Rubens’s nine paintings in the ceiling of the Banqueting Hall in Whitehall, London, provided the main decoration of this magnificent room, which was the focal point of Stuart Court ceremonial. Commissioned by King James I and his son, the future Charles I, following the destruction of the early Jacobean Banqueting Hall, their role in enhancing court spectacle came to an end with the fire that destroyed the rest of Whitehall Palace in 1698. The delay in executing the commission was due to matters of state, in which Rubens was involved as a diplomat. His stay in London in this capacity in 1629/30 made possible the realization of this commission.

Rubens would have been aware that the Stuarts owed their position to the regal union of the crowns of England and Scotland, that his royal patron had now embraced his father’s pacific policy and that he was the more determined to impose an absolute rule, which his father had eloquently expounded in speeches and treatises. These three themes form the central core of the cycle which glorified the reign of the late king, James I. The cycle presented Rubens with a great challenge, not only because of the novelty of the subject matter, but also because of the formal problems presented by the huge scale of the work.

This volume of the Corpus Rubenianum Ludwig Burchard provides the fullest review to date of the history of the commission, it also unravels the complex preparatory work and places the subject matter in the context of early Stuart political and ethical aspirations.
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AUTHOR'S PREFACE

Work on this volume began in 1992; the first typescript was completed some seven years ago. Since then the text has had to wait its turn before being published, and further delays have also occurred outside my control. What follows is an updated and improved account of how I saw the subject around the mid-1990s.

The delay has meant that many people, who are acknowledged in the text for their help over particular matters, have since changed jobs. I have not been able to keep track of their career moves, and they are here thanked in their old capacities, for which I ask their indulgence.

Here I should thank those who have been of greater, general help. Neil MacGregor and Christopher Brown, then respectively Director and Chief Curator of the National Gallery, kindly gave me permission to use their institution's library. There I was much helped by the librarian, Elspeth Hector, and by her colleagues, Helen Carron and Philip Clarke. Elizabeth McGrath of the Warburg Institute frequently gave me illuminating advice; her colleagues in the Photographic Department and in the Library were always of great assistance, as were Colin Stevenson and the staff at the issue desk of the London Library, colleagues at the Rubenianum and Claire Murphy of Historic Royal Palaces. My colleagues at Christie's allowed me one day off a week for two years to work on the book. A particular word of thanks has to go to Annette Buehler for being very generous over a financial matter.

Arnout Balis was a perceptive and congenial editor; I am grateful for his help in organising the material and clarifying my ideas. Bert Schepers was to prove an invaluable assistant in the later stages of preparing the text for the printers. Deborah Reynolds was the patient typist of many drafts; her role was to be more briefly filled by Hannah Croton. Of course, too, I have to thank my wife and family for putting up with me over the last decade or so of work on the project. My last thanks go posthumously to the late Roger d'Hulst, who enriched my life by asking me to write this book.

London, Spring 2005
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EXPLANATIONS

Dating

Unless otherwise made clear, the dates given are those of the Gregorian calendar adopted by countries of the Roman Catholic confession in 1582 (England, like other Protestant countries did not follow suit, until—in its case and then as Great Britain—1752). This was described as 'new style' (n.s.) by correspondents in continental Europe to their English counterparts. English correspondents writing from England and documents drawn up there did not identify the formula used for dating, which was that of the previous Julian calendar, then ten days in arrears and is referred to here, when necessary as 'old style' (o.s.). The same calendar calculated the beginning of the New Year at the equinox on March 25.

Translations

Translations in quotation marks are acknowledged; those not in quotation marks are by the author.

Contractions and Symbols

bt. = bought.
bt. in = bought in, that is the item failed to meet its reserve (minimum price) in an auction and thus did not sell.
d. = denarius = penny, a British, originally copper, coin, of which before decimalisation twelve made a shilling
fl. = florin, a coin, or unit of value, used in various countries; thus Dfl. = Dutch florin, now obsolete.
fr. = franc, a French (or Belgian) coin, or later unit of value, now obsolete; in 1795 the French franc was worth just under a livre Tournois.
ft. (') = foot, a British unit of measurement, converted into metres in the entries.
gn. = an English gold coin, or unit of value, now obsolete, whose value was twenty-one shillings, see below under sh.
in. (") = inch, a British unit of measurement, converted into metres in the entries.
l. = ligne, a chiefly French unit of measurement of which 12 made a pouce.
li. = livre Tournois, a French gold coin; from 1667 until the introduction of the metric system the official money of account in France, now obsolete, see above under fr.
n.s. = new style of dating, see above.
o.s. = old style of dating, see above.
p. = pouce, a chiefly French unit of measurement, now obsolete, and converted into metres in the entries.
P.R.A. = President of the Royal Academy
sh. = a British silver coin, which until decimalisation in the 1970's, was worth twelve pennies, see below; twenty shillings made up a £, see below.
Swf. = Swiss franc.
Witt Library = Witt Library, the Courtauld Institute of Art, London.
£ = pound, a British gold coin, or later unit of value, which until decimalisation, was made up of twenty shillings.
I. THE BUILDING OF THE BANQUETING HOUSE

The Banqueting House, designed by Inigo Jones, is the only intact building that remains today of Whitehall Palace, in present-day London, the main residence of the Stuart monarch and his court in the seventeenth century (Fig. 1). Its name understated its function, for the Hall, being the main room in the Banqueting House, was the focal point of many ceremonies essential to the outward conduct of the king's rule. Such halls had a long history, with several recently decorated examples in Italy that could serve as precedents. Jones's building was one of the first in Great Britain to be designed on Palladian principles. The stone exterior was richly ornamented, as was the carved wooden ceiling of the Hall, whose nine, large compartments were eventually to contain paintings designed by Rubens and executed by him and his studio in Antwerp.

The early Jacobean Banqueting House burnt down on 12 January (o.s.) 1619.1 By 19 April (o.s.), Jones, Surveyor of the King's Works, had made a model of the building which he had designed to replace it on the same site; on that day, he and four other officers of the Works signed an estimate - £9,850 - for its cost.2 An account for the expenditure on the building works was opened on 1 June (o.s.).3 This was to be controlled not by the Lord Treasurer, but by five Commissioners of the Banqueting House: the Duke of Lennox (Steward of the Household), the Earl of Pembroke (Chamberlain of the Household), the Earl of Arundel, Baron Digby (Vice-Chamberlain of the Household) and Sir Fulke Greville (Chancellor and Under-Treasurer of the Exchequer).4 The account was closed on 31 March 1622,5 but already by 23 April (o.s.) 1621 - St George's Day - the building was sufficiently advanced to receive the Knights of the Garter after the grand procession of the Order.6

4. Ibid.
5. Ibid., p. 329.
6. Ibid., p. 330. Three days earlier, both Houses of Parliament had attended the King 'at Whitehall in the hall', which may have signified the Banqueting Hall; the 'greate Hall' used by another diarist to indicate the location of a further meeting between the King and the two houses of Parliament on 3 May 1621 (see W. Notestein, F.H. Reif, and H. Simpson, Commons Debates - 1621, New Haven, 1935, III, p. 146; IV, pp. 341-342) was a different building in the Palace, dating from Cardinal Wolsey's time, and located to the north-east of the Banqueting Hall (see Thurley, Whitehall, 1999, pp. 29-30).
The building had a semi-basement or vaulted ground storey, and an upper storey chiefly consisting of the Banqueting Hall, which measured c. 34 x 17 x 17 m. (110 x 55 x 55 ft.). In 1625-26, alterations were made to the Hall’s southern wall, where ‘a newe Arche, and a greate wyndowe’ were introduced in place of a window and a niche. The interior was thus described in a return of 1633: ‘... xiiij windowes of eache side and one greate windowe at the upper [southern] end, and five Doores of stone with Frontespeescees and Cartoozses, the inside brought up with bricks finished over with twoe orders of Collomes and pillasters, parte of stone and parte of Bricks, with theire Architrave Freize and Cornish, with a galerie upon the twoe sides and the lower [northern] end borne upon greate Cartoozses of Tymber carved with Railes and ballasters of Tymber, and the floore layd with Spruce Deales, a strong Tymber roofe covered with Lead, and under it a Ceeling divided into a Frett made of great Cornishes inriched with carvings with painting glazing ....’. The final cost for the building was given as £14,940 4 sh. 1d.

A copy of Jones’s design for the openings in the ceiling of the Hall is at Chatsworth (Fig. 2). His drawing for its ornamentation omitted the friezes and the painted and gilded oval framing in the corner compartments. To date, the ceiling apparently has not been the subject of detailed study, and no records of conservation work or alterations to it have so far been traced. Its decorative and ornamental motifs are far more elaborate than in the drawing, in which only the rosettes (ten rather than twelve) are included. They are also more elaborate than those on the comparable ceiling of the Great Hall in the Queen’s House at Greenwich, also designed by Jones, in which the rosettes and guilloche recur. Round the time when Rubens’s Canvases were installed, it was painted in a transparent brown and richly gilded, see below. The ceiling was thus described in 1930: ‘The ceiling is divided into nine deep panels by decorative ribs formed by the modillion cornice and ornamental frieze being mitred around with the guilloche to the soffits; the whole constituting a rich frame to each panel. The centre panel is the oval shape favoured by Jones. The guilloche ornament on the soffit overlaps

9. Cox-Norman, Whitehall, 1930, p. 121. This did not include the cost of building a pier on the island of Portland to load the stone for the façade, but did include the cost of building a road from the quarry to the pier.
10. J. Harris and G. Higgott, [Cat. Exh.] Inigo Jones: Complete Architectural Drawings (The Drawing Center, New York), New York–London, 1989, fig. 39 under no. 35; Thurley, Whitehall, 1999, p. 88, fig. 94. The design is not drawn to scale as the central oval is disproportionately small compared with the central rectangular fields at either end.
11. For these, see William Kent, The Designs of Inigo Jones, I, 1727, pl. 52.
at the intersections with the main ribs, which position is marked by carved rosettes, similar features being introduced at the crossing of the ribs and intermediates. The main decorations are picked out in gilt, producing a rich effect.'

A Latin inscription – perhaps intended to be displayed either in, or outside, the Banqueting House, and probably datable to 1621 – is preserved in the State Papers of King James I. This records the justifiable pride felt in the building and the uses to which it was intended; translated it reads: ‘From the guardian spirit to the visiting viewer. James, first king of Great Britain built from the ground up this hall, which strikes the eye by its majesty and speaks most magnificently of the soul of its Lord, razed when scarcely made of brick, but now the equal of any marble buildings throughout Europe, intended for festive occasions, for formal spectacles, and for the ceremonials of the British court; to the eternal glory of his name and of his most peaceful empire, he left it for posterity. In the Year 1621’.13

Palme and Thurley have given a full account of the early uses to which the Banqueting Hall was put: the official reception of extraordinary ambassadors, St George’s Day feasts of the Knights of the Garter – England’s premier order of chivalry – touching for the King’s Evil (scrofula, then believed to be curable by the king’s touch), and, until the installation of the ceiling Canvases the performance of masques.14 It was also the location for important meetings between the Monarch and Parliamentary delegations; for instance, Charles I received there the Petition of Right – a crisis-driven, Parliamentary enactment of the subject’s protective rights against a listed series of oppressive, royal actions – in 1628 from the Lord President and other Lords.15 Probably on all state occa-
I. THE BUILDING OF THE BANQUETING HOUSE

sions, and certainly in the case of public audiences given to the extraordi-
inary ambassadors, the king would be 'seated beneath “the state”, a
 canopy with the royal coat of arms, behind his chair on a raised plat-
form'. This platform was placed at the southern (or upper) end of the
Hall, from whence the royal entourage would make its entry. The ambas-
sador and his retinue, accompanied by his noble, British escort, would
enter from the northern (or lower) end, the public entrance as it remains
to this day.

The evolution of the hall of state, beginning with Domitian’s Palace on
the Palatine Hill, Rome, has been outlined by Starn and Partridge. The
Banqueting Hall has been categorised as a ‘Hall of Princely Virtues’, a
term coined by Brown and Elliott, perhaps prompted by Dempsey, that
would not have been understood by James I and his contemporaries
nor by a good many succeeding generations. Recently, Thurley more
aptly and precisely described it as a ‘Presence chamber’, arguing that
Jones’s original design was altered to accommodate such an expanded
use at the behest of the Commissioners representing the various depart-
ments of the court. Indeed, the Banqueting Hall should be placed in
the tradition of such earlier decorated audience chambers as those for
the Farnese, the Medici, and the Venetian Doge. Printed contemporary
accounts of these halls would have been available to Jones; of particular
relevance, perhaps, was the commentary by Girolamo Bardi concerning
the redecoration of two chambers in the Palazzo Ducale, Venice, follow-
ing the fire of 1577.

300, 367 (entries for 23 January 1640, 29 January 1640, and 16 February 1640, respectively). For the
presentation of the Petition of Right, see also Thurley, Whitehall, 1999, p. 94, where it is referred to as
Art Bulletin, LXI, 1979, pp. 142-143.
24. Girolamo Bardi, Dichiaratione di Tutte Le Istorie che si contengono ne i quadri posti nuouamente nelle Sale
dello Scrutino, & nel Gran Consiglio, del Palagio Ducale etc., Venice, 1587 (2nd edn, 1606), pp. 2r. ff.
Donovan, Whitehall, 1995, p. 135, refers to Bardi in a more specific context.
II. TOWARDS THE COMMISSION

The First Approach to Rubens

DOCUMENTATION CONCERNING the first approach to Rubens to execute the paintings to occupy the compartments of the ceiling of the Banqueting Hall is negligible. Archives have yielded nothing of substance since Sainsbury’s publication of a transcription of a copy of Rubens’s letter of 13 September 1621, which remains the only relevant, and thus, the key document.1 Why this should have been the case is a mystery, the more so since so many other letters of the time are preserved showing extensive British contact with the artist. Indeed, of all artists then active on the Continent, Rubens was probably the, or one of the best known to British connoisseurs.

The Earl of Arundel was a prominent visitor to Antwerp early in the seventeenth century. He was there in the summer of 1612, but in spite of his assurance that the wealthy English merchant Lionel Wake ‘hath let me want the sight of no curiosity’, 2 there is no evidence that he met Rubens then.3 Even four years later Frans Sweerts thought it necessary to remind the antiquarian, William Camden, of Rubens’s reputation.4 But by about that year, two Englishmen, George Gage5 and Tobie Matthew,6 were to become familiar with him. These two Catholic friends, because of their religion, spent much of their early careers in Catholic Europe, but maintained close connections with the British court. They were soon to undertake missions for the British Crown, and both were connoisseurs familiar with the artistic community in Antwerp. Indeed, in 1620, a fellow Englishman and diplomat, resident in Brussels, wrote of Gage ‘over whom [Rubens] he hath more authority then [sic] any man I know’.7 It can thus be inferred that the involvement of these two friends in at least

4. See Rooses–Ruelens, Correspondance, 1887-1909. II, p. 82, no. CXLI.
6. For Matthew, who was converted to Catholicism in 1607 and became a Jesuit in 1623 when he was also knighted, see A.H. Mathew and A. Calthrop, The Life of Sir Tobie Matthew, London, 1907; J.P. Feil, “Sir Tobie Matthew and his Collection of Letters”, 1962, unpublished dissertation, University of Chicago (photostats of a typescript of which were kindly given to the author by Jeremy Wood). Feil’s thesis also provides much information about Gage.
the first approach to Rubens was far greater than contemporary sources have led us to assume. Matthew’s early pivotal role is indicated by the fact that later in the history of the commission, it was he who was selected as the courtier best equipped to influence the Lord Treasurer to expedite payment for Rubens’s paintings.8

In the spring of 1620, Gage returned to London; there he wrote on 14 May to Matthew of his qualified admiration of the Banqueting House: ‘I have seen Inigo Jones his banqueting house, which is a good lustie piece saving that it hath some blemishes here and there .... But though Architects may differ in opinion about ornaments, I am glad in substance to see good building begin to get into this Island’.9 Gage soon came to be held in high regard in court circles;10 and it is not hard to imagine his counsel being sought over the paintings to decorate the Banqueting Hall, especially as he (and Matthew) had in all likelihood met Inigo Jones in Rome in the winter of 1613-14, when Jones was there accompanying Arundel.11 But in the spring of 1621, Gage was despatched to Rome, where he remained until July 1622 lobbying on behalf of King James I for papal agreement to the ‘Spanish Match’ – the marriage of the Prince of Wales to the Infanta Dña María, the sister of King Philip IV of Spain.12

In Gage’s absence, the task of conducting the interview in Antwerp with Rubens, which resulted in the key letter of 13 September, fell to Matthew, who was then based in the Spanish Netherlands.13 Rubens’s letter was addressed to William Trumbull, James I’s agent at the court of the Infanta Isabella, the Governor of the Seventeen Provinces, in Brussels and resident there.14 His relations with Rubens would have been of some years standing, and of a formal nature, as is to be expected from a conscientious and experienced diplomat. Trumbull would also have known Gage and Matthew, and was in regular contact with Sir Dudley Carleton, the King’s ambassador to the States General in The Hague.

Gage had accompanied Carleton on a visit to Rubens’s studio in September 1616, and later initiated negotiations between Carleton and

---

8. See below, p. 80, and Appendix III.2 and III.3.
10. See J.P. Feil (as in n. 6), p. 155 and n. 8.
11. See M. Hervey, The Life, Correspondence & Collections of Thomas Howard Earl of Arundel, Cambridge, 1921, pp. 83-84; J.P. Feil (as in n. 6), p. 78.
12. See references in n. 5.
13. See Appendix II.2, II.4 and II.7.
Rubens for the exchange of Carleton’s collection of classical statues for examples of the artist’s recent work drawn from his stock and supplemented by tapestries. This exemplary negotiation was conducted to the satisfaction of both parties in 1618. In the following year, Carleton was to assist Rubens in obtaining the copyright for his prints in the United Provinces.

English interest in the art of Antwerp is illustrated by the pursuits in the same year of Edward Norgate, an as-yet minor courtier with a reputation as a calligrapher and limner who visited Antwerp, where ‘hee hath been continually since his coming .... in the perpetuall motion to see heere what is worth the seeinge’. In 1620, Rubens, having expressed his admiration for Arundel, made an exception for his wife by agreeing to paint her portrait. In the following year, Digby — like Arundel a commissioner for the Banqueting House and an important diplomat soon to return as ambassador to King Philip IV of Spain as a main proponent of the ‘Spanish Match’— visited the Netherlands twice, in April and June. On the first occasion, he was accompanied by Gage, who met up with Matthew before continuing his journey to Rome. It was perhaps then, and perhaps with Gage’s help, that Digby commissioned from Rubens a Hunt for the Marquess of Hamilton, which Rubens later alluded to in his letter following his key interview with Matthew.

Once it had been agreed between Jones and his royal patrons that the ceiling of the Banqueting Hall should be designed in the Venetian manner and contain nine large — in three, even five, cases very large — openings for paintings, Rubens must have seemed the obvious candidate for the task of executing them. While there are no documents to indicate what discussions took place at the British court on the subject, there is no evidence that Italian artists were then considered. There is, however, suf-

---


18. See the letter from John Chandler of 10 October (o.s.) 1619, British Library, Department of Manuscripts, Add. MSS., 722 77, fol. 85/129. For Norgate’s earlier involvement with contemporary painting in Antwerp, see his letters to Trumbull of 1618, referred to and quoted in E. Norgate (as in note 17), pp. 4-5. In the following year, Norgate asked Trumbull to procure for him drawings by Rubens and Willem van Nieulandt; see Howarth (as in note 2), p. 55, and n. 3, p. 231.


22. Ibid.

23. Balis, Hunting Scenes (CRLB), 1986, pp. 162-173, no. 11; for the letter, see Appendix II.V.
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icient circumstantial evidence to suggest that Anthony van Dyck – still young but with his reputation already made in Antwerp – was under consideration during and after his brief stay in England in the winter of 1620-21.24 Information about the career of the young genius was sent to Arundel in the summer of 1620;25 Van Dyck was then acting as Rubens’s chief assistant in the execution of the canvases for the ceilings of the aisles and galleries of the Antwerp Jesuit church. Soon he was to be persuaded to abandon this task, apparently by Lord Purbeck,26 for whose younger brother – the reigning favourite at court, the Marquess (later Duke) of Buckingham – Van Dyck was to work in England.27 He also painted the portrait of Arundel,28 who was one of the Privy Councillors to sign Van Dyck’s permit – on 28 February 1620/21 (o.s.) – to travel abroad for eight months.29

The significance of the length of absence granted to Van Dyck remains obscure. But two curious facts – perhaps more than coincidences – arise from its consideration: the Banqueting Hall commission was first broached to Rubens about seven months after the signing of the permit, and Van Dyck left Antwerp for Italy, Rubens having expressed his interest in it, about a month afterwards.30 Van Dyck would have been expected by then to have returned to England, perhaps to continue the otherwise unspecified ‘speciall service ... for his Matie’, for the performance of which, during his brief stay in England, he was awarded the sum of £100.31

Weighted against Rubens’s overwhelmingly strong candidature might have been the scale of his fee and uncertainty about the quality of work he might provide.32 Further, Van Dyck was already a servant of the British Crown, while Rubens was then court painter to the Archduke Albert and the Infanta Isabella. Something of the etiquette involved in

24. C. Brown, ‘Anton van Dyck como artista cortesano’, in [Cat. Exh.] Velázquez, Rubens y Van Dyck, Pintores Cortesanos del Siglo XVII, ed. J. Brown (Museo Nacional del Prado, Madrid, 1999-2000), p. 93, suggested that Van Dyck may have been under consideration as a successor to Paul van Somer; but the latter was to die not earlier than the summer of 1621: for Van Somer, see below.
25. See Rooses—Raeleus, Correspondance, 1887-1909, II, p. 250, no. CCl. Arundel may have been known to be interested in news about Van Dyck after perhaps having been told about his precocity by his master Hendrik van Balen when they met in Antwerp in 1612, for which see Matthew’s letter to Trumbull, enclosing an account by Arundel, of 17 July 1617, printed by Howarth (as in n. 2), p. 67, and p. 233, n. 28.
such situations can be sensed in the exchange of 1603 between the Duke of Lerma and the Duke of Mantua’s envoy, Annibale Iberti, as to whether the young Rubens, then in the service of the Duke of Mantua, was free to enter his service and that of King Philip III of Spain. Indeed, there was no obvious, recent precedent in England for the engagement of a foreign artist for such a prestigious commission, let alone one who was not a servant of the Crown. Reference, if such was made, to the efforts undertaken on behalf of Henry, Prince of Wales, some ten years earlier to assemble a team of foreign artists would probably have been of limited use.

Therefore, an approach to Rubens concerning the Banqueting Hall commission – which seems to have been finally decided on during the summer of 1621 – would have had to be undertaken with care and finesse. These qualities are not apparent in a negotiation with Rubens that was linked with the approach in Matthew’s interview. In contrast, too, is that this latter negotiation is fully documented. It was conducted in London by Baron Danvers, Keeper of St James’s Palace – the Prince of Wales’s residence not far from Whitehall. Danvers probably had been required by his master, Prince Charles, to obtain an up-to-date example of Rubens’s work for the gallery in St James’s Palace. This should not be interpreted so much as an attempt to obtain a douceur, but as a legitimate preliminary which would enable the Prince and his advisers to form a judgment as to whether to approach Rubens, who was thought to have disavowed a Judith and Holofernes, the only work by him that the Prince then owned. Charles may have inherited this lost, early painting from his elder brother or his mother.

So much is clear, for while the King was rightly given full credit for the Banqueting House in the commemorative inscription recorded in his State Papers, Rubens in his letter following his interview with Matthew referred both to the King and to the Prince of Wales as being concerned

32. Such concerns can be inferred from Matthew’s letter of 25 November 1620, in Rosse–Ruëlens, Correspondance, 1887-1909, II, p. 261, no. CCVII.
35. Henry Danvers (1573-1644), created Baron Danvers in 1603 and Earl of Danby in 1626, obtained ‘the grant, in reversion, of the office of Keeper of St James’s Palace’ in 1613, see DNB, V, pp. 487-489. His letters to Carleton of 27 May and 17 December 1621 were both written from St James’s Palace; see Rosse–Ruëlens, Correspondance, 1887-1909, II, p. 277, no. CCXVII; p. 315, no. CCXXXIII. For Van Dyck’s portrait of Danvers made in the 1630s, see J. Egerton in Brown-Vlieghe, Van Dyck, 1999, no. 73. His younger brother was a Regicide.
37. See the discussion in d’Hulst-Vandenven, Old Testament (CRLB), 1989, p. 160, under no. 50, of whether this lost work should be identified with the lost picture, thought to have been executed c. 1609, and now known only by Pontius’s engraving.
with the paintings for it. He presumably had repeated Matthew’s own, careful explanation. This marked an unusual cultural collaboration between royal father and heir, and perhaps stemmed from the King’s lack of interest in, and the Prince’s love of, pictures. An important effect of this early collaboration – whether intended or not – was to insure continuity of the commission after James I’s death; the new King, Charles I, was to retain his youthful admiration for, and (perhaps still qualified and conditional) commitment to, Rubens.

It had thus been decided that Danvers should obtain a Hunt by Rubens in exchange for a ‘Creation’ by one of the Bassano family. Danvers communicated via the official channel – Carleton – which effectively concealed the destination of the painting Rubens was to execute. This unusual transaction, embarked on in the early summer of 1619 and confusing as it unfolded, generated ill feeling on both sides. Rubens placed such a low value on the Bassano – whose condition was poor and deteriorating – as not to warrant his executing an original by his own hand in exchange. Matthew seems to have been exasperated by Rubens’s attitude; he reported that the Hunt – now to be provided in exchange for cash as well as the ‘Creation’ – was a studio work only retouched by the master. Not surprisingly, this assessment was shared at St James’s Palace, and Danvers determined to return the picture.

Such was the awkward turn of events that first Trumbull and then Matthew, acting on Carleton’s instructions, were dispatched to resolve

41. A clear account of this episode is given by Balis, Hunting Scenes (CRLB), 1986, pp. 136-138, under no. 7. See more recently, publishing a letter from Carleton, of 12 October (n.s.) 1620: D. Howarth, ‘William Trumbull and Art Collecting in Jacobean England’, The British Library Journal, XX, 1994, pp. 144-147. No painting of the Creation by any member of the Bassano family is known today; it may have been the mistaken title given to the God the Father Reproving Adam and Eve in the Prado (see Museo del Prado, Inventario General de Pinturas, 1. La Coleccion Real, Madrid, 1990, p. 191, no. 673) or a version of it (of which three are known). T. Wilks, ‘The Picture Collection of Robert Carr, Earl of Somerset (c. 1587-1645), Reconsidered’, Journal of the History of Collections, 1, 1989, pp. 170-173, 175, identified the picture as The Creation of the Animals by the Elder Bassano, a large and expensive painting that Carleton had acquired in 1615 as part of a shipment to the Earl of Somerset. This work was later passed to Danvers at no cost. But he was not to like it, and it thus was to be a perfect counter in the negotiations with Rubens, of which Wilks gives an account.
42. Rooses-Ruelens, Correspondance, 1887-1909, II, p. 261, no. CCXVII.
43. See Locke’s letter of 18 March and Danvers’s letter of 27 May 1621 both to Carleton, in Rooses–Ruelens, Correspondance, 1887-1909, II, pp. 275-276, no. CCXVII. It was probably to this episode that Constantijn Huygens referred in his long-unpublished autobiography, written between 11 May 1629 and April 1631, when he wrote about Rubens: ‘Non evasit sane Italorum invidiam, at neque, si diis placet, Britannorum, qui coemendis tabulis, exoticis peritiam de Rubenio iudicandi adeptos se praemununt. Sed has nebulas quoties suo sole non discussit’. See S. Slive, Rembrandt and his Critics, 1630-1730, The Hague, 1953, p. 11, n. 5 (for the text), pp. 9-10, n. 3 (for the autobiography). Huygens was Secretary to the Dutch Ambassador in London from 1621 to 1624; see N. MacLaren, The National Gallery Catalogues. The Dutch School 1600-1900, revised and expanded by C. Brown, London, 1991, pp. 215-216, under no. 212.
with Rubens. The instructions would not have mentioned the Banquet-
ing Hall commission as it was not part of Danvers’s remit. Thus Matthew, travelling from Brussels to Antwerp on 11 September 1621 – and perhaps intending to meet with Rubens later that day or on the day after – would have had two sets of instructions: one from Carleton about the unsatisfactory Hunt and another from an agent of the King and the Prince of Wales about the paintings for the Banqueting Hall. This agent could have been the King’s trusted servant and envoy, the flamboyant James Hay, now Baron Doncaster, who was on his way to France as the extraordinary ambassador to King Louis XIII, and like Digby, a friend and ally of Matthew. Matthew had been required to wait on the ambas-
sador at Calais, where he disembarked on his way to the French court. Thus perhaps it was at Calais that Matthew received instructions regard-
ing the approach to Rubens about the commission from Doncaster, either directly, or indirectly in the form of a letter passed to him.

As a result of the interview, Rubens agreed to furnish another Hunt, which – as Matthew tactfully explained – had failed to please because of its subject matter rather than its allegedly poor execution. The matter of the Banqueting Hall was evidently adroitly introduced in such a way that if Rubens turned the commission down, the British Crown would not have been humiliated. Rubens made it clear in his famously selfconfi-
dent letter to Trumbull that if the commission (however taxing) were to be offered to him, he would accept it.

Carleton forwarded Rubens’s letter to Danvers; and Trumbull was authorised by him to confirm arrangements with Rubens in December, but Trumbull was not confident of the outcome. In fact, Rubens did not provide another painting in place of the Hunt, preferring to repair the Bassano, which took a good year. Thus the Prince of Wales was to have no up-to-date example of Rubens’s work in his collection at least for the time being. Danvers (and thus probably his master) knew Rubens’s Daniel in the Lions’ Den – which, owned by Carleton, thus seems already to have been in England – but the Prince may have had to wait until

44. See Appendix II.2.
45. The most recent study of Hay, by R.E. Schreiber, ‘The First Carlisle: Sir James Hay First Earl of Carlisle, as Courtier, Diplomat and Entrepreneur, 1580-1636’, American Philosophical Society, 1984, pp. 22 ff., throws no light on this matter. But he had been kept informed about the Banqueting House as Matthew had earlier forwarded Gages’s letter to him about it; see J.P. Feil (as in n. 6), p. 156, and n. 5.
46. See Appendix II.2, II.3, and J.P. Feil (as in n. 6), p. 161.
47. See Appendix II.5.
48. See Appendix II.5; Trumbull quickly sent it on to Carleton, see Appendix II.6; and Rooses–Ruelens, Correspondance, 1887-1909, II, pp. 314-315, 327, nos. CCXXXI-CCXXXIII, CCXXXVI.
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after his accession for it to be given him.\textsuperscript{51} Even then, he was still to expect the gift of a more recent example of Rubens’ work, before the artist embarked on the Banqueting Hall commission.\textsuperscript{52} Thus the Prince may not have felt ready in 1621 to recommend Rubens’ employment, nor may such a course have been advised, as the artist had damaged his reputation with Danvers,\textsuperscript{53} and perhaps with others in the Prince’s entourage if not with the Prince himself. Whatever the case, no immediate further steps seem to have been taken.\textsuperscript{54} The British court was probably unaware that Rubens’s services were being sought by the Dowager Queen Marie de Médicis of France, reconciled in August with her son, King Louis XIII. In the event, the realization of the King’s and Prince of Wales’s plans were thus to be delayed for more than a dozen years.

Already in November, Rubens was hinting at a visit to Paris.\textsuperscript{55} The contract finally signed between Marie de Médicis and Rubens, in Paris on 24 February 1622,\textsuperscript{56} effectively ruled out the possibility of Rubens fulfilling a large-scale commission from London for four years. This was the time allowed in the contract for his provision of two series of paintings illustrating the life of Marie de Médicis and of her deceased husband, King Henri IV, which were to decorate two galleries in the Dowager Queen’s recently built Luxembourg Palace in Paris.

The Projects

Although no detailed programme existed when Rubens signed the contract to decorate the ceilings of the aisles and galleries of the Antwerp Jesuit Church,\textsuperscript{57} the contract for the paintings for the two galleries of the Luxembourg Palace referred to ‘toutes les histoires selon l’intention de sa maitre’, and a detailed programme had been drawn up for some of the paintings.\textsuperscript{58} Rubens would have known of the use of such programmes –

\textsuperscript{51} Millar, \textit{Van der Doorl}, 1958-60, p. 4; Van der Doort described the picture as having been given by Lord (the Earl of) Dorchester, which title Carleton received in 1628. Such an inference would only be reasonable, if Van der Doort kept a running ledger on the growth of the royal collection.

\textsuperscript{52} See p. 49.

\textsuperscript{53} For Danvers’s criticism of the painting Rubens would provide – ‘commonly wrought w.th a very careless hand’, see his letter to Carleton of 7 December 1621, in Rooses–Ruelens, \textit{Correspondance}, 1887–1909, II, p. 315, no. CCXXXIII.

\textsuperscript{54} For Vlieghie, \textit{Flemish Art}, 1998, p. 49, it may have been a ‘lack of clarity’ on the part of those ‘responsible for the project’ that could have occasioned the delay.


\textsuperscript{56} For the contract, see most recently, Held, \textit{Sketches}, 1980, I, pp. 89-90.

\textsuperscript{57} See Martin, \textit{Ceiling Paintings (CRLB)}, 1968, pp. 32-33.
a common *modus operandi* at both the French and Italian courts — and indeed he was to submit one himself for the second gallery of the Luxembourg Palace. On 13 May 1625, he wrote to Peiresc: ‘For the future I believe there will not fail to be difficulties over the subjects of the other gallery.... The theme is so vast and magnificent.... But Monsignor the Cardinal de Richelieu, although I have given him a concise program in writing ... has not had time to look at it’. Several writers have postulated the existence of a programme for the Banqueting Hall Canvases, and, indeed, contemporary copies of two programmes are among the papers of Sir John Coke, appointed a Secretary of State by King Charles I in September 1625.

The ‘Projects’ — as they were described — are among the earliest, extant programmes for a commission (in this case for paintings) in England. Their composition shows an awareness of contemporary practice on the Continent, and they may have been transcribed partly because it was understood that the commission was to go to a foreign artist. Presumably a number of sets of copies — such as the one in Coke’s papers — were made; that a set was called for by a Secretary of State, perhaps soon after he assumed office, demonstrates the official importance attached to the commission.

The epithet ‘project’, used to describe these programmes, may reflect a sense of novelty, although Speed had published in 1611 (second edi-


60. *Magurn, Letters*, 1955, pp. 109-110, no. 62. For the original text, see *Rooses–Ruelens, Correspondance*, 1887-1909, III, pp. 353-354, no. CCCLXXIV. ‘e per l’avenire credo che non mancarano delle difficoltà sopra gli soggetti de l’altra galleria ... essendo l’argumento tanto copioso e magnifico ... ma il Sr. card. de Richelieu, ben che io gli ho dato brev’es in scritto ... non ha tempo di vedergli’. Rubens had earlier devised a programme for the life of Marie de Médicis, as pointed out by J. Thuillier (as in note 58), p. 52.


62. See *Martin, Projects*, 1994, pp. 29-34. A physical description and transcriptions of the two texts are given in Appendix I.


64. See n. 59.
Lancaster's transcript taken from the 'true modell' for the planned tomb of King Henry VIII (the term probably derived from a drawn modello). The word had been used already in the second half of the previous century to describe new, industrial, agricultural, and entrepreneurial enterprises often inspired by Continental practice (the patentees and monopolists of which were much criticised in the Parliaments of 1601, 1621 and 1624). On the other hand, the meaning attached to the word may have been intended to convey nothing more than a plan or scheme; project was used synonymously with modello by the account keeper of the Grocers' Company in 1617 when recording a payment of £5 to Anthony Munday 'for his paines in drawing a project for this busyness [the Lord Mayor's show of 1617] which was offered to Comyntees'. Indeed, reason suggests that programmes had been composed for earlier artistic commissions other than civic pageants in England, but as none survives, their character may have been informal. The contemporary poet and dramatist, Ben Jonson confirmed that projects were used in cultural contexts while seeking to ridicule the pretentious Vangoose in the Masque of Augurs, performed in 1622; there he linked the notion of novelty - associated with projects - with the unpopularity of those who exploited them in his portrayal of Vangoose, who was described as 'a rare artist ... and a projector of masques'.

The two programmes are designated Project A and Project B to indicate the likely chronological primacy of Project A. Both refer to King James I in the past tense, but it is presumed that Project A was drafted before but edited after the King's death. Project B was probably composed after he died, since a Latin quotation included in the programme had been given a wide currency by its appearance in a valedictory poem to James I, as discussed below. Project B thus resulted from James's successor's changed view of the purpose of the ceiling Canvases and what they should convey. Whereas Project A intended to celebrate the reign of James I, Project B was a far more ambitious programme to commemo-

---

65. See J. Speed, The History of Great Britain..., London, II, 1611, pp. 784-785. This is a very detailed specification headed: 'The Maner of the Tombe to be made for the Kings Grace at Windsore': reference is made to what was showed in 'the patterne'.
67. For the use of the word in this sense, see OED, 1884-1928, VIII, p. 1442, 5.
68. See Bergeron, Pageantry, 1971, p. 158. The author thanks Elizabeth McGrath for this reference.
70. This in deference to Donovan, Whitehall, 1995, p. 247, n. 3, for whom, p. 255, the Projects' relevance was inconclusive.
71. Howarth, Images, 1997, p. 123, dated the programmes between 1621 and 19 May (o.s.) 1625, the date of a letter written by Danvers, for which see below, p. 45 and n. 135.
rate it, being ‘designed to the memory of King James’, as its preface makes clear.

Nothing in Project A suggests that it was anything but a celebration of the living James I. The learning for which he was renowned – James Montagu in his preface to the collection of the King’s writings and speeches, published in 1616, wrote with conscious understatement: ‘His Maiesties singular understanding in all points of good learning is not unknown’ – is alluded to by the proposal that the King be depicted as an author, holding an open book and pen, in a manner perhaps inspired by such portraits as Hans Holbein the Younger’s Portrait of Erasmus. The laurel crown perhaps signifies his fame as an author, if not his presumed victory in the controversy with Cardinal Bellarmine. The King was to be shown surrounded by the nine Muses, the source of his ‘learning’, and a not unfamiliar motif in the vocabulary of pageants, which had been recently deployed in John Squires’s Lord Major’s Show – Tes Irenes Trophaea or The Triumphs of Peace – of 1620. The composition envisaged in Project A is suggestive of Raphael’s Parnassus, with angels ‘flying with garlands & strewing of flowers’, perhaps inspired by those in Marcantonio Raimondi’s print after it (which shows putti about to bestow leafy crowns rather than flowers).

The importance attached to this aspect of the King’s character is demonstrated by the decision to locate its depiction at the southern end of the room above the ‘state’. At the opposite end, the King’s policy of the pursuit and maintenance of peace and his patronage of the arts (which can only flourish in times of peace) were to be commemorated in a composition also reminiscent of Raphael’s Parnassus. The King’s espousal of peace was well known; and in fact, in the final programme as realised by Rubens, it was to be celebrated in the central Canvas at the southern end above the ‘state’ (No. 3). The figure of Peace, as specified in Project A, was a conflation of two descriptions of the goddess as given in Ripa’s Iconologia; in one she is recorded as holding an olive branch and a

72. See The Works of the most high and mighty Prince, James ... King of Great Britaine ..., published by James Montagu, Bishop of Winchester, London, 1616, preface unpaginated.
73. Holbein’s Portrait of Erasmus Writing, The Louvre, Paris, was in the collection of Charles I when he was Prince of Wales. See J. Rowlands, The Paintings of Hans Holbein the Younger, Oxford, 1985, under no. 15.
74. King James VI and I, Political Writings, 1994, pp. XX-XXII.
76. For the print, see Illustrated Bartisch, XXVI (formerly vol. XIV, part 1), p. 244, no. 247. Elizabeth McGrath suggested this as the source of inspiration.
caduceus – symbol of peace, see p. 155 – in the other, as holding: a small statue in her right hand ... the small statue shows that peace ministers to human skills, which cannot be taught without spending much time.77

The parenthetical commemoration of the King’s encouragement – ‘expressing his providence therein’78 – of ‘those particular Arts wch began to take roote in [his] ... tyme’, which were to accompany Peace, refers to what is now generally acknowledged as the cultural reinvigoration of the Jacobean period.79 The ‘particular Arts’ are not specified; they could have included, the masque – the Jacobean art-form par excellence – and, of course, the theatre, but may also have referred to the visual arts, for the revival of which the King still receives little credit today.80 Most notable was architecture, particularly as exemplified by the Banqueting House, designed by Inigo Jones, see pp. 1-2, and embellished by the sculptor, Nicholas Stone.81 The significance attached to that building, and the pride taken in it by the King, were early demonstrated by the free depiction of its façade in Paul van Somer’s Portrait of King James I (Fig. 3).82 In the same year the new Banqueting House was begun, the establishment of the soon-to-be-famous tapestry works at Mortlake was made possible by the King granting the necessary privileges to Flemish weavers.83 And the practice of painting may then have been thought to be promoted by the royal patronage of Paul van Somer and Daniel Mytens.84

The proposal in Project A for the corner ovals to exhibit triumphant virtues was to be adopted in Rubens’s scheme but with modification and elaboration (Nos. 6-9). It is not known when the medieval murals of such virtues were painted over in the Painted Chamber in Westminster Palace,85 but they, or memories of them, may have at least encouraged the inclusion of the theme. Furthermore, conflicts between a virtue and a

77. Ripa, Iconologia, 1611, pp. 400-401 ‘... statuetta nell’ destra mano ... La statuetta mostra che la pace e ministra de gli artifici humani, lupiali non si pottono imparare se non con la spesa di molto tempo’.
78. ‘Expressing’ here is understood to mean putting thoughts into words. See OED, 1884-1928, III, p. 446, under ‘Express, no. 8b’, quoting Ben Jonson; ‘providence’ is understood to mean prudent management. See OED, 1884-1928, VII, p. 1522, under ‘Providence no. 2’, quoting Francis Bacon.
80. T. Wilks, loc. cit., gave chief credit to Queen Anne and the Prince of Wales, as did C. Foley, in Dictionary of Art, 1996, XXIX, p. 57, under ‘Van Somer’. For King James I and the visual arts, see Howarth, Images, 1997, pp. 27 ff.
81. For Stone, see Colvin, King’s Works, 1963-82, IV, pp. 132-133, and p 332 for his position as ‘Chief mason of the Banqueting House’ from 1618/19 – 1621/22. See also Dictionary of Art, 1996, XXIX, pp. 713-714.
83. W. Hefford, ‘Prince Behind the Scenes’, Country Life, 184, 4 October 1990, p. 132, preferred to credit the Prince of Wales as the instigator (and patron) of the scheme rather than the King. The tapestry manufactury was acquired by King Charles I in 1637 (ibid., p. 135).
vice were common in pageants for royal entries or in Lord Mayors' Shows; the final triumphal arch, devised by Jonson, for the entry of James I into the city of London in 1604 showed Peace Trampling on Mars, Quiet with Tumult under her Feet, Liberty Treading on Servitude, and Safety with Danger Lying at her Feet. As relevant perhaps was recent Venetian precedent. Similarly acceptable to Rubens as a basic idea with the potential for elaboration was the formulation for the Canvases flanking the central oval.

The 'inventions' – as so described in its preface – for the central Canvases at either end of the ceiling in Project B were more ambitious and complex, as was the specification for the flanking compartments of the central oval. The conceit for the Canvas at the northern end was partly to illustrate the phrase to be inscribed on it: 'sol occubuit nox nulla sequuta est'. The quotation is part of the title of a poem written for Charles I by Sir John Davies, one of the Crown's law officers, on the death of his father: 'Mira Locquor Sol Occubuit Nox Nulla Secuta Est / By that Eclipse which darkned our Apollo. / Our sunne did sett, and yett noe night did follow; / For his successors vertues shone soe bright / As they continued still their former light, / And gave the world a farther expecta­tion, / To adde a greater splendor to our nation'.

The title was believed to have been the epitaph of a medieval English king, and had been praised as such by Davies in a speech to the Society of Antiquaries in 1601. It gained some currency following Davies's flattering poem to the King, for it was quoted by Sir Henry Wotton, the King's Ambassador to the Doge of Venice, in a report to the Collegio Secreto on 9 (?) October 1625. It was still considered appropriate for quotation in a preface of 1629 addressed to Charles I: 'There is nothing can dry the overflowing spring of teares in all your loyall Subjects eyes for the inestimable losse of our late Soveraigne ... but the Oriente beam es, & bright lustre of your Majesties Emperialle Crowne, and most happy

85. J. Cherry and N. Stratford, Westminster Kings and the Medieval Palace of Westminster (British Museum Occasional Papers, 115), 1995, pp. 11 ff. Neil Stratford kindly informed the author that it is not known when the murals were over-painted; they were to be discovered in the early nineteenth century.
90. State Papers, Venice, 1907-21, XIX, p. 179. A variant had already been used by the newly elected Speaker of the House of Commons at the opening of the 1623 Parliament when describing the happy succession of King James I; see Historical Collections ... beginning ... Anno 1618. And ending ... Anno 1629, published by J. Rushworth, London, 1682, p. 117.
reign over us: whereby that is come to passe which the ancient Poet so much admired, Sol occubuit nox nulla secuta est ...'.

The main conceit, inspired perhaps in part by a depiction of *Hercules at the Cross-roads*, was to show James I conducted by Religion and Concord. Personifications of both were illustrated by Ripa; one image showed Concord crowned with olive: as a sign of peace the result of concord. Isaac Casaubon – the French scholar who settled in England under the patronage of James I – described his patron as a defender of true faith and concord. The King was to be shown embracing Minerva and Astraea, the goddesses of Wisdom and Justice respectively, and rejecting Mars and Bellona, the god and goddess of war. Significant is the presence of Astraea; encomiasts of James I had continued to use the idea of the return of the Golden Age and of Astraea to earth, which had been celebrated in glorifications of both Queen Elizabeth I and King Henri IV of France. In Jonson’s masque of *The Golden Age Restored* of 1615, Minerva announced that Jupiter (that is, James I) ‘means to settle / Astraea in her seat again’. The goddess was to be accompanied by a personification of the Golden Age. This specification was to form the basis for what can for convenience be referred to as the Wise Rule, the theme eventually chosen to occupy the central compartment at the other end of the room (No. 3). There any suggestion of the King being led was eschewed: Rubens depicted him dynamically exerting his prerogative powers as an irresistible ruler to act for the public good, see p. 101.

More audacious was the proposal (in Project B) for the central Canvas at the southern end. The King was to be shown ascending to ‘an open heaven’, lit by the beams of the ‘shying glory of the Deity’ in a manner suggestive of an assumption of a saint. The use of the word “Deity” with the definite article, meaning the Supreme Being or God, predates by over twenty years its earliest recorded use in this way in the *Oxford English Dictionary*. The word may have been employed in order to cater to Protestant – or rather Calvinist – abhorrence of the physical representa-
tion of the Divine, although Charles I’s religious leanings were in a direction opposite to Calvinism.

In this heaven, the King was to join a group of royal exemplars and ancestors with whom he would have wished to be associated: King Solomon of Israel, a favourite exemplar because of his wisdom (see p. 155); the Roman Emperor Constantine (288-337), the first Christian Emperor, whose mother was claimed to be British; King Edward ‘the Confessor’ of England (+1066), from whom the King claimed descent; St Louis (King Louis IX of France (1214-1270)), patron saint of France, to whose crown James I laid claim; and his ancestor King James I of Scotland (1394-1437).

This proposal combined the English medieval tradition of decorating domestic interiors with portraits of English Kings with the classical panegyric, which began with praise of the hero’s ancestors. A not-so-distant precedent was the tomb of the Emperor Maximilian I in the Hofkirche, Innsbruck, where the sarcophagus was to be surrounded by twenty-eight portrayals of ancestors, relations, and heroes. Rubens had advised against this formula for the decoration of the cupola above the portal of the Luxembourg Palace. However, the central motif of the King being borne upwards towards ‘a shining glory of the Deity’ formed the basis of what is usually described as the Apotheosis of King James I in the central compartment of the ceiling (No. 4). There the metaphor of a classical apotheosis was adapted to show James I about to give his account to the Deity for his actions as king, see pp. 101-103.

In one important respect the two Projects were identical: Project B repeated Project A’s proposal for the central, oval compartment. This was a novel and imaginative illustration of the Union of the Crowns (henceforth referred to as the Union) and was given pride of place in Project A. It seems to have been inspired by recent Venetian civic art, but no precise

104. L. Baldass, Der Künstlerkreis Kaiser Maximilians, Vienna, 1923, pp. 35-36, figs. 6-12.
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precedent has been found for the scene prescribed. The emphasis given it there demonstrates that the King’s accession to the English throne was still seen, some twenty years after the event, as the decisive step of his career. And, of course, it was – so far as the House of Stuart was concerned – an opinion clearly shared by Charles I when he approved the retention of the conceit and its location in Project B. Rubens may have come to realise that it was no longer suitable as the central, main subject of the cycle. In the discussions, which he presumably had in London, about the Projects and the content of the cycle, he was able to convince his interlocutors by reference to the Multiple Bozzetto (No. 1; Fig. 46) that the most appropriate way of glorifying the King’s reign, following his death, was to make him the subject of a modified form of apotheosis. The importance attached to the theme of the Union is shown by its retention in the agreed, final scheme but in a new location (No. 5; Fig. 86). There the prescription was to be both amplified and edited. Of all the formulations in the Projects, that for the Union most clearly articulated James I’s authoritarian aspirations. In fact, his prerogative powers in furthering what had taken place through his lineal descent were very limited, see pp. 100-101.

One detailed proposal was abandoned perhaps because it did not meet one of the two criteria that Rubens had laid down in respect of the subjects for the paintings of the second gallery of the Luxembourg Palace. This was that they should be not difficult to understand and inoffensive (‘facili e senza alcun scrupulo’).106 The idea that the two crowns be bound with olive and myrtle may have been thought too abstruse and illegible at a distance. This idea was inspired by a detail in the personification of Civil Union introduced in the 1618 edition of Ripa’s Iconologia:

A woman with a happy countenance holds in her right hand a branch of olive grown with myrtle ... the olive combined with myrtle is a symbol of the pleasure taken from union, and of the friendly peace of citizens, in so far as they are trees of similar nature joined by an interchanging love, their roots are interchangeable and united by being intertwined; and the branches of the myrtle with a happy union with those of the olive expand and protect the fruit of the olive tree because they provide shade against the happy force of the sun and defend them from injury from the wind.107


107. Ripa, Nova iconologia, 1618, pp. 247-248: ‘Donna di lieto aspetto, tenga nella mano destra un ramo d’oliva incolto di mirto ... l’olivo avvolto con il Mirto, è simbolo del piacere che si prende dall’unione, & amica pace de’cittadini, altesoche sono arbori di natura congiunti di scambievole amore, le radici
That the paintings flanking the central oval should show 'the effects of publique vnion' was prescribed in Project A. Gordon has shown that in the early propaganda about the Union of the Crowns, it was prophesied that it would bring about the return of the Golden Age. Closely linked to this concept and to the goddess Astraea was the Messianic prophecy of Isaiah; Project A developed a conceit, inspired by the relevant passage in Isaiah XI, that different species of animal should be depicted yoked together; and it was to be adopted in the two relevant Canvases (Nos. 10-11; Figs. 132 and 148). The festive festoon and children with cornucopias, also depicted in these Canvases, referred to the plenty and happiness that would result from the Union. Project B rejected a classical bias and the implicit allusion to Isaiah by simply quoting the particular verses from the Old Testament in full, parts of which were actually to be incorporated as themes in the Canvases, see pp. 279-280.

There are differences between the two Projects in presentation as well as content. Whereas in Project A glosses were provided for the main conceits, Project B introduced an explanatory title pertaining to the main message of the programme. Here, too, greater coherence was obtained by following as far as possible the sequence of compartments beginning at the northern entrance. On the whole, the vision of Project A is concise and static, while that of Project B is richer and more dynamic; although in the proposals for the corner ovals and the flanking compartments of the central oval the imaginative impulse seems to have faltered. There is a striking contrast between the ambitious proposals for the rectangular compositions at either end of the ceiling and the introduction both of four Evangelists to occupy the corner ovals and of the lame transcription of the four verses from Isaiah XI for the flanking compartments of the central oval. An explanation could be that this resulted from a compromise reached in a committee convened to draft the second programme.

Before the Projects were discovered, Strong insisted that Jones would have been responsible for devising the programme of the ceiling Canvases. His candidacy as author of the Projects must be as good or better than anyone else's. He was Surveyor of the King's Works under both James I and Charles I; he was the architect of the Banqueting House and

loro con scambievoli abbracciamenti s'uniscono; & li rami del Mirto per quelli dell'Olivo con grata unione si spargono e tengono protettione del frutto dell'oliva, poiche lo ripara dalla gagliarda forza del sole, e lo difende deli ingiuria del vento'.

109. F.A. Yates (as in n. 95), pp. 34-35.
110. Strong, Whitehall, 1980, pp. 14-16. Held, Glynde, 1970, p. 280, considered that Inigo Jones 'among others ... must certainly have conferred with Rubens'. Gordon, Whitehall Ceiling, 1975, p. 34, believed that William Laud, then Bishop of London, and Jones may have advised Charles I about the programme. Donovan, Whitehall, 1995, pp. 196-197, doubted that Jones was alone responsible.
had designed the format of the ceiling; and he had already been involved in the creation of a long series of complex conceits acted in court masques. But although not strictly comparable, the stylistic characteristics of the Projects differ from, for instance, those of the programme later devised by Jones for the Cupid and Psyche series for Greenwich or of his explanation of the ‘frontispiece’ for Salmacida Spolia.

The number of other candidates in England sufficiently visually experienced and culturally sophisticated to devise, or participate in devising, the Projects was perhaps not great, but not so small that the task could only have been undertaken by Jones. Balthasar Gerbier (1592-1663), the Keeper of York House – a London residence of the Duke of Buckingham and closely involved with Rubens of whom he was an early admirer, from 1625, and who may have had a hand in developing the iconography for the two paintings executed by Rubens for the Duke, see p. 46, is a potential candidate. Others are the civic pageant dramatists, inter alios: Anthony Munday (1553-1633), Thomas Middleton (?1570-1627), Thomas Dekker (?1570-?1641) and Thomas Heywood (+1660). The vocabulary and points of reference appropriate for the devices for royal entries (most famously those formulated by Jonson for James I’s entry into London in 1604) and of Lord Mayors’ Shows were not so far removed as to make their authors incapable of participating in the formulation of the Projects.

In fact, it is not possible to determine whether either Project was the work of an individual or a group of individuals, or whether the same individual or group was responsible for both Projects. Granted the importance of the commission, it is likely that any proposals would have been scrutinised and perhaps modified by senior servants of the Crown – perhaps the Commissioners for the Banqueting House and/or a Secretary of State such as Coke – and more certainly by the King and Prince of Wales in the case of Project A and the latter (now as king) in the case of Project B. Thus Jones should be regarded as a likely contributor, but not necessarily as either the prime or sole author.

Jones is not recorded as having left England after his trip to Italy in

112. See W. Grant Keith, 'The Queens House Greenwich', Journal of the Royal Institute of British Architects, XLIV, 3, 1936-37, p. 946, who published Webb’s copy of Jones’s instructions that Gerbier was to relay to Jordaens.
114. For Gerbier, see most recently Chaney, Grand Tour, 1998, pp. 215 ff.
116. For an account of these dramatists’ Lord Mayors’ Shows and other pageants, see Bergeron, Pageantry, 1971, pp. 140-241.
117. Ibid., pp. 75-77, 85-88.
1613-14. But an explanation of the difference in spirit between the two Projects may lie in a growing awareness of Rubens’s art in the 1620s. It is possible that Project B had been or was being composed by the time Buckingham and his entourage saw the Marie de Médicis cycle in Paris in late May of 1625, see pp. 44-45. Its impact, or an account of it, might have confirmed or inspired the dynamic vision at times expressed in Project B.

It is quite possible that other programmes were written. But equally it may simply have been copies of Projects A and B that were sent or given by – it is presumed – Gerbier to Rubens, along with the dimensions of the room\textsuperscript{118} and of the openings in the ceiling, sometime (it will be argued) in the year or so before the latter’s arrival in London in June 1629.

\textit{The Commission and Anglo-Spanish Relations}

Rubens’s ability to take on the commission became conditional on the course of international events.\textsuperscript{119} He was court painter to the Archduke Albert and Infanta Isabella, who were joint sovereigns of the Seventeen Provinces (under certain limitations). And thus, because they were childless, after Albert’s death in July 1621 sovereignty returned to the King of Spain, whose subject Rubens became (once again); he remained court painter to the Infanta, now Governor of the Seventeen Provinces. The fulfilment of the commission from then on became dependent on the relations between the British and Spanish Crowns, a restriction that Rubens was to recognise. In the autumn of 1625, diplomatic relations were broken off as the two countries entered into a state of war. By assuming an important role in diplomatic affairs, Rubens was to be instrumental in bringing about an exchange of ambassadors between the two Crowns. Although there seems to be no relevant documentation, it

\textsuperscript{118} See p. 51 below. Rubens made a particular point of asking for the height of the room in the Queen’s House, Greenwich, whose ceiling was to be decorated with the story of Psyche; his quotation for the work was passed on by Scaglia to Gerbier on 13 May 1640. See Rooses-Ruelens, Correspondance, 1887-1909, VI, p. 287, no. CMV.

can be assumed that as a result of the likelihood of the restoration of peace, negotiations concerning the terms of the commission were successfully concluded some four years after the outbreak of war.

Rubens’s apparently earliest involvement in affairs of state concerned efforts to obtain a suspension of arms between Spain and the United Provinces, following the resumption of hostilities after the expiry of the Twelve Years Truce in April 1621. It was officially recognised by the Infanta when she authorised a monthly payment to the artist out of Spanish military funds in September 1623 in consideration: of the good offices of Peter Paul Rubens in the service of his Majesty, so that he can continue.120

In fact, British contact with Rubens, undertaken on behalf of the Prince of Wales, had already been revived by this time. On 18 December (o.s.) 1622, about a year after the then fruitless discussions with Rubens were coming to an end, Danvers took up the reins once again by instructing Trumbull to acquire a Self-Portrait that Rubens was known to have painted.121 The artist later wrote an account of these proceedings to the Sieur de Valavez, his correspondent in Paris from 1623 to 1626, in January 1625: ‘He [the Prince of Wales] already has something by my hand, and, through the British agent resident in Brussels, has asked me for my portrait with such insistence that I found it impossible to refuse him. Though to me it did not seem fitting to send my portrait to a prince of such rank, he overcame my modesty’.122

The Prince of Wales was later to own self-portraits by both Daniel

120. ‘... las buenas partes de Pedro Paulo Rubens y á lo que ha servido á Su Magestad, para que pueda continuarlo’. See Rooses-Ruelens, Correspondance, 1887-1909, III, p. 248, no. CCCXLIX (the order is dated 30 September 1623) and pp. 249 ff. For a commentary, see also Magurn, Letters, 1955, pp. 84-86.

121. For the Self-Portrait, in the collection of H.M. the Queen, see Vlieghe, Portraits (CRLB), 1987, pp. 153-157, no. 135. Danvers’s letter of 18 December 1622 was first published by D. Howarth, ‘Rubens’s "owne pourtrait”’, Apollo, CXXXII, 1990, p. 239. A transcript is printed here in Appendix II.8. Danvers’s instructions were summarised in a letter from Trumbull to Carleton, of 1 March 1623, printed in Rooses-Ruelens, Correspondance, 1887-1909, III, p. 134, no. CCCXII. See also the transcript here in Appendix II.9. The picture is dated 1623, although Danvers referred to it as ‘made alreadie’; the signature and date have not as yet been questioned: but if the inscription is authentic, Rubens could have added it after he received the request relayed by Trumbull. It is noteworthy that David Jaffé speculated that Peiresc may have requested a self-portrait from Rubens perhaps as early as 1622; see [Cat. Exh.] Rubens’ Self-Portrait in Focus (Australian National Gallery, Canberra, 1988), p. 59. The thought thus arises that the Queen’s picture may originally have been intended for Peiresc. Although Rubens in his letter to De Valavez of January 1625 (see below) implied that the portrait had already been sent to the Prince of Wales, Van der Doort’s catalogue entry (see Millar, Van der Doort, 1958-60, p. 37) stated that it was given to the King by the Earl of Danby, which title Danvers only received in 1626 (see n. 51 above).

122. Magurn, Letters, 1955, pp. 101-102, no. 60. For the original text, see Rooses-Ruelens, Correspondance, 1887-1909, III, p. 320, no. CCCLXVII: ‘Il a eu quelque chose de ma main et m’a demandé, par l’agent d’Angleterre résidant à Bruxelles avec tel insistance mon pourtrait, qu’il n’y eut aucun moyen de le pouvoir refuser encore qu’il ne me semboit pas convenable d’envoyer mon pourtrait à un prince de telle qualité mais il forza ma modestie’. 
Mytens and Sir Anthony van Dyck; but his relationship with these artists differed from his with Rubens, in that both were members of his court, whereas Rubens was quite independent of him. Thus the satisfaction perceptible in the artist’s account is understandable; on a business level, too, the artist could be satisfied that his inflexibility had been vindicated. As the infamous Bassano had been restored, Danvers offered to write off the £25 that the artist held on account, and to forego the Hunt, the replacement of that which had already been returned. Further, the earlier policy of questioning and bargaining over the artist’s prices was to be abandoned. But as – if not more – important was the unprecedented, royal request to acquire a Self-Portrait by the artist. This was flattering; and it must have been at least partly understood as such by those who wished to re-establish a friendly relationship with the artist in order to settle the commission for the Banqueting Hall.

If any more formal understanding was required concerning the ceiling Canvases than that provided by Rubens in his letter of 1621, then this is the period when it may have been considered. It would have depended on the then seemingly warm relations between the British and Spanish governments, as negotiations about the marriage between the Prince of Wales and the sister of the King of Spain, the Infanta Doña María, long in discussion and controversial in both countries, gathered momentum. These negotiations advanced during the Prince’s and Duke of Buckingham’s officially unsolicited and to a degree impromptu visit to Madrid between March and September 1623; but any progress was accompanied by a growing underlying suspicion, and the negotiations were to be broken off after the Prince’s departure. Following his account of the Prince’s request for his Self-Portrait, Rubens stated: ‘And if the projected alliance had taken place, I should have been obliged to make a voyage to England’.

Perhaps it was in anticipation of a successful outcome that Project A was drafted. Had Rubens come to England in the autumn of 1623, a like-

124. D. Howarth (as in n. 121), p. 240, interpreted the tone of the letter differently: as written ‘in this muted vein’.
125. The connection between the Hunt, which had earlier failed to please, and the approach (as reported by Trumbull in his letter to Carleton of 1 March 1623, as in n. 121) over the Self-Portrait was first adumbrated by Millar, Charles I, 1972, loc. cit. The connection between Danvers’s approach and the Banqueting Hall commission was explicitly made by D. Howarth (as in n. 121).
126. See Palme, Triumph, 1956, pp. 8 ff., for a good account of the negotiations for the ‘Spanish Match’.
127. Magurn, Letters, 1955, p. 102, no. 60. For the original text, see Rooses-Ruelens, Correspondance, 1887-1909, loc. cit.: ‘et je vous assure que se l’alliance projetée eust succédée, jeusse este contraint de faire un voyage en Angleterre’. R. Baumstark, in [Cat. Exh.] Liechtenstein: The Princely Collections (Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York, 1985-86), under no. 208, first drew attention to the significance of this statement.
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ly result would have been the finalization of details of the commission.128 But he would presumably not have been able to begin work on it until at least the completion of the series to decorate the first gallery in the Luxembourg Palace. Rubens might not have been able to achieve this much faster than he in fact did; thus James I’s death in March 1625 would have intervened. This event may have triggered the drafting of Project B.

In his letter to the De Valavez of January 1625, referred to above, Rubens explained that he had not earlier gone to England ‘Since ... this friendship [between Spain and Great Britain] has dissolved, in general, so also has private intercourse grown cool; for the fortunes of the great draw everything else along with them’.129 In fact, his bold, but partially qualified, assertion that his own interests were not affected by national quarrels – ‘I mean (other things being equal) that I regard the whole world as my country, and I believe that I would be very welcome everywhere’130 – was not borne out by events nor did it hasten the award of the commission that was to be delayed by the collapse of Anglo-Spanish relations.

As the Infanta recognised, such a state of affairs might impinge on the war between Spain and the United Provinces, as Great Britain would provide the latter with greater assistance; thus Rubens was to be instructed to maintain contact with the Duke of Buckingham and Gerbier. They had first met in Paris after the marriage by proxy between Princess Henrietta Maria, sister of King Louis XIII of France, to Charles, the new King of Great Britain, on 11 May 1625.131 Rubens was in Paris because he had been required to finish the first gallery in the Luxem-

128. Palme, Triumph, 1956, pp. 249 ff., and especially pp. 255-259, suggested that the sketch of *Psyche Conducted by Mercury to Olympus* (coll. H.R.H. Fürst von und zu Liechtenstein, Vaduz) was executed between 1621 and 1623 as illustrative of the ‘Spanish Match’ and as a modello for the painting to occupy the central oval of the ceiling. *Held, Sketches*, 1980, I, pp. 190-192, under no. 129, rightly rejected this proposal (and the present author’s suggested association of the modello with the Duke of Buckingham’s embassy to Paris to accompany King Charles I’s bride, Princess Henrietta Maria, to England), but still retained the thesis that it was to be related to the Banqueting Hall commission by way of its being a demonstration piece painted at the time when Rubens first showed interest in the commission. See also R. Baumstark, loc. cit. (as in n. 127). However, the programmes in the Projects (see Appendix I) would appear to dispose of this idea, while McGrath, History (CRLB), 1997, I, pp. 81-94, has warned against making topical interpretations of subjects when taken from classical history and thus – perhaps by extension – from classical myth. The commission for which this modello was executed has not as yet been identified. The closest formal connection is with Rubens’s revised idea for the *Duke of Buckingham conducted to the Temple of Virtus* as developed in the National Gallery sketch (no. 187), for which, see under n. 139.

129. Magurn, Letters, 1955, loc. cit. For the original text, see Rooses-Ruelens, Correspondance, 1887-1909, loc. cit.: ‘estant esvanouye cette amitié, en général, s’est aussi refroidy le commerce des particuliers comme la fortune des grands tire avec soy tout le reste’.

130. Magurn, Letters, 1955, loc. cit. For the original text, see Rooses-Ruelens, Correspondance, 1887-1909, loc. cit.: ‘j entends (ceteris paribus) que j’estime tout le monde pour ma patrie; assy je croy qu je serois le très bien venu partout’.

131. For Rubens’s presence at the occasion, see his letter of 13 May 1625 to Peiresc, in Magurn, Letters.
bourge Palace in time for the wedding celebrations, and Buckingham was there for a week from 24 May when he attended a reception given by Richelieu in the Luxembourg Palace, as he had been accorded the honour of accompanying the Princess to London. The meeting took place under the cover of Rubens in his role as artist and it was presumably on this occasion that he made a portrait study of the Duke; diplomatic exchanges followed as Gerbier recounted: 'The Duke of Buckingham being at Paris in April [sic] 1625, the Sieur Rubens painted his portrait there, and on that occasion had communicated with and made proposals to Gerbier ... the Sieur Rubens made it known that he apprehended great difficulties might arise between the Crowns of Spain and Great Britain.... These speeches were accompanied by protestations and wishes that the Duke might be induced ... to pacify the King ... who is no doubt very much incensed [by his treatment in Spain]'.

Perhaps it had been agreed that the British side should raise the matter of the Banqueting Hall commission as being of interest to Rubens and themselves, which might explain why – perhaps not uncoincidentally – the King was then considering scale, or working, drawings of the room. Project A had evidently been composed with only a rough plan of the ceiling in view and gave only very vague and inaccurate indications of the shapes of the paintings required. Rubens would have had to have an idea of the dimensions of the room and of the size of the openings in order to establish the degree of foreshortening required either to provide an estimate of the cost, or to start preliminary work. On 19 May (o.s.) 1625, Danvers, in his idiosyncratically obscure phraseology, reported to Trumbull: 'His Matie is now upon a desighne of buildinge at Whythall wch plot once resolved will give me the measure for Rubence picture'. Significantly, Trumbull was the recipient of this information as he had been closely involved in earlier discussions with Rubens about the commission; he was the one royal servant most likely to be in touch with Rubens on his return to Antwerp, and the one best able to revive negotiations.

However, the diplomatic rupture anticipated by Rubens occurred in

1955, pp. 107-110, no. 62. For the original text, see Rooses–Ruelens, Correspondance, 1887-1909, III, pp. 351 ff., no. CCLXXIV.
135. See D. Howarth (as in n. 121), p. 238. Howarth, Images, 1997, p. 123, interpreted Danvers's obscure phraseology differently, believing that Danvers was referring to alterations made at the time to the southern wall of the Banqueting House.
the autumn with the despatch of a British fleet to attack Cadiz; diplomatic representatives of both Crowns were recalled.\textsuperscript{136} The line of communication between Rubens and Gerbier, established under the cover of the execution of paintings and the sale of works of art, was obviously important to the Infanta, who was more committed to a suspension of arms than her nephew, King Philip IV of Spain, and his favourite, the Count-Duke of Olivares; the latter nevertheless soon authorised the artist ‘to keep up this correspondence with Gerbier’.\textsuperscript{137}

No mention of the Banqueting Hall commission is to be found in the considerable, extant correspondence of these years between Rubens and Gerbier. They were soon to meet on three occasions: in Paris, Brussels, and Holland, where they spent a week together.\textsuperscript{138} It is possible that the two discussed the commission then, along with the two pictures that Rubens was to execute for the Duke of Buckingham: \textit{The Equestrian Portrait of the Duke of Buckingham} (Fig. 17) and the \textit{Minerva and Mercury conducting the Duke of Buckingham to the Temple of Honour and ‘Virtus’} (Fig. 19). Both may have been ready for despatch to England in September 1627; the latter displayed Rubens’s mastery of allegory and of the foreshortening necessary for a ceiling canvas; the work can be seen as a prospectus of what he could achieve in the Banqueting Hall.\textsuperscript{139} Indeed, the King’s likely admiration for it may have led to the request that a compositionally similar work occupy the central compartment of the ceiling in place of the canvas depicting the Union.

The tense, diplomatic exchanges in Antwerp between Rubens and Doncaster, now the Earl of Carlisle, Charles I’s ambassador extraordinary to the Duke of Savoy, on 18/19 May 1628, would probably have ruled out any consideration of the commission, although it was reported that the pretext of their meeting was ‘pictures’.\textsuperscript{140} But their positive outcome resulted in Carlisle being invited to Brussels to meet the Infanta. In

\textsuperscript{137} Sainsbury, Papers, 1859, p. 70.
\textsuperscript{139} See Martin, Cat. National Gallery, 1970, pp. 147 ff., under no. 187, and Martin, Buckingham, 1966, pp. 613-617, fig. 21, for the second picture (with a different title). See also Held, Sketches, 1980, 1, pp. 390-395, nos. 291-292, and, for the equestrian portrait, Vlieghe, Portraits (CRLB), 1987, pp. 64-66, no. 81. Both pictures were destroyed in 1949, when in the collection of the Earl of Jersey, having been at Osterley Park, Middlesex. See also Donovan, Whitehall, 1995, p. 161.
\textsuperscript{140} See the despatch of Giovanni Soranzo, Venetian ambassador to the Estates General in The Hague, in \textit{State Papers, Venice}, 1907-21, XXI, p. 113.
his report of 27 May to Buckingham, Carlisle wrote: ‘[Rubens] made mee believe that (for his particular) nothing but good intentions ... have been in his heart: which on my soul I think is trew, because in other things I finde him a reall man, and as well affectet to the King of England’s service as the King of Spaine can deseyer’. Perhaps during the short journey from Brussels to the Spanish Netherlands border, on which Rubens accompanied Carlisle in the following week, provided a more congenial time in which the commission could be discussed. Rubens’s earliest, extant preparatory work for it can indeed be dated – albeit on stylistic grounds – to around this time, see under No. 1.

The meeting in Paris between Buckingham, Gerbier, and Rubens was indirectly to have a further bearing on his taking on the commission. Rubens kept a dossier on his secret negotiations with Gerbier; as he explained: ‘inasmuch as I have been employed in this treaty constantly since the rupture, I still have in my hands all the papers presented by both sides’. It was this, now expanded dossier that he offered to divulge and review with ministers in Madrid, a hazardous mission embarked on in August-September 1628. The mission was so successfully accomplished by the artist that on 29 April 1629 he left Madrid empowered by Philip IV to negotiate an exchange of ambassadors with Charles I; he arrived in London, via Brussels and Antwerp, on 4 June.

Rubens’s overwhelming concern on his arrival in England was diplomacy. He was later to write to his friend, the Antwerp lawyer Jan van de Wouver (Woverius) to thank him for his congratulations ‘on the happy success and consummation of peace with England, on which I really worked very hard, and can say without vanity, cujus pars magna fui’. Indeed he was knighted and rewarded by Charles I for his services. The twenty-three extant letters which Rubens wrote to Olivares from the end

141. Sainsbury, Papers, 1859, p. 122, and, for an account of the whole episode, pp. 117-123. See also Gachard, Histoire, 1877, pp. 90-91.
144. For a good summary of the events that led to Rubens’s journey to Madrid, see Magurn, Letters, 1955, pp. 221-225. For an account of Rubens in Madrid, see Huemer, Portraits (CRLB), 1977, pp. 62 ff.
146. See Rubens’s letter of 13 January 1631, in Magurn, Letters, 1955, p. 370, no. 218 (the original in Italian is lost; a copy was published in 1915: p. 498, n. on no. 218). Rubens also referred to his diplomatic journeys in a letter to Peiresc of 18 December 1634. See Magurn, Letters, 1955, p. 392, no. 235, and, for the original text, see Rooses–Ruelens, Correspondance, 1887-1909, VI, p. 81, no. DCCCXXXV: ‘gli miei impiegi e viaggi di Spagna et Ingleterra mi riuscirono felicissimè con buon essito di nego­ cij gravissimi’.
II. TOWARDS THE COMMISSION

of June until the middle of December, are a testimony to his diligence. The duration of Rubens's stay was entirely dictated by diplomatic factors; already by 24 August, Olivares had informed him that he could return to Antwerp as soon as the Spanish Ambassador designate, Don Carlos Coloma, arrived at the British court.147 Rubens gave no indication that other matters might detain him; he wrote to Olivares: 'Although I enjoy every comfort and satisfaction here, and although I am universally honored, more than my rank deserves, I cannot remain here any longer than the service of his Majesty requires'.148 This letter indeed suggests that Rubens expected soon to return, a view he confirmed in a letter to his friend, the scholar and town clerk of the city of Antwerp Jan-Gaspar Gevaerts (Gevartius) of 15 September, in which he wrote that he originally thought that his mission would last not more than two months.149

Rubens could not have then anticipated that his departure from England would not take place until the following March. It is thus proposed that if discussions did resume concerning the ceiling Canvases – and it is reasonable to assume that they did – the most likely date for them would have been in the late summer or early autumn of 1629, an inference supported by the summer livery worn by the sergeant-at-arms recorded in a presumed lost study made by Rubens and then used for the figure in the Union (No. 5), see p. 214 and under No. 5g.

