madrid (Popham 1971, no. 279, pl. 113) was probably
an early idea for it.

_The Mystic Marriage of St Catherine_ is not based on an incident in the saint’s life and is not recorded
in the early texts of the Golden Legend. The theme of St Catherine (martyred in 307) as the bride of
Christ is first found in hymns of the thirteenth and fourteenth-centuries:

- _Sponsae Christi eximiae_
- _Repraesentantur nuptiae_
- _Katherinae_

(quoted, with numerous other examples, by J. Sauer, ‘Das Sposalizio der heiligen Katherina von
Alexandrien’, _Friedrich Schneider Festschrift_, Freiburg, 1906, p. 343).
By this period Catherine was one of the most popular of female saints and also one of the principal representatives of the vita contemplativa, and the event symbolizes the mystical marriage of the Christian soul to the Saviour. It is represented in the arts occasionally in the fourteenth century (Museo di Castelvecchio, Verona; Van Marle, Italian Schools, IV fig. 100) derived from the sacra conversazione (Virgin and saints) type, and frequently in the fifteenth and sixteenth century, particularly in Italy. Parmigianino follows the standard iconography for the main group and each of the main features in the picture derives from the work of other painters – the Christ Child and foreground figure from Correggio, the Madonna from Michelangelo and the St Catherine from Raphael (Gould 1975). However, the dramatic juxtaposition of St Joseph and the wheel upon which St Catherine was tortured, in the foreground, is his own innovation. The popularity of his composition is shown not only by the numerous copies and engravings, but also by its impact on other artists. An etching by Schiavone, for example, is very closely based on the Parmigianino composition.

**CONDITION** Some retouching on St Catherine’s yellow robe above left hand; otherwise good.

**PROV.** Collection of Pompeo Leoni, Madrid, until 1608; first certainly recorded in the Spanish royal collection, c. 1755, Buen Retiro, Madrid (Ponz 1772–94, p. 122, hanging in a corridor leading from the Oratory to the king’s study); Royal Palace, Madrid, 1794 inventory: hanging in the King’s dressing room; captured at Vitoria, 1813.

**EXH.** Birmingham Society of Arts, 1831


**Jean-François-Pierre PEYRON (1744–1814)**

**French School**

Born in Aix-en-Provence, he was a pupil of Louis Lagrenée, winning the Prix de Rome in 1773 and settling in Rome from 1775–82. He painted classical subjects much influenced by Poussin and enjoyed considerable success in his early years. At the Salon of 1787 his Death of Socrates suffered in comparison with David’s treatment of the same subject, and his career remained marred by the unequal rivalry with David.

**LIT.** P. Rosenberg and U. van de Sandt, Pierre Peyron, 1744–1814, Neuilly-sur-Seine, 1983
Athenian Girls drawing Lots to determine which among them shall be sent to Crete for Sacrifice to the Minotaur

Paper on canvas, 56 x 99 cm
WM 1625–1948

According to Plutarch, Minos, King of Crete, exacted a tribute from the Athenians every nine years of seven youths and seven maidens to be devoured by the Minotaur, a monster, half man, half bull. Theseus eventually delivered his country from this tribute by destroying the monster. The picture represents the Athenian girls drawing lots as to who should be sent to Crete. In the centre, in front of the statue of Athena, Theseus stands and watches.

This work is described as a ‘sketch’, and it was painted during Peyron’s stay in Rome. It is typical of the themes adopted by neoclassical artists from Greco-Roman legend and history, though Peyron was one of the few to have painted this particular subject. He reworked the theme over twenty-five years, twice earning commissions to paint a large-scale composition (in 1782 for the comte du Nord, the future Paul I of Russia, and in 1787 for the French king), and once a smaller version, also in 1787, for the comte d’Angiviller, works which remained unexecuted. He exhibited a large drawing of the same composition in the Salon of 1798 (see below), and in 1801 he was reported to be working yet again on a painting of the subject.

According to the Wellington Catalogue, this painting was signed J. Peyron 1778 on the lower step beneath the urn, but this signature is no longer visible, nor did it reappear when the picture was cleaned in 1951. In addition, Rosenberg and Van de Sandt mention an old inventory number 86 in red oil paint, bottom left (1983, p. 82). The date 1778 is plausible for the work, as one of the preparatory drawings is dated 1777, and it was apparently exhibited, amongst the works of the scholars at the French Academy, in the Palazzo Mancini in Rome in 1778, and again on the occasion of a visit there by the comte du Nord (the future Emperor Paul I of Russia) in 1782, then in the Paris Salon in 1783, though not listed in the livret, as it
Pieneman

was only inserted on the eve of its closure. There are five surviving ink drawings for this composition: (1) Paris, Louvre, Département des Arts graphiques (16.9 × 27 cm), inscribed ‘première pensée des filles d’Athènes tirant au sort’, showing the whole composition and very similar to the painting, except that there are fewer figures in the background (Rosenberg, Van de Sandt 1983, p. 84 and Gazette des Beaux-Arts, March 2000); (2) Musée Granet, Aix-en-Provence (48 × 62 cm), study for the right half of the composition, showing only the group round the urn (Rosenberg, Van de Sandt 1983, p. 85); (3) Musée Fabre, Montpellier (26 × 40 cm), showing the left half of the composition; (4) private collection, Charles Le Blanc sale, 3–6 December 1866, lot 509, (53.3 × 97 cm), signed and dated Roma 1777, very close to Apsley House composition (5) Leipzig, Museum der bildenden Künste (23.5 × 46.1 cm). Peyron returned to the subject later in his career and exhibited a drawing of it at the Salon in 1798 (Rosenberg, Van de Sandt 1983, p. 86–87). This drawing is apparently no longer extant, but it was engraved by Etienne Beisson and shows an Egyptian rather than a Roman architectural background (Rosenblum 1967, p. 17, fig. 13).


PROV. Sold by the artist in Rome in September 1782 to M. de Bures de Villiers, but retained by him until 1787, with the intention of making a full-scale version of it; the citoyen D[e] B[ures]’s sale, Paris, 21 Fructidor, an VI (=7 September 1798), lot 11; [?Moutaleau] sale, Paris, 30 Messidor, an X (=19 July 1802), lot 121; in a sale in Valencia in 1803 of part of a collection, probably of French origin, consigned from Genoa, lot 3, for 6,600 reales, one of the highest bids in the sale; (?) acquired by Charles IV of Spain (whence the red inventory number?, though this does not correspond to any known Spanish royal inventory); seized by Joseph Bonaparte; captured at Vitoria, 1813.

EXH. Rome, Palazzo Mancini, Sept. 1778 and March 1782; Paris, Salon, 28–29 September 1783; R.A., France in the 18th Century, 1968 (557, repr.)


Jan Willem PIENEMAN (1779–1853)
Dutch School

Largely self-taught, he became a well-known portrait, history and landscape-painter. From 1820 he was Director of the Amsterdam Academy, where subsequently Jozef Israëls became his pupil and Director of the Rijksmuseum, 1844–47. His Battle of Waterloo, now in the Rijksmuseum, for which the Apsley House portraits are preparatory studies, is perhaps his best-known work.

An undated diary of one of Pieneman’s journey to England to meet the 1st Duke of Wellington is in the Archives of Arti et Amicitiae, Amsterdam (inv. no. 92).


Signed lower left: JWP/Apsly (sic) House/London/1821

Paper on canvas, 51.4 × 41.2 cm

WM 1468–1948

Studies of heads only, on a grey background.

Sir Frederick Ponsonby, son of the 3rd Earl of Bessborough, entered the Army in 1800, went with his regiment to Spain as a Major in 1809, and distinguished himself at Talavera. From 1811 he commanded the 12th Light Dragoons and took a leading part in the battles of Salamanca, Vitoria and Waterloo, where he lay wounded on the field all night. He was Governor of Malta 1825–35. Sir Colin Campbell, fifth son of John Campbell of Melfort, was engaged in Wellington’s campaigns in India, 1801–05, and served with him in Hanover and Denmark in 1808 and throughout the Peninsular campaign. He was on Wellington’s staff at Waterloo, was promoted Major General in 1825 and Governor of Ceylon, 1839–47.

This is one of thirteen portrait studies painted by Pieneman from life in 1821 in preparation for his large composition of the Battle of Waterloo (1824), now on permanent loan to the Rijksmuseum from the Dutch royal collection (inv. SK-A-1117; for the other studies see nos. 128–39). The painting was en-
couraged by the 1st Duke and exhibited in London before being purchased by King William I of the Netherlands and displayed at Amsterdam, Ghent, and Brussels; it was finally installed in the king’s palace at Brussels in 1830.

In the finished painting, Campbell and Ponsonby are in the group to the right of the 1st Duke of Wellington – Campbell third from the Duke and Ponsonby fifth – their heads in more or less the same positions as in the study.

The origin of this group of studies is elucidated in correspondence between Pieneman, Lord Clancarty, the British Minister at Brussels, and the 1st Duke of Wellington in 1820 (Wellington archives). Pieneman planned to paint the Battle of Waterloo after the success of his picture of the Battle of Quatre Bras (1818, Paleis Soestdijk) at the Brussels Exhibition and, taking the advice of Colonel F.E. Hervey in Brussels, wrote to Lord Clancarty with a view to showing his sketch to the Duke of Wellington. Clancarty suggested to the duke that Pieneman should obtain sittings in London, and the result of the correspondence was several visits to London during 1819–21 and the studies in the collection, all dated 1821. Pieneman also made a study of the Duke’s horse, Copenhagen, at the same time (Stratfield Saye). A sketch of Wellington on horseback is in the Rijksprentenkabinet, Amsterdam.

Other portraits of Ponsonby include a watercolour study by Thomas Heaphy in the N.P.G. (inv. 1914/10) and a full-length ascribed to the same artist, c.1819, formerly in the Royal Lancers Officers’ Mess, Market Harborough (Christie’s, 29 July 1948, lot 2). There is also a marble bust, by Samuel Joseph, in the Wellington Museum.

Of Campbell, there is a profile caricature by Robert Dighton in the Scottish N.P.G. (inv. 2178); a watercolour drawing by Heaphy, 1813, in the N.P.G. (inv. 4320); and a portrait as an older man by William Salter in the N.P.G. (inv. 3702), which is a study for Salter’s Waterloo Banquet, 1836, also on loan to Apsley House.

**CONDITION** Some buckling of the paper surface and several small tears. Surface cleaned, 1995.

**PROV.** Bought by the 1st Duke of Wellington, with twelve other studies, from the artist in 1825 (a counterfoil in one of the Duke’s chequebooks is inscribed: ‘1825, July 21. Mons. Pieneman £417, 18s. Payment for the pictures of the officers’).

**LIT.** Dictionary of British Portraiture 1979, pp. 36, 173

---


Signed on left: JWP/Apsly House/London/1821

Paper on canvas, 30.4 × 24 cm

WM 1470–1948

Study of head and shoulders on a dark background, thinly and loosely painted, with some impasto in highlights. He wears the Army gold cross. Sir Colin Halkett was appointed Lieutenant-Colonel of the King’s German legion in 1803, having served in the Dutch Foot-guards from 1792. He took part in campaigns in Denmark and Sweden in 1807–08 and in the Peninsular War, 1808–13, becoming a Major General in 1814. At Waterloo he commanded a British brigade and was severely wounded. He became a Lieutenant-General in 1830 and a General in 1841, having been Commander-in-Chief at Bombay, 1831–
This is one of thirteen portrait studies painted by Pieneman from life for his large *Battle of Waterloo* (1824) now in the Rijksmuseum (see no. 127 for the origin of the group). In the event, Halkett was not included in the finished picture.

Halkett is also depicted in William Salter’s *Waterloo Banquet*, 1836, and there is a sketch of him for this painting in the N.P.G. (inv. 3720).

**Condition.** Surface cleaned, 1995.

**Prov.** Bought by the 1st Duke of Wellington, with twelve other studies, from the artist in 1825 (see no. 127).

**Lit.** *Dictionary of British Portraiture* 1979, p. 97


Signed on left: JWP/Apsly House/London/1821

Canvas, 64 × 52 cm

WM 1475–1948

Study of head and shoulders on dark background. He wears a black shako with silver chin-strap resting on the peak, and the uniform of the 52nd Regiment.

Sir John Colborne joined the Army in 1794, served in Egypt in 1801, was military secretary to Sir John Moore in Sweden and Portugal in 1808–09 and then joined Wellington as a Lieutenant-Colonel in Spain. After Albuera he took command of the 52nd, one of the three famous regiments which formed the Light Brigade. At Waterloo, his charge played a major part in the defeat of Napoleon’s
Old Guard. Promoted Major General in 1825, he was Lieutenant-Governor of Upper Canada 1828–38. He was elevated to the peerage in 1839, commanded the forces in Ireland 1855–60, and was created Field Marshal on his retirement in 1860.

This is one of thirteen portrait studies painted by Pieneman from life for his large Battle of Waterloo (1824) now in the Rijksmuseum (see no. 127). In the finished painting Seaton, with sword drawn, is at the far end of the group on the right of the 1st Duke of Wellington. There are portraits of him as an older man, by George Jones, 1860–63 (N.P.G., no. 982b), and W. Fisher, 1862, as well as a marble bust by George Adams, 1863 (both formerly United Services Club).


**PROV.** Bought by the 1st Duke of Wellington, with twelve other studies, from the artist in 1825 (see no. 127).

**EXH.** South Kensington 1868 (201); New Gallery, Victorian Exhibition, 1891–92 (91) – in both cases erroneously attributed to H.W. Pickersgill; Ottawa, National Gallery of Canada, A Pageant of Canada, 1967–68 (258, repr.)


Signed on right: JWP/Apsly House/London/1821.

Paper on canvas, 46.3 × 36 cm

WM 1476–1948

Study of head and shoulders on dark background. He wears the scarlet uniform of a Major General, with blue collar and gold epaulettes and the badge of a Knight Commander of the Order of the Bath.

Sir John Elley joined the Royal Horse Guards in 1789, rose from the ranks to become acting adjutant during the campaign in Flanders in 1793–95 and purchased a lieutenancy in 1796. As assistant Adjutant-General of cavalry, he served with distinction throughout the Peninsular War, 1808–13, and he was Adjutant-General of cavalry at Waterloo. In 1835 he was returned to Parliament for Windsor as a supporter of Peel and became a Lieutenant-General in 1837.

This is one of thirteen portrait studies painted by Pieneman from life for his Battle of Waterloo (1824) now in the Rijksmuseum (see no. 127). In the finished painting, Elley is third in the row at the far right of the picture. He is wearing a hat and facing left instead of right as in the study.

Other portraits include a watercolour, showing him full length and in battle, by Thomas Heaphy, 1818 (private collection), and a bust by Raimondo Trentanova, c. 1815 (St George’s Chapel, Windsor). He is also depicted in William Salter’s Waterloo Banquet, 1836, and there is a study of him for this painting in the N.P.G. (no. 3713).

**CONDITION** Two old folds or tears to the paper in the sitter’s face; loss in the paint surface on shoulder and at edge of collar, left. Surface cleaned, 1995.

**PROV.** Bought by the 1st Duke of Wellington, with twelve other studies, from the artist in 1825 (see no. 127).

**LIT.** Dictionary of British Portraiture 1979, p. 72
General Sir George Cooke, K.C.B. (1768–1837)

Signed lower left: JWP/Apsly House/London/1821

Paper on canvas, 42 × 53.3 cm

WM 1478–1948

Study of head and shoulders on a light brown background. He wears the scarlet uniform with gold epaulettes and aiguillettes of a Lieutenant-General, and the badge and star of a Knight Commander of the Bath.

Sir George Cooke entered the 1st Foot Guards in 1784, served in Flanders in 1794, in the Helder campaign in 1799 and in the Scheldt expedition 1809. He served in the Peninsular War 1811–13, was made Major General and commanded a division in the Netherlands in 1813–14. He was present at Quatre Bras and Waterloo, where he lost an arm.

This is one of thirteen portrait studies painted by Pieneman from life for his large Battle of Waterloo (1824) now in the Rijksmuseum (see no. 127). In the finished picture Cooke is shown next to Wellington, on the right.

CONDITION. Surface cleaned, 1995. Horizontal folds in paper at right and left sides; small damage at centre top edge and old loss in paper support at lower right.

PROV. Bought by the 1st Duke of Wellington, with twelve other studies, from the artist in 1825 (see no. 127).

LIT. Dictionary of British Portraiture 1979, p. 50; Rappard 2001, p. 81 fig. 6
Study of head and shoulders, nearly life-size, on a dark brown background. He wears the uniform of a Lieutenant-General with gold epaulettes. On his breast is the star of the Grand Cross of the Bath and from his neck hang the badges of the Orders of Maria Theresa of Austria and St George of Russia.

Rowland Hill was the second son of Sir John Hill, 3rd Bt, of Hawkestone, Shropshire. He joined the 38th Foot in 1790, took leave to study at the military school in Strasbourg and took part in the expedition to Toulon as a captain in 1793. He served at Gibraltar and Minorca, 1796–99, Egypt, 1801–02, Ireland, 1803–05, Hanover, 1805, and throughout the Peninsular campaign, 1808–13, as a divisional commander. M.P. for Shrewsbury 1812–14, he was raised to the peerage as Baron Hill in 1814 and took part at Waterloo, where his horse was shot from under him. When Wellington became Prime Minister in 1828, Hill was appointed Commander-in-Chief of the Army, which he remained until 1842, when he resigned and was raised to a viscountcy.

This is one of thirteen portrait studies painted by Pieneman from life in 1821 for his large Battle of Waterloo (1824) now in the Rijksmuseum (see no. 127 for the origin of the group). In the finished painting, Hill is shown mounted and wearing a hat, on the right, next to Seaton.

There are portraits of Hill by George Dawe (National Army Museum), Thomas Heaphy (water-colour drawing, N.P.G. 1914[6], 1914[7]), J.P. Knight (Government Art Collection, no. 5829) and George Richmond (N.P.G., 1055), engraved in the Rev. Edwin Sidney’s Life of Lord Hill, 1845. He is also shown in William Salter’s Waterloo Banquet, 1836, for which there is a study in the N.P.G. (3724).

CONDITION Additional strips at all four edges; canvas bulging. Surface cleaned, 1995.

PROV. Bought by the 1st Duke of Wellington, with twelve other studies, from the artist in 1825 (see no. 127).

LIT. Dictionary of British Portraiture 1979, p. 108
Another version of the study was sold Christie’s, Amsterdam, 1 Sept. 1999, lot 194 (paper on canvas, 69 × 53.5 cm); a small full-length painting by Pieneman of Anglesey on horseback, different in pose, was recently on the art market (canvas, 43 × 34.5 cm).

CONDITION Blisters caused by paper detachment from canvas.

Prov. Bought by the 1st Duke of Wellington, with twelve other studies, from the artist in 1825 (see no. 127).

Lit. Dictionary of British Portraiture 1979, p. 6

134 Lieutenant-Colonel William Thornhill (d. after 1850)

Signed lower left: JWP/Apsly House/London/ 1821

Paper on canvas, 72.3 × 54.6 cm

WM 1481–1948

Study of head and shoulders, life-size, dark background. He wears a high, black, gold-embroidered shako, with feathers, and the gold-embroidered uniform of the 7th Hussars.

Thornhill entered the 23rd Foot in 1799 and joined the 7th Light Dragoons as a captain in 1806. He served in the Peninsular War and was A.D.C. to Lord Uxbridge (later Marquess of Anglesey) at Waterloo, where he was severely wounded.

This is one of thirteen portrait studies painted by Pieneman from life in 1821 for his large Battle of Waterloo (1824) now in the Rijksmuseum (see no. 127 for the origin of the group). In the finished picture Thornhill is shown in a position identical to the study, on the right, behind Anglesey.
Study of head and shoulders, life-size, on a dark brown background. He wears the scarlet undress uniform of an aide-de-camp.

John Fremantle entered the Coldstream Guards in 1805 and served in Germany in 1806, South America in 1807 and afterwards throughout the Peninsular War. He was A.D.C. to Wellington at Waterloo.

This is one of thirteen portrait studies painted by Pieneman from life in 1821 for his large Battle of Waterloo (1824) now in the Rijksmuseum (see no. 127 for the origin of this group). In the painting Fremantle is shown mounted on the left wearing his cocked hat.

There is a portrait of Fremantle as an older man by William Salter, in the N.P.G. (3715).

CONDITION Slight abrasions lower edge and top left corner; otherwise good.
PROV. Bought by the 1st Duke of Wellington, with twelve other studies, from the artist in 1825 (see no. 127).

Signed at left above shoulder: JWP/Apsly House/London/1821
Paper on canvas, 53.3 × 42 cm
WM 1484–1948

Study, head and shoulders, body facing front, head inclined to the right, light brown background. He wears a cocked hat and feathers and the scarlet uniform of a Major General, turned back with blue and embroidered with gold, and gold epaulettes and aiguillettes. He wears the badge and star of a Knight Commander of the Bath on his breast and the badge at his neck together with the Army gold cross and the badge of the Tower and Sword of Portugal.

Lord Robert Edward Henry Somerset, third son of the 5th Duke of Beaufort and elder brother of Lord Raglan, was commissioned in the 10th Light Dragoons in 1793. He was aide-de-camp to the Duke of York in Holland in 1799 and was promoted to Lieutenant-Colonel in 1800. From 1799 to 1802 he was M.P. for Monmouth, and from 1803 to 1829 for Gloucestershire. He served with distinction throughout the Peninsular War, 1809–13, and was promoted Major General in 1813. At Waterloo he commanded the Household Brigade of Cavalry. He became a General in 1841.

This is one of thirteen portrait studies painted by Pieneman from life for his large Battle of Waterloo (1824) now in the Rijksmuseum (see no. 127). In the finished picture Somerset is shown mounted, with drawn sword, on the left.

Somerset also appears in William Salter’s Waterloo Banquet, 1836, and there is a study of him for this painting in the N.P.G. (3754). There is also a watercolour of him by Thomas Heaphy (N.P.G. 1914 (15)).


Prov.: Bought by the 1st Duke of Wellington, with twelve other studies, from the artist in 1825 (see no. 127).

Lit.: Dictionary of British Portraiture 1979, p. 198

Field Marshal Lord Fitzroy James Henry Somerset, 1st Baron Raglan, G.C.B. (1788–1855)

Signed on left: JWP/Apsly House/London/1821
Paper on canvas, 50 × 40 cm
WM 1486–1948

Study, head and shoulders, life-size on dark brown background. He wears the scarlet uniform of a colonel on the staff and the badge of the Dutch Royal Military Order of William.

Lord Fitzroy James Henry Somerset, eighth youngest son of the 5th Duke of Beaufort, was commissioned in the 4th Light Dragoons in 1804. He served on Wellington’s staff in the Peninsular War from 1808, becoming Wellington’s military secretary in 1811 and a Lieutenant-Colonel in 1812, and at Waterloo, where he lost an arm. After the war he remained Wellington’s secretary and accompanied him on a variety of diplomatic missions. He was M.P. for Truro 1818–20 and 1826–29. In 1852 he was made Master General of the Ordnance and raised to the peerage as Lord Raglan. He commanded the British troops in the Crimea 1854–55, taking part in the battles of Alma, Balaklava and Inkerman. He
was criticized for shortcomings in the organization of supplies in the winter of 1854–55 and died in June 1855 outside Sebastopol.

This is one of thirteen portrait studies painted by Pieneman from life for his large *Battle of Waterloo* (1824) now in the Rijksmuseum (see no. 127). In the finished picture Raglan is shown standing by his horse, next to Wellington. He wears a cocked hat, but the features and posture are the same as in the study.

Raglan also appears in William Salter’s *Waterloo Banquet*, 1836, and there is a study of him for this painting in the N.P.G. (3743). He is portrayed as an older man, in 1853, by Sir Francis Grant (formerly United Services Club); and in a famous photograph by Roger Fenton showing him shortly before his death (1855), together with Omar Pasha and Marshal Pelissier (print in V&A).

**CONDITION.** Horizontal wrinkles in paper below nose and at top centre; otherwise in good condition.

**PROV.** Bought by the 1st Duke of Wellington, with twelve other studies, from the artist, in 1825 (see no. 127).

**EXH.** South Kensington 1868 (188, erroneously as by Pickersgill); New Gallery, *Victorian Exhibition*, 1891–92 (88)

**LIT.** *Dictionary of British Portraiture* 1979, p. 178

**138 General Miguel Ricardo de Alava (1771–1843)**

Signed on left: *JWP/Apsly House/London/1821*

Paper on canvas, 48.8 x 38.7 cm

*WM 1527–1948*
Study of head and shoulders on light brown ground. He wears the uniform of a Spanish officer with open, gold-embroidered collar and gold buttons, the badge of a Knight Commander of the Bath and the red cross of St James of Compostella of Spain.

This is one of thirteen portrait studies painted by Pieneman from life for his large Battle of Waterloo (1824) now in the Rijksmuseum (see no. 127). In the finished picture Alava is shown wearing a cocked hat with feathers, in the group on the right of the 1st Duke of Wellington, between Campbell and Ponsonby.