By then Buckingham had been dead for just over a year.150 In fact, his assassination constituted a further threat to the realisation of the commission, as the King's priority was now to erect a monument to his deceased favourite. But he was dissuaded by the now powerful Lord High Treasurer, Baron Weston, who warned: 'I would be loth to tell your Majesty what the world would say not only here but all Christendom over, if you should erect a monument for the duke, before you set up one for King James, your father'.151 In the end, the Duke was to receive from the King the posthumous honour of being buried in King Henry VII's

147. Magurn, Letters, 1955, p. 333, no. 201. For the original text, see Rooses-Ruelens, Correspondance, 1887-1909, V, p. 188, no. DCXXVII.
148. Magurn, Letters, 1955, p. 333, no. 201. For the original text, see Rooses-Ruelens, Correspondance, 1887-1909, V, p. 188 no. DCXXXII: 'ben che me ritrovo con ogni commodita e gusto et onorato universalmente piu che non comporta la qualita mia, non posso trattenermi davantaggio di quello che il servizio di sua maiesta richiede et il stato delle cose mie domestiche comporta'.
150. He was assassinated at Portsmouth on 23 August (o.s.) 1628. See R. Lockyer (as in n. 133), p. 453.
chapel in Westminster Abbey, which hitherto had been reserved for those of royal blood. He was buried in the space that would perhaps have been occupied by a monument to King James I had it not been decided that the dead King was to be commemorated by the paintings in the ceiling of the Banqueting Hall. Work on the Duke’s tomb began probably about 1630.152

In spite of Rubens’s earlier claim to be a free agent,153 there may still have been concern about the correct etiquette for the King to commission work from the servant of another sovereign. It is perhaps in this context that Rubens’s gift of Minerva protecting Pax from Mars (Fig. 24) should be seen.154 The gift qua gift has always been interpreted as an altruistic gesture on Rubens’s part; but, even if the subject matter of the painting was close to his heart and hopes, the gift would have been totally at variance with the patron-client behaviour of British society155 and uncharacteristic of the artist. Works of art were often used as presents in British court circles at the time;156 and Rubens’s gift of this picture to Charles I would have established the appropriate relationship in which ‘the exchange of favor ... was sealed with a gift’.157 Further, although the King could already have been in possession of the Daniel in the Lions’ Den,158 and would very probably have known the ceiling painting (although never installed as such) that Rubens had painted for Buckingham (Fig. 19),159 it may still have been felt that Charles should have personal access to an up-to-date example of Rubens’s latest manner in an allegorical vein before the commission was officially awarded to him. And this in spite of the artist’s preparations for it,160 which may also have been taken into account when the decision was finally made to award him the task of decorating the ceiling of the Banqueting Hall.

In determining the programme for the ceiling Canvases, Charles I’s wishes would have been paramount, and the King has been named as the person with whom Rubens discussed it. But the title “king” should be taken in its ‘official’ sense, so as to comprise his servants as well. There may have been other Projects to consider as well as the two that

152. R.W. Lightbown, loc. cit.
153. See above and n. 130.
154. For the National Gallery picture, see Martin, Cat. National Gallery, 1970, pp. 166 ff., no. 46.
158. See pp. 29-30 above.
159. See No. 1 of the present catalogue.
160. See p. 46 above.
II. TOWARDS THE COMMISSION

have survived and these would have been tabled along with Rubens’s first proposal made in the form of a grisaille sketch, probably that still extant and called here the Multiple Bozzetto (No. 1; Fig. 46). Once it had been established that the Union of the Crowns was to be retained but in a different location, the two matters chiefly outstanding were how Rubens would represent it and what the content of the painting above the ‘state’ at the southern end would be. Probably lost and unrecorded grisailles showed preliminary ideas for the Union as well as for the Wise Rule. These early configurations and Rubens’s plans concerning the already agreed subjects might well have been the subject of long debate. Also necessary for the execution of the commission was that Rubens should study portraits of King James I, his costume and the regalia (see pp. 65-71), and perhaps his throne, as well as the uniform and staff of office of the sergeant-at-arms (see pp. 214, 218-19).

The question arises as to what extent Rubens’s participation in secret negotiations with Gerbier and then in official matters of state concerning the Spanish and British Crowns had a bearing on his being awarded the commission. The artist was not the only party involved in secret truce negotiations,161 nor was he the only contact between the two governments after the rupture in the autumn of 1625.162 Undoubtedly, as Great Britain desired peace with Spain, an agreement would have been reached sooner or later with or without Rubens. While his calling as an artist was initially an impediment to his acceptability by the Spanish side,163 the relationship that developed between the artist and Philip IV may later have been beneficial;164 most probably his reputation in England was an advantage and contributed to the successful outcome of his diplomatic mission.165 Indeed, he may have been the more welcome to Charles I because of the prospect of his executing the paintings for the Banqueting Hall.

Thus Rubens’s participation in peace initiatives had the likely effect of

164. For Rubens’s relations with King Philip IV, see his letters to Peiresc and Gevartius of 2 and 29 December 1628, in Maqurn, Letters, 1955, pp. 292 and 295, nos. 180 and 181; Rooses-Ruelens, Correspondance, 1887-1909, V, pp. 10-11, 14-17, nos. DLXIV, DLXVI.
165. A.J. Loomie, 1969 (as in n. 162), p. 1157, n. 3, published a Consulta of 19 April 1629: ‘por sus [Rubens’s] partes, manera y entendimiento, y por su profesion de Pintura, siendo el Rey de Inglaterra muy aficionado a ella, podria grangear tal entrado que pudiere servir muy bien a Su Magestad’. See also Sir Francis Cottington’s letter to Coloma of 22 May 1629: ‘De que el rey mi señor esta muy contento, no solamente por respecto de lo que trae, sino tambien por el desseo que tiene de conozcer persona de tal merito’, in Gachard, Histoire, 1877, p. 120, n. 2.
hastening and assisting his undertaking of the commission. Following the breakdown of diplomatic relations, it may even have been used as a reason for the continuation of contacts; while as an architect of reconciliation, Rubens was afforded the earliest possible opportunity – since the commission had been broached – to inspect the hall in which the Canvases were to be displayed. If Rubens had not then been in London as a Secretary of the King’s Privy Council in The Netherlands, he would probably have arrived there soon after the proclamation of peace between the two countries. But had such a proclamation been much delayed, it might well have proved difficult to persuade Rubens to make the journey to London as his disenchantment with court life grew, particularly as he would have felt under no greater obligation to the British King than he had expressed in 1621 or perhaps in the first nine months of 1623. On the other hand, a journey to London to inspect the hall and ceiling was perhaps not essential to his undertaking of the commission.167

166. See below, p. 82.
167. Rubens and Jordaens, a few years later, did not stipulate that it was necessary to inspect the room in the Queen’s House, Greenwich, which the ceiling canvases depicting the story of Cupid and Psyche were to decorate: see Sainsbury, Papers, 1859, pp. 211-223. See also under n. 118 above.
III. EXECUTION OF THE COMMISSION

An Hypothetical Contract

Rubens would have considered it normal practice for a contract to be drawn up for the execution of a commission of such importance and complexity as the ceiling decoration of the Banqueting Hall. None such is recorded; possibly one existed and was signed before the artist’s departure from England in the early spring of 1630. The King’s officers, however, may have had no precedent on which to rely for the drafting of a contract with an artist who was not a servant of the Crown, see pp. 26-27. If there was no actual contract, it seems inconceivable that there was not some form of understanding.

Rubens’s contract with Marie de Médicis for paintings to decorate the two galleries in the Luxembourg Palace covered most of the points that would have also been relevant for the Banqueting Hall commission. The contract referred to: 1) the subject matter – ‘toutes les histoires selon l’intention de sa matie’ – which in the case of the Banqueting Hall commission would have been agreed using the Projects and perhaps the Multiple Bozzetto [No. 1] as the bases for discussion; 2) design and execution –‘desseigner et peindre da sa propre main’ – the latter of which may have been of particular concern to the British side, although studio participation may have been agreed upon, as it was in the case of the paintings for the ceilings of the Jesuit Church; 3) provision of a modello for the patron’s approval; 4) completion date – the staggered annual targets set by Marie de Médicis were not met, while the delay over the Banqueting Hall commission was due to the British side; 5) delivery and installation – ‘les faire poser en leur lieu et place’ – which was accomplished by Rubens in the Luxembourg Palace, but which he avoided in the case of the Banqueting Hall; and 6) the fee and its payment, which in spite of Rubens’s apprehensions was settled in full by Charles I. Rubens finally received a gift from the King, which may either have been ex gratia as a token of his approval like the sum secretly proposed by Marie de Médici-
THE DATE OF EXECUTION

cis, which however was deducted from the contractually agreed fee, or as compensation for late payment, a matter that had been covered in the contract for the paintings for the Jesuit Church.

Rubens would in all probability have agreed to a time-table for completion of the commission; it was certainly not so tight as to prevent him from taking on an onerous diplomatic role. To be expected is a degree of punctiliousness on his part in the execution of a commission of this importance, and it seems likely that his work on the Canvases was completed by early 1634. This suggests that the time allowed for completion had been about four years. Coincidentally or not, it had taken the same amount of time to complete the Marie de Médicis series for the first gallery in the Luxembourg Palace.

The Date of Execution

To what extent Rubens's official duties interfered with his work as an artist after his return to the southern Netherlands from London in the early spring of 1630 is difficult to estimate. But we have Rubens's account of his official attendance on the now-exiled Marie de Médicis; this interrupted his artistic activity between the summer of 1631 and early spring of 1632. Some only sporadic, public service followed.

His position as a Secretary of the King's Privy Council in the Netherlands3 seems to have been honorific and did not require his residence in Brussels.4 On the other hand, in 1630, Philip IV had Rubens's monthly remuneration from the treasury in the Antwerp citadel increased from the 10 écus per month, set in 1623, to 40 écus.5 In December 1630, he was under consideration for the post of Spanish Resident at the court of Charles I6 (a post he was to decline some months later).7 And in a letter to Van de Wouwer of 13 January 1631, he referred to the 'vast correspondence' that he had in part handed over to others out of disgust at not having his expenses in Spain and England reimbursed.8

In June 1631, Rubens became involved in negotiations concerning the position of Marie de Médicis,9 and, in July, was appointed her represen-

---
5. Rooses–Ruelens, Correspondance, 1887-1909, III, p. 250, no. CCCXLIX.
In a letter, of 18 December 1635, he gave an account of this time-consuming duty and his decision to resign from his post: ‘Now, for three years, by divine grace, I have found peace of mind, having renounced every sort of employment outside of my beloved profession .... And in order that you may know all, they entrusted to me, and to me alone, all the secret affairs of France regarding the flight of the Queen Mother .... When I found myself in that labyrinth, beset night and day by a succession of urgent duties; away from my home for nine months, and obliged to be present continually at Court ... I made the decision to force myself to cut this golden knot of ambition, in order to recover my liberty’. Indeed, on 12 April 1632, Rubens wrote to Gerbier: ‘I have retired at the right time, and I have never had less regret for any decision I ever made’.

In the first months after his return to Antwerp, official duties seem not to have been so onerous as to impede his work as an artist. At the same time, there seems then to have been no urgency on Rubens’s part to start on the Banqueting Hall paintings. Rather he took up the long outstanding commission to decorate the second gallery in the Luxembourg Palace with scenes from the life of King Henri IV; this would suggest that Rubens allowed for this prior commitment in his calculating the likely date of completion of the Banqueting Hall Canvases. Work on the Henri IV series was frustrated in the autumn of 1630 and Rubens abandoned the cycle in November/December. It may be presumed that some of the time Rubens may have allocated for the execution of the series would now be expended in the service of the exiled Dowager Queen.

The other main, public commissions to occupy Rubens on his return

10. Ibid., p. 212.
12. Magurn, Letters, 1955, p. 392, no. 235. For the original text, see Rooses-Ruelens, Correspondance, 1887-1909, VI, p. 81, no. DCCLXXXV: ‘Hora mi trovo da tre anni in ?a per la gracia divina col animo qui­eto havendo rinunciato da ogni sorte d’impiegi fuori della mia dolcissima professione...Et perche V.S. sappia il tutto mi furono di poi [after his return from England] conditate (dico a me solo) tutte le pratiche secrete di Francia toccante la fuga della Reyna Madre...Hora trovandomi in quello Labir­into e sempre obsoelio notte e giorno di un corteggio assai importuno e fuori della casa mia per il spacio di nove mese dovendo assistere continuamente alla corte...presi resolutione di far violenza a me stesso et di tagliar questo nodo d’ambizione per ricovrar la mia liberta’. Rubens was to continu­ue to take part in truce discussions; as he told Peiresc, in his letter of 18 December 1635 (Rooses-Ruelens, op. cit., p. 82, no. DCCLXXXV), he was released from his duties by the Infanta: ‘con riserva però di alcune intelligenze e pratiche secrete di stato che si potevano continuare con minor scommodo’.
from London were probably the triptych for the Brotherhood of St Ildefonso in the Church of St Jacob op de Coudenberg, Brussels;\textsuperscript{15} The Crowning of St Catherine executed in 1631 or 1633-35 for the Church of the Augustinians, Mechelen,\textsuperscript{16} and the Last Supper painted for the cathedral of St Romuald in the same city in 1631-32.\textsuperscript{17} His designs for the tapestry cycle of the History of Achilles are dated to these years.\textsuperscript{18}

A lack of urgency concerning the commission was also shared by the British side, and was in evidence again once work on the Canvases was finished, see pp. 79-80. No doubt time would have been consumed by the despatch of the (lost) Overall Modello (No. 2, and pp. 72-3) to London and perhaps by discussion of it. At all events, Rubens is known to have been at work on the Canvases in May 1633, when it was recorded that the paintings were well advanced.\textsuperscript{19} When he had begun is not known, but it seems likely to have been after his resignation from his post as representative of Marie de Médicis in the spring of 1632. Burchard gave two sets of dates of c. 1632-33 and 1633-34 for the modelli;\textsuperscript{20} Held preferred to date all the modelli 1632-33.\textsuperscript{21} This latter view seems the more acceptable: indeed the majority of sketches must have been executed well before May 1633 – possibly during the previous summer, prior to the dispatch of the Overall Modello to London. Rubens's response to comments on it from London, which concerned – we think – the three main compositions, would have been executed in the winter, ready for him to begin work on the Canvases in the early spring of 1633. While the commission no doubt took some time to prepare for, it seems foolhardy to try to establish more precise sequential dates of execution for all the extant modelli, see pp. 63-4, in the period from the spring of 1632 to the following winter.

The largest of the Canvases may have been thought to be too large for Rubens to handle in his studio; he may thus have painted them in either the covered galleries of the Antwerp Exchange or in the refectory of the Carmelites where later the decorations for the Cardinal Infante's Tri-

\textsuperscript{15} Vlieghe, Saints (CRLB), 1972-73, II, pp. 84-85, under no. 117; Held, Sketches, 1980, I, p. 569, under no. 412.


\textsuperscript{17} Held, Sketches, 1980, I, p. 467, under no. 340.

\textsuperscript{18} Haverkamp Begemann, Achilles (CRLB), 1975, p. 19, as 'between 1630-1635'; Held, Sketches, 1980, I, p. 172, as 'between 1630-1632'; F. Lammertse in F. Lammertse and A. Vergara, [Cat. Exh.] Peter Paul Rubens, The Life of Achilles, Museum Boijmans Van Beuningen—Museo Nacional del Prado, 2003-04, pp. 11-12, and note 3, p. 11, as 'around 1630-1635'.

\textsuperscript{19} See Public Record Office, Privy Seal Books, E. 403/2567, fol. 25r, order to pay Henry Wicks, 8 May (o.s.) 1633. Reference kindly provided by David Howarth.

\textsuperscript{20} Burchard, Cat. Wildenstein, 1950, nos. 21, 23, dated 1633-1634, and no. 24, dated c. 1632-1633, for which, see p. 60, n. 36.

\textsuperscript{21} Held, Sketches, 1980, I, p. 187.
umphal Entry into Antwerp were to be painted. For how long after their completion they had been stored in Rubens’s house before Gerbier wrote to Charles I on 11 August 1634 warning him of damaging rumours of ‘want of money’ to pay for them is uncertain. In September of the following year, Gerbier claimed that the Canvases had been thus rolled up for nearly a year, but he may then have relied only on a brief reference to his letter-book, forgetting that it would have taken time for the rumours, about which he had warned the King the previous August, to build up and start circulating. Granted the report that work was well advanced in May 1633, it may well be that painting of the Canvases was finished towards the end of 1633 or early in 1634.

The Work in Preparation

The extant preparatory work for the Canvases consists in bozzetti painted in oils en grisaille and coloured modelli also executed in oil and on panel. Seven bozzetti en grisaille were executed on the same support (in the Multiple Bozzetto, No. 1; Fig. 46); for this reason it is unique in Rubens’s extant oeuvre, a fact that may no more than reflect the special status of the commission in his career. Hitherto, the total number of modelli was thought to have been on fourteen supports, of which two were on canvas (one the result of a transfer; No. 7b; Fig. 115). In the present study, two of the modelli on panel and another on canvas – regarded as authentic by Burchard and other authorities – are not accepted as autograph (Nos. 3g/5g, 4e and 6b; Figs. 63/94, 83 and 107).

The reverses of only four of the wooden supports have not been the object of major attention by restorers. Two of these supports bear the coat of arms of the City of Antwerp and the monogram of the panel maker Michiel Vriendt; both were made out of two members. In one, the grain of both members runs horizontally, in the other the grain of both members runs vertically (Nos. 3d/5b, 5f; Figs. 62/96, 102). The other two (Nos. 8b, 9b; Figs. 120, 127) – also made up of two members and with the grain in the opposite direction – show only part of the coat of arms of the City.

23. See Appendix III.1.
24. See Appendix IV.4.
25. See above and n. 19.
26. For Michiel Vriendt, see most recently Van Damme, Tafereelmakers, 1990, pp. 223 ff. Unfortunately, no tracings were made of the coats of arms, which could have added to the corpus built up and published by J. Wadum, ‘The Antwerp Brand on Paintings on Panel’, Leids Kunsthistorisch Jaarboek, XI, 1998, pp. 179 ff.
of Antwerp; this could indicate that the original support as supplied was larger and was cut up in Rubens’s studio. Small drips of the ground on some of the edges of three of the supports indicate the edges’ integrity.

Technical photographs (including X-radiography) have been taken of the Multiple Bozzetto (No. 1; Fig. 50) and X-radiographs have been taken of four of the modelli (Nos. 3d/5b, 3e, 5e and 9b). In the Multiple Bozzetto it is evident that Rubens used a support on which he had begun another composition or compositions that were for the most part erased and/or painted over and now are barely legible even with the most intrusive photography. Also evident are some drastic pentimenti in the bottom left hand corner of the central field, which are most likely to have been a mixture of both formal and iconographic reconsiderations. Pentimenti have been detected and thought significant for the development of the composition in the modello at Minneapolis (No. 5e; Fig. 101). But these may rather be formulations of an earlier, unrelated design for which the support had been used, that now show up light; they are even more difficult to read than are those in the Multiple Bozzetto and little shows up in the X-radiographs that have been taken. The bozzetto for the Apotheosis apart, pentimenti evident in the preparatory work seem not to be major; both the other bozzetti and the modelli give the appearance of being well rehearsed.

No drawings exist for the commission, and it has been thought that none was made. This is very improbable; most likely, and at the very least, some studies may well have been made by the artist of the sergeant-at-arms and his uniform, the physiognomy of King James I, his Parliamentary robes and the regalia, see pp. 65-71. Chalk was used in the Multiple Bozzetto (No. 1; Fig. 46) to delineate the contours of the individual designs and underdrawing is evident on the Hermitage modello for the Union (No. 5c; Fig. 98); this was probably relevant to the design but to what degree is impossible to say. It also seems likely that Rubens made preliminary compositional sketches in pen and ink or chalk to work out his basic ideas – this would explain the, for the most

27. In the case of the Rotterdam sketch (No. 3d / No. 5b), there is a trace of the stamp of one hand; the other may be concealed by labels on the reverse.
28. Held, Sketches, 1980, I, pp. 205, 206-207, under no. 137; see n. 12 under No. 5e, below.
30. See Held, Sketches, 1980, I, p. 189 ('Rubens may have sketched all of it in oils'); and White, Rubens, 1987, p. 254. This view has already been challenged by the present author (Martin, Banqueting House, 2000, p. 171).
part, deliberate and premeditated character of the preparatory work in oils.

The *Multiple Bozzetto* could appear to result from a development of the practice apparently first (and recently) adopted by Rubens when planning the *Triumph of the Eucharist* tapestry series that was to decorate the church of the Descalzas Reales, Madrid. Then Rubens worked out the compositions and arrangement of the tapestries on the three walls of the church on three supports, two of which were later cut up. In this case, the *bozzetti* were lightly coloured and the arrangement of the tapestries appears to have been definitive, whereas the *Multiple Bozzetto* (No. 1; Fig. 46) is more of a working draft; it does not contain sketches for all the compositions and the arrangement of the seven designs does not follow the plan of the ceiling. More comparable to this preparatory work for the tapestry series may have been the lost *Overall Modello* for the whole ceiling decoration, see below.

The extant *modelli* are of three different types: compositional, figural, and, in the case at least for the corner compositions, a combination of the two. Fredlund first observed that the figural *modelli* consisted of discrete studies and were not to be read as unified compositions. Held arrived independently at the same conclusion, and observed that here – uniquely – Rubens adapted to the oil sketch his practice as a draughtsman, in which he developed unrelated ideas on the same sheet. It should be noted that while the motifs may be discrete, the fall of light is consistent. It could well be argued that the *Multiple Bozzetto* was an assemblage of discrete sketches artfully arranged to look like a design for the ceiling as a whole.

The purpose of the figural sketches, of which the autograph tally accounts (with four figures sketched twice) for nearly all the protagonists in the *Wise Rule* (No. 3) and the *Union* (No. 5), is not clear. Rubens’s working up in oil sketches of separate detail motifs, already set out in a compositional *modello*, is apparently unique to this cycle, and is only to a degree anticipated by one detail *modello* for the *Virgin and Child with Saints* completed by June 1628 for the Church of the Augustinian Fathers in Antwerp. Authorities have assumed a marked degree of studio par-

---

31. See Held, *Sketches*, 1980, I, p. 159, no. 111; II, p. 114, for the *bozzetto* for the tapestries on the east wall. See E. McGrath, ‘Celebrating the Eucharist’ [review of De Poorter, *Eucharist* (CRLB), 1978], *Art History*, 4, 1981, pp. 476, 478, for the arrangement of the tapestries (and hence the *bozzetti*) for the south and north walls. Two of these supports contained designs for six tapestries and one contained designs for five tapestries.


34. Ibid., pp. 519 and 521, no. 383; see also Held, no. 382.
The protagonists in the figural sketches are on a much larger scale than their counterparts in the compositional *modelli*, which in general Held believed took chronological precedence. Their execution may have resulted from the challenge set by the commission, to clarify the artist's ideas, and to provide guidance to assistants. No such *modelli* - apparently - were found necessary for the paintings of the only other ceiling commission undertaken by the artist, but then the ceiling compartments in the aisles and galleries of the Jesuit Church were far smaller as was the viewing distance and thus the problems presented were less severe. Rubens probably too had total confidence in the ability of Van Dyck, his chief assistant in the Jesuit Church commission, to execute his designs. Hence, the purpose of the present figural *modelli* may have been threefold: as a rehearsal of the forms and reserves prior to the transfer of the figures onto the Canvas itself on a far greater scale; as an aide-mémoire as this was undertaken; and as a guide for assistants or collaborators as they were at work on the Canvases.

Held, whose survey of the oil sketches is by far the most comprehensive, stated that 'it is not likely that very many of Rubens' preparatory sketches for Whitehall have been lost', and that few of the presumed copies of lost sketches 'are essential for a reconstruction of the processes by which Rubens arrived at the final result'.

---

36. *Held, Sketches, 1980*, I, p. 189. In fact, he placed the figural sketches for the *Union* (Nos. 5b, 5e, 5f, 5g) before the *St Petersburg modello* (No. 5c), and cautiously, those for the *Wise Government* (Nos. 3d/3e, 3f, 3g) after the *Vienna modello* (No. 3b). Burchard's positions regarding the *modelli* are contradictory, as his views seem to have changed. His clearest statement is in a letter of 26 September 1951 (copy in Burchard Documentation) to Benedict Nicolson, editor of *The Burlington Magazine*: 'the greater part of the modelli were probably not painted as preparatory sketches, but as “by-products” being self contained compositions which are combining details from the ceiling with independent new groups'. This explains the different dating – c. 1632-1633 and 1633-1634 – and different descriptions of purpose accorded to the four preparatory works in the Wildenstein exhibition catalogue (see Nos. 3d/5b, 5f, 3f, 7b; Figs. 62, 102, 64, 115). The 'by-product' theory contradicted Burchard's view (expressed elsewhere in the Documentation) that the figural sketches for the *Union* precede the *St Petersburg compositional modello*. The letter must have arrived too late for an account to be given of its contents in the editorial of the October number of *The Burlington Magazine*, which was devoted to the ceiling Canvases. Burchard's theory was thus only to be ventilated by *Sutton, Whitehall, 1951*, p. 1238, where he opined that the 'finished sketches' were 'probably "by-products"', and that the Rotterdam and Minneapolis sketches were to be regarded 'as independent pictures, whether for the painter's own pleasure, or else as records of an important commission'. But the only sketch connected with the cycle, which Burchard Documentation actually records as a 'by-product', is the *Mercury and 'Argus'* in Boston (No. 3g / No. 5g). Burchard's 'by-product' theory gained no subsequent support in the literature, although Arnout Balis verbally revived the concept by applying it to the combined, partial copies of *modelli* for the *Processions* (see under Nos. 10-11: Derivative Works, pp. 302-04).
cution of a drawing or rough bozzetto and a 'lost first draft' to initiate preparation of the compositions of the Wise Rule (No. 3) and the Union (No. 5),\(^{38}\) Held's view concerning the completeness of what has survived is optimistic.

The modello for the whole cycle for the ceiling, which was sent by Rubens to King Charles I, is known only through an early description (see No. 2). No autograph modelli for the Processions have survived, but supposed copies indicate that both compositional and figural modelli were executed (see under Nos. 10-11). Only one figural modello (for two figures) in the Apotheosis, executed at an intermediary stage in the development of the composition, is extant (see No. 4d; Fig. 82). It is possible that some at least of the other fourteen figures in the final composition were prepared for either singly or in combination. Supposed copies suggest that both the Union and the Wise Rule required at least three compositional modelli, of which extant is only one for each Canvas that is autograph (see Nos. 3b and 5c; Figs. 60 and 98). The number of compositional modelli is not exceptional; three were required, for instance, for the Triumph of King Henri IV, which he planned as part of the Life of King Henri IV cycle for the Luxembourg Palace.\(^{39}\)

With the putative loss of so much preparatory work, Held's hoped-for 'reconstruction of the processes by which Rubens arrived at the final result'\(^{40}\) cannot be consistently inferred for each of the Canvases. In fact, the process varied depending on the problems presented by the different types of composition. So far as the conflicts in the corner ovals were concerned (Nos. 6-9), the process was relatively straightforward, particularly as Rubens had experience with the type of compositions required. The chief difficulty over the very long, narrow Processions (Nos. 10-11) to fill the flanking compartments of the central oval seems to have centred on uncertainty over the actual dimensions of the Canvases. Communication of new dimensions, also, seems to have featured as a crucial factor in the elongation of the composition for the central oval (No. 4, whose height (or length) was some 200 cm. less than that of the Processions). Here again Rubens had some prior experience with the configuration of the design. The most formally challenging were the large rectangular compositions at either end of the ceiling (Nos. 3 and 5). And although once again Rubens developed ideas with which he was familiar, his greatest difficulty - to judge from the extant preparatory work - seems to have arisen

---

in creating a satisfactory arrangement of the female protagonists in the Union.

Rubens’s primary aim for these two compositions was to create the illusion of a defined mise en scène that was a convincing extension of the viewer’s line of vision as he approached the composition from the other end of the room. The other seven compositions were less problematic as they were set against the sky. The architectural backdrops had to be at a right angle to the incline of the extended line of vision and the figures had properly to occupy this imaginary space demarcated by floor and far wall. That Rubens used cut-outs or silhouettes to establish the necessary degree of tilt is a possibility; at all events, he was to modify his early calculation that the composition as a whole should be foreshortened.

The formal problem of the foreshortening, particularly for the Wise Rule and Union, has usefully been broached by Held. Memories of the difficulties Rubens had surmounted may well have led to his remarks, reported by the ex-diplomat, now based in Antwerp, Abbé Scaglia in a letter in French to Gerbier of 3 May 1640, in which the artist justified his price for undertaking the ceiling paintings for the Queen’s Cabinet in the Queen’s House at Greenwich. Scaglia recorded that: ‘Il [Rubens] me dict qu’ayant considéré la peine qu’on ne scouroit éviter dans les racourcissms. et que necessairem. pour adjuster les desseins il faut faire beaucoup de choses de relief (ce qui desrobe du temps)’. What Scaglia meant is not altogether clear; while the word ‘racourcissm’s’ (raccourcissements) meant foreshortenings, the phrase ‘chooses de relief’ is more ambiguous. Presumably he was translating from the Italian, from which the French ‘relief’ derived. ‘Cosa di relievo’ still means sharpness of outline or a sense of substance or three-dimensionality. Whatever the precise meaning Scaglia attached to the phrase, relevant is Rubens’s emphasis on the time-consuming trouble involved in resolving the required foreshortenings.

41. The drawing reproduced by Held, Sketches, 1980, I, p. 218, of ‘The place of the viewer as assumed in Rubens’ design’ incidentally helps show the degree of foreshortening required; it does not indicate that the foreshortening settled on sustains satisfactory inspection until the spectator is directly beneath each Canvas. In fact, the view provided from the northern and southern walls, of the compositions at the opposite ends is the least satisfactory; in both cases, the maximum impact is obtained when approaching the centre of the room. See also J.D. Stewart, [Review] ‘Held, Sketches, 1980’, Revue Canadienne de l’Art – Canadian Art Review, 1984, pp. 214-215.

42. Held, Sketches, 1980, I, p. 188, with a note by Charles Scribner III on precedents in Veronese’s work. See also Martin, Banqueting House, 2000, p. 171.

43. The letter is Public Record Office, SP77/30, Part II, fol. 170. For a slightly incorrect transcript, see Rooses–Ruelens, Correspondance, 1887-1909, VI, p. 287, no. CMV.


45. See Trésor... (as in n. 44), p. 725, under ‘relief’.

46. See N. Tommaseo and B. Bellini, Nuovo Dizionario della Lingua Italiana, Rome–Turin–Naples, IV, 1,
Rubens executed the compositional sketches partly to consider the degree of tilt, which can be remarked in a presumed copy of an early sketch for the *Wise Rule* (No. 3c; Fig. 61). He later made a study of the upper part of the architecture (No. 3e; Fig. 67); the development of his ideas for the architecture in the *Union* can only be followed in the compositional *modelli*; perhaps a detailed sketch was made for it at some stage. In neither case are such studies extant of the architectural elements in the foregrounds. The compositional *modelli* also obviously worked out the degree of tilt necessary for the figures – two attempts were necessary to arrive at this for the group of women in the *Union* (Nos. 5b and 5e; Figs. 96 and 101) – their inter-relationship and their size relative to each other and to the architecture (in the case of the *Union* and *Wise Rule*). Such could have been the subject of readjustment when Rubens blocked out the design in dead colouring on the vast areas of canvas he had to fill.

Rubens was obliged to send a *modello* to London to obtain approval for his proposals.\(^{47}\) The importance of this long-lost work in the development of the ceiling decoration should not be underestimated; but it can only be inferred as we have no idea of its appearance. While it must be presumed that Rubens left London with a comprehensive understanding of the subjects to be depicted, and that he was to hold in check his instinctive inclination to expand and elaborate out of deference to his royal client, requests for alterations seem to have been made following study of the *Overall Modello* (No. 2) in London.

These alterations probably primarily centred on making good what Charles I regarded as the correct and essential display of the emblems of royal power; this required adjustments to the compositions of both the *Apotheosis* (No. 4) and *Wise Rule* (No. 3). Modifications to the *Union* (No. 5) also stemmed from the change in the circumstances of the royal family after Rubens’s departure, and from Rubens’s omission of a feature prescribed in the Projects. A study of the scaled-down space occupied by the designs in the *Overall Modello* may have resulted in the despatch of a new set of dimensions, which, in the case of the central oval and

---

\(^{47}\) *Millar, Rubens Whitehall, 1958*, p. 13, assumed that the compositional *modelli* in Vienna and St Petersburg (Nos. 3b and 3c) were submitted for the approval of the King’s representatives, and, in one instance, of the King.
flanking compartments, may have been larger than those allowed for by Rubens.

To cater to these requirements, Rubens seems to have re-drafted compositional *modelli* for the three main paintings; adaptations to the other compositions were probably made while at work on the Canvases. The three final compositional *modelli* are known by copies, two of which in the Hermitage are unique (Nos. 3h and 5h; Figs. 65 and 95); the best known example of the third – for the *Apotheosis* – is also in the Hermitage (No. 4e; Fig. 83).

In the case of the corner ovals (Nos. 6-9), establishing a sequence for the extant work is straightforward, consisting as it does of *bozzetto* (in the *Multiple Bozzetto*, No. 1), *modello* (in which the design was broadened), and the Canvas itself. The *modelli* did not set out Rubens’s ideas in a definitive form. Changes made in the Canvases, which did not depend on either of the preparatory works, were perhaps in part at least stimulated by comments made in London on the *Overall Modello* (No. 2).

The creative process for the corner ovals was followed for the other compositions insofar as much of the work in preparation was probably undertaken before the execution of the *Overall Modello*. The *Processions* (Nos. 10-11) designed to occupy the flanking compartments of the central oval, were prepared by *bozzetti* in the *Multiple Bozzetto*, two more elaborate compositional *modelli*, followed by detailed figural *modelli*.

As with the *Processions*, much of the original preparatory work for the *Apotheosis* is lost, except for the *bozzetto* (No. 4a; Fig. 79) in the centre of the *Multiple Bozzetto*. Only one figural *modello* is extant (No. 4d; Fig. 82), stemming from an intermediary stage in the development of the composition, evidence of which is also perhaps afforded by the literary record of another compositional *modello* (No. 4c). Whether this preceded or immediately followed the design in the *Overall Modello* is uncertain, but the latter is the more probable.

In contrast, much remains of the preparatory work for the *Union* (No. 5) and the *Wise Rule* (No. 3). Held has warned of the difficulty of establishing a coherent, let alone foolproof, sequence of execution for the *modelli* for these compositions. Rubens’s course of preparation may have followed the same general route as for the other Canvases. He began with considerations of the compositions, and then proceeded with the elaboration of individual motifs worked up on a larger scale. This work would have been completed before the execution of the *Overall Modello* (No. 2), which was sent to Charles I for his approval.

---
The body of work from which a precise sequence could be constructed is likely to be incomplete; further it may well have been the case that Rubens prepared simultaneously for both compositions, as both presented the same problems of foreshortening. It was then accepted that artists worked on more than one painting at a time. In this way, Rubens could finish ground colours on his palette and use up space on prepared supports. Thus on the supports of the sketch at Rotterdam (No. 3d/No. 5b; Fig. 62), and of the lost prototype of the Boston *Mercury and 'Argus'* (No. 3g/No. 5g; Fig. 63), were drafted preparatory motifs for both compositions. Further, it is likely that not all the space on the supports was filled at the same time, although it is to be imagined that discrete motifs were executed during the same campaign. Such cross-use of supports may not have been confined to preparation for these compositions, for on another support may have been sketched motifs for the *Hercules crushing Discord* oval and for the *Wise Rule*, which is known by what is probably a copy at Boston (No. 6b; Fig. 107).

If it is accepted that Rubens prepared for the two central compositions simultaneously, it is likely that he devoted specific campaigns to the other pendant compositions, that is, to the smaller ovals and to the long, narrow rectangular flanking compartments. The large oval (No. 4) he would also have prepared for separately. But there is no means of establishing which order he followed in this respect, other than that his work on the two main rectangular compositions (Nos. 3 and 5) may have preceded work for the long, narrow rectangles (Nos. 10-11), as a rejected motif for the *Wise Rule* was to be used in one of the *Processions*.

The impression given of the extant preparatory work is of methodical planning up to the execution of the (lost) *Overall Modello* (No. 2). He consistently reduced the degree of foreshortening he had earlier thought necessary. Following the reaction to the *Overall Modello* in London, Rubens found it necessary to execute further compositional *modelli* for the three main paintings to meet new specifications; but he then may have dispensed with further preparation as he improvised on the Canvases themselves.

---

49. See William Murray's instructions to Edward Norgate, of 21 November 1639, under '8 ... It being the custome of these Painters to work by fits, and most part on two or three peeces att one time, according their colours serves them', printed in *Sainsbury, Papers, 1859*, pp. 212-213.
The Portrayal of King James I and of the Regalia

As King James I was to be the chief protagonist in the three main Canvases, Rubens would evidently have made careful studies of the King’s physiognomy and of the dress it had been agreed he should be wearing. He would also have recorded at least part of the regalia, which were an essential part of at least formal portrayals of the monarch.50 Perhaps Gerbier, with whom Rubens lodged during his stay in England,51 and/or Sir John Finet – the Master of Ceremonies,52 or his staff – were asked to help Rubens in arranging visits for the purpose of study with the various royal officials involved. Among these were probably: Abraham van der Doort, the Surveyor of the King’s Pictures,53 and subordinates of the Earl of Pembroke, the Lord Chamberlain, responsible for the Wardrobe of Robes at Whitehall,54 and of Sir Henry Mildmay, Master of the King’s Jewel House in the Tower.55

Rubens portrayed King James I in each of the three central Canvases of the ceiling. In order to convey a sense of the passage of time the King is depicted as a youngish man in the Union (No. 5; Fig. 90) and as old in the Apotheosis (No. 4; Pl. 13). The King’s face in the Wise Rule (No. 3; Fig. 56) may not be as Rubens left it, but a modello (see No. 3f; Fig. 64) suggests that he intended the King to appear there looking older than in the Union, but not as old as in the Apotheosis.

The artist may have depicted the King nine times before executing the Canvases as there are records of at least nine modelli, made preparatory to these Canvases, in which the King is featured. Some of these are known only by copies, the execution of two of which (Nos. 3h and 5h; Figs. 65 and 95) is so weak that it is impossible to say whether the originals exhibited a good likeness or not. The other copies (Nos. 3c and 5d; Figs. 61 and 99) suggest that in the originals, Rubens may have endeavoured to convey a good likeness. In the extant modelli – those in St Petersburg (No. 5c; Fig. 98) and Vienna (No 3b; Fig. 60) – the King’s features

52. For Finet, see Finet, Notebooks, 1987, passim, and for references to the Marshal of Ceremonies, Walter Briscoe, see ibid., p. 324.
53. See Millar, Van der Doort, 1958-60, p. XIV.
54. For the administration of the royal wardrobe, see Cumming, Vanity, 1989, pp. 323-324. See Aylmer, Servants, 1974, p. 473, table 59, listing a staff of nine headed by a Gentleman of the Robes; under Robes, a department of the Chamber; and p. 475, table 63, listing about sixty as staff of the Great Wardrobe. The Great Wardrobe was by and large independent of the Lord Chamberlain, being administered by the Master of the Great Wardrobe (at the time the Earl of Denbigh). The Great Wardrobe was situated near Printing House Square in the city of London (ibid., pp. 150-151).
55. For Mildmay, see DNB, XXXVII, pp. 372 ff.
are only depicted in a very generalised way, while in the earlier Multiple Bozzetto (No. 1; Fig. 46), it is difficult to recognise the King’s physiognomy as such. Only in the two modelli at Birmingham (No. 5f; Fig. 102) and Brussels (No. 3f; Fig. 64) can it be safely said that Rubens executed posthumous portraits of the King.

The iconography of James I has been classified by Roy Strong.56 No doubt portraits of the King were made available to Rubens to study while he was in London, although he could have been familiar with the royal physiognomy before he arrived. A notable but not exceptional characteristic (it was shared by his son) was that his beard and moustache were ginger or blonde in contrast to the hair on his head, which was darker. This was not specifically noted by Strong, but is alluded to in his description of the copy in the National Portrait Gallery after the early ‘English’ portrayal of the King by John de Critz (Fig. 7): ‘grey eyes ... dark brown hair, light brown moustache and beard’.57 This contrasting colouring is still evident in the National Portrait Gallery portrait by Daniel Mytens of 1621 (Fig. 5),58 where the hair on the head is black rather than dark brown. In the modello (No. 5f; Fig. 102) at Birmingham made in preparation for the Union, the ginger or blonde-coloured beard is indicated. And as far as can be made out, the moustache and beard in the Canvas (No. 5; Pl. 5, centre) are of a lighter hue than the hair on the head. The benign, smiling face of James I in this modello and in the Canvas seem likely to have been an imaginative invention by Rubens, perhaps based on (but not inspired by) a study of both the De Critz type – although there the face is solemn and gaunt59 – and the Van Somer type – where the face is fleshier but more lined – of 1618, that replaced it (Fig. 4).60

The latter is evidently the source for the portrayal of James I in the modello at Brussels (No. 3f; Fig. 64) made in preparation for the Canvas depicting the Wise Rule (No. 3; Pls. 4, centre and 9, detail). That Van Somer’s portrait was King Charles I’s preferred image of his father is

57. Ibid., p. 177, under no. 548.
58. Ibid., pp. 177-178, no. 109. The portrait is accepted as on the whole a reliable record in spite of the ‘considerable rubbing and retouching all over’ referred to by Strong. The colour of the hair may not be correct. A. Wilson, The Life and Reign of James, The First King of Great Britain’, in A Complete History of England..., London, II, 1706, p. 791, described the King: ‘His Stature was of the middle Size, rather tall than low, well set, and somewhat plump, of a ruddy Complection, his Hair of a light brown in his full Perfection, had at last a Tincture of white.... His Beard was scattering of his Chin, and very thin’. Arthur Wilson (1595-1652) is generally considered to have been a prejudiced biographer of James I, see C.H.F., in DNB, LXII, pp. 81-82; the biography was published in 1651.
59. See n. 57.
60. Millar, Tudor, 1963, no. 103. Millar stated that ‘this was regarded as the official presentation [sic] of King James’, and is recorded as having hung in the Bear Gallery in Whitehall Palace. See also Held, Sketches, 1980, I, p. 198, under no. 132.
suggested by the fact that it was chosen as the prototype for Van Dyck's posthumous portrait of 1632.\textsuperscript{61} It is unlikely that the face in this Canvas is as Rubens intended it to be, see p. 163. It differs from the \textit{modello} in the amount of hair depicted and in the right eye and eyebrow. In Gribelin's engraving (Fig. 66; Appendix VI), the eyes and eyebrows differ from both the \textit{modello} and Canvas, though the hair on the head agrees with that in the Canvas. The mass of hair there may be original; its volume is greater than in Van Somer's portrait, but conforms with that in an engraved portrait (Fig. 8) by Jacques Granthomme (c. 1588-1613), who, however, would never have seen the King.\textsuperscript{62} In the Canvas, the moustache and beard are, it would seem, of a lighter hue than the hair on the protagonist's head (as they are in the \textit{modello}).

In the \textit{Apotheosis} (No. 4; Pls. 6 and 13), the ruddy-faced James I is white haired.\textsuperscript{63} In the last portrait type by Daniel Mytens of 1621 (Fig. 5), the sitter still has dark hair, and a ginger or blonde moustache and beard. While the physiognomy of the King in the \textit{Apotheosis} may have been inspired by the Mytens type, his complexion and the colour of the hair do not agree; Rubens's rendering of it is by Lord Keeper Williams's remark in 1625 that the late King was of a 'complexion white, and ruddie'.\textsuperscript{64} If the Mytens type is taken as reliable, it is to be presumed that the King's hair grew whiter in his very last years, and that Rubens knew of this.

The Projects, see Appendix I, made no specification concerning the apparel – other than 'Royall robes' – to be worn by James I. This would have been a matter of interest to Charles I,\textsuperscript{65} and no doubt was the subject of discussion when Rubens was in London. The Projects' lack of precision is reflected in James I's costume in the \textit{bozzetto} for the \textit{Apotheosis} (No. 4a; Fig. 79). This seems to be a fantasy combining both Classical and modern features, in the footwear and breeches, respectively. A precedent has yet to be found for the huge, swirling cloak, which may, however, be Rubens's invention inspired by the exigencies of the composition. In the record of the presumed succeeding sketch (No. 4b; see Fig. 81), the apparel seems more Classical, as the King wears a robe, probably intended as

\textsuperscript{61}. Millar, Tudor, 1963, no. 141, as a reinterpretation of his no. 103. There the moustache and beard are also of a lighter hue than the hair on the sitter's head.

\textsuperscript{62}. This engraver worked in Frankfurt and Heidelberg. See the entry in \textit{Thieme-Becker}, XIV, 1921, pp. 520-521; a photograph of the print is in the National Portrait Gallery archive.

\textsuperscript{63}. Noted by Howarth, Images, 1997, p. 124, as 'fearful, tousled, grey haired'. Howarth described the King here as how Rubens would have imagined him as 'ill and old', thus echoing Sutton, \textit{Whitehall}, 1951, p. 1237, where the King was characterised as 'tired and old'.

\textsuperscript{64}. See J. Williams, (cited in n. 12, p. 159) p. 37, and under n. 58 above.

\textsuperscript{65}. The importance that Charles I attached to the correctness of dress is seen in the \textit{Orders for Conduct at Court}, issued in January 1631; see Cumming, \textit{Vanity}, 1989, p. 340. Elizabeth McGrath pointed out to the author that much of Marie de Médicis's concerns about the cycle devoted to her life, painted by Rubens, centred on costume and its decorum.
a *pallium*, the covering worn by Roman leaders for their triumphal entries. However, he still wears a shirt and boots, so it appears that at this point, Rubens had not been informed as to precisely what costume the king should be shown as wearing.

James I was to be depicted wearing more or less the same apparel in each Canvas, the only difference being in the darker colour of the shirt in the *Union* (No. 5; Pl. 5, centre, and Fig. 90). His main garment is the Parliamentary robe and cape made out of crimson or red velvet. The expensive, ermine lining decorated with the black tips of the animals' tails – this feature for the exclusive use of the monarch – is given its fullest display in the *Apotheosis* (No. 4; Pl. 3, centre, and Fig. 69). There the King is shown wearing white hose and a garter, breeches, kirtle, white shirt, and cuffs. Rubens must therefore have made studies of his Parliamentary attire. The significance of the choice of costume cannot be overemphasized: Charles I chose to have his father depicted as acting in his constitutional role of King in Parliament, which constituted the highest court in the kingdom of England, although the Monarch had just determined to rule without Parliaments for the time being (see below).

In one respect, however, Rubens failed consistently to present the chronological sequence he had sought to establish by sequential portrayals of James I's ageing face. In each Canvas, he wears the same type of falling ruff. In both Mytens's and Van Somer's portrait types (Figs. 4-5), he wears a stiffened, layered ruff. An early example of the type of ruff Rubens chose for the King is seen in Van Dyck's *Portrait of the Earl of Arundel* in the J. Paul Getty Museum of 1620-21. When Rubens executed the Canvases, this type of ruff was out of fashion; but it would also have been anachronistic when James I ascended the English throne in 1603. By depicting him in an old fashioned ruff – seen from the vantage point of the early 1630s – Rubens demonstrated a desire to convey historical verisimilitude. But it seems that he ignored, or did not think it necessary accurately to depict, the most obvious element in the King's Parliamentary attire that would have followed the dictates of fashion – the form of the ruff.

The Imperial Crown and a sceptre are on view in each of the Canvases, and the orb certainly appears in two of them. Ronald Lightbown has cautioned that 'there is every reason to distrust painters' representations

---

67. Ibid., p. 328.
68. For the kirtle, see ibid., p. 344, and the caption to fig. 100. It was worn underneath the robe and was 'an open-fronted, ankle length garment held together by a sash or belt, with elbow length sleeves'.
69. See *Cat. Exh. Dynasties*, pp. 217-218, no. 146. Hearn stated (ibid., p. 224 under no. 150) that 'The falling ruff is a fashion of the early to mid 1620's'.
of royal crowns', but it is likely that here Rubens intended to depict 'The Imperial Crowne of this Realme of Gould'. Lightbown discussed the shape and the significance of the crown worn by James I and inherited by his son: 'The form of the state crowns was imperial, that is to say, they were closed crowns with arches surmounted by a ball or cross .... The principal reason why the English kings wore imperial crowns was not so much that they claimed to rule over several kingdoms and lordships, though this was certainly one reason ... as because they claimed to be immediately subject to no other ruler, but only to God .... From the reign of Henry VI at any rate such imperial crowns were decorated with crosses, generally alternating with fleurons. The Imperial Crown inherited by Charles I was of this design. Rubens’s rendering of the crown is not as exact as that depicted by Mytens in his Portrait of King Charles I in the National Portrait Gallery, but it agrees well enough with the portrayals of the crown in Van Somer’s Portrait of King James I of 1618 (Fig. 4). Rubens displays it as fitted with an ermine-lined cap as in Van Somer’s Portrait of King James I of c. 1620 (Fig. 3).

The Imperial Crown was listed by the Trustees for Sale as in the Upper Jewel House at the Tower, and thus appraised on 13-15 August (o.s.) 1649:

The Kings Crowne.

The Imperiall Crowne of Massy gold weighing 7. li. [pounds] 6. ounces enriched with
Pearles, The gold (6. oz being abated for the stones.) valued at 280. li. [£] The saphires at 198.li. [£] the Ballass. Rubies at 149 li. [£] the small Rubies at 16. li. [£] the Emeralds at 5li [£] the Diamonds at 288li [£] the pearle at 174li [£] amounts in all to
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00

72. R. Lightbown (as in n. 70), p. 259.
73. Ibid., pp. 259-260, fig. 84.
75. Millar, Inventories, 1972, p. 43.
Elias Ashmole described four sceptres in the regalia, which had been listed by the Trustees for Sale, and later melted down: ‘Two Sceptres, weighing 18 ounces 1 quarter . . . [and] Two Sceptres, one set with pearls and Stones the upper end gold weighing 23 ounces, the lower end Silver gilt. The other Sceptre Silver gilt having a Dove weighing 7 ounces 3 quarters’.76

The sceptre held by the King in the Union is of a different shape from that held by him in the Wise Rule and in the Apotheosis. But neither type agrees with the two sceptres whose detailed descriptions Ashmole relayed. Thus the two sceptres may have been those whose weight only was given. That depicted in the Wise Rule and Apotheosis (Figs. 56 and 74), which is topped by a fleuron, appears in other portrayals of the regalia. Selden stated that: ‘For the Scepter: some testimonies make it an antienter Ensigne of a King than the Crown .... As the Scepter is the ornament of the right hand, so [is] in the left, the Globe a Mound with Cross infiixt ... as a singular Ensign of Royal dignity .... In England, almost all the Kings, down from Edward the Confessor inclusively to this day have it [the orb] in their left hand’.77

The orb may only have been portrayed in the three main Canvases on the King’s insistence following his presumably noting its absence in the Overall Modello (No. 2). Charles I’s attachment to the ‘Singular Ensign of Royal dignity’ is shown by its conspicuous and traditional display in, for instance, Van Dyck’s grisaille sketch of the Procession of the Knights of the Garter (Fig. 6).78 If Rubens’s instructions did not specify the orb, he would not have made a special study of it. This would explain why the orb, which he came to include, lacked the two bejewelled bands with which it is decorated in other portrayals of the regalia. Rubens was able to finesse its presence at a later design stage (Nos. 3h and 5h; see Figs. 65 and 95) by depicting the King leaning on it – in a dramatic but hardly respectful way – in the Union and by placing it on the King’s lap among the folds of his robe in the Wise Rule. Only in the Apotheosis (No. 4) was he able to accord it due prominence, as it was removed from the King’s custody.

In fact the orb was not discussed in James I’s commentary on the regalia, which he gave in the Meditation published in 1620: ‘The scepter represents the Kings authority ... and the crowne represents the loue and

78. For the Van Dyck in the Ashmolean Museum, Oxford, see J. Held, in Wheelock et al., Van Dyck, 1990, no. 102. For traditional displays of the orb in royal portraits, see, for instance, the Van Somer referred to in n. 60.
willing acknowledgement of his people’. Earlier he had written of the royal robes: ‘Kings euer used to weare robes when they sate in their throne of Majestic, and euen purple robes: for robes or long gownes are fittest to sit withall’.79

The King is shown wearing the collar of the Order of the Garter in each Canvas. Ashmole thus described the collar: ‘It was further appoint­ed by King Henry the Eight’s Statutes, that this Collar should be composed of pieces of Gold in fashion of Garters, the ground enamelled Blue, and the Letters of the Motto Gold. In the midst of each Garter, two Roses placed ... of later times these Roses are wholly Red. The number of these Garters are so many, as be the ordained number of the Soveraign and Knights-companions ... viz. Twenty-six; being tyed together with Knots of Gold: and this fashion hath in all particulars hitherto continued invariable’.80 The collar was correctly depicted in each Canvas, and accords with that shown, for instance, in the Mytens portrait of 1621 (Fig. 5).

Ashmole went on to describe the badge of the Order: ‘At the middle of the Collar before, is to be fastned the Image of St George armed, sitting on Horseback, who having thrown the Dragon on his back, encounters him with a tilting Spear. This Jewel is ... called the Great George’.81 The Great George worn by the King in the Union (No. 5; Fig. 90) is now practically indecipherable, while that in the Apotheosis (No. 4; Fig. 74) was only partially indicated. Whether the Garter (one of the insignia of the Order) was worn when the King was dressed in his Parliamentary robes has not been ascertained; the question in this case is irrelevant as the King’s left calf is not depicted.

The ‘Overall Modello’

Thanks to an entry in Abraham van der Doort’s catalogue of the paintings in the collection of King Charles I,82 it can be assumed that part of the presumed contract or understanding, see pp. 52-53, between the King and Rubens for the execution of the Canvases was that the artist should submit a modello for the royal approval. It has been claimed that this should be identified with a painting in the Hermitage (for reasons for rejecting this, see under No. 4e). For Rubens to have been required to submit a modello would have constituted normal practice going back at

79. See James VI and I, Political Writings, 1994, pp. 240 and 237.
80. See E. Ashmole (as in note 76), p. 221; also R. Lightbown (as in n. 70), p. 271.
81. Ibid. For the Georges owned by Charles I, see R. Lightbown, op. cit., p. 272.
82. Millar, Van der Doort, 1958-60, pp. 76, 91. See also under No. 2, below.
least to the stipulation made by the Oratorian Fathers in 1606 in the contract for the High Altar of the Chiesa Nuova in Rome. It has been suggested that at an early stage in discussions for the Marie de Médicis cycle, Rubens painted some *modelli* for the Queen Mother’s approval, while others were later required for examination by her advisor prior to Rubens beginning work on the relevant episodes. Such *modelli* made to obtain a patron’s approval for a commission should be distinguished from *modelli* made for the benefit of the studio, which the patron might still wish to acquire.

The *modello* made by Rubens for Charles I’s approval was kept by him. Van der Doort specified that it was sent by the artist, as distinct from the *Minerva protecting Pax from Mars* (Fig. 24), which he stated had been presented by Rubens to the King. The implication is that the *modello* painted in oils on canvas was executed after Rubens’s return to Antwerp and was sent from there to London, although there is no other documentary evidence to support this, or about the *modello* itself. But the choice of canvas as a support (perhaps marginally safer and easier to ship than a wooden panel) might indicate that Rubens knew that it was going to be shipped or carried to London from Antwerp.

The size of the *modello* was 92.7 x 55.9 cm. That there was ample space for an adequate depiction of the subject matter is demonstrated by the fact that this area is larger than that required by Gribelin for his very detailed reproductive engraving on three plates (Fig. 160; Appendix VI), which also recorded elaborate, but not necessarily accurate, decorative features of the ceiling itself (and four margins). The fields available for each painting in the *modello* would have been even larger than those in Gribelin’s print had Rubens decided (which was probably the case) not to render in detail such embellishments.

As the *modello* presumably showed Rubens’s intended arrangement of the compositions in the ceiling compartments and the compositions themselves, it differed from the *Multiple Bozzetto* (No. 1; Fig. 46). It is thus designated here as the *Overall Modello* and listed as No. 2 in the catalogue

85. Rubens was offered the choice in the contract for the ceiling paintings for the Jesuit Church in Antwerp of surrendering the oil sketches, from which assistants were to work, or to paint another altarpiece; see Held, *Sketches*, 1980, I, p. 33.
88. See n. 82, and below.
that follows. A precedent would have been the *modelli* showing the proposed lay-out of the *Triumph of the Eucharist* tapestries on the walls of the church of the Descalzas Reales in Madrid, one of which has survived dismemberment.\(^8^9\) Whether these *modelli* were painted for the benefit of the patron or for Rubens’s own reference – De Poorter favours the latter conjecture\(^9^0\) – their purpose and formal character must have been comparable with the *modello* sent to Charles I. The latter was, however, on canvas, and must have been more richly coloured and sharply delineated so as to have been legible when set in the ceiling of the Cabinet Room, Whitehall Palace, where Van der Doort listed it. For further discussion of the *Overall Modello*, see under No. 2.

### Work on the Canvases

Although much detail was rendered in the ceiling paintings, Rubens, as has been earlier suggested, see p. 52, may well have insisted on the acknowledged participation of the studio in their execution, not only for the practical reason of their great size, but also because the distance from which they would be viewed would make his sole responsibility for them unnecessary.

In fact, those connoisseurs who have studied the Canvases out of their compartments in the ceiling have remarked on their intensity see pp. 129-130. Indeed, the Canvases *in situ* and viewed from the floor of the Banqueting Hall are both compelling and convincing, even after all the wear and tear resulting from harmful atmospheric conditions, the inherently perilous way in which the Canvases were fixed to the battens of the stretchers, and the consequent interventions they have suffered, see pp. 110-112, 113, 115, 119-120, 124-126, 127-128. The tradition that Rubens was assisted in their execution goes back as far as the artist Sir Godfrey Kneller, who recollected being told when he was in Antwerp as a young man that Jacob Jordaens (who was still alive there) had collaborated with Rubens on the Canvases.\(^9^1\) No evidence, visual or documentary, has been

\(^{8^9}\) *De Poorter, Eucharist (CRLB)*, 1978, I, pp. 83-93, 100-101. For a fuller reconstruction of the arrangement of the tapestries on the lateral walls (and hence the appearance of the overall *modelli*), see E. McGrath, ‘Celebrating the Eucharist’ [review of *De Poorter, Eucharist (CRLB)*, 1978], *Art History*, IV, 1981, p. 478. For a later discussion of the Chicago sketch, the only *modello* to survive dismemberment – written without knowledge of De Poorter – see Held, *Sketches*, 1980, I, p. 159, no. 111; II, colour pl. 12 and fig. 114.


advanced in support of this; it thus can only remain rumour (albeit tenta­tively espoused by Michael Jaffé), whose significance chiefly stems from its origin relatively close to the event involved and concerning one participant who was still living. About a hundred years later, and independently of Vertue’s noting this rumour, Waagen asserted that Rubens had made use of assistants, a view that has subsequently gained wide, but not universal acceptance.

Rubens, calculating the gigantic scale of the novel undertaking and the great size of the protagonists, see Figs. 13-15, might well have reck­oned from the start on using assistants. No doubt in recognition of the difficulty of depicting figures foreshortened in space and to be seen from below, he executed figural modelli, which may have been intended in part to guide relatively inexperienced assistants.

Studio participation was specified in the contract for the ceiling paint­ings of the Jesuit Church, and is generally recognised in the execution of the cartoons for the tapestries of the Triumph of the Eucharist, Rubens’s only other undertaking in which single paintings approached the scale of the Canvases for the Banqueting Hall ceiling. Having never worked on the scale required for the ceiling Canvases before, Rubens must con­sciously have adapted his handling so that the protagonists and the compos­itions would be legible from a distance of some 15.30 metres (50ft.). While there was to be no diminution of detail, a certain generalisation of forms was to be expected in the rendering of both the faces and the drap­ery. If Rubens employed one or more assistants, the handling adopted would have had to meet these requirements. That the general impression given by the Canvases is one of homogeneity points to the degree of Rubens’s control, supervision, and intervention. Rubens’s retouching of the Canvases in the early autumn of 1635 after they had lain rolled up in his premises is contemporaneously reported by Gerbier.

Some areas have apparently suffered or been repainted – notably the faces of James I and of the personifications of Peace (?) and Plenty in the Wise Rule (No. 3; Fig. 56), of Divine Love and of the children carrying

92. M. Jaffé, ‘The Oil Sketches of Rubens’ [review of Held, Sketches, 1980], Apollo, 1982, p. 62, where it is hinted that Jordaens’s participation is to be found ‘in the subsidiary fields’.
94. For which, see Martin, Ceiling Paintings (CRLB), 1968, pp. 213-219.
95. For which, see De Poorter, Eucharist (CRLB), 1978, I, pp. 133, 134 and n. 7. The total area of the car­toons was nearly double that of the ceiling Canvases.
96. See p. 82.
wheat in *Procession* II (No. 11; Figs. 151 and 152) – to a degree that would seem to make them far removed from Rubens’s original intentions. Rubens probably called on specialists: especially for the fruit and foliage in the *Processions* (Figs. 132 and 149), the laurel and oak crowns in the *Apotheosis* (No. 4; Figs. 70 and 72), and the laurel crown in the *Wise Rule*, the roses and palms in the *Apotheosis* and the roses and foliage in the *Union* (No. 5; Fig. 87). On the other hand, the five animals and the bird of prey, swallow (?) in the *Processions* (Nos. 10-11; Figs. 132 and 148 and details) and the owl in the *Minerva* oval (No. 7; Fig. 112) do not seem to be by a specialist working – as would be expected – in the style of Frans Snyders, excepting perhaps the parrot in No. 11 (Fig. 149). Moreover, one would assume that to a large extent Rubens would have relied on an assistant for the basic execution of the large areas of architecture in the *Union* and *Wise Rule* and in the canopy of the throne and pile of armour in the *Union*.

These areas apart, there appear to be differences in the level of liveliness and spontaneity in the handling. Of a seemingly high level in the *Union* are the *amoretti* holding the escutcheon, the faces of James I and the Sergeant-at-Arms and the flames amidst the pile of armour; in the *Apotheosis*, James I, the head of Divine Justice and the eagle; in the *Wise Rule*, the monsters and the fiery surround, Minerva’s thunderbolts, the flames of Mars’s torch, and the architectural embellishment of the tympanum and the light streaming down from between the broken entablature. In these areas, Rubens’s brushwork seems to be most evident. He no doubt too would have been responsible for the *pentimenti* in the architecture of the *Wise Rule*, in the open Bible, and other alterations in the *Apotheosis*.98

Not all the figures are painted in an entirely homogenous style; for instance, the face of Minerva in the *Wise Rule* (No. 3; Fig. 57) differs from that in the *Minerva* oval (No. 7; Fig. 112), while Apollo’s face and Avarice’s hand in (No. 9; Fig. 124) seem to be not by the same hand. But most of the figures and attributes are executed in a prosaic and well-rounded manner suited to their legibility at a distance. It is likely, however, that Rubens to a greater or lesser extent reviewed each figure and area of drapery, retouching with highlights where he felt it necessary, as Burchard recognised.

Arnout Balis, in his review of Rubens’s Antwerp studio practice and of the members of his studio, has suggested that in the early 1630s Rubens’s chief assistants were Erasmus Quellin II (1607-1678) and Jan van den Hoecke (1611-1651);99 the latter’s personality – moulded by and

---

97. For more extensive remarks on condition, see under the catalogue entries below.
98. For the *pentimenti*, see further under the catalogue entries below.
filtered through Rubens's supervisory and executive roles – can perhaps chiefly be detected on the Canvases. The point of comparison is the three extant figures, which Van den Hoecke executed as part of the decorations designed by Rubens for *The Arch of Ferdinand* in the *Triumphal Entry of the Cardinal Infante Ferdinand* (subsequently to referred to as the *Triumphal Entry*). The quality of the figures in the Banqueting Hall ceiling Canvases seems higher than the two personifications (Figs. 33-34) that John Rupert Martin attributed to Van den Hoecke 'or (more probably) [to] one of his assistants'; closely comparable is the figure of the Cardinal Infante, which is thought to have been later retouched by Rubens (Fig. 32). Similar, too, is its pendant figure of King Ferdinand III of Hungary, although Martin thought that this was later retouched perhaps by Jordaens, a view not accepted by Schütz.

The contract for these painted decorations for the *Triumphal Entry* was awarded to Jan and his father Gaspar, although Jan alone was credited with the execution of the two large-scale, narrative decorations that Jordaens is documented as having retouched. Gaspar is presumed to have been his son’s teacher, and that Jan later entered Rubens’s studio depends on Cornelis de Bie’s testimony of 1661, followed by that of Philip Rubens in 1676. The first archival reference to his activity is indeed the contract, dated 28 November 1634, for the decorations of the *Triumphal Entry*. He was recorded as having left for Italy in the official instruction to pay Jordaens for retouching the *Battle of Nördlingen* and its pendant on the reverse of the *Arch of Ferdinand*, the *Triumphal Entry of the Cardinal Infante*, that was undertaken between the end of April 1636 and July 1637.

Hans Vlieghe has recently reassembled Jan van den Hoecke’s early work (before he left for Italy), and if his proposed attributions to the artist of the *David playing the Harp before Saul* (Fig. 37) and *The Return of*
Saul to Jerusalem (Fig. 38) are accepted, they show that he was aware both of Rubens's *modelli* for the Achilles series of tapestries and of his work on the Henri IV cycle. This would confirm Van den Hoecke's entry into Rubens's studio in the months following the latter's return to Antwerp in the spring of 1630.

Arnout Balis has attributed a *Nativity* (Fig. 35) – a work early attributed to Rubens himself – to Van den Hoecke, working under the master's supervision; the angel on the right is very similar to that playing the tambourine in the *Foolish Virgins* at Vaduz that Vlieghe had earlier attributed to Van den Hoecke. The two other angels in the *Nativity* closely connect with *amoretti* in *Procession I* (No. 10; Fig. 132). The central angel's face is similar to that above the chariot, and may be thought more similar to that in the Canvas than in the presumed records of *modelli*. The angel on the left repeats the pose of the *amoretto* holding the laurel crown on the left in the Vienna *modello* for the *Wise Rule* (No. 3b; Fig. 60), which was later used for the *amoretto* holding the end of the festoon in the centre of *Procession I*, as recorded in a presumed copy of a lost *modello* (No. 10c, copy; Fig. 141).

This does not establish that Van den Hoecke assisted Rubens in the execution of the Canvases, but it makes the proposal that much more of a possibility. If it was the case, then he may have been Rubens's chief assistant, for his personality would seem to be evident in the majority of the Canvases. The qualitative difference in handling between the nereids in *The Voyage of the Prince from Barcelona to Genoa* or the personification of Germany and the naiad in *The Meeting of the two Ferdinands at Nördlingen* – both early stated to have been executed by Rubens as decorations for the *Stage of Welcome* in the *Triumphal Entry* – and the personifications of England and Scotland and Minerva in the *Union* (No. 5) does indeed suggest Van den Hoecke's participation. Similar handling is evident in at least six of the Canvases. And it may be that the sketch in Boston


110. The pose of Saul brings to mind that of Agamemnon in the *Wrath of Achilles*; see Haverkamp Bege mann, *Achilles Series* (CRLB), 1975, pp. 120-122, nos. 5a, 5b, figs. 46, 47. The onlookers in the *Return of Saul* recall those, bottom right, in Rubens's sketch at Bayonne for the *Triumph of Henri IV*; see Held, *Sketches*, 1980, I, pp. 130-131, no. 84; II, pl. 87.

111. Balis, *Studio Practices*, 1994, pp. 116, 126, n. 197. For the painting (in a private English collection, at present on loan to Castle Howard, north Yorkshire) see Rooses, *Oeuvre*, 1886-1892, I, pp. 187-188, no. 145; Schelte a Bolswert's print, referred to there, and which credits Rubens as the artist, was published after Rubens's death. See also Jaffe, *Catalogo*, 1989, no. 660, where the painting is dated too early; Jaffe believed that it was by Rubens and his studio.

112. H. Vlieghe (as in note 109), pp. 166, 167, fig. 1.

113. Martin, *Pompa* (CRLB), 1972, pp. 49 ff., nos. 3, 4, figs. 7, 13; for the latter picture, see also K. Schütz, in *Cat. Exh. Vienna*, 1977, no. 49, who stated, contrary to Martin, that the painting was chiefly by Rubens with assistants perhaps executing the Cardinal Infante's attendants and the naiad.
(No. 3g/No. 5g; Fig. 63) – deriving from Rubens’s figural modelli for Mercury and the sergeant-at-arms but depicting Mercury and ‘Argus’ – is Van den Hoecke’s work as well, see under No. 3g.

The head and hand of Apollo in Apollo bestowing Royal Liberality (No. 9; Fig. 124) seems possibly the work of Erasmus Quellin II, who became an independent master in Antwerp in the accounting period of September 1633 to September 1634, in which latter year he is described as having been a pupil of Rubens.\textsuperscript{114} His work for the Triumphal Entry has not survived, but it is here suggested that there is some similarity between Apollo and the Bacchus in the Bacchus and Ariadne (Fig. 29), which was soon to be executed for the Torre de la Parada by Quellin after Rubens’s\textit{modello}.\textsuperscript{115}

By early May 1633, it was known in London that the Canvases would ‘shortly be finished and ready to be sett up’.\textsuperscript{116} And it may have been at this juncture, or a little later when Quellin left the studio, that Rubens turned to another, independent, Antwerp artist for assistance in one of the Canvases – the Wise Rule (No. 3; Fig. 53). This is suggested by the distinctive handling of the physiognomy of Minerva (Fig. 57), which seems similar to that of the head in the fragment that remains of the depiction of\textit{King Philip I of Spain} (Fig. 31) executed by Cornelis de Vos for the\textit{Arch of Philip} in the Triumphal Entry.\textsuperscript{117} Cornelis de Vos (1584/5-1651) had an idiosyncratic style when working on his own account;\textsuperscript{118} no doubt had he been called to work on the Wise Rule his efforts would have been for the most part transformed by Rubens, just as were his portraits of the Emperor Maximilian I and the Emperor Charles V, also originally executed for the\textit{Arch of Philip}.\textsuperscript{119} Something of De Vos’s manner when working in Rubens’s idiom may exist in the head of Mercury in the Wise Rule (Fig. 58); it bears some comparison with that of Venus in the\textit{Birth of Venus} (Fig. 30), which was soon to be painted by De Vos for the Torre de la Parada after a\textit{modello} by Rubens.\textsuperscript{120}


\textsuperscript{115} Alpers, \textit{Torre (CRLB)}, 1971, pp. 187-188, nos. 8, 8a, figs. 74, 75.

\textsuperscript{116} Public Record Office, Privy Seal Books, E. 403/2567, fol. 25r., order to pay Henry Wicks (or Wickes), 8 May (o.s.) 1633. Reference kindly provided by David Howarth.

\textsuperscript{117} Martin, \textit{Pompa (CRLB)}, 1972, pp. 80-81, no. 9, fig. 25.


\textsuperscript{119} Martin, \textit{Pompa (CRLB)}, 1972, pp. 76-80, nos. 7, 8, figs. 23, 24, for the paintings in the Akademie der bildenden Künste, Vienna. See also K. Schütz, in \textit{[Cat. Exh.]} \textit{Vienna}, 1977, nos. 50, 51.

\textsuperscript{120} Alpers, \textit{Torre (CRLB)}, 1971, pp. 264-265, nos. 58, 58a, figs. 186, 188.
Delivery and Installation

Although work on the Canvases was reportedly far advanced by May 1633, their installation was not completed until nearly three years later. The delay was due primarily to the King’s decision to have the interior walls of the Banqueting Hall painted and the carved ceiling painted and gilt before the Canvases were put in place. A further short delay was caused by unrealistic instructions concerning the shipment of the Canvases. And while the lengthy period during which the Canvases had been rolled up may have prolonged Rubens’s task in retouching them, his decision to do this in Antwerp rather than in London probably speeded matters up, as he could work in his home, rather than in a foreign capital.

For a variety of reasons, Rubens withdrew from his obligation to install and retouch the Canvases in the Banqueting Hall. The problems that had to be surmounted by his still unidentified deputy were to be more demanding than those earlier suffered by Gerbier, now the British Agent in Brussels, when trying to arrange the transport of the Canvases. These later difficulties stemmed from the fact that the Canvases did not fit properly in the openings in the ceiling; this called for a degree of improvisation, which only an experienced technician could have provided.

It was only when it became known in London that work on the Canvases was far advanced that Charles I and Jones decided that the interior of the Banqueting Hall be painted ‘in white marble, coulor in oyle’ and that ‘the Cornishment being the ornament of the said ceiling, be painted and weightily gilt’; the total cost estimated by Inigo Jones was £880 10sh. On 8 May (o.s.) 1633, £300 was allocated to Henry Wicks (or Wickes), Paymaster of the Works, ‘for the setting in hand of the said worke’. This money was not paid to Wicks until 19 December (o.s.) 1634; two further payments were made in the following July, the final payment being made on 20 November (o.s.) 1635.

The decorating work envisaged – especially the gilding of the cornices of the carved ceiling – was a major undertaking, obviously requiring the

121. Public Record Office, Privy Seal Books, E. 403/2567, fol. 25r. Reference kindly provided by David Howarth.
122. See n. 121.
123. Public Record Office, Pells Order Book, E. 403/2753, p. 92v. Reference kindly provided by David Howarth. This was signed by the Lord High Treasurer, the Earl of Portland (previously Lord West- on), and the Chancellor of the Exchequer, Baron Cottington; the 1633 Privy Seal Order (see n. 121) was signed by John Packer.
erection of a scaffold. No information has yet come to light concerning
the progress of these embellishments, but taking into account their exten-
sive nature, the time-consuming process of gilding, and the slow provi-
sion of funds, it is hardly surprising to find Gerbier warning the King
about adverse publicity engendered by the delay in not moving the Can-
vases to London. He wrote on 11 August 1634: ‘without scruple may I
then relate what malicious tongues ... utter seeing the great work Sir Peter
Rubens hath made for yr Maj' Banqueting house, lye here, as if for want
of money’. On the same day, he wrote to Sir Tobie Matthew asking him
to draw the attention of the Lord High Treasurer to damaging gossip
about ‘ye great workes he [Rubens] hath made ... [which] liye in his
[house] as arrested for want of money to call him & the said worke into
England’.126

But Gerbier’s attempt to goad London into action had no immediate
effect, as the room was evidently not ready to receive the Canvases.
Indeed, the painting of the walls and painting and gilding of the ceiling
were probably further interrupted by the performance of the masque,
The Temple of Love, which took place on 10-14 February 1634/35 (o.s.).
This may well have required the dismantling and then the re-erection
of the scaffold so that the decorating work could continue. Such an
hypothesis — justified to a degree by Wicks not receiving further pay-
ments for his work until July and the final payment only in November —
would explain why Gerbier did not receive instructions until early
July.128 It may not have been entirely coincidental that he was asked to
ship the Canvases to London via Zeeland (an order justified by the size
of the cargo),129 for Rubens was at the time hoping to visit the United
Provinces to pursue a truce initiative, as the summer campaign turned
against the Franco-Dutch invading force in favour of the Spanish-Imper-
ial armies.130

Rubens was obliged to deliver the Canvases to London and supervise
their installation, just as he had been contracted to do in the case of the

125. See Appendix III.1.
126. See Appendix III.2. Chaney, Grand Tour, 1998, p. 220, telescoped Gerbier’s role in the delivery and
payment of the Canvases.
1973, I, p. 80, wrongly stated that the last masque performed in the Banqueting Hall was in 1634.
128. See Gerbier’s reply to Windebank’s letter of 3 July 1635: Appendix IV.1.
129. See Gerbier to Windebank, 10 August 1635: Appendix IV.3: ‘The pictures must be sent to Zealand
cause by Land impossible by reason of their bulke’.
130. See Antoine Triest, Bishop of Ghent, to Don Martin de Axpe, political secretary to the Cardinal
Infante Ferdinand, in Rooses-Ruelens, Correspondence, 1887-1909, VI, pp. 121-122, no. DCCCI, and the
commentary on pp. 123-124. Frans Baudouin kindly helped to elucidate this part of the story.
131. See Gerbier to Windebank, cited in note 129: ‘the second [part = action acknowledged as to be per-
formed by Rubens] to passe into England...if his health permitt, & assist to ye well placing of his
said pictures & to retouch them, if soe then found necessary’.
paintings for the first gallery of the Luxembourg Palace. Although there is no linkage between the two plans in Gerbier's correspondence (there is no reason why there should have been), the Venetian ambassador in The Hague was to report on 18 October 1635 – when the supposed plan was dead – a request to the Council of State: in the name of the celebrated painter Rubens, asking leave to come here with two sons on his way to England with pictures. The sons referred to would have been Albert and Nicolaes, born in 1614 and 1618 by Isabella, Rubens's first wife. The plan – if such indeed was already in being in July/August 1635 – foundered, because the States General (probably at the insistence of their new allies, the French) did not quickly issue Rubens with a passport. Gerbier, meanwhile, ineffectually tried to carry out his instructions, which were flawed by their requirement that the Canvases should be exempt from 'licent'; this was a wartime customs due levied by the government in Brussels on all goods exported from the southern Netherlands to the United Provinces through the trans-shipment fort of Lillo on the Scheldt. His efforts and difficulties are unusually well documented, because his letter-books record his correspondence of 1635 with Sir Francis Windebank, one of the Secretaries of State, of 20 July, 27 July, 10 August, and 14 September; also included are copies of letters to Rubens of 13 September and to the King of the following day, see Appendix IV.

Rubens understandably refused to take responsibility for the customs payment, and only helped to the extent of explaining the high rate of

132. See above, p. 52, and Rooses, Contrats, 1910, p. 218.
133. State Papers, Venice, 1907-21, XXIII, pp. 464-465. For the original text, see Rooses–Ruelens, Correspondance, 1887-1909, VI, p. 125, n. 1: 'a nome di Rubens...per venir egli con due suoi figliuoli in queste provincie, per passar poi in Inghilterra con piture'. The letter was published by Gachard, Histoire, 1877, pp. 342, 259.
134. See the Venetian Ambassador's report of 18 October 1635, referred to in the previous note.
135. Rubens continued to ask for a passport until the middle of October; see Constantijn Huygens's reply to a lost letter from Rubens of 14 October, in Rooses–Ruelens, Correspondance, 1887-1909, VI, p. 150, no. DCCCXIV. In fact, Sir William Boswell, the British Agent in The Hague, reported that Rubens had been issued with a passport in a letter of 26 October 'to go thorough these Provinces into England'; but he rightly assumed that Rubens would not follow this course. See Rooses–Ruelens, Correspondance, 1887-1909, VI, pp. 125-126 (giving the date of Boswell's letter as 29 October). Rubens's diplomatic usefulness was now probably diminished, for by this time the first round of what were to prove abortive truce negotiations had taken place at Kranenburg, see Gachard, Histoire, 1877, pp. 255-261; J.I. Israel, The Dutch Republic and the Hispanic World, 1606-1661, Oxford, 1982, pp. 304-305.
136. For trade via the river Scheldt between the United Provinces and the Spanish Netherlands during the Eighty Years War, which continued, but for occasional suspensions, see S.J. Bindoff, The Scheldt Question to 1839, London, 1945, pp. 83-107, and in particular pp. 90 and 99. Reference kindly provided by Frans Baudouin. Trumbull, Gerbier's predecessor, had been able to obtain such an exemption for works of art shipped by Lionel Wake to Sir Dudley Carleton, then the British Ambassador at The Hague, in 1617. See Rooses–Ruelens, Correspondance, 1887-1909, II, p. 118, no. CLIX. For Wake, see below and n. 140.
137. See Gerbier to Windebank, 27 July 1635: Appendix IV.2. An explanation may be that Rubens's tax-exempt status as court painter to the Governor of the Seventeen Provinces had lapsed at the death
levy that could be expected. Meanwhile Gerbier received no assurances from London that monies would be forthcoming if required. After nearly two months, the matter was taken out of his hands, and passed to an experienced and trusted English merchant in Antwerp, Lionel Wake, in a letter from Windebank of 28 August.

By the middle of September, Rubens may have been losing hope that he would soon travel to the United Provinces, and that therefore, with no encouragement from the Dutch, there was little point in travelling to England to request that Charles I act as an intermediary between the combatants in the conflict in the Netherlands, the possibility of which he had referred to in a letter to Peiresc of the previous month. While he had assured Gerbier that he had applied to the Marquis of Aytona 'for leave to passe unto England', he had by the second week of September received no answer (by which time too, it was learnt that the Marquis had died). Rubens's resolve to fulfil his obligations was now probably waning. The decision he took to unroll and retouch the Canvases removed a reason for his journey to London, for it had been intended that he should work on the Canvases – if it was found necessary – once they were in the Banqueting House. There is no record of a protest from the British side at Rubens's decision; and it was not mentioned again in Gerbier's extant correspondence. The artist's reputed fear of succumbing to gout when he was in England may well have been thought to be a legitimate excuse, although he was later to tell Peiresc that he had not gone because 'I have a horror of courts'.

It is not known when Rubens began this work of retouching and treating the creases that had occurred as a result of the Canvases having been of the Infanta in 1633; he was not appointed court painter to the Cardinal Infante until 15 April 1636; see Gachard, Histoire, 1877, p. 262 and n. 3, pp. 262-263.

138. See Gerbier's letter cited in n. 137.
139. See Gerbier to King Charles I, 14 September 1635: Appendix IV.6.
140. For Lionel Wake's acknowledgement of Windebank's instructions of 28 August, see Appendix IV.8. For Wake, see B. Broos, *Meesterwerken in het Mauritshuis*, The Hague, 1987, p. 119. Wake, a Catholic, was extremely wealthy and lent money to the Archduke Albert. When he became acquainted with Rubens is not known, but it was at least by 1618 when Carleton alluded to him in his correspondence with Rubens over their exchange of works of art. See Rooses–Ruelens, Correspondance, 1887–1909, II, p. 110, and p. 146, no. CLXVII.
141. Rubens to Peiresc, 16 August 1635, in Magurn, Letters, 1955, pp. 400-401, no. 237. For the original text, see Rooses–Ruelens, Correspondance, 1887–1909, VI, p. 127, no. DCCCII: 'Spero che S. Santita et il Re d'Inghilterra e sopra tutto il sig. Iddio si intrometterà per spegnere un incendio bastante a spargersi per tutta l'Europa'.
142. See Gerbier to Windebank, 14 September 1635: Appendix IV.7.
143. See n. 139.
144. See Gerbier to Windebank, referred to in n. 131.
145. See n. 139.
146. Rubens to Peiresc, 16 March 1636, in Magurn, Letters, 1955, p. 402, no. 238. For the original text, see Rooses–Ruelens, Correspondance, 1887–1909, VI, pp. 153-158, no. DCCCLXVI: 'Ho in horrore le corti'.
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rolled up for (according to Gerbier)\(^\text{147}\) nearly a year. Gerbier wrote to the artist on 13 September acknowledging the great amount of work to be done.\(^\text{148}\) Nevertheless, by the end of that month, five of the Canvases were ready for shipment.\(^\text{149}\) As Wake reported, they were packed in his house in Antwerp, and sent on the one hundred and sixty or so kilometre journey to Dunkirk by waggon.\(^\text{150}\) Which of the five Canvases made up the first consignment is not known, but presumably the three largest (central) paintings – which would have required more time to make good - were in the second shipment. This was not ready until later, for Wake only reported the safe arrival of all the Canvases – presumably at the Banqueting House, where they were delivered by William Cokayne – at the end of the year.\(^\text{151}\) The cargoes had indeed passed ‘free from French and Hollanders’,\(^\text{152}\) as was to be expected as the first British Ship Money fleet had been on station in the Channel that year.\(^\text{153}\)

The transport of the Canvases via Dunkirk had taken place without any recorded fuss; the cost was far less than the minimum anticipated by Gerbier for the shipment via Zeeland. Wake submitted a bill of £13 to Windebank at the end of December,\(^\text{154}\) whereas Rubens had estimated the cost of the customs levy for the Canvases to leave the southern Netherlands alone (the sum did not include the Dutch wartime import tax) at more than £360.\(^\text{155}\)

The deputy selected by Rubens to ‘set up the pictures’ in the Ban-

---

147. Gerbier to Rubens, 13 September 1635: Appendix IV.4. In this letter, Gerbier referred to: ‘beaucoup d’ouvrage a retoucher & raccomoder les crevasses qu’elles ont receées pour avoir esté enroulez presque un Anne entiere.’ In fact, this may have been an understatement. The press release issued by the Ministry of Works, 11 December 1950, prior to the Orangery Exhibition referred to the discovery during cleaning of ‘numerous streak-like scars [on most of the paintings] all running the same direction…. In all cases the scars were parallel with the roll they must have formed when rolled up in Rubens’ studio. They are therefore most probably the damages caused through being rolled up while the paint was fresh’.


149. See Gerbier to Windebank, 28 September 1635: Appendix IV.9.

150. Wake to Windebank, 13 October 1635: Appendix IV.11.

151. For the arrival of the Canvases, see Wake to Coke, 26 December 1635: Appendix IV.13. For the role of William Cokayne, see Wake’s letter to Windebank or Coke of 13 October 1635: Appendix IV.11. This William Cokayne – spelt without an ‘e’ by Wake – was described by him as a merchant. He was probably the Mr William Cokayne, a first cousin of Sir William Cokayne (who died in 1626 having been Lord Mayor of London in 1619/20) with whom he has been confused as he was also a member of the Worshipful Company of Skinners (of the City of London) and of the Broad Street Ward in the City. See G.E. Cokayne, Some Account of the Lord Mayors ... of the City of London ... 1601-1625, London, 1897, p. 83 under n. h. Cokayne there records Mr William Cokayne as active in 1634; he was Master of the Worshipful Company of Skinners in 1640. See J.F. Wadmore, Some Account of the Worshipful Company of Skinners of London..., London, 1902, p. 192.

152. The danger of an act of piracy was raised by Gerbier: Appendix IV.9.


154. Wake to Windebank, cited in n. 151.

155. See Gerbier to Windebank, 10 August 1635: Appendix IV.3.
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queting Hall presumably arrived in London with the first cargo.156 This arrangement had either been insisted on by the British or offered by Rubens as a *pis aller* for his not making the trip himself. Rubens's first choice of a deputy had fallen so ill that he could not make the journey;157 his identity and that of his last-minute substitute remain unknown.158 Rubens no doubt instructed his deputy as to how the Canvases were to be attached to the stretchers. The cost of making five stretchers—presumably for the five Canvases that made up the first consignment (the account for the other four stretchers has not been traced)—was itemised in the 1635-36 accounting period.159

The technical problems would not have been normally encountered in Antwerp studio practice, since most commissions were for pictures to be hung vertically. In the Banqueting Hall, however, the Canvases would have had to be suspended from the stretchers placed in the rebates of the coffering. And these paintings were far larger than the relatively small canvases executed to decorate the aisles and galleries of the Antwerp Jesuit Church.160 Rubens's *Apotheosis of King James I* was bigger than Veronese's *Triumph of Venice* in the ceiling of the Sala del Maggior Consiglio in the Doge's Palace (though not as big as the Tintoretto in the same ceiling).161 The system of ties, whereby string was fastened to the reverse of the support and attached to the battens of the stretchers, found to have been used during examination prior to the 1906/07 cleaning, see p. 124, was presumably that as originally devised.162 It is possible that neither Rubens nor Jones knew how Veronese or Tintoretto, for instance, had attached their ceiling canvases to the stretchers and prevented their sagging (the matter appears never to have been studied). Probably the heavier, Venetian twill or herring-bone weave would have been less likely to sag than the tabby or plain weave of Flemish canvases.163

156. For the purpose of the deputy's trip to London, see Gerbier to Windebank, 19 October 1635: Appendix IV.12.
157. Ibid.
158. See n. 179 below.
159. See Colvin, *King's Works*, 1963-82, IV, p. 334. John Lane (or Layne) was paid for 'five strayning frames for pictures in the Banqueting House'. Wicks had also charged in the same period for 'Cordes and lynes for the pictures in the Banqueting House for pullying (sic) in the hall and for other uses with tape thread'. See Public Record Office, Work, E351/3269.
161. The Veronese (like the Palma Giovane in the same ceiling) measured 904 x 580 cm.; the Tintoretto, in the centre of the ceiling, measured c. 1030 x 650 cm. See Schulz, *Ceilings*, 1968, p. 107, under no. 42.
162. See E.v.d.W [= E. van de Wetering] in J. Bruyn et al., *A Corpus of Rembrandt Paintings*, II, 1631-1634, Dordrecht-Boston-Lancaster, 1986, pp. 33-37, for a review of the means by which canvases for easel paintings were attached to stretchers in the United Provinces at the time. In this case, the edges of the Canvases were probably turned over the stretcher and nailed to the outer edges, as recorded in a painting by Dou (ibid., fig. 16, p. 34).
163. Jill Dunkerton of the National Gallery is here thanked for her verbal advice.
This latter type of canvas had its inherent weaknesses, as perhaps Inigo Jones recognised when he specified in the draft instructions issued to Edward Norgate on 21 November 1639 concerning the negotiations with Jordaens over the commission of paintings for the Queen’s House, Greenwich, that the supports be ‘of strong new cloth’. Indeed, Rubens had access to a supplier of the heavier Venetian style of canvas, as at least two of the supports for paintings in the then recently abandoned cycle of the *Life of King Henri IV* have been found to be of this type. The twill weave of canvas had the added advantage of being woven in large bolts: the supports of the two paintings for the *Life of King Henri IV* cycle in the Uffizi, measuring 3.83 by 6.96 metres, have recently been found to be made up of a single piece of canvas. During the 1946/47-50 cleaning campaign of the Banqueting Hall cycle, some evidence of canvas joins was noted, see below under Nos. 4 and 5, but no subsequent, systematic examination of the canvas supports has been made.

There was to be yet another more serious problem discovered during installation. It appears that the Canvases as delivered did not quite fit into the openings in the ceiling. Burchard made a diagram, which indicated the difference between Jones’s and Rubens’s measurements for the *Minerva* oval (No. 7), which was exhibited in the Orangery, Kensington Palace, in 1950; he had implied in the Wildenstein exhibition catalogue of earlier that year that the Canvas had been cut. In the following year, Jaffe was more forthright; he stated, with particular reference to the *Minerva* oval, that the Canvases had been cut in 1635. But this hypothesis is too simplistic. Jones probably relied on his memory of the installation when he drew up in 1639 the draft *Instructions* for negotiations for ceiling paintings in the Queen’s House, Greenwich, as did Murray in the


165. See next note. For a discussion of north Netherlandish canvas supports, see E. van de Wetering (as in note 162), pp. 15-43: he noted on p. 40 that Rembrandt’s *Claudius Civilis*, which was painted to hang in the Town Hall of Amsterdam, was executed on ‘twill cloth’. Anthony van Dyck’s large *Equestrian Portrait of King Charles I*, National Gallery, London, no. 1172, measuring 367 x 292 cm., which was painted in London c. 1637-1638, has a support of ‘thick, heavy canvas ticking with a tight herringbone-weave’: see A. Roy, ‘The National Gallery van Dyck: Technique and Development’, *Painting in Antwerp and London: Rubens and Van Dyck*, National Gallery Technical Bulletin, XX, 1999, p. 77; Roy pointed out that the even larger *Group Portrait of the Pembroke Family*, 335 x 580 cm., was executed on a similar canvas.


167. Burchard Documentation.
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actual ‘Instructions’ of the same date and purpose. From these documents it can be inferred what had gone wrong and why.

It would seem that two separate misunderstandings over dimensions had arisen between Rubens and his English counterpart, presumably Jones. One had a multiplicative effect, that is, it became the more marked the greater the scale; the other had an additive effect, that is, it remained as a constant factor of error whatever the scale. The relevant calculations are set out in Appendix IX; they show that these effects to a degree — granted the large areas involved — cancelled each other out; where they did not, both reducing and, more often, extending the Canvases by not significant amounts was found to be necessary.

The multiplicative factor arose from a misunderstanding about the source of the units of measurement that had been used to express the dimensions. The foot and inch were then the internationally recognised units of measurement north of the Alps, but they differed in size from place to place. Rubens would have been well aware of this, as would, for instance, the collector and statesman in London in 1629-30, Sir Dudley Carleton, now Viscount Dorchester. However, a misunderstanding did take place for in the ‘Instructions’ it was specified how the sizes of the paintings were to be conveyed, ‘since otherways Jordans may as soone faile to understand the English foote as Sir Peter Reubens diid’. Opinions vary as to the size of the Antwerp foot, but it was certainly smaller than its English namesake. It is clear from the wording in the ‘Instructions’ that the measurements had been expressed in English feet, and that for whatever reason Rubens worked following the Antwerp for-

170. See Sainsbury, Papers, 1859, p. 213; Rooses, Oeuvre, 1886-92, III, p. 29; and Rooses–Ruelens, Correspondance, 1887-1909, VI, p. 241, no. DCCCLXXVII.


172. Dorchester had been disturbed by the size of the paintings he had received from Rubens in exchange for sculptures in 1618. These were smaller than he had been led to expect from Rubens’s measurements: see Magurn, Letters, 1955, p. 67, no. 34. For the original Italian, see Rooses–Ruelens, Correspondance, 1887-1909, II, p. 181, no. CLXXIX. Rubens was to exonerate himself in another case involving a discrepancy in units of measurement that had resulted in two of his altarpieces, commissioned by the Duke of Neuburg, being too small: see Rubens’s letter to the Duke in Rooses–Ruelens, Correspondance, 1887-1909, II, pp. 252-254, no. CCI. A comparable confusion had taken place between Gerrit van Honthorst and Dorchester. Honthorst wrote to his patron on 22 May 1630: ‘I am very sorry to understand...that the piece of picture I have sent you is to bigg, it seems that a fault hath bin committed in the measure, for me, I have followed the measure that hath bin sent me’. See Carpenter, Pictorial Notices, 1844, p. 182.

173. See n. 170.

mula. If this had been the only misunderstanding all the Canvases would have been uniformly too small.

That this was not the case was due to the second misunderstanding, which produced the additive factor in the mismatch. The draft ‘Instructions’ had contained a significant clarification about how the paintings were to be measured: ‘The measures set on ye squares [plans] shew how much of ye painting will be seen besides ye breadth of ye straying frames which are hidden under ye cornicements’.

From this we can assume that an earlier confusion had arisen: Rubens had been given overall measurements, which included the size of the rebates (the area cut out from the reverse of the frame, in this case, the coffering, in which the stretcher was fitted), and these Rubens had taken for the sight size (the area of painted surface visible to the spectator). Rubens would then have added extra canvas – for the tacking edges – to provide what was required to fix onto the stretchers that would be fitted into the rebates.

The width of the rebates, set by Jones, and therefore the amount that Rubens added to the surfaces to be painted, is not known. But an estimation is attempted in Appendix IX, which arrives at a figure of about 15 centimeters. This misunderstanding had its greatest impact where the dimensions were smallest, that is, in the ‘width’ of the corner ovals and the ‘height’ of the Processions. For the larger Canvases, the multiplicative factor overrode the additive effect, hence there were shortfalls in the area of the painted surface, which had to be made good by painting over the tacking edges and adding new canvas – where necessary – to replace them. That this is indeed what happened is to a degree documented by the admonition in the draft ‘Instructions’ to take great care with the measurements ‘for heretofore for want of yt [that] care hath caused much trouble in cutting or peecing them [the canvases].”

In perhaps at least four cases, this work resulted in quite drastic alterations having to be made to Rubens’s compositions. The preparatory work shows that Rubens was uncertain about the lengths of the Processions. The shortfall in the length may have been made good – in the case of Procession II – by the extension of the wing and fluttering drapery round the amoretto at the rear of No. 11 (Fig. 154); it has a Rubensian character to be expected from one of Rubens’s studio assistants. It was an excess in ‘height’ that determined the near obliteration of one of the
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Amoretti in No. 10 (Fig. 135). The alteration required for the Apollo oval, discussed under No. 9 (Fig. 124), may also have been made by the deputy sent over by Rubens. The handling of the change to the design of the Temperance oval (No. 8; Fig. 117) appears to be different and it may not have been made in the Banqueting Hall, but in Rubens’s studio.

Perhaps also painted on the spot in the Banqueting Hall was the royal coat of arms in the escutcheon in the Union (No. 5; Fig. 87). The shape of the escutcheon and the flanking amoretti meant that the supporters – the lion and the unicorn – could not be included. Probably already present was the garter of the Order of the Garter on which the motto, later altered, was inscribed.

As mentioned above, nothing is known about Rubens’s original deputy selected to accompany the Canvases, or of his substitute. Rubens had no reason to name the latter in his letter to Peiresc of 16 March 1636 in which he alluded to the commission. No pass issued by the Privy Council in the subsequent few years would seem to refer to a Flemish artist wishing to return to Antwerp. It is likely that he came from Rubens’s studio, and he could have been the ‘pupil’ who made the copy of the bas-relief of the Trojan War owned by Arundel, which Rubens sent to Peiresc as an enclosure in the same letter.

In spite of the problems encountered, the installation was apparently quickly accomplished beginning with the first shipment of Canvases perhaps already in November-December 1635 and then in the following January and February. For in the letter of 16 March to Peiresc, Rubens wrote: ‘It [my work] has now been put in place, and my friends write that His Majesty is completely satisfied with it’. The King, in fact, may

177. Magurn, Letters, 1955, p. 404, no. 238. For the original text, see Rooses–Ruelens, Correspondance, 1887-1909, VI, p. 153, no. DCCXXVI. Rubens stated that his work was sent to England ‘per terza mano’.
178. The Indices to Privy Council Registers, Public Record Office, Work, PC 2/43-51 (from September 1635 to 30 September 1640) give lists of names of those granted ‘Licences to Pass beyond the Seas’.
179. Magurn, Letters, 1955, p. 404, no. 238. For the original text, see Rooses–Ruelens, Correspondance, 1887-1909, VI, p. 155, no. DCCXXVI. Rubens stated that the drawing was ‘disegnato da uno mio discipulo dal istesso marmo Arundelliano’. A possible candidate for the identification of the unnamed deputy and of the draftsman, referred to here, is ‘Zacharias Frond’ limner, born at Antwerp...in England some nine days, lodging with Mr. Minocks.... In Tower Ward [of the City of London]. He is the only artist specifically stated to have been born in Antwerp listed in the Return of Strangers of 1635; this particular return was requested on 15 October. If this is a date in the ‘new style’, it would agree approximately with Wake’s and Gerbier’s letters of 3 and 9 (o.s.) October (see Appendix IV.11 and IV.12), reporting on the shipment and the appointment of a new deputy. For the return, see I. Scouloudi, ‘Returns of Strangers in the Metropolis 1593, 1627, 1635, 1639’, Huguenot Society of London, Quarto Series, LVII, 1985, p. 286, no. 1192. No Zaccharias Frond is listed in the records of the Antwerp guild of St Luke; Frond was perhaps a phonetic spelling, perhaps of Vriendt; but the only artist with the Christian name of Zaccharias in the guild lists is Zaccharias van den Brouck.
have been in London when the first shipment of Canvases had arrived; he stayed in the capital for the Queen’s lying-in; Princess Elizabeth was born on 7 January 1636. About two weeks later, Charles I went to Newmarket, but had returned by 22 February. It may have been then that he inspected the newly installed Canvases.

The Fee and its Payment

Rubens’s remuneration of £3,000 for the Canvases has been described as ‘very generous’, an epithet impossible to substantiate without knowing the terms of the contract and without any idea of Rubens’s pricing policy. Although there is a good deal of information about the fees Rubens charged, little attempt has been made to analyse them, and so his method of setting his prices is unknown. One possible guide to his pricing policy, however, indicates that Rubens’s fee was not excessive.

The contract might have specified on whom the onus of charges fell. It is not known, for instance, who paid the substitute who went to England in Rubens’s place. And while Rubens presumably paid for the materials used in Antwerp, the Crown paid for the stretchers, which were made in London. Rubens may also have felt justified in setting the cost – calculated, see below, to be some £80 – of Minerva protecting Pax from Mars (Fig. 24), which he had given to King Charles I against – as has been suggested above – his receipt of the commission.

To the British, one aspect of Rubens’s pricing policy would have been well known: his prices were non-negotiable as Tobie Matthew discovered. Rubens had earlier indicated to another Englishman, Sir Dudley Carleton, the factors that determined his prices: ‘bonta, suggietto i numero di figure’. Of these, bontà was the element most difficult to

181. For the King’s movements, see the reports of Anzolo Correr, the Venetian Ambassador, in State Papers, Venice, 1907-21, XXIII, pp. 477, 501, 519.
184. See above and n. 159.
185. See above, p. 49. The cost has been calculated using the method outlined below, with the same rate that Rubens used for executing the Virgin and Child with Saints for the church of the Augustinian Fathers, Antwerp, see below. The picture was valued at £100 by the Trustees for Sale of the King’s Goods in September 1649; see Martin, Cat. National Gallery, 1970, p. 121, under no. 46.
187. Rooses–Ruelens, Correspondance, 1887-1909, II, p. 181, no. CLXXIX. Rubens was explaining to Carleton why, because of the difference in the size of the units of measurement, the pictures to be exchanged were smaller than Carleton had anticipated; this would not alter the price, as pictures were not valued in the same way as tapestries were, that is, by size.
assess, a capacity to do so being the prerogative of the artist or an experienced connoisseur. Vincenzo Borghini had long before specified the criteria to be used in paying artists employed on the decorations for the entry into Florence of Giovanna of Austria in 1565 and the decoration of the Sala Grande in the Palazzo della Signoria. Among others, two mental effort and time embraced Rubens’s components, while a third physical discomfort was another factor that Rubens might also have considered relevant. Borghini’s criteria were still appropriate in Rubens’s lifetime, and his specifications may have been a matter of discussion among artists.

Over and above these factors were the allowances Rubens made for his studio practice. His fee was higher the more he was involved in the execution of a painting. For as he made clear to Trumbull, he charged twice as much for ‘a true and entire original’ (‘un vray originel entièrem’$^\dagger$) than for a painting ‘touched and retouched everywhere equally’ (‘touchée et retouchée par tout esgallem’$^\dagger$); he also distinguished between such a painting and one ‘gone over by my hand ... lightly’ (‘amendée légèrem de ma main’).$^{190}$

For the purpose of comparing prices for different commissions, a guide (only a rough one as it must omit an evaluation of artistic merit) to the most significant feature – the rate charged – could be formulated by dividing the square meterage by the fee.$^{191}$ In prestige and importance, the Canvases for the Banqueting Hall can only be compared with the Marie de Médicis cycle executed for a gallery in the Luxembourg Palace. This is borne out by the rates – using this formula – that Rubens actually charged. The square meterage of the nine canvases for the Banqueting Hall comes to a total of some 255 square metres; as the fee was £3,000, this means that Rubens was paid £11.76 per square metre, or, as the artist Sir James Thornhill inaccurately reported in 1720, £10 ‘per yard’ ($= 0.91$ m.).$^{192}$

This was slightly more than the rate of £11.30 he had hoped to be paid for the twenty-four canvases of the Marie de Médicis cycle. The area of these canvases (if the destroyed canvas is omitted) is some 288 square metres, the fee for which was agreed at 30,000 livres tournois (c. £3,000

---

188. Rubens is likely to have used the word ‘bontà’ in the same way, as had Giorgio Vasari, to mean artistic value; see Battaglia, Grande Dizionario, p. 306, s.v. bontà (5, ‘valore artistico.’)
190. Magurn, Letters, 1955, pp. 76 and 77, nos. 45, 46 ; for the original texts, see Rooses–Ruelens, Correspondance, 1887–1909, II, pp. 273, 286, nos. CCXV, CCXXV.
sterling). But he could have expected an additional 10% at the Queen Mother’s discretion had the whole commission been completed.

By no means was £11 per square metre the most that Rubens had previously charged. In his list of pictures available for sale, which he sent to Carleton in 1618, three paintings were estimated at a cost higher than this rate: the Prometheus, Last Judgement and St Sebastian. Rubens had also charged at a higher rate for the altarpiece of the Madonna and Child with Saints for the Church of the Augustinian Fathers in Antwerp, which he executed in 1628. His rate then was 132.7 guilders (c. £13) per square metre, double that of Van Dyck, who participated in the same commission.

In calculating his fee for the Banqueting Hall Canvases, Rubens may have taken into account factors that later determined his estimate of a fee for the execution of the ceiling canvases for the Queen’s Cabinet in the Queen’s House at Greenwich. Scaglia gave Rubens’s reasons for the high level of it in a letter in French to Gerbier, in which it is clear that the chief factor in setting the fee was the amount of time it would take to solve the problems posed by foreshortening. Time would have been similarly spent in the Banqueting Hall commission; the degree of difficulty presented by the required foreshortenings is shown by the number of modelli (extant or recorded by presumed copies of lost originals) that were required, see pp. 58-63. The number is on the whole apparently larger, per composition, than those executed – it would seem – for the Marie de M édicis series, where the main concern for the artist was more of content than design.

Thus in comparison with the rates for the other commissions reviewed here, Rubens’s fee for the Canvases to decorate the Banqueting House seems proportionate. And given the time expended on solving the foreshortenings, it seems more moderate than excessive, as was perhaps

193. For the rate of exchange between the pound sterling and the livre tournois, see J. McCusker, Money and Exchange in Europe and America, London-Basingstoke, 1978, pp. 9, 44. This reference was kindly provided by Neil De Marchi of Duke University, who pointed out that the rate, c. 1630, for the guilder to the livre tournois was about 1 to 1, as was the Amsterdam guilder to the Antwerp guilder; 10 guilders were worth about 1 pound sterling (information kindly sent 8 August 1996). Different figures and rates of exchange for the M édicis cycle were given by De Poorter, Eucharist (CRLB), 1978, p. 134 and n. 7. Her calculations concerning the M édicis cycle are flawed: she stated that Rubens received 60,000 livres tournois for the M édicis cycle; but this was the sum for those 24 pictures plus the other 24 envisaged for the life of Henri IV, which Rubens never completed.
195. See Rooses–Ruelens, Correspondance, 1887-1909, II, pp. 136-137, no. CLXVI, for the sizes (in feet) and prices. For the rate of exchange between the guilder and pound sterling, see n. 193.
197. For the most recent discussion of Van Dyck’s participation, see H. Vlieghe, in Brown–Vlieghe, Van Dyck, 1999, under no. 52.
198. For Scaglia’s letter, see p. 61 above (and p. 41, n. 118). See also Rooses–Ruelens, Correspondance, 1887-1909, VI, p. 287, no. CMV.
to be expected when the prestige that would have accrued to the artist from the commission is taken into account.

In his letter to Peiresc of 16 March 1636, Rubens dwelt on his preoccupation about being paid: 'I have not yet received payment, however, and this would surprise me if I were a novice in the ways of the world. But having learned through long experience how slowly princes act in others’ interests, and how much easier it is for them to do ill than good, I have not, up to now, had any thoughts or suspicion of unwillingness to grant me satisfaction. For my friends in that Court sustain me with good hopes, always assuring me that the King will treat me in a manner worthy of himself and me'. 199

To which friends Rubens was referring can only be a matter of speculation, but during his stay in London, he would have met, among many others, the leading Hispanophiles, Catholics and crypto-Catholics at court from whom it is the most likely that he would have welcomed some communication: in particular Sir Francis, now Baron, Cottington (1518(?)-1652)200 and perhaps even Sir Francis Windebank (1582-1646), in 1629-30 still only a Signet Clerk, but from 1632 one of the two Secretaries of State, who was to direct the shipment of the Canvases to London. 201 Both were to play a part in the payment of Rubens’s fee. Perhaps, too, Rubens was referring to his old friend, George Gage, 202 but more probably to Endymion Porter, 203 with both of whom he had consorted during his stay in London. 204

Porter, who as a Groom of the Bed Chamber was a favourite of Charles I, played an important but still not well-defined role in matters connected with English patronage of artists and collecting of paintings. He had recently been in contact with Rubens over the purchase for the King of the St George and the Dragon, which the artist had painted in London, but which he had taken with him when he returned to Antwerp. 205 And Porter was to play a key role in the payment to Rubens of his remuneration, as he had been required to arrange for the collection of the

199. Magurn, Letters, 1955, p. 402, no. 238. For the original text, see Rooses--Ruelle, Correspondance, 1887-1909, VI, p. 153, no. DCCCXVI: 'Non ho ricevuto però ancora il premio di che mi stuperei se fossi noviti nelle cose del mondo; mà havendo imparato per longa esperienza quanta sia la longuezza deli principi in materia d'interessi, e quanto lor sia più facile il far del male che del bene; non mi dà gran pensiero sin adesso, ne sospetto di poca volontà a sodisfarmi, perché gli miei amici in quel-la corte mi pascono di buona speranza, assicurandomi sempre che il re me tratterà da par suo e mio'.


201. See the DNB, LXII, pp. 162 ff., and Aylmer (as in n. 200), pp. 520, 357.

202. See above, p. 23, n. 5.


204. See Gage’s letter to Porter of 20 February 1629/30 (o.s.), printed by Sainsbury, Papers, 1859, pp. 146-147, no. CXXVII.
specie from the Exchequer, and to be the royal servant responsible for handing it over to Rubens's agent. The reason for adopting this primitive method of payment rather than a bill of exchange is not known; but maybe the artist was fearful of a royal default. Porter's role in the physical transaction may have been an exceptional one for him to play. In view of his involvement, he may have warned the artist that there would be a delay in his receiving his money, much as had Gerrit van Honthorst earlier been told to expect a delay in his receiving his fee of 'six or eight months'.

In fact, Windebank obtained a privy seal warrant for the payment of Rubens's fee just under three months after the artist's letter to Peiresc. But it was not six or eight months, but just under a year – in May 1637 – before some of the money was available for Rubens to collect. For whatever reason, he took no immediate steps to effect this; he only made the necessary arrangements in November, although he could have done so earlier (assuming he had been informed) as he had been in Antwerp in late July and early August. Rubens had surely decided against travelling to London himself: rather he granted a power of attorney to Lionel Wake Jnr., the son of his eponymous friend, who was resident in London, to obtain the money and ship it to him.

Porter was helped by his man of business, Richard Harvey, and probably by William Railton, the Clerk of the Council Chamber; the latter would – we imagine – have known his way around the corridors of the royal administration and been acquainted with the Teller of the Exchequer, Arthur Squibb, who would have arranged for the issuing of the money. It took four installments and nearly six months more for the fee to be paid in full. Wake received the first tranche from Porter on 18 November (o.s.) 1637 and the final one on 4 June (o.s.) 1638.

In September of that year, Charles I decided to make a gift to Rubens presumably to show his great appreciation of the paintings in the Banqueting Hall; a further six months on, Wake received from Porter a
gold chain and medal that had been collected from the Jewel House.\textsuperscript{216} The gift was generous and substantial: valued at £300 and weighing just over two kilograms (5 lb.), it was more valuable, for instance, than the farewell present the King was accustomed to give a departing diplomatic Agent.\textsuperscript{217} The gift no doubt was intended chiefly as a mark of honour,\textsuperscript{218} but also – as it represented 10\% of the fee – perhaps partly as compensation for the delay of over a year in paying the full amount due.\textsuperscript{219} However, it was not to be shipped until March 1640; then it was listed as part of the freight onboard the Mayflower, lying in the port of London, and bound in all probability for Dunkirk.\textsuperscript{220}

\textsuperscript{216} See Appendix V.14.
\textsuperscript{217} See Finet, Notebooks, 1987, p. 37, for the value of the King’s gifts to departing diplomats.
\textsuperscript{218} See Z.Z. Filipczak (as in n. 183), pp. 99-101.
\textsuperscript{219} Perhaps the contract or agreement for the paintings for the Banqueting Hall had included a clause about interest due in the case of late payment, as had Rubens’s contract for the paintings of the Jesuit Church. See Martin, Ceiling Paintings (CRLB), 1968, pp. 214, 218. See also above pp. 52-53.
\textsuperscript{220} See Appendix V.15.
IV. THE PROJECTS, THE CANVASES, AND THE DIVINE RIGHT OF KINGS

The key theory of sovereignty expounded and to a degree practised by King James I and put into less nuanced, indeed more robust and determined use by his son, King Charles I, goes by the appellation of ‘the divine right of kings’.¹ This seems to be a misnomer, and the term was apparently not used in print by James I; it seems first to have been coined in the notorious Constitutions and canons ecclesiastical agreed upon of 1640.² By then James I had been long dead and the reign of Charles I was entering what was to be its revolutionary phase.

The title imparts an aura of divine authority to a theory that was by no means a uniquely British concept of sovereignty. Rather it owed its development to the medieval conflicts between the Holy Roman Empire and the Papacy.³ By James I’s lifetime, it was embraced and articulated as a means of combating both Papal and Presbyterian pretensions to challenge lay – in Great Britain’s case, monarchical – authority.⁴ In the early modern era, it had an influential exponent in the French theorist Jean Bodin, whose Six Livres de la république of 1576⁵ was owned by the youth-

¹. See J. Sommerville, Politics and Ideology in England, 1603-1640, London–New York, 1986, p. 12. Sommerville’s chapter on the divine right of kings is by far the clearest account of the orthodox, absolutist interpretation; another good, conventional survey is Lockyer, James VI and I, 1998, pp. 34-44 — the cover of his book is a detail of the centre of the Apotheosis of King James I, though no reference is made to Rubens in the text — for a less detailed discussion see R. Smuts, Court Culture and the Origins of a Royalist Tradition in Early Stuart England, Philadelphia, 1987, pp. 231-234. Lord Russell (Conrad Russell) challenged Sommerville’s thesis by arguing that many roles apart from the King’s were held and exercised by divine right: see his essay ‘Divine Rights in the Early Seventeenth Century’ in Public Duty and Private Conscience in Seventeenth-Century England, eds. J. Morrill, P. Slack, and D. Woolf, Oxford, 1993, pp. 101 ff. Sommerville’s (and many other like-minded historians’ views, including recently those of L. Levy Peck, ‘Kingship, counsel and law in early Stuart Britain’, in The Varieties of British Political Thought, 1500-1800, ed. J. Pocock, Cambridge, 1993, pp. 80 ff.) position has been further challenged by a ‘revisionist’ reading of contemporary political tracts by Burgess, Absolute Monarchy, 1996, who argued that the orthodox view is based on an anachronistic application of post-1642 Parliamentarian attacks on the Royalists. While there were absolutist advocates of royal power before that date, he believes that they were the exceptions. It is likely that the King was sympathetic; but his chief aim from 1629 was to reassert the Crown’s authority within the parameters of the traditional, legal system of government, whose amorphous character has been amply described by Sharpe, Remapping, 2000, pp. 38-123.


⁴. J. Sommerville (as in n. 1), pp. 9-12; J.N. Figgis, op. cit., pp. 94 ff.; Lockyer, James VI and I, 1998, pp. 37-42, stressed the importance for the King, when he ruled over Scotland, of refuting the views of George Buchanan who advocated and justified Calvinist resistance theory against lay authorities.

⁵. J. Sommerville (as in n. 1), p. 38.
ful, Scot King James VI (the later James I)\(^6\) and was widely read in England.\(^7\)

James I, one of if not the most articulate and literate of kings of England or Great Britain, was a widely translated, popular author and controversialist.\(^8\) His subject matter was chiefly high matters of state as they pertained to his rule as King of Scotland and then of Great Britain. Central to his thinking was the old and by no means original principle that kings were answerable only to God to whom they directly owed their power. He argued the case for his irresistible authority in all its applications with subtlety, scholarship and wit, and usually practised this ideology—translated in politics into his prerogative powers—with moderation, stemming from his respect for the laws and custom of the country. In contrast, even before the premature dissolution of Parliament in March 1629—which recall was not envisaged in the short term and which thus heralded what was to be eleven years of ‘personal rule’ by the exercise of the royal prerogative—Charles I had antagonised his earlier parliaments by what they considered illegal uses of his powers, and by sponsoring a publication that advocated ‘absolutism’ and justified controversial, unacceptable views concerning the power of the king.\(^9\)

Rubens’s views on general political or constitutional matters (as they would be described today), as opposed to issues of concern in his service of the Infanta’s government in Brussels and of the King of Spain in the quest for a diplomatic peace, have not been the subject of research. Perhaps it has been assumed that because he was an artist, he was not greatly interested in such abstract topics. But he was a man very much engaged both with history and contemporary affairs, and we know that he read with interest, for instance, pamphlets on ‘the present government and ... on the pure “reason of state” of the kingdom of France, without any other consideration or respect for Catholicism’, as he told Jacques Dupuy in a letter of 15 October 1626.\(^10\) His opinions were proba-

\(^6\) See James VI and I, Political Writings, 1994, p. XXVIII.
\(^7\) See J. Sommerville (as in n. 1), p. 39.
\(^8\) See James VI and I, Political Writings, 1994, p. XV, and Sharpe, Remapping, 2000, p. 134.
\(^10\) Magurn, Letters, 1955, p. 147, no. 91 and n. 9, p. 468, under no. 91; for the original text, published by Magurn in her appendix, see pp. 422-424, in particular, pp. 423-424: ‘ho letto alcune cose...fatte in favore del governo presente y della pura raggion di stato del Regno di Francia senza alcun altra considerazione o rispetto del Cattolichismo che mi piacquero in estremo’. For contemporary attitudes to
bly deeply influenced by his Roman Catholicism and by the outlook of
the greatly influential scholar Justus Lipsius – whose favourite pupil his
elder brother, Philip, had been – although the artist was to reject Lipsian
neo-Stoicism at the death of his first wife, Isabella Brant, in 1626.\textsuperscript{11} It is
likely that Rubens’s thoughts on politics would have been moulded by
Lipsius’s Tacitism, which advocated both ruthlessness and gentleness on
the part of a disciplinarian prince in the search for civil peace;\textsuperscript{12} Lipsius’s
call for truce negotiations with the rebellious northern provinces, pub-
lished in 1605, was relevant once again after the end of the Twelve Years’
Truce in 1621.\textsuperscript{13} But while, like Lipsius, Rubens would have accepted that
a princely act could be justified simply by necessity or reason of state, he
may not have been in sympathy with the high, authoritarian claims of
James I and his son,\textsuperscript{14} and he indeed criticised their practical implemen-
tation.\textsuperscript{15}

Rubens met many of the leading British courtiers and officers of state
during his time in England and reported on their opinions and alle-
giances in his detailed despatches to Olivares.\textsuperscript{16} Of the notables he met,
he praised only Charles I. Rubens singled out his trustworthiness\textsuperscript{17} and

\begin{quote}
'reason of state', see P. Burke, 'Tacitism, Scepticism and reason of state' in The Cambridge History of
Political Thought 1450-1700, ed. J. Burns and M. Goldie, Cambridge, 1999, p. 479. For Rubens's inter-
cest in current, political affairs, see F. Baudouin, 'Pictor Doctus', in 'De Bibliotheek van Pieter Pauwel
the publication referred to by Rubens in his letter to Dupuy, see ibid., p. 262, no. J.17.
\end{quote}

\begin{quote}
\end{quote}

\begin{quote}
us’s indebtedness to, and admiration for, the writings of the classical historian Tacitus, see R. Tuck,
Philosophy and Government 1572-1651, Cambridge, 1993, pp. 45-64, in particular, pp. 56-57 (Lipsius
was to produce the authoritative, annotated editions of Tacitus’s works). For Tacitism, see also
Burke (as in n. 10), loc. cit.. Otto Sperling recorded visiting Rubens’s studio, when the artist was
having Tacitus read to him while he worked; see Rooses-Ruelens, Correspondance, 11, p. 156. See also
M. Morford, op. cit., pp. 124-126, for Lipsius’s oration to the Archducal couple on the relation
between prince and subject in Leuven in 1599.
\end{quote}

\begin{quote}
\end{quote}

\begin{quote}
43-44, 74, and Morford, Stoics, 1991, pp. 124-126. Oestreich has been criticised for conflating neo-Sto-
icism and Tacitism: see D. Woolf, 'The Career and Writings of James Howell', in Public Duty and Pri-
vate Conscience (as in n. 1 above), p. 248, n. 16.
\end{quote}

\begin{quote}
15. Rubens, in his letter to Olivares of 30 June 1629, criticised the means used by Charles I in his nego-
tiations with him: 'For whereas in other courts negotiations begin with ministers and finish with the
royal word and signature here they begin with the King and end with the ministers'. See Magurn,
Letters, 1955, p. 301, no. 185. For the original in Italian, see Rooses–Ruelens, Correspondance, 1887-1909,
V. p. 76, no. DXXV: 'si come in altre corti si cominciano gli negozi da gli ministri et si finiscono con
parolla e firma Reale così si comincia col Re et si achava con gli ministri'. The King’s personal
control of government, already recognised by Rubens, has recently been highlit by B. Quintrell, 'The
Church Triumphant? The emergence of a spiritual Lord Treasurer, 1635-1636', in The Political World
\end{quote}

\begin{quote}
\end{quote}

\begin{quote}
17. See Magurn, Letters, 1955, p. 332, no. 200, for Rubens’s letter to Olivares of 24 August 1629: ‘the King,
who really seems to me to be most conscientious in keeping his promises’. For the original text, see
Rooses–Ruelens, Correspondance, 1887-1909, V, p. 184, no. DCXXV: 'il Re, che veramente mi par pun-
tualissimo ad osservar la sua promessa'.
\end{quote}
the Stoic qualities of constancy and equanimity. This may have been done to smooth the course of his negotiations with Olivares. But Rubens’s painting of *St George and the Dragon*, which depicts the King in the guise of St George and the Queen in that of the princess, commemorates the artist’s approbation of the King’s victory over those who opposed his policies. Otherwise his comments on British political events – rather than on the political and cultural landscapes – and on personalities are rare. But he had expressed disapproval of the Duke of Buckingham’s character prior to executing a painting that eulogised his statesmanship (Fig. 19). And he was to condemn John Selden, who occupied the other end of the political spectrum, for his ‘insolent and unmannerly carriage’ in the 1629 session of Parliament – as presumably would have Lipsius.

It may be inferred from his many contacts with men in public life that Rubens would have been well aware of the Stuart monarchy’s advocacy and assertion of its unconditional authority. He knew, for instance, Sir Dudley Carleton (although they had met only briefly before 1629-30 when both were in London) who had no illusions about the British monarchy’s inheritance of irresistible, because divinely ordained, power. He is recorded as having contrasted in a speech made in the House of Commons in 1610 the powers of the British Crown with that of ‘Spaine, where all the actions of the prince, great and small, are bounded and limited by express statutes to tie prerogative, and to set the subject at liberty’. It is a matter of frustration that the only book by an Englishman Rubens is known to have read – Francis Bacon’s *Life of Henry VII* –

---


19. For the picture, see K.d.K. ed. Oldenbourg, 1921, p. 22; Rooses-Ruelens, *Correspondance*, 1887-1909, V, pp. 287-288, no. DCLXVII; and Millar, *Charles I*, 1972, no. 84. Rubens decided to keep this tribute to the King for himself (why is not known).

20. Rubens complained of Buckingham’s ‘caprice and arrogance’ in a letter to De Valavex of 26 December 1625 (see Magurn, *Letters*, 1955, pp. 121-123, no. 72), but it is noteworthy that, in a letter to the Earl of Carlisle of 5 October 1628, the artist was to refer to the then dead Duke as a particular friend of mine and of the Common Good – ‘amy en mon particulier et aussi pour le bien commun’; see R.W. Scheller, ‘An Unknown Letter by Rubens: On the Death of Buckingham’, *The Burlington Magazine*, CXIX, 1977, p. 647. For the painting, the *Duke of Buckingham conducted to the Temple of Honour and Virtus*, destroyed in 1949, see Jaffe, *Catalogo*, 1989, no. 795.

21. His motto was ‘liberty above all things’. See J. Sommerville (as in n. 1), p. 215; and further under No. 6, p. 247 and p. 249.


23. For Lipsius’s views on challenges to the authority of the state or Prince, see Oestreich (as in n. 14), pp. 39-40; Lipsius ignored or dismissed the matter of representation of the estates, see pp. 41-42.


25. J. Sommerville (as in n. 1), p. 60.

eschews any theoretical discussion of kingship or issues connected with sovereignty. But the form of government, which was favoured by Charles I and adopted after the dissolution of March 1629, had been a concern before Rubens’s arrival in London, as the King’s at best ambivalent attitude towards the calling of parliaments was a matter of public knowledge.27

It seems reasonable to assume that when Rubens came to consider the commission for the Banqueting Hall, he was not ignorant of James I and his widely broadcast, regal ambitions for himself and his heirs, even if he was also aware of the gap between these assertions and the actual weakness of the Crown in foreign affairs as the Thirty Years War was waged in Germany and the Netherlands.28 Indeed, it has been often claimed that the Canvases must in some way express a portrayal of the King empowered by divine right. Thus Smuts has propounded that ‘above the heads of the spectators at royal ceremonies Charles’ father had literally become an image of God. The Banqueting Hall functioned as a temple of royal divinity expressing the sanctity of the king’.29 Such statements have to be treated circumspectly, as ‘it was not the king himself, but his authority, which was divine’.30 But it is clear that the compositions for the three central canvases more clearly, powerfully, and consistently expressed the King’s ideology than had Project B, whose specifications were likely to have been Rubens’s initial guide. The artist’s imaginative genius – his ability to express content in a dramatic, powerful manner – provided the perfect vehicle for the promulgation of the King’s high, but uncontroversial claims for majesty and royal power.

Rubens’s interpretation probably reflected, or was stimulated by, Charles I’s aspiration to exercise authoritarian power after the assassination of the Duke of Buckingham and the turbulent scene in the House of Commons in March 1629, which brought about his dissolution of the English Parliament and determination not to recall it for at least the time being.31 The King’s policy was not then ‘absolutist’ or tyrannical as his
Parliamentary opponents, during the 1640s, were to claim. During the intervening ‘personal rule’, parliaments were to be summoned in his kingdoms of Ireland and Scotland. Charles I’s as yet instinctive respect for the ‘ancient constitution’ of England was early demonstrated by his decision that Rubens should depict James I in the ceiling paintings wearing his Parliamentary robes: the king in parliament constituted the highest court in the land (of course in the case of the Union, it alluded also to historical reality, as the matter had been debated in Parliament, see below).

Only one of the main proposals in Project A, see Appendix I.1, stemmed from and sought to express the Stuart philosophy of kingship: in the prescription for the Union of the Crowns, the dominant and pre-eminent role of James I is evident. The two other main proposals were less controversial tending rather towards platitude. James I’s international reputation would have been seen as sufficient to merit the flattering prescription illustrating his learning, although claims concerning the flourishing state of the arts in England, which was selected as the subject for the remaining central compartment, could have been regarded with a degree of scepticism when viewed from the vantage point of Rubens’s studio in Antwerp.

The prescription for the Union was to a degree confusing, as the King’s right to the imperial crown of England, France, and Ireland was by lineal descent.32 James I was able to use his prerogative power only to proclaim that he would ‘with all convenient diligence with the advice of the Estates and Parliament of both Kingdomes make the same [that is, the union of the two Realms of Scotland and England] to be perfited’.33 Then, to further the cause of union, he used his prerogative – ‘we are proposed ... to doe by Our selfe that, which justly and safely wee-may by Our absolute power doe’ – to change the style by which he was known.34

The proposal in the Projects all but ignored reference to ‘the Estates and Parliament’, and in the Canvas (No. 5; Fig. 86) it was further edited by reducing the number of contemporary witnesses. Thus the King’s circumscribed role was much exaggerated in what was a partly historical, but chiefly allegorical representation. The disposition of the protagonists, with the dominant position occupied by the King, probably accurately bounded by the laws...’. A calmer insight into the King’s assumptions concerning his authority is provided by Milton, op. cit. as in n. 15, pp. 133ff.

33. Ibid., p. 19, no. 9 (proclamation of 1603).
34. Ibid., p. 19, no. 45 (proclamation of 1604). Palme, Triumph, 1956, p. 236, claimed that: ‘On this proclamation ... the programme of the Banqueting House ceiling was based’. 
recorded the reality of the Stuarts’ physical relation to their subjects on formal occasions.

In Project B, see Appendix I.2, however, was an even greater emphasis on the King’s power, anticipated by the retention of the prescription for the Union. For the central compartment at the northern end was now proposed a grandiloquent illustration of James I exercising his prerogative being led by his religious belief and the complaisance of his subjects (Religion and Concord) to reject War, and succour Wisdom and the Arts (represented by Minerva) and general Happiness in the form of the goddess Astrapia, who would return with the Golden Age.

This was the basis for Rubens’s rendering of the Wise Rule (No. 3; Fig. 53), in which James I is shown exercising his power – inspired from on High – to pursue some of the beneficial policies and duties listed long since by the King himself: ‘Their [the Kings’] office is .... To advance the good and punish the euill .... To procure the peace of the people .... To decide all contouversies that arise among them ... and as the minister of God, to take vengeance upon them that doe euill’.35 Palme, Gordon, and Parry saw illustrated in the Canvas the divine, absolute power of the King.36 Rather, Rubens depicts him as the vigorous epitome of a divinely ordained ruler being crowned with laurel, while he exerts his prerogative for the public good during his reign; thus the Canvas should be seen as an allegorical depiction of the triumph of the wise King.

The new prescription for the central compartment at the opposite end of the room in Project B was the more unusual and exceptional. The dead King was to be depicted being carried upwards by angels to join an assembly of royal exemplars, all of whom have ascended to proximity with the Deity. The prescription formed the basis of what was to become the Apotheosis of King James I (No. 4; Fig. 69), which was to occupy the oval, central compartment of the ceiling. It has been argued that in the Apotheosis, Rubens depicted ‘the perfect consummation ... for a King who ruled by divine right’.37 But this is to confuse layers of meaning in the Canvas; the apotheosis theme was probably not primarily introduced to illustrate the assertion that ‘kings are called Gods’,38 which referred to the King during his rule as he exercised supreme power, but rather as an

35. See [King James VI], The Trew Law of Free Monarchies, 1598, reprinted in James VI and I, Political Writings, 1994, p. 64.
37. See G. Parry (as in note 29), p. 36. Gordon, Whitehall Ceiling, 1975, p. 37, had earlier stated: ‘The King can rise to heaven in his imperial robes because his kingship is itself sacred’.
38. A favourite dictum of James I: see n. 29, and also his speech in the Star Chamber of 1616 (reprinted in James VI and I, Political Writings, 1994, p. 204): ‘for Kings sit in the Throne of God, and they themselves are called Gods’.
appropriate means of glorifying the dead King, inspired by classical precedent in part exemplified by the recently discovered *Gemma Tiberiana* (Fig. 20).  

But the Canvas did depict 'a shyning glory of the *Deity*' as proposed in Project B, and showed the King being borne upwards not by angels but helped upwards by Divine Justice. Thus was illustrated the old, but still core tenet that kings 'haue the count of their administration to giue vnto him [God]'. The crucial point, only implied in Project B and broadcast clearly in the Canvas, was to depict the only check or limitation imposed on a monarch — for subjects could never resist royal orders — namely God’s judgement of the King: ‘Not that ... I meane that whatsoever errors and intollerable abominaiones a sovuereigne prince committ, hee ought to escape all punishment ... but, by the contrary, by remitting them to God (who is their only ordinary Iudge) I remit them to the sorest and sharpest schoolemaster ... for the further a king is preferred by God ... the greater is his obligation to his maker’.  

James I last described this awesome, divine reckoning in the concluding passage of *A Meditation ... or a Paterne for a King’s inavguration*, written towards the end of his life for Prince Charles when he was ‘weary of controversies’: 'a Christian King should neuer be without that continuall and euer wakeriffe [wakeful, vigilant] care, of the account he is one day to giue to *God*, of the good gouernmment of his people, & their prosperous estate both in soules and bodies'. The presence of Divine Justice in escorting the King towards 'a shyning glory of the Deity' to answer for his prerogative actions as a Christian king is thus explained. Rubens here has introduced the language and form of an apotheosis as a pictorial metaphor by which to propound the key concept concerning what followed on a king’s physical death.  

James I was well aware that his continual vigilance would redound to his son’s advantage. He concluded in the *Meditation* that he would as a result of it ‘neuer need to doubt of that happy and willing acclamacion of his people ... to accompany him all of his life thereafter; and when they have bedewed and washed his graue with teares, his posteritie to bee well-commed by them, as a bright and sunne-shining morning after a darke and gloomie night’. This moving finale is echoed in the Latin

---

39. See p. 186.
40. See n. 35. This point was made by Howarth, Images, 1997, p. 124.
41. See [King James VI], *The Trew Law of Free Monarchies*, 1598, reprinted in *James VI and I, Political Writings*, 1994, p. 83; see also his ‘Speach in the Starre-Chamber’ of 1616, see *James VI and I, Political Writings*, 1994, pp. 206, 211; and J. Sommerville (as in n. 1), pp. 38-39.
42. See *James VI and I, Political Writings*, 1994, p. 229.
43. Ibid., p. 249.
44. Ibid.
quotation which was to be inscribed on the first ‘invention’ prescribed in Project B. It may well have been the case that Charles I thus believed that his own reputation and standing would be strengthened by the portrayal of the prerogative actions and the triumphant, final reckoning of his dead father.
V. THE SUBSEQUENT HISTORY OF THE CANVASES

The Canvases from c. 1637 to c. 1700

The use of the Banqueting Hall as the focus of court life and state occasions reached its apogee during the reigns of Kings Charles II and James II; it was later to be the setting for the ceremonial of the Glorious Revolution of 1688-89, which saw the (invited) invasion of England by the Dutch Stadholder, Prince William of Orange, the flight of James II, and the tender of the Crown by the Speaker of the House of Lords to William and his wife, Princess Mary (née Stuart). Charles I’s enjoyment of the room, as it had been originally planned, lasted only some five years; its function as a setting for occasions of state ceased with his departure from London to embark on the Civil War, early in 1642, and only revived during the Protectorate of Oliver Cromwell. Charles I early expressed his satisfaction at Rubens’s paintings set in the ceiling, see p. 88. But there seems to be no documentary evidence for the employment of the room for ceremonies for at least another year, and it may thus have remained out of commission – perhaps fear of the plague kept the Court out of London – for some time after Rubens had heard that all was well.1

The first known ceremony to take place in the newly decorated Hall beneath the ceiling Canvases by Rubens was the feast of the Knights of the Garter, which took place on 17 April 1637.2 Sir John Finet, Master of Ceremonies, kept a record which concentrates on events of diplomatic

1. Thurley, Whitehall, 1999, pp. 95, 175 n. 32, claims that further decorating work was undertaken in 1637; this was itemised as 'new painting the ceilings and windows with walnut tree colour in oyle, richly gilding all the carved work thereof'. Thurley referred to Public Record Office, Work, E 351/3271; but this account roll for the period 1 October 1637-30 September 1638 seems to make no mention of such work and not to contain the quotation he gave. Thurley’s statement is repeated by K. Stonor, Conservation History of Rubens Ceiling, Report on Findings of Research into the History of Conservation Treatments on the 17th Century Ceiling Paintings by Peter Paul Rubens at the Banqueting House, Whitehall, 1999 unpublished Report produced for Historic Royal Palaces, copy at Hampton Court Palace, Surrey, p. 6, where she states that ‘Rolls’ record that in 1637-38 the ceiling and spandrels were painted and gilded.

2. Finet, Notebooks, 1987, p. 217. The Venetian ambassador believed that the Knights of the Garter ceremony at Windsor, about which he reported on 16 October 1637, as having taken place recently, replaced that earlier scheduled for St George’s Day in London. See State Papers, Venice, 1907-21, XXIV, p. 288. That latter event had not been conducted with full ceremony for fear of attracting too great a crowd in time of the plague, see Finet, Notebooks, 1987, loc. cit.
consequence, but he did not specify where the audiences of the arriving French and departing Spanish ambassadors in December 1637 and May 1638 took place; the audience of the departing French ambassador was scheduled to take place in the Banqueting Hall on 12 January (o.s.) 1640 but the venue was moved on the day; great numbers attended the audiences of the next Spanish ambassador in the Banqueting House on 8 April (o.s.) and of the extraordinary ambassador some weeks later. Finet recorded three further court ceremonies in 1641. For state events the Hall was decorated with ‘the richest hangings’; and it is likely that the appearance of the room for these events was not dissimilar to that for the audience accorded to the Spanish Ambassador, Claude Lamoral, Prince de Ligne in 1660, as depicted in a painting by the Flemish artist, Gillis van Tilborch (1625-1678).

On 29 September (o.s.) 1637, Charles I ordered the construction of a timber masquing room close to the Banqueting House; this occasioned the first printed reference to the Canvases. It appeared in the foreword to the published text of the first masque performed in the new masquing room on the Sunday after Twelfth Night, 1638. The foreword, perhaps pointedly, omitted Rubens’s name; but praised Jones for having had quickly erected an alternative masquing room to the Banqueting Hall so that the Canvases there would not suffer damage from the smoke of torches.

The frontispiece to the text reads: ‘Britannia Triumphans, a Masque. Presented at White Hall by the Kings Majestie and his Lords, on Sunday after Twelfth-night, 1637 [o.s.]. By Inigo Jones ... and William D’Avenant ... London ... printed by John Haviland ... 1637’ (o.s.). The foreword stated: ‘There being now past three years of intermission that the King and Queen’s majesties have not made masques with shewes and intermedii, by reason the room where formerly they were presented having the ceiling since richly adorned with pieces of painting of great value, figuring the acts of King James of happy memory, and other enrichments; lest this

5. Ibid., pp. 277-278, 282. By this time, three meetings between the King and members of both Houses of Parliament had taken place in the Banqueting House: see n. 15, p. 21.
7. For references to ‘rich hangings’ (tapestries), see Finet, Notebooks, 1987, pp. 271, 277, 295-296.
8. Belœil, Belgium, coll. The Prince de Ligne, oil on canvas, 145 x 390 cm., rep. in S. Thurlley et al., The Banqueting House, Whitehall Palace, Historic Royal Palaces Agency, 1997, p. 20. A reproduction of Van Tilborch’s painting is displayed on the ground floor of the Banqueting House. The picture does not show the rail protecting the State, which had been erected for the audience of the Spanish ambassador on 8 April 1640. See Finet, Notebooks, 1987, p. 277. For the painting, see M. Díaz Padrón and M. Royo Villanova, [Cat. Exh.] David Teniers, Jan Brueghel y Los Gabinetes de Pintura (Museo del Prado, Madrid, 1992), p. 263.
might suffer by the smoke of many lights his majesty commanded the
surveyor of his works that a new temporary room of timber ... should be
suddenly built for that use; which being performed in two months, the
Scenes for this masque were prepared'.

Eleven years later, the Regicides chose a location contiguous to the
western front of the Banqueting House as the most appropriate place for
Charles I’s execution, for the Banqueting House was where ‘he was wont
to ascend his Throne, and shew the pomp of Majesty due to Princes’. But other considerations could have weighed as heavily with the com-
mittee appointed to ‘consider the Time and Place of execution of the
Judgment against the King’. Its recommendation and the subsequent
warrant did not allude specifically to the Banqueting House, but merely
referred to the ‘open street before Whitehall’. On 30 January 1648/49
(o.s.), the King was conducted from St. James’s Palace to Whitehall
Palace, and finally, through the Banqueting Hall and then through one of
the window frames – perhaps that on the landing on the staircase of the
adjoining north annexe – onto the scaffold where he was beheaded.

Rubens’s Canvases were to be ignored by the Trustees for sale of the
King’s goods and personal estate (as they had been by Van der Doort
when compiling the catalogue of the royal collection). Like Gentileschi’s
paintings for the ceiling of the Great Hall in the Queen’s House at Green-
wich, they seem to have been reserved for the use of the Commonwealth,
although Gentileschi’s were listed by the Trustees for sale, and the cen-
tral painting may have been removed during the Interregnum. Why
Rubens’s Canvases were ignored remains a matter of conjecture.

It has been implied that they were in part threatened by a scheme,
submitted to the Long Parliament by Gerbier, and the painters George
Geldorp (+1665) and the young Peter Lely (1618-1680), for the execution

10. Orgel-Strong, Jones, 1973, II, p. 662; for a slightly different transcription, see The Dramatic Works ... (as
11. W. Sanderson, A Compleat History of the Life and Reign of King Charles from his Cradle to his Grave..., London, 1658, p. 1133.
14. [Cat. Exh.] Orazio Gentileschi at the Court of Charles I (The National Gallery, London / Museo de Bellas Artes de Bilbao / Museo del Prado, Madrid, 1999), p. 100, no. 7, and p. 37, n. 77; J. Bold, Green-
wich. An Architectural History of the Royal Hospital for Seamen and the Queen’s House, New Haven–Lon-
don, 2000, p. 69, who stated that all the ceiling canvases were removed. For the Reserved Goods, see
briefly, Millar, Inventories 1972, pp. xviii ff., and A. MacGregor, ‘The King’s Goods and the Com-
1989, pp. 15-16; and S. Kelsey, Inventing a republic. The Political Culture of the English Commonwealth,
Art, II, Albion’s Classicism: The Visual Arts in Britain, 1550-1660, ed. L. Gent, New Haven–London,
1995, p. 220, n. 80 (referring to F. Haskell’s Mellon Lectures, The Dispersal of the Collections of Charles
I ... ) considered it remarkable that the ceiling remained intact.
of two commemorative group portraits of members of the government of the new English Republic. These were not destined to be displayed in the ceiling but at either end of the Hall. Nothing came of this proposal, only perhaps partly because of the condition (following Dutch practice) that 'sitters ... bear the Charges'.

The Canvases were early noted and admired by the young Lodewijck Huygens, the third son of Sir Constantijn Huygens, who was a member of the entourage of the three Dutch Ambassadors sent to obtain a revocation of the Navigation Act passed in October 1651. The party reached England at the end of 1651. On the fifth day of their stay in London – on 31 December – they visited Whitehall and 'the Banqueting House, where there was nothing in the world now except three long deal tables at which the whole Parliament had been intended to eat after the final Victory. But this had not happened. High up between the beams, there were still those beautiful Rubens paintings .... They showed us the window, and opened it, through which the King had gone to the scaffold'.

Earlier that year, the Canvases had been the subject of discussion by Richard Symonds (1617-1660), the Royalist exile in Rome in 1651, who considered them of sufficient importance for mention in his manuscript notebook, *Secreta intorno la Pittura*. Inspired by a remark from Nicolas Poussin, he criticised them: 'Speaking of paintings upon Roofes in Scorcio those of King James in ye banqueting howse to be caried up to heaven is not Decoro, because higher they cannot paint il Dio Padre .... And for Scorcy above, unless they be Quadri rapportati tis theyle be too licentious & improper perche non siamo avezzati vedere persone in Aria [because we are not used to seeing people in the air] as Monsr Poussin sd to Sig C.A. [Giovanni Angelo Canini] & I Upon the like discourse'. Symonds compared Rubens here to a man who having gilded his stable, 'what he would doe with this best room', the point being that Rubens had awarded the King the most prominence and not the figure of God.


The earliest mention in print of the Canvases as being by Rubens would appear to be that by William Sanderson in *A Compleat History of the Life and Raigne of King Charles*, published in 1658: ‘King Charles had a minde to dignifie the structure of the Banqueting House, and Reuben sent hither for that designe.... The Painting over head in the Room fore shortened and looking downwards, as from clouds, the rarest postures that late ages can paralel, being portraatures of King James with all imaginary similitude of him tending towards Eternity’.  

For Sanderson, the more detailed meaning of the Canvases was lost sight of or was no longer of interest; if this was the case for a Royalist sympathiser, it is not hard to see how their content would have been ignored as obscure by the Cromwellian court. Perhaps already by November 1649, their purpose was officially judged to be of such irrelevance that the use of the room as a temporary chapel, where sermons could be heard, may have been considered. The Banqueting Hall was indeed the venue for a sermon following the ceremony at which Oliver Cromwell was admitted to the office of Lord Protector in December 1653; he soon took up residence in Whitehall Palace and from thence forth the Hall witnessed many of the same ceremonies that had been enacted there under the Stuarts. In 1657, it was the setting for formal exchanges between Parliament and Cromwell, notably its offer of kingship to him.  

The Banqueting House was to be put to its greatest use following the Restoration of the monarchy in 1660 until the Glorious Revolution of 1688-89. It was to be the setting of two occasions of great historic
THE CANVASES FROM C. 1637 TO C. 1700

moment. King Charles II was greeted by both houses of Parliament in the Banqueting Hall at the end of his entry into London on 29 May (o.s.) 1660. 25 He touched for the King’s Evil for the first time there on 6 July (o.s.) 1660; 26 and it was the frequent venue for the reception of ambassadors. 27 Christiaan Huygens witnessed what was to be the last creation of knights of the Bath on 29 April 1661: ‘I was at Whitehall at the Banqueting House where the King created knights of the Bath ... the room is large and beautiful with beautiful ceilings’; 28 nine days earlier Pepys had been present when the King created peers of the realm. 29 The second great historic event was the offer of the Imperial Crown of Great Britain to Prince William and Princess Mary of Orange on 13 February 1688/89 (o.s.). 30

In June 1663, the traveller De Monconys visited the Banqueting House: ‘I went to see the great room called Banquetin (sic) .... The ceiling is painted by Rubens on canvas, but the paintings are not all of equal beauty, because those in the corners are much better than those in the middle, of which one in which King James is shown much larger than he should be because the distances were not properly calculated’. 31 Presumably De Monconys was here referring to the Apotheosis (No. 4). The Banqueting House was also noted by Cosimo III de’Medici on his journey to England three years later: ‘All its [Whitehall’s] magnificence is confined to the royal saloon .... The cieling is richly gilded and decorated with pictures of Rubens which are admirable in the design and execution’. 32 Quite contrary to prevailing sentiments would have been the view of Dr Wren – (later Sir) Christopher Wren (1632-1723), the architect-scientist, and soon to be Surveyor General of the King’s Works – and other ‘virtuosos’ in Sergeant-Painter Robert Streeter’s (or Streeter) studio, whom

25. It is not clear but likely that members of the House of Lords were present along with the Speaker and members of the House of Commons to greet King Charles II at 7.30 p.m.; for a full description of the occasion, see The Parliamentary History of England, London, IV, 1808, cols. 54-55.


27. Ibid.

28. H.L. Brugmans, Le Séjour de Christian Huygens à Paris ..., Paris, 1935, p. 169: ‘esté a Withall au banquet­tinghaus ou le Roy faiçoit les chevaliers of the Bath ... la sale est grande et belle avec un beau plat­fonds...’. The ceremony had nothing to do with the Order of the Bath, which was only established in 1725.


31. Journal des Voyages de Monsieur de Monconys, Lyons, 1666, II, p. 58: ‘j'allay voir la grand’Sale nommé Banquetin ... le plat-fond est peint par Rubens sur de la Toile, mais tous les tableaux ne sont pas d'é­gale beauté, car ceux des coins sont beaucoup meilleurs que ceux du milieu, don’t l’un entre autres, où est le Roi Jacques, paroit escessivement plus gros qu’il ne devroit, pour n’auoir pas bien pris les distances’.