There is another portrait of Alava at Apsley House – painted by George Dawe in 1818 (see no. 34 for biographical note), as well as a portrait by William Salter, 1834–40 (N.P.G. 3691).

**CONDITION** Some blistering owing to paper separation from canvas; canvas is slack. Surface cleaned, revarnished, 1995.

**PROV.** Bought by the 1st Duke of Wellington, with twelve other studies, from the artist in 1825 (see no. 127).

139 **General Sir James Shaw Kennedy, K.C.B.** (1788–1865)

Signed on right: JWP/Apsly House/London/1821

Paper on canvas, 29.2 × 23.4 cm

WM 1540–1948

Study of head and shoulders on dark background. He wears the scarlet undress uniform of a staff officer.

James Shaw (he took the name of Kennedy, his wife's name, in about 1834) joined the 43rd Light Infantry in 1805, was at Copenhagen in 1807 and fought with distinction in the Peninsular War, 1808–12. In spite of illness, he was recalled to fight at Quatre Bras and Waterloo in 1815 and was promoted
Platzer

Major and made commandant of the garrison at Calais soon after the battle. From 1826 until 1835 he was stationed at Manchester to deal with outbreaks of violence against the combination laws, and in 1836–38 he was Inspector-General of the Irish Constabulary.

This is one of thirteen portrait studies painted by Pieneman from life for his large Battle of Waterloo (1824) now in the Rijksmuseum (see no. 127). In the event, Shaw Kennedy does not appear to have been included in the finished picture.

**CONDITION.** Small areas of old damage in neck and proper left shoulder. Surface cleaned, 1995.

**PROV.** Bought by the 1st Duke of Wellington, with twelve other studies, from the artist, in 1825 (see no. 127).


**Johann Georg PLATZER (1704–1761)**

**Austrian School**

Born in St Paul in Eppan, in the Tyrol, he was a pupil of his stepfather Josef Anton Kessler at Innsbruck and of his uncle Johann Christoph Platzer in Passau. From 1728, when he entered the Vienna Academy, he worked mainly in Vienna. He painted genre, historical and mythological subjects, with a high degree of finish, influenced by the Antwerp school of the seventeenth century, in particular the Francken family and Jan Brueghel.


**140 Antony and Cleopatra at the Battle of Actium**

*Copper, 52 × 80 cm
WM 1496–1948*

The Battle of Actium, 30 BC, marked the defeat of Mark Antony at the hands of Augustus and led to the suicide of Cleopatra (see no. 141). Mark Antony is shown in the central galley commanding his men, while Cleopatra is enthroned on a splendid ship on the right. Platzer used a very similar composition – a mêlée of ships of the ancient world as he saw it – for his depiction of The Rape of Helen (Wallace Collection, no. 634).

This painting and its companion were bought by the 1st Duke of Wellington from the Chevalier Gaspard Thierry, who ascribed them to ‘François Georges Platzer’. No such artist exists, and it is clearly an error for Johann Georg Platzer, but the confusion was compounded when Evelyn Wellington gave them to Johann Victor, the father of Johann Georg, while supplying him with the dates of his son.
In any case the style of the two paintings leaves no room for doubt that they are by Johann Georg Platzer.

Platzer was one of the most prolific painters on copper during the eighteenth century and he frequently depicted classical subjects (Komanecky et al. 1998, pp. 256–57). His facile handling of paint and fluid blending of colour, combined with detailed drapery was suited to works on copper. Platzer frequently used thick and uneven sheets of copper and in the case of the supports for this pair of paintings, the copper was first beaten, then rolled (Komanecky et al. 1998, p. 259, note 8). Platzer’s subject matter and technique were influenced by Flemish artists such as Frans Francken II (1581–1642), whose work could be seen in Vienna (Schubert 2000, p. 83).

CONDITION Generally sound.

PROV. Bought together with its companion by the 1st Duke of Wellington in Paris in 1817, for 3000 frs. from the Chevalier Gaspard Thierry. According to Thierry these two paintings ’ont été donnés en recompense de services éminents par le roi de Bavière à un Prince Hohenzollern, d’après ce que le Prince Charles d’Issenbourg, qui les a vus, en a dit au propriétaire actuel’ (letter of 17 Jan. 1817 in Wellington archive).

EXH. B.I., Old Masters, 1819 (128)

The Death of Cleopatra

Copper, 52 × 80 cm
WM 1493–1948

After Mark Antony’s defeat by Augustus at the Battle of Actium, Cleopatra resolved not to become the prisoner of Augustus and killed herself by applying an asp to her arm. The picture shows a magnificent hall with rococo decoration, in which Cleopatra, dying on her throne, is attended by a physician. Augustus, accompanied by a retinue of soldiers, is approaching the dying queen.

Cleopatra’s death is traditionally depicted either by a single figure (for example, by Guido Reni, Palazzo Pitti, Florence; or by Guercino, Sir Denis Mahon Collection) or with the queen and a small group of attendants (e.g. Jordaens, Kassel, Staatliche Kunstsammlung). The huge throng of figures in this painting appears to be Platzer’s own variation on the theme.

PROV.; LIT. See previous entry.
EXH. B.I., Old Masters, 1819 (137)
Formerly BREENBERGH
Cornelis van POELENBURCH (c. 1595–1667)
Dutch (Utrecht) School

Born in Utrecht, where he studied under Abraham Bloemaert, he was in Rome and Florence from 1617 until about 1627, when he returned to settle in Utrecht. Under the influence of Bril and Elsheimer, he specialized in Italianate landscapes peopled with mythological figures.


14 Landscape with Classical Ruins and Figures
Inscribed with inventory no.: 82
Copper, 31.8 × 43.2 cm
WM 1647–1948

Although attributed to Bartholomeus Breenbergh at least since it entered the collection, WM 1647 is almost certainly a work by Poelenburch, as Roethlisberger (1981) was first to point out. Works by the artists from the 1620s, when both were active in Rome, have been confused since the eighteenth century; however
this painting exhibits the simple spatial organization, smooth brushwork, and overall crystalline quality that characterize works by Poelenburch. The tall tree framing the composition at left, the sharply defined foreground zone, and the delineation of the figures are all typical of paintings from his Italian period. There are several comparable works on copper in the Galeria Palatina, Florence, all datable to c. 1600–25 (nos. 1195, 466, and 422; see M. Chiarini, I dipinti olandesi del Seicento e del Settecento, Gallerie e musei statali di Firenze, Rome, 1989, pp. 404–43), a date which also seems appropriate for WM 1647.

CONDITION Some small areas of damage above hills in left background, otherwise good.  
PROV. Spanish royal collection (not identified in the inventories); captured at Vitoria, 1813.  
LIT. Gaya Nuño 1964, no. 172; M. Roethlisberger, Bartolomeus Breenbergh: The Paintings, Berlin and New York, 1981, p. 36, no. 42 (as by Poelenburch); Sluijter-Seiffert 1984, no. 152 (as by Poelenburch, Landschap met ruïne van het Colosseum).

142 The Crucifixion, with the Fall of the Rebel Angels

Signed on stone centre foreground: CP, inscribed in white with a St Andrew’s cross, lower right, and inventory no.: 447, lower left  
Oak panel, 57.5 × 50.7 cm  
WM 1610–1948

Mary Magdalen embraces the Cross while John and Mary stand together on the right. There are numerous figures on the hillside, including, on the left, a group casting lots for Christ’s garments. Jerusalem is outlined in the distance on the left. Balancing the Crucifixion, on the right, is the Fall of the Rebel Angels, with the good angel, probably to be identified with St Michael, flogging a sinner beneath whom is a snake and skull.

The diagonally placed Cross occurs occasionally in the sixteenth century, but it was with the compositional experiments of Rubens in the second decade of the seventeenth century that it became popular (Alte Pinakothek, Munich, inv. 339; Koninklijk Museum voor Schone Kunsten, Antwerp, inv. 297; Jaffé 1989, nos. 239, 200 respectively). It was Rubens, also, who returned to the late Gothic type of Christ with the body low on the Cross, arms tautly stretched and the head sunk down on the chest. Of the numerous Crucifixions derived from Rubens, it is perhaps with those of Van Dyck that WM 1610 can be most closely compared (e.g. Musée des Beaux Arts, Lille, c. 1630; G. Glück, Van Dyck (K.d.K.), Stuttgart, 1931, pl. 224). It is worth noting that Poelenburch was personally acquainted with both Rubens and Van Dyck.

There are depictions of the Fall of the Rebel Angels – the expulsion from Paradise of the Sons of God who had lusted after earthly women – as early as the tenth century, but the theme’s popularity in the Counter-Reformation was due to the interpretation of Michael’s victory as a symbol of the Church’s triumph over heresy. As in this instance, the composition is similar to both the Last Judgment and to St Michael and the Devil. What is so unusual here is the combination of the Fall of the Rebel Angels with the Crucifixion. One may presume an intended contrast between the Fall and Salvation, and, indeed, whenever the Fall of the Rebel Angels is shown with other scenes, it is used as an antithesis to the subject.
that is being glorified (K.A. Wirth, ‘Engelsturz’, Reallexikon zur Deutschen Kunstgeschichte, V, 1967, cols. 654ff., esp. 671). The fact that it is painted on oak panel indicates that this picture originated in the Netherlands after Poelenburch’s return from Rome in 1627. Such devotional images, painted at Utrecht, provide further evidence for the existence of a considerable Catholic minority in the northern Netherlands at this period. Indeed, although the painters of Utrecht were the principal exponents of Dutch religious painting in the seventeenth century, they were by no means the only ones (S. Slive, ‘Notes on the Relationship of Protestantism to Seventeenth-Century Dutch Painting’, Art Quarterly, 19, 1956, pp. 3ff.; P.J.J. van Thiel, ‘Catholic Elements in Seventeenth-Century Dutch Painting …’, Simiolus, xx, 1990–91, pp. 39–62, etc.).

CONDITION Scratches in right background, otherwise good. There is a slight warp to the panel, which is bevelled on all sides.

Prov. Possibly Jacques Meyers, Rotterdam; possibly Meyers sale, Rotterdam, 9 Sept. 1722, lot 119 (fl. 320); acquired by Philip V (1700–1746) before 1727. His ownership is indicated by the white cross. La Granja inventory, 1746, no. 447; Aranjuez inventory, 1794, no. 477; captured at Vitoria, 1813.

143 The Angels guiding the Shepherds to the Nativity

Signed on stone, left foreground: CP
Copper, 41.2 × 33.3 cm
WM 1588–1948

The half-draped, gesturing classical figures and the baroque arrangement of the angels are derived from Italian painting and indicate a date after Poelenburch’s return from Italy in c. 1627. This is a fine example of his religious compositions; comparable works with similar groups of angels include an Annunciation to the Shepherds (Gray, Musée Baron Martin, inv. 1694; Paris 1970–71, under no. 162), an Annunciation (c. 1635; Vienna, Kunsthistorisches Museum, inv. 614), an Adoration of the Shepherds (Rutland sale, Christie’s, 16 April 1926, lot 31, later Bernard Houthakker gallery, Amsterdam, exh. 1968) and an Adoration of the Magi (Geneva, Musée d’art et d’histoire). There was a version of the Wellington picture in the Gerhardt sale, Lepke, Berlin, November 1911 (lot 22, repr.), and another with W. J. Hoogsteder, The Hague, 1990 (signed; panel, 47.5 × 36.5 cm). A drawing in red chalk of the figures at left (sale Sotheby’s, Amsterdam, 1 Dec. 1968, lot 33; A. Chong, ‘The Drawings of Cornelis van Poelenburch’, Master Drawings, 25, 1987, p. 50, no. 121) may have been made as a ricordo to enable the artist to repeat the figures precisely in subsequent iterations of the painting.

CONDITION Small areas of flaking and retouching, passim.
Portuguese

Prov. Possibly Jacques Meyers, Rotterdam; possibly Meyers sale, Rotterdam, 9 Sept. 1722, lot 123 (with dimensions 1 voet 1 duim x 1 voet 4 1/2 duim; fl. 200); acquired by Philip V (1700–1746) before 1727; La Granja inventory, 1746, no. 85; Aranjuez inventory, 1794, no. 85 (perhaps identifiable with a Nativity by Poelenburch in the 1794 inventory, where the size is given as 1 1/4 pie by 1 pie y seis (i.e. 38 x 45.7 cm); captured at Vitoria, 1813.


PORTUGUESE School, c. 1822

144 King John VI of Portugal (1769–1826)

Canvas, 208 x 136 cm, including 5 cm strip at bottom, a later addition

WM 1466–1948

He wears an ermine cloak with purple border over a yellow silk coat and knee-breeches. On his chest is the ‘triple-coloured’ sash of the order of Christ, St James and Aviz. The royal arms of Portugal are embroidered on the tablecloth on the right.
John VI was the son of Peter III of Portugal. He became Regent in 1799 and fled to Brazil at the time of the French invasion in 1807. In 1816 he became king, but refused to leave Brazil, and it was not until 1822 that he returned to Portugal, promising to uphold the constitution drawn up after the revolution of 1820. However, he abolished it in the following year, with the result that he was faced with renewed revolt.

The best portraits of John VI are by Domingos Antonio de Sequeira (1768–1837), court painter and designer of the famous Portuguese silver table service at Apsley House (see D. Lord, ‘Sequeira: A Neglected Portuguese Painter’, *The Burlington Magazine*, lxxiv, 1939, pp. 153ff.; exh. cat., Groeninge Museum, Bruges, *La Toison d’Or*, 1962, nos. 300ff.). However, WM 1466 does not appear to approach Sequeira’s portraits in quality and no artist’s name was connected with the picture when it was presented by the sitter to the Duke of Wellington, presumably not long after his return to Portugal in 1822.

**CONDITION.** Marked discoloration, otherwise good.

**PROV.** Presented to the 1st Duke of Wellington by King John VI of Portugal.


145 After RAPHAEL (formerly) see ROMANO

**Guido RENI (1575–1642)**

*Italian (Bolognese) School*

Born in Bologna, he studied under Denys Calvaert c. 1584–93 and then in the Carracci academy from 1594/95. In the early part of his career he worked in Rome, but moved back to Bologna from about 1625. He was one of the principal exponents of early baroque art in Italy.


**After Guido RENI**

146 **Head of St Joseph**

Inscribed in white with crosses and inventory no.: x.109.x

Canvas, oval 70.5 × 56.2 cm

WM 1513–1948

This picture is not included in any of the catalogues raisonnés of Reni’s work (Gnudi, Cavalli 1955;
Garboli, Baccheschi 1971, Pepper 1984) and it does not seem likely that it is by Reni’s hand, despite
the attribution to Guido under which it entered the Spanish royal collection in the early eighteenth cen-
tury. It is very similar in style and posture to the St Jerome in the Capitoline Gallery, Rome (Pepper 1984,
p. 271, pl. 173, c. 1633–34) and also to the St Joseph in the Galleria Nazionale d’Arte Antica, Rome (Pepper
1984, p. 288, pl. 223, c. 1639–40), although Richard Spear (written opinion to author, 2008) suggests com-
parisons in the brushwork with earlier work by Reni of the 1620s. Of the many drawings of such heads
by Guido perhaps the closest is the one in the Palais des Beaux-Arts, Lille (Gernsheim photo no. 18211).
The white St Andrew’s cross usually indicates a painting acquired by Philip V, though in the La Granja
(San Ildefonso) inventory of 1746 this picture is listed with those of his wife Elisabetta Farnese, which
formed a separate collection. It remained at La Granja until 1812, when it was one of a group of twelve
pictures (only two have been identified – the other is the Sainted Nun, no. 77) presented to the 1st Duke
of Wellington by the Intendant of Segovia on behalf of the Spanish nation (see Introduction, p. 10).

**CONDITION.** Paint surface considerably worn, especially on right side of face and neck; cleaned by S. Isepp in 1950.

**PROV.** Counts of Altamira, Palace of Morata de Tajuña (see López-Fanjul Díez del Corral and Pérez Preciado
2005, p. 101); Philip V and Isabella Farnese collections, La Granja inventories 1746, 1774, 1794, no. 905, ‘una
pintura original en lienzo de Guido Reni una caveza de san Joseph su forma ovalado’; presented to the 1st Duke of
Wellington by the Intendant of Segovia, 15 August 1812, described as ‘La Cabeza de San José: su autor Huido
Reni’ (Palacio Real Archives, Madrid, AGP Historica, box 129)

**LIT.** Pérez Sánchez 1965, p. 176 (as Guido Reni); Gaya Nuño 1964, p. 86, no. 281, pl. 95; Aterido Fernández 2004,
II, p. 453 (no. 885); M. López-Fanjul Díez del Corral and J.J. Pérez Preciado, ‘Los números y marcas de colec-
ción en los cuadros del Museo del Prado’, Boletín del Museo del Prado, XI, 2005, pp. 84–110, see p. 101 and n. 93
Sir Joshua REYNOLDS, P.R.A. (1723–1792)
British School

Born in Devon, the son of a clergyman, Reynolds went to Italy in 1749 and returned in 1752 determined to bring the influence of Italian baroque painting to English portraiture. He was, with Gainsborough, the leading portrait painter in London and this, together with his importance as a theorist, led to his appointment as first President of the Royal Academy in 1768.


Traditionally ascribed to REYNOLDS

147 Landscape with the Flight into Egypt
Canvas, 61.5 × 51.3 cm
WM 1545–1948
From its appearance alone, it is hard to imagine why this painting was ever attributed to Reynolds. The few religious scenes he painted, for example the *Holy Family* of 1788 in Tate Britain, are quite different, primarily figure subjects with the landscape kept firmly in the background. We know from C.R. Leslie that Reynolds ‘did not neglect the study of landscape’ during his early years in Devon, 1746–49 (C.R. Leslie, *Life and Times of Sir Joshua Reynolds*, London, I, 1865, p. 34), and Northcote lists two or three landscapes in his catalogue of Reynolds’ paintings (J. Northcote, *Life of Sir Joshua Reynolds*, 2nd edn, 1818, II, p. 350). On this slender basis, over thirty landscapes were attributed to Reynolds in the course of the nineteenth century. They are listed by Graves and Cronin (1899, pp. 1233ff.) but they have not been included in any more recent survey of his work.

WM 1545 is based on a Claudian type of composition; indeed a close comparison can be made with Claude’s *Pastoral Landscape with the Flight into Egypt* at Dresden (M. Roethlisberger, *Claude Lorrain: the Paintings*, London, 1961, no. 110, fig. 191). There is nothing inherently unlikely about Reynolds painting such a subject in his early years, but the crudity of the execution makes it a very doubtful hypothesis in this instance.

**CONDITION.** Severe bitumen craquelure in dark areas; tendency to blister.

**PROV.** John, 2nd Baron Northwick (1770–1859), died intestate; his posthumous sale, Phillips, 24 Aug. 1859, lot 1835; bought by Archbold for the 2nd Duke of Wellington for £35.14s.


---

**After REYNOLDS**

**148 Self-portrait, wearing Glasses**

Panel, 71 × 62 cm

Wm 1533–1948

This is probably a nineteenth-century copy of the self-portrait in the Royal Collection at Windsor Castle (panel, 75 × 63.4 cm; Millar 1969, p. 98, no. 1008, pl. 105). The original, painted in 1788, was Reynolds’s last portrait of himself.

Among other replicas and old copies are those at Petworth House, Dulwich Picture Gallery and Kenwood House.

**CONDITION.** Cleaned by H. Rogers in 1950.

**PROV.** Henry W. Phillips sale, Christie’s, 8 April 1869, lot 193; W.B. Beaumont sale, Christie’s, July 1881, lot 239, bought by Martin Colnaghi for £17.17s; Messrs. Henry Graves and Co., from whom bought by the 2nd Duke of Wellington on 1 May 1882 for 250 guineas (£262.10s).

Born in Játiva, near Valencia, he was a pupil of Francisco Ribalta, but went to Italy at an early age and remained there for the rest of his life. Documented in Rome in 1612, he settled in Naples in 1616 and enjoyed the patronage of the Spanish Viceroy's. He painted mainly religious subjects in a Caravaggesque style.


149 St James the Great

Inscribed in white with inventory no.: 412.
Canvas, 45 × 101 cm
WM 1619–1948

St James is identified by his pilgrim's staff. He is shown reading the inscription on the parapet ASCENIT AD CAELOS SEDET AD DEXTERA[M] (he ascended into Heaven and sits at the right side [of the Father]). This is the sixth article of the Apostles' Creed.
This painting was engraved as by Ribera by Josef Vázquez in 1792 when it was in the Royal Palace, Madrid (inscribed: Santiago el Menor (sic) cuyo original se halla en el Real Palacio de Madrid; published in Cuadros en el Real Palacio y en el Museo de Madrid, Madrid (1787–58) and it was catalogued as such in the Wellington collection. However, it was not listed by A.L. Mayer (1923), and was described as a studio production by C.M. Felton (PhD., 1971). Its quality is such that it can be considered autograph and it is accepted as such in the most recent monograph on the artist and dated 1630–32 (Spinosa 2006, p. 304). No other version of the composition is known, though the type of the half-length figure enveloped by a cloak recurs frequently in Ribera’s work and the foreshortening of the head is paralleled in the St Paul the Hermit in the Prado (Mayer 1923, pl. 46).

**CONDITION** Retouched areas on cloak; vertical line of damage down the centre. Cleaned by S. Isepp in 1950.

**Prov.** Royal Palace Madrid, 1792 (date of engraving); captured at Vitoria, 1813.

**Exh.** Agnew’s, Third Magnasco Society Exhibition, 1926 (6) (see Osbert Sitwell, ‘The Magnasco Society’, Apollo, LXXIX, May 1964, p. 383)

**Lit.** Gaya Nuño 1958, no. 2277 (as Ribera); Paintings at Apsley House, 1965, pl. 14; C.M. Felton, Jusepe de Ribera, PhD. dissertation, Univ. of Pittsburgh, 1971, no. S.22 (studio); Pérez Sánchez, Spinosa 1978, no. 79 (uncertain); Spinosa 2003, p. 280, A96 (as Ribera); N. Spinosa, Ribera, Naples, 2006 (2nd revised edn), p. 304, no. A116
Ribera painted many compositions of the Baptist but none is very close to the Wellington picture. It was accepted as autograph by Mayer (1923). Gabriele Finaldi recently confirmed his belief that it is autograph, but suggests the date may have been mistakenly reinforced and is more likely to be 1630 (written communication, 2008). The authority of the inscription is called into question by the date 1650. This was the period of Ribera’s late, most expressionist style, at which period emaciated saints dominate his work. Felton questioned the work’s authenticity in his doctoral thesis (1971), but later accepted that it was by Ribera (Fort Worth 1982, p. 225). He suggested that the canvas may have been harshly conserved and cut down in the nineteenth century and the inscribed date tampered with, arguing that the figure was painted earlier than 1650. Spinosa (1978) noted the work’s resemblance to Ribera’s *St John the Baptist*, c. 1640 (Prado, inv. P1108). Spinosa (2003, p. 323, A239) believes the work to be autograph and records the sale of a workshop copy from the collection of Piero Pagano, Genoa, at Finarte in Milan (2003), attributed to Guarino.
**Ribera**

**CONDITION** Somewhat worn in sky and flesh. Retouched paint loss on chest and face, at left eye and nose, and on sheep. Cleaned by S. Isepp, 1950.

**PROV.** Royal Palace, Madrid; 1794 inventory, in the Palace oratory; captured at Vitoria, 1813.


**151 Hecate: Procession to a Witches’ Sabbath**

Inscribed lower left: R.V. inventor/Yoseph de Ribera pingit/16 – ; inventory no. in red, lower left: 90

Copper, 34.3 × 65.5 cm

WM 1580–1948

This is an exact copy, with only minor variants, of an engraving of c. 1520–25 ascribed to Agostino dei Musi, called Agostino Veneziano (36.1 × 63.8 cm; Bartsch 1803–21, XIV, p. 426). Only the group of tiny figures around a fire, representing a witches’ Sabbath, and the crescent moon are not in the engraving. The inscription R.V. inventor may be read as Raphael Urbinas inventor, which suggests that the original design for the engraving was Raphael’s. Although there is no corroborating evidence, this is not an implausible tradition and it has been accepted by several authorities (Bartsch 1803–21; Pittaluga 1930).
Only the inscription connects this painting with Ribera and it is in a form which does not appear elsewhere. In style the picture is not typical of Ribera’s work; the greenish-blue and reddish flesh tones suggest a Flemish origin, possibly under the influence of Rubens. The copper support also indicates a Netherlandish rather than a Spanish origin. Certainly, if the attribution to Ribera in the inscription is taken at face value, this can only be a youthful work. It is hardly conceivable that it is a painting by the mature Ribera after c. 1620. Spinosa (2003, p. 364, C37) includes this work under ‘problem attributions’ and suggests a possible attribution to Salvator Rosa, based on the style of his Florentine period and the numerous witchcraft compositions in his oeuvre (Naples 2008, p. 182). This is rejected, however, by other scholars in the field, who believe that it can be confidently given to Ribera (Gabriele Finaldi, verbal opinion, 2008, see also X. Salomon, The Burlington Magazine, July 2008, p. 495).

The subject has been variously interpreted. Its components are the skeleton of a huge monster ridden by a witch and accompanied by heroic figures. E. Tietze-Conrat (1936) identified the witch as Hecate, goddess of magic, whose retinue included the souls of those who died before their time, particularly children, or who were killed by force. Hence she is here shown picking up children and putting them into a brazier, while the heroic figures in her train also represent those who died before their time. This is a plausible interpretation, based on classical descriptions of Hecate combined with the evidence of fifteenth-century witchcraft trials, but there are no pictorial parallels to this composition. Helen Langdon (letter, 2008) suggests instead that the scene depicts the Renaissance idea of a witches’ Sabbath elaborated in contemporary witchcraft manuals such as Malleus Maleficarum (1486), in which the witches anoint themselves with the blood of dead babies and become airborn, departing in a cavalcade to the Sabbath.

CONDITION A few small areas retouched; good on the whole. Cleaned in 1950 and 2008.

PROV. Don Juan Alfonso Enríquez de Cabrera, Admiral of Castile, 1647; recorded in the Alcázar in 1666 (according to Madrid 1992, p. 364; Spinosa 2008, p. 182); Spanish royal collection: 1734 inventory of pictures saved from the fire in the Alcázar, no. 219; 1772 inventory of the Royal Palace, Madrid, no. 90, King’s withdrawing room; 1794 inventory, no. 90, first room in new wing; captured at Vitoria, 1813.

EXH. B.I., Old Masters, 1828 (59); Birmingham Society of Arts, 1831; B.I., Old Masters, 1854 (reviewed The Times, 5 June 1854); Madrid, Prado and New York, Metropolitan Museum, Ribera, 1992 (109); Naples, Museo Nazionale di Capodimonte, Salvator Rosa, tra mito e magia, 2008 (49) (reviewed The Burlington Magazine, CL, July 2008, pp. 493–95)

Formerly Philipp Peter ROOS, called Rosa da Tivoli  
Cajetan ROOS, called Gaetano de Rosa (1690–1770)  
*Austrian School*

Working in Germany, the Netherlands, Italy and Austria, five generations of the Roos family painted animals, landscapes and portraits for an elite clientele. The founder, Johann Heinrich Roos (1631–1685), introduced a baroque style of landscape and animal painting to Germany that was successfully imitated by his descendants. His grandson Cajetan (Gaetano) initially painted Italianate landscapes with herdsmen and cattle; after about 1740 he painted altarpieces for Austrian churches.


152 *Shepherd and Cattle*  
Canvas, 87.7 × 133.6 cm  
WM 1648–1948

Until its recent relining, the back of the canvas bore the inscription *Pt. Nro. Sro.* (Príncipe Nuestro Señor), indicating that it belonged to Charles IV when he was still Prince of the Asturias. This inscription should be accepted at its face value even though the picture is not recorded in the inventory of c. 1782 of Charles IV’s collection in the Casita del Príncipe of the Escorial, published by J. Zarco Cuevas (for other paintings from this collection see under d’Arpino, Sassoferrato and Vernet).
Attributed by Kauffmann (1982) to Philipp Peter Roos (Rosa da Tivoli), WM 1648 has recently been proposed by H. Jedding (1998) as a work by that artist’s son, Cajetan (Gaetano de Rosa). While animals typically form a dense barrier across the foreground in pastoral landscapes by the former, comparable scenes by Cajetan devote greater space to the surrounding landscape, buildings and ruins. The ‘cruder’ execution noted by Kauffmann is also characteristic of works by the son, as is the relatively finer detailing of distant buildings. Comparable paintings are in the Residenz, Würzburg (Jedding 1998, figs. 403, 404); all probably date to the 1730s.

**CONDITION** Lined in 1974, when a long horizontal tear through the rump of the standing cow was repaired. Another vertical tear through hill, left of centre; some additional damage in sky, left.

**PROV.** Collection of Charles IV when Prince of the Asturias, in the Casita del Príncipe of El Escorial; captured at Vitoria, 1813.

**LIT.** Jedding 1998, p. 272, fig. 402

Formerly after RAPHAEL

**Giulio ROMANO (1492/9–1546)**

*Italian (Roman and Mantuan) School*

Trained by Raphael in Rome, where he assisted in the decoration of the papal apartments in the Vatican, Giulio Romano was later best known for his monumental fresco and decorative programmes and architectural projects. He moved to Mantua in 1524, becoming court artist to Federico II Gonzaga, 1st Duke of Mantua, for whom he designed the Palazzo del Te and the Palazzo Ducale.


**145 The Virgin and Child**

*Panel, 51 × 37 cm*

*WM 1618–1948*

Although this painting is patently based on Raphael’s *Madonna della Sedia* in the Galleria Palatina, Palazzo Pitti, Florence, it differs from it in several respects. The original is round, indeed it is the quintessential tondo. In WM 1618, St John has been omitted on the right and a lit candle placed there instead. Both faces have been changed: the Virgin, with her piercing dark eyes, has been beautified, and her costume has been changed; she no longer wears a turban as in the original.

The early authorities were full of praise for this picture. Mengs (1782) thought that the head of the Madonna ‘is his (Raphael’s) and has equal merit to any of his works, being full of life and spirit’, and Ponz wrote: ‘The head of the Virgin and that of the Child in this picture are evidently finished by Raphael himself’. By the time it reached England it had attracted an attribution to Giulio Romano,
and in a letter to the 1st Duke of Wellington dated 9 Feb. 1814, Lord Maryborough wrote: ‘West said the Correggio and the Julio Romano ought to be framed in diamonds, and that it was worth fighting the battle for them.’ This attribution was noted by Waagen (1954), maintained by Evelyn Wellington, and defended by Adolfo Venturi (1926), who enumerated the Virgin’s beauty and strong *chiaroscuro* as specifically typical of Giulio Romano. The attribution to Giulio Romano, however, has been much disputed and WM 1618 was dismissed as an old copy of the *Madonna della Sedia* (Dussler 1971), and further rejected by Ferino Pagden (1989). More recently, scholars have re-attributed the work to Giulio Romano and dated it to before Raphael’s death c. 1517–19 (Joannides 1985). A detailed technical examination has brought to light numerous revisions in the composition, particularly at the foot of the chair-post and the replacement of the Virgin’s turban with the existing chignon (Young, Joannides 1995, p. 731–35). Various copies of this version exist, most notably in the Prado, Madrid (Ruiz Manero 1992, p. 97).


**Prov.** According to Ruiz Manero (1996, p. 96) Spanish royal collection, Royal Palace, Madrid, 1734 inventory (1095); 1747 handed over to don Santiago Bonavia; Royal Palace, 1772 inventory (Princess’s Antechamber), Royal Palace, 1789 inventory (95) (Dressing room); Royal Palace, Madrid 1794 (Ponz: Princess’s room); captured at Vitoria, 1813.

**Exh.** B.I., Old Masters, 1828 (40, *as Giulio Romano*); Birmingham Society of Arts, 1831
Rosa


Salvator ROSA (1615–1673)

Italian School

Born in Naples, he studied under his uncle Domenico Greco, but was strongly influenced by Ribera and Aniello Falcone. He left Naples for Rome in 1635, then moved to Tuscany before finally settling in Rome after 1649. He painted a wide variety of subjects, but has remained best known for his landscapes with craggy rocks and broken trees, which provided the inspiration for the Picturesque in eighteenth-century English landscape gardening.


153 Battle Scene with Classical Colonnade

Signed on plank lower left: SR (monogram); inscribed in white with inventory no.: 159
Canvas, 84 × 153 cm
WM 1591–1948

Under the influence of Aniello Falcone, Salvator Rosa painted battle scenes from the beginning of his career. Indeed, his earliest known dated picture is a Battle of 1637 (formerly W. Mostyn-Owen coll.; Salerno 1975, no. 7). The majority of these were painted while he was living in Tuscany (Florence, Siena, Pisa) in 1640–49 (Salerno 1975, nos. 88–94) and WM 1591 can be placed in the same period, for it is very close to them in both style and composition. Even the motif of the Corinthian columns – setting the scene in the classical period – is a recurrent feature (e.g. Palazzo Pitti, Florence; Kunsthistorisches Museum, Vienna, dated 1645; Salerno 1975, nos. 89,94). The Wellington picture is one of his smaller battle scenes comparable to those in the Palazzo Pitti and in Althorp; Salerno 1975, nos. 89, 90). The
Louvre houses one of Rosa’s finest battle scenes (111), commissioned in 1652 for Louis XIV of France. By this time, Rosa would only paint such works for important patrons, writing to a friend: ‘I think you know how repugnant I find this sort of painting, even though it is my home ground for beating any painter that wants to attack me. Besides, the job involves some extremely hard work’ (Scott 1995, p. 100). Rosa made numerous small individual figure sketches in ink in the development of the composition. Rosa’s satirical poem Guerra, written in 1647, reflected his indignation over the cost of war, and may have been inspired by the popular Neapolitan uprising, the Masaniello revolt, which took place in the same year (Tomory 1990, p. 259).

Although they form only a minor aspect of his total output, Salvator Rosa’s battle pieces exerted a considerable influence on specialists in this field throughout the seventeenth century, such as Jacques Courtois, Il Borgognone.

**Condition.** Generally rubbed, especially in the sky and dark areas; retouched area of irregular width down left edge.

**Prov.** Spanish royal collection (not identified in the inventories); captured at Vitoria, 1813.

**Exh.** Second Magnasco Society Exhibition, Agnew’s, 1925 (14) (see Osbert Sitwell, Apollo, lxxix, May 1964, p. 382). Tokyo 1990–91 (6)

Rubens

Sir Peter Paul RUBENS (1577–1640)
Flemish (Antwerp) School

Born in Siegen, Westphalia, of an Antwerp family, Rubens moved in 1587 to Antwerp where, after leaving school, he became a pupil of Adam van Noort and Otto van Veen. From 1600–08 he lived in Italy, entering the service of Vincenzo I Gonzaga, Duke of Mantua, on whose behalf he visited Spain in 1603. He returned to Antwerp in 1608, and was appointed painter to the Brussels court of the Archduke Albert in the following year. He was commissioned by Marie de Médicis to execute a series of paintings for the Luxembourg Palace and accordingly visited Paris in 1622 and 1625. His activities as a diplomat took him to Spain in 1628 and to London in 1629–30, when he was knighted by Charles I. Having returned to Antwerp in 1630, he carried out the paintings for the ceiling of the Whitehall Banqueting House in the succeeding year. He died in 1640, renowned as a courtier and diplomat as well as a painter.


154 Ana Dorotea, Daughter of Rudolph II, a Nun at the Convent of the Descalzas Reales, Madrid

Canvas, 73 × 65.4 cm

WM 1626–1948

The sitter is in the habit of the Barefooted Carmelites, as worn by members of the Spanish royal family and other noble families who, on retiring to this Madrid cloister, were called the Descalzas Reales (royal barefooted nuns). In style and subject this painting fits well into a series of portraits of members of the Spanish royal family carried out by Rubens during his visit to Madrid in 1628. The painter Pacheco recorded: ‘In the nine months that he spent in Madrid … he painted many things, as we shall see (such is his dexterity and his ease). First of all, he portrayed the kings and the infantes in half-length, to take to Flanders; he made of His Majesty five portraits …. He painted a portrait of the Infanta from the Descalzas in more than half-length, and made copies after them’ (F. Pacheco, El arte de la pintura, ed. B. Bassegoda I Hugás, Madrid, 1990, trans. Vergara 1999, p. 10. For other portraits in the series and a discussion of the group, see Wildenstein 1950, nos. 33–34).

There has been considerable discussion concerning the identity of WM 1626. Catalogued simply as the ‘portrait of a nun’ by Evelyn Wellington, the picture was recognized as a version of a painting in the cloister of the Descalzas Reales at Madrid by Ellis Waterhouse (1949 Arts Council exhibition). This painting was inscribed with the name Sor Margarita de la Cruz, daughter of Maximilian II, and Waterhouse accepted this identification for the Wellington picture also. Subsequently, it was pointed out by Ludwig Burchard (Wildenstein 1950) that Sor Margarita de la Cruz was 61 in 1628 and totally blind and hence that the identification was hardly acceptable. Burchard suggested that the name Margarita on the inscription nevertheless provided a clue and identified the sitter as the Infanta Margarita, sister of Philip IV (for a reproduction of the Descalzas version before
cleaning, see *Catalogo de la exposition franciscana*, Madrid, Sociedad Española de Amigos de Arte, 1927, no. 22, pl. 27).

A decade later, the Descalzas Reales portrait was cleaned and the inscription disappeared, together with a considerable amount of nineteenth-century repaint, and thus the name Margarita was finally dissociated from the sitter. The convincing identification of the Infanta Ana Dorotea was made by Maria Teresa Ruiz Alcón (1963), on the basis of a comparison with another portrait by Andres Lopez. Ana Dorotea was the daughter of Emperor Rudolf II (see above cat. 1) by his mistress Catherine de Strada. She came from Austria to Spain in 1623, entered the monastery of the Descalzas and took her vow in 1628, aged seventeen. She may be identified with the Infanta at the Descalzas discussed by Pacheco, and the replica is also mentioned by him. However, Vergara draws attention to the fact that the portrait mentioned by Pacheco is specifically described as ‘more than half-length’, whereas both WM 1626 and the Descalzas version are half-length or less. Both WM 1626 and the Descalzas version were in the royal collection in 1794; they are described in the inventory as ‘two portraits of nuns … holding rosaries … by Rubens’ (nos. 58 and 59). Whether the version in the Descalzas is in fact by Rubens remains an open question; according to Jaffé (1989) it is a copy.

**CONDITION** Some wear in dark areas; otherwise good.

**PROV.** Collection Florencio Kelly by 1732 (no. 10); collection Juan Kelly (d. 1763) (no. 58, ‘Dos retratos de dos Religiosas de las Descalzas Reales de la Casa de Austria, de bara de alto, y tres quartas de ancho, con marcos, originales...')
Rubens

de Rubens, 2,000 [reales]); among the paintings selected by Mengs in 1764 for the collection of Carlos III; Spanish royal collection; Royal Palace inventory 1794, nos. 58–59, passage to the library; captured at Vitoria, 1813.

EXH. Grafton Gallery, Second National Loan Exhibition, 1913–14, no. 45, pl. 45; V&A, 1947 (11); Arts Council 1949 (7), pl. 2 (entry by E.K. Waterhouse); Wildenstein, Peter Paul Rubens, 1950 (35), repr. (entry by L. Burchard); Madrid, Museo Municipal, La Alianza de dos monarquías: Wellington en España, 1988 (7.1.7); Tokyo 1990–91 (24)


155 Head of an Old Man
Oak panel, oval, 49.7 × 36.2 cm
WM 1570–1948
Rubens

The costume suggests a date c. 1620; a comparable portrait of the same period, though not with a sketchy background, is in the collection of R. Crosby Kemper, Kansas City (panel, 64 × 48 cm; Jaffé 1989, p. 262, no. 651 repr.). The high quality of the picture supports the judgement made by Rooses (1890): ‘bon tableau, probablement authentique’. Jaffé (1989) dates WM 1570 to c. 1624–25 and compares it to Rubens’s Portrait of Baron Henri de Vicq, c. 1625 (panel, 74 × 56 cm; Paris, Musée du Louvre, inv. 1793); compare also Rubens’s Portrait of a Man, possibly Burgomaster Nicolaas Rockox, c. 1620–25 (panel, 39.1 × 31.1 cm; Philadelphia Museum of Art, inv. 44-9-9) and Portrait of an Old Man (Jan van Ghindertalen?), c. 1622–25 (panel, 64.7 × 49.5 cm; Berlin, Staatliche Museen zu Berlin, Gemäldegalerie, no. 776F; Jaffé 1989, p. 280, no. 762, repr.). Rubens’s characteristically streaky imprimatura is visible, especially in the background.

CONDITION. Two vertical splits in the panel, one extending the length of the panel through the sitter’s proper left eye; another from bottom left to the lower edge of the ruff. Long-standing tendency to flake. Cleaned by Adam Webster, English Heritage Conservation Studio, 2007.

PROV. Spanish royal collection. Royal Palace, Madrid (1794 inventory, no. 13612, one of a pair in the King’s dressing room); captured at Vitoria, 1813.

EXH. Dowdeswell Galleries, Sketches and Studies by P.P. Rubens, 1912 (8)

LIT. M. Rooses, Rubens, Antwerp, IV, 1890, p. 297, no. 1101; Jaffé 1989, p. 284, no. 785

After RUBENS

156 The Holy Family with St Elizabeth and the Infant St John

Inscribed in white with inventory no.: 806 and a fleur-de-lis

Copper, octagonal, 24.8 × 24.8 cm

WM 1586–1948

This is a much-reduced copy of a painting by Rubens in the Wallace Collection (panel, 136 × 100 cm; inv. P81). The original was painted c. 1614–15 for the Archduke Albert, co-Regent of the Spanish Netherlands, to whom Rubens was appointed court painter in 1609. WM 1586 differs from the original in the addition of a vase of flowers on the left, which were ascribed to Jan Brueghel and the picture itself to Teniers (Wellington 1901; Wallace Collection Catalogue 1968), but these attributions have not been generally accepted. The small format and fluid brushwork recall Teniers’s many pastici, or small painted copies, after Italian paintings, in the collection of Albert’s successor, Archduke Leopold Wilhelm, which were reproduced as engravings in the Theatrum Pictorium (Antwerp, 1660; a selection of Teniers’s pastici repr. in Ernst Vegelin van Claerbergen et al., David Teniers and the Theatre of Painting, exh. cat., London, Courtauld Institute of Art Gallery, 2006). Although an attribution to Teniers cannot be confirmed, WM 1586 is clearly a good seventeenth-century copy, appropriately described by Max Rooses as ‘charmante reduction peinte d’un pinceau délicat par une main habile’. Among the several copies and versions of the Wallace Collection picture noted by Ingamells (1992,
pp. 314–16), most closely comparable to WM 1586 is another octagonal version on copper, $25 \times 25$ cm, sold Christie’s, 18 May 1990, lot 128; a rectangular version on copper ($46.3 \times 31.1$ cm), with additional figures and lacking the vase of flowers, was sold Christie’s, 22 July 1983, lot 171, as by David Teniers the Younger.

**CONDITION.** Slight wearing of flesh paint, especially on Elizabeth, otherwise good. There are old nailholes at each corner of the copper panel.

**Prov.** Isabella Farnese, Queen of Spain (*fleur-de-lis*), La Granja inventory, 1746, no. 806, as Rubens; La Granja inventory, 1766, no. 806, unattributed; Aranjuez inventory, 1794, as Rubens; captured at Vitoria, 1813.

**Exh.** R.A., Old Masters, 1887 (104), as Rubens; Dowdeswell Galleries, *P.P. Rubens*, 1912 (17), with list of attributions

This was the first of the twelve labours Hercules performed in the service of Eurystheus. The Nemean lion was brought on the scene by Juno, stepmother of Hercules, in order to endanger him. But in spite of its supposed invulnerability, Hercules was able to choke it in his arms.

WM 1608 is a copy, probably of the eighteenth century, of a composition by Rubens which was itself derived from a popular classical motif. In about 1606, while in Rome, Rubens made a pen and ink drawing of the Roman relief of *Hercules and the Nemean Lion* in the Villa Medici, depicting it in its damaged state with detailed accuracy (private collection, Dorset; M. Jaffé, *Rubens in Italy*, Oxford, 1977, p. 83, pls. 285–86).

Over the course of three decades he made several drawings in which the classical relief was converted into a rounder, more flowing composition showing Hercules and the lion almost as a single unit. These are, respectively, in the Louvre (c. 1600–05; Jaffé 1977, pl. 287), in the Plantin-Moretus Museum, Antwerp (c. 1635–38; Held 1986, no. 97, pl. 89), in the Sterling and Francine Clark Art Institute, Williamstown, MA (c. 1605–10) and in the British Museum (c. 1630–35; A. Hind, *Catalogue of Drawings by French and Flemish Artists preserved in the Department of Prints and Drawings in the British Museum*, London, 1923, II and Held 1986, no. 217, pl. 216).

The oil painting in the collection of R. van de Broek, Brussels, showing Hercules with his left foot on a tiger, is generally accepted as the original (Jaffé 1989, no. 290, repr., where it is dated ‘about 1615’). There is an oil sketch of c. 1639 showing Hercules in a somewhat different posture without the tiger, in the Busch-Reisinger Museum (Harvard University Art Museums, Cambridge MA, inv. 2000.199; *Drawn by the Brush: Oil Sketches by Peter Paul Rubens*, exh. cat., Greenwich CT, Bruce Museum, 2004, no. 40); and another, slightly earlier, oil sketch in the Musée Jacquemart-André, Paris (inv. I-840; Held 1980, no. 242; S. Alpers, *The Decoration of the Torre de la Parada, Corpus Rubenianum Ludwig Burchard*, IX, 1977, p. 277, fig. 198, dated ‘in the early 1630s’).

There are also numerous copies, including: (1) Formerly Sanssouci, Potsdam, life-size (R. Oldenbourg in *Jahrbuch der Königlichen Preussischen Kunstsammlungen*, 37, 1916, pp. 270ff., fig. 2; destroyed in World War II); (2) National Museum of Art, Bucarest, life-size (Muzeul de Arta al R.P.R., *Galeria Universala, Catalog*, 1957, no. 269, pl. 53); (3) Christie’s, 9 Feb. 1979, lot 12, 104 × 149 cm; (4) V&A Museum, no. 308–1864, 44.5 × 39 cm, eighteenth/nineteenth-century copy (*Catalogue of Foreign Paintings*, I, 1973, p. 251, no. 310). The composition was engraved by N. Rhein, and by R. Freidhof, 1801.

It has been suggested, in connection with some of the above versions, that the composition was originally painted as part of a Hercules series for the Torre de la Parada, near Madrid, which Rubens decorated for Philip IV in 1636–38. Recently, however, S. Alpers (*loc. cit.*) has found that there is insufficient evidence for such a cycle ever having been in the Torre de la Parada and she argues that the composition of *Hercules and the Nemean Lion* clearly predates Rubens’s work on the Torre. Nevertheless, there must have been a Rubensian Hercules cycle available for the artist of WM 1608 to copy, presumably, though not certainly, in Spain. It is recorded as one of four such works in the style of Rubens in the Royal Palace inventory of 1794. One of these is the companion at Apsley House, *Hercules wrestling with Achelous in the Form*
Rubens

of a Bull (see next entry); the other two were described as Hercules killing the Centaur (presumably Nessus); and the last, apparently not connected with Hercules, as ‘a huntress removing an arrow from a deer’.

CONDITION. Cleaned and overpaint removed, 2008.

PROV. Spanish royal collection; Royal Palace inventory, 1794 (no. 14247), one of four paintings in the manner of Rubens measuring 1/4 by more than one 1/2 vara (i.e. 63 x 42 cm) (see above); captured at Vitoria, 1813.

LIT. Rooses 1890, II, p. 102, under no. 619 (‘The Duke of Wellington possesses a small picture representing the same subject’); A.J.J. Delen, Cabinet des Estampes de la Ville d’Anvers, Catalogue des dessins anciens, école flamande et hollandaise, Brussels, 1938, p. 64 (listed as one of several versions); J.S. Held, Rubens: Selected Drawings, New York, 1986, p. 107, under no. 97

158 Hercules wrestling with Achelous in the Form of a Bull

Canvas, 70 x 48 cm

WM 1597–1948

Companion piece to WM 1608 (see previous entry).

To obtain the hand of Deianeira, Hercules had to fight the river-god Achelous, who had the power
of taking on various shapes. Hercules mastered him when he was in the form of a bull and broke off one of his horns. This is presumably the picture’s subject, but it could almost equally well illustrate the Capture of the Cretan Bull, which is the seventh labour.

As opposed to the composition of the companion piece, Hercules and the Nemean Lion, of which there are numerous drawings, versions and copies, this theme is extremely rare in extant Rubensian works. Apart from WM 1597, there are only two drawings to denote the existence of the original composition by Rubens: (1) A slight preparatory drawing by Rubens in the corner of a sheet of studies for the Lapiths and Centaurs (formerly W. Burchard collection, Farnham; Alpers 1977, p. 278, fig. 137) which differs in showing Hercules in profile; (2) a more finished drawing in the Courtauld Gallery (inv. D.1978.PG.326), formerly catalogued as by Rubens (A. Seilern, Flemish Paintings and Drawings at 56 Princes Gate, V, Addenda, London, 1969, p. 62, no. 326, pl. 41) but now considered a work by his school (Alpers 1977, p. 278, fig. 200).

The Courtauld drawing has a companion, Hercules killing the Hydra, which reinforces the view that these compositions derived from a fuller Hercules cycle by Rubens, though not that this was necessarily connected with the Torre de la Parada (see previous entry).

**Condition.** Poor. Cleaned, 1951; cleaned and conserved, 2008. There is a large loss at upper right, a hole in the sky to the right of Hercules’s head and vertical and diagonal folds or creases to the canvas support.