Pepys records on 1 February 1669 as believing that Streater’s canvases for the ceiling of the Sheldonian Theatre, Oxford—which were then being painted—to be better than Rubens’s Canvases in the Banqueting Hall. Pepys disagreed with this chauvinist attitude.

The commission to Rubens and his execution of it entered the mainstream of art history in 1672, when it was described by G. P. Bellori in his biography of Rubens: King Charles took great satisfaction in Rubens’s coming to London and treated him with unusual honour, he also commissioned him to paint nine paintings to be set in the compartments of the ceiling of the ambassadorial audience chamber; they were to depict the acts of King James when he victoriously entered England from his kingdom of Scotland. Bellori was the first to give the number of Canvases involved; his description of the subject matter differed from Sanderson’s but was only marginally more accurate. The text suggests that his informant, probably Sir Kenelm Digby, the friend of Van Dyck, had no great interest in the Canvases, or if he did, he did not adequately convey it to Bellori, who was far better informed about the Marie de Médicis series, which he treated at greater length and in full detail. For William Aglionby there was no doubting the importance of Rubens’s paintings in the Banqueting Hall; in the introduction to his survey of paintings for the would-be connoisseur, he wrote: ‘In our days... his Rubens’s Talent for the Great affairs of State was no less admired than his Pencil, which has so richly Adorned the Ceiling of one of the best Rooms in Europe, I mean the Banqueting-House’.

In 1686, Wren, by then Surveyor General of the King’s Works, was required ‘to Erect Scaffolds in the Banqueting House in Whitehall for ye...'


35. For Digby as Bellori’s informant, see G. P. Bellori (as in n. 34), p. 316. For Digby and Van Dyck, see A. Wheelock, in Wheelock et al., Van Dyck, 1990, p. 254.

36. William Aglionby, Painting Illustrated in Three Dialogues..., London, 1685, p. b.2 ff. For the architect Colin Campbell, see Colen (sic) Campbell, Vitruvius Britannicus..., London, I, 1717, p. (3): it was ‘without Dispute the first Room in the World’. See also G.S. Dugdale, Whitehall through the Centuries, London, 1950, p. 39, for the reference, but an inaccurate quotation.
Mending the Pictures in the Caelings, which are to bee done with all Convenient Speede’. Wren submitted an estimate: ‘His Majestie having directed ye ceeling of ye Banquetting House to be refreshed by Mr. Walton, wch cannot be done without scaffolding ye whole room, I must acquaint yor Lop. ye expense of this & other things that it will necessarily draw along wth it’. The estimate included taking down and putting back the ‘frames’, painting the interior walls in ‘plaine stone colour in oyle as they were at first’, and cleaning the gilding. Parry Walton had been appointed by April 1679 as Surveyor and Keeper of the King’s pictures; in 1682, he was described as ‘the Cleaner’, his work on the Canvases and that of the Sergeant-Painter, Robert Streater (or Streeter) II († 1711) in the Banqueting House was paid for over and above his retainer.

Walton’s account for £212 was made up thus: ‘For Clothe to line the Pictures £65 / For Priming £30 / For Paste £5 / For Nailes £1 / For Colours £20 / For Oyle Varnish and glew £10 / For Six Workmen to help me 5 months £77 / For Porters to help me £4’. From this it is clear that

39. Ibid., pp. 54-55. The Canvases were not of course enclosed by free-standing frames; the word was probably used to describe the stretchers or ‘straining frames’, the last phrase as used in the executors’ accounts book of the estate of Sir Peter Lely († 1680), see M. Kirby Talley, ‘Extracts from the Executors Account-Book of Sir Peter Lely: An Account of the Contents of Sir Peter’s Studio’, The Burlington Magazine, CXX, 1978, p. 747. It is also in this sense, it has been claimed, that the poet Sir John Suckling used the word when he wrote (probably in 1637): ‘Van Dyck with all his fine Colours and Pensills about him, his Frame and right Light’, see J. Kirkby, ‘The Painter’s Trade in the Seventeenth Century, Theory and Practice’, Painting in Antwerp and London: Rubens and Van Dyck, National Gallery Technical Bulletin, XX, 1999, pp. 25-26, n. 46. However, in this context the word may have meant ‘easel’: see OED, 1884-1928, IV, p. 507, under 111, 7.
40. O. Millar, ‘Caring For the Queen’s Pictures: Surveyors Past and Present’, in C. Lloyd, [Cat. Exh.] The Queen’s Pictures. The Royal Collection Through the Centuries, London, 1991, p. 15. After the Glorious Revolution of 1688/89, Millar recorded that Walton was retained as ‘Mender and Repairer’; he was succeeded by his son, Peter, in 1701. Payments to Walton are recorded from 22 March 1685/86 (o.s.) to 3 July 1688 (o.s.) in ‘Moneys Received and Paid for Secret Services of Charles II and James II ...’, ed. J.H. Akerman, Camden Society, LI, 1851, pp. 120, 131, 162, 176, 198. Walton was later to lay down on canvas the Raphael Cartoons; see J. Shearman, The Pictures in the Collection of Her Majesty the Queen, Raphael’s Cartoons ..., London, 1972, p. 149; these had been exhibited in their original strips in the Banqueting Hall in May, 1689, and December, 1690; see Journaal van Constantijn Huygens III (Société Historique à Utrecht), Utrecht, 1888, p. 7. See also M. Kirby Talley, Jr., ‘Miscreants and Hottentots ...’, Studies in the History of Painting Restoration, ed. C. Sitwell and C. Staniforth, London, 1998, pp. 36-37.
41. See next note for the date and duration of Walton’s work. Sir Christopher Wren was requested to erect scaffolds on 5 July (o.s.) 1686 ‘for ye Mending the pictures’ and again on 20 March 1686/87 (o.s.) ‘for taking down the pictures...and set up againe’; Public Record Office, Work, LCS/147, pp. 151, 306. In October 1687, an account was itemised for raising a scaffold to fix perhaps one of the Processions and the Apotheosis and to take down the pictures at the ends of the room; Public Record Office, Work, 5/41, fol. 89; fol. 97, specifies work done by the locksmith ‘to hold up the great Ovall picture’. In June and July 1688 are itemised accounts for striking and removing the scaffolds. See Public Record Office, Work, 5/42, fols. 29, 35; fol. 52 itemised Robert Streater’s account, for September 1688: ‘For cleansing varnishing & gilding the Banqueting House ceiling & cornice’. References from Thurley, Whitehall, 1999, pp. 136 and 177, nn. 50 and 51, and his letter, kindly written to the author, of 4 September 2000.
42. For the account, see The Eighteenth Volume etc. (as in n. 38), p. 67.
Walton relined and retouched the Canvases. Wren was asked to approve the account, and replied early in July 1688: ‘I have considered this bill of Mr Walton’s ... and having been eye witness of the paines and skill he hath used in this worke I conceive his demands are very modest and reasonable’.\(^{43}\) It has recently been suggested that part of Walton’s work was to re-arrange the Canvases so that they could be viewed from the southern end of the room, but this is unlikely.\(^{44}\)

If the fire of 1619 had made necessary the building of Jones’s Banqueting House – and the subsequent commission to Rubens – the fire which destroyed most of Whitehall Palace on 4 January 1697/98 (o.s.),\(^{45}\) determined its use for the next two hundred years or so. The fire was prevented from engulfing the Banqueting Hall; four days later, it had been decided to make good the loss of the Chapel Royal by converting the Banqueting Hall to that use.\(^{46}\) King William III attended service there for the first time on Christmas Day, 1698.\(^{47}\) In spite of early plans to the contrary, the Banqueting Hall was to remain as the Chapel Royal for nearly two hundred years; its use was temporarily changed in 1808-09 to that of a military chapel,\(^{48}\) and so it remained for some twenty years.\(^{49}\)

The Canvases from c. 1700 to c. 1830

The Stuarts’ traditional esteem for the building (and the ceiling Canvases) – shown by Queen Anne’s unrealised plan of 1702 to have it restored to lay use by the Crown\(^{50}\) – was inherited by the Hanoverians; also ‘as

---

\(^{43}\) Ibid., p. 68. Walton was paid ‘in satisfaccion of his extraordinary pains in repaying all the pictures in the ceiling of the banqueting house in Whitehall’ on 2 October (o.s.) 1688; see ‘Moneys Received...’ (as in note 40), p. 206. See also a Treasury note of 7 July (o.s.) 1688, Calendar of Treasury Books 1685-1689, VIII, prepared by W.H. Shaw, London, 1923, p. 198. See also Cox–Norman, Whitehall, 1930, p. 128, n. [6].

\(^{44}\) Thurley, Whitehall, 1999, pp. 135-136, stated that this followed the building of a great staircase at the southern end of the building and of a doorway from it into the room. This, he argued, meant the relocation of the throne to the northern end, where, for instance, the Prince and Princess of Orange stood as the offer of the crown was made to them. But, as the report for 13 February 1688/89 (o.s.) in the Parliamentary History... (as in note 30), col. 108, indicates, the Prince and Princess stood by the throne at the southern end, because the Speakers and the Lords and Commons made ‘three obeisances, one at the lower end of the room, one in the middle and one at the step where their Highnesses stood’. Nor do the itemised accounts for the erection and dismantling of the scaffolds during the restoration work (see note 41), make any reference to the re-arrangement of the Canvases. Thurley claimed that Walton’s re-arrangement is recorded in Gribelin’s engraving (Fig. 160; Appendix VI).

\(^{45}\) See Colvin, King’s Works, 1963-82, V, p. 297.

\(^{46}\) Ibid., pp. 300-301, and n. 1. See also Cox–Norman, Whitehall, 1930, p. 122, n. [4], quoting the order to Wren of 15 March 1698: ‘to fit up the Banqueting House for a Chapell’.

\(^{47}\) Cox–Norman, Whitehall, 1930, pp. 122-123, and n. [5].

\(^{48}\) Ibid., p. 123. See also Colvin, King’s Works, 1963-82, VI, pp. 545-547.

\(^{49}\) See Cox–Norman, Whitehall, 1930, p. 124.

\(^{50}\) Colvin, King’s Works, 1963-82, V, p. 301.
one of the principal works of Inigo Jones the Banqueting House was a building of special interest to the Georgian [that is, Hanoverian] Office of Works".51 Simon Gribelin II’s reproductive engraving of the whole ceiling, published in 1720, on three sheets and with an informed explanation of the general subject matter in English and Latin, is further evidence of an appreciation of the ceiling during Queen Anne’s reign and testifies to the regard in which it was still held, six years after her death (Fig. 160).52 Indeed, Sir Robert Walpole, the First Lord of the Treasury and Chancellor of the Exchequer for much of the reigns (until 1742) of the first two Georges, owned what was then believed to be the modello for the Apotheosis and displayed it in 10, Downing Street, Whitehall, his London residence, see under No. 4e.

In 1726, the Lord Chamberlain’s office requested the Office of Works to ‘erect a Scaffold in the Banquetting house to take down the paintings in order to be repaired, & to Secure the Ceiling and roofe’.53 The Office of Works responded by submitting an estimate for erecting a scaffold, which was agreed upon by the Treasury Board (headed by Sir Robert Walpole) on 19 October (o.s.).54 What work was then done is not known. About two years later the Treasury Board, on 9 August (o.s.), again agreed upon an estimate to erect a scaffold (which was perhaps an extension or elaboration of that previously erected) ‘in Such manner as will Secure the roof for the present, and enable us to see better what repairs will be wanting, and will be no hindrance to Divine Service’.55 No further pertinent activity is documented by the Office of Works for four years; but the paintings had been taken down by 29 August (o.s.), when a report was submitted on the decayed state of the roof.56 The paintings too were ‘in so bad a way that unless they are soon new lined, cleaned &c. we fear they will be in danger of totally perishing’.57 William Kent, who had been appointed Surveyor of the King’s Pictures in 1728,58 was authorised by the Treasury Board to restore them. On 12 January 1733/34 (o.s.), King George II and Queen Caroline climbed the scaffold to inspect Kent’s restoration; that, and the subsequent interview were rightly

51. Ibid.
52. For Gribelin’s print, see Appendix VI. Gribelin was granted the privilege to engrave the ceiling by Queen Anne († 1714). The inscription was first published by Held, Glynde, 1970, p. 281, n. 23.
regarded as so significant by Kent that he made a note of it on the end paper of a manuscript copy of Ovid’s *Metamorphoses*: ‘The 12th day of January 1733 [o.s.] the King & Queen came to the Banqueting House at Whitehall, and came upon the scaffold forty foot high to see the paintings of Ruben’s, that I had restor’d – his Majesty was pleas’d to tell me I had done them exceeding well – the Queen told me I not only deserv’d thanks from the King but to [sic] all lovers of Painting’. 59

It is clear from a reading of Vertue’s notes that Kent’s cleaning campaign extended probably intermittently for over a decade, 60 although no other evidence for this has apparently come to light. Available for inspection by the King and Queen – ‘new lind and clean’d’ – were the ‘Middle peecees’, that is the central, inner Canvases. 61 Some time after 9 July (o.s.) 1743, Vertue saw ‘one of the end (sic = side) peecees being a long pictures 40 foot long’. 62 It is not clear which one it was, as Vertue describes it showing lions (sic) and leopards (sic). But it is likely that the painting he saw was *Procession I*. 63

Vertue was greatly impressed: ‘these [sic=his] when down are [sic= is] vastly large great nobly draw’n & masterly pencil with such surprizing force of Colours in the fleshy parts as also the Fruit and Animals – and equally all the ornamentals – no doubt such a great work is admirable & shews the superior genius of that great Master Rubens’; ‘no matter’ that on the authority of Sir Godfrey Kneller, Jacob Jordaens was said to have collaborated for ‘it is a noble & great work’. 64

Colvin records that in 1748 one of the side panels was cleaned and restored. 65 This was done by Stephen Wright, then Clerk of the Works at Hampton Court, to whom the Board must have turned following Kent’s death. He was paid £ 48 10 shillings for ‘Cleaning and mending one of the side panels to the ceiling of Rubens in the Banquitting House and strowing ground glass on thick colour on the back’. 66 In the course of the 1946/47-50 cleaning campaign, an inserted piece of canvas was discovered in the area occupied by the upper part of the personification of

59. *Colvin, King’s Works, 1963-82*, V, p. 301, n. 5; J. Carré, *Lord Burlington ... le connaisseur, le mécène, l’architecte*, Clermont-Ferrand, 1993, p. 264. Wilson, loc. cit. (as in n. 58), stated that this record of the royal visit was written on the back fly-leaf of the notebook devoted to Kent’s 1714 Italian tour; he also stated that the restoration was begun in 1729.

60. See *Vertue Note Books*, V, pp. 25-26. M. Wilson, loc. cit. (as in n. 58), stated that the restoration ‘took some time’.

61. Vertue described these (see previous note), in the passage written after 9 July 1743, as having been restored ‘some years past’.


63. See below.

64. See above, pp. 73-74.

65. *Colvin, King’s Works, 1963-82*, V, p. 301 and n. 6. For Wright, see *Colvin, King’s Works, 1963-82*, V, pp. 89-90; for his official position at Hampton Court, see p. 475.

Divine Love in Procession II (No. 11); this might have been the ‘mending’ effected by Wright. Ground glass or glue (it was uncertain which) was discovered on the removal of the relining canvases in 1906-07, when it was supposed that either substance had been applied to stiffen the Canvases to prevent their sagging. It may be assumed that Wright here followed what Kent had prescribed for the reverse of the Canvases that he had cleaned and relined.

What occasioned the next cleaning campaign, undertaken by the artist Giovanni Battista Cipriani (1727-1785), is not clear. The laconic minutes of the Board of the Office of Works, headed by Sir William Chambers, give no indication of that sense of urgency, which had and would in future accompany most decisions to clean and restore the Canvases. Perhaps it was a combination of Cipriani’s reputation as a restorer and the sagging of the Canvases that determined the Board’s decision. At all events, it was recorded at a meeting of the Board on 26 April 1776 that: ‘Mr Cipriani acquainted the Board [on which now sat Stephen Wright] that He was now at leisure to proceed with the painting of the Ceiling at Whitehall Chapel and could wish to begin the same directly’. On 28 November 1778, the Board visited Whitehall Chapel ‘to view the painting which Mr Cipriani had compleated’.

John Thomas Smith (1766-1833), who had been taken by his father onto the scaffold during Cipriani’s campaign, stated that Cipriani had been paid £1000, and accused him of having ‘repainted it [the Canvases] wholesale’ because of the scale of his fee. The amount in fact paid for Cipriani’s work has not been published; Smith is most likely to have exaggerated it. Nor is there corroboration for his assertion that subsequent to Cipriani’s campaign, ‘Rigaud was employed to refresh it [the Canvases]’. He would have been referring here to the artist John Francis Rigaud (1742-1810), a friend of the artist Joseph Nollekens and thus probably at least an acquaintance of Smith. (Rigaud restored paintings on the grand staircase of the British Museum and Sir James Thornhill’s ceiling in the Painted Hall at Greenwich Hospital.) The detailed

---

67. See below, p. 296.
68. See below, p. 125.
69. Colvin, King’s Works, 1963-82, V, p. 301 and n. 7; and Public Record Office, Work, 4/15, Minutes of the Board Meeting of 26 April 1776. The matter was referred to Mr Woolfe [John Woolfe], Clerk of the Works at Whitehall, Westminster and St James’s Palace 1775-1790, for whom see Colvin, King’s Works, 1963-82, V, p. 476.
70. Colvin, King’s Works, 1963-82, V, p. 301 and n. 7; and Public Record Office, Work, 4/15, Minutes of the Board Meeting of 28 November 1778.
72. J.T. Smith, op. cit., p. 184. Wide currency was given to this claim of Rigaud’s intervention by his being referred to by Smith, Catalogue, 1829-42, II, pp. 236-237.
account of Rigaud’s career by his son significantly omits any mention of such a major task as working on the Canvases in the Banqueting Hall.74 Perhaps Smith confused the Banqueting Hall with the Painted Hall.

By this date, the first critical assessment of some aspects of the content of the cycle had been published. The cultivated, classical scholar the Reverend Joseph Spence was presumably writing *Polymetis*, published in 1747,75 while Kent was still at work on the paintings. In it he praised the ceiling in a heartfelt but more conventional manner than had Vertue in his notes: ‘I believe you could not be unwilling to allow me, that two of the most capital works Rubens ever did, are the ceiling, in the banqueting-house at Whitehall; and the fine set of pictures in the Luxemburg gallery ... it [the Banqueting Hall ceiling] is certainly one of the finest paintings, as the beauties of the colouring, the happiness of the pencil and the judicious management of the lights and shades, in the whole world’.76

Spence, who had a profound knowledge of the ancient Greek and Roman worlds and believed that personifications should only be classical, had as his main purpose the demolition of the widespread influence of Ripa’s *Iconologia*.77 But he found fault with aspects of Rubens’s work, not only on the grounds of common sense – Piety ‘holds’ such a large altar with the fire on it; Justice holds in one hand a bundle of flames (sic) as well as the scales of justice (No. 4) – but also on grounds of inaccuracy, for he claimed never to have seen Apollo holding a cornucopia (No. 9). He also accused Rubens of inconsistency by showing a personification of Temperance and mythical beings (Apollo, Minerva, and Hercules) as personifications of the other virtues (Nos. 6-9). In the case of Minerva and Apollo, he did not find the artist’s choice of them appropriate. He provided identifications of three of the conquered vices, but was unable to identify Minerva’s victim – ‘a naked person whose name I cannot so much as guess at’.78

While Spence criticised the iconography, the artist Joseph Highmore found fault with the perspective of the columns in the *Wise Rule* (No. 3).79 His treatise, which parades a detailed knowledge of optics, was very

---

74. See the previous note. Stephen Rigaud’s memoir is also referred to in the entry on Rigaud in *DNB*, XVI, p. 297. Coleini, *King’s Works*, 1963-82, VI, pp. 545-547, does not refer to any restoration by Rigaud.
76. Ibid., p. 297.
78. J. Spence, loc. cit. (as in n. 75).
probably not as influential as Spence’s book, which was published in at least three editions, the third in 1774. The extent of that influence is impossible to judge; but it is noteworthy that Sir Joshua Reynolds PRA never referred to the Canvases in his Discourses, even though he was to acquire, late in his life, what he believed to be the modelli for the central compositions at either end of the ceiling.80

Spence indeed had commented on the fact that the ceiling was little known: it ‘deserves to be much better known, and much more regarded among us, than it has generally been. Were it in Italy, instead of England, I doubt not but several of our travellers would willingly have gone a hundred miles out of their way, on purpose to see it: who, perhaps have now never seen it at all; because it is just at their own doors’.81 Such words may have stimulated more art lovers to visit the chapel. The guide to London, printed for P. and J. Dodsley in 1761, described the ceiling as ‘justly esteemed [to be] one of the finest ... in the world’;82 it was also mentioned in The English Connoisseur published in 1766.83

Perhaps it was in belated response to Spence’s criticism and to requests for explanation from an increased number of visitors that a key-plan to the paintings was produced; this is now known from a photograph (Fig. 9).84 From its typography, Held dated the key-plan to the eighteenth century;85 but on these grounds a date of about 1815 seems preferable.86 Its author remains unknown. Presumably he was either a member of the Office of Works,87 or, more probably, the Surveyor of the

80. See under Nos. 3c and 5d.
81. J. Spence, loc. cit. (as in n. 75).
82. London and its Environs Described, printed for R. and J. Dodsley, London, I, 1761, pp. 245-246. The subject was described as ‘the entrance, inauguration and coronation of King James I. represented by Pagan emblems’.
84. The photograph is preserved in the Print Room of the Victoria and Albert Museum, inv. no. 107-1908; RKD neg. no. 13721. See most recently, Held, Sketches, 1980, I, pp. 189-190, who mistakenly believed that the key-plan itself (rather than a photograph) was preserved in the Victoria and Albert Museum (the author thanks Ms. Lambert, Keeper of the Department of Prints and Drawings in the Victoria and Albert Museum, for this clarification). It was described by L. Van Puyvelde, ‘Rubens’ Glorification of James I at Whitehall’, Message, 2, 1942, no. 12, pp. 83-87, as being the original key to the paintings in the ceiling; as a refugee from occupied Belgium, he had no doubt and understandably forgotten that the key-plan was still available for inspection in the room when the London County Council Survey of London volume was compiled; see Cox-Norman, Whitehall, 1930, p. 132, n. [3]: ‘In default of other information the descriptions of the paintings...have had to be based primarily on an old key (of unknown origin and date) preserved in the Hall’. It had been published in Black and White, 28 December 1907; the press cutting from which is preserved in Public Record Office, Work, 14/147.
86. This is the view of Meg Ford, Christie’s Book Department, who also kindly ascertained that the sheet is not listed in the Eighteenth-Century Short Title Catalogue. Roy Strong independently proposed more or less the same dating; see R. Strong, The Tudor and Stuart Monarchy. Pageantry, Painting, Iconography, III, Jacobean and Caroline, Woodbridge, 1998, p. 155, where he gives a transcription of the key.
87. Two members of the Office of Works and Office of Works and Public Buildings, between 1782-1832,
V. THE SUBSEQUENT HISTORY OF THE CANVASES

King’s Pictures. In that case, the author could be identified either as Benjamin West (1738-1820), the President of the Royal Academy, Surveyor from 1791, or his successor in the latter capacity, William Seguier (1772-1843), who in 1824 was also appointed first Keeper of the National Gallery. West’s interest in the cycle may perhaps be inferred from his possession of a superb *modello* for one of the Canvases (No. 3f); but the content and style of the key-plan seem not consistent with West’s elevated and sophisticated manner of expression. Seguier’s intellectual attainments came to be considered inadequate at least by the time of his death; but it is not impossible that the key-plan to the Canvases, which he is known to have admired, was an early product of his employment as Surveyor from 1821.

Whoever its author, this key-plan appears to be the most comprehensive explanation of the subject matter to have been published to date. The identification of the subject matter of each painting cannot be said to have been that far from the mark. Although John Smith and Max Rooses paid no heed to the key-plan, it formed the basis for some later authoritative accounts, notably but with reservation, that of the Survey of London published in 1930. However, its ‘discovery’ and authentication by Leo van Puyvelde endowed it with an unmerited importance and significance; Julius Held as late as 1980, still found it necessary to refer to it. The commentary was at its most perverse in the reading of the actions of the two *amoretti* round the lion in *Procession I* (No. 10) as ‘tickling him in his Ear and ... drawing his teeth’. Thus is demonstrated the extent to which Rubens’s intentions had been lost sight of.

The Canvases from c. 1830 to c. 1970

In 1830, John Smith, the dealer and author of seminal catalogue raisonnés of paintings chiefly by seventeenth-century Netherlandish artists,
averted that the ceiling paintings in what was then the ‘Chapel of Whitehall’ ‘once possessed all the beauties of his best productions; but whether these beauties have been swept away by the ignorant cleaner, or concealed by the pencil of the presumptuous painter, it is impossible, in the situation in which they now are, to decide; if however, by good fortune, they are only obscured by the dirt which has accumulated from smoke and dust, and are in a state capable of being restored to anything like what they must once have been, they would form a glorious set to augment the national collection’. Although the Canvases were in fact soon to be cleaned, they have not received the acclaim that Smith felt they could deserve for well over a century. Apart from brief bursts of appreciation following two subsequent cleaning campaigns, they have remained neglected by art-historians and have been by and large unappreciated by the general public.

By 1830, work was under way in refurbishing the Banqueting Hall to effect its re-conversion to a Chapel Royal; the exterior of the House was restored by Sir John Soane (1753-1837), while the reconstitution of the interior, completed by 1838, was placed in the charge of Robert Smirke. In the course of preparing an estimate for the cost of renewing the stonework, Soane, the Attached Architect for the district to the Office of Works, had also inspected the roof, which, as he reported on 21 February 1829, ‘is ... in a very dangerous state’. On 30 April 1830, the Treasury agreed to his estimate for building a new roof, the construction of which entailed the removal of the paintings from the ceiling. The new roof was in place by the following autumn; and it was on 27 September 1831 that William Seguier wrote: ‘Understanding the Chapel at Whitehall is now in a state to receive back the Paintings in the Ceiling, I feel it my duty to apprize you of the condition of these invaluable Works of Art. The whole of them require a certain degree of restoration but two [or three?] of the compartments which I beg to observe I showed to Lord Farnborough when taken down are in a state of great decay, the wet having apparently for years been punctuating the Canvas on which they are painted, indeed such is the injury they have received that I cannot be answerable for putting them up with safety in their present condition’. The Treasury agreed to Seguier’s estimate and to his carrying out the

100. Public Record Office, Work, 19/24/2. Charles Long (1760-1838), created Lord Farnborough in 1826, had been an important member of the ‘art world’; he was a Trustee of both the British Museum and the National Gallery. See DNB, XII, pp. 99-100; and J. Egerton, National Gallery Catalogues, The British School, London, 1998, pp. 376 ff., under no. 2786.
work proposed, which was (quickly) completed by the end of January 1832.  

Apart from his official duties as Surveyor of the King’s Pictures, Seguier ran a picture dealing and restoration business with his younger brother John (1785-1856), and the latter has been claimed to have been responsible for restoring the Canvases. If this was the case, it was done presumably under the direction of William, who was the official picture cleaner to the Royal Collection. In this capacity he has been described as ‘a sensible man’. Alistair Laing has described his minimalist approach to cleaning and restoration, which ‘reflected the best practice of his generation ... Seguier and his fellows restricted their restoration to essential repairs, and to the partial removal of varnish’ but abstained from the use of solvents. It can be assumed that this was his approach to the cleaning and restoration of the Canvases, whose appearance, however, was soon to be criticised.

For Seguier, these ‘noble Works of Rubens form[ing] perhaps the finest ceiling in the world’. G.F. Waagen, the influential Director of the Royal Picture Gallery in Berlin, did not share such enthusiasm. He visited the interior of the Banqueting House in July 1835 and was highly critical. The Canvases were inconvenient to look at and, like all ceiling paintings, were oppressive: ‘the overcharging and clumsiness of [the allegories] ... are not calculated to make them attractive’. Further, King James I ‘could scarcely have inspired him [Rubens]’; while the paintings themselves, for ‘the greater part’ the work of pupils, had been restored four times; ‘and now, as in fastening them again to the ceiling, they have been here and there drawn quite tight, the reflection and shining spots make it impossible to derive any pleasure from them’ (Fig. 12). These criticisms were repeated in a further report, written for publication, in

---

101. Public Record Office, Work, 19/24/2. The account of the 1906-07 cleaning campaign (see below) in The Recent Restoration of the Rubens Ceiling and the Additions to the Official Catalogue of the Royal United Service Museum, December 1907 (which formed the basis for the account given of the Canvases in the Official Catalogue of the Royal United Service Museum, Whitehall...), by A. Leetham and B.E. Sargeaunt, 1908 [3rd edn consulted]), which incorrectly gave the date of cleaning as 1837. Seguier, rather than Cipriani, see p. 115, probably nailed the supports to the front of their stretchers rather than line or strip-line them to replace decayed tacking edges. Nail holes were found round all the edges of the canvases during cleaning in the 1946/7-50 campaign (see under the entries for the Canvases, below). Such a procedure was not used in the campaign of 1906-07, see p. 125, and Walton and Kent are known to have relined the supports, see pp. 111-112 and 114.

102. J. Egerton (as in note 100), pp. 390, 397, nn. 20, 28, under no. 6022.

103. DNB, XVIII, p. 1146.


105. Ibid., p. 397, n. 47, quoting Sir Oliver Millar.


1850-51, with only slight modification.\textsuperscript{109} Waagen’s account of 1835 was published in 1838; and his views early resulted in the Canvases falling into critical neglect. No mention of them was made in the deliberations of the House of Commons select committee on the arts and their connection with manufactures of 1836, nor were they referred to in the cross-examination of experts by the House of Commons select committee on national monuments and works of art of 1841, which investigated the whole matter of paintings as decorations of public buildings. They were again ignored by experts called to give evidence before the select committee on the National Gallery of 1850, when opinions were offered (as in 1836) that Raphael’s cartoons, then at Hampton Court, should be exhibited in the National Gallery.\textsuperscript{110}

But a sole appreciation of the paintings’ qualities was at last to be voiced by George Foggo, artist and secretary to the National Monuments Society, when he gave evidence before the select committee on the National Gallery, convened in 1853. He stated that the ceiling pictures should be removed and exhibited in the National Gallery as they were not appropriate for a chapel; he held to this opinion against the committee’s chairman, who opined: ‘that a considerable part of the interest of these pictures in Whitehall is connected with the period and the circumstances under which they were painted in that locality and with the Sovereign by whom Whitehall was built’.\textsuperscript{111}

As the popularity of the Pre-Raphaelite movement was taking hold, it is hardly surprising that Foggo’s proposal found no support. The opinion of Colonel More – the committee’s chairman of the day – that the paintings in the ceiling were of historical interest rather than of aesthetic merit was probably widely shared. Thus J. Noël Sainsbury’s important 1859 publication of original documents relevant to the early history of the paintings\textsuperscript{112} would have come as a timely contribution to contemporary attitudes to the ceiling (which he nevertheless described as ‘magnificent’).\textsuperscript{113}

\textsuperscript{109} Waagen, Treasures, 1854, 1, pp. 395-396. In his view Seguier (by implication) has been responsible for the tie technology; he claimed that at the last restoration ‘they [the Canvases] were fastened to the ceiling at various points, thus occasioning all kinds of reflections...’ But it seems unlikely that Seguier was responsible for the system.

\textsuperscript{110} By G.F. Waagen and Sir Charles Eastlake, Director of the National Gallery, in 1850; see their evidence in Report from the Select Committee on the National Gallery; together with Minutes of Evidence, [London] 1850. Waagen and Eastlake repeated the views of the dealer Samuel Woodburn and the collector Edward Solly expressed in 1836 (with Seguier dissenting); see their evidence in Report from the Select Committee on the Arts and their connexion with Manufactures; with the Minutes of Evidence, [London] 1836.

\textsuperscript{111} Report from the Select Committee... (as in note 110), 1853, p. 515, paras. 7265, 7270, and p. 526, para. 7410.

\textsuperscript{112} Sainsbury, Papers, 1859, pp. 183-205.

\textsuperscript{113} Sainsbury, Papers, 1859, pp. XX, 183-184.
A nadir in the reputation and appreciation of the Canvases was reached when the Chapel Royal closed its doors in 1890 due to poor attendance, and the building was made available to the Museum of the Royal United Service Institution, which opened to the public in this, its new home, in 1893 (where it remained for nearly seventy years). Although in the document that granted the Museum the use of the premises reference was made to ‘the fine ceiling with Paintings by Rubens’, the purpose of the then prestigious Museum – to record and glorify Great Britain’s military and naval history – was entirely at variance with the theme of the ceiling that commemorated the ideals and achievements of James I. But it was not to be until 1951 that a criticism in print was made of ‘the cumbersome models of the battles of Waterloo and Trafalgar [which] detract from the general impression [of the Hall]’.

No further restoration work, after Seguier’s, was undertaken during the rest of the nineteenth century. Indeed, in a memorandum dated 19 August 1885, Sir John Robinson, Surveyor of the Queen’s Pictures, expressly stated that ‘no cleaning or so called “restoration” is called for’; although the pictures were ‘considerably obscured by incrustation of discoloured varnish & London dirt ... they are in substantially sound condition’. On 11 April 1904, his successor, Lionel Cust agreed: he reported

114. See the answer to a Parliamentary question tabled on 9 February 1891 and reported in The Times on the following day. In the 1830s, the Chapel Royal pew holders were the leasehold occupiers of houses on the site of the Palace of Whitehall, and therefore distinguished and aristocratic members of society; see the list, dated 17 March 1837, in Public Record Office, Work, 19, 46/1. The Times, 4 November 1890, recorded that in recent years members of the nobility had married in the Banqueting House; the Prince and Princess of Wales attended services there in 1867, 1887, and 1888. The last state occasion, scheduled to take place in the Banqueting House, was the wedding and coronation of King Edward VIII and Mrs Simpson; see the working drawing for the seating plan and decoration of the exterior, stamped 7 November 1936, belonging to the Royal United Service Institute, and exhibited in the entrance to the Banqueting House. The King abdicated on 10 December 1936.

115. The Times, 5 June 1893, p. 12, published arrangements for the grand opening by the Prince of Wales. For the removal of the Museum, see below.


117. The Times, 21 February 1895, p. 12, printed the text of the Prince of Wales’s speech when opening the newly constructed premises of the Royal United Service Institute, adjacent to the Banqueting House: ‘I am convinced however that our officers will not serve their country as efficiently as they might do...unless they are fully versed in the science of modern warfare, and it is because this institution affords them great facilities for acquiring this knowledge that it has afforded its claim to the support of the nation’.

118. Editorial in The Burlington Magazine, XCIII, October 1951, p. 309. Palme, Triumph, 1956, pp. 226-227, referred to ‘the depressing elements introduced by the Royal United Service Institution - the show cases and match boarding, the dusty martial ensigns and banners’.

119. The account of the 1906-07 cleaning stated that restoration took place ‘at a later date in the 19th century’, that is, after 1837 (sic = 1831), see note 101; but no evidence can be found to support this.

120. Public Record Office, Work, 14/147. Subsequent Office of Works’ documents – letters, reports and memoranda – up to 1908 discussed below have this catalogue reference, unless otherwise stated. W. Sinclair, The Chapels Royal, London, 1912, p. 170, reminiscing about the Hall’s use as a Chapel Royal, wrote: ‘The gorgeous figures of Rubens’ immense canvas on the ceiling were certainly incongruous, but were very little seen, and gave a general aspect of dim magnificence’.

122
that the pictures were ‘in as good condition as could be expected…. The varnish in most cases seems to be old and dead and in some parts discoloured’.

In fact, in his biography of Rubens, the English translation of which was published in 1904, the leading Rubens scholar of his generation, Max Rooses, had stated: ‘It is difficult to say now-a-days what artistic value the Whitehall ceilings had. Hardly anything can be seen of them; a brown tone has flooded both light and colour with a kind of warm muddy vapour, so that nothing appears distinctly ... of the decoration which was once the pride of the banqueting-hall only a mournful ruin is left’.121 The extent to which the paintings were obscured by grime and discoloured varnish is shown by his misunderstanding of Procession II (No. 11) where he detected ‘a stag and a wolf’; in the other Procession (No. 10) he detected two lions drawing the chariot, indicating perhaps that Gribelin had earlier faithfully recorded the transformation of the bear into a lion. Five years earlier, Emile Michel, in the translation of his monograph on the artist, had said much the same: ‘the condition of the paintings, damaged by damp and by numerous restorations is very bad. The canvases [were] stretched & blistered, tarnished and darkened’.122

Cust’s memorandum had been made in response to press reports about the condition of the paintings in the ceiling. On 17 May 1906, perhaps resulting from renewed criticism of the state of the paintings, Major Anstruther Gray MP tabled a question in the House of Commons ‘whether his [the first Commissioner of Public Works] attention had been drawn to the state of the Canvases ... and whether he would see his way to have it cleaned’. The Rt. Hon. Louis Harcourt, the Commissioner, in part relying on Cust’s report and that of the much trusted firm of picture restorer’s, F. Haines & Co., who held the royal warrant, replied that the Canvases were in a condition as satisfactory as could be expected, but he agreed that they required cleaning.123 Messrs. Haines were subsequently to decline to give an estimate of the costs involved, because it would be impossible to do so without a close examination and they were ‘too old to do ceiling scaffold work’. They recommended Messrs. White Allom, who held the Prince of Wales’s warrant, and who had done conservation work on pictures at Hampton Court.

121. Rooses, Rubens, 1904, II, p. 534. Rooses had been equally dismissive, although not so much on the grounds of the illegibility of the paintings, in Rooses, Oeuvre, 1886-92, III, p. 289.


123. The Parliamentary Question, reply, and draft replies are in Public Record Office, Work, 14/147; see also The Parliamentary Debates, London, CLVII, 1906, col. 654.
The Office of Works seems then to have decided on a thorough investigation. The Clerk of the Works produced a detailed study of the roof and of the way the ceiling was suspended from it. It is likely too that a scaffolding was put up to enable Messrs. White Allom to make a detailed examination. It was the latter, whose findings were set out in a letter from Charles Allom of 31 July, which resulted in the conservation of the Canvases officially becoming 'a matter of greatest importance and urgency'. Charles Allom had stated that 'The ceiling itself is in very bad condition, much more so than can be seen at first glance, and in fact has been very badly neglected'. The chief cause of the perilously delicate state of the Canvases – so delicate that unless work was soon undertaken 'it will be impossible in another few years, to handle them successfully' – were the canvas ties that had attached the canvas supports at intervals of about three feet to the battens of the stretchers (Fig. 12). Allom warned that a strong wind gusting through one of the dormer windows could blow the Canvases away. On 3 August, Sir Schomberg McDonnell, the Permanent Secretary at the Office of Works, urged the Treasury to allocate funds 'not provided for in the current year' because of 'the urgency and importance of safeguarding the ceiling'.

In November, work began, and a full account was made available on the occasion of the visit of King Edward VII on 20 December 1907 to the Banqueting House, the day before it was reopened to the public. By 1908, this account had been incorporated in the *Official Catalogue of the Royal United Service Museum*; thus the important information provided by the Office of Works could well have been unknown to Rubens scholars. The King's visit and the restoration of the Canvases were widely reported in the English newspapers on the following days and weeks (when photographs were reproduced). *The Times* on 21 December 1907 was full of praise: 'what is really memorable ... is the complete and really wonderful restoration of the famous Rubens ceiling .... Till now it has been very naturally ignored by visitors and has been the despair of students .... It now shows a perfectly even surface, and by the removal of Kent's and Cipriani's repaints ... the nine separate pictures [have been brought back] to their original condition ... probably not much more than the design is his [Rubens's], while the execution is the work of the multiple of clever assistants .... How much all this Rubens himself painted it is impossible to say, one cannot critically examine the handling ... thirty or forty feet away'. In spite or because of such extensive newspaper reports, the restoration was ignored by the specialist art-historical journals.

---

124. See under n. 101.
125. A large number of newspaper cuttings are preserved in an envelope in Public Record Office, Work, 14/147.
THE CANVASES FROM c. 1830 to c. 1970

The crucial aspect of the conservation treatment had been the stabilisation of the Canvases. This was effected by fixing a support of laminated wood, 1.2 cm. (¼ in.) thick, to the stretchers. A canvas support was glued to the wood onto which the original support was then also glued. A trial was made on one of the corner ovals; it was examined and the treatment approved on 12 February when Sir Schomberg met at the Banqueting House Sir Charles Holroyd, director of the National Gallery, the Earl of Carlisle and J. P. Heseltine, both Trustees of the National Gallery, Lionel Cust, and R.C. McColl, Keeper of the Tate Gallery. Mr Abby, R.A. (sic= the Royal Academician, Edwin Austin Abbey), Professor Gerald Moira, and Henri Hymans, mistakenly believed to be director of the Royal Museum, Antwerp,126 were also to be consulted and to approve the treatment that had been devised, so it was claimed, by Charles Allom.

Before the Canvases were thus stabilised, they were cleaned and the relining canvases were removed; this latter intervention revealed a surface of glue or powdered glass, put on, it was surmised, to stiffen the Canvases in order to prevent sagging between the ties, see above p. 115. The sagging had been noted by Waagen. The conservation work took place between December 1906 and August 1907; the room was decorated between September and October. It became public knowledge, while the work was being carried out, that the cleaning (and retouching and varnishing) had been subcontracted to Messrs. Izod.127 Joseph Izod was asked in 1914 what mixture of varnish he had used and, with this additional information, A.P. Laurie of Heriot Watt University was able to report on 6 August of that year that the ‘portion [of the ceiling] I examined was in thoroughly good condition’.128 Two other benefits accrued from the restoration campaign: a full set of photographs was made and

126. McColl’s attendance was never publicly alluded to. The names of the last three experts consulted and also never published were given by Sir Schomberg McDonnell in a letter of 25 February 1907, where Hymans’s occupation was wrongly given (he was in fact Keeper of the Print Room of the Bibliothèque Royale in Brussels, as Frans Baudouin kindly pointed out). Edwin Austin Abbey (1852-1911) – the only Royal Academician with an analogous name at the time – was a member of several distinguished London clubs and foreign societies, and was appointed Official Painter to the Coronation of H.M. King Edward VII, 1903-04. Sir Charles Holroyd recommended that the advice of Professor Moira, Professor of Painting at the Royal College of Art, South Kensington, be sought, as he ‘has had experience of decorative work on a large scale at Lloyds’. In the pamphlet of 1907 (as in n. 101), the Trustees of the National Gallery, and Sir Charles Holroyd, the Director, were thanked. In the account subsequently given (as in n. 101), reference is only made to a ‘committee of experts’.

127. Much to the Commissioner’s and the Permanent Secretary’s anger. See also Charles C. Allom’s letter of explanation of 7 March 1908, in which he also stated that the ‘painting in’ (i.e., retouching) was done by Cooke and Hahn.

128. Public Record Office, Work, 14/162. Some expansion of the laminated supports, which caused thin splits in the canvases, was to be recorded during the 1946/47-50 cleaning campaign; see the reports in Public Record Office, Work 14/2378, copies at Historic Royal Palaces, Hampton Court Palace, Surrey.
the measurements of the canvases were published for the first time. But the photographs were not reproduced nor were the measurements ever recorded in any specialist art-historical magazine.

As was customary, at the time, the actual cleaning was speedily done: the central oval (No. 4) was cleaned in as little as four days in February 1907. Probably it was of a relatively superficial nature; such at least was the conclusion during the next cleaning campaign. How quickly Izod’s varnish of 75% mastic and 25% copal discoloured in London’s smoky atmosphere is not possible to say; but the distinguished art historian and Director of the Warburg Institute, Fritz Saxl, recalled in a letter of 5 December 1946 his pre-War sentiment when studying the ceiling: ‘it was very painful that this single great remnant of the grand style was in such bad condition that I could hardly see any detail of the pictures’.

This echoed the view in 1932 of Emile Cammaerts, who stated: ‘the roof was allowed to deteriorate so badly that, in spite of recent restoration, the central panel ... is now the only one which can give some idea of the original colouring’. In fact, Saxl’s complaint had to a degree been alleviated already by 1925 when good black-and-white reproductions had been published followed by even better ones in 1930. The latter appeared in the London County Council Survey, which is still the fundamental account of the building and the ceiling.

By the end of 1938, when war against Nazi Germany was looming, officials of the Ministry of Works were considering how best to protect the ceiling from bomb damage (from this time the word ‘ceiling’ seems to have become officially synonymous with the nine Canvases that form a major part of it and was used to refer to the Canvases rather than the ceiling as a whole). The choice was whether to put in place protection from incendiary bombs or to remove the ceiling. To effect the latter, a report made early in 1939 pointed out that as all the Canvases had been glued to wooden supports, only the corner ovals could be removed through the largest windows; the other canvases would have to be cut up to remove them from the building. It was decided on grounds of cost

129. See the 1907 pamphlet and subsequent catalogues of the Royal United Service Museum; see under n. 101.
130. See Allom’s letter of 7 February 1907 in Public Record Office, Work, 14/147.
131. Public Record Office, Work, 14/1386. See also under n. 133.
133. Royal Commission on Historical Monuments (England)...London, II, West London, ..., London, 1925, pp. 125 ff. That details were difficult to read is shown by the author’s statement that the chariot of Procession II (No. 11) was drawn by a ram and a monster.
135. For the history of the ceiling during the Second World War, see documents and newspaper cuttings in Public Record Office, Work, 14/2374. Subsequent discussion of Ministry of Works’ memoranda and reports have this catalogue reference.
that the ceiling be only protected against incendiary bombs. As the blitz wrought destruction in central London in the autumn of 1940, concern about the safety of the paintings was expressed. On 17 November, William Gibson, the Keeper of the National Gallery, urged their removal; shortly afterwards, Sir Kenneth Clark, Director of the National Gallery and Surveyor of the King’s Pictures, pressed the point, and on 30 November The Times published a letter from Clive Bell, a distinguished critic and noted figure in the art world, which began: ‘I believe you and some of your readers will be shocked to learn that the ceiling of the Banqueting House is still unprotected’. He urged its removal. Bell had referred to Rooses’s statement that the Canvases were in poor condition. The public pressure was given more weight when this was corrected in a letter to The Times of 3 December 1940, from Van Puyvelde: ‘May I add that probably these paintings are not in poor condition .... I saw the paintings last year ... and, contrary to Max Rooses, I believe these paintings are the work of Rubens and not of his pupils’ (this contradicted his view in his Esquisses de Rubens published in Basle in that year).136

The decision was quickly taken to effect this. On 15 December, a question was tabled in the House of Commons asking what was being done. It was answered on 19 December: ‘a short while ago work began on the dismantling of the ceiling and the panels are to be removed to safe storage’.137 By 14 January, the Canvases were in storage at Hall Barn, Beaconsfield, Buckinghamshire; the home of the Hon. Mrs F. Lawson. A report was made describing their removal; apart from the smaller ovals, they had to be cut into segments between 5.49 to 6.10 metres (18 to 20 feet) long and 2.44 to 2.75 metres (8 to 9 feet) wide. One segment of the Apotheosis (No. 4) had been damaged as it was lowered to the floor.

The Canvases were removed from Beaconsfield on 10-12 July 1945 after the end of the War, and temporarily stored in the Orangery at Kensington Palace.138 The Ministry’s first plan was to effect a minimum of work on them ‘so as to present the same appearance as ... before the removal of the ceiling during the war’. And, in fact, in July 1946, the five oval Canvases and the Canvas for the central compartment at the southern (?) end were re-installed in the ceiling and retouched.

But at the end of that month, Philip Hendy, the new director of the National Gallery, with his colleagues, inspected the remaining segments in the Orangery. In August, he and Gibson, recommended cleaning; and

136. Van Puyvelde, Esquisses, 1940, pp. 36-37, under (Banqueting House) nos. 2, 3, 7, 8, and pp. 87-88, under nos. 71, 72, 74-76, 77.
138. See Public Record Office, Work, 14/1386; subsequent references to Ministry of Works’ memoranda and reports up to 1951 have this catalogue reference unless otherwise stated.
Hendy, in November, suggested that the Canvases, recently installed in the Banqueting Hall, be cleaned and restored in the Orangery along with the others. They were returned at the end of the month. Of significance is the view expressed by Helmuth Ruhemann – a picture restorer of international, if soon to be controversial renown, attached to the National Gallery – that the Canvases he had been able to examine were in a comparatively good state of preservation.

It was to be over a year before the Orangery was adequately set up as a conservation studio, with proper photographic facilities and stands to support the segments. On 7 January 1948, it was reported: ‘After endless delays and hindrances, chiefly brought about by lack of industrial staff and difficulties in getting materials, we have now got the Orangery fitted up ... work is now proceeding satisfactorily’. Eleven of the segments still awaited attention at the middle of the month, and in February it was estimated that another four years was required to complete the work.\(^\text{139}\)

But two years later, the Ministry was being pressed to have the Canvases installed by the opening of the Festival of Britain in May 1951.\(^\text{140}\) At the same time, there was a wish to have them publicly exhibited before their installation. Eleven cleaned and restored segments were taken to the Banqueting House for installation in October 1950; this was followed by an announcement of a forthcoming exhibition in the Orangery from 12-16 December.

On 4 December, a question was asked in the House of Commons whether ‘the Minister of Works ... in view of the great public interest in the Rubens ceiling for Whitehall ... will extend the public viewing of the panels of that ceiling at South Kensington for a further week after 16 December’. The reply made clear the situation: ‘As it is desired to have the ceiling restored to the Banqueting House in time for the Festival of Britain a start had to be made in the replacement of the panels .... It is

\(^{139}\) The work was supervised by superintending architect, J.F.S. Jack; the ‘artists’ and carpenter/technician were photographed at work (neg. nos. G.2636/184/5 deposited at the Historic Royal Palaces, Head Office, Hampton Court Palace) (Figs. 13-15). They were kindly identified by Jan Keevil, a former head of conservation at the Department of the Environment Regents Park Conservation studios, in a letter of 11 May 1993. These were from left to right in G.2636/184: D. Williams, W. Hampton, J. Mead and A.N. Stewart; and in G.2636/185: V.C. Hardingham, Mr Crumbly (carpenter/technician), W. Percival Prescott, W. Hampton and D. Williams. Dated reports on the work in progress were kept by W. Hampton; these reports, with one missing, are at present in the English Heritage Studio Archive, Regents Park, London, accompanied by a set of black-and-white photographs; these were kindly made available to me by Adrian Buckley, Head of the English Heritage Studio, Regents Park, London. A conservation commentary, typed up from the ms. reports, is with Historic Royal Palaces, Hampton Court Palace, Surrey. A published account is by B. Bryant, ‘“Stalwart Young Men”': The First Public Conservation Studios, Collections Review, 3, 2001, pp. 132-134. Some of the original negatives are preserved at Hampton Court, the set has been completed by copy negatives made from the photographs at Regents Park.

\(^{140}\) See Public Record Office, Work, 14/1486.
only possible, therefore, to have nine of the panels on view, and as these are in sections, they are more likely to be of interest to the art expert .... If it is found that the interest is more general than had been expected, I shall be quite prepared to extend the exhibition'.\textsuperscript{141} The duration of the exhibition was extended a further five days.

Exhibited were the two ovals of Hercules and Minerva triumphant (Nos. 6-7), and, in the segments into which it had had to be cut in the winter of 1940, the \textit{Union} (No. 5), and two of the most northern segments of both the \textit{Processions} (Nos. 10-11; Figs. 132 and 148). The exhibition was open to the public from 12 to 21 December. As in 1907, a full account of the work and description of the Canvases was made available, but on this occasion only in the form of press release.\textsuperscript{142}

On the opening day, 12 December 1950, \textit{The Times} reported enthusiastically: ‘To see these immense and heroic paintings at close hand is so extraordinary and invigorating an experience ... the pictures give the impression of being quite literally the work of a giant ... the artist has somehow managed to keep the quality and vitality of a sketch while controlling and organising throughout these vast constructions; all Rubens’s normal brilliance of handling is here and the freshness and luxury of his usual colour’. This enthusiasm was echoed by Sir Gerald Kelly, President of the Royal Academy, in a letter to \textit{The Times} on the following day: ‘The paintings themselves were not, as I had rather expected to find, grand designs by Rubens, carried out by assistants. Instead I found magnificent examples of that great master revealing himself as the giant he was ... these panels are masterpieces by Rubens at his grandest’.

This view was not shared by Neil MacLaren, the assistant keeper in charge of the Flemish and Dutch Schools at the National Gallery who had been an enthusiastic supporter of the cleaning campaign. Ludwig Burchard recorded his disagreement with MacLaren in a letter to another authority on Rubens, Christopher Norris, of 13 December 1950. ‘McLaren \textit{sic}] insisted that he could not see much of Rubens’ hand anywhere. We were standing in front of the ram’s head. In McLaren’s opinion any collaborator could have done such a head. I tried to convince him that at least this ram’s head being first painted by a pupil had afterwards been reinforced by Rubens himself (forehead, eye) (Fig. 152).’\textsuperscript{143} \textit{The Times} had reported on the previous day that ‘When the Ministry of Works restorers got the varnish off they found, nevertheless, that there

\textsuperscript{141} Parliamentary Debates (Hansard), 5\textsuperscript{th} series, vol. 482, \textit{House of Commons}, London, 1951, cols. 15-16.
\textsuperscript{142} A copy is in the Burchard Documentation.
\textsuperscript{143} A copy of Burchard’s letter to Christopher Norris, in which the exchange is recorded, is in the Burchard Documentation.
V. THE SUBSEQUENT HISTORY OF THE CANVASES

was much more of Rubens’s work there than had been suspected’. This view was shared by Professor Ellis Waterhouse, a leading connoisseur and art historian of his generation, who wrote: ‘Recent opportunity for close examination shows that a considerable number of the major figures are executed by Rubens himself’, and by Oliver Millar, a younger authority on Flemish seventeenth-century painting.¹⁴⁴

The Banqueting House was reopened to the public on 1 May 1951. The Times correspondent had been given a preview and reported on 28 April: ‘The visitor must inevitably stumble backwards with craning neck ... to get as good a view as possible of these stupendous masterpieces .... The cleaning ... brought to light ... what must be now considered consummate masterpieces of seventeenth century painting’ (Fig. 10).¹⁴⁵ In commenting on the difficulty of looking at the Canvases, the correspondent was echoing Waagen’s complaint of ‘the inconvenience of looking at them’.¹⁴⁶

The modelli had been greatly admired since the late eighteenth century; but the restoration campaigns in 1831, 1906-07, and 1946/47-50 had not stimulated study of the actual paintings. Indeed, Waterhouse was to state: ‘It [the Banqueting House] has remained the least fruitful and the least studied of the surviving great works inspired by the patronage of Charles I’.¹⁴⁷ In fact, it can be said that it was only three years later – in 1956 – that interest became slightly more focused on it with the publication of Per Palme’s The Triumph of Peace¹⁴⁸ and Millar’s publication of the Multiple Bozzetto (No. 1),¹⁴⁹ two studies which can be said to be seminal to an understanding of the Canvases.

Palme apart, art historians persisted in concentrating on the modelli rather than the paintings. This is demonstrated by Held’s study in the late 1960s of the Multiple Bozzetto, which led him to conclude that the Canvases were incorrectly displayed in the ceiling. This would explain The Times correspondent’s ‘craning neck’; indeed, Held, in his article “Rubens’s Glynde Sketch and the Installation of the Whitehall Ceiling,” published in 1970,¹⁵⁰ stated: ‘few visitors to the great Hall could have

¹⁴⁴. E. Waterhouse, Painting in Britain 1530 to 1790, Melbourne–London–Baltimore, 1953, p. 46; Millar, Rubens Whitehall, 1958, p. 21: ‘The recent complete restoration ... revealed ... evidence of remarkably high quality’.
¹⁴⁵. The editorial of The Burlington Magazine, XCVII, October, 1951, p. 309, was to state: ‘one of the outstanding events in the art world this year had been the completion of the thorough-restoration of Rubens’s ... ceiling .... Those who were privileged to examine the pictures in detail ... during the course of cleaning, and who have since visited them ... are agreed that the work has been executed with signal success’.
¹⁴⁶. Waagen, loc. cit. (as in n. 108).
¹⁴⁷. E. Waterhouse, loc. cit. (as in n. 144); also noted by Donovan, Whitehall, 1995, p. 9.
¹⁴⁸. It is regrettable that Palme’s monograph was never reviewed in The Burlington Magazine.
overlooked the fact that viewing Rubens's ceiling is no undivided pleasure. Several scenes particularly the Peaceful Reign of James I at the south end of the Hall ... force the visitor to look straight up.... The modern visitor ... is informed by a booklet ... that he must walk to the end of the Hall "since the paintings were meant to be seen from the Westminster or south end".151 Held, adducing evidence provided by sixteenth- and early seventeenth-century ceiling decorations that depended on at least two viewpoints (as in some of the Venetian examples not long previously assembled by Schulz).152 was the first to question the arrangement of the Canvases.

The Present Installation

In his article of May 1970, Held concluded that the post-War, and by implication the previous, installation was flawed; he published what he considered to be the authentic arrangement of the Canvases.153 However, certainty in this respect is an impossibility because Rubens's plan would most probably have been set out in the Overall Modello (No. 2), and that modello is no longer extant. It has also to be borne in mind that King Charles I's advisers may have had different ideas when they directed the Canvases' installation. But Held was successful in proposing a disposition of the Canvases that permitted coherent viewing by the spectator. His scheme, with some modification, is that which is in place today; and the present appearance is as likely as not to be that which Rubens had devised.

After the first installation and before the emergency of 1940, changes to the placement of the Canvases could have been effected on the five occasions when cleaning and restoration took place. It is likely, though no documentary evidence has yet been traced, that alterations also took place in 1963-64 when the Hall was redecorated following the removal of the museum of the Royal United Service Institution.154

152. Schulz, Ceilings, 1968. J.D. Stewart, [Review] 'Held, Sketches, 1980', Revue Canadienne de l’Art – Canadian Art Review, 1984, p. 215, pointed out that by no means all Venetian ceilings were thus arranged. In his view the double viewpoint in church ceiling decorations was dependent on the presence of a monks' choir loft above the entrance.
154. The Royal United Service Institute was asked to surrender its Grace and Favour occupation of the Banqueting Hall, which H.M. the Queen then placed in the charge of the Minister of Works, in January 1962; see Public Record Office, Work, 14/2818. The Banqueting Hall was made available in November 1963 and was reopened to the public after redecoration on 22 September 1964; see Public Record Office, Work, 14/2821. See also Colin, King’s Works, 1963-82, VI, p. 549. No reference is made to the movement of Canvases in what would seem to be the relevant file in the Public Record Office, Work, 14/2821.
At issue are both the location and orientation of the Canvases. But precisely what alterations took place and when is difficult (and perhaps ultimately pointless) to establish. There are few verbal descriptions or pictorial records of how the Canvases were arranged, and those that exist are not entirely reliable. The failure to identify a viewpoint or to take into account that which is viewed as a ground plan is the mirror image when transferred to a ceiling and vice versa leaves room for confusion.155 Gribelin’s engraving (Fig. 160; Appendix VI) might provide the earliest evidence for the arrangement of the Canvases; it was published in 1720, thus after Walton’s and before Kent’s cleaning campaigns. Indeed, Thurley has argued that the engraving reproduces the appearance of the ceiling after Walton’s cleaning campaign, during which, it is claimed, the disposition of the Canvases was altered.156 This thesis is improbable, not least because Held had already drawn attention to the likely unreliability of the engraving as evidence of the general disposition of the Canvases due to the fact that the three sheets, of which it is comprised, were designed so as to be legible when displayed vertically. The precise liberties taken with the then current arrangement of the Canvases to make this possible are not certain; Held’s account is probably incorrect.157

Also unreliable is the early nineteenth-century key-plan (Fig. 9), see pp. 117-118, whose purpose was likely to have been a guide for the visitor as he perambulated, thus the relative positions of the Canvases changed with the shifting vantage point. Rooses failed to identify his viewpoints in his accounts of 1890 and of 1904;158 his description was of the disposition made by Seguier in the early 1830s. Only in 1930 did the Survey of London reproduce two photographs with identifiable viewpoints; also published were reproductions of detail photographs of the southern corners.159 Thus was indicated the arrangement of the 1907 installation; in 1962, Croft-Murray published one of the first photographs of the whole ceiling, thus reproducing (in mirror image) the appearance of the ceiling as determined in 1950-51 (Fig. 10).160

155. See also Held, Glynde, 1970, p. 278.
156. Thurley, Whitehall, 1999, p. 136. The archival records referred to by Thurley (p. 177, nn. 49-51) do not seem to refer to any alteration of the placement of the Canvases.
158. Rooses’s first account published in 1890 (see Rooses, Oeuvre, 1886-1892, III, p. 280) confusingly states that he entered the Hall from the southern end, presumably via The Royal United Service Institution. He then stated that the Apollo oval was on the left of the Wise Rule at the southern end, as was the Hercules oval on the left of the Union. For his later description, see Rooses, Rubens, 1904, II, p. 534.
160. Croft-Murray, Painting, 1962-70, I, fig. 62; see also n. 171 below.
The question of location chiefly concerns the corner ovals (Nos. 6-9) and the flanking Canvases (Nos. 10-11) of the central oval. It is obvious where the *Apotheosis* (No. 4) had to be placed. The public, as opposed to the royal, entrance was at the northern end, and the key-plan (Fig. 9) shows that the *Wise Rule* (No. 3) was the furthest from the spectator; this was later confirmed by Rooses, who described it ‘at the far end’.\(^{161}\) This left the central compartment of the northern end for the *Union* (No. 5); a watercolour, probably made after Cipriani’s cleaning campaign, seems to show it in this position.\(^{162}\)

The same watercolour shows the *Hercules* (No. 6) and *Minerva* (No. 7) ovals occupying the north-west and north-east corners respectively. This lateral pairing was already established in the *Multiple Bozzetto* (No. 1; Fig. 46) (which should be considered as depicting Rubens’s early thoughts rather than plans, see p. 147), but in which, if it is treated as an embryonic ground plan, *Hercules* occupies the north-west corner. The key-plan (Fig. 9), if held by the visitor facing north, would also show the *Hercules* oval located there, as does a print of the ceiling published in 1837; this location is confirmed by the most likely reading of Rooses.\(^{163}\)

However, for the installation in 1907, Gribelin and the key-plan were used as ground plans, thus the *Hercules* oval was placed in the north-east corner,\(^{164}\) as it was again in 1950-51. It seems only to have been returned to the northwest corner during the redecoration of the room in the early 1960s following the departure of the Royal United Service Museum.\(^{165}\)

The *Minerva* oval was, of course, correspondingly relocated.

The *Multiple Bozzetto* (Fig. 46) paired laterally what was to become the *Apollo* oval (No. 9) and the *Temperance* (No. 8) oval, with the former diagonally opposite the *Hercules* oval. The key-plan (Fig. 9), like Gribelin (Fig. 160), placed the *Apollo* oval to the left of the *Wise Rule*. The images occupying the compartments at the southern end are exceedingly blurred in Shepherd and Melville’s print of 1841,\(^{166}\) but if anything it is perhaps the legs of Intemperance that can be made out in the south-east corner. But in 1907, having recourse to Gribelin and the key-plan as ground plans, the *Apollo* oval was placed there. In 1950-51 it was placed in the opposite corner where it remains and is now longitudinally in line with

---

162. See *Cox-Norman, Whitehall*, 1930, p. 123.
164. The journal *Black and White*, 28 December 1907, reproduced Gribelin’s print and the key-plan, which was described as the ‘contemporary key’.
165. See n. 154.
the Hercules oval. Held was happy with the lateral pairings of the ovals and their location; however, the question of location of the ovals at the southern end was to be addressed in 1972, see below.

The early location of the Processions is not clear. In Gribelin’s print Procession II (that with the wolf and ram; No. 11) is on the left of the Apotheosis (No. 4), while the key-plan placed it on the right. A photograph taken before the 1906-07 cleaning campaign seems to show it on the left of the Apotheosis (Fig. 12), that is, on the eastern side facing north; the reproduction in the 1930 Survey of London volume shows it occupying the same compartment. However, adhering to Gribelin (Fig. 160), it was placed on the west side facing north in 1950-51. The two Processions seem to have been exchanged during the refurbishment of 1963-64, when the Hercules and Minerva ovals seem likely to have been interchanged.

The location of the Processions redounds upon their orientation, and although on this particular point Held was not convincing in his 1970 article, his general conclusions concerning the orientation of the Canvases formed the major contribution to the debate he had initiated. In 1956, Millar had briefly referred to two viewpoints, which was the basic formula followed by Rubens in the execution of the Multiple Bozzetto (No. 1; Fig. 46). Held applied the lesson to be learnt from the Multiple Bozzetto to the arrangement of the Canvases in the ceiling, and recognised that the principle followed in the 1950-51 installation – that the Canvases be viewed as a coherent whole from the southern end – was incorrect. He stipulated that the main Canvases had to be seen from two viewpoints, the Apotheosis and those at the southern end from towards northern entrance, and those above the northern entrance from towards the southern end. Two further viewpoints were required for the Processions.

In fact, the orientation of the Apotheosis and the Wise Rule and its flanking ovals at the southern end may have been due to Seguier. The photograph taken before the 1906-07 cleaning campaign (Fig. 12) shows the King in the Apotheosis at the northern end of the compartment, as

168. See Cox-Norman, Whitehall, 1930, pl. 33.
169. See under n. 154.
171. A good account of the 1950-51 installation is that by Sutton, Whitehall, 1951, pp. 1236 ff.; his fig. 1 is of the photograph later reproduced by Croft-Murray, Painting, 1962, fig. 62. In the relevant Ministry of Works’ files at the Public Record Office there is no record of a discussion about the reinstallation of the Canvases. There exists only a plan with a description of the Canvases, largely inspired by the early nineteenth-century key-plan, following the arrangement as given in Gribelin’s engraving; see Public Record Office, Work, 31/2288.
172. See the diagram published by Held, Glynde, 1970, fig. 10, p. 278 (repeated in Held, Sketches, 1980, 1, p. 218). In fact, the optimum viewpoints for the main Canvases are not at either ends of the room but more towards the centre.
does a print of the ceiling published in 1837;\textsuperscript{173} and, in 1841, the orientation can be inferred as having gone awry, for the visitor was advised to lie on his back to appreciate the Canvases.\textsuperscript{174} The faint images in the print, published in that year, indicate that the Canvases at the southern end were orientated so that their bases, like that of the Apotheosis, were set at north.\textsuperscript{175} If not Seguier, it is impossible to identify which of his predecessors bears responsibility for the incorrect installation of these Canvases.\textsuperscript{176} The same principle was followed in the 1907 and 1950-51 installations. In recognition of the difficulty of viewing the Apotheosis and the Canvases at the southern end, mirrors on stands were introduced to facilitate viewing in 1907.\textsuperscript{177} Held in 1970 advocated that these Canvases be reorientated.\textsuperscript{178} With their bases, as now, set at the south, there is no difficulty in reading these compositions on the approach from the northern entrance. So far as the Processions were concerned, it seems that only the 1950-51 installation followed Gribelin’s print by placing the baselines on the inner side of the ceiling.\textsuperscript{179} The Multiple Bozzetto (then as-yet unpublished) was to propose the reverse. And, indeed, the latter configuration seems to have been in place following Seguier’s cleaning campaign and the installation of 1907.\textsuperscript{180}

At a meeting convened in the Banqueting Hall on 4 November 1972 to discuss the arrangement of the Canvases,\textsuperscript{181} John Charlton, Inspector of Ancient Monuments, consulted with two \textit{ad hoc} outside advisers: Dr. Roy Strong, then Director of the National Portrait Gallery, and Professor

\textsuperscript{173} See n. 163.
\textsuperscript{174} See \textit{[Cat. Exh.] London Interiors...}, op. cit. (as in note 166), p. 46; the doorkeeper had available a green cloth on which visitors could lie. Waagen had earlier referred to ‘the inconvenience of looking at them [the Canvases]’, see \textit{Waagen, Works of Art, 1838}, III, p. 17.
\textsuperscript{175} See n. 163.
\textsuperscript{176} \textit{Held, Glynde, 1970}, p. 281, believed that the composition of Thornhill’s ceiling decoration of the Painted Hall, Greenwich Hospital, with its two viewpoints was inspired by the orientation of the Canvases in the Banqueting Hall. Thornhill began his work in 1708, which, Held argued, provided a \textit{terminus post quem} for the alteration of the Canvases’s orientation. This could be the case, but Thornhill may not have depended on Rubens for his decision to have two viewpoints, but on common sense and/or Venetian precedent.
\textsuperscript{177} See the report of the \textit{Daily Chronicle}, 21 December 1907, among the clippings in the Public Record Office, Work, 14/147.
\textsuperscript{178} The Ministry of the Environment, then responsible, was early alerted to Held’s thesis and had decided in favour of it in principle, but dependent on public consultation, by 20 October 1970; see Department for National Heritage, File AE/1551/4/1. This file is now deposited in the Public Record Office. Nicholas Casey, of the Department of National Heritage, kindly obtained permission for the author to consult this and subsequent files relevant to 1972. From 5 to 30 July 1972, an exhibition was held in the Banqueting House showing the planned changes, which also involved restoring the arched window in the south wall and removing the late nineteenth-century balustrade there; see Department of National Heritage, File AE/1551/4/1, Part 3. The Banqueting Hall was shut for alterations from 16 October 1972 to 14 June 1973.
\textsuperscript{179} See \textit{Croft-Murray, Painting, 1962}, fig. 62.
\textsuperscript{180} See the print of 1837, referred to in note 163; see also Fig. 12, and \textit{Cox–Norman, Whitehall, 1930}, pl. 34.
\textsuperscript{181} See Department for National Heritage, File AE/1551/4/1, Part 3.
Michael Jaffé, a leading authority on Rubens and Director of the Fitzwilliam Museum. Sir Oliver Millar, the Surveyor of the Queen’s Pictures who had published the *Multiple Bozzetto* in 1956, was unable to attend but indicated that he would accept the conclusion of the others. It was decided that the three Canvases at the southern end be ‘inverted’ (turned to face the opposite direction), but that the *Apollo* and *Temperance* ovals should not be interchanged, and that the *Apotheosis* and *Processions* also be ‘inverted’. The latter meant that the *Processions* are seen to move in a northerly direction with their baselines on the outer side of the ceiling (Fig. 11). Held’s thesis that the *Processions* should be shown as pointing in a southerly direction was by implication rejected and for a spurious reason. The decision to reposition their baselines so as to occupy the outer side of the ceiling is supported by earlier precedent and by their setting in the *Multiple Bozzetto* (Fig. 46). The decision made in 1972 that the *Processions* should face, or be seen to move towards, the *Union* (No. 5) was later to be justified by the prescription in the Projects, in which the *Processions* were directly associated with it.

**Postscript**

From 1945, responsibility for the Banqueting House and the paintings in the ceiling of the Hall continued to remain with the Ministry of Works (it was to have various titles), until it was abolished in 1970. The Banqueting House then became the responsibility of the Department of the Environment until 1988, when it was transferred to the administration of the Historic Royal Palaces agency (from 1998 known simply as Historic Royal Palaces), based at Hampton Court Palace, Surrey. Following a superficial cleaning of the Canvases at the time of the re-arrangement in 1972-73, a further cleaning of a similar nature was carried out in two campaigns in 1994 and 1995.

182. *Held, Glynde, 1970*, pp. 279-280. Held advocated that to obtain his desired arrangement the *Processions* would have to be interchanged and turned 180 degrees, which would confirm that the *Processions* had been swapped in 1963-64 thus altering the 1950-51 installation.


184. The reason given was that the ‘fruits of the Peaceful & Plenteous Reign of James ... (be) borne not to the throne from which they emanate but ... to a grateful people’. See Department for National Heritage, File AE/1551/4/1, Part 3.

185. See *Held, Glynde, 1970*, p. 280, where he drew attention to the baselines of the lateral compartments showing *putti* with garlands in Veronese’s ceiling decoration of the Church of San Sebastiano, Venice (his fig. 13).
The Influence of the Canvases

Rubens's Canvases in the Banqueting Hall exerted only a very slight influence on British artists and on artists active in Great Britain. A misunderstanding of a passage written by Gerbier led Edward Croft-Murray to suggest that he had executed adaptations of the Canvases in a room in York House, an official residence of the Duke of Buckingham in London. It has been suggested that the English-born artist Emmanuel de Critz's three scenes from the Life of Perseus, painted for the Earl of Pembroke in the 1640s on the ceiling of the Double Cube Room at Wilton House, Wiltshire, were influenced by the Canvases, and in particular that the architecture of the central scene may have been inspired by the architectural setting of the Union (No. 5).

Visitors to Robert Streater's (or Streeter) London studio on 1 February 1669 favourably compared his decorations for the ceiling of the Sheldonian Theatre, Oxford, with Rubens's Canvases, and a similar comparison has been made in a recent architectural guide of Oxford. Indeed, Streater may have turned to Rubens's modelli (which he may have owned; they were in the collection of his eponymous son) for the Processions, for while the composition owes nothing to that of the Canvases, several of the putti near the organ loft directly derive from figures in Rubens's Canvases. The personification of Envy owes much, too, to the personifications of Discord and Ignorance in the northern ovals (Nos. 6-7). Some ten years later, Sir Christopher Wren was commissioned to design a mausoleum for King Charles I that was to be erected in St. George's Chapel in Windsor Castle. The mausoleum, which was never built, was to contain a monument to the King, for which two drawings are extant: one long attributed to Grinling Gibbons and the other recently ascribed by J. D. Stewart to

186. Croft-Murray, Painting, 1962, p. 202 under Gerbier I, referring to Sir Balthasar Gerbier D'Ouilly, A British Discourse concerning the three Chief Principles of Magnificent Building, London, 1662, p. 42. There Gerbier (who had been knighted in 1638) recalled how Charles I had stated that 'he had seen in anno 1628 (close to the Gate of York-House, in a Roome not above 35. foot square), as much as could be represented (as to scenes) in the great Banqueting Room'. The King was thus referring to a masque rather than to the Canvases, which of course, had not been executed by 1628.