**Prov.** See previous entry.
Jacob van RUISDAEL (1628/29–82)
Dutch School

Born in Haarlem, he was the son of a frame-maker and dealer who was also a painter, and may have studied under his uncle, Salomon van Ruysdael; he was also influenced by Cornelis Vroom (c. 1590/91–1661). A member of the Haarlem guild in 1648, he had settled in Amsterdam by 1657. He later became a doctor of medicine in 1676, at Caen. Hobbema was among his pupils.


Follower of RUISDAEL

159 Landscape with Bleaching Grounds
Indistinctly signed lower left: (?) Gi. . . or Ri. . .; inscribed lower right with inventory no.: 147
Canvas, 54 x 65 cm
WM 1594–1948
While the woman is spreading out the sheets on the grass, a man is bringing a further load in a wheelbarrow. Another woman, carrying linen, is entering an outhouse.

Both the style and the subject matter derive from Jacob van Ruisdael. He painted bleaching grounds near Haarlem on several occasions (see Slive 2001, pp. 51–96, nos. 35, 36, 37, 40, 41, 43, 46, 48, 50, 52, 53, 55, 58, 62, 64, 65, 70), and the closed-in type of composition is typical of Ruisdael in the 1650s.

The picture’s poor condition generally, in particular the thinness of the paint surface in the foreground and on the trees, makes it difficult to speak with confidence about details of style and quality, yet it is clear that on no count can it be attributed to Jacob Ruisdael himself. Jan Vermeer van Haarlem (1628–1691) has been the traditional attribution accepted in the Wellington Catalogue, but this is difficult to support from his secure work. He was much influenced by Ruisdael and is known to have painted comparable views of bleaching grounds (e.g. Senff sale, Anderson, New York, 28–29 March 1928, lot 12, repr.; or Dune Landscape, c. 1675, Frans Halsmuseum, Haarlem, inv. OS I–255), but the comparisons are insufficiently close to warrant a definitive attribution. Most of Vermeer van Haarlem’s dune landscapes are seen from an elevated vantage point and encompass extensive vistas (signed examples in the Gemäldegalerie, Berlin; and sold Christie’s, 3 Dec. 1997, lot 125). Another follower of Ruisdael for whom bleaching grounds were a favourite subject was Jan van Kessel III (1641–1680), but his works differ in composition, being derived from Ruisdael’s later, open vista landscapes (examples at Musées Royaux des Beaux-Arts de Belgique, Brussels; Felbrigg Hall, National Trust; and formerly in the Gemäldegalerie, Kassel; Alice I. Davies, Jan van Kessel (1641–1680), Doornspijk, 1992, nos. 23, 34, and 24 respectively). Until a convincing attribution is found, therefore, the picture can best be described as by an immediate follower or imitator of Jacob van Ruisdael.

CONDITION Paint surface much worn, particularly in the foreground and on the tree; much retouched. Cleaned and restored, 2007–08.

PROV. Spanish royal collection (not identified in the inventories); captured at Vitoria, 1813.

Giovanni Battista Salvi, called IL SASSOFERRATO (1609–1685)
Italian School

Born in Sassoferrato (Le Marche), he was inspired by Raphael’s and Annibale Carracci’s work in Rome, where he was also influenced by Domenichino. He was active mainly in Perugia, Urbino and Rome, and was famous for his Madonnas, which he repeated in endless series of replicas. His paintings are so close to those of Raphael that he was at one time thought to be a sixteenth-century artist.

The Virgin and Child with St Elizabeth and the Infant St John

Canvas, 157 x 120 cm
WM 1606–1948

The composition is reminiscent of Raphael, though there is no closely comparable one by him, or by Guido Reni, who, between them, provided the source of so many of Il Sassoferrato’s works. Hermann Voss (1924) linked this painting with the artist’s depictions of the Holy Family in Chantilly and Berlin, but these show St Joseph as well as St John and Elizabeth and are not very similar. The same figures (without St Joseph) appear on a painting by Il Sassoferrato in the Glasgow City Art Gallery (Italian Paintings, Illustrations, 1970, p. 92), but there also the composition is quite different. For a similar Raphaelesque composition at Apsley House, painted a century later, see Mengs’s Holy Family.

CONDITION. On coarse canvas which gives the surface a rough texture under smooth handling. There are large areas of repaint, e.g. the Baptist’s left arm, the lamb and the lower part of the Virgin’s dress.
PROV. Spanish royal collection (not identified in the royal inventories); captured at Vitoria, 1813.

EXH. Royal Manchester Institution, 1834 (118); Agnew’s, Second Magnasco Society Exhibition, 1925 (7) (see Osbert Sitwell, ‘The Magnasco Society’, Apollo, lxxix, May 1964, p. 382)

LIT. Waagen 1854, II, p. 277; H. Voss, Die Malerei des Barock in Rom, 1924, p. 516; Gaya Nuño 1964, p. 87, no. 290; Pérez Sánchez 1965, p. 332

161 The Virgin and Child
Canvas, 49.2 × 39.3 cm
WM 1614–1948

This may be identified with the painting of the Virgin and Child by Il Sassoferrato recorded in the collection of Charles IV, when he was Prince of the Asturias, in his summer palace, the Casa de Campo at the Escorial: ‘Otra pintura de Nuestra Señora con el Niño, de dos tercios de alta y media vara de ancho; su autor Sasso Ferrato’ (i.e. about 56 × 42 cm; see Zarco Cuevas 1934). It should be distinguished from the Virgin and Sleeping Child in the Prado (no. 342) with which it has been confused (Zarco Cuevas 1934; Pérez Sánchez 1965).

There are several versions of this composition by Il Sassoferrato or his workshop, including those in the Corsini Gallery, Rome; with Brian Koetser, London, exh. 1968; and formerly in the F.O. Blundell collection.

CONDITION. Damaged and retouched lower right, especially on the Child’s arm and on the Child’s head and right eye; otherwise quite good.
Prov. Charles IV, when Prince of the Asturias, in the Casita del Príncipe de El Escorial, c. 1782–88; captured at Vitoria, 1813.

Exh. Royal Manchester Institution, 1834 (118)
Lit. J. Zarco Cuevas, ‘Cuadros reunidos por Carlos IV, siendo principe, en su Casa de Campo de El Escorial’, Religion y Cultura, 25, Madrid, 1934, pp. 382–419; Gaya Nuño 1964, p. 87, no. 288; Pérez Sánchez 1965, p. 331 (as ‘Virgin and sleeping Child’)

John SIMPSON (1782–1847)
British School

Student at the R.A. School and then assistant to Lawrence, he left London for Lisbon in 1834 and became court painter to the Queen of Portugal.

See also Wilkie, no. 195.

Canvas, rectangular, framed in oval, 28 × 23 cm
WM 1561–1948

Head and shoulders, c. 1835, wearing dark coat and white neckcloth. An inscription on the stretcher at the back: Sir John Beckett, 11 Stratford Place, has linked this portrait with correspondence between Sir John
Beckett and the 1st Duke of Wellington, in which Beckett asks the Duke to sit for him to Mr Simpson. The Duke refused in a letter of July 1834:

‘I have not promised to sit for less than a score of portraits. No Portrait Painter will copy the picture of another nor paint an original under from 15 to 20 sittings, and thus I am expected to give not less than 400 sittings to a Portrait Painter in addition to all the other matters I must attend to, and in addition to the reception of and answers to such applications. ‘A l’impossible personne n’est tenu,’ and I must plead the truth of that Proverb ….’

It is possible that the Duke relented and sat to Simpson after all, but, as Wellesley and Steegmann point out, the portrait is very close to Lawrence’s unfinished portrait of c. 1829 in the collection of the Earl of Jersey (Wellesley, Steegmann 1935, pl. 28), and may have been inspired by it. Simpson did paint a full-length of Wellington in 1835, which was exhibited at the R.A. in the following year, and there is evidence that he sat to Simpson in 1837 for a head-and-shoulders portrait in the Earl of Normanton’s collection (Wellesley, Steegmann 1935, p. 46, nos. 2 and 3).

PROV. Sir John Beckett; bought by or presented to the 1st or 2nd Duke of Wellington.
LIT. Wellesley, Steegmann 1935, p. 46; Walker 1985, I, p. 538

Jan STEEN (1625/26–1679)
Dutch School

Born in Leiden, he was a pupil of Jan van Goyen, whose daughter he married. He subsequently lived at The Hague, Delft (where he leased a brewery from his father), Haarlem and Leiden, where he received permission to keep an inn in 1672. He is well known for his lively genre scenes.


163 The Physician’s Visit

Signed on lower step leading to inner room: J Steen
Oak panel, 49 × 42 cm
WM 1525–1948

In this painting, as in the many other variations on this theme by Jan Steen, the girl is not ill but lovesick. To underline the point, there is a picture of Venus and Adonis on the wall (free copy after Antonio
Tempesta; identified by G.J.M. Weber in *Wallraf-Richartz-Jahrbuch*, 55, 1994, p. 301), and the boy in the foreground is Cupid in seventeenth-century costume, putting an arrow in his bow. The doctor takes the woman’s pulse and looks knowingly at the maid, who is holding a urine bottle. Erotic melancholy was allegedly detected by feeling the pulse, whilst visual examination of the urine was claimed to reveal the same disorder, or pregnancy (see Bedaux 1975). The second picture on the wall, Frans Hals’s *Peeckelaeringsh*, now at Kassel, alludes to the girl’s foolishness; it also appears in Steen’s *Christening* in the Gemäldegalerie, Berlin. A brazier at the girl’s feet contains a length of ribbon from her garments: the odour of the singed ribbon was used as smelling salts to revive a swooning patient (J.B.F. van Gils, ‘Een detail op de Doktorsschilderijen van Jan Steen’, *Oud Holland*, xxxviii, 1920, pp. 200f.).

The doctor’s outmoded costume is loosely based on garments worn by popular Commedia dell’Arte figures (Gudlaugsson 1945; English edn, 1975; Martin 1954, p. 64), but, more importantly, it marks him as a charlatan and figure of ridicule. Quack doctors were stock characters in contemporary farces (both painted and performed), especially in Leiden, home to the one of the most prestigious medical faculties in Europe.

Jan Steen painted this subject on at least nineteen occasions; examples in the Alte Pinakothen, Munich (c. 1661–63; no. 158), the Hermitage, St Petersburg (c. 1660; no. 879), and the Mauritshuis, The
Steen

Hague (no. 168), are all similar in various ways. A copy was in the collection of P.H. Ford (Christie’s, 24 Oct. 1958, lot 102, panel, 47 × 41 cm; Hofstede de Groot 1908–27, no. 167; R.A., Winter Exhibition, 1885, no. 75). The especially refined technique of the Wellington picture suggests a date of about 1660.

No other artist treated this subject so often or in such variety, but Leiden contemporaries Gerard Dou, Gabriel Metsu, and Frans van Mieris also painted comparable scenes of lovesick women (J.A. van Dongen, De Zieke Mens in de Beeldende Kunst, Amsterdam, 1968, p. 11; Amsterdam 1976, p. 242; Dixon 1995; and especially Petterson 1999). This, also, was the period of Molière’s Le Malade Imaginaire, and theatrical productions in which medical buffoons treat melancholic women were enormously popular in the Netherlands.

**Condition** Panel split one-third from right-hand edge; repaired in 1950.

**Prov.** Either this or an identical version was in the J.P. Wierman (Leiden) sale, Amsterdam, 18 Aug. 1762, lot 40 (fl. 750, to Yver); sale Amsterdam, 4 July 1798, lot 90; Jan Gildemeester Jansz, Amsterdam, 11 June 1800, lot 203 (fl. 199, to Zuyderhof); the dowager L. Boreel, Amsterdam, 23 Sept. 1814, lot 19 (fl. 1805, to Nieuwenhuys). Bought by Férol de Bonnemaison for the 1st Duke of Wellington at the Lapeyrière sale, Paris, 14 April 1817, lot 55, for 11,500 frs.

**Exh.** B.I., Old Masters, 1818 (19); Guildhall, Loan Exhibition, 1892 (87); Dowdeswell Galleries, Jan Steen, 1909 (30); B.F.A.C., Winter Exhibition, 1927–28 (33); R.A., Dutch Art, 1929 (188); Arts Council 1949, no. 9, pl. 1 (but not actually exhibited); Washington, National Gallery of Art, and Amsterdam, Rijksmuseum, Jan Steen: Painter and Storyteller, 1996–97 (16)

164 The Dissolute Household

Signed on board on floor: J. Steen (J and S monogram); inscribed: Bedurfve huishow (dissolute or disorderly household)

Canvas, 80.5 × 89 cm
WM 1514–1948

As the inscription indicates, the picture expounds the effects of intemperance, and these are made clearly visible in every detail. The master of the house (bearing Steen’s own facial features) is too busy love-making to care about the chaos that will soon engulf him, the mother is having her pocket picked as she slumbers in a drunken stupor, the dog is eating the meat in the foreground, and the maid, who has stolen a necklace, is entertaining a fiddler. Less obviously, an unwatched roast has fallen into the fire in the next room, a monkey – a symbol of ‘everything sub-human in man, of lust, greed, gluttony and shamelessness in the widest possible sense’ (E. Panofsky, Studies in Iconology, New York and London, 1967, p. 195) – has stopped the clock, and even the oyster shells in the foreground are unduly large. Suspended from the ceiling is a tub containing objects that allude to the dire fate awaiting the dissolute household, including a sword and a birch (representing justice and punishment), an empty purse and a crutch and a clapper, used to give warning of contagious diseases.

Jan Steen painted this subject several times. There is a similar scene, ‘In weelde siet toe’ (‘In luxury beware’), dated 1663, in the Kunsthistorisches Museum, Vienna; and another, Effects of Intemperance,
c. 1665, in The Jack and Belle Linsky Collection, The Metropolitan Museum of Art (inv. 1982.60.31; Liedtke 2007, pp. 841–44). A date in the first half of the 1660s is likely for the Wellington picture also.

**CONDITION** Cleaned by Horace Buttery c. 1947.

**PROV.** Probably P. de Smeth van Alphen sale, Amsterdam, 1 Aug. 1810, lot 96 (fl. 1299, Rijers); W. Rijers sale, Amsterdam, 21 Sept. 1814, lot 143 (fl. 1400, to Eversdijk), but the description in the first catalogue, at least, is not sufficiently precise to allow a conclusive identification. Bought for the 1st Duke of Wellington by Féréol de Bonnemaison in 1818.


**165 A Wedding Party**

Signed and dated lower centre: J. Steen 1667

Canvas, 101 x 156 cm

WM 1510–1948

The bride and groom sitting under the middle wreath are dwarfed by the guests in their revelry. In front of the couple is a woman with a saucepan on her head, holding a large spoon – one of a troupe of whimsically dressed revellers that populate Steen’s festive celebrations (e.g. *Twelfth Night*, Staatliche Museen Kassel, GK 296; or a similar composition in the Los Angeles County Museum of Art). In this instance, the figure evokes traditional allegorical representations of Gluttony (compare the monster in the lower right-hand corner of Pieter I Bruegel’s *Gula* (Gluttony) drawing of 1556–67, subsequently engraved; for a discussion of the subject-matter see C.G. Stridbeck, *Bruegelstudien*, Stockholm, 1956, p. 113, fig. 14). She intrudes on a round of *handjeklap*, a popular party game in which the ‘victim’, face hidden in another player’s lap, tries to guess who has slapped him. The use of the wedding feast as a theme to highlight human debauchery also occurs in the work of Pieter Bruegel, whose *Wedding Banquet* (Vienna, Kunsthistorisches Museum) and *Wedding Dance* (Detroit, Institute of Arts) may be seen as the forerunners of Jan Steen’s composition (F. Grossmann, *Pieter Bruegel, The Complete Paintings*, 3rd edn, New York, 1973, pp. 199–201; see also S. Alpers, ‘Bruegel’s festive peasants’, *Simiolus*, 6, 1972–73, p. 163).

Several of the figures – in particular the musicians on the left – are in the actors’ costumes of the *Commedia dell’Arte*. The man in the high hat on the left is the innkeeper, whose costume is reminiscent of Pulcinello’s (Gudlaugsson 1945).
Here, as elsewhere in his work, Jan Steen can be appreciated for the meticulous painting of the still life in the foreground as much as for his cheerfully moralizing portrayal of peasant life. The figure seated in the foreground is possibly intended as a self-portrait; the type is ubiquitous in Jan Steen’s paintings (cf. the self-portrait, formerly in the Wetzlar collection, sold Sotheby’s, 9 July 2008, lot 51).

CONDITION Crack in paint surface running down centre and damaging the last letter of the signature, otherwise good. Cleaned by Horace Buttery, 1950–51.

PROV. Auctioned at The Hague, 24 April 1737, lot 7; Vrouwe Anna Maria Ebeling (widow of Paul Iwan Hogguer) sale, Amsterdam 18 Aug. 1817, lot 78 (fl. 2100 to Woodburn and Buchanan; ms. notation in catalogue: ‘sold to le Rouge for 500 advance’); Le Rouge sale, Paris, 27 April 1818, lot 53, bt. by Féréol de Bonnemaison for 11,810 frs. (£472) for the 1st Duke of Wellington.

EXH. B.I., Old Masters, 1821 (82); 1848 (15) (reviewed, The Athenaeum, 24 June 1848); 1856; R.A., Old Masters, 1888 (59) (reviewed, The Athenaeum, 7 Jan. 1888); Dowdeswell Galleries, Jan Steen, 1909 (8); R.A., Dutch Art, 1929 (204); Arts Council 1949 (8); The Hague, Mauritshuis, Jan Steen, 1958–59 (43), pl. 41

The ‘egg dance’ is being performed by the group in the centre, the idea being for the participants to work the eggs out of the chalk circle without breaking any of them. It was a popular spring- or Easter-time game in the Netherlands in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries; among earlier representations is Pieter Aertsen’s Egg Dance in the Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam (inv. SK-A-3; see exh. cat., N.G. 1976, and M. Bijl et al., ‘Pieter Aertsen in het restauratie-atelier van het Rijksmuseum’, Nederlands Kunsthistorisch Jaarboek, XL, 1989, pp. 200–02). The floral crown suspended from the ceiling suggests that this may, like WM 1510, be a wedding celebration (Braun 1980); tellingly, the bird, symbol of chastity, has flown from the cage nearby. The majority of the revellers are engaged in eating, drinking and amorous pursuits. Ellis Waterhouse (Arts Council 1949) suggested that the lady standing in the doorway on the right between the two men may be an illustration of the choice between virtue and vice. The fashionable man could be encouraging her to enter the inn while his soberly dressed companion stands behind, but the more usual representation of this scene is of a man choosing between two women, as in the Choice of Hercules. The theme of the well-dressed lady accosted or attacked as she enters a rowdy tavern, on the other hand, is a recurrent one in Jan Steen’s work and may be seen, for example, in the merrymaking scenes in the Kunsthistorisches Museum, Vienna and the Hermitage, St Petersburg.
This is one of Jan Steen’s most elaborate and ambitious compositions in terms of the large number of figures and activities portrayed. Like the other paintings of this kind, it is a late work. It is closely comparable with the *Merrymaking in an Inn* in the Louvre (inv. 1863), which is dated 1674, and the similar scene in the Royal Collection (RCIN 1340, C. White, *The Dutch Pictures in the Collection of Her Majesty the Queen*, Cambridge, 1982, p. 125, no. 192).


**PROV.** Burggraaff sale, Paris, 18–19 Nov. 1811, lot 43 (withdrawn); Berthier sale, Paris, 4 May 1813, lot 21 (not sold); Le Rouge sale, Paris, 27 April 1818, lot 54, bought by Féréol de Bonnemaison for the 1st Duke of Wellington for 3,010 frs. (£120).


**Abraham STORCK (1644–1708)**

*Dutch School*

Storck was born in Amsterdam and lived there most of his life. He was a member of the Guild of St Luke in 1688. His seascapes and Dutch harbour scenes are in the style of Willem van de Velde and Ludolf Bakhuizen; he also painted imaginary views of Mediterranean ports.


167 *Dutch Shipping in a River*

Signed on lowest bar of fence on right: A. STORCK; inscribed in white with inventory no.: 328, lower right

*Canvas, 34 × 46 cm*

*WM 1642–1948*

The ship on the left bears a lion rampant, symbol of the Dutch Republic, on the stern.

**CONDITION** Worn. Cleaned 1950.

**PROV.** Spanish royal collection (not identified in the inventories); captured at Vitoria, 1813.

**LIT.** Gaya Nuño 1964, no. 197; Valdivieso 1973, p. 374
Jacques-François-Joseph SWEBACH, called Fontaine (or Swebach-Desfontaines) (1769–1823)
*French School*

Born in Metz, the son of a painter, he was a pupil of Michel Duplessis in Paris and began to exhibit camp and battle scenes regularly from 1788. In 1800 he was commissioned to paint a picture for the Empress Josephine’s château at Malmaison. From 1802–13 he was the First Painter at the Sèvres porcelain factory, and then from 1815–20 he worked in St Petersburg for Tsar Alexander I as First Painter to the Russian Imperial porcelain factory.


168 *An Encampment*

Signed on fountain lower left: *Swebach dit font(aine) 1796*. Inscribed with inventory no.: 103, lower left corner

Canvas, $67 \times 85.7$ cm

WM 1643–1948
In the centre four mounted officers are conversing, with the one on the left riding away. Behind them are various tents; the one on the right with a signboard is apparently a canteen, with soldiers drinking outside. There is another tent in the right foreground, with barrel hoops at the side.

Although the composition is derived from Dutch seventeenth-century camp scenes, in particular from those of Wouwerman (compare no. 197), the tonality is very much lighter, as befits a painting of this period.

**CONDITION** Good, cleaned in 1980.

**PROV.** Spanish royal collection (not identified in the inventories); captured at Vitoria, 1813.


169 *The Passage of the Danube by Napoleon before the Battle of Wagram*

Signed on hut on left: Swebach dit fontaines. 1810

Canvas, 80.5 × 128.5 cm

WM 1560–1948

In the foreground the French army is shown on the right bank of the Danube, crossing on a pile bridge to a small island and beyond that to the island of Lobau. On the right a mounted groom in imperial livery,
facing the river, is talking to Rustam, the Emperor’s famous Mameluke. A little to the left is the Emperor’s
grey charger Marengo, held by another groom on foot. Napoleon himself stands in the right centre
foreground accompanied by a General and a Marshal, talking to an officer of the ordnance. In the centre
foreground, seen from the back, are a General and an officer of the Bavarian army. On a second bridge – of
boats – troops are returning to the right bank with wagons, presumably to fetch ammunition and supplies.

This is the painting for which Swebach was awarded the grande medaille at the Salon of 1810. It bore
the double title: Passage du Danube avant la bataille de Wagram and Napoléon traversant le Danube pendant la
matinée du 5 Juillet 1809. The Duchess of Wellington, unaware that this was the artist’s own title, argued
that the painting depicted the crossing of the Danube before the battle of Essling, six weeks before
Wagram. The original title has since been supported by M. Jean Brunon, specialist in Napoleonic stud-
ies, who confirmed that the scene represents the early morning of Wednesday, 5 July, the first day of
the battle of Wagram, also known as the battle of Enzersdorf (written opinion, 1964).

The construction of this pile bridge was a matter of great pride to the French engineers. It had been
built during June with supplies brought from Vienna, and it enabled Napoleon to make his claim that
‘the Danube no longer exists’ (Rauchensteiner 1977). A comparable depiction of this scene, apparently
showing the second stage of the crossing to Lobau, with two pile bridges next to each other, is given
in a drawing by A. Delaborde (repr. Quennerat 1966, p. 117, fig. 23). After the crossing, Napoleon’s first
attack on the Austrian army under Archduke Charles was beaten back, but he inflicted a heavy defeat
on the Austrians on the following day. The victory at Wagram led to the Treaty of Schönbrunn, which
ended Austria’s war of 1809 against the French control of Germany.

Swebach exhibited battle scenes of Napoleon’s victories from 1802, including those at Mount Thabor,
Marengo, Rivoli and Austerlitz. In each of these he succeeded in incorporating lively anecdotal scenes in
Teniers

large, carefully controlled, formal set-pieces. WM 1560 has a more naturalistic appearance. The first owner of the picture, B.B. Williams, maintained that Swebach was actually an eyewitness of the crossing, claiming that it was ‘taken on the spot by Swebach’ (Wellington 1901). We do know that he visited the banks of the Danube in 1809 and made sketches there (André 1905, p. 20). In any case, the painting was recognized as outstanding in Swebach’s oeuvre; it won him a gold medal at the Salon and a glowing review by the anonymous author of the Entretiens sur les ouvrages de peinture, sculpture et gravure exposés au Musée Napoléon en 1810. He listed its qualities – masterly perspective, realism of landscape, freshness of atmosphere, composition and movement – and pronounced it one of the most beautiful pictures in the exhibition.

CONDITION. Diagonal scratch lower right; otherwise good.

PROV. 1814, B.B. Williams; bought from him by the 1st Duke of Wellington in 1843 for £600 (the original price had been £1200, but after consulting Seguier the Duke offered £500 and Williams ultimately settled for £600).


David TENIERS the Younger (1610–1690)

Flemish school

Born in Antwerp, where he was a pupil of his father David Teniers I, he moved to Brussels in 1651 and became court painter to the Archduke Leopold Wilhelm, Governor of the Netherlands, and curator of his picture collection. Teniers’s earliest works are peasant interiors in the manner of Adriaen Brouwer; from about 1640 he combined landscapes with scenes of peasant life.

The 1st Duke of Wellington owned fifteen paintings by Teniers – most of them from the Spanish royal collection. Ten are now in the Wellington Museum (see below), and five remain in the present Duke’s collection (Wellington 1901, nos. 13, 14, 16, 31, 237).


170 A Village Festival on St George’s Day

Signed and dated lower right: D. TENIERS. FIC.1655

Copper, 17 × 20.6 cm

WM 1499–1948
Village festivals (known as a kermis or kermesse) with dancers and bagpipers are very common in Teniers’s work: compare the larger work on copper signed and dated 1651, in the Museum Boijmans van Beuningen, Rotterdam; a similar composition was formerly in the Metropolitan Museum, New York (sold Christie’s, New York, 18 June 1982, lot 95). The red banner flying from the window appears in several of Teniers’s kermis scenes, in which it is more clearly marked with an image of St George (e.g. two examples in the Royal Collection, nos. RCIN 405952, dated 1649, and RCIN 405207, dated mid 1660s). Popular celebrations of the St George’s Day Festival (23 April) were also depicted by Pieter Bruegel the Elder and Younger, and other Netherlandish painters.

In contrast to the large canvases by Teniers from the Spanish royal collection, this small painting on copper was acquired by the 1st Duke at the Lapeyrière sale. One similar composition of comparable size was among the paintings captured at Vitoria (Wellington 1901, p. 23, no. 16, now at Stratfield Saye). Painted after the artist’s appointment as court painter to the Archduke Leopold Wilhelm, the small scale and careful finish of WM 1499 was undoubtedly intended to appeal to a sophisticated taste for elegant cabinet pictures.

**CONDITION** Good. Cleaned in 1949.

**PROV.** Randon de Boisset sale, Paris, 27 Feb. 1777 (lot 62; 2011 livres, to Donjeux); Destouches sale, Paris, 21 March 1794, lot 76 (2600 livres, to Le Brun); Wautier (Brussels) sale, Paris, 9 June 1797, lot 7 (4000 livres); Solirène sale, 11–13 Paris, March 1812, lot 116 (2501 frs.); Lapeyrière sale, Paris, 14 April 1817, lot 58. Bought by Féréol de Bonnemaison for 5,500 frs. (£222) for the 1st Duke of Wellington.
Teniers

Exh. B.I., Old Masters, 1818 (21); R.A., Old Masters, 1890 (109) (reviewed, The Athenaeum, 8 Feb. 1890).

171 Peasants playing Bowls in front of an Inn by a River
Signed on the stone on the right: D. TENIERS F
Canvas, 60.6 × 79.4 cm
WM 1579–1948

This is a recurrent theme in the work of Teniers. There are similar compositions, for example, in the National Gallery of Scotland, Edinburgh (on loan from the University of Edinburgh, Torrie Collection, c. 1635–40; Antwerp 1991, no. 15), and, on a larger scale, in the Los Angeles County Museum of Art (c. 1650) and the National Gallery (NG 951, dated about 1660; Gregory Martin, The Flemish School, 1970, p. 267).

Condition. Cleaned 1949. There is an old L-shaped tear through the palisaded fence.
Prov. Possibly Jacques Meyers sale, Rotterdam, 9 Sept. 1722, lot 181 (fl. 160), where acquired for Philip V of Spain; Isabella Farnese collection; La Granja inventory 1746, no. 329; Royal Palace, Madrid, inventory 1772, no. 329, in the King’s retiring room; captured at Vitoria, 1813.
172 A Flemish Village Festival

Signed right foreground below cloth: DAVID TENIERS FC; dated: 1639 on the Magpie board
Inscribed in pink with inventory no.: 894
Canvas, 85 x 119 cm
WM 1581–1948

In the centre, a man with an apron (presumably the innkeeper) is apparently drinking the health of the winner of a game, who is holding the prize in his hand. On the right, women are playing a game (described in the 1829 sale cat. as ‘women running a race for a cake exhibited on a pole’), watched by an audience of men. In both instances the ‘prize’ appears to be a flat cake or bread, or a plaque, with white markings in the form of an X, though the nature of the contest is obscure. The inn on the left has the sign of the Magpie.

The 1829 Emmerson sale catalogue notes: ‘The two following Noble Specimens of Teniers were taken by Joseph Buonaparte to America, from whence they were sent to Paris, where they were recently purchased of his agent’. (The so-called ‘pendant’ to WM 1581 in this sale, lot 159, is The Bleaching Ground now in The Barber Institute of Fine Arts, Birmingham, inv. 47.1; canvas, 85 x 120.5 cm). Though nearly identical in size, the two paintings can hardly be pendants, as the scale of the figures differs considerably.) In 1825 and 1826, Bonaparte (under the pseudonym, ‘the Count de Survelliers’, exhibited two landscapes with figures by Teniers at the American Academy of Fine Arts, New York (American Academy of Fine Arts and American Art-Union … 1816–1852, ed. M.B. Cowdrey, New York, 1953, II, p. 347), but without further details it cannot be confirmed that WM 1581 was one of these works. In late autumn 1826,
Teniers

Bonaparte sent a small group of pictures (including an *Adoration of the Magi* and a *Fêtes de Village* by Teniers) to London to be sold at auction by his agents, Sampson Batard; according to Batard: ‘the prices you have fixed … will very much impede the sale from their being so extremely high’ (P.T. Stroud, *The Man who had been King: the American Exile of Napoleon’s Brother*, Philadelphia, c. 2005, p. 133.)

**CONDITION** Flaking paint laid and cleaned, 1981.

**Prov.** Possibly from the Spanish royal collection (the inscription 894 is presumably the inventory number, but it does not tally with the principal royal inventories. According to Nieuwenhuys, in a letter to Lady Burghersh, 12 October 1840: ‘Le tableau … fit autrefois de la Galerie des Rois d’Espagne, ou il resta jusqu’à la première invasion française de ce pays’). Thomas Emmerson sale, London, 1–2 May 1829, lot 158 (with pendant, as ‘taken by Joseph Buonaparte to America, from whence they were sent to Paris, where they were recently purchased of his agent’; 370 guineas); possibly Joseph Marsland Esq. sale, Christie’s, 6 June 1840, lot 36 (‘A Village Fete; a composition of numerous figures before a Cabaret, beyond which is a fine tree, and a Village Church. This capital Picture is from the Collection of Joseph Buonaparte’; £414.15), bought for the Duke of Wellington in 1840 by Lord Burghersh at Brussels for 25,000 frs. (£1,000).

**Exh.** B.I., Old Masters, 1841 (58); R.A., Old Masters, 1886 (reviewed, *The Athenaeum*, 30 Jan. 1886); Tokyo 1990–91 (26)


173 *A Lime-kiln with Figures*

Signed on stone in right foreground: D. TENIERS F

Canvas, 58.5 × 88 cm

WM 1583–1948
This is one of the rare examples of paintings of industrial scenery in the seventeenth century. It shows the preparation of limestone for the kiln in which lime – the chief constituent of mortar – is produced by calcining the limestone. The head and shoulders of the barrow-wheeling man in the foreground are lightly dusted with lime.

With the coming of the industrial revolution in the eighteenth century, industrial landscape became a feature of picturesque and of romantic painting in England (F.D. Klingender, *Art and the Industrial Revolution*, London, 1947, pp. 72ff.), but it appears only occasionally in the art of seventeenth-century Europe. Rural industries like bleaching and sand quarries were depicted by Netherlandish artists, including Teniers (Kunsthalle, Hamburg; and Petworth House, respectively), but scenes with lime-kilns are exceedingly rare. Aside from Teniers, Jan van Goyen painted a few (H.-U. Beck, *Jan van Goyen 1596–1656*, Amsterdam, 1972–73, I, no. 25, II, nos. 599, 1078); there are also several depictions of lime kilns by Dutch painters working in Rome, such as Pieter van Laer and Jan Both (see Levine 1988, pp. 569–89). Comparable scenes by Teniers are the *Brick-Yard near an Inn* (sold Christie’s, 23 June 1967 and again Sotheby’s, 13 Dec. 2001, lot 35) and the *Brickmakers near Hemiksen* in the Dulwich Picture Gallery (P. Murray, *The Dulwich Picture Gallery*, London, 1980, no. 57, repr.). The Wellington picture has points of similarity with both these compositions.

**CONDITION** Cleaned in 1949.

**PROV.** Isabella Farnese collection; La Granja inventory 1746, no. 443; transported to Madrid, 1759; Buenavista inventory, 1766, no. 443; captured at Vitoria, 1813.


**174 Landscape with Two Shepherds, Cattle and Ducks**

Signed on stone lower left: D. TENIERS F.; inscribed in white with inventory no.: 791

Canvas, 46.7 × 96 cm

WM 1589–1948
The large foreground figures are very similar to those in the Harvest Scene, WM 1602, and the Landscape with Shepherds and Cattle, WM 1613 (nos. 176, 179). An analogous composition is the Coloquio pastoril in the Prado, Madrid (no. 1814; M. Díaz Padrón, El Siglo de Rubens en el Museo del Prado, Madrid, 1995, II, p. 1412), which has been dated to the 1650s, a date appropriate for WM 1589 as well.


**PROV.** Spanish royal collection: 1734 inventory of pictures saved from the fire of the Alcázar, no. 791; 1772 inventory of the Royal Palace, Madrid, no. 791, Green Cabinet room; captured at Vitoria, 1813.

**LIT.** Gaya Nuño 1964, no. 146

**175 Interior of a Cowshed**

*Canvas, 54 × 91.4 cm*

*WM 1595–1948*

Stylistic factors, including the careful execution and the monumental quality of the figures, suggest that this picture was painted in c. 1640–50, when Teniers was at the peak of his career. Such compositions are not very frequent in Teniers's oeuvre, but the woman and the boy with the calf reappear in identical postures in an Interior in Budapest (exh. cat., Budapest, Szépművészeti Múzeum, Old Masters in Hungarian Private Collections, 1946, no. 93, pl. 27), and there are comparable scenes of cowsheds in the Kiev Museum, formerly in the Kunsthistorisches Museum, Vienna (sold 1922; repr. Antwerp 1991, p. 204, fig. 68a) and in one of the Sedelmeyer sales (Paris, 1907, no. 55). A copy of WM 1595, with the composition extended at top and right, was with the dealer Douwes, Amsterdam, in 1928. Other artists who depicted maids in cow stalls include Gerard ter Borch (c. 1653/4; J. Paul Getty Museum, Los Angeles, no. 83.P8.232) and Aelbert Cuyp (1645–48, Dordrechts Museum, inv. DM/983/580; Nationalmuseum, Stockholm, inv. NM 4441; and in a private collection).
Teniers

The paintings by Teniers in Kiev, Vienna and in the Sedelmeyer sale also include the owl perched on rafters or on the stalls. Since antiquity, owls had been invested with a range of symbolic meanings; they could represent wisdom and learning, yet also (by virtue of their nocturnal habits) ignorance, sin and debauchery (see P. Paskiewicz, ‘Nocturnal Bird of Wisdom: Symbolic Functions of the Owl in Emblems’, Bulletin du Musée National de Varsovie, xxiii, 1982, pp. 56–83; and P. Vandenbroecke, ‘Bubo Significans. Die Eule als Sinnbild von Schlechtigkeit und Torheit’, Jaarboek van het Koninklijk Museum voor Schone Kunsten Antwerpen, 1985, pp. 19–135).

CONDITION Cleaned 1950; small area of damage lower right.

Prov. Spanish royal collection (not identified in the inventories); captured at Vitoria, 1813.

Lit. Gaya Nuño 1964, no. 145

176 A Harvest Scene

Signed lower centre: D. Teniers F; inscribed in white with inventory no.: 108

Canvas, 50 × 61.6 cm

WM 1602–1948

Numerous figures are at work cutting and binding in a cornfield. Such scenes of harvesting are not common in Teniers’s oeuvre; a comparable painting is in the Liechtenstein Collection (panel, 18 × 25 cm) and another from the mid-1640s in the Hermitage (canvas, 49 × 78 cm). The subject is the
Teniers

traditional one chosen to illustrate the month of July or August in calendars, and Teniers used the motif of cutting and binding hay in a depiction of Summer from a cycle of the Four Seasons that can be dated to the early 1660s (copper, 62.1 × 82.5 cm; Instituut Collectie Nederland, on loan to the Noordbrabants Museum, ’s-Hertogenbosch; Antwerp 1991, no. 86); and in the single figure of a labourer representing Summer from a series of the Seasons c. 1644 (National Gallery, London, inv. NG 858).

CONDITION Good. Cleaned in 1950.
Prov. Spanish royal collection: 1734 inventory of pictures saved from the fire in the Alcázar, no. 108; 1772 inventory of the Royal Palace, Madrid, no. 108, passage to the King’s pew; captured at Vitoria, 1813.
Exh. B.I., Old Masters, 1824 (44)
Lit. Gaya Nuño 1964, no. 147; Dreher 1975, pp. 80, 91, 93, fig. 68

177 Landscape with Peasants driving Cattle: Evening

Signed on stone lower right: D. TENIERS FEC.
Canvas, 46.3 × 74.3 cm
WM 1609–1948

Similar in subject to WM 1589 and 1613, the scale of the figures is smaller and the execution more perfunctory, probably indicating a later date.

CONDITION Cleaned in 1949.
Prov. Spanish royal collection: 1734 inventory of pictures saved from the fire in the Alcázar, no. 864; 1772
inventory of the Royal Palace, Madrid, no. 864, apartment of the Infante Don Xavier: ‘a landscape with a cottage, a shepherd and shepherdess’; captured at Vitoria, 1813.

Lit. Gaya Nuño 1964, no. 154

178 View of the Artist’s House ‘de Drij Toren’ near Perk

Signed on stone lower right: DT.F (DT in monogram)

Canvas, 83 x 170 cm

WM 1611–1948

The building was identified with Teniers’s own house, De Drij Toren near Perk, by Gregory Martin (1968) on the basis of comparisons with a line illustration in Les Belges Illustres, Panthéon Nationale, 1844 (II, p. 32). Of its three towers, the third is an observation tower, characterized by its openwork top. The entrance gate at the centre of the composition is the only part of the house still standing (Antwerp 1991, p. 248, fig. 85a). Views of this house recur frequently in Teniers’s work (e.g. Summer, from a cycle of the Four Seasons, Instituut Collectie Nederland, on loan to the Noordbrabants Museum, s-Hertogenbosch; Antwerp 1991, no. 86; A Feast at Harvest-Time, Royal Collection, no. RCIN 405206; Duke of Buccleuch coll., exh. Flemish Art, R.A., 1927, no. 300; and sale, Fischer, Lucerne, 12 June 1970, lot 521). A nearly identical view of the house is included in Game of Bowls before Drij Toren (Goudstikker, Amsterdam, 1918, no. 33). Teniers bought De Drij Toren from Hélène Fourment, Rubens’s widow, and her second husband J.B. de Broeckhoven de Bergeyck in 1662, which provides a terminus post for this painting. Perk is not far from Rubens’s own estate, Het Steen.

Condition Cleaned in 1949.

Prov. Spanish royal collection (not identified in the inventories); captured at Vitoria, 1813.

Exh. Antwerp 1991 (85)

Lit. Gaya Nuño 1964, no. 151, pl. 59; G. Martin, ‘A view of Het Sterckshof by David Teniers the younger’,
179 Landscape with Shepherds and a Distant View of a Castle

Inscribed in white (toned pink) with inventory no.: 893
Canvas, 54.6 x 89 cm
WM 1613–1948

The large foreground figures are very similar to those in the *Landscape with Two Shepherds* (WM 1589, no. 174) and the theme is analogous to the pastoral landscapes in the Prado, Madrid (see no. 174) and to one in a private collection in Denmark, which is dated 1668 (Brussels 1980, no. 226).

Teniers painted a large number of pastoral scenes throughout his career; the elegiac, arcadian mood of WM 1613 is characteristic of works from the late 1660s. The motif of a man removing fleas from his dog appears in a number of paintings by the artist.

**CONDITION** Cleaned in 1949. Cleaned and relined, 2006. The sky is especially abraded, with the grey/cream priming visible in places. Losses along the top edge and at bottom centre.

**PROV.** Spanish royal collection: 1734 inventory of pictures saved from the fire in the Alcázar, no. 893, 1772 inventory of the Royal Palace, Madrid, no. 893, apartment of the Infante Don Xavier; captured at Vitoria, 1813.

**EXH.** Brussels, Palais des Beaux-Arts, *Bruegel: Une dynastie de peintres*, 1980 (228)

**LIT.** Gaya Nuño 1964, no. 150, pl. 60
Titian came from Cadore in the Dolomites to Venice to learn painting and, according to Vasari, became a pupil of Gentile and Giovanni Bellini and Giorgione. From the time of his Assumption of the Virgin, 1516–18 (Frari, Venice) until his death, he was widely recognized as the greatest Venetian painter. He was extremely successful as a painter of portraits, mythological, and religious subjects.


Follower of TITIAN

180 An Unknown Lady, called ‘Titian’s Mistress’
Inscribed in red, centre foreground, with inventory no.: 49
Canvas, 97.5 × 71 cm
WM 1620–1948
The nude breast was at one time painted over with a pale grey veil, the remains of which are still visible. According to the 1772 inventory of the Royal Palace, Madrid, this was one of eight portraits, more than half-length, by Titian; one a portrait of himself, another of his wife, and the others of unknown sitters. The size given is $1 \frac{1}{4} \times 1$ vara (106 × 85 cm) and a marginal note indicates that all these pictures were originally oval but were made square. The outlines of the original oval shape are still visible on the canvas.

H. Wethey (1971) describes WM 1620 as School of Titian, about 1550: ‘the quality … is moderately high, little if any inferior to the well-known picture of the Girl in a Fur Coat and Hat in Leningrad’ (Titian workshop; Wethey 1971, pl. 265). The type of portrait is similar to Titian’s Girl in a Fur Coat in the Kunsthistorisches Museum, Vienna (Wethey 1971, pl. 73). For another comparable portrait from Titian’s workshop in the Dortmund Gallery see M. Roy Fisher, Titian’s Assistants during his Later Years, New York, 1977, p. 36, pl. 25.

**CONDITION.** See above.

**PROV.** Royal Palace, Madrid, King’s antechamber (1772 inventory, one of a group of eight portraits ascribed to Titian; captured at Vitoria, 1813.

**LIT.** Ponz 1772–94, VI, p. 26; Wethey 1971, II, p. 179, no. x–91, pl. 266

---

**Francesco TREVISANI (1656–1746)**

**Italian School**

Born in Capodistria, Trevisani studied in Venice until about 1678 when he settled in Rome. His paintings combine the expressiveness and *chiaroscuro* of the Roman followers of Caravaggio with the strong colours of the Venetian tradition.


---

**Ascribed to TREVISANI**

**181 The Virgin and Child with St Carlo Borromeo**

Inscribed in white, lower right, with inventory no. 396

Canvas, 47.3 × 28.3 cm

WM 1624–1948

The painting was attributed to Francesco Trevisani (1656–1746) in the Wellington Catalogue, although it was not identified in the Spanish royal inventories. There are generic similarities with Trevisani in style and composition (e.g. Di Federico 1977, pl. 74), but the attribution is not really convincing in the light of recent appraisals of Trevisani’s oeuvre. Some areas are very crudely painted, for example the saint’s hand, although the surface is so rubbed, in many places down to the canvas, that it is difficult to assess the picture’s original quality. Yet the pentimenti, for example at the saint’s ear,
indicate that it is probably an original work and not merely a copy. Karin Wolfe has recently suggested an attribution to Sebastiano Conca (letter, 2008), whose early work is very close to that of Trevisani. Distinctive details such as the curved chair leg appear in Conca’s work, for example in *The Mystic Marriage of St Catherine* (Academy of St Luke, Rome).

Carlo Borromeo (1538–1584) was the nephew of Pius IV, whose close collaborator he became. Created cardinal in 1560, he took a leading part in the Council of Trent, 1562–63, and as Archbishop of Milan from 1564 became one of the outstanding figures in the Counter-Reformation Church. He was canonized in 1610. Eight years later, Cardinal Federico Borromeo cited the portrait by Ambrogio Figini (1548–1600) in the Biblioteca Ambrosiana, Milan, as ‘the best head done of him in a painting’. This authoritative evidence, together with the death-mask in the Capuchin monastery at Milan, have fixed Carlo Borromeo’s physiognomy for future generations, though the multitude of subsequent portraits tend to exaggerate its most characteristic feature, the prominent nose (Angelo Maria Raggi, in *Bibliotheca Sanctorum*, Pontificia Universitá Lateranense, Rome, III, 1963, cols. 846ff., with illustrations and bibliography).

**CONDITION.** Surface badly rubbed, particularly on the Christ Child and on the Virgin’s face.

**PROV.** Spanish royal collection (not identified in the royal inventories); captured at Vitoria, 1813.
Diego VELÁZQUEZ (1599–1660)
Spanish School

Born in Seville, he was a pupil of Francisco Pacheco, 1613–18. He first visited Madrid in 1622, and was recalled there in the following year by the Count-Duke Olivares, minister of Philip IV. He enjoyed immediate success, was appointed court painter, and thereafter remained attached to the royal court, painting mainly portraits of the royal family and members of the court. He was in Italy in 1629–31, studying the painters of Venice, Rome and Naples, and again in 1649–51.


Two Young Men eating at a Humble Table
Canvas, 65.3 x 104 cm
WM 1593–1948

Velázquez painted several such ‘scenes of everyday life’ or bodegones in his early years, from 1617, when he entered the Guild of St Luke at Seville, until his final departure for Madrid in 1623. (The word bodegón means a humble public eating-place.) Related to the picaresque novels which had originated in Spain with Lazarillo de Tormes (1554), they show ordinary people eating and drinking or preparing food, and are characterized by an uncompromising realism and an ochre tonality, with strong contrasts of light and shade. In these respects they owe much to the influence of Caravaggio (to whom this work was attributed on its arrival in England), although in subject matter they are also related to the genre paintings of the sixteenth-century Flemish school. Several of these bodegones are oblong in shape, with half-length figures and prominent still lifes. In particular, the Kitchen Scene with Christ at Emmaus (National Gallery of Ireland, Dublin), Kitchen Scene with Christ in the House of Martha and Mary (National Gallery, London), and the Wellington picture form a closely knit group. The precise dating of these early paintings has hitherto been largely conjectural, as only one of them was known to be dated: the Adoration of the Magi (Prado, Madrid) of 1619. More recently, however, cleaning has revealed the date 1618 on both An Old Woman cooking Eggs (National Gallery, Edinburgh) and the Kitchen Scene with Christ in the House of Martha and Mary (National Gallery, London). The two paintings are very similar in style to the Wellington picture, while the pestle and mortar and the green-glazed oil jug appear in all three of them. This bears out a date of about 1618–20 for the Wellington picture, even though it is painted on a finer canvas than the National Gallery and Edinburgh pictures.

The painting was first described by Palomino in 1724: ‘He painted another picture of two poor men eating at a humble little table where there are different earthenware vessels, oranges, bread and other things, everything observed with rare thoroughness’. It has recently been suggested that the two men, formerly identified as beggars, were in fact kitchen helpers (D. Carr in London 2006).
Dawson Carr (London 2006, p. 128) also suggests that the painting may have been in the collection of the Sevillian nobleman Fernando Enríquez Afán de Ribera, 3rd Duke of Alcalá, (1583–1637). The source is an inventory description of Alcalá’s collection in the Casa de Pilatos, Seville, dated 1637, of ‘a canvas of two men, in half-length, with a small glass jar’ [VI.4] (published in Brown and Kagan 1987, p. 238). The first fully authenticated location for the painting was in the collection of the Marquis de la Ensenada, as: ‘two poor persons eating at a humble table’: it was one of 29 pictures bought from the Ensenada collection by Charles III on 25 August 1768, and it has been fully recorded ever since (see below). There are versions or copies in a collection in Seville (López-Rey 1963, no. 106) and in a collection in Rome (López-Rey 1963, no. 107; A. di Stefano, Archivo Español de Arte, xxvii, 1954, pp. 257–59).

**CONDITION**

**Prov.** Marquis de la Ensenada; bought by Charles III in 1768; Royal Palace, Madrid (1772 inventory, King’s retiring room), not in 1794 inventory; captured at Vitoria, 1813.