188. For Pepys’s record of his visit to Streeter’s studio, see pp. 109-110 above.


190. See p. 290, under No. 10c below.


V. THE SUBSEQUENT HISTORY OF THE CANVASES

Cajus Gabriel Cibber. Stewart noted iconographic parallels particularly between the latter drawing and Rubens's Canvases, most notably in the main theme of an Apotheosis and in the conflict between Virtues and Vices. The Hercules and the Victory crowning Peace in the Triumph of Peace by Louis Cheron (active in England after 1695), painted for Halnaker Hall, may have been inspired by the figure of Hercules (No. 6) and one of the Victories in the Wise Rule (No. 3).

Julius Held has suggested that the Canvases influenced Sir James Thornhill's ceiling decoration in the Painted Hall at Greenwich Hospital, executed 1708-14. However, this is chiefly apparent only in individual motifs: in the centre, King William III seated astride the personification of Arbitrary Power recalls Apollo in No. 9; beyond, in the centre, Minerva and Hercules triumphing over the forces of Evil recall the triumphant goddess and hero in the northern corners of the ceiling (Nos. 7 and 6), while below, Hymen recalls Divine Love in Procession II (No. 11) and the figure carrying flags, the Victory about to crown King James I with laurels in the Wise Rule (No. 3).

The design of the ceiling above the staircase in Little Haugh Hall, Norton, Suffolk, by its owner Dr. Cox Macro, may owe something to that of the central oval of the ceiling (No. 4). Francis Hayman was to decorate it with Apollo and the Muses crowning Archimedes in the early 1740's; two of the putti in the spandrels may have been inspired by two in Procession I (No. 10), but the relationship is not close. Christopher White found a connection between the composition of the Union (No. 5) and Reynolds's Infant Hercules; he also detected the presumed influence of the Union on the design of Vincenzo Valdré's ceiling decoration of St. Patrick's Hall, Dublin Castle, executed by 1802, depicting King George III enthroned and surrounded by allegorical figures. John Thomas Smith tracked down a papier-mâché ceiling in the parlour of no. 41, Leicester Fields (in London), which "unskilfully" combined 'groups of figures from several of Rubens' designs' of the central compartments.

193. J.D. Stewart, op. cit., pp. 30-33, pls. 4-5.
194. Ibid., p. 39.
197. See B. Allen, Francis Hayman, New Haven-London, 1987, p. 53, fig. 27, as was kindly pointed out to the author by Christopher White.
199. C. White (as in n. 187), p. 29; the ceiling is reproduced by Croft-Murray, Painting, 1962-70, II, 1970, fig. 134.
CATALOGUE
INTRODUCTION TO THE CATALOGUE

Because the subject matter of Rubens's Canvases for the Banqueting Hall combines both allegory and history, and because the paintings were designed to be seen from different viewpoints, with the chronologically earliest subject (The Union of the Crowns of England and Scotland, No. 5) placed so as to be seen last by the visitor (Pls. 2 and 5), there is no obvious sequence for a catalogue of the nine paintings.

Not surprisingly then, Ludwig Burchard's documentation is in a different order to the sequence given in Max Rooses (Rooses, Oeuvre, 1886–92, III, nos. 763-771). Rooses seems to have followed the likely path of a visitor walking round the Hall: from the Apotheosis to the Processions to the Wise Rule and its lateral ovals; and, finally, to the Union and its lateral ovals. Burchard's sequence is: the Wise Rule (described as the 'Peaceful Reign'), the Apotheosis, the Union, the four 'allegories' – Hercules, Minerva, Temperance, 'Royal Bounty' – and the two Processions (described as 'putto friezes'), beginning with that showing the wolf and ram (No. 11). Julius Held's order, fortuitously or not, was the same, but for exchanging the ovals showing Temperance and 'Royal Bounty' (Held, Sketches, 1980, I, pp. 193-218).

Held preceded his discussion of the sketches for the Canvases with an entry on the Mercury conducting Psyche to Olympus (coll. H.R.H. Fürst von und zu Liechtenstein, Vienna-Vaduz; Held, Sketches, 1980, I, pp. 190-192, no. 129), where he slightly modified Per Palme's thesis of the intended purpose of this modello (see Palme, Triumph, 1956, pp. 255-262). Burchard did not associate this sketch with the Banqueting Hall commission, a standpoint largely vindicated by the prescription for the central oval in the Projects, see Appendix I; thus it is omitted from the present catalogue.

The order of the catalogue sequence follows that of Burchard Documentation, but for two main modifications. First, Burchard (and Held) assigned their chief consideration of the 'Brand sketch' or 'Glynde Place panel', here referred to as the Multiple Bozzetto (No. 1; Fig. 46), to their discussions of the Apotheosis. However, as the work as a whole consists in bozzetti (preliminary sketches) for seven of the Canvases, it is here accorded a separate entry; then in the relevant entries that follow, each individual draft is treated as the first, extant bozzetto in a suggested sequence (for example, No. 4a, No. 6a, etc.) that follows the catalogue entry on the painting itself (often referred to simply as the Canvas) des-
tined for the ceiling. Second, the main entry on the _Multiple Bozzetto_ is followed by that on the lost _modello_ — a coloured (we presume) sketch — sent by Rubens to King Charles I for his approval and catalogued soon afterwards by Abraham van der Doort. As is argued in the text, this probably showed Rubens’s scheme for the whole decoration of the ceiling, and it is here described as the _Overall Modello_ (No. 2). Such being the case, a reference to the relevant part of the _modello_ could have been included in the sequences concerning the individual Canvases. But as we have no knowledge of its appearance, such a reference would have been jejune and has been omitted.

Following the example of Held in his critical catalogue, essays that analyse the iconography and review the historical context precede the catalogue entries for each Canvas; the corner Canvases (Nos. 6-9) are treated as a group in an introductory essay as well. An account of the preparatory work for each composition is given under the entry for each Canvas. As each entry has been written to be — as far as is reasonable — self-contained, there is a fair amount of repetition in those for the preparatory works for each Canvas, which becomes particularly noticeable if they are read in sequence.

It may be helpful here to summarise the analysis of the extant preparatory oil sketches for the commission given in Chapter III. Four categories of oil sketch have been identified: 1) _bozzetti_, executed _en grisaille_, and 2) coloured _modelli_, of which there are three kinds: a) figural _modelli_, in which poses of individual protagonists — often in combination with others — are elaborated; b) compositional _modelli_, in which the configuration of the composition as a whole is developed; and c) _modelli_ for the corner ovals — which share characteristics of a) and b). In the summaries at the end of the entries for Nos. 3, 4, 5, and 10 (which includes a summary for No. 11) and in the alphabetised sub-ordering within each sequence, an attempt is made to reconstruct the development of these compositions. That of the compositions of the corner compartments is more straightforward. In two cases, figures for different compositions are sketched on the same support and thus the supports appear in two separate catalogue sequences: these are Nos. 3d and 5b, and Nos. 3g and 5g.

Following the practice of previous volumes of the _Corpus_, Ludwig Burchard’s opinion concerning authenticity is respected in the catalogue sequences, but any differing opinion is clearly indicated. Suggestions are made concerning the authorship of the Canvases and the degree of Rubens’s participation in their execution. It is necessary to emphasise the very tentative nature of these remarks, as it has not been possible to study any of the Canvases close up for any length of time.
INTRODUCTION

Throughout the cycle Rubens used personifications to express abstract ideas; to avoid repetition, these ideas will be given initial capitals and will not be prefixed with 'personification of', except in the introductory description of each work.

A description of the engraving of the ceiling made by Simon Gribelin II (Fig. 160), to which a detail reference is made in each entry on the Canvases, is found in Appendix VI. A list of related but otherwise unidentifiable sketches recorded in sale catalogues and elsewhere, which is no doubt by no means exhaustive, is given in Appendix VII. A résumé indicating the sources of light in the Canvases is given in Appendix VIII.

Partial Glossary

As is clear from L. and G. Bauer, 'Artists' inventories and the language of the oil sketch', The Burlington Magazine, CXLI, 1999, pp. 520ff., following J. M. Muller, 'Oil Sketches in Rubens's Collection', The Burlington Magazine, CXVII, 1971, pp. 371ff., Rubens would probably have described his preparatory work in oils for the commission as being made up of sketches. The group as a whole served mainly two different purposes; but we do not know what terms Rubens would have used to distinguish them. The noun 'modello' was then, or had by then, been used with the meaning attached to it here, pace L. and G. Bauer; Battaglia, Grande Dizionario, X, p. 646, under 1I, cites three 16th century authors using the word in this sense and Van der Doort described the modello, sent over to Charles I, as 'the Moddle or first paterne', see below, under No. 2. However 'bozzetto' is an anachronism; 'bozza' would convey our meaning as is shown by Battaglia, Grande Dizionario, 11, pp. 336-337, but this is a word not current in art-historical parlance today. Thus the anachronistic 'bozzetto' is used only for convenience.

Some explanation is due over the terms used to describe the dress worn by the female personifications and goddesses. There is no accepted terminology for such imaginary clothing, as is pointed out by Emilie Gordenker, Anthony van Dyck (1599-1641) and the Representation of Dress in Seventeenth-century Portraiture, Turnhout, 2001, pp. 41-44 and 50-60. The loose, full-length garment is here called a 'gown', the upper garment a 'mantle', and the loose drapery, usually around the shoulders, a 'wrap'.
Pl. 1. The interior of the Banqueting Hall, looking south
Pl. 2. The ceiling of the Banqueting Hall (southern end at base)
Pl. 3. The central section of the Banqueting Hall ceiling (Nos. 11, 4 and 10)
Pl. 4. The southern section of the Banqueting Hall ceiling (Nos. 8, 3 and 9)
Pl. 5. The northern section of the Banqueting Hall ceiling (Nos. 6, 5 and 7)
Pl. 6. The Apotheosis of King James I (detail of No. 4, Pl. 3)
Pl. 7. The head of the amoretto who holds the orb and the Imperial Crown (detail of No. 4, Pl. 3)

Pl. 8. The altar and King James I's sceptre (detail of No. 4, Pl. 3)
Pl. 9. The Wise Rule of King James I (detail of No. 3, Pl. 4)
Pl. 10. The Union of the Crowns of England and Scotland (detail of No. 5, Pl. 5)
Pl. 11. Minerva (detail of No. 7, Pl. 5)
12. Temperance (detail of No. 8, Pl. 4)
Pl. 13. The head of King James I and the orb (detail of No. 4, Pl. 3)

Pl. 14. The head of the lion (detail of No. 10, Pl. 3)
CATALOGUE RAISONNÉ

1. *Multiple Bozzetto for Seven of the Canvases (Fig. 46 and details in Figs. 79, 106, 114, 116, 123, 139 and 155)*

Oil on ? oak support, laminated onto a cradled mahogany support; 94.7 x 63 cm.


**PROVENANCE:** Perhaps acquired in Rome by a syndicate, consisting of Thomas Trevor, later Hampden, 2nd Viscount Hampden (1746-1824), Motteux and O’Brien;1 anonymous (Viscount Hampden) sale, London (Christie’s), 31 May 1799, lot 102 (as ‘Rubens, The apotheosis of King James the 1st., the original sketch for the great cieling [sic]’), bt. in for 18 gns. against a reserve of 20 gns.;2 by descent at Glynde Place, Glynde, Sussex, to Mrs. H. Brand († 1979); thence by descent.


In the centre, the apotheosis of King James I is set in an oval. Depicted at the two shorter sides are processions of children, infant Bacchants and amoretti with chariots, animals, a festoon, and a cornucopia of fruit. At the longer sides, in ovals, are Hercules and Minerva and personifications of Abundance or Plenty and Temperance triumphant over personifications of opposing vices.

The support is probably made up of three members with widths, reading from the left, of c. 24 cm., 15 cm., and 24 cm.3 There is a split in the central member running from the top towards the centre of the support. This split and the joins are retouched. There are small losses of paint on the left and right sides, indicating where the edges have been slightly planed down. The sketches bordering the sides are thus incomplete.

It is likely that Rubens first worked in brown, translucent oil wash, as is still evident in the sketches at the top and bottom of the support. This he selectively reworked with touches of white and black paint; the rest he reworked more heavily in white, black, and grey paint following demarcation of the lateral ovals with black chalk. The most heavily reworked area is the sketch in the central oval.

The present sketch, whose attribution to Rubens cannot be doubted, was published by Oliver Millar in 1956; subsequent to his analysis is that provided by Julius Held. Many of the observations that follow were first pointed out by these scholars. In fact, infra-red photography (Fig. 47) – for Held, the expected solution to the difficulty of interpretation by the naked eye – has not elucidated much, nor have X-ray images (see Fig. 50), which are vitiated by the cradling.4
Rubens used the support to sketch designs for seven of the nine compartments of the ceiling. Individual sketches will be treated separately in the entries pertaining to the relevant Canvases and there designated as bozzetti (see Nos. 4a, 6a, etc.). What follows are observations concerning Rubens’s use of the support as a whole.

As Millar observed the support was worked on in three different positions. These are a horizontal format (position A; Fig. 48) and in two vertical formats (positions B and C, Figs. 51-52). Work in position A was not relevant to the commission. Rubens sketched the designs (Nos. 10a and 11a) destined for either side of the central oval, at top and bottom – using positions B and C – and the oval designs (Nos. 6a - 9a), which were to occupy the four corners of the ceiling, between them at the sides. That the orientation of the ovals should be in opposite directions stemmed from Rubens’s knowledge of Italian High Renaissance ceiling decoration, which was often designed to be viewed from different vantage points (see pp. 130-131).

The support was first used in position A (Fig. 48). Millar detected towards the bottom left, a standing man executed in black paint; he faces right, his right leg thrust forward, and wears a doublet and breeches (Fig. 49); his right arm is placed behind his back and he holds something in the crook of his elbow. Behind are three men’s (?) heads also facing right, in front is an illegible object. Above, less clear and perhaps but not certainly related, is a seated woman (?) in a chariot (?) whose wheel can be made out to the left of the eagle; she may have been accompanied by a winged figure also facing right, and above three onlookers may have faced her. There are also many indications of earlier thoughts in black paint in the central field and above it to the right. Infra-red photography (Fig. 47) shows scrape marks made to wipe away these drafts. Scumbled black paint later used as shadows further obscures what was first sketched in this area. The standing figure was unscathed but for his face, which was wiped away and painted over.

Having abandoned the first intended use of the support, Rubens turned it onto its left side, which now became its base, position B (Fig. 51). The grain is now running vertically. The support in this position was first used to sketch, presumably in brown oil wash, the composition to occupy the central oval field; no trace of this can be made out as the design is worked up in grey, white, and black paint (No. 4a). There are traces of brown paint used to encompass the field; these indicate that the oval is irregular, being fuller to the right and flatter to the left. For pentimenti in the central field, see below, under The Apotheosis of King James I (No. 4a). It seems likely that having made the initial draft of the central field, Rubens executed the sketches at the top and bottom of the support using positions C and then B in brown oil wash. In position C (Fig. 52), he allowed ample space between the base of the design and the edge of the support indicating that he either did not intend a further use of the space provided by the support here or that if the extra space was insufficient it was of no account.

Rubens was right handed, so his execution of this sketch (No. 10a) in position C would have presented no problem. He allowed plenty of room before commencing it, and then found there was not space enough, so that two amoretti, perhaps intended to come at the end of the design, had to be included above, in the space left by the cusp of the oval of the central field. That the artist was able to execute the pendant (No. 11a) in position B is a tribute to his dexterity aided by the use of a maulstick. He showed an awareness that there was not space enough, by including a child emerging from below as an introduction; Rubens used the cusp above the design on the left to sketch again the motif used to begin it – a child with a basket on its shoulders.

Rubens depicted nineteen features in the two processions: in that executed first, in position C, were seven children, one chariot and two animals; in that painted later, in position B, were the same number of children and the one chariot, but three animals, one compensating for the fact that the cornucopia was shorter than the festoon. For a further discussion of these two bozzetti for the central, lateral compartments of
the ceiling, see below under Nos. 10a and 11a.

Because the ‘over-runs’ of the processions were sketched on the same side (the left when viewed from position B), the subsequent placement of the ovals could not be symmetrical. Those on the right are closer to the top and bottom of the support than those on the left, and these latter ovals are marginally smaller in extent.10

The likely sequence of work following the execution of the first sketch in the central oval (No. 4a) in position B, was the drafting in position C of the procession (No. 10a), then reverting to position B its pendant (No. 11a), and then also in light brown oil wash, the two uppermost lateral ovals (Nos. 8a and 9a). Reverting to position C, Rubens may have sketched in the same medium the other two lateral ovals (Nos. 6a and 7a), finishing with that on his right. Then using black chalk, he suggested rough demarcations of the lateral ovals.11

The designs in brown oil wash were then elaborated and worked up in white, black, and grey oil paint probably following the same sequence. Most thoroughly elaborated was the central field (where amoretti at the top left were probably then added) and the lateral ovals. The sketches at the top and bottom, especially that at the top, were hardly touched, and give an indication of the appearance of the whole before reworking began. As heavily reworked as the central oval, is the right-hand lateral design (No. 7a) executed in position C where the oval demarcation line was not respected; it is barely visible. For more detailed discussion of the designs for each oval, see Nos. 6a-9a, below.

It is highly improbable that the arrangement of the differently shaped compartments in the Multiple Bozzetto represented Rubens’s notion of the configuration of the openings in the ceiling. Such a design would have been unusual indeed; and it must be assumed that he had at least a vague idea of Jones’s design for the ceiling. Indeed, a good impression of it could have been obtained from a reading of the Projects, see Appendix I.

The artist seems to have been chiefly concerned with working out the iconographic programme; clearly his main purpose was to draft a new theme in the central oval—relying on his own ideas—as it had been decided to abandon that proposed by the Projects. The prescriptions in Project A for the corner ovals were also altered and rearranged. Coincidentally or not, if the Multiple Bozzetto is read as a ground plan, with the base of the support in position B taken as north, then the new pairings were to be placed at the ends of the ceiling in which they are always subsequently recorded.

But this marked the limit at this stage of Rubens’s planning for a coherent disposition of the individual designs. With this reading, the orientation of the Apotheosis oval would be wrong. Although Rubens recognised that the two sets of ovals should be seen from opposite viewpoints, he depicted them with the wrong orientation. Their lighting is inconsistent: the Abundance and Temperance ovals are both lit from the top left, while the Minerva and Hercules ovals are lit from the top and top right respectively. And while the comparative scale of the figures in the pendant compositions is in line, that between the figures in the other compositions has not been addressed.

A calculation can establish that the compartments roughly outlined, or allowed for, by Rubens in the Multiple Bozzetto—even taking into account that it has been trimmed at the sides—are not in proportion to the dimensions of the actual openings in the ceiling. Thus it seems likely that the proposals for the seven compartments were set out on the one support for convenient, individual reference by maximising the use of readily available space. Rubens should thus here be seen as putting this large support to a composite use in a more elaborate way than that he was to adopt for the later figurative studies, see p. 58. That the overall impression looks to be a design for a ceiling decoration must be regarded as fortuitous or as a result of the artist’s playful conceit. This could have relevance when the date of execution of the Multiple Bozzetto is considered, for it would seem to be evidence that Rubens had not as yet had available the dimensions of the Hall, or of the nine openings, nor had he had the opportunity to survey the Hall itself.
No other extant sketch by Rubens seems to be as complex or so multifarious in scope. Comparable is the presentation \textit{modello} executed to show the ensemble of tapestries in the \textit{Triumph of the Eucharist} to cover the east end of the chapel of the convent of the Descalzas Reales in Madrid on the feast of Corpus Christi and on Good Friday; but this was executed after Rubens had determined on the compositions of each individual tapestry in order to show how they were to be arranged.\footnote{Millar has suggested that the present work could have been executed just prior to Rubens’s departure from Antwerp to London in 1629,\footnote{Held believed that it was executed in London in late 1629 or in 1630 before his return to Antwerp. It may well be that “it could have served as the basis for discussion ... with Charles I”, but this does not mean that it had to have been executed immediately before or very soon after Rubens’s arrival in England. Held has stated that when Rubens executed the sketch, he “knew precisely what the problems of the ceiling were and how he planned to solve them”. But, as is argued above, this seems not to have been the case. That the cycle was early a matter of Charles I’s consideration is shown by Danvers’s letter to Trumbull of 19 May 1625; the wording is obscure but allows the assumption that at the least the King was thinking about the scheme, and that Danvers hoped soon to be able to send the measurements for the paintings, see p. 46, to Rubens. In the same month, Rubens was to meet Buckingham in Paris, and subsequent contact with him (until his death in August 1628) and more frequently with Gerbier could have provided the opportunity for further discussion of the commission, for which one programme had probably already been written by 1625 and a second had been, or was in the process of being, devised, see pp. 32-33. And it seems more than likely that the present work was painted at least by the time Rubens left England in early 1630.}
The proposition for a dating within a further reduced time bracket of the early summer of 1625 to the first half of 1626 has to be \textit{ex silente}; it assumes that Rubens could have been sent (or given by Gerbier) copies of the Projects, from which he would have gained some idea of the configuration of the compartments.

There is no other work by the artist that compares closely with the \textit{Multiple Bozzetto} on stylistic grounds. The handling seems to be of the 1620s. The central motif most closely connects with that in the \textit{modello} for the \textit{Duke of Buckingham conducted to the Temple of ‘Virtus’} in the National Gallery (Fig. 18), which Held has dated as early as \textit{c}. 1625,\footnote{The bodies are not as generously proportioned as those in the preparatory oil sketches, with their more generous forms, for a carver and silversmith normally dated to the very early 1630s.\footnote{The altarpiece was completed by June 1628; works made in preparation are dated by Held to 1627-28.\footnote{The abandoned preliminary work done when the support was in position A has not been directly associated with any other known composition by the artist. Millar has suggested that the standing man may have been an idea for the}} and which at the least had been executed by September 1627 when the finished canvas was probably ready for shipment.\footnote{The proposition for a dating within a further reduced time bracket of the early summer of 1625 to the first half of 1626 has to be \textit{ex silente}; it assumes that Rubens could have been sent (or given by Gerbier) copies of the Projects, from which he would have gained some idea of the configuration of the compartments.

There is no other work by the artist that compares closely with the \textit{Multiple Bozzetto} on stylistic grounds. The handling seems to be of the 1620s. The central motif most closely connects with that in the \textit{modello} for the \textit{Duke of Buckingham conducted to the Temple of ‘Virtus’} in the National Gallery (Fig. 18), which Held has dated as early as \textit{c}. 1625,\footnote{The bodies are not as generously proportioned as those in the preparatory oil sketches, with their more generous forms, for a carver and silversmith normally dated to the very early 1630s.\footnote{The altarpiece was completed by June 1628; works made in preparation are dated by Held to 1627-28.\footnote{The abandoned preliminary work done when the support was in position A has not been directly associated with any other known composition by the artist. Millar has suggested that the standing man may have been an idea for the}} and which at the least had been executed by September 1627 when the finished canvas was probably ready for shipment.\footnote{The bodies are not as generously proportioned as those in the preparatory oil sketches, with their more generous forms, for a carver and silversmith normally dated to the very early 1630s.\footnote{The altarpiece was completed by June 1628; works made in preparation are dated by Held to 1627-28.\footnote{The abandoned preliminary work done when the support was in position A has not been directly associated with any other known composition by the artist. Millar has suggested that the standing man may have been an idea for the}}
figure of King Henri IV in the Capture of Paris, one of the designs for the Life of King Henri IV.25 Rubens’s more developed proposal for this subject is the modello at Berlin, which Held has dated to early 1628.26 If Millar’s proposal is accepted, it could provide an approximate stylistic terminus post quem for the execution of the Multiple Bozzetto. How long the support with its first, unfinished, preparatory work remained in the studio before it was put to its second use is not known, but it could have been some weeks or months. A date of execution for the Multiple Bozzetto in the first half of 1628, before Rubens’s departure for Spain in the late summer is thus perhaps to be preferred. By this time, the artist would have presumably had favourable reactions from London to the Duke of Buckingham conducted to the Temple of Honour and ‘Virtus’ (Fig. 19), a work which may well have reinforced Charles I’s hope that he should execute the cycle to decorate the Banqueting Hall ceiling and which led to the King’s request that the prescription for the central compartment of the ceiling be replaced by a suitable subject expressed in a comparable composition. In support of such a date is the fanciful apparel of King James, which indicates that Rubens had not yet received instructions as to what costume it was considered appropriate that the King should wear, or that he had not yet had explained Project B’s ‘Royall robes’, the King’s Parliamentary robes.

For Rubens to have then executed the Multiple Bozzetto at the prompting of Gerbier or Carlisle when he met with Rubens in Antwerp in May 1628, or more likely during their subsequent, short journey from Brussels to the border in June, see p. 47, would have been as consistent as had been his earlier diplomatic contacts with Gerbier in search of peace and his work for Buckingham.27 The execution of the Multiple Bozzetto and the ideas it set out did not in themselves result from, or express, an alteration in Charles I’s bellicose foreign policy, as has been suggested, but it implied an appreciation of his father’s outlook.28 While it partially elaborated subject matter proposed in Project B, see Appendix I.2, the iconography of the central composition was a new departure, devised by Rubens to show the now dead monarch about to account for his deeds to the Almighty. Charles I’s recognition of the wisdom of his father’s pacific policy is fully articulated in the Wise Rule (No. 3), the composition of which, with that of the Union, was presumably to be drafted by Rubens on a separate support or supports, see Nos. 3a and 5a.

That this was anticipated at about the same time as the execution of the Multiple Bozzetto is suggested by Rubens’s elaboration and rearrangement there of the conceits, as specified in Project A, see Appendix I.1, for the corner ovals. Although the virtues and their opposing vices that Rubens chose to portray were both relevant, uncontroversial, and lacking in specificity, see Nos. 6-9, he may well have considered them to be appropriate as pendants to the compositions they were to flank. While the Union (No. 5) was presented in both Projects, the Wise Rule (No. 3), partly inspired by a selective reading of both Projects, was, like the Apotheosis, a new departure. However, the subject matter of the Wise Rule – if only in a preliminary formulation – would have been acceptable to Charles I already by the summer of 1628,29 even if the peace treaties with France and Spain had yet to be settled. Significantly its final formulation led to the alteration of one of the prescriptions in the Multiple Bozzetto, see under No. 9.

The dating proposed above relies primarily on stylistic evidence, and is favoured by the present author. But the fragility of such evidence is readily admitted. Thus the slightly later dating for the execution of the Multiple Bozzetto – one dictated more by practicality – to the months of 1629 and 1630 when the artist was in England, before he had studied the required apparel for James I, is left to stand as an alternative.

1. See next note.
2. See the auctioneer’s sale catalogue, Christie’s archive, London. Lots 100-108 were offered as ‘Pictures lately brought from Rome’; the owners are identified by the auctioneer’s note in the catalogue. Lot 102 was originally assigned to ‘Trevor’ (presumably Lord Hampden’s brother,
The Hon. John, who briefly succeeded him in the title. The main seller was Nathaniel Bayly, under whose name the sale is listed by Lugi, Répertoire, I, no. 5930; see also Martin, Cat. National Gallery, 1970, p. 152, n. 45; G. Martin, in Cat. Exh. Dynasties, under no. 151. Held, Sketches, 1980, I, p. 203 under no. 135, referring to Rooses, Oeuvre, 1886-1892, III, p. 281, under no. 763-3, placed the picture in the Nathaniel Bayley [sic] sale under copies of the St Petersburg Apotheosis (No. 4e).

3. Millar, Whitehall, 1956, p. 264, noted what he considered to be a join approximately 33 cm. from the right edge; he suggested that the support was originally smaller and that it was later enlarged by the addition of this right-hand member. Held, Sketches, 1980, I, p. 199, under no. 133, noted the two joints about 14 cm. apart.

4. The author thanks Martin Wyld and Rachel Billinge of the National Gallery for their help in trying to decipher the pentimenti, and Martin Wyld for providing technical photographs made by the National Gallery Photographic Department.


8. The projected sequence that follows elaborates that suggested by Held, Sketches, 1980, I, p. 199, and differs from that suggested by Millar, Whitehall, 1956, pp. 261, 264.

9. As can be inferred from Rubens’s letter to Dupuy of 6 March 1628, Magurn, Letters, 1955, p. 242, no. 152.

10. As observed by Held, Sketches, 1980, I, pp. 199-200.

11. Held, Sketches, 1980, I, p. 199, wrongly stated that the lines in black chalk ‘such as the circumferences of the oval fields’ were ‘preliminary’.

12. Ibid., where it is described as occupying ‘a unique place among Rubens’ sketches in oil’.

13. The comparison is due to Held, Sketches, 1980, I, p. 199. For the modello of The Adoration of the Eucharist at Chicago, see Held, Sketches, 1980, I, p. 159, no. 111. For McGrath’s reconstitution of the modello for the north and south walls of the chapel, see p.74, n. 89.


15. Held, Sketches, 1980, I, p. 200, under no. 133; this is the date also preferred by Jaffe and Donovan, cited under Literature.


17. See Held, loc. cit.


23. For the drawing, see Held, Drawings, 1959, I, p. 117, no. 53; II, pl. 58: Burchard-d’Hulst, Drawings, 1963, I, no. 145, pp. 225-227, and II, pl. 145v. Also comparable is the Infant Jesus in the pen drawing at Darmstadt; see Burchard-d’Hulst, Drawings, 1963, I, no. 131, pp. 204-205 (where dated 1624-27), and II, pl. 131.

24. See n. 22 above.

25. Millar, Whitehall, 1956, p. 264. Held, Sketches, 1980, I, p. 200, described ‘these earlier studies’ as ‘too indefinite for one to be certain about them’.


27. For which, see Held, Sketches, 1980, I, pp. 391-395, under nos. 291, 292.

28. As, for instance, by this author in his entry in Cat. Exh. Dynasties, under no. 151.


2. Overall Modello

Oil on canvas; c. 93 x 56 cm.

Whereabouts unknown; probably destroyed.

PROVENANCE: Sent by Rubens to King Charles I before May 1633, see below, and displayed in the ceiling of the Cabinet Room, Whitehall Palace, see below; recorded there by Abraham van der Doort c. 1639; probably destroyed in the Whitehall Palace fire of 1698.

LITERATURE: Millar, Van der Doort, 1958-60, pp. 76 and 91.

Abraham van der Doort’s catalogue entry is the only source of information about the modello.

The heading and entry reads as follows:

‘By your Mat's especiall command your pictures ... yee had kept at St Jameses / in the Cabbonett roome, were transported / and brought to Whitehall into ye privy = / Gallery in ye Mat's new erected Cabonnett. / roome, whereof the perticulers ... from St James’s as / alsoe other Pictures ... since by yor Matie thereunto augm= / ented do the appeareth as followeth ...
The phrase 'upon the right lighte' means that 'the light falls from the spectator's left'.

The modello would have summarised not only the subject matter decided on following discussion of the Projects, see Appendix I, and presumably finalized in London, but also the way Rubens intended to depict the subjects in the nine compartments. Some duplication of what was set out in the Multiple Bozzetto (No. 1) would then have been unavoidable. That it showed Rubens's solution to the problem presented by the requirements of the different viewpoints is indicated by its display in the ceiling of the Whitehall Palace Cabinet Room. A display of the modello in a vertical position would have meant that part of the design would have been upside down and illegible. The support was larger than Gribelin's detailed engraving, see Appendix VI, which reproduced the carved ceiling and contained four margins, thus there could have been ample space for Rubens to depict all the agreed upon motifs.

Van der Doort stated that the modello was sent to the King for his approval, thus implying that it was executed in Antwerp after Rubens's return there in the spring of 1630. As it is likely that Rubens began work on the commission in the spring of 1632, see p. 55, and as it was reported that work on the Canvases was well under way in May 1633, see p. 55, a date of execution for the modello of c. 1632 is likely.

It is impossible to be certain at what point during the preparatory work the modello was executed. The comparable modelli for the Triumph of the Eucharist tapestry series were painted at an early stage (De Poorter likened them with the Multiple Bozzetto), but this by no means acted as a constraint to subsequent alterations to, and elaborations of, the designs. Because of Rubens's execution of the Multiple Bozzetto (No. 1; Fig. 46), the modello would not have set out the artist's early thoughts, but it could represent his thoughts once he returned to the commission in 1632. However, the quite drastic formal and iconographic alteration of the composition of the central oval (No. 4) and the marked elaboration of the central, rectangular compositions (Nos. 3 and 5) probably resulted from comments made on the Overall Modello once it had been studied in London. It is thus reasonable to assume that it was executed towards what Rubens would have considered as the end of the design process; it was thus to precede - as it turned out - the final, compositional modelli for the central Canvases, see Nos. 3h, 4e and 5h.

Since 1837, the modello, sent to the King, has often been identified with the sketch depicting the Apotheosis in the Hermitage (No. 4e). Burditch did not believe this. Irrespective of the status of the Hermitage picture, it seems highly unlikely that Rubens would have sought the King's approval for a design for only one, albeit the most important, compartment of the ceiling. The Apotheosis had not been adumbrated in the Projects, and was thus a new subject, but then nor had the Wise Rule (No. 3) as it was finally developed, and the Projects' proposal for the Union (No. 5) had been much edited and amplified.

Like the Canvases themselves, the modello - also set in a ceiling - was not listed by the Trustees for sale of the King's (Charles I, executed in 1649) goods and personal effects. It may either have been stolen from the Palace after the King abandoned London or after his execution, but this seems unlikely; it could have been overlooked or deliberately omitted as a fixture reserved for the use of the Commonwealth, see p. 106. It was apparently never subsequently mentioned after its cataloguing by Van der Doort; it could thus have remained in the ceiling.
of the Cabinet Room until the room was destroyed in the fire of 1698.

1. See Millar, Van der Doort, 1958-60, p. xx, for the date of Van der Doort’s compilation of the catalogue.

2. Ibid., p. 76 for the heading; p. 91 for the entry.


4. See n. 2. The ‘kinge’s rich cabonett’ in Whitehall Palace was fitted out with shelves and cupboards in 1630-31; see Calvin, King’s Works, 1963-82, II, pp. 341-342.


6. Ibid., p. 86; De Poorter recorded, p. 86, n. 5, two other modelli with multiple designs.


Another manuscript catalogue of the same group of pictures (belonging to Charles I) had been published in 1752; see A Catalogue and Description of King Charles the First’s Capital Collection of Pictures ... the whole transcribed and prepared for the press ... by the late ingenious Mr Vertue, 1752, p. 161, no. 5 (for the modello). But the identification was not advanced by either Walpole or then Dallaway in Anecdotes of Painting in England...Collected by the late Mr George Vertue etc., published in 1826. Recently, this identification has been repeated by Muller and Murrell (as in note 3), p. 177, n. 93.

They claimed that Sanderson in W. Sanderson, Graphice, London, 1658, p. 74, was referring to the Apotheosis sketch (No. 4e), when he wrote ‘So Ruben in affected Colouring sometimes in the privy Gallery at Whitehall’. They argued that it was the ‘Only [one] picture by Rubens listed in seventeenth-century inventories of the Privy Gallery’. But Van der Doort listed no paintings by Rubens in the Privy Gallery per se; see Millar, Van der Doort, 1958-60, pp. 23-34. Thirley, Whitehall, 1999, p. 93, fig. 99, showed the Cabinet Room as one of a suite of rooms off the Privy Gallery. Sanderson was probably referring either to the present modello in the ceiling of the Cabinet Room, or (but less probably) to Rubens’s early Portrait of Vincenzo Gonzaga (Jaffe, Catalogo, 1989, no. 38), which Charles I had acquired before his accession to the throne, and which hung in a room between the Breakfast Chamber and the Long Gallery, for which see Millar, Van der Doort, 1958-60, pp. 23-34. John Smith did not refer to either the modello owned by Charles I or the picture in the Hermitage (No. 4e) in his Catalogue, 1829-42, II, and Supplement.

8. Burchard Documentation.

9. The contents of the Cabinet Room were split up and moved about during the Civil War and Interregnum, but the modello is not specifically mentioned in the documents, for which see Millar, Inventories, 1972, pp. XII ff.; he did not believe that there was much theft of royal property during the Civil War.

3. The Wise Rule of King James I

The Iconography

For the painting, which came to occupy the central compartment at the upper, or southern, end of the ceiling, none of the thematic prescriptions – taken as a whole – in the Projects, was judged to be suitable. In response to the foreign policy of King Charles I, which was in process of revision (or had been revised) as the re-establishment of peace came to be seen as the most desirable objective, one subsidiary conceit proposed in the Projects, see Appendix I, were developed. These ideas were amplified and transformed, chiefly by deciding to celebrate and commemorate the role to which King James I had attached supreme importance: that of keeper and promoter of peace. The result was an allegorical portrayal of the King in triumph as he wisely exercised his prerogative power to bring war to an end and to procure and maintain peace, see p. 101, as indeed he had from the time he ascended to the English throne.

The Canvas (Fig. 53) principally shows James I about to be invested with the triumphal crown (corona triumphalis). That the painting was probably intended to be displayed above the cloth of estate (or the ‘state’) in the Banqueting Hall, before which extraordinary ambassadors offered their reverences or respects (in modern parlance) to the King at their first public audiences, would have made the subject matter the more suitable, and indeed could have been influential in its conception.

The first benefit that James I claimed to have brought to his new English subjects was peace.
In his speech to the inaugural Parliament of his reign in England, made on 19 March (o.s.) 1604, he stated: 'The first [blessing] then ... is outward Peace: that is peace abroad with all forreine neighbours'. In the pursuit of the maintenance of peace, the King greatly expanded diplomatic contacts that had markedly declined in the last decades of Queen Elizabeth I's reign. In recognition of the importance of such exchanges, one of the King's first acts was to create the post of Master of Ceremonies, a title borrowed from the Papal Curia and given to an official who was to be responsible for assisting visiting diplomats.\(^5\)

Fifteen years later when the King was at the height of his powers, there appeared a pamphlet *The Peace-maker: Or, Great Brittaines [sic] Blessing*, with which the King was associated by virtue of the royal coat of arms that appeared on the opening pages.\(^6\) This work celebrated the King's achievements, inspired by the 'hallowed text' - 'Beati Pacifi'\(^7\) - the motto he had adopted.\(^8\) It expatiated on the international recognition of his role as peace-maker: 'Nay, what Christian Kingdome that knowes the blessing of peace, has not desired & tasted this our blessing from us? Come they not hither as to the Fountaine from whence it springs? Here sits Salomon, and hither come the Tribes for Judgements: Oh happy Moderator, blessed Father, not father of thy Country alone, but Father of all thy neighbour Countries about thee. Spaine, & her withholding Prounsices thou hast set at peace ...... Denmarke and Sueavia, Sueuvia and Poland, Cleve and Brandenburg: haue not these & many more come to this Oracle of Peace, and received their doomes from it?\(^9\) The same theme was taken up in Ben Jonson's masque *The Gypsies Metamorphos'd* of 1621, in which the King's fortune was read: 'To see the wayes of truthe you take / To ballance business, and to make / All Christian differences cease: / Or till the quarrell and the cause / You can compose, to glue them lawes, / As Arbitre of warre and Peace? / ffor this, of all the world you shall / Be stiled James the Iust'.\(^10\)

The King had described Solomon as 'that great patterne of wisedome',\(^11\) and in 1618 he was himself described as Solomon, an appropriation that found its fullest form in Bishop Williams's\(^12\) tribute given at the King's funeral in Westminster Abbey on 7 May (o.s.) 1625. It was published with the title *Great Britains [sic] Salomon*, the first book to appear on the recently deceased King.

Williams's thesis was that God had made 'a lively *Repraisentation of the Vertues of Salomon* in the Person of King James'.\(^13\) Of one of many points of comparison, Williams singled out that 'Salomon was honoured with Embassadors from all the Kings of the Earth ... and so you know, was King James'.\(^14\) In praising the peaceful reign of the late King, he observed that 'But for the managing of a long, and a continued Peace, no lesse is required than the Wisedome of Salomon'; 'any Phaethon will serve to fire the world, but none besides the God of Wisedome can keepe it in order.'\(^15\) Thus James I 'can be honoured of all Europe ... he that held the Ballance of all Europe; and, for the space of twentie yeares at the least, preserved the peace of all Europe'.\(^16\)

Because of hostility towards Spain and militant Catholicism in Europe stimulated by the resumption of war in and near the Netherlands, following the Battle of the White Mountain in November 1620 and the end of the Twelve Years Truce in April 1621 such pacific aims would have been unpopular in Great Britain (except with the Catholics, some of whom were highly placed) towards the end of the King's reign or in the three years or so following his death.\(^17\) The Venetian agent reported after the King's death: 'In this very serious event [the Kings's death] one can say that the universal joy was greater than the sadness of individuals.\(^18\) Simonds D'Ewes, who was to be a moderate supporter of Parliament in the Civil War (having recently been created a baronet by Charles I), in his *Autobiography* (written in 1638 relying on his earlier diaries) recorded that, following the King's burial: 'It did not a little amaze me to see all men generally slight and disregard the loss of so mild and gentle a Prince, which made me even then fear that the ensuing times might yet render his loss more sensible, and his memory more dear unto posterity. For though it cannot be denied that he had his vices and deviations ...
yet, if we consider his virtues and learning ... we cannot but acknowledge that his death deserved more sorrow and condolement from his subjects than it found'.

Neither of the Projects had sought to illustrate the King's dedication to the pursuit of peace, although they envisioned celebrating the happiness resulting from the internal peace created by the union of the crowns in the flanking paintings of the central oval, see p. 279. Project A selected the King's learning as a matter worthy of tribute, while Project B came closest to celebrating the King's espousal of peace in the negative sense of his rejection of war: 'King James sett out in Royale robes ... to be in the act of repelling Mars & Bellona with one hand, & receiving Minerva & Astraea with the other', see Appendix 1.2. It was decided to adapt this formula by substituting Peace and Plenty for Minerva and Astraea, and amalgamate it with the same general theme expressed in the picture (in the National Gallery) that was to be considered appropriate as a gift to be offered by Rubens to Charles I. This picture was executed by Rubens and then given to the King while he was in London (Fig. 24). The allegory, acted out by the King's father, thus had the clearest relevance to the then current political situation in Great Britain: Charles I had determined on restoring peace with his foreign enemies as he assumed the direction of internal as well as external affairs, see pp. 99-100, following the death of the favourite, Buckingham, in 1628.

Baumstark has drawn attention to the close thematic connection between the allegory in the National Gallery picture and that which came to occupy the compartment above the 'state' in the ceiling. In both, Minerva repulses Mars and his attendant evils so that peace can flourish, thus elaborately paraphrasing the rubric on a print after Jacopo Tintoretto by Agostino Carracci (Fig. 42): 'As Wisdom ejects War, Peace and Abundance rejoice together' ('Sapientia Martem depellente Pax et Abundantia cogaduent'). But whereas it is the figure of Peace in the National Gallery picture, with her attendant blessings, who is most prominent, in the ceiling Canvas (No. 3; Fig. 53) it is James I, the embodiment of Wisdom, who dominates. He is thus depicted as triumphant in his role as monarch, whose wisdom and power were such that he did not require 'to be conducted by ... Religion ... [and] Concorde' as Project B had proposed, see Appendix 1.2. The final idea, settled on in the Canvas itself, was to show the King divinely inspired through the agency of the heavenly light above (Figs. 54 and 55), which Rooses remarked on, and which Fredlund likened to the light emanating from the Holy Spirit in Rubens's title-page for F. Longo a Coriolano, Summa Conciliorum Omnium, Antwerp, 1623.

Of all the facets of the King's sovereignty, the most jealously guarded (until a slight relaxation in the last Parliament of his reign in 1624) was the conduct of his relations with foreign powers. It is probably this aspect of the royal prerogative that is the basic subject here. Probably, too, no particular set of circumstances, in which the King had succeeded in obtaining the renunciation of war by negotiation and the practice of the arts of peace, inspired the allegory: rather it was intended as an illustration of his general policy and outlook.

Rubens's depiction of the King's widely proclaimed concept of his irresistible authority, for which he was answerable only to God, in the Wise Rule sharply contrasts with the deployment of the Infanta Isabella in the Apotheosis of the Infanta Isabella, one of the decorations for the Pompia Introitus Ferdinandi. There she also is the prime mover in the allegorical narrative scene that takes place below, but she modestly looks down from Heaven as King Philip IV despatches his brother, the Cardinal Infante Ferdinand, to the Netherlands as Governor. Two gods – Jupiter and Minerva – are present as the retinue. Jupiter, ostentatiously holding his thunderbolts, is a symbol of dominion or supreme power (imperium) and force (potentia); Minerva is depicted not in her role as the goddess of Wisdom, but – as Gevartius makes clear – as the presiding goddess of the arts of War and Peace ('belli pacisque artibus praeses dea'). Minerva may be intended to play this same role in the present composition, where she is recognisable as elsewhere in the cycle, by her helmet, breast-
plates and shield.\textsuperscript{31} She is already armed with Jupiter’s thunderbolts in the record of what was probably the second compositional \textit{modello} (No. 3c; Fig. 61), and eventually thus armed in the Canvas (Fig. 57), where she overcomes Mars, who, even in war, was the less powerful.\textsuperscript{32} Virgil, \textit{Aeneid}, VIII, 435-438, described Minerva’s shield as it was made in Vulcan’s forge: ‘and eagerly with golden scales of serpents [they] were burnishing the awful aegis, armour of wrathful Pallas, with interwoven snakes, and the Gorgon’s self on the breast of the goddess, with neck severed and eyes revolving’.\textsuperscript{33} For Rubens the description of Medusa’s revolving eyes could have inspired and would justify the differing expressions given to the face of Medusa as he prepared for the composition, see below.

In the \textit{Apotheosis of the Infanta Isabella}, the Cardinal Infante is accompanied by two \textit{genii}, one holding a symbol of war (Minerva’s aegis) and the other, symbols of peace (the caduceus and cornucopia).\textsuperscript{34} Beneath, the text ‘and ready for either event’ (‘in\textit{ vtrvmqve paratvs}’) indicates that to achieve his end, the Governor had to be prepared to use both war and peace.\textsuperscript{35} In a similar manner, just as James I is depicted as having at his behest Minerva to repulse Mars, so he has at hand Mercury to subdue or pacify Fury (\textit{Furor}), see below, with his caduceus.

Mercury (Fig. 58) is depicted in the bottom left hand corner of the composition besides what appears to be rough terrain. This now looks much the same as it does in Grubelin’s engraving (Fig. 66; see Appendix VI). It may be that Grubelin misunderstood this passage, or that the restorer Walton, see p. 114, had already distorted it. Rubens’s original intention was probably fairly accurately recorded in the design recorded in No. 3c (Fig. 61), and may have been partially understood by the hand that executed the free (?) copy made after a figural \textit{modello} (?) by Rubens for the god (No. 3g; Fig. 63). Both Cartari and Ripa\textsuperscript{36} record that in classical times, statues of Mercury, placed on public roads, were surrounded by piles of stones, the stones having been thrown by passersby as offerings to the god. It may be that the indeterminate mounds behind Mercury and beneath the ledge in the Canvas were originally intended as piles of stones; they were read as ‘rocks’ during the 1946/47-50 cleaning campaign, see also below p. 163.\textsuperscript{37}

Mercury is present, as the messenger of the gods and as the god of eloquence, to demonstrate James I’s use of peaceful means to quell discordant fury; Mercury points the caduceus, symbol of peace and ancient insignia of ambassadors,\textsuperscript{38} at what is probably the figure of Fury (?), see below, already knocked flat by the force of Minerva’s expulsion of Mars. Mercury’s action thus illustrates the King’s reliance on diplomacy and ambassadors whose duties ‘to build up friendships and conclude treaties’ were thus to be described by Rubens in his explanation of the frontispiece he designed, 1635-1638, for F. de Marselaer’s \textit{Legatus Libri duo}; there Minerva extends her right hand to Mercury’s to ‘conclude affairs in a friendly way’.\textsuperscript{39} Rubens followed the traditional iconography of the god by depicting him as a beautiful youth with a winged cap and a cloak covering his left shoulder.\textsuperscript{40}

The portrayal of Mars (Figs. 57 and 59) in the ceiling differs from that in the National Gallery picture (Fig. 24) and in the other related works where he always appears in armour and holding a shield and sword. While the figure is in armour, he has no shield and his sword is sheathed, and he holds in his right hand a flaming torch. Indeed, there has been uncertainty both about what this figure was intended to personify and what he is doing. It remains an open question as to whether Rubens here attempted to define a certain type of war; Held, for instance, identified the figure as ‘Armed Rebellion’, and, by inference, an allusion, to the Gunpowder Plot of 1605 when a conspiracy was discovered to blow up the King, Lords, and Commons assembled in the House of Lords; but although the King naturally attached supreme importance to his discovery of the plot (which was long celebrated by order of a Jacobean Act of Parliament) and consequent survival, such a specific reference seems unlikely.\textsuperscript{41}

In contrast, Millar believed that Mars was not the object of the King’s expulsion, but rather
proclaims the King’s victories but is rebuked by Minerva. However, this seems improbable, if only for the reason that Project B had explicitly described the King to be ‘in the act of repelling Mars & Bellona’, see Appendix I.2. Indeed, the flaming torch is more to be associated with Bellona, the goddess of war who is full of anger and fury; but a print by Heinrich Aldegrever also shows Mars in armour, without a shield or sword, but holding a flaming torch; and perhaps Rubens here alluded to the practice of soldiers in classical times throwing lit torches before the beginning of a battle.

Mars falls onto a prostrate figure of masculine build (Fig. 59); the serpents in the hair, and the snake held in the right hand should allow an identification of it as Discord, one of Mars’s followers, but for the fact that the Latin discordia is feminine, see under No. 6. For Baumstark, the figure is a Kriegsfuror; more specifically it could be identified as Fury (Furor) – a companion deity of Mars – although his attributes are different from those of the blindfolded Furor who rushes out from the Temple of Janus in the Pompa Introitus Ferdinandi (Fig. 26). To this extent, the precise identity of the evil figure on his back in the Wise Rule must as yet remain unclear: it may be that it is a hybrid personification – combining the attributes of Fury (Furor) and Discord (Discordia) and/or Envy (Invidia) – as of discordant and/or envious fury. Rubens identified the two monsters to the right of the Fury Alecto in his later allegory in the Palazzo Pitti as ‘Pestilence and Famine, those inseparable partners of War’ (‘la Peste e la Fame, compagni inseparabili della Guerra’). Similar calamities were no doubt intended to be personified by the three infernal monsters to the right, beneath Mars (Fig. 59).

Above Mercury and in the place or honour to the King’s right are two women embracing (Pl. 9 and Fig. 56); that on the right, who seems perhaps to be curtseying and being lifted up by the other, holds a cornucopia – a symbol of both plenty and peace. The other, more dominant female holds no emblem by which she can be safely identified in what is probably the first, compositional modello (No. 3b; Fig. 60), or in the Canvas (No. 3; Fig. 56). In the figural study of the two figures (No. 3c; Fig. 67), the object she holds, which might well have been intended as a caduceus, has been suppressed; however, in the design presumably recorded in No. 3c (Fig. 61), she is definitely depicted holding one.

The general source for the motif may well connect with that described in Psalm LXXIV, v. 2: ‘iustitiae et pax osculatae sunt’; and there is a Netherlandish tradition for two, comely female personifications embracing each other. The Arch of Security, designed by Giorgio Vasari for the entry of the Archduchess Giovanna of Austria into Florence in 1565, also displayed a sculpture of two female personifications embracing. It is clear that the figure on the left was originally intended by Rubens to personify Peace (Pax); but as she came to be depicted without any emblem – perhaps because it was felt inappropriate or confusing that two caducei, should be exhibited (the other being that held by Mercury) – an element of caution is called for in thus identifying her. The curtseying woman holds a cornucopia and can thus safely be described as personifying Plenty or Abundance (Abundantia). It is possible that the unifying embrace of the two women makes an allusion to the idea of an abundance of peace as expressed in Psalm LXXI, v. 7: ‘orietur in diebus eius ... abundantia pacis’. The introduction of the theme of peace and plenty would have been welcomed by Charles I – and may have been proposed by him – as in 1629, in spite of impending, temporary difficulties over trade, he had chosen to emphasize the happy state of the realm in a public declaration concerning the sudden dissolution of Parliament.
stand long without wearying; walking betokens a wandering lightness and distraction of the senses; leaning portends weakness, and lying inability ... Kings therefore ... sit in thrones'.

The King is also about to be crowned with the triumphal crown by two Victories (Figs. 54 and 55) for his defeat of Mars and Fury (?). He is similarly shown about to be crowned in the Apotheosis (No. 4; Fig. 69), where also his earthly crown is being removed; for the significance of the triumphal crown, see under No. 4, and for the motif of the removal of his earthly crown, see p. 166.

The architectural setting (Fig. 53) for this royal triumph was no doubt carefully considered. The King is seated before a niche, his foot rests on a footstool, which is set on a dais. The niche is protected above by a temple pediment, fixed to a rear wall and on either side by a pair of Ionic spiral columns of which the inner column is projected forwards. The voluted pediment they support gives an opening to the sky.

The main features of the architectural setting were clearly established in the first, compositional modello (No. 3b; Fig. 60); subsequently Rubens was to elaborate the decorative embellishments. His idea may have been that the whole scene be revealed by a retracted curtain of a baldaquin, indicated by the furled drapery in the top right; this was only abandoned at a late stage, see under No. 3h (Fig. 65).

McGrath has drawn attention to the symbolic importance Rubens attached to architecture. The spiral, fluted columns, made popular by Jacopo Vignola, derive from those in St Peter's, Rome, which according to legend came from King Solomon's Temple in Jerusalem. One of these may have been copied by Rubens early in his career; they occur in his œuvre not infrequently thereafter, and McGrath has suggested that they 'could have been the ideal architectural expression of heaven and apotheosis'. Such indeed may partly have been Rubens's intention in this Canvas, for his subject – James I – was dead. But rather, or also, their inclusion here may have been as much factual as symbolic, for Rubens may have intended to replicate the portico in which King Solomon placed his judgment seat. Spiral columns appear in his lost Judgment of Solomon and Judgment of Cambyses painted for the Brussels Town Hall. The King, depicted here in a recognisable but not precise Solomonic setting, is thus to be seen as having assumed King Solomon's character, qualities and reputation.

Blunt has pointed out how unusual was Rubens's use of Ionic spiral columns; his choice of it here was not only chronologically correct, for the scene enacted followed that of the Union (No. 5) where the Order was Doric, but also it reflected or rather pointed to notable attributes of James I. Sebastiano Serlio, developing the ideas of Vitruvius, considered the Ionic Order appropriate for those saints: 'In the lives of those who were between the robust and the tender ... And if any building, either public or private, was to do with lettered men of a quiet life, neither robust nor tender, this Ionic order is appropriate'.

Thus the use of the Ionic Order can be thought to allude to the King's scholarship and distinction as an author. It also made reference to his balanced policies, for the Ionic Order was appropriate to those who: 'look to the middle way, as the Doric manner is for the severe and the Corinthian is for the delicate, so the Ionic will be for the moderate'.

Newman, following Palme, has recently shown how Jones in designing the interior of the Banqueting Hall was influenced by Palladio's descriptions of the: Egyptian style rooms [which] are very suitable for festivities and receptions; and of the antique basilica: where on certain occasions great and important negotiations are conducted. An important feature of the basilica was the great niche ('Nicchio grande'); Colvin records that in 1625/26 'a new Arche and a great windowe' were inserted in the southern wall of the Banqueting Hall, which could have been the time when the niche, part of the original design, disappeared. The source for the niche above Solomon's judgment seat, which was depicted by Rubens fortuitously or not as the fictitious replacement of that originally in the southern wall, is the Vulgate, 3, Kings 10:18-19: 'King Salomon also made a great throne of ivory ... the top of the throne was
round behind' ('Fecit etiam rex Salomon thronum de e bore grandem ...et summitas throni rotunda erat in parte posteriori'). While Rubens did not follow exactly the Vulgate's confused description of Solomon's judgment seat, he did place it in the centre of a portico, as 3, Kings 7:7-8, recorded: 'He made also the colonnade of the throne, where in is the seat of judgement' ('Porticum quoque solii, in qua tribunal est, fecit').

In a figural modello (No. 3e; Fig. 67), Rubens included a scallop shell in the niche; a similar shell was depicted above Solomon in an earlier Judgment of Solomon, and in the niche in the lost Judgment of Cambyses. The key to the meaning that Rubens intended to introduce in the modello (and in these finished compositions) lies in William Heckscher's review of the use of the shell (or conch) niche in his analysis of Rembrandt's Anatomy Lesson of Dr Tulp, where he argued that it designated the protagonist by 'alluding to a time-honoured tradition, as a fountain-head of inspired wisdom'. As part of, and illustrative of, the tradition on which Rubens also here drew, was the shell niche, before which St Thomas Aquinas sits in Filippino Lippi's Triumph of St Thomas Aquinas of 1489 in S. Maria-sopra-Minerva, Rome, where the defeated figure of Heresy holds a shell inscribed 'Sapientia Vincit Malatiam'. The shell was not in fact included in the Canvas (Fig. 53), perhaps because it could not have been easily made out behind the laurel wreath.

In this modello (No. 3e), in the design recorded in No. 3c, and in the Canvas (No. 3) a cherub or seraph is depicted in the tympanum between the niche and the temple pediment. A similar head appears in the fictive frame at the top of the Apotheosis of the Infanta Isabella. Cherubim were frequently used as a decorative feature in King Solomon’s temple. The meaning to be attached to its presence here is not as yet known. In the Canvas, the cherub (?) appears to have a basket on its head. It may be that the winged child’s head should be taken as a reference to Love, understood in the wider sense of Jacobean and Caroline discourse.

In the Canvas, Rubens included festoons hanging from the Ionic capitals of the columns and between the Ionic ends of the broken entablature, which reveal open sky or heaven. These may allude to the reticula or net-work bags (recticula) of pomegranates that Hiram made to protect and join the capitals of the two columns he made in King Solomon’s Temple. But it has to be said that such a decorative motif also often appears in the designs for the Pompa Introitus Ferdinandi and was used by Jones for the Banqueting House itself. Thus they may have no Solomonic reference, but should perhaps be seen rather as festive garlands.

As in the two other Canvases occupying the central compartments (Nos. 4 and 5), Rubens portrayed the King in Parliamentary robes, with the regalia and wearing the chain of the Order of the Garter. The King in Parliament constituted the highest court in England, and the choice of this costume as that to be worn by James I reflected this historical reality – as Parliaments were called by James I (but not at regular intervals) – and Charles I’s decision not openly to abandon the traditional, consensual mode of government. In fact, the Imperial Crown and orb were only introduced at a late stage in the design, probably at the insistence of the King. The crown was shown being removed, while the orb was placed, as English tradition allowed, on the Monarch’s lap. For a discussion of the Parliamentary robes, the regalia, the chain of the Order of the Garter, and the physiognomy of the King, see pp. 67-71.

2. The King quickly brought to an end the war with Spain, which he had inherited. The Treaty of London was signed in August 1604. For a full account of the King’s role as peace-maker, see W. Patterson, King James VI and I and the Reunion of Christendom, Cambridge, 1997 (edn 2000), pp. 293 ff.; for a good summary, see Lockyer, James VI and I, 1998, pp. 138-158; for a review of the King’s role as promoter of international peace with special emphasis on the last years of his reign, see M. Lee Jr., Great Britain’s Solomon: James VI and I in His Three Kingdoms, Urbana – Chicago, 1990, pp. 261-298. G. Akrigg, Jacobean Pageant and the Court of King James I, London, 1962, pp. 383 ff., gives an account of the collapse of the King’s policy of peace following the failure of the ‘Spanish Match’
in 1623, for which W. Patterson, op. cit., pp. 345 ff., also gives a good account. L. Levy Peck, in *The Mental World of the Jacobean Court*, ed. L. Levy Peck, Cambridge – New York, 1991, p. 7, has argued that the Canvas was ‘the text of King James VI’s *The Law of Free Monarchies* symbolized in baroque imagery’; for the (real) text, see *James VI and I, Political Writings*, 1994, pp. 62 ff. This tract was chiefly concerned with the subject’s duties to his king; the king’s duty towards his subjects was so briefly touched on, pp. 64-65, ‘to minister justice...to procure the peace’, as to make Levy Peck’s claim rather ambitious and doubtful; it was later denied by P. Christianson, also in *The Mental World of the Jacobean Court...*, op. cit., p. 94.


4. *James VI and I, Political Writings*, 1994, p. 133. See also above under n. 2.


7. *James I, The Peace-maker* (as in previous note), pp. A+4r.-Br-

8. See below and under No. 3c.

9. *James I*, op. cit. (as in n. 6), Bu.


11. See James VI’s *Basilicon Doron*, written in 1598, published in 1603 in *James VI and I, Political Writings*, 1994, p. 15. The King would have been imbued with the example of King Solomon from an early age: the pageant of 1579 celebrating his entry into the City of Edinburgh contained a tableau showing the ‘Wisdom of Solomon’; see *Bergeron, Pageantry*, 1971, pp. 66-67.

12. See J. Williams, *Great Britains [sic] Solomon...*, London, 1625, p. 76. John Williams (1582-1650) was Lord Keeper, Dean of Westminster and Bishop of Lincoln, at the time of the King’s funeral. But he was losing favour with Charles I and the Duke of Buckingham; see S.R. Gardiner, in *DNB*, reprint 1921-22, XXII, pp. 414 ff.

13. See J. Williams, op. cit., p. 76.


15. Ibid., pp. 56-57.

16. Ibid., p. 60. Ignored is the bellicose tilt against Spain in the last year or so of the King’s life, described *inter alia*, by G. Akkigg, loc. cit. (as in n. 2), see also next note.

17. As Williams himself was to discover, see under note 12. For a brief summary of the war-mongering policy of Prince Charles and Buckingham on their return from Spain in winter of 1623, see, for instance, Lockyer, *James VI and I*, 1998, pp. 151-155.


27. The House of Commons’s discussion of foreign affairs was the chief cause for the King’s angry dissolution of the 1621 Parliament; see *James VI and I, Political Writings*, 1994, pp. 251 ff. For the relaxation of the royal prerogative concerning relations with foreign powers in the Parliament of 1624, see Lockyer, *James VI and I*, 1998, pp. 152-153.


30. See E. McGrath, loc. cit., and C. Gevaritius, loc. cit.

31. See *Cartari, Imagini*, 1571, p. 356.

446-447), which shows the freedom of Cartari’s rendering: ‘Stern goddess ... powerful in war ... nor did ever Mavors [Mars] or Bellona with her battle spear inspire more furious trumpet blasts’ (‘diva ferox... bellipotens...’/ nec magis ardentem Mavors hastataque pugnæ/impulserit Bellona tubas’).


34. See McGrath, Pompa, 1971, pp. 127-128; Martin, Pompa (CRLB), 1972, p. 140, under no. 35. McGrath pointed to the relevance of the frontispiece designed by Rubens for F. Tristan, La Peinture de la Sérénissime Princesse Isabelle Claire Eugénie, 1634, for which see Judson—Van de Velde, Title-pages (CRLB), 1978, I, pp. 277-280, no. 66; II, fig. 222, and for Moretus’s explanation, ibid., II, pp. 371-372. The genii, supporting the cornucopia flanking the medallion containing her portrait, hold a caduceus and Jupiter’s thunderbolts (this genius wears Minerva’s helmet). They were thus explained by Moretus: ‘The Genii on both sides express by the thunderbolt and caduceus...War and Peace’ (‘Genii utrinque Bellum et Pacem...fulmine et caduceo exprimunt’). See also C. Gevartius, loc. cit. (as in n. 29).

35. See Martin, Pompa (CRLB), 1972, pp. 139-140, under no. 35. The quotation is from the Aeneid, II, 61-62, describing Simon about to deceive the Trojans: ‘confident in spirit, and ready for either event, whether to ply his crafty wiles or to meet certain death’ (‘fidens animi atque in utrumque paratus / seu versare dolos seu certae occumbere morti’); see The Loeb Classical Library (as in note 33), pp. 298-299. See also McGrath, Pompa, 1971, p. 127, and n. 101, p. 338.

36. Cartari, Imagini, 1571, pp. 24-28; and Ripa, Iconologia, 1603, p. 50.
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3. The Wise Rule of King James I: Ceiling Painting (Pls. 4, centre, 9 detail, and Figs. 53-59)

Oil on canvas adhered to canvas laid down on a laminated wood support; 762 x 549 cm.1

London, Whitehall, The Banqueting Hall in the Banqueting House, the central, southern compartment of the ceiling.

COPY: Engraving by Simon Gribelin II (Fig. 66; see Appendix VI).


King James I, in a Solomonic judgment seat, is about to be crowned with the triumphal crown (corona triumphalis) by two Victories. With a sweeping gesture, the King expels Mars, the god of War, who is repulsed by Minerva, the goddess of Wisdom, or more specifically, the presiding goddess of the arts of Peace and War, and Fury (Furor), who is pacified by Mercury, the god of Eloquence. The King acknowledges, with his sceptre, personifications of Peace (Pax) and Plenty or Abundance (Abundantia) as they embrace. In Mars's retinue are three monsters that rise up from a fiery depth; above the King, the pediment is suffused in heavenly light.

James I, with ample hair, moustache, and beard, wears a falling ruff, Parliamentary robes over a white shirt and cuffs, white shoes, and the chain of the Order of the Garter. The hardly visible orb rests on his lap. Beside him, a naked child, half-length, holds the Imperial Crown. Beneath the King, to his right, are Peace and Plenty embracing: Peace with blonde, braided hair wears an off-the-shoulder, yellow mantle over a white gown; Plenty with dark hair, holds a cornucopia of fruit, and wears a dark gown with a blue wrap. Beneath is Mercury, naked but for a dark wrap over his left thigh and a pink winged cap. He points his caduceus at fallen Fury, in whose hair are serpents and who holds a snake. To the right, above, is Minerva wearing a dark purple crested helmet, an off-the-shoulder yellow-grey mantle, which reveals her breast, over a dark gown. She holds Jupiter's thunderbolts in her right hand and thrusts at Mars with her aegis whose Medusa head confronts him. Mars, wearing classical, Roman-style armour and a Roman military cloak (paludamentum), boots (caligae) and helmet (cassis), brandishes a torch at James I as he falls on Fury. Beneath are three monsters, two with snake bodies and bird's and dog's heads, the other has a cat-like head; they rise up among flames and smoke. Above are two Victories, who bear the triumphal crown towards the King: that on the right has a grey and white swan-like wing and yellowish grey drapery, that in the centre has a smaller, butterfly-shaped wing and dark, ? purple, drapery that streams up above her.

The Canvas as supplied was probably marginally too small, see pp. 85-87, and Appendix IX. It is uncertain as to whether it has since been reduced.

The Canvas and its wooden support were sawn into three horizontal sections in 1940 to enable its removal, see p. 127.

The condition of at least the lower two-thirds was described in the conservation report made in 1948 as generally 'very bad'. Damaged areas are recorded in Mercury's body, Mars's cloak,
the King’s robe, the boy holding the Imperial Crown, the innermost column on the left, and the left-hand side of the niche. The faces of the King and of Peace and Plenty seem to have been repainted.

Alterations to the architecture were noted during the post-World War cleaning; they are not apparent in photographs but for one evident *pentimento*, in the bottom right-hand corner of the tympanum. Here Rubens may first have intended to carry on the wing of the Victory, but then suppressed its swan-like shape, abbreviated it, and depicted the tympanum with a hollowed corner. Another *pentimento* was noted in the downward flying Victory’s left heal. A circular object on the King’s right thigh, faintly discernible in photographs taken during the 1946/47-1950 cleaning campaign (and in earlier photographs of the Canvas), was intended as the orb.

The light comes from above.

The Canvas was painted under Rubens’s direction, probably after he had laid in the design, and following his verbal instruction and example, by a collaborator, perhaps Cornelis de Vos, see p. 78. Rubens may well have retouched his collaborator’s work where he saw fit. It may be that the monsters at bottom right, the Medusa head, the thunderbolts held by Minerva, the fire of Mars’s torch, and the decoration of the tympanum are his work. The *pentimento* in the tympanum was also probably his, as may have been the golden light above. The festoons and the fruit in the cornucopia may have been the work of a specialist assistant.

The King is so placed that his face is fully visible; how much of the face is as Rubens intended is impossible to say. It looks quite different from Rubens’s two other portrayals of James I (Nos. 3b and 3f) in preparation for the Canvas. He appears younger than he does in the *Apotheosis* (No. 4) and not so benign as in the *Union* (No. 5). For a further discussion, see pp. 65-67.

The setting is a niche beneath a temple pediment, in the tympanum of which is a sculpted bust of a cherub or seraph supported by a bracket truss. A curled wing is beside the child’s head, which appears to bear a basket of fruit (?). The pediment is raised above a rear wall, set against which is the niche placed between a pair of Ionic spiral columns. The two innermost columns protrude. The voluted pediment reveals the heavenly sky, two festoons or festive garlands are suspended between the volutes, and smaller garlands decorate the capitals of the columns. Gilt are the egg-and-dart enrichment of the cornice, the capitals, the bases of the columns, the twisted bands round the partially fluted columns, and some of the decorative features of the niche, including the dentils. James I sits before the niche, his foot rests on a rectangular platform decorated with fretwork set on an ornamental, stone, cylindrical stand; this rests on an articulated base, which is extended forward in two staggered platforms on the left. Beneath, Mercury may kneel on what was intended to be rough, boulder-strewn ground, see p. 155. Opposite is the mouth of Hell.

No precise visual source for the elaborate, architectural setting has been traced. General inspiration may have been engendered by Michelangelo’s *Tomb of Pope Julius II* in San Pietro in Vincoli, Rome, in which the central figure is seated in a portico (the four prominent volutes may have been the source for the voluted plinth introduced in the discrete *modello* for the architectural setting, No. 3e); the design was engraved in 1554 by Antonio Salamanca. The combination of a temple’s straight pediment and a niche’s curved pediment may also have been inspired by Michelangelo.

Palme has compared the composition with Rubens’s earlier renderings of the *Last Judgment*. The upper part of the composition appears to have been inspired by Veronese’s *Triumph of Venice* in the Palazzo Ducale, Venice, where twisted columns are also seen in pronounced foreshortening. Rubens had earlier designed a Tuscan spiral column — differently decorated and in sharper foreshortening — for a canvas for a compartment in the ceiling of one of the aisles or galleries of the Antwerp Jesuit church.

So far as individual poses are concerned, Palme believed that the configuration of the
King may have been inspired by Michelangelo's Prophet Daniel on the ceiling of the Sistine Chapel, while Held thought that the Delphic Sybil in the same ceiling was the source for his gesture. Rubens may have had in mind Michelangelo's sculptures of Giuliano de' Medici in the Medici Chapel, or of Moses in the Tomb of Pope Julius II. In fact, no exact source for the seated King - dominant like a seated Classical emperor - has been identified. Held has also suggested that a source for the motif of the child holding the crown beside him may have been the child behind the Prophet Ezekiel on the Sistine ceiling. The boy holds the Imperial Crown so that James I can be invested with the triumphal crown, a motif far more dramatically relayed in the Apotheosis (No. 4). The artist had earlier used it in the Hermitage Perseus and Andromeda, where an amoretto holds Theseus's helmet so that he could be crowned by Victory. The idea had been used by Giorgio Vasari in the Apotheosis of Cosimo I in the Sala Grande of the Palazzo Vecchio (Fig. 16). This could have been a precedent for Rubens, who would also, perhaps, have recalled the figure of Death removing the Emperor's crown in one of the designs in the Dance of Death by Hans Holbein the Younger, which he had copied many years earlier.

Minerva was compared by Palme to Rubens's earlier renderings of St Michael. The motif of Minerva repelling Mars also occurs in horizontal format in the painting that the artist painted in England as a gift for Charles I (Fig. 24); it also connects with later developments of these ideas that culminated in the Allegory of War in the Palazzo Pitti. The pose of Mars probably derives from that of Laocoön, which Rubens had copied from several angles (Fig. 28). The pose of Fury (?) connects with that of the possessed man that Rubens devised for the Miracles of St Ignatius of Loyola altarpiece for the Antwerp Jesuit church; as Held pointed out, it had earlier been used in the Conversion of St Paul (Princes Gate Collection, The Courtauld Institute of Art Gallery). The silhouette of the Victory, plunging head-long, and her arms and head may have been inspired by the Victory in Veronese's Triumph of Venice (Palazzo Ducale, Venice), while the frontal pose may owe something, too, to Jupiter in Veronese's Jupiter Expelling the Vices (Louvre, Paris), painted for the Sala del Consiglio, also in the Palazzo Ducale. The right-hand Victory was to a degree anticipated by the angel on the left holding the frame of the painting in Rubens's altarpiece for the Chiesa Nuova, Rome, of 1608. The pose of Mercury may ultimately derive from the antique sculpture The Knife Grinder, although the position of the arms differs (Fig. 41). Rubens obviously liked the pose he had devised, as he repeated it - but seen from a different angle - for Hercules in Hercules's Dog Discovers the Tyrian Purple for the Torre de la Parada. The motif of Peace and Plenty embracing, whose relationship is suggestive of depictions of the Visitation, has Netherlandish precedents.

The likely poor condition of the faces of Peace and Plenty (not to speak of that of James I) has already been pointed out. The extent to which those of Peace and Plenty fall short of Rubens's intentions may be inferred, if they are compared, for instance, with those of St Veronica and of the mother centre right in the Brussels Ascent to Calvary probably executed two or three years later. Other facial types are more recognisably Rubensian. For Mars there are quite a few comparables (and not only of the 1630s); for instance, the faces of the soldier in the bottom right of the Ascent to Calvary and of Barnabas, centre right, in the design for the Christ Presented to the People engraved by Nicolaes Lauwers, executed probably at about the time that work on the Wise Rule was nearing completion. The model or type adopted for Mercury was perhaps the same as that for Paris in the National Gallery Judgment of Paris, which was probably executed at about the same time as Rubens was working on the commission; he may also have been used for Mercury in the later Prado picture of the same subject. Finally, the face of Minerva seems similar, though in a more generalised rendering, to that of the goddess in the former Judgment of Paris. Her features differ from those of Minerva at the northern end of the ceiling (No. 5; Fig. 86).

Every protagonist, apart from the right-hand
Victory and the child holding the crown, was prepared for by a figural modello. And while there is extant only one autograph compositional modello, evidence in the form of presumed copies points to the execution of two others over and above the design in the relevant area of the lost Overall Modello (No. 2). The compositional modelli contained drafts of the architectural ensemble, and the columns and niche were also the subject of discrete modelli.