**Exh.** R.A., Old Masters, 1888 (125); New Gallery, Spanish Art, 1895–96 (73); Guildhall, Spanish Painters, 1901 (103); Grafton Galleries, Spanish Old Masters, 1913–14 (45); Arts Council, N.G.L., Spanish Paintings, 1947 (39); Arts Council 1949 (14); N.G.L., El Greco to Goya, 1981 (14); Edinburgh, N.G.S., Velázquez in Seville, 1996 (24); Tokyo 1990–91; N.G.L., Velázquez, 2006 (7)

**Lit.** (The early sources are gathered together in Velázquez, Homenaje en el Tercer Centenario, Instituto Diego Velázquez, Madrid, 1960.) Palomino 1715–24, III, p. 480 (1960 edn, p. 32); Cumberland 1787, p. 54 (King’s retiring room); Ponz 1772–94, VI, p. 34 (King’s retiring room); Ceán Bermúdez 1880, V, p. 178; Stirling Maxwell 1848, II, p. 581; W. Stirling Maxwell, Velázquez and his Works, London, 1855, p. 36; French edn with
183 The Waterseller of Seville

Canvas 107.7 × 81.3 cm (including a 4 cm strip added at top)
WM 1600–1948

This is the most famous of all the bodegones painted by Velázquez before he left Seville for Madrid in 1623 (see previous entry). The nickname ‘el Corzo’, the Corsican, for the waterseller was recorded in the Buen Retiro inventory of 1701. According to one scholar (Justi 1922) ‘el Corzo’ was a local tradesman, although more recently El Corzo de Sevilla has been identified as a rich merchant, and ‘el Corzo’ as shorthand for a rich person (Wind 1987). Velázquez’s early biographer, Palomino (1724, quoted by López-Rey) described him somewhat fancifully: ‘The painting called the Waterseller, who is an old man very shabbily dressed in a sordid ragged smock, which would discover his chest and abdomen covered with scabs and hard, strong callouses. And beside him there is a boy to whom he is giving a drink. This work has been so talked of that it has been kept to this day at the Palace of Buen Retiro.’

In style, this painting is very similar to the Two Men eating at a Humble Table and to the other genre scenes of Velázquez’s early period, 1617–23 (see previous entry). It has been variously dated within that period but there is no firm evidence for its precise dating. The handling of the chiaroscuro is very close to the Adoration of the Magi (Prado, Madrid), which is dated 1619; the posture and lighting of the boy’s head on the left is the same on both pictures. MacLaren and Braham (1970) pointed out that the open-weave canvas is of the same kind as that used for the Kitchen Scene with Christ in the House of Martha and Mary (N.G.L.) and An Old Woman cooking Eggs (N.G.S., Edinburgh), both dated 1618. However, as these are the only three dated pictures of Velázquez’s early period, there is insufficient evidence for a precise chronology, and about 1620 would seem to be the most reasonable rendering of the date of the Waterseller.
This was probably one of the paintings Velázquez brought with him in 1623 to Madrid, where it was acquired by his early admirer and friend Don Juan Fonseca y Figueroa (1585–1627), former Canon of Seville Cathedral and ‘Chief Officer’ of Philip IV’s chapel from 1622. Fonseca was an amateur painter and author of a treatise on ancient painting, with whom Velázquez stayed on his arrival in Madrid. On Fonseca’s death in 1627, Velázquez appraised the work at 400 reales, higher than any other painting in the collection. The Waterseller may be a visual pun on the name Fonseca y Figueroa, because ‘fonseca’ means ‘dry fountain’ and there is an object, possibly a fig (higo), at the bottom of the glass (López-Rey 1963, p. 163). Figs were commonly used to freshen water, although more recent scholarship suggests that the ‘fig’ may in fact be a glass bubble found in expensive façon de Venise glassware (Ramírez-Montesinos 1985).

There are three copies of the work, in each of which the waterseller is shown wearing a cap: Contini-Bonacossi collection, Florence; Walters Art Museum, Baltimore; and ex-New York art market (López-Rey 1963, nos. 125–27, pls. 189–90, 194). The painting was etched by Goya and frequently engraved (Blas Amettler, Madrid 1792–94; Bartolomeo Vázquez, 1793, etc.).

Velázquez’s bodegones were usually accepted at their face value as realistic genre scenes, the visual counterpart of the picaresque novel, until recently, when scholars took to analysing them for symbolic or allegorical content (for an overview see D. Davies in Edinburgh 1996, pp. 51–65). Davies concludes
in support of Jordan and Cherry’s (1995) argument that the work was a display of Velázquez’s virtuosity in genre scenes, rather than a narrative with psychological interaction. Other scholars have aired more creative interpretations: Mena Marqués (1999) argues that the waterseller represents the figure of the Greek philosopher Diogenes, in his role as mentor of youth; Wind (1987) and Drury (1999) suggest that it is an allegory of Christian charity or a paradigm of benevolence; Moffitt (1978) argues that it is an allegory of Providence, Prudence and Good Counsel, and Gállego (1974) that it represents the Three Ages of Man; whilst Steinberg (1971) contends that it is an initiation rite. The subject-matter has also been associated with picaresque novels, stories relating to urchins, the earliest of which was Lazarillo de Tormes (1554). The dignity of the figure of the waterseller, however, contradicts this hypothesis, as he shows none of the attributes of the ‘pittore ridicole’ associated with scenes depicting the antics of the lesser orders (Brown 1986).

New technical information (Z. Véliz in Edinburgh 1996, pp. 79–83) provides evidence of fine graphic lines visible beneath the waterseller’s hands and the contour of his head and ear, where Velázquez ‘drew’ the outlines of the composition with a stiff pointed brush. Véliz also highlights the flurry of vertical white brushstrokes underlying the hands and goblet near the centre of the picture – brush-wipings by the artist which were not intended to be seen and which indicate that the work was painted in sections with the hands completed after the area to which the brush-wipings correspond.

**CONDITION** Good; cleaned in 1959. There are pentimenti at the collar of the waterseller’s jacket, his right sleeve, and the fingers of both hands.

**PROV.** Juan de Fonseca y Figueroa, Madrid (d. 1627); bought by Gaspar de Bracamonte, Madrid; traditionally, Cardinal Infante Don Fernando (d. 1641); royal collection, Madrid: Buen Retiro Palace (1701 inventory, no. 496); Royal Palace (1772 inventory, no. 497, hanging in the passage to the King’s pew; 1794 inventory, King’s dining room); captured at Vitoria, 1813.

**EXH.** B.I., Old Masters, 1828 (46); 1847 (121); Royal Manchester Institution, 1834 (121); R.A., Old Masters, 1886 (119); New Gallery, 1895–96 (134); Guildhall, 1901 (100); Grafton Galleries, National Loan Exhibition, 1909–10 (31); ibid., 1913–14 (49); B.F.A.C., Spanish Art, 1928 (3); R.A., Seventeenth Century, 1938 (219); Arts Council/N.G.L., Spanish Paintings, 1947, (37); Arts Council 1949 (13); Madrid, Prado, Velázquez y lo Velazqueño, 1960 (40); Montreal, Man and his World, 1967 (35); N.G.L., El Greco to Goya, 1981 (15); New York, Metropolitan Museum of Art, Velázquez, 1989 (5); Madrid, Prado, Velázquez, 1990 (3); N.G.L., Spanish Still Life from Velázquez to Goya, 1995 (8); Edinburgh, N.G.S., Velázquez in Seville, 1996 (31); Seville, Monasterio de Sta Maria de las Cuevas, Velázquez y Sevilla, 1999 (87); Capodimonte, Naples, Velázquez a Capodimonte, 2005 (6); N.G.L., Velázquez, 2006 (8)

**LIT.** (See previous entry regarding the early sources); Palomino 1715–24, III (1960 edn, p. 32); D. D’Argenville, Abregé de la vie des plus fameux peintres, Paris, 1745, II, p. 331; N. Caimo, Lettere d’un vago Italiano ad un suo amico, Milan, 1768, p. 152; Cumberland 1783, II, p. 6 (1960 edn, p. 111); Cumberland 1787, p. 39 (Royal Palace, King’s dressing room); Ponz 1772–94, VI, pp. 31, 198; J.N. D’Azara, The Works of Anthony Raphael Mengs, II, 1796, p. 83; Ceán Bermúdez 1800, V, pp. 158, 178 (1960 edn, pp. 125, 137); J.D. Fiorillo, Geschichte der Malerey in Spanien, 1806, p. 235, (1960 edn, p. 146); Passavant 1836, I, p. 170; Waagen 1838, II, p. 298; idem 1854, II p. 276; Stirling Maxwell 1848, II, p. 580; Stirling Maxwell 1855, p. 35; French edn by W. Bürger, 1865,
The earliest record (1772 inventory) describes this picture simply as ‘portrait with a golilla’ — a reference to the sitter’s white collar. Cumberland’s (1787) description of a half-length Velázquez portrait of Antonio Pérez, secretary to Philip II (died in 1611), hanging in the Prince’s dining room in the Royal Palace may refer to this picture, and subsequently the sitter was identified as the artist Alonso Cano (Mayer); the playwright Pedro Calderón de la Barca (most recently Greer in Stratton-Pruitt 2002, pp. 149–69) and Velázquez himself (Waagen 1838; Pemán 1960), but none of these is remotely acceptable. At one point a fictitious inscription AC was invented to support the Alonso Cano identification (J. Ortega y Gasset, Velázquez, Glasgow, 1954, pl. 40).

Enriqueta Harris has more convincingly identified the sitter as José Nieto (1600/10–1684), Queen Mariana of Austria’s chamberlain (apostentador) in the 1650s. It is he who appears in the background of the famous Las Meninas painting (Prado, Madrid), and, although this image is sketchy and indistinct, it is sufficiently similar to the Apsley House portrait to warrant a tentative identification (Harris 1978, figs. 65–66), although more recent writers, López-Rey (1999, p. 224) and Carr (London 2006, p. 188) still consider the identity inconclusive. Nieto was probably an early acquaintance of Velázquez at court and he
had been his opposite number in the royal household as chamberlain to the Queen for several years before Las Meninas was painted in 1656.

Elements of the painting have a sketchy appearance, particularly the hair and ear, which seem unfinished. Trapier has pointed to the three strokes of the brush in the upper right-hand corner where the artist wiped it. This unfinished appearance led Neil MacLaren (1947) to suggest a date in the 1650s, after the second Italian visit, but most other authorities agree on a date in the late 1630s to early 1640s (see literature below). It is similar in style to the portrait of the sculptor Martínez Montañés in the Prado (López-Rey, 1963, no. 503, pl. 102), which may be dated 1635–36, when Martínez was at court in Madrid. However, Enriqueta Harris (1978, p. 153) has suggested a date in the mid 1640s as fitting both the style and the approximate age of the sitter (about forty years old): ‘Joseph Nieto, some dozen years younger than when he appears, his hair now receding, as the Queen’s Chamberlain in the doorway of the Meninas (1656)’. López-Rey (1999, no. 91) suggests a date of c. 1635–45.

Harris (1978, p. 308) notes four early copies, three of which were apparently made when the picture was narrower: (1) El Palacio de Bellas Artes, Mexico (called Mazo; López-Rey 1963, p. 311, no. 552); (2) formerly (?) Mayorga collection, Madrid; (3) (formerly) Somerset de Chair collection, St Osyth’s Priory, Essex; (4) Friedsam Memorial Library, St Bonaventure University, New York (López-Rey 1963, no. 551), head and shoulders only. Finally, a copy labelled ‘Goya’ in the Fundación Lázaro Galdiano, Madrid, is nineteenth-century.
CONDITION Somewhat rubbed on hair and cloak; generally good. Pentimenti visible on hair. Strips added to canvas on left (4 cm) and right (2.5 cm).

PROV. Duquesa del Arco; Royal Palace, Madrid (1772 inventory, probably identical with the ‘man said to be Antonio Pérez’ hanging with the Innocent X portrait in the Prince’s apartment (Pieza del Oratorio), though Velázquez’s name is not mentioned; Cumberland 1787, pp. 75f. (lists a half-length portrait of Antonio Pérez by Velázquez in the Prince’s dining room in the Royal Palace, where Ponz (1772–94, p. 49) had described the man with the golilla); captured at Vitoria, 1813.

EXH. B.I., Old Masters, 1828 (9) (Spanish gentleman); no. 11, 1855, (self-portrait); New Gallery, 1895–96 (107); Guildhall, 1901 (125); Grafton Galleries, 1913–14 (62); R.A., Spanish Paintings, 1920–21 (67); R.A., Seventeenth Century, 1938 (220); B.F.A.C., Spanish Art, 1928 (4); Arts Council/N.G.L., Spanish Painting, 1947 (36); Arts Council 1949 (12); Stockholm, Nationalmuseum, Exhibition of Spanish Masters, 1959–60 (102); Madrid, Museo Municipal, La alianza de dos monarquías: Wellington en España, 1988 (7.1.8); Madrid, Prado, The Spanish Portrait from El Greco to Picasso, 2005 (36); N.G.L., Velázquez, 2006 (29)

LIT. Cumberland 1787, p. 75; Ponz 1772–94, VI, p. 49; Passavant 1836, I, p. 170; Waagen 1838, II, p. 298 (said to be a self-portrait); Stirling Maxwell 1848, III, p. 1401; Stirling Maxwell 1855, French edn by W. Bürger, 1865, p. 271, no. 116; Curtis 1883, no. 209; Justi 1889, pp. 300, 426 (not a self-portrait); Mesonero Romanos 1889, p. 197; Beruete 1906, pp. 48, 151, 157 (1638–44); Allende-Salazar 1925, pl. 51 (c. 1632); Mayer 1936, no. 378 (c. 1632–4); Lafuente 1943, no. 52; Trapier 1948, p. 187 (early 1630s); Pantorba 1955, no. 81 (c. 1640); C. Pemán, ‘Sobre autorretratos de juventud de Velázquez’, Varia Velazqueña, I, 1960, pp. 696–704; Asturias and Bardi 1969, no. 57 (1632–34); J. Gudiol, Velázquez, English edn, New York, 1974, p. 211; E. Harris, ‘Velázquez’s Apsley House Portrait: an Identification’, The Burlington Magazine, CXX, 1978, pp. 304–08; López-Rey 1979, no. 91 (late 1630s); J. López-Rey 1996, II, p. 224 (91); M. Greer: ‘Calderón de la Barca: Playwright at Court’, in S. Stratton-Pruitt, The Cambridge Companion to Velázquez, Cambridge, 2002, pp. 149–69; J. Portús in Madrid 2004 (c. 1640–50); London 2006 (1635–45); Checa 2008, no. 62

185 Pope Innocent X, 1650
Canvas, 82 x 71.5 cm
WM 1590–1948

Early in 1649 Velázquez travelled to Italy, at the command of Philip IV, to buy pictures and sculptures for the royal collection. It was his second visit and it resulted in the appearance of a strong Italian, particularly Venetian, influence in his work. Velázquez was afforded the great privilege of painting the portrait of Innocent X (Giambattista Pamphilj, 1574–1655), whom he had met as papal nuncio in Madrid in 1626–30 (Harris 1999, p. 210). This portrait is now in the Galleria Doria Pamphilj in Rome and it differs from the Wellington picture in showing the Pope three-quarter-length, seated and holding a piece of paper inscribed: Alla Santa di Nro Sigre / Innocencio X /Per /Diego di Silva y Velázquez de la Ca/mera di S. Mta. Cattca, with the addition of a date, now illegible, which has been read as 1650. This was Jubilee year, the high-water mark of Innocent’s papacy, when 700,000 pilgrims converged on Rome. Innocent is considered to have been a reforming Pope, active in sending out missions and reforming religious orders, but indecisive and too much under the influence of his sister-in-law, Olimpia Maidalchini. The
masterpiece in the Galleria Doria Pamphilj has always belonged to the sitter’s family and there has never been any doubt that it is the original painting commissioned by the Pope, who gave Velázquez a golden medallion with his portrait as a sign of his appreciation. With its red tonality and fluid brush strokes it has been considered, since the seventeenth century (M. Boschini, *Carta del Navigar pitoresco*, 1660), as the most Titianesque of Velázquez’s paintings.

Several contemporary witnesses, and subsequently Palomino (1724), record that Velázquez brought a copy of his portrait of Innocent X back with him when he returned to Madrid in June 1651. The fullest comment appears in a letter dated 8 July 1651 from the papal nuncio in Madrid, Giulio Rospigliosi, to Cardinal Pamphilj in Rome, in which he says that Velázquez has returned from Italy ‘and brought with him a good many originals by the best painters as well as a very like portrait of our Lord (Innocent X) which His Majesty has shown to enjoy very much’ (Harris, ‘Velázquez en Roma’, *Archivo Español de Arte*, xxxi, 1958, p. 186).

Velázquez himself owned a portrait of Innocent which is recorded in the inventory made at his death (Pita Andrade 2000; Velázquez-Homenaje, 1960, p. 312, no. 374) but who painted it is not mentioned. Rospigliosi’s comment that the picture pleased the king suggests that it was given to him, and this is confirmed in a marginal note in a manuscript of Velázquez’s friend Lázaro Díaz del Valle of 1656: ‘he had a portrait of His Holiness to bring to His Majesty in Spain’ (hizo un retrato de Su Santidad para traerle a Su Mgd
It used to be assumed that the Apsley House picture was the one recorded by Palomino as brought back to Spain by Velázquez (Wellington 1901). It is first listed in the inventories of the royal collection in 1772, when it was in the passage to the King’s pew in the Royal Palace at Madrid: ‘Un retrato del Papa Innocencio 10 de medio cuerpo de vara de alto, y poco menos de ancho, original de Velázquez’. The size fits well (1 vara = 84.7 cm) and it is reasonable to suppose that this is indeed the Wellington picture, which remained in the royal collection until 1813. (López-Rey 1996 suggests that the record of a painting of identical description and size in the royal inventory of 1814 is simply an error.) However, in the 1772 inventory it is marked as coming from the Marquis de la Ensenada’s collection, bought by Charles III in 1769, which makes it doubtful whether this was the picture given to Philip IV by Velázquez in 1651 – if, indeed, the gift was ever made.

There are many copies of the portrait of Innocent X; unfortunately none has a provenance extending further back than the eighteenth century. This makes it impossible to identify the copy or copies described by the artist’s contemporaries with extant paintings. The fact that the Wellington picture was accepted as by Velázquez in the Spanish royal collection in the inventories of 1772 and 1794 enhances its status, but it does not prove that it was the copy brought back by the artist himself in 1651.

On grounds of style and quality the picture has been the subject of dispute among authorities for the last hundred years, but it has now been accepted as autograph. Curtis (1883) and Armstrong (1896) believed it to be autograph, while Justi (1889) argued that the head was by Velázquez himself, the robe and background perhaps by another hand. Beruete (1898), on the other hand, considered that the execution was less fresh than Velázquez’s own, and this doubt was echoed by Allende-Salazar (1925), who rejected the picture from the Velázquez canon and listed it, without any evidence, as probably a copy by the artist’s Moorish assistant Juan de Pareja. This view was in turn rejected by Mayer (1936), according to whom ‘the quality is entirely that of Velázquez’ own work’. Camón Aznar (1964) argued that it was by Velázquez himself and López-Rey (1963) echoed Justi’s view that the head ‘reveals the master’s hand’, while much of the costume and background was by an assistant. López-Rey reasserted this view more recently, cataloguing the painting as ‘Velázquez and workshop’ (López-Rey 1999, p. 284). Harris (1999, pp. 361–62) disagreed with this assessment and, after a close comparison of the Doria Pamphilj and Wellington portraits, concluded that they were unquestionably by the same hand, with the former work painted first, with which Pons (2002) agreed. The most recent close technical examination, by Larry Keith, revealed no disjunction between the paint of the head and the mozzetta, suggesting that they were executed at the same time (Carr in London 2006, p. 222) – and not, as Harris suggested, with the sketchy mozzetta painted later. In addition, Carr could find no evidence to indicate which portrait was painted first, indicating the possibility that the Wellington work was the original, produced by the Pope’s sittings to the artist. The debate remains open as to whether the Apsley House painting was the initial study made from the life or an autograph replica produced for the king (Carr in London 2006, p. 86).

Eight drawings in brown ink and graphite on two sheets of white paper authenticated by McKim-Smith (1980) as studies for the portrait were dismissed by Harris (1999).

The precise date of the work has been debated, as Harris (1999, p. 351) suggested that it was begun as early as 26 April 1649, because Innocent is wearing his summer costume. Pons (2002, p. 320), however, cites a document dated 13 August 1650, which describes the Pope sitting to Velázquez then.
Of the many copies, relatively few show the three-quarter-length composition of the Doria-Pamphilj picture; the majority are, like the Wellington version, bust size (López-Rey 1963, nos. 446–57). Nearly all of them are considered to be copies by other hands. Apart from the one in the National Gallery of Art, Washington (López-Rey 1963, no. 448; formerly Horace Walpole and Catherine the Great, Hermitage, St Petersburg, and Mellon collections), only the Wellington picture has any claim to be considered autograph. Subsequently it was copied by Goya (López-Rey 1963, no. 456, pl. 358) and others, and more recently the original version inspired a series of compositions by Francis Bacon.

**CONDITION** Thinly painted and some wearing, particularly in the background. Cleaned by Larry Keith, National Gallery, in June 2006. For his technical analysis see London 2006, pp. 85–86.

**PROV.** Marquis de la Ensenada, bought by Charles III, 1768; Royal Palace, Madrid, 1772 inventory: passage to the royal pew; 1789 inventory: Prince’s apartment (Pieza del Oratorio) no. 384 (F. Fernández-Miranda y Lozana 1988); 1794 inventory: Prince’s apartment (Pieza del Oratorio); 1811 Sala Antigua del Consejo de Estado, no. 756 (Luna 1993); captured at Vitoria, 1813.

**EXH.** B.I., Old Masters, 1828 (5); R.A., Old Masters, 1887 (160); New Gallery, 1895–96 (54); Guildhall, 1901 (122); Grafton Galleries, 1913–14 (59); Arts Council 1949 (15); Madrid, Velázquez y lo Velazqueño, 1960 (71); N.G.L., Velázquez, 2006 (39)

Quevedo was a brilliant classical scholar, a satirist and lyric poet, whose work probed the moral aspect of the Spanish decline in the seventeenth century. His life was punctuated by a series of duels, vendettas and periods of exile caused both by his satirical exposure of corruption and by his own fiery temperament. He fled to Italy after a duel in 1611 and subsequently entered the service of the Duke of Osuna, Viceroy of Naples and Sicily, who was his protector until his own fall in 1620. After a period of banishment, Quevedo obtained a position at the court of Philip IV and became secretary to the king in 1632. Meanwhile, his reputation was assured with the publication in 1626 of the *Vida del Buscón*, a picaresque romance, and of the series of *Sueños* (visions of hell) in which he provided a satirical analysis of the human condition. His attacks on the Duke of Olivares led to his imprisonment in 1639–42 and he died three years later. He much admired Velázquez and celebrated his fame in two of his poems (*Varia Velazqueña*, Madrid, 1960, II, p. 19).

Both this portrait and another in the Instituto de Valencia de Don Juan in Madrid (López-Rey 1963, no. 532), which is inscribed with the name of the sitter, are widely considered to be studio copies of a lost original by Velázquez. Palomino (1715–24, p. 333) described the original: ‘Another portrait was done by Velázquez of Don Francisco de Quevedo Villegas …. He painted him with his spectacles on, as he was in the habit of wearing them.’ Indeed the word *quevedos* has come to mean eyeglasses (Nottingham 1980). There are three further copies (Biblioteca Nacional, Madrid, and de Salas collection, formerly Bankes, Kingston Lacy; López-Rey 1963, nos. 533–34), and J. Lafuente collection (repr. Camón Aznar 1964, p. 357), and an engraving of one by Juan de Noort was used to illustrate the posthumous edition of Quevedo’s poems, *El Parnaso español*, Madrid, 1648 (repr. Camón Aznar 1964, p. 358).

Velázquez must have painted the original before 1639, when Quevedo was imprisoned. A date in the 1630s, when the poet was in his fifties, is inherently likely and Trapier (1948) has argued that as he is depicted in secular costume it must have been painted after 1634, when he gave up his church benefices to marry. The other versions of the portrait show the sitter with the red cross of the Order of Santiago on his chest, which he was awarded in 1617.

More recent scholarship (Jordan in Madrid and Dallas 2005, pp. 162–66) tentatively suggests that this portrait may be a version of an original by Juan van der Hamen y León (1596–1631), whose brother was a close friend of the poet. Jordan argues that the work is a good imitation of Velázquez’s style, and can be dated to the years 1623–28. Both van der Hamen and Velázquez painted portraits of famous figures of the day.

**CONDITION** Fair. Some retouching.

**PROV.** Possibly Don Francisco de Bruna, Seville (see R. Twiss, *Travels through Portugal and Spain in 1772 and 1773, 1775*, p. 308; but this could have been one of the other versions); Louisa, Lady Stuart, London, sale,
Velázquez

Christie’s, 15 May 1841, lot 44, 47 guineas (£49 7s); bought by the 1st Duke of Wellington from Messrs Smith in 1841 for 100 guineas (£105).

Exh. B.I., Old Masters, 1885; R.A., Old Masters, 1887 (111); New Gallery, 1896 (68); Guildhall, 1901 (98); Grafton Galleries, 1913–14 (42); Arts Council 1949 (16); Nottingham University Art Gallery, The Golden Age of Spanish Painting, 1980 (39).

Hendrik DUBBELS (and possibly Willem van de VELDE)

Hendrik DUBBELS (1621–1707)
Dutch School

Dubbels worked in Amsterdam as a painter of seascapes and winter landscapes, developing close contacts with Willem van de Velde the Younger.

Lit. U. Middendorf, Hendrik J. Dubbels (1621–1707), Freren, 1989

Willem van de VELDE the Younger (1633–1707)
Dutch School

Elder brother of Adriaen van de Velde, both sons of Willem van de Velde the Elder, he was born in Leiden, the family afterwards settling at Amsterdam. He studied with his father and probably also with Simon de Vlieger. By 1672 he had followed his father to England where, from 1674, they worked for Charles II, remaining for the rest of their lives. He is known for seascapes with shipping.


187 Large Ships and Boats in a Calm

Signed in white, right of centre: W V V over DVBBELS
Oak panel, 40.7 × 41.5 cm
WM 1644–1948

To the right is a States yacht at anchor, surrounded by a kaag and other ships; another kaag and a smalschip are at left. The flag is that of the Dutch Republic.

This is one of a dozen or so pictures catalogued by Middendorf (1989) as by Dubbels working in the Van de Velde studio; Robinson (1991, I, p. 347) suggests that it is ‘perhaps mainly by Dubbels with a little work on it by [Willem van de Velde] the Younger’, and dates it c. 1660. Although the format of the WVV signature is consistent with Van de Velde’s practice, sails and rigging are not rendered with his customary precision. The signature itself is painted over Dubbels’s. Another painting with both artists’ signatures is in the collection of the Earl of Halifax (Robinson 1991, no. 696; Middendorf 1989, no. 15). A signed painting by Dubbels, similar to WM 1644, was in the Blank sale, Parke-Bernet, New York, 19 Nov. 1949, lot 24 (Middendorf 1989, no. 18).

Condition Lines of grain showing through paint; otherwise good.

Prov. Spanish royal collection (not identified in the royal inventories); captured at Vitoria, 1813.
VENETIAN School, sixteenth century

188 An Unknown Lady

Inscribed on the back: Catherine Cornaro

Canvas, 113 × 91.5 cm

WM 1543–1948

She is wearing a red velvet gown with a V-shaped white lace front. Round her wrist is a gold shell-pattern belt; a gold pendant, showing two putti flanking a central object, perhaps an armorial shield, hangs from a long necklace.

In the Beckford catalogue of 1823 this painting – if indeed it can be so identified – was described as ‘P. Veronese. A finely coloured portrait of Catherine Cornaro’, and this description was retained in the Wellington Catalogue. Yet it is a curious one, for Caterina Cornaro, Queen of Cyprus (1454–1510), died several years before Veronese (1528–1588) was born and there was no suggestion that he was copying
an earlier portrait. Indeed the identification was utterly fanciful: we know from contemporary portraits that Caterina Cornaro’s appearance was quite different (e.g. Gentile Bellini, c. 1500, in the Szépművészeti Múzeum, Budapest; see E. Schaeffer, ‘Bildnisse … der Caterina Cornaro’, Monatshefte für Kunstwissenschaft, IV, 1911, pp. 12ff., pl. 8), and in any case this picture was painted nearly half a century after her death. Nor is the attribution to Veronese tenable. To judge from the costume and from comparable portraits by Titian, Paris Bordone and other members of the Venetian school, a date in the middle or third quarter of the sixteenth century is likely. Although it is difficult to suggest a convincing attribution, W. Mostyn-Owen argues that the painting should be ascribed to Francesco Beccaruzzi (1490/3–c. 1563), from Treviso, portraits by whom are in the Doria-Pamphilj Gallery, Rome and the Gemäldegalerie, Berlin (written opinion to author, 2008).

The pendant with the two putti is typical of the roundels used as hat badges in the first half of the sixteenth century and then adapted for use as pendants from the 1540s (e.g. Y. Hackenbroch, Renaissance Jewellery, Munich, 1979, pl. 140 A and B; I am grateful to Michael Snodin for this information).

PROV. Perhaps to be identified with a portrait in the Beckford sale, 10 Oct. 1823, lot 43 (see above); bought by Mr King for 19 guineas (not 16 as in Wellington 1901); Peter Norton, Soho Square; Messrs Henry Graves & Co., who sold it to the 1st Duke of Wellington for 100 guineas (£105) in 1845.
Marcello VENUSTI (1512/15–1579)
Italian (Roman) School

Born in Como, Venusti began his career under Giulio Romano at Mantua and then became a pupil of Perino del Vaga in Florence, but most of his career was spent in Rome. His early work is reminiscent of Correggio, but he subsequently became a friend and close follower of Michelangelo, whose drawings he frequently turned into small-scale paintings.

Lit. G. Kamp, Marcello Venusti: religiöse kunst in Umfeld Michelangelo, Egelsbach, 1993

189 The Annunciation
Poplar panel, 38 × 28 cm
WM 1616–1948

The original of this picture is in the sacristy of San Giovanni in Laterano, Rome, attributed to Marcello Venusti (panel, 320 × 210 cm; Parroni 1937, fig. 6). The attribution is due to Vasari, according to whom Marcello Venusti painted the panel from Michelangelo’s design (Vasari, ed. Milanesi, VII, 1881, p. 575). Most authorities have accepted Vasari’s account; only Giuseppe Parroni has put forward a dissenting view and attributed the San Giovanni in Laterano panel to Michelangelo himself.

It is not difficult to detect Michelangelo’s ideas behind the composition; as Tolnay pointed out, the angel’s gesture is analogous to that of God in the Creation of Adam on the Sistine ceiling. There is indeed a drawing in the Uffizi, Florence, which is directly preparatory for the San Giovanni in Laterano painting and which used to be considered the Michelangelo design described by Vasari (Parroni 1937, fig. 5; Wilde 1959, fig. 7). However, this drawing is, by common consent, now attributed to Venusti, working from a lost Michelangelo original (Tolnay 1960; Barocchi 1962).

There are several other recorded copies of the composition. Parroni reproduces two panels which were, in 1937, in the collections of Mgr Steinmann, Palazzo Brancaccio, Rome (210 × 160 cm., Parroni 1937, fig. 8) and of Prof. Canali, Rome (86 × 66 cm). Another, closer in size to WM 1616, is at Castle Howard and there is a version in landscape format in the Museum at Chambéry (inv. 719; 43.5 × 59 cm). The Wellington picture is a miniature version of the original, which it follows closely, differing only in the patterning of the floor and in not having an arched top. It is convincing as a sixteenth-century work, but has usually been considered as after, rather than by, Marcello Venusti. However, Wilde (1959) described it as a reduced replica painted by Venusti himself and suggested that ‘it was perhaps the success of these replicas that led him to specialize in the piccola maniera’. Vasari himself wrote of ‘… Marcello who continues to produce small things executed with incredible patience’, and WM 1616 fits well with this description. Infra-red examination reveals the presence of underdrawing in the Virgin’s dress, and in other opaque areas, as well as pentimenti on the lectern, which supports the view that this is by Venusti himself rather than a copyist. There is an engraving of the composition by Nicholas Béatrizet (Tolnay 1960, fig. 316).
CONDITION. The panel has tended to split along the grain and the paint surface has flaked considerably and been retouched passim.

PROV. Spanish royal collection (not identified in the royal inventories); captured at Vitoria, 1813.


(Claude)-Joseph VERNET (1714–1789)

French School

Born in Avignon, where he studied under his father Antoine, it was during his residence in Rome from 1734 to 1753 that he established his reputation, particularly with Irish and English clients making the Grand Tour. Influenced in Rome by Adrian Manglard and Panini, he specialized in imaginary coastal and river views, painted in pairs or sets of four, expressive of different weather and of various times of day. Commissioned in 1735 to paint the ports of France for the French king, he produced a set of views unrivalled in quality and variety. In 1753 he became a member of the French Académie, and in 1762 he gave up his itinerant life to settle in Paris.
Vernet


190 Sunset: View over a Bay with Figures
Inscribed on the back: Fait par M. Vernet 1742 et appartient a M.D- (illegible) and Pe Nro Sor (Principe Nuestro Senor)
Canvas, 57 × 105 cm
WM 1645–1948

The coast is reminiscent of the area north of Naples, near Posillipo or further round the Golfo di Pozzuoli; elegant visitors examine some fish proffered by two fishermen.

The French inscription on the back is no longer clearly legible, but there is no doubt that the date is 1742. This was during Vernet’s most inventive period, when he was living in Rome and visiting the coast of central Italy, before his work became repetitive in the second half of his career. A replica dated 1759, larger in size (134 × 178 cm) and taller in format, is in a private collection in Madrid (Juan J. Luna, verbal communication, 1974). A late eighteenth-century copy was sold at Christie’s, 31 Oct. 1975 (lot 177; 59.7 × 110.5 cm), and there is a copy in the collection of one of Vernet’s descendants in Paris. The inscription Pe Nro Sor indicates the ownership of the Prince of the Asturias, before he became Charles IV in 1788. Among the paintings hanging in his newly built country house, the Casita del Príncipe at the Escorial, were no less than twelve by Joseph Vernet, who must have been one of his favourite artists. Two of these were given to Charles by Louis XVI in February 1781 (Ingersoll-Smouse 1926, nos. 895 and 1013; Zarco Cuevas 1934, nos. 329–30). A further six were commissioned by Charles from Vernet himself in May 1781 for 40,000 livres (Ingersoll-Smouse 1926, nos. 1082–87; Zarco Cuevas 1934, nos. 335–40). They
arrived in Madrid in December 1782. Of these, three are now in the Prado (nos. 2347–49) and one (View of a Port during a Fire) is in the private collection of the Duke of Wellington. Finally, four more canvases by Vernet are listed in the Casita del Príncipe inventory (c. 1782–88): ‘Cuatro iguales también Países, Marinas y un incendio del mar’ (landscapes, seascapes and a fire at sea; Zarco Cuevas 1934, nos. 331–34). The size given for these – less than two-thirds of a vara by one vara, or about 60 x 80 cm – fits reasonably well with WM 1645–1948 and also with its pendant, The Italian Gondola (view of Sorrento) in the Prado (no. 2350; Ingersoll-Smouse 1926, no. 456). It is, therefore, likely that these are two of the four paintings listed under this heading. Both were acquired in the sale of the notable collector the Baron de Breteuil, who probably obtained them when the ambassador was in Naples; but it is impossible to identify the Monsieur D– for whom they were originally painted. Vernet’s Livre de Raison records no less than seven marines of the appropriate size as having been painted for various clients in 1742.

CONDITION Unlined.

PROV. Monsieur D; Louis-Auguste le Tonnelier, Baron de Breteuil (1733–1807), French ambassador in Naples, 1771–75; his sale 16–25 Jan. 1786, no. 52; Charles IV, when Prince of the Asturias; Casita del Príncipe, Escorial, c. 1786; captured at Vitoria, 1813.

EXH. Kenwood, Iveagh Bequest, and Paris, Musée de la Marine), Claude Joseph Vernet, 1976 (9) (repr.)

LIT. Ingersoll-Smouse 1926, p. 43, no. 78 bis; J. Zarco Cuevas, Cuadros reunidos por Carlos IV, siendo Príncipe, en su Casa de Campo de El Escorial, in Religión y Cultura, 25, Madrid, 1934, p. 382–419, nos. 331–34; Gaya Nuño 1964, no. 221

After VERNET

191 A Shipwreck
Canvas, 34 x 49 cm
WM 1575–1948

This is probably a studio replica or contemporary copy of the Shipwreck in the collection of the Earl of Elgin (Ingersoll-Smouse 1926, no. 747, fig. 185, as c. 1760–65; exh. Landscape in French Art, R.A., 1949–50, no. 135, together with its companion Calm, no. 136). The Wellington version differs in omitting the birds in the sky and a figure clinging to a piece of wood in the foreground, but it is otherwise identical in composition. However, it is considerably weaker in execution than the Elgin picture and it no longer appears possible to uphold the old attribution to Vernet’s hand. Ingersoll-Smouse did not list it, but she did catalogue a third version, in the Aschaffenburg Gallery, as a copy of the Elgin picture.

WM 1575 cannot be identified with any of the twelve Vernets obtained by Charles IV when Prince of the Asturias for the Casita del Príncipe del Escorial (see previous entry).

PROV. Spanish royal collection (not identified in the royal inventories); captured at Vitoria, 1813.
LIT. Gaya Nuño 1964, no. 219, pl. 73
Jan VICTORS (1620–c. 1676)
Dutch (Amsterdam) School

A native of Amsterdam, he was probably a pupil of Rembrandt before 1640. He painted mainly religious pictures under Rembrandt’s influence until the 1650s, when he increasingly produced peasant genre scenes in a more individual style. In 1673 he became a medical orderly and lay preacher on ships owned by the Dutch East India Company, and died in the East Indies.

Lit. D. Miller, Jan Victors (1619–76), PhD diss., University of Delaware, Newark, DE, 1985

192 A Village Scene
Signed and dated on wooden trough: Jan Victors F ± / 1654
Canvas, 73.7 × 94 cm
WM 1512–1948

The man tending his horse on the right is balanced on the left by a group of figures including courting couples and two fish pedlars, one of whom is extracting eels from an eel basket suspended in water. There are several similar scenes by Jan Victors: the closest was in the Max Wassermann collection (sold Palais Galliéra, Paris, 26 Nov. 1967, lot 41, repr., 78 × 92 cm); others are in the Kunstmuseum,
Victors

Basle (dated 1652); Gemäldestammlung der Universität, Göttingen; and the Národni Galerie, Prague (Sumowski 1989, under no. 1795; Miller 1985, nos. A 137, A 132, A 141 and A142 respectively). Individual figures also reappear in his work: the man on the right is identical with the standing figure in the Rijksmuseum Greengrocer (no. SK-A-2345, Rijksmuseum, All the paintings, 1975, p. 579), which is also dated 1654.

Victors’s large-figured scenes of village life have similarities to the work of Jan Miense Molenaer (c. 1610–1668), who was active in Amsterdam c. 1636–48 (e.g., Tavern of the Crescent Moon, c. 1637–40, Szépművészeti Múzeum, Budapest; or Peasants near a Tavern, c. 1633–34, Frans Halsmuseum, Haarlem).


PROV. Le Rouge sale, Paris, 27 April 1818 (lot 68), bought for the 1st Duke of Wellington by Féreol de Bonnemaison for 1400 frs. (£56).

EXH. B.I., Old Masters, 1821 (128)

Edward Matthew WARD, R.A. (1816–1879)
British School

A pupil of John Cawse, he completed his education in Rome, 1836–38, and with Peter Cornelius in Munich, 1839. An accurate illustrator, he concentrated on history pieces of the English seventeenth century and the period of the French Revolution, and on illustrations to Dr Johnson and Goldsmith.

193 Napoleon in the Prison of Nice in 1794
Signed lower left centre: EMW 1841; inscribed on label on back: No.2/EMWard/13 Russell Place/Fitzroy Square
Canvas, 76 × 63.5 cm
WM 1518–1948

Napoleon was given command of the artillery of the Army in Italy in February 1794 at the age of twenty-four, but his relations with the Jacobins became strained during the height of the Terror later in the year. The picture is described in detail in the British Institution catalogue of 1841: ‘He incurred the suspicion of Laporte and the other “representatives” attached to the “army of Italy” in consequence of a journey to the Gulf of Genoa, which he performed in obedience to secret orders from Paris; and, as soon as his absence from headquarters was thus explained, he regained his freedom. The officer who came to release him was surprised to find him busy in his dungeon over the map of Lombardy. – Lockhart.’ Various inscriptions, including Vive la Nation and Napoléon, are clearly visible on the wall behind Napoleon.
This is one of the earliest of several history pieces relating to the period of the French Revolution painted by Ward throughout his career. Others include The French Royal Family in the Prison of the Temple (c. 1854, Preston Art Gallery, exh. R.A. Bicentenary, 1968, no. 224), Marie Antoinette listening to the Act of Accusation, 1859, and The Last Toilet of Charlotte Corday, 1862 (both engraved by Lumb Stocks; Dafforne, pls. 10, 13).

According to a tradition enshrined in the Wellington Catalogue, the artist was highly pleased at the Duke's purchase of this picture and said that it was 'his first success'.

PROV. Bought by the 1st Duke of Wellington from the artist in 1841 for 20 guineas (£21).
EXH. B.I., 1841 (341)

Wijnants and Lingelbach see Lingelbach

Sir David WILKIE R.A. (1785–1841)
Scottish School

Born in Cults, near Edinburgh, he studied at the Trustees' Academy, Edinburgh, under John Graham. In 1805 he came to London, spending time at the R.A. schools. From the beginning of his career Teniers was his guiding star and Sir George Beaumont his principal patron. His early genre scenes brought him considerable popularity, and he was elected A.R.A. in 1809 and R.A. in 1811. His development towards a broader style, confirmed by his travels in Italy and Spain from 1825–28, led to a decline in his popularity, though he continued to enjoy royal patronage, becoming Painter in Ordinary successively to George IV, William IV and Queen Victoria.


194 Chelsea Pensioners reading the Waterloo Despatch
Signed lower left: David Wilkie, 1822
Panel, 158 × 97 cm
WM 1469–1948

The picture is set in Jew's Row off the King's Road, Chelsea, with the Chelsea Hospital on the left (Tromans 2002, p. 89). The soldiers pore over the Duke of Wellington's despatch dated 19 June, which was reprinted in a special number of the London Gazette on 22 June.

A full description of the scene is given by Wilkie's contemporary, Allan Cunningham: ‘There are fifteen prominent characters who perform leading parts in this martial drama, besides a number of subordinate personages, who contribute to the general joy by supplying
the tables with drink, the feet with music, and the mouth with savory food: 1, an orderly of the Marquis of Anglesey’s Lancers, who brings the Gazette of the battle; 2, an artilleryman, who throws down his knapsack, and is speaking to the lancer, to whom several hands are offering liquor in exchange for his intelligence; 3, a sergeant of the gallant forty-second, a Macgregor from Glengarry, who fought at Barossa, stands listening to the comments of the lancer, as well as the words of the Gazette, and seems ready to exclaim, ‘Bravo, the brave forty-second!’ 4, a soldier of the Hanoverian Legion, a corps distinguished at Waterloo; 5, a Life Guardsman, whose regiment united with the Greys, the Blues and the Enniskillens in repelling the desperate charges of the French Cuirassiers; 6, an old Pensioner who was with Wolfe at Quebec, and who reads aloud, but without emotion, the Gazette of Waterloo: this, as well as many others, is a portrait; 7, a soldier’s wife, pressing eagerly forward to see if her husband’s regiment has many slain; her face, from which the colour has fled, and her agonized look, intimate that much blood has been shed, and that she fears the babe she carries is fatherless and herself a widow; 8, a veteran whose appetite has survived all the vicissitudes of war, and whose love of good cheer is only suspended for a moment by the great news: his mouth seems to open naturally for the oyster which he has lifted on his fork; 9, a negro of the Band of Foot Guards, who was once a servant of the celebrated Moreau, and accompanied him in his retreat through the Black Forest; 10, a soldier from India, who fought in the battle of Assaye, and served too under the Marquis of Granby; 11 and 12, an Irishman of the 12th Dragoons telling the news to the veteran who seems hard of hearing; his pipe dropping insensibly from his hand; both are touched with liquor, and the younger seems saying to the elder, ‘Bunker’s Hill was but a cock-fight to this’; 13, a sergeant of the Oxford Blues who shared in the battle of Vittoria; at his feet is a black dog, known to the officers and men by the name of ‘The Old Duke,’ which followed the regiment all over Spain; the sergeant holds up his little son, and his looks, as well as those of his wife, seem to say, ‘An if ye live to be a man’; 14, a soldier of the Foot Guards, stretching himself anxiously out from one of the windows of the ‘Duke of York’ public-house, anxious to hear what the Gazette says; 15, an out-door Pensioner, who, on his way to have his keg and can replenished, halts to hear the news; his wounded hand and the wooden leg denote that he has been where blows are abundant. To this barren roll-call of names I may add, that the joy is great, the drink plentiful, and the whole scene animated and picturesque.’ (Cunningham 1843, II, pp. 76ff.).

Thanks to Wilkie’s own letters and diaries, it is possible to trace the development of the composition from the original commission in August 1816 to the exhibition at the R.A. in May 1822. Wilkie wrote to Benjamin Robert Haydon on 18 August 1816, full of excitement, to tell him of the Duke of Wellington’s commission. The introduction was effected by Lord Lynedoch (see under Lawrence, no. 86 above) and the Duke gave Wilkie the commission after looking through his work in the studio. Wilkie reported the conversation:

‘The Duke … said that the subject should be a parcel of old soldiers assembled together on their seats at the door of a public-house chewing tobacco and talking over their old stories. He thought they might be in any uniform, and that it should be at some public-
house in the King’s road, Chelsea. I said this would make a most beautiful picture, and
that it only wanted some story or a principal incident to connect the figures together:
he said perhaps playing at skittles would do or any other game. When I proposed that
one might be reading a newspaper aloud to the rest, and that in making a sketch of it
many other incidents would occur, in this he perfectly agreed, and said I might send the
sketch to him when he was abroad ….’ (Haydon 1853, p. 324).

At the time, Wilkie estimated that the project would take him two years. In 1817 he is recorded as
busy preparing studies for the Wellington picture (Cunningham 1843, I, p. 459) but it was only in
December of the following year that he was ready to show the Duke a sketch (Cunningham 1843, II, pp.
17f.). This meeting did not take place until 7 March, 1819, when the Duke told Wilkie to ‘picture more of
the soldiers of the present day, instead of those I had put of half a century ago’ (Cunningham 1843, II,
p. 17). At a meeting on 12 July, at which the Tory politician Charles Long (later Baron Farnborough) ad-
vised the Duke, Wilkie submitted two sketches of which the Duke ‘preferred the one with the young fig-
ures; but as Mr Long remonstrated against the old fellows being taken out, the Duke agreed that the man
reading aloud should be a pensioner …’ and that the man with the wooden leg should be retained. It was
agreed that Wilkie should begin the picture immediately (Cunningham 1843, II, p. 18). Yet it was not until
the end of the following year that he immersed himself in the subject and he then devoted sixteen months
of uninterrupted work to it before it was finished to his satisfaction. Several witnesses reported on his ob-
sessive sketching of figures and buildings in Chelsea throughout 1821 (Cunningham 1843, II, pp. 50, 53ff.).
As well as sketching from life, it appears that Wilkie made use of coloured clay models of groups of fig-
ures in the construction of his composition (letter to Perry Nursey, 20 July 1820, The Academy, 1878).
But what remains unclear is the precise stage at which Wilkie made the change from an anecdotal genre scene with old soldiers and a man reading, as agreed in 1816, into a dramatic subject of contemporary history of the reading of the Waterloo despatch, although Hamish Miles (letter, 2008) suggests the decision ‘seems likely to have been made about the beginning of February 1821’. All Wilkie tells us in 1822 is that ‘the introduction of the Gazette was a subsequent idea of my own to unite the interest and give importance to the business of the picture’ (Cunningham 1843, II, p. 72). The fact remains that it was this change which makes the Chelsea Pensioners such a central work in Wilkie’s career, marking his transition from genre to history painter, whilst offering one of the first ‘emotive British tributes to the common soldier’ (Campbell 1971; Gear 1977; Tromans 2002).

According to Wilkie, Wellington’s last visit was on 29 May 1821, after which no further changes were requested (Miles, letter 2008). By this time the picture’s fame was assured: ‘I find that the picture of the Chelsea Pensioners has produced an interest that is quite new to me in my professional progress,’ wrote Wilkie in April 1822 (Cunningham 1843, II, p. 68), and at the Academy it was hung in the centre, over the fireplace, next to Lawrence’s portrait of the Duke. Such was the picture’s popularity that a rail had to be erected to protect it from the crowds. Wilkie received 1200 guineas from the Duke, paid in cash on the spot, and the same amount from the publishers Graves & Co. for copyright of the print engraved by Wilkie’s fellow member of the Trustees’ Academy, Edinburgh, John Burnet in 1829 (Raimbach 1843; Art Journal, 1850, p. 276: 1100 guineas plus the presentation proof). The publishers also paid for a watercolour copy of the painting to be made, which was auctioned at Sotheby’s, London, 14 April 1994 (Tromans 2002, p. 89).

There are some eighty extant drawings which confirm Wilkie’s conscientious approach to the subject. The majority are studies of figures or groups (especially British Museum; Ashmolean; R.A.) and it is clear that the picture grew in terms of loosely linked groups. There are, for example, numerous studies of the girl on the right doing her hair; many of them showing her frontal, but Wilkie must have decided that this pose was too much of a distraction from the main theme (Campbell 1971, p. 418, figs. 4–6). There are also drawings of the whole composition, for example in the Duke of Wellington’s collection; at Mead Art Museum, Amherst College, Amherst, MA; in the National Gallery of Scotland, Edinburgh (no. D.4935; squared for transfer); in Sotheby’s sale, 25 March 1920, lot 114 (formerly J.P. Heseltine coll.) and at Christie’s, 5 March 1974, lot 196 (watermark 1819). These link with the surviving eight or nine oil sketches (Miles, letter 2008), which fall into two groups: (1) with fewer figures than the finished composition, with the father and child in profile on the extreme right, subsequently abandoned (e.g. Yale Center for British Art, dated 1822, repr. The Burlington Magazine, Dec. 1969, Supplement, pl. 76; and Christie’s, 22 March 1974, lot 134, from the collection of Dr John Gott, Bishop of Truro); and (2) with a multitude of figures, as in the final version (e.g. Christie’s, 25 Nov. 1974, lot 140). There is a drawing relating to the group of the seated soldier holding up the baby in the V&A (E. 1097–1963).