No trace exists of the artist’s early thoughts and ideas for the composition, which he would probably have sketched out on paper and which probably would have found their first coherent expression in a grisaille sketch similar to those in the Multiple Bozzetto (No. 1); this hypothetical work has been given a separate entry in the sequence (No. 3a). Apart from the autograph compositional modello at Vienna (No. 3b), there are presumed copies of two others (Nos. 3c and 3h); a draft of Rubens’s considered proposal would have been sent to Charles I, as part of the lost Overall Modello (No. 2). The King, Minerva, Mars, and ? Fury were elaborated in a figural modello (No. 3f), as were Peace and Plenty against the top three-quarters of the architectural background in another (No. 3e). The central Victory and Mercury, were treated in combination with figures destined for the Union (No. 5) in two other figural modelli (Nos. 3d and 3g), the second of which has come down to us in the form of what is very possibly an embroidered copy.

The extant preparatory material presents a composition already established as that which was to all intents to be finally carried over onto the Canvas. It shows Rubens assessing both iconographic and formal refinements. Indeed, there were only two major adjustments: the degree of foreshortening and the introduction of a child holding the Imperial Crown beside the King. That Rubens probably continued to elaborate and embellish while work on the Canvas itself was taking place, is shown by, for instance, his portrayal of the golden light above, partly no doubt as a counterpart to the fiery depths below right.

Rubens considered different colour schemes for the costumes of two of the female protagonists in the preparatory sketches; Peace’s costume remained yellow. The main garment worn by Plenty, which in the Canvas is of a dark hue, was first pink and in the later preparatory work of a reddish colour, to which was early added a blue wrap. In the Canvas, Minerva’s gown is dark and her mantle a yellowish green, much as in the figural modello and presumed copy of the final compositional modello (No. 3h). His first proposal was for a blue-grey mantle; the yellowish green covering (combined with a purple gown) was introduced in the copy of the second (?) compositional modello (No. 3c).

The chief iconographic questions that Rubens addressed were whether: 1) Minerva should be armed with her lance or Jupiter’s thunderbolts; 2) the King should be shown acknowledging Peace and Plenty or expelling Mars; and 3) Peace should display a caduceus. Of iconographic and decorative consequence was the adornment of the pediment and of the architecture on either side of the niche. The reduction of the foreshortening involved the final abandonment of the folded-up curtain of what could be suggestive of a baldaquin in the top right-hand corner (early depicted in a compositional modello, No. 3b, and in the presumed copy of a second compositional modello, No. 3c) and the raising of the pediment above the rear wall to reduce the area of sky and to avoid any clash between its decoration and the head of the central Victory. Both changes were effected in what is assumed to be a copy of the final modello (No. 3h). The configuration of Mars’s monstrous retinue was probably less of a formal preoccupation than that of the bearers of the triumphal crown who occupied the centre of the composition, towards the top. Rubens had probably decided on his own accord that it was inappropriate for the triumphal crown to be borne by a Victory assisted by amoretti, and thus substituted for the latter a second Victory in No. 3c. But the final, formal solution for that was only reached as a result of accommodating Charles I’s presumed wish that the Imperial Crown should be shown: Rubens realised his wish by showing it being removed from the King’s head.
Rubens did not abandon the two amoretti sketched in No. 3b (Fig. 60); that on the left was re-used to hold the end of the festoon in the centre of Procession I (No. 10; and notably No. 10d, Fig. 145). The subsequent career of the right-hand amoretti in the preparations for the Canvases was more complicated, as it was to experience migrations for potential incorporation in two other compositions. Indeed, it may not have been immediately abandoned for use in the Wise Rule, as Rubens may have elaborated the pose in a figural modello on a support that was cross-used with a modello for Hercules crushing Discord (No. 6b; Fig. 107). This proposal remains too tentative to justify awarding the proposed figural modello for the amoretti in No. 6b a separate entry in the sequence of preparatory works for the Wise Rule. Rubens may also have considered it in a modified pose as an escutcheon bearer in the Union (see Nos. 5d and 5e; Figs. 99 and 101). He was finally to adapt it as the bearer of the civic crown in Leegh's woodcut of Hercules crushing Discord (No. 6d; Fig. 108). This last use of it may have been inspired by the fortuitous juxtaposition of the two discrete modelli on the support of No. 6b – or the prototype from which, it is argued under No. 6b, it derived.

The motif of the child holding the Imperial Crown, which repeated that more imaginatively expressed in the Apotheosis (No. 4), had not featured in the earlier compositional modelli; it is rather lamely introduced for the first time – as if as an afterthought – in the presumed copy of the final compositional modello (No. 3h; Fig. 65). It seems likely that Charles I insisted on the inclusion of the Imperial Crown in order that there should have been no misapprehension concerning his father's majesty, all the emblems of which were to be depicted: the orb was placed on the king's lap – apparently for the first time – in the same lost modello. There is extant at least one painted English precedent for this in a Coronation Portrait of Queen Elizabeth I, although Rubens had devised the King's gesture, which remained unaltered, in such a way that the orb could not be held in position.

The introduction of the child holding the crown had formal consequences since surround-space had to be provided so that the feature should not appear hidden or obscured. Thus the pose of the right-hand Victory had to be recast to allow for this and the group of Minerva, Mars, and ? Fury had to be moved downwards and compressed. To help achieve this, Mars's pose was altered to dramatic effect – so that Mars more directly threatened the King with his torch – and the pose of ? Fury was flattened. Mercury, too, had to be moved down the Canvas, beside him. No figural modello exists for the child or for the new pose of the Victory and perhaps none was made; the same was probably the case for the altered pose of Mars.

A coherent sequence of execution of the preparatory sketches is difficult to establish – especially when little technical photography has been undertaken and when two works are known only from presumed copies – without allowance for some internal inconsistencies. But it seems possible that the Vienna compositional modello (No. 3b) is the earliest extant draft, granted its sketchy character and eschewal of detail. Although the next compositional modello (No. 3c) showed the sloping foreshortening emphasized by the expanse of sky, both of which were to be abandoned, in other respects – in decorative and iconographic detail – it comes closer to the proposals that were to be finally adopted, but for the caduceus held by Peace. This motif was probably included and then suppressed in the figural modello that most likely followed (No. 3e). It is proposed here that all the other figural modelli (Nos. 3d, 3f and 3g) were executed about the same time in spite of the lance rather than Jupiter's thunderbolts held by Minerva in No. 3f. The figural modelli would have been followed by the lost overall Modello (No. 2); and Charles I's comments would have been incorporated in the presumed copy of the third, compositional modello (No. 3h).

Summary of the proposed sequence:
No. 3a. Compositional bozzetto.
Whereabouts unknown (unrecorded and only hypothetical).
No. 3b. First (?) compositional modello. Vienna, Gemäldegalerie der Akademie der bildenden Künste (Fig. 60).

No. 3c. Second (?) compositional modello. Whereabouts unknown (recorded in a Copy, Fig. 61).

No. 3d (and No. 5b). Figural modelli for the two Victories (executed on the same support as the figural modello for Minerva, Cupid, and the personifications of England and Scotland in The Union, No. 5b). Rotterdam, Museum Boijmans Van Beuningen (Fig. 62).

No. 3e. Figural modelli for the personifications of Peace and Plenty and parts of the architectural setting. New Haven, Yale Center for British Art (Fig. 67).

No. 3f. Figural modelli for King James I and for Minerva, Mars, and Fury (?). Brussels, Musées Royaux des Beaux-Arts de Belgique (Fig. 64).

No. 3g. Figural modello for Mercury (executed on the same support as the figural modello for the sergeant-at-arms in the Union, No. 5g). (Accepted by Burchard as autograph but doubted by the present author.) Boston, Museum of Fine Arts (Fig. 63).

No. 2. Proposed treatment in the Overall Modello. Listed in the catalogue of King Charles I’s collection of c. 1639. Not included in the catalogue of preparatory work that follows. Whereabouts unknown, presumed destroyed.

No. 3h. Third and final compositional modello. Whereabouts unknown (recorded in a Copy, Fig. 65).

No. 3. The Canvas in the ceiling. The Banqueting Hall, Whitehall (Pl. 4, centre, and Fig. 53).

---

1. Imperial measurements published by the Ministry of Works in 1950: 25 ft. x 18 ft. [762 x 548,6 cm.]. Those published in 1907 were: 24 ft. 8 in. x 18 ft. 2 in. [752 x 554 cm.]; see p. 120, n. 101, and p. 126.

2. See the MS. condition report by W. Hampton, made during the 1946/47-1950 cleaning campaign, held at present by the English Heritage Studio Archive, Regency Park, London (typescript at Historic Royal Palaces, Hampton Court Palace, Surrey). As with the other eight canvases nail holes were revealed where the support had been nailed to the front of the stretcher; see further p. 123 under n. 101.


11. C. de Tolnay (as in n. 3), fig. 18.


18. See Van der Meulen, Antique (CRLB), 1994, II, Cat. nos. 76-93; no. 81 is a study seen from the back.

19. For the oil sketch for the St Ignatius altarpiece and references to the altarpiece itself and to the Conversion of St Paul, see Held, Sketches, 1980, I, no. 410; II, pl. 398.


22. For the sculpture, see Bober-Rubinstein, Handbook, 1986, no. 33, fig. 33 (a side view).

23. See Held, Sketches, 1980, I, no. 194; II, pl. 203, for the modello; and Alpers, Torre (CRLB), 1971, p 221, no. 31.

24. See above, n. 56, under No. 3, Iconography.


26. Judson, Passion (CRLB), 2000, pp. 69-71, no. 14b, fig. 40, and Copy 6, fig. 43. The facial type may have first been used for the legionary behind the priest in the Decius Mus Consulting the Auguries; see R. Baumstark, Peter Paul Rubens: Tod und Sieg
CATALOGUE NOS. 3a and b
29. Ibid., pl. 7; Martin, Cat. National Gallery, 1970, loc. cit.

3a. The Wise Rule of King James I:
Bozzetto

Oil on oak (?) support, ? grisaille; measurements unknown.

Whereabouts unknown (unrecorded).

There is no record that Rubens prepared for the composition with a bozzetto. But as the compositions of seven of the other Canvases were initiated by at least a bozzetto executed en grisaille (in the Multiple Bozzetto, No. 1), it seems reasonable to assume that the same procedure was followed for the Wise Rule. The bozzetto may have been painted in London in the late summer or early autumn of 1629, at about the same time as the hypothetical bozzetto for the Union (No. 5a), and shown to Charles I for his initial approval. One agreed motif meant that a prescription in the Multiple Bozzetto (No. 1) had to be altered, see under No. 9.

3b. The Wise Rule of King James I:
Modello (Fig. 60)

Oil on cradled oak (?) support; 64.5 x 47 cm.

Vienna, Gemäldegalerie der Akademie der bildenden Künste. Inv. no. 628.

PROVENANCE: Acquired from Braun1 by Graf Anton Franz de Paula Lamberg-Sprinzenstein (1740-1822), listed in the inventory of the Picture Gallery in the Loprestoschen Hause in the Kornestrasse (now Kärtnerstrasse, corner of Walfischgasse), Vienna;2 bequeathed by him with the rest of his collection to the Akademie.

COPY: Painting, whereabouts unknown; panel 65 x ? 49 cm. PROV. Dealer Sedelmeyer, Paris 1899 (Fifth Series of 100 Paintings by Old Masters, Paris, 1899, no. 44; as on cradled panel, 61 x 47 cm.).3 Fr. Schwarz, Vienna (as 66 x 50 cm.).4 private collection, Hungary (see below);5 offered to the dealer F. Stern, New York, in 1951;6 shown to the dealer A.F. Mondschein (Frederik Mont), New York, in April 1960;7 Marygrove College, sale, New York (Sotheby’s), 25 March 1982, lot 14 (as 65 x 49 cm.).


King James I, enthroned in a Solomonic seat of judgment and revealed by a retracted curtain (?), is about to be invested with a triumphal crown (corona triumphalis) by a Victory and two amoretti. Minerva, the goddess of Wisdom, or more specifically the presiding goddess of the arts of Peace and War, repels Mars, the god of War, while Mercury, the god of Eloquence, pacifies ? Fury, and the personifications of Peace (Pax) and Plenty or Abundance (Abundantia) embrace.

James I wears Parliamentary robes, with a white-sleeved shirt, and the chain of the Order of the Garter. He is balding and white-bearded. Peace, below to the King's right, wears a yellow off-the-shoulder gown revealing her naked torso; Plenty, who also has blonde hair, is dressed in a pink gown with a blue wrap. Beneath is Mercury whose cap is pink and decorated with a white feather; his scanty drapery is blue. He points his caduceus at fallen ? Fury, who has serpents in his black hair and holds a snake. Minerva has black hair; her off-the-shoulder mantle, revealing her breast, is grey-blue, the plumes on her helmet are pink. She holds her lance in her right hand and thrusts her aegis at Mars, whose Medusa head confronts him. Mars wears Classical, Roman-style armour and a Roman military cloak (paludamentum), boots (caligae) and helmet (cassis); his armour is rendered in thinned black paint, and his beard is black. The flames of the torch held in his right hand are reflected in Minerva's gown. In his retinue, a monster with a snake's body and canine head rises from the fiery depth. Above, a Victory and two amoretti fly towards the King, bearing the triumphal crown. The architectural setting of a seat of judgment, placed beneath a pediment-topped niche between spiral columns is executed en grisaille and heightened with white. What may have been intended as the curtain of a baldachin, above right, is dark red.

The support is perhaps made up by two members 26.7 cm. and 20.3 cm. wide. There are two retouched splits in the right hand member, one goes through the face of Fury (?) and up to Minerva's face, another goes through the monster's neck, Minerva's left leg, and through the right side of the inner column.

There may be indications of underdrawing in black chalk, although none has been observed during recent conservation work. Some areas of more opaque paint to the left of the throne, beneath the right-hand amoretto, and between Mercury and ? Fury (a passage that seems rather clumsy) may have been applied to suppress pentimenti. There is a pentimento in the Victory's wing. There are random scratches made by the top of the brush in the curtain top right. Only a negligible amount of retouching was required, following cleaning in 1998.8

The support is painted up to the edges in varying degrees of finish. Thus, the King's robe and base of the throne are more thickly rendered than Minerva's costume, Mars's armour, the columns, and voluted pediment. The architecture seems to have been executed after the figures. The decorative features of the niche behind the King are only suggested to the left; his sceptre was added after they were painted. The King's chin was left as a reserve as was much of the left hand of the amoretto above to the right and Peace's head.

169
The overall impression is one of fast but deliberate execution of a well-planned and thought-out composition. The apparently speedy execution — alluded to by Held — may account for the fact that the Victory at centre top has no right wing: it was omitted perhaps also because of Rubens's concern with the detail of the voluted pediment. A curious feature is Fury's left leg and foot, which is depicted as a right foot with ankle and big toe. At first glance there would also appear to be a knee above; in which case it might be thought that ? Fury's legs are crossed (as Arnout Balis, in discussions, believes). But such a pose would have been physically impossible; and what can be read as the outline of the knee is in fact the snake of the caduceus. The inclusion of a right for a left foot may also be best explained by the likely speed with which the work was executed.

There are pin (?) marks approximately 2.5 cm. apart along the bottom and top edges. The light falls from the top right.

Rubens's authorship of the present work has not, and need not, be doubted. This is the only extant, autograph, compositional modello for the Canvas. The pin (?) marks — if such they are — at the top and bottom of the support could be made to assist in the transfer of a design onto a larger support. No other such marks on supports connected with the commission have been detected, and such a method of transfer would have served no useful purpose in the circumstances.

For a discussion of the event enacted, the protagonists, and the composition and its constituent parts, see under No. 3, Iconography, and catalogue No. 3.

The composition presents the artist's ideas in nearly their finished form; previous authorities have wrongly thought it the only modello for the Canvas. However, irrespective of the design included in the lost Overall Modello (No. 2), two other modelli were probably executed, one (No. 3h) very probably after it. The question arises as to whether the present modello was executed before or after the other (No. 3c; Fig. 61).

Such a question cannot be answered conclusively either way as in both cases there are motifs immediately abandoned or carried a stage further and then abandoned in the subsequent process of settling on an acceptable composition. A strong reason in favour of the precedence of No. 3c is the positioning of the architectural background in such a way as to leave an appreciable area of sky visible. This sloped foreshortening is detectable in the early drafts for other compositions of the ceiling, and, in this case, called for the inclusion of what was possibly intended as the folded-up curtain of a baldaquin in the top right-hand corner to accentuate the illusion of space. In No. 3c, the right-hand Victory echoed the pose of Minerva, and both Victories were sketched in figural modelli above the earliest known figural modello for the Union (No. 3d/No. 5b), in which a similar sloped foreshortening is evident. This is an added reason for placing the sketch in an early stage of the development of the composition. It is difficult to understand why Rubens would have reverted to a sloping foreshortening in No. 3c after positioning the architectural background practically parallel to the picture plane — at an angle that he was finally satisfied with — in No. 3b if the latter was executed first.

However, as Arnout Balis, in discussions, has pointed out, the sketchy character of No. 3b, in which architectural detail is eschewed, is an argument in favour of its primary status. Furthermore, Rubens was to abandon several motifs essayed in No. 3b: the 'troika' bearing the triumphal crown, the lance held by Minerva, and the slanted positioning of Mercury's left leg (both developed or retained in the figural modelli). And in No. 3c, he introduced iconographic motifs that were to be retained: the child's head decorating the niche, the rocky terrain round Mercury, the King's gesture favouring Peace and Plenty, the arming of Minerva with Jupiter's thunderbolts, the attire of Minerva, and the increased number of monsters in Mars's retinue. Finally, the physiognomy of the King was more accurately rendered. One new motif in No. 3c was abandoned in the subsequent figural modello: Peace was given a caduceus to hold, which was repeated and then suppressed in No. 3e (fig. 67). Nevertheless, it does allow
the specific identification of this figure as Peace.

Rubens's idea in No. 3b for the bearers of the triumphal crown was a balanced formation of two amoretto – one flying on his back, the other on his stomach – with a Victory in the centre. The pose of the latter may have been inspired by the Victory in Veronese's *Triumph of Venice*, while the amoretto on the left corresponds with that of an angel at the top of Orazio Samacchini's fresco of *The Annunciation* in S. Abbondio, Cremona, and both may have been inspired by an as yet unidentified source. An angel in a similar, but not identical pose was earlier devised by Rubens for the upper centre of the *Triumph of Divine Love* in the *Triumph of the Eucharist* series. The Victory was to be retained throughout the preparatory process and utilized in the final Canvas (Fig. 54), although when the second amoretto was rejected, both her arms were included to hold the triumphal crown. As has already been discussed, neither amoretto was to be altogether abandoned; that on the left was reused in the *Procession I* (No. 10), while adaptations of that on the right were to be considered for an escutcheon bearer in the *Union* (see Nos. 5d and 5e; Figs. 99, 101) (having perhaps been the subject of a discrete, figural modello on a support chiefly used as a modello for *Hercules crushing Discord*, No. 6b; Fig. 107) and finally formed the basis for the bearer of the civic crown in Jegher's woodcut of *Hercules crushing Discord* (No. 6d; Fig. 108). That it was the subject of a figural modello is discussed under No. 6b; the idea is sufficiently attractive to require mention here, but remains too tentative to justify awarding a separate entry in the sequence of preparatory work for the *Wise Rule* that follows.

The idea of the scene as a whole being revealed by what may have been intended to be read as the folded-up curtain of a baldaquin had recently been given fuller expression in the wings of the triptych showing, in the central compartment, *St Ildefonso Receiving the Chasuble from the Madonna* of 1630-32 (Kunsthistorisches Museum, Vienna).15

---

1. According to the transcript of the Lamberg inventory in the Vienna Akademie's archive: p 22/11


3c. The Wise Rule of King James I: Modello

Support and measurements unknown.

Whereabouts unknown (recorded in a copy).

COPY: Painting (Fig. 61), with Galerie Traude Sauer, Schweinfurt (1993); oil on canvas, 68.8 x 53.5 cm. PROV. With its pendant, a modello for the Union (probably No. 5d, Copy; Fig. 99), probably in the collection of J.B. Horion, écuyer, seigneur du Jardin, sale (†), in the deceased’s house, rue Notre Dame aux Neiges, Brussels, 1 ff. September 1788, lot 23 (as ‘Deux Tableaux représentant des plafonds esquisses terminées, sur T[eilen], dont les grands Tableaux sont dans la Grande Eglise a Londres 25 x 19” [= 63.5 x 49.2 cm.”], bt. by Defrens (?) for 91 fl., subsequently acquired by Sir Joshua Reynolds (1723-1792), PRA, who had admired them in 1781 during his tour of the Low Countries; his sale (†), London (Christie’s), 17 March 1795, lot 68 (as ‘A Pair Emblematical Subjects designs for the ceiling of Whitehall, two complete finished studies), bt. in, £189; Farington records their being offered to Berwick, 30 January 1796, for 110 gns.; Sir Joshua Reynolds sale (†), London (Phillips), 9 May (= 2nd day) 1798, lot 45 (as ‘Two Grand Designs for the ceiling of the banqueting-house, Whitehall’), sold for 51 gns.; Mathew Mitchell of Enfield sale (†), London (Christie’s), 8 March 1819 (1st day), lots 93 and 94 (as ‘A small Design for part of the Cieling [sic] at Whitehall from the collection of Sir Joshua Reynolds, [and] ditto the Companion’), bt. by Pinney (the dealer Bernard Pinney) for 28 and 31 gns. respectively; with Colonel H. Baillie (Colonel Hugh Duncan Baillie, 1777-1866), 1830, according to Smith, see below; at some stage separated from its pendant, the present copy is very probably next recorded with the dealer Gaston Newhouse, Paris, July 1932; with Galerie Pieter Griebert, 1975; the dealer Jürgen Ludwig Baron von Quernheim, 1986. EXH. Ralph’s Exhibition of Pictures, April 1791, nos. 49 and 51, Haymarket, London (as ‘Rubens. The Ceiling at Whitehall [2]’). LIT. Smith, Catalogue, 1829-1842, II, p. 199, no. 717, where the support and measurements are given as canvas about 66 x 53.3 cm. (Smith stated wrongly that the pair was in the Danoot collection when seen by Reynolds); Rooses, Oeuvre, 1886-92, III, p. 284, no. 766-2, and p. 286, no. 769-2 (as ‘on panel, c. 65 x 53 cm.’); d’Hulst, Olieverfschetsen, 1968, p. 105, under no. 29; Held, Sketches, 1980, I, p. 189.

King James I, enthroned in a Solomonic seat of judgment, is about to be crowned with the triumphal crown corona triumphalis by two Victories. Minerva, the goddess of Wisdom, or more specifically the presiding goddess of the arts of Peace and War, repels Mars, the god of War, while Mercury, the god of Eloquence, pacifies Fury (Furor), and the personifications of Peace (Pax) and Abundance or Plenty (Abundantia) embrace above.

James I is depicted with thinning dark hair, and a greying beard; he wears a falling ruff, Parliamentary robes over a white shirt with cuffs, white shoe(s) done up with a bow, and the chain of the Order of the Garter. Beneath the King, to his right, are Peace and Plenty embracing; blonde-haired Peace holds a caduceus and wears an off-the-shoulder yellow gown; Plenty, with auburn hair, holds a cornucopia of fruit and wears a light purple gown with a blue wrap and white veil. Beneath is Mercury, naked but for a blue wrap over his left thigh and yellow winged cap; he points his caduceus at fallen ? Fury, in whose hair are serpents and who holds a snake. To the right, above, is Minerva wearing a helmet decorated with a dark purple plumed crest; she wears an off-the-shoulder dark, olive-green mantle, revealing her breast, over a purple gown. She holds Jupiter’s thunderbolts in her right hand and thrusts at Mars with her aegis, whose Medusa head confronts him. Mars, wearing classical, Roman-style armour and a Roman military cloak (paludamentum), boots (caligae), and helmet (cassis), brandishes a torch as he falls on ? Fury; beneath are two monsters, one with a dog’s head; they rise up among flames and smoke. Above are two Victories, who carry the triumphal crown towards the King; that on the right has swan-
like wings and wears a light-grey mantle over a blue gown; that on the left has smaller, blue bird’s wings and wears a purple mantle that streams up above her.

For a discussion of the event enacted, the protagonists, the composition and its constituent parts, see under No. 3, Iconography and catalogue No. 3.

An expertise by Justus Müller Hofstede, dated 5 July 1975, confirmed 4 June 1988, claimed that the work, listed here as a Copy (Fig. 61), was a ‘selbständige Phase in der Konzeption’ of the composition by Rubens. The sketch is only known to the present author from a colour photograph; it seems improbable, to judge from it, that the work is by Rubens. Nevertheless, it is likely that it is a copy of a lost modello, as d’Hulst, see above, believed. Müller Hofstede’s view that the present composition succeeded that in the Vienna modello is here accepted with qualification. For a discussion, see under Nos. 3 and 3b.

Introduced here is a new formula for the bearers of the triumphal crown, a different gesture for James I, in which he acknowledges Peace and Plenty, a recognisable physiognomy of the King, the arming of Minerva with Jupiter’s thunderbolts, the rough terrain round Mercury, the positioning of his left leg so as to act as a repoussoir, the amplification of Mars’s retinue, and the award of a caduceus to Peace.

The architecture was embellished by decorative detail, including dentils on the pilasters of the niche and festoons hanging on the Ionic capitals.

To be noted also is the sculpted lion’s head on the cylindrical dais beneath the throne; this also occurs in the copy of what is considered to be a subsequent modello (No. 3h; Fig. 65), but is no longer visible on the Canvas (Fig. 53), where it may originally have been depicted as it is rendered in Gribelin’s engraving (Fig. 66; see Appendix VI). Graham Parry was the first to draw attention to it there. The lion’s head was the King’s ‘old impresa of fortitude’; it was thus alluded to by the King in his Meditation upon the Lord’s Prayer of 1619: ‘I know not by what fortune, the dictum of PACIFICUS was added to my title at my comming in England; that of the Lyon, expressing true fortitude, haung beene my dictum before: but I am not ashamed of this addition; for King Salomon was a figure of CHRIST in that, he was a king of peace. The greatest gift that our Saviour gave his Apostles, immediatly before his Ascension, was, that hee left his Peace, with them’.13

The Horion-Reynolds provenance has been claimed on occasion for different modelli for the Banqueting Hall Canvases. Reynolds’s notes in his journal make it clear that the sketches were connected with the two large compositions at either end of the ceiling. That they were on canvas, pace the Horion sale catalogue and Smith, see above, would argue – not conclusively – against their authenticity, an inference to a degree borne out by their poor showing on the London art market between 1795 and 1819. The probability is therefore that the two works were copies. Arnout Balis, in discussions, proposed that they are copies not – as might be assumed – after the supposed prototypes from which Nos. 3h and 5h were made, but after the two intermediary modelli (Nos. 3c and 5d), and thus to be identified with the two supposed copies that are now only known by photographs and a reproduction. To judge from these, the handling of the two works seems not dissimilar.

1. A colour photograph and documentation were kindly sent to R.-A. d’Hulst in 1993.
2. See the annotated sale catalogue in the R.K.D.
3. See J. Reynolds, A Journey to Flanders and Holland, ed. H. Mount, Cambridge, 1996, p. 21: ‘Mr Orions ... two admirable sketches of the two ends of the cieling [sic] of the Banqueting-house, the middle was in Lord Orford’s collection’. Mount identified, p. 155, n. 92, ‘Orion’ as the merchant J.B. Horion; Reynolds saw the collection on 10 September 1781 and 24 July 1785, see pp. 199, 205. He wrote to Sir George Beaumont about the collection and these sketches on 23 August 1786, see pp. 212-213, and Reynolds acquired the sketches at the Horion sale or ‘shortly thereafter’, see p. 155 and n. 95.
CATALOGUE NOS. 3d and e

7. For the auctioneer’s sale catalogue, see Christie’s archive, London; Burchard Documentation gives the buyer as Lambert.
8. Burchard Documentation.
9. Ibid.
10. Ibid.
11. A. Graves and W.V. Cronin (as in n. 4), pp. 1595, 1600.

3d. Two Victories (with England and Scotland, Minerva and Cupid); 
Modello (Fig. 62)

Oil on oak support; 64.3/5 x 48.9/49.1 cm.

Rotterdam, Museum Boijmans Van Beuningen, Inv. no. 2516.

See under No. 5b for information concerning Provenance, Copies, Exhibitions, and Literature.

The two Victories occupy the upper field of the support of a modello for Minerva, Cupid, and the two personifications of England and Scotland in the Union, see under No. 5b for a detailed discussion.

The Victory on the right is seen in profile; she has a swan-like wing, and wears a white, off-the-shoulder mantle over a greyish purple gown; she holds a laurel crown and looks back and downwards. That on the left is seen head-first, diving down, in steep foreshortening; she wears a billowing, yellow mantle over a grey gown. Part of a leafy crown can be made out in her right hand.

X-radiographs (Fig. 97) show no significant pentimenti.¹

As first observed by Held,² the two Victories in the upper field are not part of the composition beneath, but are discrete studies. However, his association of both with the Victories in the Wise Rule (No. 3) requires refinement. He stated that the left-hand Victory was a study for that in the centre of the Canvas and that the other was ‘similar’ to its counterpart,³ but this is not so.

The head and right arm of the Victory on the left are only lightly brushed in; in spite of the difference in handling, it is here assumed that the two Victories were executed not long after the main motif sketched on the support below and during the same campaign, even though the two groups were preparatory to two different compositions (Nos. 3 and 5, respectively).

The two Victories were executed as figural modelli: as a rehearsal for the transfer of the design onto the Canvas, an aide-mémoire during this process, and as a guide for an assistant while executing the painting. The left-hand Victory was, however, never fully worked up, although it was later to be utilized, while that on the right, although more finished, was to be abandoned.⁴

The light falls from above and from above to the left.

For a discussion of the event enacted, the protagonists, the composition, and its constituent parts, see under No. 3, Iconography and catalogue No. 3.

1. See n. 16, under No. 5b.
3. See also De Poorter, Cat. Rotterdam, 1990, p. 91, under no. 24.
4. The figure reappears, although much altered, as the angel on the right in a Nativity, in which the two other angels also derive from figures devised for the cycle; see p. 77.

3e. Peace and Plenty, and much of the architectural Setting; Modello (Fig. 67)

Oil on cradled oak support; 62.5 x 47 cm.

New Haven, Yale Center for British Art, Paul Mellon Collection, Inv. no. B. 1977.14.70.

PROVENANCE: Anonymous sale [Trouard],¹ Paris (Chariot and Paillet), 22 February 1779, lot 93 (as ‘Une Esquisse du plus beau ton de couleur,
représentant l'Abondance & la Paix. Ce morceau exécuté en plafond... sur panneaux de 23 pouces... sur (17) (= 62.1 x 45.9 cm.), bt. by De Cosse for 802 li.;2 anonymous sale,3 Paris (Le Brun), 11 December 1780, lot 35 (as ‘Deux Figures allégoriques... belle Esquisse avancée, qu’a servi pour la plafond qu’il a peint... Angleterre... 22 pouces... [1] 7 (= 59.6 x 46 cm.) B[ois]), bt. by Le Brun for 260 li. (bt. in?);4 anonymous [Morel]5 sale, Paris (Le Brun), 15 April [postponed until 3 May] 1786, lot 35 (as ‘L’Abondance... Le commerce, esquisses d’une des parties du grand plafond exécuté en Angleterre... l’ancien palais... brûlé’), bt. by Le Brun for 331 li.;6 the dealer Jean-Baptiste-Pierre Le Brun (1748-1813), sale, Paris (Le Brun), 11-30 April 1791, lot 75 (as ‘Deux figures allégoriques... esquisse avancée qui a servi pour le plafond qu’il a peint... au palais de Houit-Hall... 23 pouces... [1] 7 (= 59.6 x 46 cm.) B[ois?]), bt. in (?) for 300 li.;7 exhibited for sale with the Orléans collection, at the Great Rooms, later the Royal Academy, 125 Pall Mall, London, April-June 1793, no. 152;8 anonymous sale [Marquess of Headfort, Philip Panné, et al.], London (Phillips), 21 March 1815, lot 71 (as ‘Peace & Plenty, a study for part of the Ceiling of Whitehall’), bt. in for £ 42. 1 sh.;9 the dealer Philip Panné of Great George St, Hanover Square, London (+1818),10 from whom acquired by the botanist and antiquary, Dawson Turner (1775-1858) of Great Yarmouth;11 his sale, London (Christie’s), 14 May 1852, lot 68, bt. by the dealer Nieuwenhuys for £ 43 1 sh.;12 the dealer Kleinberger, Paris and New York, 1911;13 the dealer Dowdeswell, London;14 Leopold Koppel (1854-1933), Berlin, by 1913;15 in the possession of his son-in-law,16 Paul Klotz, Pontresina, and later New York;17 the dealer Colnaghi, London, from whom acquired by the D.J. Lewis Family Trust, London in 1973;18 sold through Messrs. Colnaghi and E.V. Thaw in January 1977 to the Yale Center for British Art, Paul Mellon Collection, New Haven.19


CATALOGUE NO. 3e

logo, 1989, no. 1008; Donovan, Whitehall, 1995, p. 131, fig. 52.


A woman – the personification of Peace – bends to embrace another holding a cornucopia, the personification of Abundance or Plenty, who makes a curtsey. Above is much of the architectural setting for King Solomon’s seat of judgment.

Peace and Plenty have blonde hair, Plenty’s being more unkempt – touches of pink are suggestive of loosened bows. Plenty has brown eyes; she wears a pink mantle over a white gown with a blue wrap, a white veil streams behind her; she holds a cornucopia of fruit; she returns the embrace of Peace, who wears a yellow mantle pulled away from her shoulders to reveal her naked torso and who bends to kiss her.

Above is a separate study of the architecture with the chief emphasis on the pair of spiral columns on the left and the pediment above. The single spiral column on the right is more cursorily treated; but included is its base shown as a voluted plinth. In the centre, but not seen in such steep foreshortening as the columns, is the niche and the temple pediment above, embellished with a conch shell and seraph respectively.

The grain of the support runs vertically. The support is made up of two members, that on the left being c. 28 cm. wide.

The support is painted up to the edges but for the bottom, where a margin, approximately 2.7 cm. wide, has been left to suggest a ledge, where, at the left, the yellow drapery falls over it.

There may be some strengthening by a later hand between the spiral column left and the edge of the support, in the blacks between the columns and around the top of the scallop shell in the niche. Held noted a small, retouched damage at the top of the shell.24

Peace was first shown holding a thin horn or most probably a caduceus, which shows up faintly beneath Plenty’s veil and the voluted plinth. Adjustments were made to the base of the cornucopia; the leaves at its mouth were an afterthought. There are scratch marks on the voluted plinth, bottom right, made by the end of the brush while the paint was still wet. X-radiographs show no further, significant pentimenti (Fig. 68).25

But for the pentimento, the modello is painted with reserves, beginning with the figures. The area of black paint to the left of the base of the cornucopia indicates a reserve to be left for what in the Canvas (Fig. 53) was intended to be filled by Mercury’s cap. Rubens presumably painted the pointed base of the cornucopia for aesthetic reasons. Less assured in handling is the niche, not only in its constituent parts but in its alignment with the adjacent columns. Quite tentative is the voluted plinth, lower right, where there are the scratch marks noted above. The elaboration of the veil worn by Plenty to suppress the caduceus held by Peace was executed after it and the scratch marks.

The light falls from the top right.

Rubens’s authorship of the present work has never been questioned and, in spite of the less than assured handling of the niche and unneces-
sary experiment with the voluted plinth, bottom right (unnecessary because it was never planned as part of the composition), it should not be doubted. It was executed as a figural *modello*, in rehearsal for transfer of the design on to the Canvas, as an aide-mémoire during that process, and as a guide for an assistant during the execution of the painting.

For a discussion of the event enacted, the protagonists, the composition and its constituent parts, see under No. 3, *Iconography* and catalogue No. 3.

So far as concerned the two figures, the artist continued to experiment with Plenty's attire, which he made more elaborate by introducing a white gown. Although these figures occupied only the left-hand side of the planned composition, Rubens drafted much of the envisaged architectural backdrop. The pair of spiral columns on the left and the niche are depicted head on, and the column on the right is seen from the same viewpoint. Studied is the fall of light from the top right. The columns are seen closer up than in No. 3c (Fig. 61) and perhaps are depicted more upright. Rubens's work here seems to have been a less detailed reconsideration of that earlier executed. His chief concern may rather have been with the niche, which he elaborated. It is now placed higher in relation to the columns so that the temple pediment is silhouetted against the sky as it was to be in his final formulation. The whole of the cherub's or seraph's head was depicted; this was also a motif he was to retain.

Also introduced was an inverted scallop shell into the niche itself; its base merges with the now voluted pediment. Rubens had recently or contemporaneously formulated a similar decoration – in a religious context – as a suitable back to a throne, flanked by Solomonic columns, on which were seated the Virgin and Child in an oil sketch for an altarpiece, whose commission seems to have been abandoned. The same architectural motif appears above the Virgin and Child in the central compartment of the triptych showing *St Ildefonso Receiving the Chasuble from the Virgin* (Kunsthistorisches Museum, Vienna). Rubens may have introduced it for consideration in the present sketch as a decorative motif and as means of emphasizing the dominant wisdom of James I, who was to be depicted seated before it, see p. 157-158.

Held first pointed out that the present work (like Nos. 3d and 3f) consists of two discrete *modelli*, one for the figures and one for the architecture, and that it should not be regarded as integrated whole, notwithstanding the unified lighting scheme. He also believed that the right-hand column was added 'slightly later' 'perhaps to give the sketch a more 'complete' appearance. If this was the case, the elaboration of the veil, worn by Plenty, would also be an afterthought – and significant – as its brushing in resulted in the suppression of the caduceus. This may have been done not to make the personification ambiguous, but because Mercury already held a caduceus in the same composition in which Peace was to appear; to have had two on display in the same work would have been confusing.

As it seems possible that Rubens may have not worked sequentially on all the *modelli*, but on more than one during the same session, see p. 65, Held's theory that the right-hand column may have been added slightly later than the rest of the architecture cannot be ruled out. The same might also be proposed for the niche and temple pediment. This could also be seen as a discrete study – set in different foreshortening and in a position relative to the height of the columns – that was never repeated.

2. Ibid.
3. The vendors were Le Brun and other dealers, according to Lugt, *Répertoire*, i, no. 3193.
5. Ibid.
6. Ibid.
7. Lugt, *Répertoire*, no. 4705, gives three sets of dates for the sale: 11-30, 11-23, and 27-30 March. No buyer's name is given in the marked copy in the R.K.D., and it is thus possible that it was bought in like No. 3f below. According to the catalogue, the lot had earlier been in a Le Rouge sale, lot 207. This must refer to the Rubens offered as lot 207 in the Le Rouge sale, Paris, 19 January 1778;
but this was a sketch for the 'fameux plafond d’Angleterre', on canvas, of six figures, as Joanne Held kindly informed the author having searched all the Le Rouge sale catalogues in the Bibliothèque Nationale, Paris. See also below under Untraced and Unidentified Preparatory Works (Appendix VII).

8. Burchard (see his Documentation) pointed out that not all the pictures exhibited were from the Orléans Collection.

9. Kindly suggested in a letter of 14 September 1993 from the Getty Art History Information Program in the museum dossier; for Philip Panné as a con­signor in this sale, see Fredericksen, British Isles, 1988, III, 1811-1815, Part 1, p. 82, no. 1265. For the result of the sale, see ibid., Part 2, p. 899.

10. The address given on the frontispiece of Christie's sale catalogue of paintings from Panné's estate on 11 December 1818. Philip Panné had been active as a dealer for thirty-seven years.

11. See D. Turner, Outlines in Lithography from a small collection of Paintings, Yarmouth (for private circulation), 1840, p. 65; he stated that the picture was bought direct from Philip Panné 'a gentleman, through whose hands some of the finest pictures in this kingdom passed, about thirty or forty years ago'. This makes it impossible that the work was offered in an anonymous sale, London (George Stanley), 23 November 1825, lot 65 (as 'Rubens. An Allegory, Peace and Plenty'), as suggested in the letter from the Getty Art History Information Program referred to in n. 9, as by this date Panné was dead. Turner refuted Smith's statement (in Smith, Catalogue, 1829-42, see below) that the sketch had been in the possession of Colonel Hugh Duncan Baillie (see under No. 3c), by quoting Baillie's denial of the fact. For Daw­son Turner, see DNB, LVII, pp. 334-335; and A. Moore, [Cat. Exh.] Dutch and Flemish Painting in Norfolk, Norwich Castle Museum, 1988, pp. 32-35.

12. For the auctioneer's sale catalogue, see Christie's archive, London.

13. See Burchard Documentation; and Van Puyvelde, Esquisses, 1940, p. 98, under no. 77.


15. Burchard Documentation. The author thanks Christine Schütte, writing on behalf of Jan Kelch of the Staatliche Museen zu Berlin, Gemäldegalerie, for giving information about Leopold Kopp­el, a banker and founder of the present day firm of Osram, and for information of his loan of the present sketch to the Kônigliche Akademie in 1914, see below.


17. Van Puyvelde, Esquisses, 1937, under no. 98. Recorded in New York by 1946, see [Cat. Exh.] Loan Exhibition of Paintings by Rubens and Van Dyck (Los Angeles County Museum, Los Angeles, 1946, no. 35).

18. Information kindly provided by the D.J. Lewis Family Trust.

19. See the Yale Center dossier.

20. See L. Van Puyvelde (as in n. 17).


22. Information kindly provided by Rhea Blok of the Fondation Custodia.

23. Moore (as in n. 11) and the DNB.

24. Evident in x-radiographs (Fig. 68) kindly provided by Julia Marciani Alexander of the Yale Center for British Art. See also Held, Sketches, 1980, p. 196, under no. 131.

25. The mosaic was made and photographed by the Photographische Department of the National Gallery, London, which is here thanked.


27. Vlieghe, Saints (CRLB), 1972-73, II, pp. 82-85, no. 117, figs. 48, 50.


**3f. King James I, Minerva, Mars, and ? Fury; Modello (Fig. 64)**

Oil on cradled ? oak support; 69.8 x 85.3 cm.

**Brussels, Musées Royaux des Beaux-Arts de Belgique. Inv. no. 392.**

**PROVENANCE:** The dealers Dulac and Lachaise sale, Paris, 30 November ff. (8th & last vacation) 1778, lot 405 (as 'P.P. Rubeins / Peint sur bois large 32 pouces, haut 26 [86.7 x 70.5 cm.]. Une composition de quatre figures; sujet allégorique: ce morceau, esquisse d’une grande force de couleur, est aussi d’une touche ferme et savante(1), sold for 602 liv.; the dealer Jean-Bap­tiste-Pierre Le Brun (1748-1813) sale, Paris (Le Brun), 11-30 April 1791, lot 74 (as 'Une partie du principal tableau du plafond de Houit-Hall .... On y voit Minerve et Mars combattant. Ce dernier tenant un flambeau, est agenouillé sur l’envie qui’il terrasse, et protège un Roi sur le trône. Il vient de la vente de M. Dulac ...').

24. Evident in x-radiographs (Fig. 68) kindly provided by Julia Marciani Alexander of the Yale Center for British Art. See also Held, Sketches, 1980, p. 196, under no. 131.

25. The mosaic was made and photographed by the Photographische Department of the National Gallery, London, which is here thanked.


27. Vlieghe, Saints (CRLB), 1972-73, II, pp. 82-85, no. 117, figs. 48, 50.

cord form the throne of James I, whose whole-length portrait forms a part of the group ... 27 by 33 in. [69.8 x 84 cm.], £162.15 sh., bt. in; 3 Benjamin West PRA, sale (t), London (Christie's) 21 May 1824, lot 77, bt. in for 135 gns; 4 Sir Hugh Purves-Hume-Campbell Bt. (1812-1894) by 1843, when exhibited at the British Institution; 5 Sir Hugh Hume Campbell Bt., sale (t), London (Christie's), 16 June 1894, lot 46, bt. by the dealer Colnaghi for £357; 6 sold by the dealer Léon Gauchez to Le Musée de Bruxelles (now the Musées Royaux des Beaux-Arts de Belgique), 1894.7


King James I is seated and making a sweeping gesture. Beneath him, Minerva, the goddess of Wisdom, or more specifically, the presiding goddess of the arts of peace and War, repels Mars, the god of war, who falls on ? Fury (Furor).

James I has brown-black hair, brown eyes, and a beard and moustache; he is crowned with the triumphal crown (corona triumphalis) and wears salmon pink, Parliamentary robes over a white shirt, a falling collar, and the chain of the Order of the Garter; his white shoe is done up with a bow. The approach to the throne is a stone dais resting on a step. Minerva’s hair is dark brown and the crest of her helmet is purple and pink. The mantle over her right shoulder is yellowish green; beneath is a dark grey gown. Mars has a dark brown beard; his Roman military cloak (paludamentum) is deep red, and he wears a grey tunic beneath his chain mail skirt – part of his Classical, Roman-style military uniform.

The grain of the support runs horizontally. A fair number of splits in it are evident, but among these, no join is certainly identifiable without benefit of the study of X-radiographs. In some areas, no imprimatura is evident. Additions to the base of the throne, bottom left, and to the sceptre were removed during cleaning before the 1965 Brussels exhibition.8

The use of reserves is evident, and confirms that the figures rendered had been well rehearsed. The only pentimenti visible to the naked eye are minor: in the outline of Minerva’s helmet, at the bottom right of Mars’s cloak, in Mars’s right knee, and ? Fury’s left thumb. It seems likely that the sequence, headed by Minerva, was executed first and that the seated King was added afterwards.

The light falls from the top right. There could be no reason to doubt Rubens’s authorship of the present work, which is the largest and one of the most elaborate of the extant figural modelli. It was executed as a figural modello, in rehearsal for, and as an aide-mémoire during, the transfer of the design onto
the Canvas and as a guide for an assistant while executing the painting.

For a discussion of the event enacted, the protagonists, the composition and its constituent parts, see No. 3, Iconography and catalogue No. 3.

Held, who did not discuss No. 3c (Fig. 61) above, believed that the present work was executed after the Vienna modello (No. 3b; Fig. 60).9 As it repeats ideas set out in both Nos. 3b and 3c, it seems likely that, like the other figurative modelli, it succeeded both. Some details diverge from both compositional modelli: the King wears a laurel crown, the throne rests on a cylindrical dais set on a step, Minerva's gown is grey and all of it is depicted; the goddess is placed slightly more to the right of Mars and the position of the aegis differs such that all of the Medusa head is visible. Her expression is as fierce and frightening as ever. By showing the King laureated, Rubens may have briefly considered a change in the iconography in that the Victories and/or amoretti were now perhaps to bestow a civic crown (corona civica); but more probably the laurel crown was included out of artistic whim.

The King's features are similar to those in No. 3c, see the copy, Fig. 61; they are not, as Held would have, an idealised physiognomy to be compared with that recorded by John de Critz (Fig. 7),10 but depend on the portrayal by Paul van Somer of 1618 (Fig. 4); see p. 66.

Held pointed out that Minerva is depicted almost level with the King, who is too small in comparison with the goddess.11 It should also be added that the goddess is placed a good deal to the right of him. Held rightly concluded that the support bears two discrete, figurual modelli (in spite of the unified lighting), and that it had not been the artist's intention to depict the interrelationship between the King with Minerva and their enemies, as had always previously been thought.

1. See the marked catalogue in the Bibliothèque Nationale, Paris (BNP microfiche V37201). The author thanks Joanne Hedley for looking up the sale catalogue.
2. For the date of sale, see under No. 3e, n. 7. For the entry, see the catalogue in the R.K.D. For the result of the sale, see Charles Blanc, Le Trésor de la Curiosité, Paris, II, 1858, p. 131 (where the entry is incorrectly given).
3. Although Le Brun had recognised that the sketch was a modello for a Canvas in the Banqueting Hall ceiling, Christie's catalogue did not make a specific connection. For the outcome of the sale, see the auctioneer's catalogue, Christie's archive, London. For an account of this unsuccessful sale, see Fredericksen, British Isles, 1988, IV, 1816-1820, Part I, p. 96.
4. For the auctioneer's catalogue, see Christie's archive, London.
5. Sir Hugh's father, Sir William Purves, assumed the surname Hume-Campbell on the death of his great uncle, the Earl of Marchmont, in 1792. The Earl died without male issue and his estate, including Marchmont House in Berwickshire, Scotland, passed to Sir William, who died in 1833. The present work could have been acquired by Sir William and have been left to his son; it is listed by Waagen as at Marchmont House in 1854-56; see Waagen, 1857, p. 443.
6. For the auctioneer's catalogue, see Christie's archive, London.
7. A.J. Wauters, Le Musée de Bruxelles, Tableaux Anciens, Brussels, 1900, p. 132, no. 392 (wrongly given as on canvas).
8. It was still reproduced in its pre-cleaned state in Held, Sketches, 1980, II, pl. 137.
10. Ibid.
11. Ibid.

3g. Mercury with the Sergeant-at-Arms (Mercury and 'Argus'):
Modello (Fig. 63)

Oil on inset, cradled; oak support; 61 x 48.3 cm.

Boston, Museum of Fine Arts. Inv. no. 42.179.

The authenticity of the present work was accepted by Burchard but is doubted by the present author.

PROVENANCE: François Pauwels, Master Brewer, Brussels, sale, Brussels (Marnesse), 22 August 1803, lot 68 (as 'Argus endormi au bas d'un rocher: Mercure plus élevé le touche du caducée; à la tête, à droite est un chien: une vache descend vers une vallée, une autre se trouve entre deux montagnes ... B[ois] Haut 36
Mercury's drapery is blue; his winged cap is salmon pink, the same colour as the tunic of the sleeping 'Argus'.

The grain of the support runs vertically. There is an addition to the base of the support of c. 7 mm. and to the right-hand side of c. 2.3 cm. There is a join c. 27.3 cm. from the left hand edge. Three splits spring from the top of the support, one c. 18.5 cm. from the left hand edge; there are two smaller splits to the right of Mercury.

The drapery above Mercury looks to be rubbed, and the pigment of the drapery on the lower part of his body is diseased. The sky looks to be later and there seems to be a good deal of later retouching towards the right-hand edge, especially behind 'Argus'.

There is some indecipherable underdrawing in the bottom left-hand area beneath Mercury's right leg. The knob decorating the top of the pole held by 'Argus' has been suppressed. The hind leg of a dog has also been painted over, but shows up faintly, at the right-hand edge towards the bottom. This is probably the remnant of the enlarged composition as described in the Pauwels sale catalogues, when the support was substantially larger. The additions may have been executed for the most part on paper laid down on panel, and must have been removed before the De Beurnonville sale, when the measurements given in the catalogue more or less correspond with those of today.

There is a *pentimento* in 'Argus's' left shank, which was originally more vertical; traces of a rosette (?) or a garter (?) are visible beneath the knee. There may also be a *pentimento* in Mercury's right knee.

Constable's mistaken thesis that the subject of the present work was intended to be Mercury and Argus, and that it was to be associated with the Torre de la Parada commission has had a lengthy but not unquestioned currency. Goris and Held proposed as early as 1947 that depicted are studies for two unrelated figures in the Banqueting Hall cycle: Mercury in the Wise Rule (No. 3) and the sergeant-at-arms in the Union (No. 5). The two studies, they argued, were early adapted and further additions (the pipes...
and sword) made to convert the two discrete sketches into a rendering of *Mercury and Argus*; they imply that this was done by Rubens, a thesis accepted by Burchard, who described the work as a 'by-product'. The account given of the story, as told by Ovid, contained some errors; Rubens, of course, knew the story, and how the subject should be relayed. Held more recently rejected the idea that Rubens ever intended that the two 'fortuitously juxtaposed figures' illustrate the story. In this Held is surely right, granted also that Mercury is bereft of any psychological engagement. For convenience, the two figural *modello* are discussed here; a separate number (No. 5g) is given to the figural *modello* of the sergeant-at-arms in the catalogue sequence of the *Union*, below.

That the two studies (not wholly free of supposed alterations and additions by another hand) were the work of Rubens made in preparation for the Canvases at the northern and southern ends of the ceiling has recently been generally accepted, but there is good reason to question their authenticity.

Mercury connects most closely with the study of the god in the Vienna compositional *modello* (No. 3b; Fig. 60), in the placement of the left calf at a slant, the curled index finger of the left hand, the right arm raised above the knee, and the drapery round the god's thigh and left shoulder. Neither No. 3b, nor the presumed records of other *modelli* (Nos. 3c and 3h; see Figs. 61 and 65), show the billowing drapery, about which Held was 'not completely sure', or so much of the right leg. Held believed that the sketch preceded No. 3b. But, if it is indeed a copy or free copy after a lost original by Rubens, the prototype must have been an elaboration of the motif sketched there in preference to that in No. 3c, where it is rendered slightly differently. It would still be difficult to explain why Rubens had included so much of the right calf of the god when it had seemingly been settled that this was not required, nor why the billowing drapery should have been introduced.

There are also infelicities in the 'sleeping Argus', who closely connects with the sergeant-at-arms in the St. Petersburg *modello* (No. 5c; Fig. 98). The features and hair on the head are messy, the facing of the tunic has been omitted, while the rosette beneath the right hand has been suppressed, and the foot is either unshod or a sandal has been tentatively suggested. Misunderstood is the shadow cast by the ledge and right calf. The spherical metal head of the mace has been roughly suppressed, and what is now a pole has been feebly extended downwards.

No doubt Rubens had prepared for this protagonist by a life drawing of the sergeant-at-arms made in England, see p. 57; but it is difficult to believe that he referred to it while executing the Boston sketch. In spite of the weight of critical opinion — including Burchard's — which supports its authenticity, the present compiler has doubts as to whether either figure can be the work of Rubens. The handling seems far less dynamic and animated than that in the Brussels figural *modello* (No. 3f; Fig. 64), with which it should stand comparison.

But a question remains concerning the work's genesis: whether it is a copy of a (lost) support that originally bore two discrete figural *modelli* or whether two studies were combined by a hand relying on the Vienna and St. Petersburg compositional *modelli* (Nos. 3b and 5c; Figs. 60 and 98). Of these two hypotheses, the first is perhaps to be preferred. For this reason — and out of deference to Burchard's opinion and those of other authorities — the Boston sketch is placed in the sequence of the figural *modelli*, but with a caveat concerning its status.

For the purpose of the figural *modelli*, see under Nos. 3d-f above. For a discussion of the event enacted, the protagonist, Mercury, the composition and its constituent parts, see No. 3 *Iconography* and catalogue No. 3.

A further question arises as to whether the Boston painting was later converted into a *Mercury and Argus* or whether it was originally adapted as a variant (but not by Rubens). That the latter was perhaps the case is indicated by the decision not to reproduce all the details of the sergeant-at-arms's uniform, to suppress the top of the mace, and by the durability of the additions (the terrain, the sword and billowing drapery of Mercury, the extension of the pole,
and the hind leg of the dog). These have resisted the attentions of conservators since the early 1940s, thus suggesting that they were contemporary with the main body of the work. That the variant was executed in Rubens’s studio or very soon after his death is a probability granted its Rubensian character, which would justify the work’s ascription to a follower of Rubens. This follower can perhaps be identified as Jan van den Hoecke, who it has been suggested was possibly Rubens’s chief assistant in the execution of the Canvases, see pp. 75-78. Vlieghe has attributed two oil sketches, whose earlier attribution to Rubens had previously been rejected by Held, to Van den Hoecke. That the present sketch is by the same hand as the Karlruhe Moses’s Song of Praise and Miriam’s Dance (Fig. 39) and the Fort Worth David with the Head of Goliath met by the Women of Israel (Fig. 40) seems to be a distinct possibility. At least the handling in all three works clearly reflects Rubens’s manner of the early 1630s.

1. Information from the Getty Provenance Index, provided by Victoria Reed of the Boston Museum of Fine Arts, whose help is here gratefully acknowledged. Rooses, Oeuvre, 1886-1892, III, p. 123, under no. 644, stated that the lot was sold for 56 fl.. The support was then considerably larger, and allowed for a mountainous landscape; see further, below.

1a. Information from the Getty Provenance Index, provided by Victoria Reed; the catalogue consulted by the Provenance Index had an annotation ‘faux et peint sur papier’.

2. The Sedelmeyer seal is on the reverse; see also the succeeding note. Three other, unidentified seals are on the reverse.

3. See the marked catalogue from the étude Pillet, in the R.K.D. On the separately printed Ordre des Vacations, also in the R.K.D., in which lot 441 is stated as being offered on 11 [sic?] May, this lot is described in a MS note as ex ‘v[ente], de Sedelmeyer.’


5. Burchard Documentation. A German custom’s stamp is on the reverse of the support.

6. Ibid. See also the annotated mount in the R.K.D. The photograph there shows a repainted background and the rear view of a cow and, beneath, the hind leg of a dog at the right-hand edge, the latter is still visible. See also below.

7. Photograph in Burchard Documentation. It shows that the picture had been cleaned especially in the background, which entailed the removal of the cow and the appearance of a dog and a dog’s head at bottom left.

8. See the letter from Mondschein of 4 April 1942, in Burchard Documentation; he stated that the picture had been cleaned by Suhr, who (he incorrectly reported, see previous note) had removed the cow along with the dog and dark background.

9. Victoria Reed, as in n. 1, identified the official vendor to the Museum; she also pointed out that the sketch was with Spink in 1924, (photograph in the Witt Library). According to a letter from Paul M. Byk and a note by W.G. Constable of 21 April 1942, in the Museum of Fine Arts’s dossier, the picture had passed directly from Baron d’Eder to an American collector, and had been acquired from an American family, which had inherited the picture from its parents.


12. See also nn. 6-8.


14. Still dated c. 1635 in the 1956 exhibition catalogue (Drawings and Oil Sketches by P.P. Rubens from American Collections, Fogg Art Museum Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass., 1956, no. 45); while the connection with the figures in the Banqueting Hall Canvases was noted, the hypothesis was advanced that the sketch is an abandoned proposal for the Torre de la Parada commission. A.R. Murphy, European Paintings in the Museum of Fine Arts, Boston, An Illustrated Summary Catalogue, Museum of Fine Arts, Boston, Mass., 1985, p. 253, identified the protagonists as Mercury and a sleeping herdsman and stated that they were figure studies for the Banqueting Hall cycle.


16. Burchard Documentation; for a discussion of Burchard’s designation of ‘by-product’ for some of the modelli, see p. 59, n. 36.

17. As pointed out by Constable (as in n. 13).

18. See Alpers (as in n. 13).


21. Ibid.


CATALOGUE NO. 3h

3h. The Wise Rule of King James I: Modello

Support and measurements unknown.

Whereabouts unknown (recorded in a copy).

COPY: Painting (Fig. 65), St Petersburg, The State Hermitage Museum, inv. no. 2579 (pendant to No. 5h, Copy; Fig. 95); on wood support, 29 x 19.5 cm. PROV. Acquired by the Empress Catherine II (the Great) (1729-1746) of Russia before 1774 as one of 'two designs for ceilings' by Rubens; transferred from the Hermitage to Gatchina Palace, near St Petersburg in 1799; returned to the State Hermitage Museum in 1926; available for sale through Antiquariat, 28 September 1931, no. 2, according to an inscription on the reverse. EXH. Old Master Pictures in Private St Petersburg Collections, The Hermitage (?), St Petersburg, 1908, no. 354 (exhibition did not open); London, 2003-04. LIT. J. von Schmidt, 'Gemälde alter Meister in Petersburger Privatbesitz, Die Ausstellung der Staryje Gody in St Petersburg', Monatsheft für Kunstwissenschaft, II, 1909, 4, pp. 176-177; R. Eigenberger, Die Gemäldegalerie der Bildenden Künste in Wien, Vienna–Leipzig, 1927, p. 334, under no. 628; Haverkamp Begemann, Olieverfschetsen, 1953, under no. 88; Held, Sketches, 1980, I, p. 195, under no. 130, copy 1; Gritsay, Sketches, 2003, pp. 45-46 and colour plate 36.

King James I, enthroned in a Solomonic seat of judgement, is about to be invested with a triumphal crown (corona triumphalis) by two Victories. Mars, the god of War, is repelled by Minerva, the goddess of Wisdom, or more specifically the presiding goddess of the arts of peace and war, and falls on ? Fury (Furor), who is pacified by Mercury, the god of Eloquence, kneeling beneath the embracing Personifications of Peace (Pax) and Abundance or Plenty (Abundantia).

The composition is as previously drafted (Nos. 3b and 3c); significant differences are discussed below. The crest of Minerva's helmet is blue and white; she wears an off-the-shoulder mantle over a dark grey gown. Peace wears a yellow gown over a white undergarment; Plenty wears a pink gown with a blue wrap over her knee. For the sculpted lion's head on the dais, see under No. 3c.

The painting in St Petersburg (Copy; Fig. 65) is not well executed; scientific analysis suggests that it was executed before c. 1760. Burchard's early view, based on a reproduction, and as recorded by Eigenberger and subsequently repeated by later authors, that the present work is a copy of the Vienna modello (No. 3b), is incorrect; he was to note that it 'corresponds to the canvas'. However, there are small differences, which suggest that the present work, like its pendant (No. 5h), is a copy after a lost, probably larger modello. The differences between it and the Canvas are not as telling as in the case of its pendant; nevertheless, they seem to support this proposal. Indeed, the differences between the Canvas and the two other compositional modelli (Nos. 3b and 3c) are so great as to suggest that Rubens would have felt the necessity of executing an intervening modello.

The differences between the composition of the St Petersburg painting and the Canvas are: the left leg of the central Victory is not so extended; the alignment of the wing of the right-hand Victory with the pediment differs; there is no sculpted cherub's or seraph's head in the tympanum; there is no bow to the triumphal crown; both of Minerva's feet are included; only one monster in Mars's train is evident (it follows that in No. 3c). Not included, perhaps because only faintly indicated in the lost prototype, is the King's right hand and sceptre, Mercury's caduceus, and the decorative enrichments to the niche and tympanum.

For a discussion of the event enacted, the protagonists, the composition, and its constituent parts, see under No. 3, Iconography and catalogue No. 3.

The modello, whose design is likely to be recorded in the St Petersburg painting, was probably made after the lost Overall Modello (No. 2), that Rubens had executed and sent to London for the King's approval. What alternatives among the available choices were there selected for representation is impossible to say.
But probably repeated were many of the ideas which had been set out in No. 3c (see the Copy, Pl. 61), but for the giving up of what may have been intended as the folded-up curtain of a baldaquin in the top right-hand corner, and the raising of the pediment, both of which in part may have signalled the abandonment of any appreciable foreshortening in the architectural backdrop. The temple pediment was also possibly raised so as to allow an unobstructed view of the child’s head in the tympanum. The sense of celebration was heightened by the introduction of festoons between the volutes, while to add variation and interest to Peace’s apparel, her mantle was raised to her right knee to reveal a white undergarment. As for the decorative elements of the architecture, Rubens altered the design of the entablature, while Peace and Plenty now stand on a platform whose base is articulated and no longer approached by steps.

Two significant changes may have been made to meet requirements and/or comments that had come from London following study of the Overall Modello (No. 2). Charles I may have criticised the design because of the absence of two emblems of majesty: the Imperial Crown and the orb. At all events, both were now introduced, the first held by a naked child beside James I, the second placed on his lap. The introduction of the child, who has removed the Imperial Crown so that the King could be invested with the triumphal crown had formal consequences, as sufficient space had to be created so that the motif could obtain its full impact. This entailed casting the pose of Victory with an acrobatically raised right leg, whose pose was to a degree anticipated by an angel on the left supporting the frame round the image of the Madonna and Child in Rubens’s Chiesa Nuova altarpiece of 1608. The introduction of the child also resulted in Rubens moving the group, headed by Minerva, lower down the Canvas. The consequent reduction in space available for the goddess and her antagonist brought about a significant adjustment to Mars’s right arm (and a heightened dramatic impact), which was now moved so as to thrust up directly to threaten James I with the torch, rather than to ward off Minerva. As already noted, see p. 158, there was at least one painted precedent for such a placement of the orb, although it is held in place by the monarch, in the Coronation Portrait of Queen Elizabeth I. The unattended orb here introduced by Rubens may be thought to be as unusual as its placement in the Union (No. 5).

2. See Gritsay as in n. 1, p. 45.
3. As interpreted by N. Gritsay, of the State Hermitage Museum, who kindly showed the author the present work and its pendant in the Museum’s reserve and then later communicated the colours of the costumes. Burchard was shown a photograph of the present work in Berlin in 1931.
4. See Gritsay (as in n. 1) p. 50, n. 9.
5. Information kindly provided by Gritsay.
6. See n. 21 under No. 3.
7. This alteration was pointed out by W. Prohaska, in Cat. Exh. Vienna, 1977, p. 114, under no. 48.

4. The Apotheosis of King James I

The Iconography

Project B, see Appendix 1.2, had proposed that the painting in the ‘square’ at the upper, or southern, end of the Hall should depict what could be described as a Christian assumption of King James I. He was to be shown ‘sitting upon a Cloude’, being ‘caryed up by divers Angells’ to join King Solomon and Christian rulers with whom he wished also to be associated, bathed in ‘beames ... shying downe’ from ‘the glory of the Deity’ above. In fact, a much altered but comparable episode came to replace the Union (No. 5) and occupy the central compartment of the ceiling. It must remain uncertain as to who was responsible for this fundamental change of the programme as set out in Projects A and B, which would make less directly relevant the conceits for the long, flanking compartments (because the Union was no longer contiguous) that were to be in essence retained (Nos. 10-11), but it seems likely that it was Rubens, see pp.
101-102 and 147. His first, extant proposal, set out in No. 4a – the bozzetto – would have been approved in principle by King Charles I; it depicted the assumption of his father in the form of an apotheosis (Fig. 79).

By this fusion of two themes, Rubens amplified Project B's prescription and was able to give a dynamic and coherent portrayal of a key principle of an old theory of sovereignty so often and clearly enunciated by James I – on the last occasion in print in A Meditation ... or a Patern... for a Kings Inavguration of 1620, which was dedicated to the Prince of Wales. The theory insisted that a king, whose irresistible authority derived directly from God, was only answerable to God for his actions: it was given wide currency by being paraphrased by Charles I in speeches to the House of Lords of 1628 and 1629. This awesome reckoning would take place after the King's death. In the Canvas, James I is shown being taken up, towards Project B's 'shyning glory of the Deity' to give 'the account... to God, of the good gouernment of his people, & their prosperous estate both in soules and bodies', see p. 102. The happy outcome of this posthumous reckoning was signified and anticipated in the Canvas by the bestowal of the triumphal and civic crowns (corona triumphalis and corona civica). The traditional title of the Canvas – the Apotheosis of King James I – is thus inadequate. Insofar as the noun 'apotheosis' can loosely be defined as release from earthly life, but chiefly out of respect for the Canvas's traditional appellation, it is here retained. However, a heading such as King James I triumphantly escorted to Heaven to give an Account of his Rule would more precisely convey Rubens's intentions.

Rubens's awareness of the apotheosis theme had probably been stimulated by Peiresc's discovery of the Gemma Tiberiana, after which the artist made a largescale copy (Fig. 20), in the sacristy of the Ste. Chapelle, Paris, in 1620; Indeed, Van der Meulen, following Saward, has stated that the cameo inspired the apotheosis of King Henri IV (Fig. 21), depicted in the Marie de Medicis cycle, whose central motif closely related to that which Rubens was later to devise for the present painting (No. 4; Fig. 69) as Palme recognised. Gordon had earlier pointed out that the King in this Canvas was shown ascending with 'the Classical symbols of apotheosis', while Millar stated that in Rubens's first, extant formulation (No. 4a; Fig. 79), he is shown not in contemporary, but Classical-style costume. In fact, this observation requires modification, as here Rubens offered alternative styles of dress, both contemporary and 'Classical'; in the following, lost sketch, whose design is recorded by a print (No. 4b; Fig. 81), the alternatives remain, though now the emphasis is more on Classical, Roman-type attire. These early experiments with the King's costume were probably due to Rubens's not having received any precise instructions on the matter, or, if he had, his as yet ignorance of the appearance of Parliamentary robes, or robes of State, and of the chain and badge of the Order of the Garter.

It is possible that Rubens had in mind Cicero's Dream of Scipio, which Saward has identified as being influential in the treatment of the theme of apotheosis, when he proposed and adapted it: 'all those who have preserved, aided, or enlarged their fatherland have a special place prepared for them in the heavens, where they may enjoy an eternal life of happiness... But Scipio, imitate your grandfather here; imitate me, your father; love justice and duty, which are indeed strictly due to parents and kinsmen, but most of all to the fatherland. Such a life is the road to the skies, to that gathering of those who have completed their earthly lives and been relieved of the body, and who live in yonder place which you now see (it was the circle of light which blazed most brightly among the other fires) and which you on earth call the Milky Circle'.

Cicero's stated qualifications for an apotheosis were certainly met by James I, who had preserved and enlarged his fatherland.

In the Canvas, the female personification lifting up the King holds the scales of justice. In the bozzetto (No. 4a; Fig. 79), the scales are held by an adjacent child. In that first formulation, Justice also holds a flaming sword, changed into a straight sword in a lost sketch (No 4b; Fig. 81) and returned to a more profusely flaming sword
in the Canvas (No 4; Fig. 69). The sword and scales are the traditional symbols of Justice and described as such by Shakespeare in Henry IV, Part 2, Act V, Scene II, where King Henry V says to the Lord Chief Justice: ‘You are right justice, and you weigh this well; Therefore still beare the Ballance and the Sword’. But the flaming sword in the Canvas indicates that the personification was not intended as Justice – in the earthly sense, as one of the four Cardinal Virtues and an essential attribute of kingship – but Divine Justice.\(^{13}\) She was the daughter of Jupiter, and described by Plato, as following but Divine Justic e.\(^{13}\)

At about the time that the artist was completing work on the Banqueting Hall commission, he distinguished in another context between Pietas, Religio, and Sacra (ritual); this was in his inscriptions explaining his design for the frontispiece for J. Bidermann, Heroum Epistolae, Epigrammata et Herodias, published in 1634.\(^{24}\) The frontispiece showed, inter alia, an altar (for pietas), patera (for religio) and simpulum (a small ladle, for sacra). On the basis of Rubens’s explanation of the frontispiece, Held has suggested that the personification beside the King in the present composition was of Piety and Religion.\(^{25}\) A personification of Religion in the 1603 and 1611 editions of Ripa goes some way in support of this identification, although the characteristics itemised are not exactly those set out by Rubens.\(^{26}\)

However, just as the word pietas had a range of meanings, so did religio. In its widest sense, it subsumed ‘the rites and ceremonies as well as the entire system of religion and worship, the res divinae or sacrae’,\(^{27}\) and it is uncertain what precise meaning Rubens wished to convey in his frontispiece for Biderman. Given the similarity between the personification close to the door of the Temple of Janus with that to the King’s right, it is probable that Rubens intended a similar meaning to be attached to both, namely that of the Latin pietas with all its connotations, but in particular so far as it concerned a ruler’s duty towards, and a love of, his subjects.

Rubens’s concept for the personification changed as he developed the composition. In the bozzetto (No. 4a; Fig. 79) and the lost sketch (No. 4b; Fig. 81), the young woman’s demeanour is stern and determined; in the latter, her look is directed at Divine Justice. In the Louvre figural modello (No. 4d; Fig. 82), and subsequently, the young woman becomes ampler, her beauty is emphasized, and her gaze directed upwards. She thus also differs from the personification beside the door of the Temple of Janus (Fig. 26), who is mature and who concentrates on the door before her. It seems clear that Rubens has
expressed three different nuances of the concept of *pietas*; what precise meaning was early intended and then elaborated or modified remains as yet obscure. But it seems that in the figure’s demeanour love has replaced duty.

Rubens may have improvised the costume he early gave James I so that it was only in part ‘Classical’; in the *bozzetto* and the lost sketch, known by a print, (Nos. 4a and 4b), he is shown with a radiate crown (*corona radiata*), a symbol of apotheosis and deification. Prominent are other Classical features. The King is borne upwards by Jupiter’s messenger, the eagle, identifiable by the thunderbolts in his talons. The eagle was commonly the agent for a Classical apotheosis. His foot rests on the globe of the world (*orbis mundi*), a symbol of power or imperial authority. The golden light of the sky in the *bozzetto* (No. 4a) was presumably intended in the context of an apotheosis to be ethereal (and in a Christian context to refer to Project B’s ‘shining glory of the Diety’, see Appendix 1.2).

To signify and broadcast the Divine approval of James I’s exercise of his prerogative for the public good, Rubens also adapted the theme of a Classical triumph: the king was depicted as about to be crowned with the triumphal crown (*corona triumphalis*), while a child and amoretti, above left in the *bozzetto*, (No. 4a; Fig. 79) – the motif was amplified and clarified in the Canvas (No. 4; Fig. 70) – descend with a second crown, no doubt the civic crown of oak leaves (*corona civica*). The triumphal crown was worn by a Roman commander during his triumph. Pliny described the origins of, and the qualification for, an award of the civic crown: ‘the Civic Wreaths, that glorious emblem of military valour, but now for a long time past also an emblem of the emperor’s clemency, ever since ... not to kill a fellow citizen had come to be deemed meritorious’. A civic crown had been bestowed on Julius Caesar as the saviour of his country. Seneca thus described it: ‘True happiness consists in giving safety to many, in calling back to life from the very verge of death and in earning the civic crown by showing mercy. No decoration is worthier of the eminence of a prince or more beautiful than the crown bestowed for saving the lives of fellow citizens’. In the Canvas (No. 4; Fig. 73), the King is also offered two victor’s palms, while two amoretti play a tuba and trumpet, acceptably but not precisely an allusion to Fame (*Fama*).

In one case a classical conceit may have been replaced by what may have been a reference to English history. In the presumed final modello (No. 4e, Fig. 83) a child was introduced at the top left holding an olive branch, an allusion to Minerva and a symbol of Peace (but see also below), which was replaced in the canvas by flowers – red and white roses? – that are about to be strewn on the ascending King. When and why this alteration took place and whether it was on Rubens’s sole initiative remains unknown. It has to be borne in mind that another iconographic change was made at an even later stage, see below. In this case it may have occurred out of a preference for the conceit of ‘Angells flying wt garlands & strewing of flowers’ prescribed in Project A, see Appendix 1.1, as part of the design for the central compartment at the upper, or southern, end of the ceiling. The roses – if such they are – would allude to the Houses of York and Lancaster as did those in the festoon in the *Union*, see under No. 5.