In 1822 there was no hint of adverse criticism to mar the picture’s triumph, though it was pointed out that eating oysters in June – the Gazette announcing the battle is dated June 22 – was forbidden by Act of Parliament. As a war memorial, it balanced the exhilaration of triumph against a recognition of its costs, as noted by the radical Examiner, 12 May 1822: ‘We are right glad to see at last one good result from the dearly-bought Victory at Waterloo’. More serious doubts were only voiced...
much later; *The Athenaeum*, 2 July 1842, for example, commented upon the artificial nature of the picture, pronouncing it ‘composed rather than inspired’ and, more surprisingly, criticized its brilliant tonality (quoted in Wellington 1901, p. 82). The *Chelsea Pensioners* has remained one of the most popular pictures at Apsley House and has been called upon to grace a dozen exhibitions, more than any other painting in the collection.

**CONDITION** Paint surface in excellent condition; reverse of panel sealed with moisture barrier, 1955.

**PROV.** Bought by the 1st Duke of Wellington from the artist for 1200 guineas (£1260) in 1822.


195 King George IV (1762–1830)

Signed lower right: DAVID WILKIE 1830

Canvas, 279 × 178 cm

WM 1459–1948

The King is wearing full Highland dress, consisting of a bonnet with three eagle's feathers, the royal Stuart tartan jacket and kilt, green tartan plaid and the usual Highland accoutrements – pistols,
broadsword, dirk, powderhorn and sporran. The Order of the Golden Fleece hangs from his neck, and he wears the sash and star of the Order of the Thistle and the star of the Order of the Garter.

George IV, eldest son of George III, was appointed Regent in 1811 and ascended to the throne in 1820. He was an active and discerning patron and connoisseur of the visual arts.

This is a replica of the portrait in the royal collection at Holyrood House, dated 1829 (Millar 1969, p. 141, no. 183, pl. 273). The Highland dress dates from the King’s visit of 1822 to Edinburgh, but the original full-length portrait was only begun in 1829. The progress of the original painting is fully recorded in Wilkie’s letters to Sir William Knighton, Keeper of the Privy Purse to George IV. The King sat to Wilkie in April 1829, and after seven sittings the study of the head and hands was sufficiently advanced to allow the project to be completed in the studio. This was done in February 1830: ‘I am now working upon the whole-length for which I have a fine-looking Highlander for a model’, and the picture was one of three sent by Wilkie to the R.A. in April of that year. He himself singled out its rich dark colouring (‘I have made this the most glazed, and deepest toned picture I have ever tried or seen tried in these times’) and the low perspective (‘the low perspective is thought new and successful’) as its salient characteristics. Wilkie’s letters are published in full in Cunningham 1432 (III, pp. 10, 21f., 42–44), and summarized by Millar (1969).

There is a pen and wash sketch in the National Gallery of Scotland, Edinburgh (Millar 1969, fig. 47) and another was sold at Christie’s, 16 July 1974 (lot 85 repr.). Wilkie received £525 for the original portrait.
and frame and £420 from the 1st Duke of Wellington for the replica portrait and frame.

It has always been accepted that WM 1459 is a replica signed and painted by Wilkie himself for the Duke. Wilkie’s bill, dated 4 August 1831, simply states: ‘To extra whole length portrait of his late majesty George IV, including gilt frame, £420.0.0’ (Wellington archives). However, Hamish Miles has discovered from Wilkie’s letters that John Simpson, a known portrait painter and one-time assistant to Lawrence (see above, no. 162), painted a copy of the Holyrood picture for Wilkie and has identified WM 1459 with Simpson’s copy. The crucial letter is the one written by Wilkie to Sir William Knighton on 4 November 1830: ‘The portrait of his late Majesty has been copied in excellent style by Mr. Simpson. I am much pleased with it. The drawing of the head, hands, and figure is capitally understood, and the general hue very like the picture. What it wants is a skin all over. I have these two days begun upon the head and hands, and mean to go all over it to make it as nearly my own as possible’ (Glasgow, Mitchell Library).

The identification with the Wellington portrait is supported by another letter from Wilkie to Knighton, 9 February 1831: ‘The portrait of his late Majesty for the Duke of Wellington – the frame being now ready – I hope shortly to get delivered to his Grace’.

We are on the whole ill-informed about early nineteenth-century studio practice, but it seems plausible that by the time Wilkie had ‘gone all over’ an assistant’s copy it could be sold as his own work, at a price one-fifth below that of the original portrait.

The King also paid £210 for a half-length replica which he presented to the Duke of Buccleuch, with whom he had stayed at Dalkeith Palace in 1822 (Buccleuch Coll.). Wilkie’s other major portrayal of the King is in The Entrance of George IV at Holyroodhouse, which was also exhibited at the R.A. in 1830 (Millar 1969, no. 1184, pl. 282).

**CONDITION** Pronounced bitumen craquelure.

**PROV.** Bought by the 1st Duke of Wellington from Wilkie for 400 guineas (£420) including the frame.

**EXH.** B.I., *Works of Sir David Wilkie*, 1842 (45); South Kensington 1868 (212)


196 **King William IV (1765–1837)**

Signed lower right: *David Wilkie f. Brighton 1833*

Canvas, 267 × 173 cm

WM 1460–1948

The King wears the coatee and epaulettes of Captain-General of the Honourable Artillery Company and the waist belt, sword and cocked hat of a General. He wears the sash and star of the Order of the Garter, the sovereign’s badge of the Order of the Bath from his neck and the star of the Grand Cross of the Bath on his chest.

William IV was the third son of George III. At the age of thirteen he went to sea, and became Lord High Admiral in 1827. He succeeded his brother to the throne in 1830. Wilkie recorded that the
King sat for him at Brighton in November 1831 (Cunningham 1843, III, p. 50) and the first result of these sittings was the full-length portrait of William in the robes of the Garter exhibited at the R.A. in 1832 (71) and now at Windsor (Millar 1969, p. 143, no. 1185, pl. 276). The head in WM 1460, exhibited at the R.A. in the following year, is very similar to that in the Windsor portrait and it is likely that both pictures derive from the same sittings. Various sketches for the Windsor portrait are recorded by Millar, the only ones specifically for the Apsley picture, showing the King standing in military uniform, being a sheet containing five pen-and-ink studies sold at Sotheby’s 30 November 1978 (lot 29, repr), and one in the volume sold at Sotheby’s 18 March 1982 (lot 37, repr.). There are several other oil paintings of William IV by Wilkie (e.g. Scottish N.P.G., no. 806) but the Apsley House portrait is the only one showing him in military uniform. Wilkie thought it a ‘strong and highly finished head’ and it has since been described as his ‘finest portrait’ (R.A. 1958). The artist received 300 guineas (£315) for the work, and the Duke instructed the restorer and his picture adviser William Seguier (who was Keeper of the Royal Picture Galleries) ‘to fix upon a place for it’ at Apsley House (Chiego 1987, p. 229).

**CONDITION.** Retouched scratch to right of hilt of sword; otherwise good.

**PROV.** Delivered to the 1st Duke of Wellington as a present from William IV on 1st or 2nd August 1833.

**EXH.** R.A., 1833 (140); B.I., Works of Sir David Wilkie, 1842 (41); R.A., Sir David Wilkie, 1958 (35, pl. 22); Raleigh, North Carolina Museum of Art and New Haven, Yale Center for British Art, Sir David Wilkie of Scotland (1785–1841), 1987 (34)

**LIT.** Waagen 1854, II, p. 277 (‘very animated and vigorous’); Cunningham 1843, III, p. 529; J. Woodward, Connoisseur Period Guides 1830–60, p. 53, pl. 33; Paintings at Apsley House 1965, pl. 51; Millar 1969, p. 143; Chiego 1987, p. 229

---

**Philips WOUWERMAN (1619–1668)**

*Dutch (Haarlem) school*

A painter, mainly of landscapes with battles, camps or hunts, he was born in Haarlem and lived there throughout his life. He was influenced by Pieter van Laer (‘Bamboccio’, 1592/5–1642), one of the leading Dutch painters of figure subjects in Rome. Wouwerman was extraordinarily prolific; nearly 600 paintings are accepted as autograph.


**197 Camp Scene with Trumpeter and Farrier’s Booth**

Signed lower left: PHLS (monogram) W; inscribed in white with fleur-de-lis, lower right, and inventory no.: 314, left

Canvas, 57.5 × 79 cm

WM 1584–1948
The drunk soldier on the right, and the tankard suspended over the awning, indicate that the tent in the foreground is a canteen; the one behind it is a farrier’s booth where a horse is being shod. Next to the trumpeter on the left are two bound prisoners, guarded by a soldier. This composition is typical of Wouwerman’s camp scenes – a similar scene is in the Royal Collection (inv. RCIN 400682) – and there is a replica on wood, sold at Fischer, Lucerne (8 Sept. 1924, lot 101, repr.). According to Schumacher (2006), this is a late work, painted around 1665.

**CONDITION** Good; small tear in canvas at lower left. Cleaned (by Ruth Bubb) and relined, 2006.

**PROV.** Spanish royal collection: Queen Isabella Farnese (fleur-de-lis); La Granja inventories 1746, no. 314, and 1774; Aranjuez inventory 1794, no. 314; captured at Vitoria, 1813.

**EXH.** B.I., Old Masters, 1828 (156); 1852 (81)


**198 The Departure of a Hawking Party**

Signed lower right: P.H. (monogram) W.

Canvas, 76.2 × 106 cm

WM 1650–1948
Companion to WM 1617 (see next entry).

These two paintings are particularly fine examples of the hunting scenes with mansions, ruins and fountains which Wouwerman produced from about 1650. A very similar composition, for example, was in the collection of Baroness Bentinck (Hofstede de Groot 1908–27, II, no. 533; Sotheby’s, 28 Nov. 1975, lot 73). They are characterized by their cool, grey tonality, and in both of them Wouwerman has used his device of placing a white horse in the foreground as a focal point of the composition. He is not known to have visited Italy, and the Mediterranean aspect of these scenes is probably derived from the work of Pieter van Laer, who was also a native of Haarlem. Wouwerman’s compositions of this kind were enormously popular in the eighteenth century, and exercised a considerable influence on French Rococo painting. According to Schumacher (2006), this is a late work, painted about 1665. A copy was with Goudstikker, Amsterdam, before 1940.

**CONDITION** Areas of wearing and damage in mountains and sky, particularly upper right.

**Prov.** Spanish royal collection (together with pendant, WM 1617); Royal Palace, Madrid, 1772 inventory (Infante Don Xavier’s quarters), 1794 inventory (King’s dressing room, though according to Cumberland 1787, p. 78, they were hanging in the Prince’s dining room); captured at Vitoria, 1813.

**Exh.** (together with WM 1617): B.I., Old Masters, 1844 (15, 19; reviewed, The Athenæum, 22 June 1844), 1855; R.A., Old Masters, 1887 (73, 79) (reviewed in The Times, 14 Jan. 1887); R.A., 1908 (55, 59); Whitechapel 1912 (2, 5); Arts Council 1949 (17, 18); (alone) Tokyo 1990–91 (16)
The Return from the Chase

Signed on stone lower left: PH (monogram) W

Canvas, 77.5 x 107 cm

WM 1617–1948

Companion to WM 1650 (see previous entry). Dated by Schumacher to around 1665.

Prov. see previous entry.

Exh. B.I., Old Masters, 1828 (120); Birmingham Society of Arts, 1831; B.I., Old Masters, 1841 (72); Newcastle upon Tyne, Laing Art Gallery, Dutch Landscape Painting, 1983 (48); together with WM 1650 (as previous entry)

Lit. Cumberland 1787, p. 78; Smith 1829–43, i, p. 284, no. 306; Waagen 1854, ii, p. 274 (the companion was at Stratfield Saye); Hofstede de Groot 1908–27, II, no. 766; Paintings at Apsley House, 1965, pl.33; Gaya Nuño 1964, no. 187; Valdivieso 1973, p. 412; Schumacher 2006, i, pp. 257–58, no. A219; II, pl. 110 (as Return from the Hunt)
Henry WYATT (1794–1840)

British School

Born near Lichfield, he was a pupil at the R.A. schools from 1812 and assistant to Thomas Lawrence 1815–17. He worked in Birmingham (1817–19), Manchester (1819–25, 1838) and Leamington (1834–37), as well as in London (1825–34), painting portraits in the manner of Lawrence and also genre and landscape.

200 Frederick Augustus Duke of York and Albany, K.G. (1763–1827)

Inscribed on the back: Painted by H. Wyatt, 78 Newman St.

Millboard, 28 x 24 cm

WM 1472–1948

The sitter faces left and is wearing a dark frock coat with a black stock and the star of the Garter.

Frederick, Duke of York, second son of George III, was trained as a soldier. He commanded the British forces in Flanders in 1793–95, became Commander-in-Chief of the Army in 1798 and again fought the French in Holland in 1799. Both campaigns ended in failure, but he subsequently achieved some distinction as a reformer of army organization.

Wyatt lived at 78 Newman Street from c. 1825 until 1834 (Graves, R.A. Exhibitors). WM 1472 appears to be a copy of Lawrence’s portrait exhibited at the R.A. in 1822 (K. Garlick, Walpole Society, xxxix, 1964, p. 205, no. 4). It corresponds very closely, even in size, with G.T. Doo’s engraving after Lawrence of 1824 (proof in V&A, inv. 18936).

PROV. Probably bought by the 1st Duke of Wellington from Lord Canterbury in 1843.
## Catalogue of the Principal Pictures Found in the Baggage of Joseph Bonaparte
Made by Mr Seguier on Their Arrival in London (1813)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Artist</th>
<th>No. in 1901 Catalogue</th>
<th>No. in this Catalogue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Portrait of a Lady</td>
<td>Titian</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Christ in the Garden</td>
<td>Coreggio</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Virgin and Child</td>
<td>Leo. da Vinci (School of)</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Battle Piece</td>
<td>Vandermeulen</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Battle Piece</td>
<td>Vandermeulen</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. The Ball</td>
<td>Watteau</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Dead Game</td>
<td>Fyt</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Female Head</td>
<td>Murillo</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Mountebanks</td>
<td>Vandermeulen</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Farriers</td>
<td>Wouwermans (School of)</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Madonna</td>
<td>Sasso Ferrata</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. ...</td>
<td>Titian's Brother</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Dead Christ</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Landscape</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Infant Christ and Saint</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Landscape</td>
<td>Teniers</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Christ</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. St. Peter</td>
<td>Spagnoletto</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Portrait</td>
<td>Velasquez</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Card Players</td>
<td>G. Hondthorst</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Water Seller</td>
<td>M. A. Caravaggio</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Battle Piece</td>
<td>Bourgognone</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Battle Piece</td>
<td>Bourgognone</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Dressing a Wound</td>
<td>Teniers</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. A Female Saint</td>
<td>Spanish Painter</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. St. John in the Wilderness</td>
<td>Spagnoletto</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Portrait of Innocent X</td>
<td>Velasquez</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. Lime Kiln</td>
<td>Teniers</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. Landscape</td>
<td>Artois</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. Landscape</td>
<td>Moucheron.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. Sketch of the Plague</td>
<td>Nic. Poussin</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. Interior: Gaming</td>
<td>Teniers</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. Smoking</td>
<td>Teniers</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. Landscape</td>
<td>Elsheimer</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. Landscape</td>
<td>Vanderneer</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37. Portrait</td>
<td>Maas</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38. Landscape</td>
<td>Van der Heyde</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39. St. Francis</td>
<td>Murillo</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40. Cattle</td>
<td>Van-Bergen</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41. Storm</td>
<td>Vernet</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42. Landscape</td>
<td>Paul Bril.- A. Caracci</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43. Adoration</td>
<td>Sebastian Conca</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44. Man Tying his Shoe</td>
<td>Teniers</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45. Embarkation of St. Paul</td>
<td>Claude Lorraine</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46. Landscape</td>
<td>Claude Lorraine</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47. Soldiers at Cards</td>
<td>Hondt</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48. Landscape</td>
<td>Teniers</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49. Playing at Bowls</td>
<td>Teniers</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50. Landscape and Figures</td>
<td>An. Caricci</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51. Landscape</td>
<td>Vanderneer</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52. Halt of an Army</td>
<td>Wouwermans</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53. Hawking</td>
<td>Hawking</td>
<td>Wouwermans</td>
<td>245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54. Hawking</td>
<td>Hawking</td>
<td>Wouwermans</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55. Battle Piece</td>
<td>Battle Piece</td>
<td>Paracel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56. Battle Piece</td>
<td>Battle Piece</td>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57. Virgin and Child</td>
<td>Virgin and Child</td>
<td>Sasso Ferrata</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58. Portrait of Murillo</td>
<td>Portrait of Murillo</td>
<td>Murillo</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59. Old Man's Head</td>
<td>Old Man's Head</td>
<td>Spagnolatto</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60. Portrait of Th. Zucchero</td>
<td>Portrait of Th. Zucchero</td>
<td>Th. Zucchero</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61. Reaping</td>
<td>Reaping</td>
<td>Teniers</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62. St. Catherine</td>
<td>St. Catherine</td>
<td>Clad Coel</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63. Orpheus</td>
<td>Orpheus</td>
<td>Titian</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64. Holy Family</td>
<td>Holy Family</td>
<td>Mengs</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65. Venus and Adonis</td>
<td>Venus and Adonis</td>
<td>Domenichino</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66. Danae</td>
<td>Danae</td>
<td>Titian</td>
<td>256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67. Ismael and Hagar</td>
<td>Ismael and Hagar</td>
<td>Luca Giordano</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68. Portrait of a Lady</td>
<td>Portrait of a Lady</td>
<td>Titian</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69. Jacob Stealing the Blessing</td>
<td>Jacob Stealing the Blessing</td>
<td>Murillo</td>
<td>253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70. Magdalen</td>
<td>Magdalen</td>
<td>Mengs</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71. Concert Flemish Painter</td>
<td>Concert Flemish Painter</td>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72. Holy Family</td>
<td>Holy Family</td>
<td>Carletto Cagliari</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73. Annunciation</td>
<td>Annunciation</td>
<td>Michelangelo</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74. The Miraculous Draught</td>
<td>The Miraculous Draught</td>
<td>Raffaello</td>
<td>124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75. Virgin and Child</td>
<td>Virgin and Child</td>
<td>Guido</td>
<td>216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76. Portrait</td>
<td>Portrait</td>
<td>Murillo</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77. The Arts</td>
<td>The Arts</td>
<td>Old Franks and Breughel</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78. Ignatius Loyola</td>
<td>Ignatius Loyola</td>
<td>Mengs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79. Landscape</td>
<td>Landscape</td>
<td>Zuccarelli</td>
<td>202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80. Hercules and Lion</td>
<td>Hercules and Lion</td>
<td>Rubens (School of Rubens)</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81. Landscape</td>
<td>Landscape</td>
<td>Gysels</td>
<td>207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82. Battle Piece</td>
<td>Battle Piece</td>
<td>Salv. Rosa</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83. Diana and Acteon</td>
<td>Diana and Acteon</td>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td>235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84. Pan and Syrinx</td>
<td>Pan and Syrinx</td>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td>255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85. Conflagration</td>
<td>Conflagration</td>
<td>Vernet</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86. Holy Family</td>
<td>Holy Family</td>
<td>Leo. Da Vinci</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87. Virgin and Child</td>
<td>Virgin and Child</td>
<td>Leo. Da Vinci</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88. The Scourging</td>
<td>The Scourging</td>
<td>Velasquez</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89. Our Saviour on the Mount</td>
<td>Our Saviour on the Mount</td>
<td>Carlo Olorada Flamenco</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90. Adam and Eve</td>
<td>Adam and Eve</td>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91. Diana Hunting</td>
<td>Diana Hunting</td>
<td>Kerinx</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92. Child</td>
<td>Child</td>
<td>Coreggio</td>
<td>169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93. Taking down from the Cross</td>
<td>Taking down from the Cross</td>
<td>Lud. Caracei</td>
<td>192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94. Crucifixion</td>
<td>Crucifixion</td>
<td>Polemberg</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95. St. John</td>
<td>St. John</td>
<td>Mengs</td>
<td>129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96. Landscape</td>
<td>Landscape</td>
<td>Breughel</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97. Playing at Cards</td>
<td>Playing at Cards</td>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td>232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98. Annunciation</td>
<td>Annunciation</td>
<td>Anciend Master</td>
<td>238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99. Ruins and Figures</td>
<td>Ruins and Figures</td>
<td>Spanish Painter</td>
<td>133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100. Madonna and Flowers</td>
<td>Madonna and Flowers</td>
<td>M. Fioro</td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101. Judith and Holofernes</td>
<td>Judith and Holofernes</td>
<td>Elsheimer</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102. Taking down from the Cross</td>
<td>Taking down from the Cross</td>
<td>Alonzo di Arco</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103. Magdalen</td>
<td>Magdalen</td>
<td>Painter's name not legible</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104. Last Supper</td>
<td>Last Supper</td>
<td>Albert Durer</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105. Sea Piece</td>
<td>Sea Piece</td>
<td>Peters</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106. Holy Family</td>
<td>Holy Family</td>
<td>Rubens</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107. A Head</td>
<td>A Head</td>
<td>Spanish Painter</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108. Landscape</td>
<td>Landscape</td>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109. Landscape</td>
<td>Landscape</td>
<td>Paul Potter</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110. Landscape</td>
<td>Landscape</td>
<td>Painter's name not legible</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111. Boys with Birds' Nest</td>
<td>Boys with Birds' Nest</td>
<td>Vanderneer</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112. Smoking</td>
<td>Smoking</td>
<td>Teniers</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113. Virgin and Child</td>
<td>Virgin and Child</td>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A Drawing in Water-Colours of The Massacre of St. Bartholomew, by Callot
A Fine Drawing of The Last Supper.

In addition to the above Pictures, there are fifty or sixty more – some of which are good pictures by Modern Masters—worth preserving, the remainder of no value.
**Concordance of numbers**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WM NO.</th>
<th>CAT. NO.</th>
<th>WM NO.</th>
<th>CAT. NO.</th>
<th>WM NO.</th>
<th>CAT. NO.</th>
<th>WM NO.</th>
<th>CAT. NO.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1459</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>1509</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1559</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1609</td>
<td>177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1460</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>1510</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>1560</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>1610</td>
<td>142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1461</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>1511</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>1561</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>1611</td>
<td>178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1462</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>1512</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>1562</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>1612</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1463</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>1513</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>1563</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1613</td>
<td>179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1464</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>1514</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>1564</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>1614</td>
<td>161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1465</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>1515</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>1565</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>1615</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1466</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>1516</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>1566</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>1616</td>
<td>189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1467</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>1517</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>1567</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>1617</td>
<td>199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1468</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>1518</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>1568</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>1618</td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1469</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>1519</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>1569</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>1619</td>
<td>149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1470</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>1520</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>1570</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>1620</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1471</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>1521</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>1571</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>1621</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1472</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>1522</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1572</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>1622</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1473</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>1523</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>1573</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>1623</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1474</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>1524</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>1574</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1624</td>
<td>181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1475</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>1525</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>1575</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>1625</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1476</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>1526</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>1576</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>1626</td>
<td>154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1477</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>1527</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>1577</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>1627</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1478</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>1528</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>1578</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>1628</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1479</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>1529</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>1579</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>1629</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1480</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>1530</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1580</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>1630</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1481</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>1531</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>1581</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>1631</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1482</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>1532</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>1582</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>1632</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1483</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>1533</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>1583</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>1633</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1484</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>1534</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>1584</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>1634</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1485</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1535</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>1585</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>1635</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1486</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>1536</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>1586</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>1636</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1487</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>1537</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>1587</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>1637</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1488</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>1538</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>1588</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>1638</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1489</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>1539</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1589</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>1639</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1490</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1540</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>1590</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>1640</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1491</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>1541</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>1591</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>1641</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1492</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>1542</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>1592</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>1642</td>
<td>167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1493</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>1543</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>1593</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>1643</td>
<td>169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1494</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>1544</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1594</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>1644</td>
<td>187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1495</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>1545</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>1595</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>1645</td>
<td>190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1496</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>1546</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>1596</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>1646</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1497</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>1547</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>1597</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>1647</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1498</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>1548</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>1598</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>1648</td>
<td>152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1499</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>1549</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>1599</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>1649</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1500</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>1550</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>1600</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>1650</td>
<td>198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1501</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>1551</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>1601</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>1651</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1502</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>1552</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1602</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>1652</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1503</td>
<td>102</td>
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