Various identifications have been proposed for the two personifications who are about to invest the King with the triumphal crown. By reference to Gevartius’s description of an antique coin in his commentary on the designs for the *Pompa Introitus Ferdinandi*, Held has convincingly identified the winged female on the left as Peace-bearing Victory (*Victoria Pacifera*). In the *bozzetto* (No. 4a; Fig. 79), she was at an early stage shown holding the caduceus; however, having moved the figure, Rubens had not retrieved and restored it to her when he ceased work on the support. The personification holds the caduceus in the Canvas as she does in the records of other preparatory work (Nos. 4b and 4e).

Held considered the attributes there displayed of helmet, shield and lance, and of the helmet and shield in the Canvas to be insufficient to warrant an identification of the other figure as Minerva. Further, the pose and cos-
tume seem hardly worthy of such a powerful goddess. Held’s proposal, based on an analogy between the figure and the personification of Roman Monarchy in Rubens’s frontispiece to Goltzius’s Romanae Antiquitates,31 that it could ‘represent’ Britain is not on the face of it convincing, as it is by no means certain that Rubens ever intended the figure to hold a lance of honour (hasta pura) and it never held a small statue of a Victory (victoriola). In the bozzetto (No. 4a), the object held in the same hand as the shield looks like a lance, though its point was either never executed or has been worn away; and it is most definitely a lance in the record of the lost sketch (No. 4b; Fig. 81). In the lost, third or fourth (?) modello (No. 4e; Figs. 83-84), it could be a goad or a lance; in the Canvas (No. 4; Fig. 69), the emblem has been abandoned, but surely not, pace Held,42 chiefly for aesthetic reasons only.

A woman dressed in a similar way, wearing a helmet and holding a shield and dart (dardo) in her left hand and an olive branch in her right, is Ripa’s personification of Governo della Repubblica.43 The helmet and shield (held on the right arm) and earlier considerations of a lance or goad-like object have affinities or agree with Ripa’s conceit; but the personification does not here hold an olive branch. This absent emblem (also appropriate to Minerva; see under No. 7, Iconography) may at one stage – in the lost, final modello (No. 4e; Fig. 83) – have been that held on her behalf by an adjacent child. For the personification to be adapted from Ripa’s recently codified conceit, Charles I and Rubens would not have understood repubblica literally as republic, but would have interpreted it to mean more loosely ‘res publica’ or commonwealth, in the sense of its meaning a body politic. The fact that the Roundheads established a Commonwealth after the execution of Charles I, should of course not obscure the fact that the concept by no means only had republican connotations.44 Thus it could be that the figure was intended to personify the Commonwealth of Great Britain, as distinct from Britannia, who as Strong has shown was depicted differently.45 Maybe this proposed adaptation of Ripa’s conceit is too tenuous in our present state of knowledge, and thus the not wholly satisfactory identification of the figure as Minerva as favoured by Strong46 and Millar47 is only with qualification followed here. The crowning of James I by the goddess of Wisdom would mark a recognition of his wisdom,48 but it might be seen as an intrusion for the pagan goddess to act on behalf of the (Christian) Deity.

The coherent depiction of the irresistible monarch’s final confrontation with God in the idiom of a triumphant apotheosis had come to be modified and elaborated at least by the time the lost, third or fourth (?) modello, known by copies (No. 4e; Figs. 83-84) was executed. Held has described this process, which was probably not undertaken, as he believed, only because of a change of format,49 but because of the likely (but only hypothetical) communication both of new measurements, which made the field longer, and of royal requirements concerning the iconography. This probably happened after the inspection in London of the lost Overall Modello (No. 2) which Rubens had sent to Charles I for his approval. Then it may have been realised that the design for the central compartment was not ample enough to fill it, and that he had not endowed the King with all the necessary emblems of majesty. The same criticism was then also probably levelled at Rubens’s first ideas for the Wise Rule (No. 3), the other composition for which the artist had devised an alternative subject to those proposed in the Projects.

In answer to criticism from, and to make modifications required by, London, Rubens widened a diagonal band across the composition to create the extra length now required. In it he introduced: to the left above Piety, a female personification holding a book; in the centre, the motif of amoretti removing symbols of the King’s earthly power, the Imperial Crown, and the orb; and in the centre and right, an amoretto pointing upwards and two amoretti blowing a tuba and a trumpet. In the top left, room was found for a child helping to hold the civic crown and (initially) holding an olive branch, see above.
on the early nineteenth-century key-plan (Fig. 9), identified her as 'Zeal', while emphasizing that both female personifications 'undoubtedly refer to the king's concern for matters of religion'. However, she may be best identified as Theology by comparison with Raphael's personification (whose head covering differs) in the Stanza della Segnatura in the Vatican. This female figure, who holds a closed book, is seated between two angels who hold tablets, one inscribed DIVINAR / RER[UM], the other NOTI / TIA.

It was originally intended that the book should also be shut in the Canvas, but it was modified so that an open left-hand page became visible (Fig. 75). Whether Rubens made the change on his own initiative or whether it was authorized can probably never be determined. But as a result, the identity of the personification could have been altered, and the question arises as to what she should then be understood to have personified. In the 1603 edition of Ripa's Iconologia, one - but only one - of the attributes of Religione vera Christiana is an open book in which was written the Latin text of admonition to love God and thy neighbour; the open book is explained as 'Patris lex veneranda mei'. The open book no longer featured in the 1618 edition of the Iconologia, but around the Tree of Honour in Thomas Dekker's Lord Mayor's Show of 1628, entitled Britannia's Honour, were various allegorical figures among whom was Religion 'in a white glittering robe ... holding in one hand, a Booke open'. Thus the figure may have been altered so that it could be identified as Religion. The reason for the introduction of Theology, and its later alteration to Religion was presumably first intended to demonstrate James I's great expertise as a theologian, and then his pastoral concern for his subjects' souls.

On the now open book is a different inscription to the lengthy injunction specified by Ripa; it reads: 'IN PR / VERBl' (that is, IN PRINCIPIO ERAT / VERBl[M], the last parts of the inscriptions being understood to be on the opposite page of the book), the opening words of St John's Gospel in the Vulgate. Whether the inscription is authentic and/or as originally intended is impossible to say; it appears as 'IN PR / V [?] in Gribelin's engraving of 1720 (Fig. 85; see Appendix VI). With the book shut or even open without an inscription, the Christian reference could have been no more than neutral, but open and with a quotation from the Vulgate, the Christian element may be thought to become more specifically Catholic, as the book perhaps should be identified as the Vulgate itself. However, this inference should not be laboured too strenuously, for emphasis on the Word was a fundamental and key Evangelical tenet; the Bible beside the King in Simon van der Passe's engraved Portrait of King James I - the frontispiece for A Collection of his Maiesties Workes - of 1616, was inscribed 'Verbum Dei'.

It seems unlikely that the inscription was due to the artist himself, working shortly before the packing of the Canvas, or to his (unidentified) assistant, working in the Banqueting Hall, on official instructions. If the latter had been the case, it could be taken as (perhaps not robust) evidence of a public recognition of Catholicism (not Roman Catholicism) by Charles I (whose Queen was of course a Roman Catholic). But such an association would have been particularly inappropriate for James I, one of whose major achievements was to obtain a translation of the Bible into English.

By 1720, the Canvases had only received the attention of one restorer since their installation. This work was undertaken in 1687, during the reign of the Roman Catholic King James II, whose pro-Roman Catholic policy was the main factor that brought about the Glorious Revolution of 1688-89 and his exile. It might be argued that the inscription would have been the kind of detail that a restorer would respect; but against this is the fact that the other inscription in the cycle (on the garter in the Union, No. 5) is incorrect, see p. 221. It may be that the restorer, Parry Walton, was instructed discreetly to add the inscription to indicate the King's religious preference. But why this particular quotation was selected as a means of identifying the book as the Bible (if such it does), remains obscure, as does its intended significance. On the other hand, Lord Dacre (the historian Hugh Trevor-
Roper) cautioned against attaching too great a significance to the quotation, which may have been inserted simply because it was traditionally regarded in England with particular reverence.\(^6\)

The introduction of the Imperial Crown – with the consequent abandonment of the radiate crown – and of the orb, which followed the decision to depict James I wearing Parliamentary robes (first essayed perhaps in No. 4c), achieved a degree of overall coherence, as he was thus attired and equipped in the two other Canvases occupying the central compartments of the ceiling (Nos. 3 and 5). The King arrayed in his Parliamentary robes celebrated or commemorated his adherence to the traditional form of consensual government – the ancient constitution – as the King in Parliament was the highest court in England, see pp. 68 and 158. The Imperial Crown and orb had been omitted in the early sketches; their inclusion would have been chiefly requested as necessary to complement the symbols of his power, earlier represented by the sceptre alone, which should accompany portrayals of the monarch. For a discussion of the regalia, James I’s appearance and physiognomy, see pp. 66-71.

Held worried needlessly about their removal from the King;\(^5\) the motif was determined as much by iconography as by practicality. The removal of the crown was also introduced probably at this late stage in the Wise Rule (No. 3) by the introduction of the child taking it away, see p. 158. In both compositions, the function of the motif was not only to display all the emblems of the King’s majesty but also to make it possible for him to be invested with the triumphal crown. It had been used before by Rubens and perhaps derived from Vasari, see p. 164. Clearly, when the action taking place in the Apotheosis was considered, it was realised that the orb, held on State occasions in the King’s left hand, would also have to be shown as being removed so that James I could hold onto Divine Justice as she helped him upwards.

The decision to have James I thus presented was iconographically significant as it further reduced the bias towards a Classical, Roman apotheosis. Clearly, Charles I wished to stress the idea of his dead father’s final reckoning with God for his prerogative actions as a Christian king, who had upheld custom and tradition. This was achieved by depicting his father in Parliamentary robes accompanied by the emblems of (Christian) kingship (crown, sceptre, and orb). The introduction of Piety and finally of (Christian) Religion in the Canvas, further sustained such a reading. This Palme has provided;\(^5\) Gordon, too, identifying the figure, who lifts up the King, as Justice, rather than Divine Justice, referred rightly or wrongly to the two opening chapters (sic) of the Basilikon Doron to draw out further relevance and meaning of the personifications closest to him.\(^6\)

Maybe the last sentences of James I’s A Meditation..., of 1620, were brought to Rubens’s attention as being an appropriate means of clarifying and improving the formulation of Project B, see Appendix 1.2. Or it is possible that Rubens lit on it in the course of his research and preparations. At all events, it seems equally likely that it was Rubens’s idea to adapt the apotheosis theme as the best means of depicting the concept there movingly expressed, see pp. 101-102 and 186. That the final reckoning would be favourable to James I, and redound on his successor, was made quite clear by the triumphal and civic crowns, with which he was about to be invested, and by his expectant upward gaze towards the ‘shyning glory of the Deity’.

1. See pp. 102-103, and James I and VI, Political Writings, 1994, pp. 229 ff.
2. See his opening statement ‘I must avow, that I owe the account of my actions to God alone’ in his speech at the ‘Prorogation of Parliament at the end of the session of 1628, 26th June 1628’, reprinted in S. Gardiner, The Constitutional Documents of the Puritan Revolution 1625-1660, Oxford, 1899 (edn), p. 73; see also ‘The King’s Declaration showing the Causes of the late Dissolution 10 March 1629, in ibid., p. 83.
3. James I and VI, Political Writings, 1994, p. 249. See also Howarth, Images, 1997, p. 124, who described the King as being here ‘called to account’.
5. Van der Meulen, Antique (CRLB), 1994, loc. cit.
13. See Saward, Medici, 1982, p. 180. For the flaming sword, see ibid., pp. 162 and 292, n. 10, where she noted that the flaming sword as a symbol of Divine Justice is to be found in M. Paradin, Les Devises Heritiques, Antwerp, 1567, pp. 146 ff. Three swords of justice from the personal regalia were displayed at the coronation of Charles I, 'the Curtana, or Sword of Mercy ... the "pointed sword of temporal Justice"', and 'the sword of Spiritual Justice'; see R. Lightbown, 'The King's Goods, 1989, p. 266-267. Moreover, the very next night he (Octavius, the father of Augustus) dreamed that his son appeared to him in a guise more majestic than that of a mortal man, with the thunderbolt, sceptre and insignia of Jupiter Optimus Maximus, wearing a crown begirt with rays and mounted upon a laurel-wreathed chariot'. (Atque etiam sequenti statui nocte videre visus est lilium mortalium specie ampliorem, cum fulmine et sceptro exuviaque ilium Optimis Maximis ac radiata corona, super laureatum currum.)

As would have been readily known following the publication of G.P. Valerianus, Hieroglyphica, 1556. For easier reference, see G.P. Valeriano, Bolzani, Hieroglyphica, Lyon, 1602, p. 191 A-B (reprint, New York—London 1976), the reference kindly provided by Elizabeth McGrath. See also S. Weinstock (as in note 20), pp. 356 ff.; and Saward, Medici, 1982, p. 100.


15. Ripa, Iconologia, 1611, pp. 202-203. Ripa endowed the personification with additional features to the sword (not specified as flaming) and scales.


17. Martin, Pompa (CRLB) 1972, pp. 163-169, no. 44.

18. Martin, Pompa (CRLB) 1972, p. 171, under no. 44a, and figs. 86, 87; see also Held, Sketches, 1980, i, no. 161; ii, pl. 162.

19. Geoffartius, Pompa, 1641, p. 117: 'Pietas iuxta Aram illi adstans, ac pateram dextrâ tenens'.


23. See OED, 1884-1928, VII, p. 843, under 'Pietie'.

24. See Judson—Van de Velde, Title-pages (CRLB). 1978, pp. 280-282, no. 67, and pp. 282-283, no. 67a, for Rubens's inscribed drawing for the engraver; the engraver received final payment for his work on 25 January 1634. See ibid., p. 282, under no. 67.


26. Ripa, Iconologia, 1611, p. 458: A venerable woman, wearing a cloth of white linen, her right hand open and her left is placed over an altar, on which a flame burns ('Matrona, d'aespera venerabile, vestita di panno di lino bianco; terrá la destra mano aperta, & la sinistra sopra vn'altare, nel quale arderà vna fiamma di tuco'); see also the 1603 edition, but not that of 1618.


28. See Saward, Medici, 1982, pp. 32 and 266, n. 55, referring to the account of portents of Augustus's greatness by Gaius Suetonius Tranquillus, De Vita Caesarum, II, Divus Augustus, XCIV, 6, in the Loeb Classical Library, Suetonius, with an English translation by J. Rolfe, London–New York, 1924 (reprint), i, pp. 266-267. 'Moreover, the very next night he (Octavius, the father of Augustus) dreamed that his son appeared to him in a guise more majestic than that of a mortal man, with the thunderbolt, sceptre and insignia of Jupiter Optimus Maximus, wearing a crown begirt with rays and mounted upon a laurel-wreathed chariot'. (Atque etiam sequenti statui nocte videre visus est lilium mortalium specie ampliorem, cum fulmine et sceptro exuviaque ilium Optimis Maximis ac radiata corona, super laureatum currum.)

34. See *The Loeb Classical Library, Pliny* (as in note 33), p. 390, n. ‘b’.


36. See G. de Tervarent (as in n. 32), p. 387. Fame’s attributes should properly be two trumpets.

37. They are described simply as flowers by W. Hampton in his MS. condition report made during the 1946/47-1950 cleaning campaign, at present held in the English Heritage Studio Archive, Regents Park, London (typescript at Historic Royal Palaces, Hampton Court Palace, Surrey). *Held, Sketches*, 1980, I, p. 202, under no. 135, mistakenly read the heads of flowers held by the boy as a purse – ‘a transparent allusion, perhaps, to the king’s bounty’.


42. See *Held, loc. cit.*

43. *Ripa, Iconologia*, 1618, p. 193: Government of the Republic – a woman similar to Minerva; she holds in her right hand an olive branch on her left arm a shield and she holds a dart and wears a helmet (‘Governo della Repubblica / Donna simile a Minerva; nella destra mano tiene un ramo d’olivo, col braccio sinistro un scudo & nella medesima mano un dardo & con un morione in capo’).

44. See *OED*, 1884-1928, II, p. 696, under ‘Commonwealth (2)’. See also Sharpe, *Remapping*, 2000, pp. 48-53, who preferred to use the term ‘commonwealth’.


46. Ibid, p. 52.


48. Held’s unconvincing objection (*Held, Sketches*, 1980, I, p. 203, under no. 135) notwithstanding, that the King could not be crowned by the Personification of one of the qualities that he possessed.

49. *Held, Sketches*, 1980, I, p. 202, under no. 135. It should be noted that Rubens had already altered the format, but not catered for a much larger area, when he executed the prototype of Vorsterman’s engraving, see No. 4b.

50. *Held, loc. cit.*


57. The inscription is incorrectly given in full by *Gordon, Whitehall Ceiling*, 1975, p. 35; see also *Martin, King James*, 1995, p. 169, fig. 1, p. 365.

58. For the engraving, see *Hollstein (Dutch and Flemish)*, XVI, p. 171, no. 67. Indicative of the problematic interpretation of the inscription is that this quotation from St John’s Gospel, inscribed in full on an open book, is the motto of Oxford University, recorded in 1575. See L. Pine, *A Dictionary of Mottoes*, London–Boston–Melbourne–Henley, 1983, p. 110.


60. In a conversation with the author in 2001, Lord Dacre kindly pointed to the use of the quotation by Geoffrey Chaucer in his description of the Friar in the General Prologue to *The Canterbury Tales*: ‘For thogh a wydwe hadde noght a sho, / So pleasent was his ‘In principio’ / Yet wolde he have a ferthyng er he wente’. See *The Works of Geoffrey Chaucer*, ed. F. Robinson, Boston, 1957 (edn), p. 19, lines 253-255. Robinson, p. 657 n. to
line 254, stated that ‘The opening words of St John’s Gospel (vv. 1-14) were regarded with peculiar reverence and even held to have a magical virtue’.

61. Held, Sketches, 1980, I, p. 203, under no. 135, seeking to refute Palme, Triumph, 1956, p. 247. J. Charlton, The Banqueting House, Whitehall, London, 1983, p. 30, denied that the Imperial Crown and orb were being taken away; but clearly, the contrary is the case, as the King would have no further need for them.


63. Gordon, Whitehall Ceiling, 1975, pp. 37-38. The first two books of the Basilikon Doron are entitled ‘Of A Kings Christian Dvitie Towards God’ (that is religion) and ‘Of A Kings Dvitie In His Office’ (that is Justice). See James I and VI, Political Writings, 1994, pp. 12, 19. Morford, Stoics, 1991, pp. 205-206, suggested that Rubens here followed Stoic and neo-Stoic beliefs, as Seneca in the Politica, which had been edited by Lipsius, characterised justice as the ‘supreme princely virtue’ and specified ‘the protection of religion...[as] the Prince’s duty’.

64. Howarth, Images, 1997, p. 124, described the King here as ‘a fearful, tousled, grey-haired old man’.

4. The Apotheosis of King James I: Ceiling Painting (Pls. 3 centre, 6-8 and 13 details, and Figs. 69-78)

Oil on canvas, adhered to canvas laid down on a laminated wood support: 975 x 625 cm. Inscribed on the open page of the book held by the personification of Christian Religion: IN PRI / VERBU

London, Whitehall, The Banqueting Hall in the Banqueting House, the central compartment of the ceiling.

COPY: Engraving by Simon Gribelin II (Fig. 85; see Appendix VI).


King James I, holding a sceptre in his right hand, his left foot resting on the globe of the world (orbis mundi), his right on the wing of Jupiter’s eagle, is lifted upwards by the personification of Divine Justice (Justitia Divina), accompanied by the personifications of Piety (Pietas) and Christian Religion (Religio Christiana). The King is about to be crowned with a triumphal crown (corona triumphalis) by the goddess Peace-bearing Victory (Victoria Pacifera), who holds a caduceus, and by ? Minerva, as amoretti remove the orb and Imperial Crown. Two play a tuba and a trumpet, while two children and an amoretti offer victor’s palm fronds, one of whom, above, with an amoretti, proffers a civic crown (corona civica), while the child also scatters flowers. All is set against heavenly light.

The grey-haired King is wearing Parliamentary robes and the chain of the Order of the Garter. Divine Justice, holding scales and a flaming sword, wears an off-the-shoulder yellow mantle over a dark gown; ? Minerva wears a reddish grey mantle over a grey gown; Peace-bearing Victory’s torso is naked; she wears a greenish black gown worn below the waist and a pinkish wrap over her wing and arm; Christian Religion wears a grey mantle, Piety, a white mantle over a yellow gown.

The Canvas as supplied was probably marginally too small, see pp. 85-87 and Appendix IX. It is uncertain as to whether it has since been reduced.

The Canvas and its wooden support were sawn into four horizontal sections to enable its removal in 1940, see p. 127.

The conservation report made in 1947 noted three horizontal canvas joins: one running
through the King’s hand, which holds the sceptre, the next through the base of the caduceus, and last running through the calf of the child top left. It recorded that the state of preservation is better in the bottom half than the top. There is a tear in the centre that goes through the head of the King, but he, the eagle, and Divine Justice are described as in good condition as is the amorettos holding the orb. The amorettos holding the crown is more damaged, as is the amorettos pointing upwards; the condition of the child and three amorettos to the right is good, as are the heads of Christian Religion and Piety and the sky around them. The left-hand side of the book has worn thin. Peace-bearing Victory is recorded as having numerous damages; the child at top left is not in good condition nor is the pink mantle of Minerva (?). The clouds are in poor state. Some areas were noted for the thinness of paint: the eagle, the drapery on Peace-bearing Victory’s wing, the shield and nearby trumpet, the amorettos swooping down in the top left, and the sky, where the grey priming or imprimatura shows through.2

Pentimenti were noted in the book – which was originally depicted shut – the finger and thumb of the personification’s left hand are now visible (Fig. 75), and in the foot and knee of the genius with the orb. There is also a pentimento in the right arm of Christian Religion. The amorettos directly beneath the shield first pointed up to the left towards the group holding the civic crown (Fig. 73). And an alteration was made to the little finger of the hand holding the caduceus (Fig. 72).

The light comes from above.

The Canvas was painted under Rubens’s direction, probably after he had laid in the design and following his verbal instructions and his example, by an assistant, possibly Jan van den Hoecke, see pp. 75-78. However, Rubens probably retained the figure of James I, the globe, and the eagle as his final responsibility; he may well also have painted the head of Divine Justice. Rubens would also have made the alterations (whether to the book held by Religion is discussed below), most notably to the arm of the pointing amorettos; his retouching of the amorettos and child in the centre and centre right and the face of Piety (for instance) seems to have been quite extensive. A specialist was probably responsible for the wreaths, flowers, and palm fronds.

The colours of the costumes seem to be approximately those in the presumed copies of the lost, third or fourth compositional modello (No. 4e), although the gowns worn by Peace-bearing Victory and Divine Justice are (now) of a dark hue. But to the composition, as there recorded, Rubens did make several alterations, some during work on the Canvas itself. In the Canvas, the King’s head has been brought forward and is seen in three-quarters profile looking up to his left; in this way, a more recognisable portrayal of his face could be made, see p. 67. To heighten the impression of the effort required by the left-hand amorettos to carry away the orb and Imperial Crown, his right thigh was depicted. A major, formal alteration seems to have been to execute the figures on a larger scale. As a result there was less space between the King, Peace-bearing Victory, and ? Minerva, so the group of amorettos in the centre and right had to be compressed. Unforeseen was the now too-close juxtaposition of the amorettos hand pointing towards the group, top left, with the civic crown. To avoid this, the arm was altered so that it pointed straight upwards. Of iconographic consequence was the bestowal of a palm to the child at the centre, right-hand edge, and the substitution of flowers (red and white roses?) for the olive branch held by the child top left,3 whose wings were abandoned. Also abandoned was ? Minerva’s lance.

The decision to alter the book held by Theology to allow a change in the concept personified to that of Christian Religion was made during the execution of the Canvas. The personification’s thumb and finger of the left hand were originally executed so as to hold the top left-hand corner of the book, but then a new pose for the right arm and hand were devised so that the book could be held open. The thumb and finger show up beneath the open page. These latter two pentimenti, undertaken for iconographic reasons, could well have been executed
by Rubens at the very last stage of his responsibility for the Canvases, during the retouching that Gerbier reported that he had undertaken in the early autumn of 1635, see p. 82. This might explain its cursory nature.

The motif of the King being helped upwards is a development of that evolved for the apotheosis of King Henri IV in the Marie de Médicis cycle (Fig. 21); it comes closest, while reversed, to Minerva helping up the Duke of Buckingham in the Minerva and Mercury conducting the Duke of Buckingham to the Temple of Honour and 'Virtus' (Fig. 19), which was probably ready for despatch to London in 1627. The pose of Minerva was probably inspired by the Victory in Veronese's Triumph of Venice; the similarity of the pose is even closer in the bozzetto (No. 4a; Fig. 79).

The idea of the eagle bearing the King upwards derives from renderings of Jupiter enthroned above the eagle of which there are examples in Classical art; and is later depicted by Raphael in the Villa Farnesina. There seem to be no precedents for the eagle bearing both the globe of the world and Jupiter; but a print after Stradanus (Jan van der Straet) shows the eagle holding Jupiter's thunderbolts in its talons as Jupiter is borne upwards. And Jupiter is thus prominently - but in a loose arrangement and not being lifted upwards - depicted by Rubens in the Apotheosis of King Henri IV. The crowning of the King by Peace-bearing Victory is probably an adaptation of an earlier formulation by the artist in the Kassel Crowning of the Victor where the foreshortening is far less pronounced. There the pose of the hero bears a resemblance to that devised for James I, although the legs are interchanged.

In order to render the figure of Peace-bearing Victory partly in steep foreshortening, the artist turned to the connected pose developed for the Hora to the left in the Birth of Marie de Médicis; the top half of her body may ultimately depend on the Hora dropping flowers, above and to the left of the table, in Raphael's Marriage of Cupid and Psyche in the Farnesina. The pose is nearly replicated in the topmost child in the Canvas (Fig. 70). A child holding dividers in a similar pose and occupying a similar position in the composition to the amoretto (only part of whom and now holding a victor's palm was finally to be included in the Canvas) above and to the right of Divine Justice is found in the ceiling fresco of the Four Cardinal Virtues by Orazio Samacchini in S. Abbondio, Cremona, which was executed by July 1576. Cremona is not a city that Rubens is known to have visited, though he might well have had to pass through it on his travels, and Samacchini is not an artist otherwise known to have influenced or interested him. However, three other resemblances with figures in this and the two accompanying frescoes in the series suggest that Rubens may have known this ceiling decoration.

Indeed, the pose of the amoretto removing the orb (Fig. 74) has links with another figure in the same cycle by Samacchini. It recalls the angel at lower left beneath the Glory in the Circumcision painted by Rubens for St Ambrogio, Genoa, in 1605. Rubens had recently repeated it, but in reverse, in the pose for Zephyr in the Zephyr and Flora at Dessau, which he executed in collaboration with Jan Brueghel II. The top half of Piety is a sinuous elaboration of that suggested in the Louvre modello (No. 4d; Fig. 82); she is now depicted full length as in the lost compositional modello (No. 4e; Figs. 83-84). For Theology, Rubens used one of the rejected poses for Piety considered in the bozzetto (No. 4a; Fig. 79). The pose of the newly introduced, trumpet-playing amoretto is very similar to that of the escutcheon bearing amoretto in the Union, see p. 223, although the wing differs slightly. It was to be used again with slight alteration for the amoretto leading Procession II (No. 11), where the wing again differs as does the colour of the hair, see No. 11c; Fig. 158.

For the regalia and Parliamentary robes and Garter collar, see pp. 68-71. Rubens's rendering of James I physiognomy is as imaginatively successful as that in the Union (No. 5) and is also discussed above, see p. 61. Howarth thought his demeanour to be 'fearful', but this could hardly have been Rubens's only intention, which, it is suggested, was to convey both the king's apprehension at the reckoning and confidence of the outcome (Pls. 6 and 13, and Fig. 69).
The extant preparatory work, or records of it, are among the least complete of the compositions for the ceiling. While there are sketches or records of sketches for perhaps every phase in Rubens’s development of the composition, there is a marked lack of extant figural modelli. The only example, in the Louvre (No. 4d; Fig. 82), is exceptional as its support is hybrid; and it could well be a fragment. Here the attitude of Peace-bearing Victory is one not otherwise recorded in the preparatory work; maybe Rubens temporarily reconsidered the pose as he increased the number of amoretti. The Louvre sketch may have followed immediately on the lost compositional sketch described by Smith, No. 4b, which, if authentic, would be the largest of all the recorded preparatory works for the commission.

In spite of the pentimenti to the right of the King in the first bozzetto (No. 4a; Figs. 79-80), it is evident that Rubens had already formulated the basic scheme of the composition when he came to draft it there. The next sketch – perhaps also a grisaille, recorded by Vorsterman’s print (No. 4b; Fig. 81) – shows a concern to determine the degree of foreshortening of the main feature consisting of James I, the globe of the world and the eagle, however the King’s attire was still fanciful. Therefore the work should be dated to before Rubens received instructions about the correct apparel and/or before he had a chance to study the Sovereign’s Parliamentary robes and the badge and chain of the Order of the Garter. These important features would have been introduced in the subsequent compositional modello (No. 4c). The figural modelli would have preceded the setting out of Rubens’s proposals in the lost Overall Modello (No. 2).

It seems quite possible that the design sent to London for approval (No. 2) was an elaboration of that sketched in the Multiple Bozzetto (No. 4a; Fig. 79), as worked out in No 4c, whose design may have been reflected in the figural modello (No 4d; Fig. 82). A study of the Overall Modello (No. 2) must have alerted the King to improvements required for reasons of decorum concerning emblems of majesty omitted in the modello. These had also been incomplete in the proposal for the Wise Rule (No. 3) and Union (No. 5); and it was probably Rubens’s idea to have them displayed as they were being removed to allow James I to be crowned with Roman symbols of triumph. The request for an amplified iconography was probably accompanied by a new set of measurements, which facilitated Rubens’s task in meeting it. At least two seventeenth-century copies exist of what is probably Rubens’s third or fourth (?), anyway final compositional modello (No. 4e; Figs. 83-84). Rubens was to continue to make significant changes during the execution of the Canvas itself.

Summary of the proposed sequence:

No. 4a. Compositional bozzetto in the centre of the Multiple Bozzetto (No. 1; Fig. 79), executed in position B (Fig. 51).

No. 4b. Second compositional bozzetto or first compositional modello.
Whereabouts unknown (recorded in a print, listed under Copy, Fig. 81).

No. 4c. First or second compositional modello.
Whereabouts unknown (described in a catalogue of 1842).

No. 4d. Figural modelli for Piety and Victory.
Paris, Musée du Louvre (Fig. 82).

No. 2. Proposed treatment in the Overall Modello. Listed in the catalogue of King Charles I’s collection of c. 1639. Not included in the catalogue of preparatory work that follows.
Whereabouts unknown, presumed destroyed.

No. 4e. Third or fourth (?) compositional modello. (Accepted by Burchard as autograph but doubted by the present author).
St Petersburg, The State Hermitage Museum (Fig. 83).

No. 4. The Canvas in the ceiling.
The Banqueting Hall, Whitehall (Pl. 3, centre, and Fig. 69).

1. Imperial measurements provided by the Ministry of Works in 1950: 32 ft. x 20 ft. 6 in. [9.754 x 6.248 cm.]. Those published in 1907 were: 32 ft. 1 in. x 20 ft. 8 in. [9.879 x 6.299 cm.]; see p. 123, n. 101, and p. 126.
2. See the MS. condition report by W. Hampton, at present in the English Heritage Studio Archive, Regents Park, London (typescript at Historic Royal Palaces, Hampton Court Palace, Surrey). The tear in the King's face probably was made when the Canvas was being lowered from the ceiling in 1940; see p. 127. As with the other canvases, nail holes were revealed round the edges, where the support had been nailed to the front of the stretcher; see further p. 123, under note 101.

3. As noted by Held, Sketches, 1980, I, p. 202, under no. 135, but read by him as 'an open purse'.


5. See Jaffe, Catalogo, 1989, no. 795. For the modello, see Martin, Cat. National Gallery, 1970, pp. 147 ff., under no. 187, and Held, Sketches, 1986, pp. 391-392, no. 291. The picture was destroyed in 1949, when in the collection of the Earl of Jersey, having previously hung at Osterley Park, Middlesex, for over two hundred years.

6. As last pointed out by Held, Sketches, 1980, loc. cit. For the Veronese, see, for instance, G. Piovone and R. Marini, L'Opera Completa del Veronese, Milan, 1968, no. 269. A common source may have been the figure of God the Father creating plants in the Sistine ceiling, for which see C. de Tolnay, Michelangelo, II. The Sistine Ceiling, Princeton, 1945, pl. 51.

7. See, for instance, the Jupiter enthroned in the tympanum of a temple in the Triumph of Marcus Aurelius relief, copied in the Codex Coburgensis, for which see H. Wrede and R. Harprath, [Cat. Exh.] Der Codex Coburgensis (Kunstsammlungen der Veste Coburg, Coburger Landesstiftung, Coburg, 1986), no. 31, fig. 12.

8. In the fresco depicting Venus imploring the Help of Jupiter, see Gronau, Raffaell, 1909, p. 152, left, which also inspired a Cupid supplianting Jupiter's Consent by Rubens, known by a copy by Pannells, for which see Burchard-d'Hulst, Drawings, 1963, I, p. 191, under no. 121, and Martin, Buckingham, 1966, p. 613, under n. 3, and p. 617, fig. 24.

9. By Hans (Jan Baptist I) Collaert (1566-1628). See Hollstein (Dutch and Flemish), vol. IV, p. 212, nos. 113-120; the relevant print is no. 2 in a series of the seven Planets. A print by Gian Giacomo Caraglio after Rosso Fiorentino shows Jupiter riding the eagle, but it does not hold the thunderbolts, see Illustrated Bartsch, XXVIII (formerly, XV, part I), p. 123, no. 26-II (79). In the same vein, but in a Christian context, is the print by 'AV' after Giulio Romano of St John, see Illustrated Bartsch, XXVI (formerly, XIV, part I), p. 121, no. 93 (83).

10. See K.d.K. ed. Oldenburg, 1921, loc. cit., Jupiter is also thus depicted in the Destiny of Marie de Medicis, p. 243: for these observations, see Burchard-d'Hulst, Drawings, 1963, I, loc. cit.

11. See K.d.K. ed. Oldenburg, 1921, p. 57. The motif might have been considered appropriate for an apotheosis, but Rubens did not accept Peiresc's interpretation of the Gemma Augustae, in which a seated hero is laurated, as the Apotheosis of Augustus, see Van der Meulen, Antique (CRLB), 1994, II, p. 177, under no. 164.

12. See K.d.K. ed. Oldenburg, 1921, p. 244. Held, Sketches, 1980, loc. cit., preferred to link this pose with the outer Grace in the Mercury conducting Psyche to Olympus, coll. H.R.H. Fürst von und zu Liechtenstein (his no. 129), a pose he traced back to the bending figure, central, in Titian's Andrians, for which see H. Wethey, The Paintings of Titian, III, The Mythological and Historical Paintings, London, 1975, no. 15, pl. 57. Peace - bearing Victory's pose also connects with that created by Rubens for Psyche in the Cupid and Psyche, for which see Jaffe, Catalogo, 1989, no. 120.


15. Compare the youth holding a scroll in the Three Theological Virtues by Samacchini, for which see V. Fortunati Pietrantonio, op. cit. (as in n. 14), p. 676.

16. See Jaffe, Catalogo, 1989, p. 157, no. 54. Rubens was soon to replace the pose for the left-hand angel holding the scroll in the Adoration of the Shepherds at Fermo, see Jaffe, op. cit., p. 163, and no. 79, p. 162, and for that middle left, in the Assumption and Coronation of the Virgin, one of the modelli submitted for the High Altar of Antwerp cathedral in 1611, in the Hermitage, for which see Held, op. cit., I, no. 374 and II, pl. 365.

17. See Jaffe, op. cit., no. 483. K. Erz, Jan Brueghel the Younger (1601-1678), Freren, 1984, p. 352, no. 187 and rep. p. 353, attributed the figures in this work to Abraham Janssen. A similar pose - but seen from the back - was selected by Rubens for that of Mercury in the Minerva and Mercury conducting the Duke of Buckingham to the Temple of Honour and Virtus, for which see above and under note 5.


4a. The Apotheosis of King James I: Bozzetto (Fig. 79)

Oil on ? oak support, see under No. 1. Located in the central field of the Multiple Bozzetto (No. 1; Fig. 46) in position B (Fig. 51).

For Provenance, Exhibitions, Literature and commentary, see under No. 1.
tre, is lifted upwards by Jupiter’s eagle. His left foot rests on the globe of the world (orbis mundi), his right hangs over the wing of the eagle. He is helped upwards by the personification of Divine Justice (Justitias Divina), wearing a mantle over a gown, who climbs up on clouds, her right hand holding a flaming sword; her scales are held by a seated child in the sky immediately above.1 To the left of the King, is a female personification, her gown worn off her shoulders, holding a drum-shaped object; this figure would later be given sufficient attributes to enable her identification as Piety (Pietas). Above her is a personification of Peace-bearing Victory (Victoria Pacifica), whose torso is naked; she holds a triumphal crown (corona triumphalis) and was intended to hold a caduceus (see below). The triumphal crown is also held by a female personification (?Minerva), above in the centre, wearing a ? helmet, mantle and gown, and holding a shield and ? lance in her right hand. In the top left are an amoretto and a child; they hold a leafy crown and one perhaps also holds a palm frond. Above the child, holding scales, is another perhaps plunging downwards holding a palm frond. The yellow paint in the sky depicts both ethereal light and ‘a shyning glory of the Deity’ specified in Project B, see Appendix 1.2.

The oval field was first indicated in brown paint, worn thin for much of its course, especially on the right. Paint loss resulting from the opening of the join, which runs through the King’s right leg, has been retouched; the retouching is particularly marked round the head of ? Minerva; her head and helmet are not reliable. The second join running up through the legs of Divine Justice is also retouched as is a split springing from the top of the support to a point above the head of Divine Justice. There is a mass of black scumbled paint beneath the clouds on which Divine Justice climbs, beneath the eagle’s wings and to a lesser extent beneath the King’s left arm.

The design, in black oil wash and white/grey oil paint, with some yellow, was executed over earlier, now indecipherable ideas set out in black oil wash (Fig. 80). These are most evident to the left of James I, where they extend into the adjacent field, and to a less marked extent above Divine Justice. A curving double line runs across the centre of the field. A now incomprehensible draft extends beyond the top right of the field. These indications, many having been painted over, now show up light; they presumably all relate to the use put to the support in position A (Fig. 48), see pp. 148-149.

Rubens made many alterations when working on the support in position B.2 They chiefly relate to Piety (see Figs. 79-80). It is possible that the artist considered an amoretto, beside the King’s right leg, flying upwards in support of her; Piety may first have been depicted looking downwards; she was then raised with her face looking sideways, then altered so that she looked upwards with her arm first sketched straight in front of her and then bent slightly downwards before her.

The area immediately beneath the legs of Peace-bearing Victory is occupied by incomprehensible brushwork (Figs. 79 and 80), but there may be pentimenti in her right leg and in the drapery over her upper body. An arm holding a caduceus is evident as a first thought beneath and to the right of her left arm, indicating that the figure was first placed lower and closer to the centre of the field. Other pentimenti are evident in the wing of Peace-bearing Victory and in the drapery of ? Minerva. The King’s robe falling down to his right was first less extensive.

The light comes from above.

For a discussion of the scene enacted, of the protagonists and the composition and its constituent parts, see under No. 4, Iconography and catalogue No. 4.

Held is likely to be right in believing that other sketches – perhaps drawings3 – were made preliminary to this and the other ideas set out in the Multiple Bozzetto (No. 1 = No. 4a), although none is extant. Granted the extent of the pentimenti, it may be presumed that in the case of the Apotheosis Rubens’s preliminary ideas were set down in a generalized way on paper.4 Evidently apart from the many uncertainties regarding the depiction of Piety and to a lesser degree Peace-bearing Victory, Rubens had
clearly already settled on the main elements of the composition and general iconography for the central compartment. A significant amplification of the iconography and format was to be requested of Rubens at a later stage.

A recollection of the design in the bozzetto (No. 4a), rather than subsequent preparatory works or the Canvas itself, may have inspired The Personification of the City of Amsterdam Crowned by Wisdom, which was executed by Erasmus Quellin II as a ceiling decoration for the Town Hall of Amsterdam in 1656. The figure of Amsterdam borne upwards by an eagle, may owe something to Rubens’s design, and the pose of Wisdom, while not exactly following Minerva, is set in a similar foreshortening that Rubens was later to modify. Quellin was probably working in Rubens’s studio in the early 1630s, see above p. 78.

1. Held, Sketches, 1980, I, p. 200, under no. 133, believed that Divine Justice was here depicted holding a pair of scales.
2. First noted by Millar when publishing the present work; see Millar, Whitehall, 1956, p. 262. Millar thought he could detect indications of ‘the head of the female figure who eventually held the open Book’, but it is argued below that there are preliminary proposals for Piety. See also Held, Sketches, 1980, I, p. 189, under no. 133.
5. For the ceiling painting, see J.-P. De Bruyn, Erasmus II Quellinus (1607-1678). De schilderijen met catalogue raisonné, Freren, 1988, p. 229, no. 180, and fig. 180/1, p. 230.

In the print – which evidently renders a lost preparatory work by Rubens in reverse – the bearded, long-haired King, wearing a great, flowing robe, shirt, and boots and holding a sceptre, his head illumined by an aureole of light, is lifted upwards by Jupiter’s eagle. His left foot rests on the eagle’s wing, his right just visible on the globe of world (orbis mundi). He is helped upwards by the personification of Divine Justice (Justitia Divina), who holds his right arm; in her left hand is a straight bladed sword. The King’s right hand is held by the personification of Piety (Pietas), who crouches before a flaming altar. Above, a helmeted woman holding a lance and bearing a shield joins with Peace-bearing Victory (Victoria Pacifera), who holds a caduceus, to laureate the King. Two amoretti to the left offer a palm and leafy crown; above, right, two amoretti offer another leafy crown. In the centre is a radiance.

Lucas Vorsterman II was the son of his famous, eponymous father, whom he predeceased c. 1667, having become a master in the Antwerp guild of St Luke in 1651 at the age of twenty-seven.

For a discussion of the scene enacted, of the protagonists, and of the composition and its constituent parts, see No. 4, Iconography and catalogue No. 4.

Millar believed that the ‘source’ for Vorster-
man’s print was the central sketch in the *Multiple Bozzetto* (No. 4a; Fig. 79), but because of differences between the two, this is unlikely. This thesis was modified by Held, who proposed that the prototype was a drawing ‘essentially based on the Glynde sketch [sic = No. 4a] but incorporating ideas of the next phase’. The rubric on the print, however, states that Vorsterman’s prototype had been painted by Rubens. Whether the prototype (otherwise unknown) is best described as a *bozzetto* or a *modello*—whether it was *en grisaille* or fully coloured (in either case with some passages difficult to read)—cannot be determined, but it was perhaps the former.

An important preoccupation for the artist in the lost sketch would appear to have been the spatial alignment of the main motif of the King, the globe of the world, and the eagle. Rubens adjusted the foreshortening of the first *bozzetto* (No. 4a) by bringing the figure forward and depicting the eagle more from beneath. Its upward movement is suggested by its raised head. The globe now sits lower on the eagle’s back such that its base is evident, while James I’s left (in the print) foot rests on its wing and the right foot has to be barely visible at the top of the globe.

Other differences in the design with that in No. 4a may be summarised as follows. The field is now an elongated oval. The physiognomy is more recognisably that of James I, more clearly indicated too is the radiate crown. Practically the whole of his body is covered by a robe, and while the boot looks contemporary, the robe seems Classical in style; it falls differently over the legs. Rubens seems to have repeated a preliminary pose proposed for Piety, who looks upwards in three-quarters profile with her arm bent slightly downwards, and to have clarified the object beside her: it is now recognisable as an altar on which a flame burns. The figure and altar were depicted closer to the King. But it may well have been that in the prototype Rubens continued to make alterations such that his ideas were here hard to read. At all events, this was to be one of the areas Vorsterman misread, as he showed Piety holding James I’s hand rather than a libation saucer (*patera*).

Perhaps also misread was Divine Justice’s sword, depicted as straight, and omitted are her scales, which perhaps had been as faintly indicated as they were previously. The child that had held them before is now shown as an *amoretto* displaying a wreath aloft—thus bringing the total number of leafy crowns to an improbable three—while his companion plunges downwards with a palm frond as was perhaps previously suggested. ? Minerva is armed with what is clearly a lance, but whether Vorsterman’s version of it follows Rubens’s precise intentions seems not clear. Her helmet is crested, but no grip is shown on the inside of the shield.

The specification of Project B, see Appendix 1.2, is more closely followed than in No. 4a insofar as concerned the depiction of the Deity ‘from whom the beames shall come shying down’. The beams are shown behind the triumphal crown and above the caduceus, which is now clearly displayed in the right (of the print) hand of Peace-bearing Victory. The King’s fanciful costume indicates that Rubens had still not received instructions concerning the dress that James I would wear, or if he had, had not studied the Parliamentary robes. From this it could be inferred that the lost sketch may have been executed soon after the *Multiple Bozzetto* (No. 4a) either in 1628, or before he had studied the King’s Parliamentary apparel in 1629-30, when he was in London.

**Related Works**

(1) Painting, whereabouts unknown. PROV. European Museum sale, London, May 1812, lot 372 (as ‘The Apotheosis of King Charles I [sic] being the Original Sketch for the ceiling of the Chapel of Whitehall. Rubens ... from Berlin’); offered again in June 1812, lot 372.

(2) Painting, perhaps identical with the previous work, whereabouts unknown. PROV. Property of two Gentlemen, sale, London (Denew), 16 June 1813, lot 63: ‘Rubens. The Apotheosis of King James, the original design for the ceiling of White Hall, bt. in for £ 50 8 sh.’ (a MS. annotation
on the copy of the sale catalogue in the Courtauld Institute gives the support and dimensions as: panel, 2'3/4 × 2'1/2w [= c. 78.6 x 76 cm.].

1. For the few, known details concerning Lucas Vorsterman II’s life, see, for instance, Bodart, Incisione, 1977, no. 334.

4c. The Apotheosis of King James I: Modello

Oil on wood support; 107 x 89 cm.

Whereabouts unknown (recorded in a description).

PROVENANCE: Dr. Robertson, Edinburgh, 1842.


This work, considered to be a modello by Smith, was described by him as: ‘done in a spirited bravura manner, differing in many points from the finished picture, as first studies usually do’; a slightly different and fuller description is given in Smith’s manuscript annotations to his 1830 catalogue raisonné volume: 2 ‘done in coarse & bravura manner.... The King is here represented in a similar position with justice clothed in a blue vest & a yellow mantle & having a flaming sword on his left, while religion suitably attired in white raiment is on his right. Victory and Minerva soar above. These are surrounded by six cupids bearing a shield, wreath & other emblems’. Imperial measurements were given by Smith.

The sketch could not have been the prototype for Vorsterman’s print (No. 4b, Copy; Fig. 81), which depicted only four amoretti. The fact that it is recorded as on a wood support gives some credence to the possibility that it could be a lost modello for the whole composition, further the format is upright, but the size of the support would have been exceptional, being larger than the figural modello at Brussels (No. 3f). It would have been at this stage and in this modello, that Rubens would have introduced the correct royal attire and depicted the King wearing Parliamentary robes and the chain and badge of the Order of the Garter.

Our present lack of knowledge must largely rule out further speculation. Smith’s entry mentioned only one female personification on the King’s right, from which it might be inferred that the sketch was executed before the lost, third or fourth (?) modello (No. 4e), in which the personification of Theology was introduced.

1. The identity of this collector remains elusive. Enquiries kindly conducted by Aidan Weston-Lewis of the National Gallery of Scotland have drawn a blank. Sara Stevenson of the Scottish National Portrait Gallery kindly suggested that he may have been the Dr Robertson of Leith who was associated with efforts to obtain a painting by Daniel Scott for the Trinity House of Leith in 1849; see William Bell Scott, Memoir of David Scott, R.S.A., Edinburgh, 1850, pp. 336-337. A trawl through the ledgers of John Smith’s art dealing firm in the library of the Victoria and Albert Museum (for which Charles Sebag Montefiore kindly gave guidance) yielded nothing.

2. Smith, Catalogue, 1829-42, IX, p. 317, no. 267; his annotated copy of his 1830 volume is in the National Gallery library, London.

4d. Piety and Victory: Modello (Fig. 82)

Oil on oak support; 41.2/3 x 48.5/49 cm.

Paris, Musée du Louvre. Inv. no. M.I.969

PROVENANCE: Marquis de XX [d’Arcambale] sale, Paris (Paillet), 22 ff. February 1776, lot 9 (as ‘Rubens, La Religion couronnée par un ange. Ce morceau, étude achevée ... est terminé; il est peint en plafond ... hauteur quatorze pouces six lignes largeur dix huit pouces [39.1 x 48.6 cm.].
Piety, who has dark hair and eyes, wears a yellow gown with a white mantle; the side of the altar may have been decorated with a child’s head. A flame is evident on the altar. Victory has blonde hair; she wears an orange-yellow gown pulled away from her shoulders to reveal part of her naked torso. Light streams through the grey circlet (?) that she holds.

The support is made out of two members with the join about 20 cm. from the left. The grain runs vertically. A piece of wood with the grain and priming or imprimatura running horizontally has been inserted into the support in the bottom left-hand corner; it is about 22 cm. wide, and 11 cm. high at its top right corner. This carpentry was done before Rubens used the support, as the dress of Piety is executed partly on it. It is impossible to state, without a detailed technical investigation, whether the support has been reduced or not, or whether it is fragment of a larger support. This cannot be ruled out.

The blue to the right of Piety and beneath Victory may not be original. Black splotches of paint to the left of Piety, and chiefly on the inserted piece of wood, are later; the outer left fold of Piety’s gown may also be later.

There may be a pentimento in the left hand of Victory; Held believed that the wings may have been afterthoughts.

The light falls from the top right.

As the winged female does not hold a caduceus, she is best here described as Victory, although the grey circlet she holds is not obviously a laurel wreath.

For a further discussion of the events enacted, of the protagonists, and of the composition and its constituent parts, see No. 4, Iconography and catalogue No. 4.

There can be no reason to doubt Rubens’s authorship of the present work, in which, as Held pointed out, the two figures are discrete studies and not thematically connected as the traditional title, still current – Génie couronnant la Religion – would indicate. The scale of the figures would suggest that both were intended as figural modelli executed in preparation for, and as an aide-mémoire during, the transfer of the design onto the Canvas and as a guide for
an assistant. If so, they would have been preceded by a compositional *modello*, perhaps No. 4c, as both are different from the formulations in Nos. 4a and 4b.

The attitude of Piety is no longer one of stern intensity directed towards Divine Justice as it was in No. 4b (Fig. 81); her supplicant radiance as she looks upwards slightly to her right indicates that a different meaning or nuance is now to be attached to her. The pose was still subject to refinement by Rubens who was later to make her right leg more prominent and include the foot and give a greater twist to the neck, so that the direction of the gaze was now up and to the left.

The absence of the caduceus indicates an alteration in the meaning to be attached to the winged figure, see above. Her pose has been radically transformed by depicting the lower part of her body in profile, and by raising the left leg and lowering the left arm. The figure is more compactly disposed and occupies less space. Perhaps this experiment is a development of ideas set out in the lost compositional *modello* (?) (No. 4c), in which Rubens may have partially enlarged the composition. At all events, the pose was to be abandoned, and Rubens in the lost, final *modello* (No. 4e; cf. Fig. 83), returned to the figure of Peace-bearing Victory as earlier sketched.

The streaming light from the top right may refer to the specification in Project B, see Appendix 1.2, concerning 'a shyning glory of the Deity, from whome the beames shall come shyning downe'.
First ascending to Heaven: the Sketch for the Cieling [sic] of the Banquetting House at Whitehall 2'11" x 1'9 1/2" (89 x 54.6 cm.),2 and later recorded by George Vertue 'near the Treasury' (i.e., in the same house) (as an overdoor in the Dining Room: 'a sketch K. James I. Banquetting House Cieling [sic]. Whitehall-Rubens');3 moved to Houghton Hall, Norfolk, after Sir Robert's resignation from office early in 1742,4 in which year he was created 1st Earl of Orford; recorded in the Cabinet at Houghton Hall by 1744;5 inherited by his son and heir Robert, 2nd Earl of Orford (c. 1701-1751), and recorded at Houghton Hall in 1747, as in 'The Cabinet... 170. The Banquetting[sic]-House Cieling [sic]; it is the original Design of Rubens for the middle Compartm ent of that Cieling [sic], and represents the Assum ption of King James the First into Heaven; it belonged to Sir Godfrey Kneller ... Two Feet eleven Inches high by one Foot nine Inches and a half wide [89 x 54.5 cm.];6 inherited by his son and heir George, 3rd Earl of Orford (1730-1791); sold with the rest of the collection of pictures at Houghton Hall, for a total of £ 40,555, with the present work being numbered 162 and valued at £ 100, to the Empress Catherine II (the Great) (1729-1796) of Russia in 1779;7 thence in the (State) Hermitage Museum, St Petersburg.


(2) Painting. Richmond, Surrey, private collection; canvas, 74.9 x 60.9 cm. LIT. F.J.B. Watson, 'Watteau, Peintures Inconnues' [review of J. Mathey, Antoine Watteau Peintures Réapparues], The Burlington Magazine, CIV, 1962, p. 126, fig. 33 (attributed to Watteau, with some hesitation).

(3) Painting, whereabouts unknown; canvas, 74.4 x 52.8 cm. PROV. Anonymous sale, London (Sotheby's), 18 December 1965, lot 81 (as Watteau).8

(4) Painting, whereabouts unknown; canvas, 74.9 x 52 cm. PROV. Anonymous sale, London (Christie's), 26 March 1971, lot 134 (as Antoine Watteau after Rubens; probably identical with Copy 3).

The grey-haired King wears Parliamentary robes and the chain of the Order of the Garter; Divine Justice (Justitia Divina) wears a yellow mantle over a light-blue gown; Minerva (?) wears a red mantle over a grey gown; Peace-bearing Victory (Victoria Pacifera), whose wings are grey, wears a grey mantle over the lower part of her body; touches of yellow are evident in the mantle worn by Piety (Pietas). Theology (Theologica), like Piety, is partially veiled; she wears a white mantle over a white gown.

Varshavskaya noted the number 98 inscribed on a label on the reverse. According to her, the picture had been relined before it entered the Hermitage. The support has been made up in the course of its 25/27 cm. length. The support has been made up in the course of its 25/27 cm. length. The support has been made up in the course of its 25/27 cm. length.
The present work was painted on a grey ground, of which much is in evidence. The oval composition is surrounded by clouds, which mask its contours. Extensive retouching in the sky is evident in the reproductions in Varshavskaya's 1975 catalogue and the 1991 exhibition catalogue, for which see above.

Varshavskaya and Yegorova in their 1989 publication state that *pentimenti* show up in X-radiographs of the centre of the composition. For a discussion of the scene enacted, of the protagonists, and of the composition and its constituent parts, see No. 4, *Iconography* and catalogue No. 4.

This sketch has been generally accepted since at least towards the middle of the eighteenth century as an autograph work by Rubens. Doubts expressed by Millar have been ignored hitherto, but are wholly justified. The handling is weak and the facial expressions are feeble. There is no hint of the dynamic yet methodical handling of the brush, which are the hallmarks of Rubens's manner when working on panel to execute the other *modelli* for this commission, or elsewhere, working on panel or canvas, at this or any time in his career. The work has all the characteristics of a copy, albeit early – as use of the grey ground is apparent – and is here treated as such. Another copy in the Ashmolean, listed above as Copy 1 (Fig. 84), is of equal or greater merit. As both paintings follow first ideas, which were to be the subject of *pentimenti* in the Canvas (in the book and the arm of the *amoretto* upper centre), it is reasonable to assume that both, or one (if one was copied from the other) is a faithful copy of a lost *modello*, probably Rubens's third or fourth (?) or, at the least, the final, compositional *modello*. But in deference to the opinion of Ludwig Burchard, the Hermitage painting is listed as an original by Rubens and appropriately placed in the catalogue sequence. In the discussion that follows it is treated as a copy.

Both the St Petersburg and Oxford copies show that in the prototype the decision had been taken, probably following examination of the *Overall Modelllo* (No. 2) in London, to expand the composition from one of nine (as in Nos. 4a and 4b) or of eleven (as in No. 4c), to one of sixteen figures, most likely in order to meet Charles I's requirements concerning iconography and to fill a larger format than had been earlier envisaged. Present are: 1) two *amorettti* removing the King's Imperial Crown and the orb, neither had previously been depicted, and it is likely that Charles I's wishes were met by showing the removal of the Imperial Crown, so that James I could receive the triumphal crown, and of the orb so that he could hold onto Divine Justice with his left hand; 2) Theology who holds a book; 3) an *amoretto* pointing upwards to the left; 4) two *amoretti* blowing a trumpet and a tuba, together to be taken as alluding to Fame (one of whom replaced the child who held Divine Justice's scales, who has been moved up and to the right); and 5) a child holding an olive branch in the top left. The olive branch was either to be bestowed on James I, or was intended as an emblem of the female figure – ? Minerva or the Commonwealth of Great Britain (?) – crowning James I, see p. 198; red and white ? roses were to be substituted for it in the Canvas). Divine Justice was made to hold the scales of justice, as well as the flaming sword.

Rubens would appear to have made further adjustments in the prototype to the spatial alignment of the motif of the King, the globe of the world, and the eagle. The eagle is similar to that in the lost sketch, No. 4b (Fig. 81), as is the fall of the robe beneath the globe. For the position of the globe and the king's straddling of it, he returned to the *bozzetto* (No. 4a; Fig. 79). However, an important departure was in the foreshortening of the King, which was made steeper thanks to the increase in the size his left shank. The foreshortening of ? Minerva at the top of the support was also modified so that she appears to plunge more steeply downwards.

The Hermitage picture has long been thought to have been the *modello* (No. 2) that was displayed in Charles I's lifetime in the ceiling above the table in the Cabinet Room in Whitehall Palace; for reasons for rejecting this, see under No. 2.

1. According to Horace Walpole, see below. *Lugt, Répertoire*, I, no. 188a, refers to a sale of Kneller's
‘estate’ on 21 March put off till 27 March 1704. This is wrong as Kneller did not die till 1723. The British Library copy of the sale catalogue cannot be traced.


3. Ver Vue, Note Books, V, p. 117; see also VI, pp. 175-177.


5. Pictures at Houghton, 1744, 7 folios, Hertfordshire County Record Office, cited by A. Moore (as in note 4). [B. Nicolson], [Editorial], ‘The Whitehall Ceiling’, The Burlington Magazine, XC XIII, 1951, p. 309, under n. 5, refers to a MS. inventory of Lord Orford’s collection at Houghton of 1743, in which it is said that the present work is listed.

6. See H. Walpole, Ædes Walpolianæ: or a Description of the Collection of Pictures at Houghton-Hall in Norfolk, the seat of the Right Honourable Sir Robert Walpole, Earl of Orford, London, 1752, pp. 69-70. Walpole’s dedication to his father, the recently created Earl of Orford, is dated 24 August 1743.

7. For the numbering, price, and total, see the marked copy of Ædes Walpolianæ in the National Gallery library. For an account of the sale at Houghton Hall to the Empress Catherine the Great, see A. Moore (ed.), Houghton Hall: The Prime Minister, The Empress and The Hermitage, London, 1996, pp. 56 ff., where it is recorded, p. 61, that the sale was made as a last attempt at liquidating the first Earl’s debts, and that it was negotiated on behalf of the Empress by her ambassador to the Court of St James, Count Aleksei Semonovich Musin-Pushkin (1732-1817), recalled in 1779 after the negotiations were completed. For the most recent account, see L. Dukelskaya, ‘The Houghton Sale and the Fate of the Collection’, in [Cat. Exh.] A Capital Collection (as in n. 2), pp. 64-74. James Christie was asked in May 1778 to value the collection, which arrived in St Petersburg at the end of 1779.

8. The author thanks Christopher White for having earlier made available his draft typescript entry. He pointed out that the attribution to Watteau was due to K.T. Parker. Apart from the cloud in the bottom right-hand corner, the oval is better defined in Copy (1) than in the Hermitage picture. Here, also? Minerva carries what is clearly a lance and more of the right leg of the amoretto, immediately above the King, is shown, which makes the pose incredible.


10. Ibid.

11. Ibid.


5. The Union of the Crowns of England and Scotland

The Iconography

Queen Elizabeth I of England, France and Ireland had no direct heir, and the matter of the succession after her death in 1603 was handled by the Privy Council acting with the knowledge of her wishes. The inheritance of the crown by the preferred candidate, the Queen’s cousin (thrice removed), King James VI of Scotland, was largely undisputed; it was to be unopposed and greeted with joy, thus confounding gloomy forebodings to the contrary. The early policy of the new King of England was to obtain a union between the two, main kingdoms he now ruled.

As ‘a first stone in this worke ... [because] ... Wee thanke it unreasonable, that the thing, which is ... see much in effect one, should not be one in name, Unite in name being so fit a meanes to impreinte in the hearts of people a Character and memoriall of that Unite which oughte to be amongst them’, the King, by proclamation of 20 October 1604, assumed the style of King of Great Britain, France, and Ireland. In the same year, a commission was established by Act of Parliament to determine how could be brought about ‘that real and effec-
tual Union already inherent in his Majesty’s Royal Blood and Person’.5

The union was to be the chief issue of the 1606–07 session of Parliament.6 On the adjournment of the two Houses for recess at the end of March 1607, James I stated his desire for ‘a perfect Union of Lawes and persons, and such a Naturalizing as may make one body of both Kingdomes under mee your King. That I and my posteritie ... may rule ouer you to the worlds ende’.7 The re-assembled Parliament was to frustrate the fulfillment of his policy, and subsequently the issue was no longer a preoccupation of Jacobean politics, although some legislative, judicial, and prerogative acts were to be made towards promoting and obtaining a greater degree of unity between the two kingdoms.8

Up until just over a generation earlier, the two kingdoms had been among the most hostile in Europe; and James I’s achievement in fostering a union is now again recognised.9 John Seeley justly summarised the result of the Jacobean union: ‘England in 1620 was not the same State that she had been under the Queen [Elizabeth]. England and Scotland were united in the person of the King, and united in the Reformation. All those dangerous and terrible discords which in the Queen’s time had laid the island open to foreign invasion were extinguished .... The State ruled by James was ... much greater than the State ruled by Elizabeth’.10

The Jacobean union of the two kingdoms has been called the union of the crowns.11 This is incorrect as the two crowns were not united or combined by James VI and I or by his son, Charles I, who was crowned King of Scotland in Edinburgh in 1633, seven years after his English coronation in London. The alternative – Regal union12 – perhaps more accurately conveys the complex, pragmatic efforts of James I to unite his two kingdoms. But in the case of the present study, the retention of the more commonly used phrase – union of the crowns – is justified by the central conceit of the two Projects.

Both Projects, see Appendix 1.1 and 1.2, had specified that the subject to fill the central compartment of the ceiling should depict James I ‘in action of ioyning’ ‘two Crownes’ held by ‘figures of women kneeling’, who represented ‘the two Kingdomes of England & Scotland’. The enactment was to be witnessed by ‘some of the nobility of England & Scotland & belowe some halfe figures of Sergeants at Armes for State’, see Appendix, I; they were to be onlookers as the King exercised his prerogative powers as an irresistible monarch. In reality, these powers were to be of very limited use in bringing about the union, see pp. 100-101. The ideated scene was probably intended to have a spectacular Venetian character comparable to the ceiling pictures depicting episodes in the history of the Venetian Republic executed by Veronese and Tintoretto et al. in the Doge’s Palace, Venice.13

In fact, the location of the Union (No. 5) in the ceiling was changed to make way for the Apotheosis (No. 4); it came to occupy the central compartment at the northern end. Moreover, the audience, as envisaged in the Projects, was curtailed; but Rubens adopted the key idea of representing the two kingdoms by ‘figures of women’, and vividly interpreted the phrase ‘in action of ioyning’ the two crowns they hold as James I directed with his sceptre.

The reason (or reasons) for modifying the prescription concerning ‘some of the nobility of England & Scotland’ and ‘some halfe figures of Sergeants at Armes’ by the depiction of only two bust-length figures and one seated sergeant-at-arms is not known (Figs. 90 and 92). Rubens had shown in the Marie de Médicis cycle that he could or would include portraits of the lesser participants in events when requested. Perhaps the difficulty of obtaining portraits, as prototypes, of members of the nobility active in promoting the union some twenty-five years earlier, was felt to be insuperable (especially if there were insufficient numbers willing to be associated with the King’s policy), or the selection of a number of contemporary noblemen to be portrayed was too invidious to be pursued. Modification was perhaps also agreed out of a dislike of a strictly historical approach, which made more persuasive Rubens’s view that the composition he had in mind could not easily accommodate a large number of spectators and that the scene could be given added meaning and
interest by the introduction of other motifs and personifications.

At all events, in place of a number of noblemen and sergeants-at-arms, five new conceits were introduced. Two flying amoretti broadcast an escutcheon exhibiting the new royal coat of arms, topped by the Imperial Crown and decorated with the garter of the Order of the Garter and swags of white and red roses (Fig. 87). Rubens’s idea was evidently to show the decorated escutcheon being manoeuvred to its place in the ‘back’ or tester above and behind the King (some ‘backs’ were thus decorated with the royal coat of arms, see p. 214). Minerva is the divine surrogate of James I ‘in action of ioyning’; she ties together initially (Nos 5b-5e) two gold circlets, which are held by the ‘figures of women’. These are united by the embrace of Cupid, changed in the final formulation simply to a boy, who tramples underfoot accoutrements of war, which are set fire to by a flaming torch held by an amoretti (Figs. 89 and 91). Some of the King’s qualities are illustrated by the sphinx behind him. Also given a role is a guard, standing beneath the throne (Fig. 90). Not dressed in contemporary uniform but in classical-style armour, he may not have any iconographic significance, although by virtue of his costume he is part of the allegorical rather than the historical enactment.

The coat of arms (only depicted in the final Canvas; Fig. 87) is the royal arms as used between 1603 and 1689. Its heraldic description is: ‘1 and 4 grand quarters of i and iv Azure three fleur de lys Or, ii and iii Gules three lions passant guardant Or, 2 Or a lion rampant within a double tressure flory counter flory Gules, 3 Azure a harp Or stringed Argent’. King Edward III quartered the arms of France with that of England; the coat thus became the arms of England. On King James VI of Scotland’s accession to the English throne, as King James I, the royal arms were changed so that the quartered arms of England and France occupied the first and fourth quarters, and introduced for the first time were the arms of Scotland in the second quarter and as balance that of Ireland in the third quarter. ‘The Kings of England had been Lords of Ireland since the reign of John, and hereditary Kings of Ireland since the assumption of that title by Henry VIII in 1541’. The arms are displayed without the supporters, but—as was normal—within the Garter; it should have been inscribed with the motto of the Order: ‘Honi soit qui mal y pense’.

The Order of the Garter, England’s most senior order of chivalry, was seen as a contributor to the union: ‘The Garter is the favour of a King / Clasping the leg on which man’s best part stands / A posey in’t, as in a nuptial ring / Binding the heart of their leige Lord in bands’. According to Elias Ashmole, King Charles I was ‘the greatest Increaser of the Honor and Renown of this most Illustrious Order’; in his reign celebrations of the Feast of St George, the Order’s patron saint, culminated in a feast not infrequently held in the Banqueting Hall. Towards the end of the 1630s, Van Dyck executed a bozzetto of Procession of the Knights of the Garter (Fig. 6, detail); this was the first (or the first two) of what were to have been a series of bozzetti for tapestry cartoons, which illustrated the history and ceremonial of the Garter; had the scheme been carried out, the tapestries would have been displayed on the lateral walls beneath the gallery of the Banqueting Hall.

The Imperial Crown above the escutcheon is similar but not identical to that worn by James I beneath; it also features in the two other central Canvases (Nos. 3 and 4; see pp. 68-69).

The symbolism of the festoons of red and white roses has been construed by Fredlund, who was the first to observe that they are an attribute of Venus, the goddess of Love, and were thus considered appropriate to Perfect Love, whose personification in Thomas Middleton’s Triumph of Truth of 1613, wore ‘a wreath of white and red roses mingled together, the antient witnesse of peace, love, and union, wherein consists the happinesse of this Land’. This was because red and white roses were the badges of the rival royal houses of Lancaster and York, from both of which James I was descended. This genealogical descent had also earlier been promoted by the Tudors as a contributor to peace and union; James I thus part-
ly followed precedent when he stated in his speech on 19 March 1604 at the opening of the English Parliament: 'But although outward Peace be a great blessing; yet is it as farre inferiour to peace within, as Ciuill warres are more cruell and vnnaturall then warres abroad. And therefore the second great blessing that GOD hath with my Person sent vnto you, is Peace within, and that in a double forme. First, by my descent lineally out of the loynes of Henry the seuenth, is reunited and confirm ed in mee the Vnion of the two Princely Roses of the two Houses of LANCASTER and YORKE, whereof that King of happy memorie was the first Vniter, as he was the first ground-layer of the other Peace. The lamentable and miserable euents by the Ciuill and bloody dissention betwixt these two Houses was so great and so late, as it need not be renewed vnto your memories .... But the Vnion of these two princely houses, is nothing comparable to the Vnion of two ancient and famous Kingdomes, which is the other inward Peace annexed to my Person'.

The symbolism of the red and white roses, alluded to Jam es I, continued to be used in the follow ing reign; and, before its introduction into the final pro­gramme for the Union (No. 5) destined for the ceiling of the Banqueting Hall, it had appeared in Dekker’s Lord Mayor’s pageant, Britannia’s Honor of 1628.

Beneath the escutcheon borne by the amoretti is Minerva, identifiable by her plumed helm et and just visible breastplate; she is manifestly intended to be the same figure who appears elsewhere in the ceiling. She appears as the goddess of Wisdom and ties a knot in a ribbon, which binds the two coronets in the Canvas (two circlets in the modelli, Nos. 5b-5e) held by the two ‘figures of women’.

The two women are hardly distinguishable apart from the colour of their apparel from which Fredlund found evidence to identify the woman on the left as personifying England and that in the centre, Scotland. His evidence is Samuel Daniel’s parenthetical explanation of Concordia’s costume in his masque The Vision of the Twelve Goddesses, performed in 1604: a party-coloured mantle of crimson and white (the colours of Eng-

land and Scotland joyned). Whether the colour of the gown on the left can be described as crimson or whether the white and yellow colours worn by the other woman can be described simply as white is open to question, as is the whole matter of whether such a concept of a national colour (as opposed to colours of a national flag) was generally shared with Daniel, the text of whose masque and introduction was published for the second time in 1623. As the Projects did not specify distinctive characteristics for the ‘figures of women’, it seems unlikely that Rubens was requested to provide them, especially as this could have introduced an unwanted controversy over precedence that he would have had to resolve in the composition. For these reasons, Fredlund’s proposal is not yet acceptable without further evidence.

The circlets (in the modelli, Nos. 5b-5e) were probably intended to depict ‘the plain circle of plate’ and the circulus aureus, which according to John Selden was the type of crown worn by King Fergus of Scotland and the kings of England from Edward II to Henry V (?) respectively.

Beneath the escutcheon borne by the amoretti is Minerva, identifiable by her plumed helmet and just visible breastplate; she is manifestly intended to be the same figure who appears elsewhere in the ceiling. She appears as the goddess of Wisdom and ties a knot in a ribbon, which binds the two coronets in the Canvas (two circlets in the modelli, Nos. 5b-5e) held by the two ‘figures of women’.
the god's wings and bow. The introduction of such a concept as love in a matter of State was entirely in keeping with the Jacobean and Caroline discourse. However, the quiver does not appear in the copy of the presumed final modello (No. 5h; Fig. 95) or in the Canvas (Fig. 86), providing some justification for Held's rejection of Fredlund's theory (although this justification was not recognised by him).

The earliest published reference to the child is in the inscription on Gribelin's engraving of 1720: the recently born son of the King. This by implication referred to Charles I, son of James (Fig. 93, and for the Latin inscription, Appendix VI); the painting was interpreted as a testimony to the flourishing condition of the Kingdom, with England and Scotland joined under one rule with a son having recently been born. In 1720, the grave concern caused by the death in 1700 of Princess Anne's last surviving child, William, Duke of Gloucester, would not have been forgotten. By the Act of Settlement of 1701, the succession to the English throne was limited to the Protestant Electress Sophia of Hanover (1630-1714) and her descendants. The Act of Union of 1707 established the same succession for the Crown of Scotland. The existence of an acceptable heir, especially a male heir, had been recently of crucial importance; that the child in the Canvas was seen, in 1720, as a son of James I, is thus understandable.

The early nineteenth-century key-plan (Fig. 9) hardly modified the interpretation of the inscription on Gribelin's print when it described the scene as James I 'pointing to Prince Charles who is crowned King of Scotland'. This identification has persisted in spite of Fredlund's detection of the quiver in the preparatory sketches. But more recently, Strong has favoured Saxl's proposal that the child 'must be an allegorical being representing the happy birth of the United Kingdom'.

Anxiety about the succession in early eighteenth-century England (and Scotland) - implicit in the rubric on Gribelin's engraving - also obtained when Rubens was in England, though not in so extreme a form. But then, too, there was still no heir to the throne after Charles I's marriage in 1625. It may therefore be of significance that the eldest surviving child of Charles I and Henrietta Maria - Charles, Prince of Wales - was born on 29 May (o.s.) 1630, after Rubens had returned to Antwerp. His birth in 1630 was of nearly comparable significance to the succession as the absence of an heir to Queen Anne would be a matter of deep concern early in the next century. The birth of the Prince was (of course!) publicly celebrated and prompted congratulations, offered on behalf of the Infanta Isabella by, and personally from, Rubens in a letter to the Secretary of State, Lord Dorchester, of 18 June 1630.

Thus it could well have been the case that the iconographic programme presumably worked out by Rubens and Charles I, which transformed ideas set out in the Projects, was the subject of modification after the birth and survival of the infant Prince of Wales, the future King Charles II. James I, of course, could never have known his grandson; but this would not be a valid objection to this new identification of the child. The emphasis on an historically biased illustration of the Union, specified in the Projects, had already been partly superseded. As time advanced, it could well have seemed legitimate to accommodate a new, happy, and relevant event - such as the birth of an heir - even if it involved an anachronism. Further, to abandon the quiver and the identification of the child as Cupid for a straightforward identification of the child as the future King would have involved no more intellectual violence to the coherence of the programme than had the moving of the envisioned composition from the central oval (as specified in the Projects) to the lower or northern, central compartment.

It has recently been suggested that Orazio Gentileschi's Finding of Moses (private collection, on loan to the National Gallery, London [2003]), recorded in 1633-34 as at Greenwich and probably already in the Great Hall of the Queen's House, is an allegorical celebration of the birth of the Prince of Wales. Further evidence of the significance and importance attached to the birth and survival of the Prince of Wales is found in Hendrick Gerritsz. Pot's Group Portrait
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of Charles I, Henrietta Maria and Charles Prince of Wales, of 1632 (Royal Collection). Leaves of laurel are on the table near the King, and more are scattered on the floor. The sprig of olive held by the Queen and laurel leaves have been interpreted as alluding to the peace-loving nature of James I, King Charles I's father, and the war-like propensities of King Henri IV, the Queen's father; but it is more convincing to explain these emblems as alluding to her peaceable nature and to a triumphant Charles I. A crown of laurel and olive leaves underfoot in Cartari allude to triumph and 'quiete'.

That the infant Prince of Wales was intended in the Group Portrait to embody the same characteristic as his mother is indicated by the emblem of peace that he also holds. Expressive of the hopes inspired by his birth were those earlier uttered in a contemporary poem of uncertain authorship, which described him as: 'An Infant Emblem of his Grandsires Peace... [who] Have made both Union & Succession fixt'. Less specifically, the royal proclamation announcing the birth of the Prince described it 'as being a principal meanes for the establishing the peace and prosperous estate of this and others our Kingdomes'.

In spite of the proclamation's omission of a reference to the Union, the King evidently wished to foster the notion that his eldest son constituted a significant bond in it. The Venetian ambassador in an account of England, written for his government in April 1635, referred to the now obscure and what proved to be short-lived courtesy title by which the Prince was then known 'Prince of Great Britain, not Prince of Wales, as used to be the custom'. Thus it is not too far-fetched (assuming that the courtesy title was current a year or two earlier than the Ambassador's account) to identify the child in the Canvas as at the least an allusion, if not a reference, to the Prince of Great Britain, not Prince of Wales, as used to be the custom.

James I's gesture and the smiling complaisance of his expression in the Canvas (Fig. 90) do not lead themselves to a specific interpretation. It may be that by altering the object of his instruction from the tying together of the two crowns to the boy Prince trampling on the accoutrements of war, it had been decided that it was more relevant to show James I recognising his recently born, male descendant — the future King Charles II — as the inheritor of the two kingdoms. It could now thus be broadcast that his birth would ensure that no war between the two countries would henceforth occur.

Fredlund insisted too much that the whole conceit concerned a marriage of the two kingdoms; the circlets are not rings (as marriage rings) and Hymen, not Cupid, is the god of marriage. The Cupid in the modelli and the boy in the Canvas look up at or towards the tying of a marriage knot; but his role is to bring together the two 'figures of women' either by Love — used in the wider Jacobean and Caroline sense — or by dynastic succession. He is not directly involved in the tying of the knot; but he makes it possible.

That it was intended that the child could or should be interpreted as having two meanings (as Held believed), and that one of those meanings was connected with the god of Love is suggested by the child's action of trampling on the accoutrements of war, a conceit developed in the modelli. Also given prominence was the conceit of the amoretto setting fire to the arsenal. Such an action was usually undertaken by Peace, as Baumstark has shown; he also showed that the torch was identified by Ripa as signifying universal love: [the torch] which sets fire to the pile of arms, signifies universal love and reciprocity among people, which burns and consumes all remnants of hatred that usually remain after the death of men. The identity of the child with the torch, who was usually winged in the preparatory work (Nos. 5c and 5e), has not hitherto been addressed. He may have been intended as an acolyte of Peace, like the 'Amoris & Amicitiae Genii', the two winged children by the open door of the Temple of Janus (Fig. 26) in the Pompa Introitus Ferdinandi, one of whom is depicted trying to shut it with the base of the lampstand (lychnuchus), which he carries. The child in the Canvas wields a firebrand; as it was earlier planned that the god of Love was to be above, he may have been intended as the genius of Friendship. Cupid's
linked action of trampling on the accoutrements of war may have been intended to suggest the same wider connotations posited by Ripa.

The Projects specified 'some halfe figures of Sergeants at Armes for State', see Appendix I. Rubens modified this to one sergeant-at-arms seated full length (Fig. 92); he was first recognised as such by Gordon. Strong has given further details of the office, describing it as the oldest and most senior in the royal household. The staff of office was the mace; Finet, for instance, described the 'Sergeantes at Armes with theyr masses'; the royal servant is wearing the summer, 'w atching' (that is, not a State coat) livery of the King's household, 'of red cloth guarded with black velvet ... enriched with Roses and Crowns'. The Tudor rose is evident on the back of the uniform as Gordon observed. According to Beard, 'the short puffered sleeves of the ... coat ' were replaced 'by wide full sleeves' in the first year of Charles I's reign.

Why Rubens chose not to depict a second sergeant-at-arms beneath the throne and introduced a guard wearing classical-style armour remains unclear (Figs. 90 and 92). Gordon described his dress as 'neither modern nor ancient', but it fits fairly easily into Rubens's category of the antique. Strong believed that the figure should be identified as the Trojan Brutus 'founder of the Empire of Great Britain whose descendant, James I, [was] hailed so often as “our second Brute and King”'. But the stance and pose of the figure suggests that of a guard rather than a royal forebear, and maybe Rubens intended him as a praetorian guard. Certainly no convincing iconographic meaning attached to the figure has been found. Perhaps none exists and the guard was introduced only for formal reasons.

Not discernible in Gribelin's print (Fig. 93; see Appendix VI), and perhaps only revealed after the 1946/47-50 cleaning, is the faintly visible head and shoulders of a naked female behind James I in the Canvas (Fig. 90). The modelli (Nos. 5c, 5d and 5f; Figs. 98, 99, 102) show the head and shoulders of a winged female, whose leonine legs form the arm and legs of the throne. On the basis of Gevartius's commentary on the pair of sphinxes on the Arch of St Michael in the Pompa Introitus Ferdinandi: 'to be noted is the Sphinx, a monster of three parts, known and made in olden times, with a girl's face, bird's wings and lion's feet,' the figure can be identified as a sphinx, as Burchard and Gordon believed, rather than as a seraph as held proposed. Gordon stated that the animal was 'associated with Minerva...[and] emphasizes his wisdom as king', while Burchard believed its presence referred to James I's sobriquet 'Sphinx of the North', the authenticity of which has not, as yet, been confirmed. For Rubens, however, the allegorical meaning to be attached to the sphinx may well have been that provided by Gevartius – quoting the Neo-Platonist, Synesius: the Egyptians placed the Sphinx in front of their shrines as a sacred sign of the union of the virtues of fortitude and prudence. The first seal used by the deified Emperor Augustus for official business was of a sphinx.

The Projects had prescribed that James I should be in a regal setting 'on a Throne rayed wth degrees', see Appendix 1.1 and 1.2. Rubens's sphinx-throne may have been suggested by an existing throne in the British court that had sphinx chair posts; Charles I, when Prince of Wales, had been depicted on it in a portrait perhaps presented to his uncle King Christian IV of Denmark. Above the throne, Rubens probably intended to convey the idea of a cloth of estate. Perhaps in recognition of the formally dramatic potential of curtains, he actually depicted the less formal canopy, whose distinctive feature they were (Fig. 88). The curtains hang from a valanced 'ceilour' or 'topp' on either side of the back or 'tester' that could be decorated with a coat of arms.

Beneath and to the right of James I are two male spectators. One wears the blue sash of the Order of the Garter (Fig. 86). These men are 'some of the nobility of England and Scotland' specified in the Projects. Saxl and Gordon believed the faces delineated were portraits, and proposed to identify the sitters as 'Charles' and 'Buckingham'. That they were intended as portraits seemed likely to the present author, who proposed as sitters the Englishman Sir Richard...
Weston (1577-1635, created Baron Weston in 1628 and Earl of Portland in 1633) and the Scot James Hamilton, Marquis (later Duke) of Hamilton (1606-1649). Weston, created Lord High Treasurer in 1628, was the most powerful minister after Buckingham's assassination until his death in 1635; Hamilton, created Master of the Horse after the death of Buckingham, was a kinsman and favourite of the King. That the two spectators were intended as specific portraits may be open to question, but that they were intended to represent the contemporary members of the aristocracy of the two kingdoms cannot be doubted. Strong’s proposed identification of one as ‘certainly ... Lucius, the first Christian King of Britain ... [the other] Perhaps is the British born Constantine, the Roman Emperor who christianized the Empire’ should be abandoned.

James I himself is depicted by Rubens as younger than in the Wise Rule (No. 3) and the Apotheosis (No. 4). The artist thus attempted to convey historical accuracy, as the Jacobean Union, here allegorically enacted, took place early in his reign in England. King James I inherited the English Crown in his thirty-seventh year, in middle age, see also pp. 65-66. He is shown seated as implied by the Projects (and as he himself would have considered appropriate) wearing Parliamentary robes and the Imperial Crown (Fig. 90). This apparel recorded the reality that the Union had been debated (ineffectually) in the English Parliament, and served to emphasise the King’s adherence to the time-honoured, consensual conduct of government. In the Canvas the King points with the sceptre held in his right hand, while in an unprecedented way, which sacrificed convention for dramatic urgency, he leans on the orb with his left hand. For the regalia, see pp. 70-71.

The Projects did not specify a setting for the enactment of the Union. The architectural mise en scène (Fig. 86) could have been a matter of discussion in London between Rubens and Charles I. It has been described by Strong as ‘specific ... a semi rotunda with a coffered dome’. Such a view has been challenged, by implication, by Held who observed that the pair of columns on the left in the St Petersburg mode-
of about 1633–34 and in the later engraved design for a pegma devised by Rubens for the *Pompa Introitus Ferdinandi*, which was not erected for want of money.

**Summary of identifications**

Of all the paintings of the cycle, that depicting the *Union* has attracted the greatest number of conflicting identifications of its motifs. These are, for convenience, set out below.

*The coat of arms* (Fig. 87). Smith inaccurately described these as the royal arms of the United Kingdom. The catalogues of the 1948 Worcester Art Museum, and of the 1956 Fogg Art Museum and Pierpont Morgan Library exhibitions described the coat of arms (sic) in the Minneapolis *modello* (No. 5e; Fig. 101) as the arms of the United Kingdom. Smith had earlier described the escutcheon in this sketch as displaying the arms of (the Principality of) Wales, with which Burchard in the 1951 Wildenstein, New York, exhibition catalogue agreed. Palme in 1956 described the escutcheon in the final Canvas (Fig. 87) as 'the escutcheon of the new Imperium'. In 1956 and 1967, Gordon correctly identified the coat of arms as 'the new arms assumed by James'.

*The two golden circlets altered to two crowns in the Canvas* (Fig. 89). The 1898 Sedelmeyer and the 1951 Wildenstein, New York, exhibition catalogues described the two gold circlets as a Triple Crown. Palme was more confused; describing the Canvas, he wrote: 'the two females each hold a crown, or rather part of a crown ... [Minerva] ties the crowns together with an iron band, thus framing the one imperial crown of Great Britain'. The part of a crown was then amplified to 'separate hal(ves) of the Imperial crown'. Strong later described the motif: 'the two female figures ... support a diadem ... The crown is in two parts'.

*The woman in armour beneath the escutcheon* (Fig. 89). Although identified as Minerva in the early nineteenth century key-plan (Fig. 9), Smith proposed Britannia, an identification accepted by Somoff and the 1893 Sedelmeyer, 1939 World’s Fair, 1950 and 1951 Wildenstein, and 1956 Fogg Art Museum exhibition catalogues. Palme and Millar remained undecided as to whether the figure was Britannia or Minerva; Held in 1980 thought Britain was more 'correct', in which he was followed by White in 1987. Haverkamp Begemann in the 1956 Rotterdam exhibition catalogue favoured Minerva, as did Gordon. Strong in 1980 had opted for Minerva, as did De Poorter in 1990, where she explicitly rejected the Britannia identification, and Donovan in 1995.

*The two women beneath the escutcheon* (Fig. 89). Although these have been generally accepted as representing England and Scotland, Smith and Somoff believed that they represented Scotland and Ireland, a view accepted in the 1948 Cincinnati and Worcester Art Museum exhibition catalogues.

*The boy between the two women* (Figs. 89 and 91). Since 1720 at least – the date of Gribelin’s print (Fig. 160; see Appendix VI) – the child was for long identified as the recently born son of James I ('filio Regi recens nato') and thus as Prince Charles, later King Charles I. According to Gordon, Saxl in 1945 first challenged this identification; he had concluded that such an identification was an 'obvious travesty of the facts'. Gordon accepted Saxl’s proposal that 'the naked child ... must be an allegorical being representing the happy birth of the United Kingdom', a view which Strong was to find 'acceptable'; while Millar thought it ‘fanciful, though not necessarily incorrect’, having preferred the traditional interpretation, while also mentioning the claim of Prince Henry (the eldest son of King James I, who died in 1612). Strong also by implication seemed to see in the child ‘the newly reunited British Church’, Fredlund, having detected the quiver at the boy’s side in two *modelli* (Nos. 5b and 5c), proposed in 1977 that the child was intended as Cupid, and that, in spite of the absence of the quiver in the finished painting, ‘Rubens still intended this personage to be understood as Cupid’. Held preferred the traditional identification and saw no contradiction ‘in his [the boy] being both the historical Charles I and the mythological god of love’. However, both
Giltaij\(^1\)\(^2\) and De Poorter\(^1\)\(^3\) have supported Fredlund, the latter stating that 'later scholars have inexplicably failed to follow up his comments'.

*Seated man in the centre foreground* (Fig. 92). For Palme he was a man 'cloaked in a mantle',\(^1\)\(^2\)\(^4\) Gordon in 1956 seems to have been the first to identify him as the sergeant-at-arms,\(^1\)\(^5\) not as he thought following Millar, who had identified the figure as a yeoman.\(^1\)\(^6\) Held adopted the same identification,\(^1\)\(^7\) while Strong had at first preferred a vaguer description of '[a man] in some kind of court uniform', later expanding on the significance of the presence of the sergeant-at-arms.\(^1\)\(^8\)

The figure behind King James I (Fig. 90). First discussed and identified as a sphinx by Bur
dard\(^1\)\(^9\) in the Wildenstein, 1950 exhibition catalogue, a suggestion followed by Palme — when referring to the 'sphinx-guarded throne'\(^1\)\(^0\) and Strong.\(^1\)\(^3\)\(^1\) Held, however, preferred to describe the figure as a seraph.\(^1\)\(^3\)\(^2\)

The two men beneath and to the right of the throne (Fig. 86). These are described by Palme unobjectionably as 'spectators';\(^1\)\(^3\) both Saxl and Gordon would have liked to identify them as 'Charles' accompanied by 'Buckingham',\(^1\)\(^3\)\(^4\) a proposal rejected by Strong in favour of 'Lucius, the first Christian King of Britain' and perhaps the 'British born Constantine, the Roman Emperor'.\(^1\)\(^3\)\(^5\)\(^6\) Held preferred Palme's formula.\(^1\)\(^3\)\(^6\) Huener proposed Rubens himself and Balthasar Gerbier.\(^1\)\(^3\)\(^7\) More recently, the present author has tentatively suggested the Lord High Treasurer, Baron Weston, from 1633 the Earl of Portland, on the left and the Master of the Horse, the Marquis of Hamilton on the right.\(^1\)\(^3\)\(^8\)
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63. See also Martin, Pompa, 1841, p. 161: 'Spinhem /Egyptia gens ante delubra ... collocavit ut sacrum Symbolum coniunctionis Virtutum Fortitudinis & Prudentiae'. See also McGrath, Pompa, 1971, p. 242; Martin, Pompa (CRLB), 1972, p. 207, under no. 52.


66. See S. Jervis, 'Shadows, not substantial Things, Furniture in the Commonwealth Inventories', in MacGregor, The King's Goods, 1989, pp. 292-293; and D. King, 'Textile Furnishings', in ibid., pp. 314-315 (with different spellings). Jervis recorded that the canopy 'back' and tester of the cloth of estate could be similar, the latter being more often decorated with the royal coat of arms; he noted a canopy 'back' decorated with the coat of arms of the King of Denmark.


68. See Martin, Projects, 1994, p. 30, and n. 17, where Millar's scepticism concerning the identifications is recorded.

69. See Cat. Exh. Dynasties, no. 142.

70. See S. Jervis, 'Shadows, not substantial Things, Furniture in the Commonwealth Inventories', in MacGregor, The King's Goods, 1989, pp. 292-293; and D. King, 'Textile Furnishings', in ibid., pp. 314-315 (with different spellings). Jervis recorded that the canopy 'back' and tester of the cloth of estate could be similar, the latter being more often decorated with the royal coat of arms; he noted a canopy 'back' decorated with the coat of arms of the King of Denmark.

71. See Martin, Projects, 1994, p. 30, and n. 17, where Millar's scepticism concerning the identifications is recorded.


73. For the King's views as to the appropriateness of the seated posture, see under 3, Iconography, pp. 156-157.


76. See below under No. 5b, and his article 'Rubens in Rotterdam', Apollo, LXXXVI, 1967, p. 40.
5. The Union of the Crowns of England and Scotland: Ceiling Painting (Pls. 5 centre, and 10 detail, and Figs. 86-92)

Oil on canvas adhered to canvas laid down on a laminated wood support; 762 x 549 cm. Inscribed on the Garter round the coat of arms, on the near side, indistinctly H(?)N(?)S(?) (?); on the far side, reading from below: Y PENSE.

London, Whitehall, The Banqueting House, the central compartment at the northern end of the ceiling.

COPY: [Engraving by Simon Gribelin II] (Fig. 93; see Appendix VI).


King James I, enthroned in a classical-style rotunda, indicates perhaps his grandson, the infant Charles – Prince of Wales, then probably known as the Prince of Great Britain – who joins female personifications of the kingdoms of England and Scotland; they hold coronets, which are being tied together by Minerva, the goddess of Wisdom, as Charles tramples on the accoutrements of war set ablaze by the genius of Friendship (?). Above, two amoretti carry an elaborately adorned escutcheon, and the Imperial Crown, bearing the royal coat of arms towards the tester beneath the canopy; the scene is witnessed by an English and a Scottish nobleman, one of whom wears the blue sash of the
Order of the Garter, a sergeant-at-arms and a guard.

The King is seated beneath a cloth of estate or rather a canopy; he wears the Imperial Crown and Parliamentary robes over a dark shirt, a falling ruff, and the chain and badge of the Order of the Garter. His face is one of maturity and his hair is darker than his beard. The woman on the left wears a reddish pink gown and white undergarment, which are pulled away to reveal her torso. Her brown hair is done up with a string of pearls. The woman on the right has blonde, flowing hair topped by a jewelled fillet; she wears a yellow mantle over her left shoulder, exposed are her right shoulder, arm (decorated with a jewelled band), and breast; beneath she wears a white gown. A boy (see above) stands between them, and links them by his embrace. Minerva wears a pink crested helmet, breastplate, and long, pinkish grey mantle. Above, two amoretti, one with butterfly the other with bird wings, carry an escutcheon, which is topped by the Imperial Crown, decorated with the garter of the Order of the Garter and with a swag of red and white roses.

The armoury consists of a helmet on top of a cuirass, which lies on a shield above a drum; beneath the shield, beside the sergeant-at-arms's knee, an upturned helmet and another object. Above the shield is the back of a breastplate; to the right are weapons - two pikes, and an axe, which lies above a standard. Another helmet lies above the burning torch.

The Canvas as supplied was probably marginally too small, see pp. 85-87 and Appendix IX. It is uncertain as to whether it has since been reduced.

The Canvas and its support were sawn into three horizontal sections to enable its removal in 1940, see p. 127.

The conservation report made after the cleaning and restoration in 1950 records that on the whole the condition was 'very good'; a canvas join running through Mars's helmet was noted during the 1946/47-50 cleaning campaign.

There is a pentimento in the steps to the throne, where as an after-thought the step beneath the circular dais has been raised and extended (Fig. 92).

The Canvas was painted under Rubens's direction, probably after he had laid in the design, and following his instructions by an assistant, perhaps Jan van den Hoecke, see pp. 76-79. Rubens may well have retouched his assistant's work where he saw fit; he may have been wholly responsible for the two amoretti bearing the escutcheon, the heads of James I and the sergeant-at-arms, the flames burning the armour and the feigned bas-relief of a Victory. The swag of roses decorating the escutcheon may have been the work of a specialist.

The coat of arms and the lettering on the garter were presumably added in the Banqueting Hall and before installation. The inscription on its right-hand side should read from top to bottom (Fig. 87).3

Minerva has a similar face to that in the adjacent corner oval showing Minerva Overcoming Ignorance (No. 7; Fig. 111). Although not endowed with so many attributes as the goddess there or in the Wise Rule (No. 3), she can be identified by her helmet and breastplate.4 The two women are 'the two kingdoms of England and Scotland in figures of women' prescribed in the Projects, see Appendix 1.1 and 1.2. They are brought together by the child, to be identified or associated with the infant Charles, the Prince of Great Britain (the later King Charles II), as Minerva ties the two coronets together. For the portrayal of the King, see p. 215; for the sphinx forming the back of the throne, see p. 214. The sergeant-at-arms wears summer livery and carries his staff of office, the mace, and a short sword, see p. 214.

The guard wears classical-style military uniform; his buskins (caligae) have contrasting tops; he sports a yellow cloak over his cuirass, which is gathered at the waist where it covers most of his tunic. The military attendant with the fasces in the Decius Mus Consulting the Auguries wears similar buskins; his companion wears a yellow cloak over his armour.7 The prominent culet resting on the massive drum at the base of the arsenal was a defence worn on most cuirassier armours of the period but not a
defence put on Greenwich armour, which would have been that worn by the English cavalry. The object between the helmet and the sergeant-at-arms’s knee has not as yet been identified.

The scene takes place in an imaginary ceremonial hall, or hall of state, beneath a coffered cupola with a circular opening (oculus) to the sky. Beneath the cupola is an architrave supported by four Doric columns set between two archways, the second of which in the centre, opens to the sky. James I is seated beneath a canopy on a throne ‘raised with degrees’ as the Projects specified.

Palme, while recognising that Veronese’s Esther before Ahasuerus in San Sebastiano, Venice, was Rubens’s ultimate source for the composition, also suggested that treatments of two other Biblical subjects – The Circumcision and The Judgment of Solomon – may have been influential. The former proposal is flawed; Strong supported the latter, which may indeed have some relevance, as is discussed below. Held has disposed of Palme’s theory of the sceptre/stiletto transformation, while his reading of the two female personifications as ‘gently contending’ for the infant between them seems the opposite to the case.

As has been pointed out, the artist here returned to his ideas originally proposed for the Esther before Ahasuerus, destined to occupy one of the ceiling compartments of the Jesuit Church in Antwerp, for which two modelli are extant, of which the second is more apposite (Fig. 22). Here the foreshortening was far more pronounced; but strikingly similar is the architectural interior (though not the order) with the canopy set before the opening in the dome (the arrangement of the curtains was to grow more elaborate, but originally was also similar). The coffered dome was abandoned in the canvas executed for the Jesuit ceiling; thus was precluded any accusation that Rubens here simply repeated a setting devised for the enactment of an event in the Old Testament. Closely related too is the pose adopted for James I with that of King Ahasuerus. And although the sceptre is preferred in a similar way, it is likely that while Ahasuerus “held out the golden sceptre towards Esther” as a sign of goodwill, James I’s gesture was intended more to be seen as an instruction. A further motif carried over by Rubens from these earlier modelli is the group of Esther and her handmaids set in supplication before Ahasuerus. Indeed, the left arm of the furthermost handmaid and her raised eyes in the first modello are similar to those of the right-hand personification. However, the upper half of the personification on the left depends on that of the outer Grace in the Mercury conducting Psyche to Olympus and then in Minerva and Mercury conducting the Duke of Buckingham to the Temple of Honour and ‘Virtus’ (Fig. 19).

Beneath Ahasuerus in the second modello for the Jesuit ceiling is a soldier seen in pronounced foreshortening, who serves as a repoussoir. The guard beneath James I performs a similar formal role, but now Rubens added further interest by twisting and lowering the body at the hips and shoulders (for a further discussion of which, see under No. 5f). As in the Jesuit Church modello, Rubens has allowed for the foreshortening of the ledge on which the guard stands by depicting the right leg lower than the left. In the same earlier modello, Rubens also included in the foreground a crouching soldier; in the design for the Union the sergeant-at-arms occupies nearly the same area. His relaxed pose may have been inspired by the guards in Tintoretto’s Triumph of Doge Nicolò da Ponte in the Sala del Maggior Consiglio, in the Doges’ Palace. Another possible source for the pose may have been the ‘captive’ crouching beside Germanicus in the Gemma Tiberiana (Fig. 20).

The two spectators in the top centre of Tintoretto’s composition may have inspired those depicted by Rubens on the far side beneath the throne in both the modelli for Esther before Ahasuerus. He had first employed the motif in the Coup de Lance, which was put in place in the Antwerp Franciscan Church in 1620. The artist would thus have turned to this earlier idea, when he was reminded by Charles I, probably after his examination of the lost Overall Modello (No. 2), that he had omitted members of the nobility of England and Scotland, prescribed in the Projects.
For the left hand amorettto, bearing the escutcheon, Rubens adapted a pose for an angel attaching the fictive tapestry to the capital in the tapestry design for the Eucharistic Teachers and Saints for the Triumph of the Eucharist series.22

The extant preparatory work is similar in scope and extent to that which has survived for the Wise Rule (No. 3). None of what could be presumed to be Rubens’s earliest thoughts on paper has survived. At the least, a study must have been made to record the uniform and arms of the sergeant-at-arms and his idiosyncratic profile. And although there is underdrawing in a compositional modello (No. 5c), this would not have precluded the sketching on paper of the general outlines of the composition Rubens developed to illustrate and amplify the scene prescribed in the Projects.

Such work may not have been protracted, as Rubens decided to depend on the general arrangement he had earlier devised for another royal enactment in which the other protagonists were supplicant women — that of Esther before Ahasuerus — itself related to a composition in which the chief participant was King Solomon,23 appropriately so, as he was an exemplar particularly cherished by James I. As with the Wise Rule (No. 3a), a lost bozzetto (No. 5a) is assumed formally to have initiated the preparatory process, comparable to the grisaille sketches for the other seven compositions sketched in the Multiple Bozzetto (No. 1).

Only one autograph, compositional sketch — in the Hermitage (No. 5c; Fig. 98) — is extant (where is present the under-drawing already referred to). Evidence of two others is found in presumed copies. One, also in the Hermitage (No. 5h, Copy; Fig. 95), is a pendant to the presumed copy of a modello for the Wise Rule (No. 3h, Copy). Like the latter, it was probably the last compositional modello made to cater to criticisms from London about details of the design in the lost Overall Modello (No. 2), which Rubens had sent to Charles I for his approval. The second (No. 5d, Copy; Fig. 99) is likely to be of a modello made at an intermediary stage probably before the lost Overall Modello (No. 2) and before Rubens turned to the realisation of the figural modelli.

There are figural modelli (Nos. 5b, 5e-5g) for all the participants (one known by what is probably an embroidered copy, Nos. 5g/3g) except for the right-hand amorettto bearing the escutcheon. As the pose of that figure (Fig. 88) was similar to that of the leading amorettto in Procession II (No. 11; Fig. 149) and to that of the trumpet-blowing amorettto in the Apotheosis (No. 4; Fig. 69), Rubens probably felt that it had, or would be, adequately rehearsed, probably as part of the preparation for one of the other two Canvases. No specific recapitulation of the architectural setting is extant and probably none was made, unlike in the case of the Wise Rule (see No. 3e). But the props in the setting — the throne (but not the canopy) and the arsenal (in a preliminary configuration) — were both rehearsed, see Nos. 5c, 5d, 5h.

All the extant individual figural studies share supports with others, and two share supports with protagonists destined for the Wise Rule (of which one painting, No. 5g, is the likely copy already referred to). The main group beneath and including Minerva was treated as a single entity for the purpose of rehearsal, and unusually this group was twice drafted on two, separate supports (Nos. 5b and 5e; Figs. 96 and 101). A comparison with these two studies shows that the artist’s chief early concern was with the degree of foreshortening, a particularly taxing problem given the complexity of the physical relationships within the main group in the left centre. The foreshortening and make-up of the arsenal was also subject to re-consideration, as was the formulation of the escutcheon bearers and the angle at which the escutcheon should be set.

The main components of the iconography were early established. But alternatives were offered for the main focus of James I’s attention — indicated by the direction of his sceptre — whether it was to be the actual process of union or the child immediately beneath. Criticism of aspects of the design in the Overall Modello (No. 2) were probably met in the third (?) compositional modello (No. 5h; Copy, Fig. 95). A means was found of introducing the orb — an essential emblem of majesty, which Rubens had also probably omitted in the early designs for the
Wise Rule and Apotheosis — and the noble witnesses specified in the Projects.

The colours of the garments worn by England and Scotland were early established as pinkish red and white, and yellow and white (whether respectively or not is an open question). Rubens experimented with the colours worn by Minerva to offset her breastplate, beginning with mauve and green, and then combined grey first with purple and then with blue in the first compositional modello and in the copy of the last compositional modello. In the Canvas (Pl. 10, detail), Minerva’s cloak is a pinkish grey. The decorative aspects of the architectural setting seem only to have been devised during work on the Canvas. It was then also that Rubens made a major formal alteration by greatly enlarging the escutcheon-bearing group to enhance the illusion that the main scene took place beneath and behind it.

As is the case with the Wise Rule (No. 3), it has proved impossible to establish a sequence of execution of the extant, preparatory material, without inner contradiction. Following the likely but only hypothetical grisaille bozzetto (No. 5a), the proposed order is essentially the same as that offered for the Wise Rule, but for the suggested early execution of the first figural modello for the Minerva group (No. 5b), in which a marked foreshortening is essayed. A similar foreshortening was employed in an early compositional modello for the Wise Rule (No. 3c) and for the designs essayed in the Multiple Bozzetto (No. 1). Subsequent were two compositional modelli (Nos. 5c and 5d) accompanied by the figural modelli, of which at least one (No. 5e) may not have been ‘completed’ in a single session. The third (?) compositional modello (No. 5h) was executed after the lost Overall Modello (No. 2), although Rubens reserved important elements and details of the composition to be finally determined during work on the Canvas itself.

Three compositional innovations were made during work on the Canvas (No. 5; Fig. 86). The foreshortening of the background was made less pronounced by raising the entablature closer to the top left-hand corner; this was achieved by greatly increasing the height of the two columns on the left. The escutcheon was moved up the field so as to be level with the opening in the dome, as Held noted, and the size its bearers was greatly increased to heighten the illusion of a three-dimensional setting. The arsenal was reconstituted below.

Rubens made adjustments to the appearance of the personification in the centre by exposing her breast and the upper part of her right arm, and embellishing it with a jewelled band; the jewelled fillet on her head was accentuated (Fig. 89). The left-hand amoretto carrying the escutcheon was given (now faint) butterfly wings.

Some iconographic additions or alterations were made as work on the Canvas proceeded. Triglyphs were added to the architrave and the main arch was embellished by a feigned bas-relief of a Victory (its pendant is concealed by the King’s crown). The escutcheon’s festoons were made up of red and white roses, and the garter of the Order of the Garter was inserted round the heraldic shield (Fig. 87) (replacing two straps evident in the ? third modello (No. 5h; Fig. 95)). In the central motif — of the two crowns being tied together — the circles were changed to jewelled coronets (Fig. 89).

The most significant iconographic decision concerned the direction of the sceptre held by the King and had already been made, probably in accordance with the wishes of Charles I. In the Hermitage modello (No. 5c; Fig. 98), the sceptre is pointed at the two circles of the ‘union’; in the presumed ? second lost modello (No. 5d; Fig. 99), it is pointed at the child beneath. In the copy of the ? third modello (No. 5h; Fig. 95), the latter alternative was adopted (as can be gauged by the position of the King’s hand) and the child’s head was slightly lowered so that his gaze could now take in both the coronet and James I. Of related significance was the likely instruction to omit the quiver from the boy’s side, thus subordinating his identification as Cupid to that of the then male heir to the throne, the infant Prince Charles — probably by then known by the courtesy title of Prince of Great Britain — the future King Charles II.
Summary of the proposed sequence:

No. 5a. Compositional bozzetto.
Whereabouts unknown (unrecorded and only hypothetical).

No. 5b (and No. 3d). Figural modelli for Minerva, Cupid, and the personifications of England and Scotland (executed on the same support as the figural modelli for the two Victories in the Wise Rule, No. 3d).
Rotterdam, Museum Boijmans Van Beuningen (Fig. 93).

No. 5c. First compositional modello.
St Petersburg, The State Hermitage Museum (Fig. 98).

No. 5d. Second compositional modello.
Whereabouts unknown (recorded in a Copy, Fig. 99).

No. 5e. Figural modelli for Minerva, Cupid, and the personifications of England and Scotland, for the two amoretti bearing the escutcheon and the genius of Friendship (?) and a partial compositional modello for the arsenal (executed on the same support).
Minneapolis, The Minneapolis Institute of Arts (Figs. 100-101).

No. 5f. Figural modelli for James I and for the Guard (executed on the same support).
Birmingham, Birmingham Museum and Art Gallery (Fig. 102).

No. 5g (and No. 3g). Figural modello for the sergeant-at-arms (executed on the same support as the figural modello for Mercury in The Wise Rule, No. 3g).
(Accepted by Burchard as autograph but doubted by the present author).
Boston, Museum of Fine Arts (Fig. 94 and see Fig. 63))

No. 2. Proposed treatment in the Overall Modello. Listed in the catalogue of King Charles I's collection of c. 1639. Not included in the catalogue of preparatory work that follows.
Whereabouts unknown, presumed destroyed.

No. 5h. Final compositional modello.
Whereabouts unknown (recorded in a Copy, Fig. 95).

No. 5. Canvas in the ceiling.
The Banqueting Hall, Whitehall (Pl. 5, centre, and Fig. 86).

1. Imperial measurements provided by the Ministry of Works in 1950: 25 ft. x 18 ft. [762 x 548.6 cm.]. Those provided in 1907 were: 24 ft. 8 in. x 18 ft. 2 in. [752 x 554 cm.]; see p. 123, n. 101, and p. 126.
2. See the MS. condition report by W. Hampton, made during the 1946/47-1950 cleaning campaign, at present in the English Heritage Studio Archive, Regents Park, London (typescript at Historic Royal Palaces, Hampton Court Palace, Surrey). As with the other canvases, nail holes were revealed round the edges, where the support had been nailed to the front of the stretcher; see further p. 123, under n. 101.
3. The inscription must have been incorrectly replaced during one of the cleaning campaigns after 1720 as it is correctly rendered in Gribelin’s engraving of that date, see Appendix no. VI. It is perhaps noteworthy that the partial inscription on the Garter surrounding the coat of arms in Rubens’s portrait of Aletheia Talbot, the wife of the Earl of Arundel, with her retinue is correctly transcribed. For the portrait, see Vlieghe, Portraits (CRLB), 1987, no. 72, fig. 24.
4. For the attributes of Minerva, see, for instance, Cartari, Imagini, 1571, p. 356.
6. See note 4 under No. 5f.
14. Ibid., nos. 17a-17b, figs. 94-95.
5a. The Union of the Crowns of England and Scotland: Bozzetto

Oil on oak support, ? grisaille; measurements unknown.

Whereabouts unknown (unrecorded).

There is no record that Rubens prepared for the composition with a bozzetto. But as seven of the other compositions were established in bozzetti, painted en grisaille – see the Multiple Bozzetto (No. 1; Fig. 46) – it seems reasonable to assume that the same procedure was followed for the Union (No. 5) and the Wise Rule (No. 3). Indeed, Held has stated that ‘The basic plan of how to present the subject [of the Union of the Crowns] had, of course, previously been worked out’ before Rubens executed the earliest extant modello for it, see No. 5b, without specifying how this had been done. The bozzetto may have be painted in London in the late summer or early autumn of 1629, see p. 214, and shown to Charles I for his approval. In it, he may have indicated how he proposed to amplify the scene presented by the Projects (see Appendix I) by including Minerva and Cupid, the motif of Cupid trampling on the accoutrements of war, the genius of Friendship and the escutcheon carried aloft in the direction of the ‘back’ of a cloth of estate.


5b. England and Scotland with Minerva and Cupid (and with two Victories above): Modello (Fig. 96)

Oil on oak support; 64.3/5 x 48.9/49.1 cm.

Rotterdam, Museum Boijmans Van Beuningen. Inv. no. 2516.

PROVENANCE: F.A.E. Bruyninx, Canon and Archdeacon of Antwerp Cathedral, sale (†), Antwerp, 1 August 1791, lot 1 (as ‘La Valeur soutenue par d’autres Vertu...’ Bois 24 x 18½ [Antwerp inches = 63.9 x 48.2 cm.]), bt. by Spruyt (Philip Spruyt, 1727-1801) for 174 fl. ; 2 Van den Hecke, Ghent, when etched; 8 James Tulloch F.R.S., Monseigeur Van Den Hecke...F. SPRUYT FA2 LIT.: E. Duverger, ‘Filip Spruyt en zijn Inventaris van kunstwerken in openbaar en privaat bezit te Gent (ca. 1789-1791), Gentse Bijdragen tot de
Minerva, the goddess of Wisdom, is tying a knot in a ribbon binding the crowns – in the form of circlets – of England and Scotland held by personifications of the two kingdoms, who are conjoined by Cupid, the god of Love; Cupid also suppresses with his foot accoutrements of war; above are two Victories.

The blonde-haired woman to the left, wears a pinkish red gown held up round her waist, over a white undergarment; these have been pulled back and off her right shoulder to reveal her torso. In the centre is Cupid with a quiver at his side; his foot is placed on a helmet that rests on a cuirass, beneath is a shield, face down, and flames. To the right is a blonde-haired woman wearing a white gown and yellow wrap. Above is Minerva wearing a helmet with a purple and white crest; she wears a breastplate and a mauve cloak or mantle over a green gown. Minerva ties a knot in a ribbon binding two golden circlets held by the women beneath.

For the two Victories, see No. 3d.

The reverse of the support bears the stamp of part of the coat of arms of the City of Antwerp (the castle and the trace of one hand). The top, bottom, and right-hand edges are bevelled; traces of the bevel remain on the left-hand edge. There are traces of the ground on both the left- and right-hand edges.

The grain of the support runs vertically. The support is made up of two members, c. 20.6 and 18.4 cm. wide. There is a split in the support springing from the top edge just to the
right of the join, and another split also springing from the top edge close to the left-hand edge.

The support is painted up to the edges. Two layers of grey are filled in between the figures; the top, darker layer was probably applied when the support was framed. It is likely that both layers are later.14 Other areas where there may be later strengthening are: the black round the quiver (present in the copy noted above), parts of Minerva’s cloak, beneath the golden circlets and along the bottom edge. There are retouched losses in the drapery below the knee of the woman on the left, in her chin and in the cloud above, and to the left of the shield. There are small losses along the openings in the support.

The work was executed with reserves, as for instance in Minerva’s crest where the plumes were not filled in but allowance was made for them in the arm of the Victory above. A reserve has also been left, unfilled, towards the base of the cuirass. The head and right arm of the figure to the upper left are hardly articulated in contrast to the other figures, which are more heavily worked up. X-radiographs (Fig. 97), show few pentimenti: it is possible that Cupid’s head was first placed just to the left of its present position and was shown in less steep foreshortening.15

There is no reason to doubt Rubens’s authorship of the present work, but for the infilling between the figures (see above).

For a discussion of the event enacted, the protagonists, the composition and its constituent parts, see under No. 5, Iconography and under catalogue No. 5.

Minerva is identifiable by her helmet and breastplate.16 Fredlund has identified the child as Cupid by virtue of the quiver at his side.17 The two women are ‘the two kingdoms of England & Scotland in figures of women’ prescribed in the Projects, see Appendix 1.1 and 1.2. They are brought together by Cupid as Minerva joins the two circlets representing the crowns of the two kingdoms.18 Cupid also tramples on accoutrements of war, which are being set fire to from below.19

The part of the sketch, here under consideration, is generally and probably rightly considered to be the earliest, extant modello for the Union. Evidently Rubens’s idea for the composition was already far advanced; his first thoughts had probably been set out in at least a grisaille bozzetto (No. 5a). It is likely that when Rubens executed this modello he had in mind a composition not unlike that which was to be finally executed. That the main scene was actually envisaged as taking place among clouds seems most improbable.20 How much of the infilling to the right of the cuirass and of the clouds is Rubens’s work is to be questioned (see above for the infilling), but the fluently handled white impasto seems acceptably by Rubens and must be taken as the artist’s whimsical gloss on the composition he was devising. Indeed, a celestial setting can hardly have been his original intention when the Projects specified that the scene should take place before the ‘King on a Throne raysed with degrees’, see Appendix I.

The present work was most likely executed as a figural modello after the presumed, lost bozzetto (No. 5a). Its purpose would thus have been to act as a larger-scale rehearsal of, and an aid to, the transfer of the figures onto the Canvas, and as guide to an assistant during work on the Canvas. However, the support once used would have been put aside, especially after the problem of the foreshortening and extent of the arsenal came to be re-addressed.

Rubens had here already modified and elaborated the Project’s main conceit by replacing the crowns bound by olive and myrtle with Minerva tying the marriage knot binding the two circlets and by introducing Cupid. The dominant role of the King is understood by the supplicatory poses of the two ‘figures of women’ and his position indicated by the direction of the right-hand woman’s and Minerva’s glances. It may or may not be significant that they do not look in the same precise direction (actually for the woman to have looked in exactly the same direction as the goddess would have been physically impossible); but the disjunction may indicate that Rubens had not yet worked out the exact position of the King in the composition.

Cupid and the two women – and more
markedly Cupid – are depicted in a sloped foreshortening, which is also evident in the early planning of the *Wise Rule* (No. 3c), the *Apotheosis* (No. 4a), and the paintings for the corner compartments (see under Nos. 6a-9a). The Classical-style cuirass is similar to and was depicted from the same angle as, that on which Honour is seated in the *Allegorical Design* (coll. H.R.H. Fürst von und zu Liechtenstein), which has been recently dated by Held to von und zu Liechtenstein), which has been recently dated by Held to

1. Burchard Documentation. The entry, buyer, and price were first published by Burchard, *Cat. Wildenstein*, 1950, under no. 21. The sale catalogue entry was pasted onto the reverse of the support, only traces of which remain.


3. See below and n. 12. Van den Hecke may have been Philippe François Xavier van der Hecke, but the present work was not in his sale: Ghent (Ver­mandel), 15 September 1824.

4. See Waagen, *Supplement*, 1857, p. 200: ‘The Apo­theosis of a hero crowned by Fame & Pallas. A composition of six figures for a ceiling. On wood 2 ft. 1 in. high 1 ft. 7 in. wide [63.5 x 48.2 cm.]’. Waagen’s description is an improvement on Tulloch’s in his MS. catalogue of his pictures (in the National Gallery library): ‘Drawing Room ... Allegory of Valour Crowned by Fame & Pallas – Rubens’, which, in turn, is an improvement on, but also depends on, the Bruyninx sale catalogue entry. The Tulloch provenance was first published by Burchard in 1930, see below, presumably on information provided by the new owner Franz Koenigs. The Irish address (see below) is there given incorrectly, but that seems hardly significant in the circumstances. It seems highly improbable that the provenance was an invention, particularly as there was a connection between James Tulloch and Kate France Lushington-Tulloch; see below.

5. It was Tulloch’s wish that the collection was to be ‘presented by the late John Tulloch Esq. and his brother James Tulloch Esq.; a minute made at the National Gallery Trustees’ meeting of May 1863 states that the Director was to inspect the pictures, but nothing further is recorded of the matter. See the relevant volume of minutes of Trustees’ meetings in the National Gallery archive. Of James Tulloch little has been ascer­tained. He was a member of the Royal Society being elected in 1843, when living in Montague Square, London. By that time he was also a member of other learned Societies: The Antiquaries, Royal Institution, Zoological Society of London and the Linnean Society (information kindly provided by Jane Taylor-Reid of The Royal Society in a letter of 28 March 1996). Adrian James, Assistant Librarian of the Society of Antiquaries, kindly informed the author, in a letter of 4 April 1996, that Tulloch took little part in that Society’s activities, having been elected a Fellow six days before being elected to the Royal Society. His death is noted as having taken place on 22 March 1863, but it was not recorded in *The Times*, and there was no obituary notice in the *Gentleman’s Magazine* nor is there an entry in *Boose’s Modern English Biography* (as Adrian Jones pointed out).


10. See Nicholas, op. cit., p. 111.

11. Described as ‘Rubens The Union of England & Scotland’; recorded in Burchard Documentation. Perhaps the property of Ludwig Burchard when offered and bought in (?), certainly the property of his son, and still owned by his heirs in 1999 when inspected. Actual measurements are 64.5 x 51 cm.; the manner of execution suggested a perhaps early nineteenth-century hand. Notable is a burst of yellow light round the head and shoulders of the plunging Victory left, and the absence of a strap for the quiver. As No. 5b is the only extant sketch showing six figures, another copy (?) also stated to have been on canvas, may have been that in an anonymous sale, Paris, 14 January 1778, lot 207, see under Appendix VII.

12. The original is in the Print Room of the Museum voor Schone Kunsten, Antwerp, and is no. 41 in a list of prints, which according to a sale catalogue of 1802, were in a Spruyt inventory made in 1789-91; see E. Duverger, op. cit., p. 238. The print shows the top of the torch from which flames emerge at the bottom of the picture beneath the armour.
CATALOGUE NOS. 5b and c

13. Pace J. Giltaij, in [Cat. Exh.] Schilderkunst uit de eerste hand, Olieverfschetsen van Tintoretto tot Goya / Malerei aus erster Hand, Ölgemälde von Tintoretto bis Goya (Museum Boijmans Van Beuningen, Rotterdam, and Herzog Anton Ulrich Museum, Braunschweig, 1983-84), under no. 15, who noted the coat of arms of the City of Antwerp.

14. E. Haverkamp Begemann, ‘Rubens in Rotterdam’, Apollo, LXXXVI, 1967, p. 40, took a different view about the background, stating that Rubens only ‘summarily finished’ it in order to give the figures more definition (thus implying that he believed the background work was by Rubens). The infilling is not evident in the painted copy noted above.

15. Jeroen Giltaij of the Museum Boijmans Van Beuningen kindly obtained and provided the X-radiographs. Marina Aarts is also thanked for her assistance in this matter. The photograph of the mosaic of the X-radiographs was taken by the National Gallery Photographic Department, as kindly arranged by Martin Wyld.

16. For the attributes of Minerva, see, for instance, Cartari, Imagini, 1571, p. 356.

17. Fredlund, Iconography, 1976-78, pp. 43-44. His view has been unequivocally accepted by Giltaij, loc. cit. (as in n. 13), and De Poorter et al., Cat. Rotterdam, 1990, under no. 24.

18. For a discussion on the golden circlets, see above p. 211.

19. De Poorter, Cat. Rotterdam, 1990, p. 91, n. 12, under no. 24, believed the torch to be Bellona’s and thus an attribute of War.


21. See also Held, Sketches, 1980, I, p. 206, under no. 136, where he described the foreshortening as steeper than in subsequent studies.


5c. The Union of the Crowns of England and Scotland: Modello
(Fig. 98)

Oil on cradled ? oak support; 64.0/64.2 x 48.8 cm.

St Petersburg, The State Hermitage Museum.

Inv. no. 513.

PROVENANCE: Louis-Antoine Crozat, Baron de Thiers (1699-1770), Place Louis le Grand (later Vendôme), Paris, and recorded in the third room of the ground floor in 1755 (as ‘La Félicité du règne de Jacques I. Roi de la Grande Bretagne, traitée allegoriquement; Esquisse de Rubens, pour le grand Tableau qu’il a peint dans le plafond de la Salle des Banquets au Palais de Withall ... sur bois, de 24 ... sur 18 pouces [64.8 x 48.6 cm.]’); listed in the inventory drawn up after his death, 30 May 1770, by Nicholas Lefebvre and Remy Gosses (as ‘421. Un tableau peint sur bois de vingt pouces huit lignes de haut sur dix huit pouces de large [64.1 x 48.7 cm.], representant Un Roy dans son trône avec plusieurs figures – sujet allegorique esquisse peint par Rubens prise, 200 l[i.];’); sold by Baron de Thiers’s three daughters to the Empress Catherine II (the Great) (1729-1796) of Russia, 1772; thence in the (State) Hermitage Museum, St Petersburg.


King James I effects the union of the crowns of England and Scotland through Minerva, the goddess of Wisdom, who ties together circlets held by personifications of the two Kingdoms, who in turn are united by Cupid, the god of Love, and who, at the same time, tramples on accoutrements of war that are being set ablaze by the genius of Friendship (?). Above are two amoretti carrying an escutcheon, below the sergeant-at-arms and a guard.

The scene takes place in an imaginary ceremonial hall, or hall of state, before a coffered cupola with a circular opening (oculus) to the sky. The coffers are picked out in yellow. The dome is supported by an architrave, beneath which are three archways separated by Doric or Tuscan pilasters. The space is not circular, as Held has pointed out, because of the pair of free-standing columns supporting the architrave and blind casement above, on the left.

Dominating the interior is the canopy, beneath which sits James I on a throne; behind is a sphinx. He wears pink, ermine-lined Parliamentary robes and the Imperial Crown. Beneath is a guard wearing classical-style armour standing on a protruding step on which sits the sergeant-at-arms wearing summer livery, see p. 214, a short sword, and holding a mace. The throne is placed on a decorated platform, set on a cylindrical dais, and is approached by a terrace on to which the woman on the left steps. She has long, blonde hair and a pink gown and white undergarment, which has been pulled away from her right shoulder to reveal her torso. Minerva above wears a pink crested helmet, breastplate, and blue mantle over a grey gown; the woman beneath her has long, blonde hair and wears a yellow mantle over a white gown.

The pile of accoutrements of war consists of a helmet placed on a cuirass with a culet added, which stands on a drum and shield. Behind the shield are an up-ended cuirass, three lances, and a martel de fer. Behind the winged genius is a helmet; above is another piece of armour, perhaps a helmet. Beneath is a fascine, presumably another is beyond being lit by the torch.

The grain of the support runs vertically. It is not easy to detect joins in it; one may be c. 20.5 cm. from the left-hand edge; a second may be 36.5 cm. from the same edge. This latter may be a split, there are two further splits (the first perhaps also being a candidate for a join) 39 cm. and 42 cm. from the same edge. There are some very small paint losses along these openings.

There may be some retouching to the right of the guard, on the drumskin and beneath it, behind the left-hand female personification, round the golden circlets, and between Minerva and the King. There are retouchings in his face and a blob of impasto, possibly not original, forms the end of his beard.

There is underdrawing in black chalk probably related to the painted design; these are to be found most obviously to the left of the face of James I, to the left of the far corner of the canopy and above Minerva’s helmet. More under-drawing is evident in the detail colour plate, published in 1989, of the lower left-hand part of the composition, most notably beneath the flames above the pile of armour, where it would appear that Rubens first drew lances and other weapons. There is a pentimento in the left-hand part of the stone dais on which is placed the footstool beneath the throne: it has been slightly extended. For the rest, the sketch seems to have been executed with reserves, but no allowance was made for the sceptre. The architecture seems to have been added last.
CATALOGUE NO. 5c

For a discussion of the event enacted, the protagonists, the composition, and its constituent parts, see under No. 5, Iconography, and under catalogue No. 5.

There can be no reason to doubt Rubens’s authorship of the present work, which is the only extant, autograph, compositional modello for the Canvas. It was probably preceded by a lost bozzetto (No. 5a), and by the figural modello at Rotterdam (No. 5b). The modello shows Rubens’s ideas in an advanced but not definitive form; still requiring refinement was the architecture, the motif of the leaf-garlanded escutcheon borne by the amoretti (although the pose of the left-hand amoreto was here established, having been anticipated by that of an angel in the top right of the Eucharistic Teachers and Saints in the Triumph of the Eucharist series), the object of the King’s attention, the configuration of the arsenal, and the poses of the left-hand woman and the sergeant-at-arms. Some alternative proposals were to be – or had been – set out in a presumed copy of another compositional modello (No. 5d).

Rubens here adjusted the foreshortening of the Minerva group as sketched in No. 5b (Fig. 96). This and other differences may thus be summarised. Cupid and the two women are more upright and more compactly placed. Minerva’s body is set at a lower angle and her face is no longer in profile while her hands have been brought closer to the golden circlets by altering her right arm; the left arm of the woman on the right has been lowered so that her right shoulder is visible; the woman on the left is in a more upright pose. Her left hand rests on Cupid’s left shoulder to steady him. The angle of Cupid’s face has been lowered so that his features are visible. The colours of Minerva’s costume have been slightly adjusted.

The canopy is arranged in a similar way to that in the Esther before Ahasuerus (Fig. 22; Courtauld Institute of Art Gallery), although it is likely that Rubens made a special study of the British setting. The curtain on the far side is attached to the outside of the valance that on the nearside emanates from within and is half lifted up – its base is folded above and behind the sphinx – so that the figure of the King could be seen. The footstool beneath the throne has a similar decorative embellishment to that in the Vienna modello for the Wise Rule (No. 3b; Fig. 56), where it also rests on a cylindrical dais.

The arsenal is here laid out in very nearly its final configuration, though the weapons were to be altered. Rubens here tilts the drum downwards over the ledge much as the guard’s and Cupid’s right legs are set lower than their left so as to indicate the degree of foreshortening and so as not to give the impression that Cupid, the drum and guard were about to fall towards the spectator. Whereas the armour in the Rotterdam modello (No. 5b) was suggestive of a classical style, the arsenal now seems distinctly contemporary. A similar up-ended cuirass and array of weapons appear in the Marie de Médicis as Queen Triumphant. Fascines were accoutrements of war insolar as they were used to protect gun emplacements. The prominent culet above the drum in the left foreground was a defence worn on most cuirassier armours of the period, but was not a defence put on Greenwich armour.

It is strange that as the Projects had specified that ‘some of the nobility of England & Scotland’ be depicted, see Appendix I.1 and I.2, and that as there were spectators in the paintings, which Rubens may have had in mind when he developed the composition, see under No. 5, he should have omitted them in this early modello.

1. See J.B. Lacurne de Sainte Palaye, Catalogue des Tableaux du Cabinet de M. Crozat, Baron de Thiers, Paris, 1755, p. 21 (numbered in MS. 80), reprinted in Catalogues de Ventes et Livrets de Salons illustrées par Gabriel de Saint Aubin, introduction by E. Dacier, Paris, I-II, 1909, Catalogue de la Collection Crozat,... Saint Aubin only drew the frame of the present work. The catalogue was published four years after the collection was opened to the public. As recently as 1980, see Held, Sketches, 1980, I, p. 209, the present work has been claimed to have been owned by Thiers’s uncle Pierre Crozat (1665-1740); but it is not included among the works by Rubens listed in his estate: see M. Stuffman, ‘Inventaire après décès de Pierre Crozat’, Gazette des Beaux-Arts, LXXII, 1968, pp. 123-124. For Crozat de Thiers, see, most recently, H. Meyer, in [Cat. Exh.] L’Age d’or flamand et hollandais. Collections de Catherine II, Musée de l’Ermitage, Saint-Petersbourg (Musée des Beaux-Arts, Dijon, 1993), pp. 49 ff.

3. For an account of the sale of the collection for a total of 460,000 livres, negotiations for which began in 1770, see, most recently, H. Meyer (as in n. 1), pp. 51 ff.


5. Held, loc. cit., detected 'two (or three?) boards joined vertically'.

6. This last area is noted as damaged by Varshavskaya, Rubens, 1975, p. 191, under no. 32.

7. Held, loc. cit., detected underdrawing 'around the king'.


11. Jaffé, Catalogo, 1989, no. 704; the modello, is no. 703.

12. Another form of defence was a wicker fence as illustrated by Rubens in the sketch for The Victims of War, coll. H.R.H. Fürst von und zu Liechtenstein, for which see Held, Sketches, 1980, I, no. 270; II, p. 263.


5d. The Union of the Crowns of England and Scotland: Modello

Support and measurements unknown.

Whereabouts unknown (recorded in a copy).

COPY: Painting (Fig. 99), whereabouts unknown; oil on canvas, 68 x 53 cm. PROV. For the early provenance, when still united with its likely pendant No. 3c, Copy, see under the latter; with Sedelmeyer, Paris,1 from whom acquired in 1892 for 12,500 fr. by Henri Heugel (1844-1916), Paris,2 still with his widow in 1930;3 C.J. Weitzenberg, Neu Allschwiz, Switzerland, March 1955;4 Itti, Liestal, Switzerland, December 1956.5 EXH. Exposition Internationale, Coloniale, Maritime et d'Art Flamand, Antwerp, 1930, no. 244. LIT. Trésor de l'Art Flamand...Mémorial de l'Exposition d'Art Flamand à Anvers, 1930, Paris, I, 1932, no. 244 (as 'Le couronnement de Charles I').

King James I indicates Cupid, the god of Love, who unites the Kingdoms of England and Scotland, the personifications of which hold circlets that are being tied together by Minerva, goddess of Wisdom, as the genius of Friendship (?) sets ablaze accoutrements of war that are trampled on by Cupid.

Burchard rejected the attribution of the present work to Rubens in 1955;6 he believed that it was a copy of a lost sketch, the first in the sequence of preparatory works. It is known to the author only by way of a black-and-white reproduction in the 1930 memorial volume (see above). However, Burchard's view that it is a copy of a lost modello is likely, because while the presumed prototype would appear to have in common many motifs with the other preparatory works (notably the Hermitage modello (No. 5c; Fig. 98)), it exhibits some unique differences. More contentious is Burchard's view that the prototype was the earliest in the sequence. But it was probably executed during the same early phase as the Hermitage modello (No. 5c), in order to essay some alternative ideas.

For a discussion of the event enacted, its protagonists, of the composition and its constituent parts, see No. 5, Iconography and under catalogue No. 5.

In this presumed record of a lost compositional modello, it can be seen that Rubens effected several alterations. In the Minerva group he gave the female personification on the left a more upright pose and directed her gaze straight ahead; her head and that of her opposite number were embellished by a tiara and triangular-shaped, jewelled fillet respectively. The escutcheon was moved further up and to the left. One of the amoretti bearing the escutcheon was recast in the guise of a discarded bearer of the triumphal crown from the Vienna modello for the Wise Rule (see under Nos. 3 and 3b), as Held recognised.7

Other ideas - alternatives to those in the Hermitage modello - are found in the genius of Friendship (?), who is wingless, in the arsenal,8 and in the top of the mace, which is modelled, perhaps following a reference to the (or a) drawing made of it in England. To the architecture, Rubens introduced a large archway behind the King; the pilaster and subsidiary archway were
moved to the left to make room for it. Three adjustments were made to James I: he sits in a more upright position so as to be more on a level with Minerva; an extensive swathe of the royal ermine is displayed over his left arm, and his sceptre is now directed at the child — still to be identified as Cupid — rather than at the union of the two 'circlets of plate'. Finally, the footstool and cylindrical dais beneath the throne were amplified.

Arnout Balis suggested (in discussions) that the present work (Fig. 99) is likely to have been by the same hand that executed the presumed copy discussed under No. 3c (Fig. 61), and that both may be identified with the sketches first recorded in the Horion collection in Brussels.

1. See A. Brejon de Lavergnée, 'La Collection de tableaux d’Henri Heugel (1844-1916)', Bulletin de la Société de l'Histoire de l'Art Français, 1994 (published in 1995), p. 230, under no. 77. The author thanks Joanne Hedley, Curator of Paintings at the Wallace Collection, for drawing his attention to this article and for photostats of it.

2. Ibid. Heugel, a distinguished music publisher, and patron, lived from 1890-1900 at 58, rue Pierre Charron, and from 1900 at 42, avenue du Bois de Boulogne (later Foch). See Brejon de Lavergnée, op. cit., pp. 215-218.

3. When exhibited at Antwerp, see below.


5. Ibid.

6. Ibid.

7. Held, Sketches, 1980, I, p. 207, under no. 137, in his discussion of No. 5e, below, and not in reference to the present sketch.

8. Most notably what has been read as a fascine in No. 5c has been replaced by an arm-piece, and a standard has been introduced among the weapons.

5e. **England and Scotland with Minerva and Cupid, the Accoutrements of War and the Genius of Friendship (?), and two Amoretti bearing an Escutcheon: Modello** (Figs. 100-101)

Oil on cradled ? oak support; 84.2 x 71.1 cm.

**Minneapolis, The Minneapolis Institute of Arts, The William Hood Dunwoody Fund. Inv. no. 26.2.**

**PROVENANCE:** ? Edward Gray, by 1830 (as 'An allegorical subject, allusive to the Union ... under the similitude of two females holding a triple crown, which Britannia has brought them, over the head of an infant [Charles I]; two angels, bearing the arms and crown of Wales, soar above their heads; under the foot of the child is a pile of armour ... to which Zephyr is putting a blazing torch ... 2 ft. 8 in. by 4 ft. 4 in. [81.2 x 132 cm.] P[anel]');? Samuel Sandars by 1879; Prince Demidoff, sale, Palais de San Donato, Florence, (Pillet, Le Roy and Mannheim), 15 ff. March, 1880, lot 1098 (Grande Galerie Flamande et Hollandaise) (as 'Le Plafond de Whitehall ... un enfant, portrait du prince de Galles, depuis Charles Ier, qu'entourent les figures allégoriques de l'Ecosse et de l'Irlande, tandis que derrière lui l'Anglerre soutient, avec les deux autres royaumes, la couronne royale au dessus de la tête du jeune prince. L'amour en signe de paix met le feu à des armes'), panel, 83 x 70 cm.; Charles Porgès, Paris; the dealer Sedelmeyer, Paris, by whom sold to Albert Lehmann, Paris, by 1898; Albert Lehmann sale, Paris, (Georges Petit), 12 June (1st day) 1925, lot 279 sold for 120,000 fr.; the dealer Cassirer, Amsterdam, July 1925; sold by the Munich dealer Julius Böhler to the Minneapolis Institute of Arts by November 1926.

**COPIES:** (1) Painting, whereabouts unknown; technique unknown, 90 x 75.5 cm. PROV. Frau Fritsch, Stuttgart, 1954.9

(2) **Engraving by Félix Augustin Milis (1843-1894) in L'Art**, according to the San Donato catalogue of 1880 (see above, under Provenance), where the print was also reproduced.

**EXHIBITED:** ? Works by the Old Masters, Royal Academy, London, 1879, no. 122 (lent by Samuel Sandars); 300 Paintings by Old Masters ... being some principal pictures which have ... formed part of the Sedelmeyer Gallery, Paris, 1898, no. 160; Exposition d'Art Ancien. L'Art Belge au XVIIe siècle, Nouveau Palais, Parc du Cinquantenaire, Bruxelles, 1910, no. 316; (? Exposition Universelle et Internationale de Gand, L'Art ancien dans Les Flandres, 1913 (it is not no. 31 of the exhibition as stated on a label on the reverse of the support);
An Exhibition of Sixty Paintings and Some Drawings by Peter Paul Rubens, Detroit Institute of Arts, 1936, no. 52; European Painting & Sculpture from 1300-1800, New York World’s Fair, New York, 1939, no. 337; Rubens Exhibition, Gallery of Fine Arts, Columbus, Ohio, 1940; Loan Exhibition of Forty-Two Paintings by Rubens and Twenty-Five Paintings by Van Dyck, Los Angeles County Museum, Los Angeles, 1946, no. 34 (omitted from the catalogue, but indirectly referred to in the unpaginated introduction); Nicholas Poussin – Peter Paul Rubens, The Cincinnati Art Museum, 1948, no. 8; Art of Europe XVIIth-XVIIIth Centuries, Worcester Art Museum, Worcester, 1948, no. 10; A Loan Exhibition of Rubens, Wildenstein, New York, 1951, no. 25; Rotterdam, 1953-54, no. 86; Drawings and Oil Sketches by P.P. Rubens from American Collections, Fogg Art Museum, Cambridge, Mass. and The Pierpont Morgan Library, New York, 1956, no. 41; Paintings and Sculpture from the Minneapolis Institute of Arts, A Loan Exhibition, Knoedler Galleries and The Society for the Four Arts, Palm Beach, 1957 (not numbered); Masterpieces, Wildenstein, New York, 1961, no. 11; Antwerp, 1977, no. 93.


Minerva, the goddess of Wisdom, ties a knot in the ribbon binding the crowns – in the form of circlets – of England and Scotland held by personifications of the two Kingdoms who are brought together by Cupid, the god of Love; Cupid is also trampling on accoutrements of war, which are being set fire to by the genius of Friendship; above two amoretti carry an escutcheon, which is surmounted by a crown and decorated with a garland of foliage.

The blonde-haired woman on the left wears a tiara and a reddish pink gown drawn in at the waist over a white undergarment, which have been pulled away from her right shoulder to reveal her torso. Cupid, in the centre, is naked, and has a quiver of arrows beside him held by a strap round his midriff. The arrows are painted white, red, and green. The blonde-haired woman on the right wears a triangular-shaped, jewelled fillet on her head and a yellow wrap over her left shoulder and greyish gown beneath.

Cupid’s left foot stamps on a helmet placed on a cuirass; beneath is a drum lying against a shield, which rests on a pike and a standard. A winged child sets fire to these accoutrements of war. The shield is decorated with green tassels; the standard is striped black and red.

Above are two amoretti holding an escutcheon, which is topped by a crown and decorated with a garland of green foliage, done up with a pink ribbon.
The support is made up, perhaps, out of three members: what may be joins are c. 19 cm. from the left-hand edge and c. 31 cm. from the right-hand edge. Because the support has been cradled, it is impossible to determine whether it has been reduced. That the edge of the support runs through the genius of Friendship and the drum suggests that it may have been reduced at the bottom. The grain of the support runs vertically.

A retouched split in the middle of the support runs up through the drum, the golden circles and to the left of the escutcheon. There is some repainting on the faces of Minerva and the woman on the right. The lower part of Minerva’s body is worn. The left hand of the amoretto above left is repainted.

Held has drawn attention to the marked evidence of pentimenti, the great majority of which are indecipherable to the naked eye; he believed they were relevant to the development of the design. Their extent is best visible in the colour reproduction in Baudouin’s monograph of 1977, which indicates rather that Rubens used the support of an abandoned oil sketch, perhaps not related to the present commission. However, nothing is shown up by X-rayographs, perhaps partly because of the cradling. Any earlier use of the support has been roughly brushed over in black, white, and grey paint. Some evidence of an extensive earlier design is below the white gown and at the bottom right, where if viewed upside down there appears to be a capital of a column and the beginnings of an arch springing up towards the left. Notable too is the unexplained gap between the right-hand side of the composition and the edge of the support (the designs in the other modelli usually fill the field of their supports).

The step beneath Cupid was introduced after the execution of the figures; the shield was painted over the standard, but a reserve was left in the shield for the drum.

For a discussion of the event enacted, the protagonists, the composition and its constituent parts, see under No. 5, Iconography and under catalogue No. 5.

There can be no reason to doubt Rubens’s authorship of the present work, which, it is generally agreed, was executed after that at Rotterdam (No. 5b). And it is here proposed that it was executed after the first two compositional modelli (Nos. 5c and 5d). But of all the preparatory sketches for the commission, the present work is the hardest to categorise. It probably consists of three discrete studies (rather than the two proposed by Held), which were executed during different sessions, like the Rotterdam sketch. The central and upper motifs are very similar to those essayed in No. 5d (Fig. 99), although Minerva’s wrap is now purple rather than blue. In the present sketch they are thus to be considered as probably figural modelli, that is, executed as larger-scale rehearsals of, and aids to, the transfer of the design on to the Canvas and as guides for an assistant. However, the arsenal does not follow that as devised in either Nos. 5c or 5d.

Rubens worked up his ideas for the arsenal’s configuration, which he had either previously sketched elsewhere (of which no trace exists) or more probably drafted for the first time at the base of the present support (in the position it was to occupy on the Canvas). This would have been done before its recasting in the compositional modelli (Nos. 5c and 5d). The arsenal is arranged with the sloping foreshortening evident in the main figures of the Rotterdam modello, and adopted by Rubens in the early stage of planning the compositions of the Wise Rule (No. 3c) and designs in the Multiple Bozzetto (No. 1). The two other motifs may then have been added later filling the unoccupied space. Thus two angles of foreshortening are employed. It is here proposed that the present support bears two figural modelli and a compositional sketch for a prominent section of the design. The latter had already been in part superseded when the figural modelli were introduced.

But if it is accepted that the execution of No. 5e may not have been the result of one uninterrupted session of work, then this sequence and the serial relationship between Nos. 5c, 5d, and 5e can only be tentatively advanced; different sequences can be propounded, of which none as yet is more or less convincing than the present.
Towards the bottom of the Minneapolis work, Rubens elaborated — in what is described above as part of a compositional sketch — the conceit of Cupid’s suppression of accoutrements of war first drafted in the Rotterdam modello (No. 5b; Fig. 96), where the burning of which was also there hinted at. Present is the genius of Friendship holding a burning torch, who sets fire to the arsenal. Cupid’s foot presses down on a helmet resting on a cuirass as in the Rotterdam modello, but the position of the helmet has been altered and the cuirass has been reversed. Before it are placed a lance, standard, shield, and finally in the foreground, a drum, seen from much the same angle as that in the modello for Marie de Médicis as Queen Triumphant. The arsenal depicted there and in the later sketch of Two Captive Soldiers recalls that in the present modello.

1. The owner may be identical with the Edward Gray of Haringay Park or House, Hornsey, London, who had died by 1839, in which year Christie’s held four sales of his possessions, none of which was of pictures.

2. See Smith, Catalogue, 1829-42, II, p. 232-233, no. 814. The measurements given are presumably incorrect; the 4 ft. may well have been a misprint, 2 ft. having been intended. Smith gives an earlier provenance of anonymous sale, London (Stanley), 1822, sold for 60 gns., but this sale has not been traced.

3. When exhibited at the Royal Academy, Works by Old Masters (as ‘Sketch for a portion of the ceiling of the Whitehall Chapel ... Three female figures holding a crown, two angels above holding an escutcheon, one beneath with a torch’), oil on panel, 23 x 38 in. [58.4 x 96.5 cm.]. No sale by Samuel Sandars is recorded in Lught, Répertoire and no subsequent citing of a modello with these measurements is recorded. From the description, the present work would appear to be very similar to the Minneapolis modello. It is likely that the two are identical, as the date of the end of the Royal Academy exhibition would have allowed as much as c. nine months for it to enter the Demidoff collection; indeed, the explanation may lie in a printer’s error, for if the first digits of the imperial measurements given in the Royal Academy catalogue are interchanged, the size would be the same as that of the sketch in the Demidoff collection. Sandars’s identity remains as yet obscure. Two authors with this name were publishing from about the middle of the century; one an antiquarian and Master of Arts, who published two works with the Cambridge Antiquarian Society, dated 1851 and 1878; and the other of Hemel Hempstead, who published four books between 1850 and 1882.

4. See the Lehmann sale catalogue, below; it was not in the anonymous (Fargès) sale, Paris (Drouot), 25 April 1892.

5. See the Sedelmeyer catalogue, cited under exhibitions below.


8. See the Bulletin of the Minneapolis Institute of Arts, XV, Nov. 6, 1926, no. 29, p. 154.


10. Held, Sketches, 1980, I, p. 206, under no. 137. The pentimenti above Cupid’s head and in the position of the head itself, detailed by Held, were not observed by the compiler.


12. X-radiographs and a photograph of a loosely assembled mosaic were kindly supplied by Erika Holmium-Wall of the Minneapolis Institute of Arts, and are lodged in the Rubenianum.


15. Ibid., I, pp. 365-366, no. 271, and II, pl. 264.

5f. King James I and the Guard; Modello (Fig. 102)

Oil on oak support; 64.8 x 50.8 cm.

Birmingham, Birmingham Museum and Art Gallery. Inv. no. P2’84.

PROVENANCE: F.A.E. Bruynincx, Canon and Archdeacon of Antwerp Cathedral, sale (+), Antwerp, 1 August 1791, lot 3 (as ‘Assuerus sur son trône; à côté de lui se voit un homme debout. Esquisse de la partie d’un plafond devoré dans l’incendie de l’église des ci devant Jesuites à Anvers [B]ois’ 24 p x 18 1/2 p [Antwerp inches = 62.57 x 48.23 cm.’), bt. by Mensaert for 8 fl.; Richard Cosway RA (1742-1821), sale (+), London, (Stanley), 19 May (3rd day) 1821, ‘at Mr Cosway’s late Residence No. 20 Stratford Place, Oxford St,... Parlours and Drawing Rooms’, lot 71 (as ‘Rubens A Study for one of the Paintings in Whitehall’), £ 25 4 sh. bt. in; Richard Cosway sale (+), 9 March (2nd day)
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1822. London (Stanley), 'removed from Stratford Place to his late residence in Edgware Rd.', lot 67 (as 'Rubens a Study for one of the Pictures in Whitehall'), bt. by Colonel Thomas Henry Davies (1789-1846) of Elmley Castle, Worcestershire for £26 5 sh.; 2 inherited by his nephew, General Francis John Davies (1791-1874), his son, Lieutenant-General Henry Fanshawe Davies (1837-1914), his son, Colonel (later General) Sir Francis John Davies (1864-1948), and finally, his son, Lieutenant-Colonel Henry Rodolph Hugh Davies (1903-1982); from whose estate acquired by the Birmingham Museum and Art Gallery, 1984.


Above, King James I is seated on a throne. He wears Parliamentary robes with a decorated cape, a grey undergarment, and the ermine-lined imperial crown. His white shoe is done up with a pink lace. His hair is black with white streaks, his moustache and beard are a light brown. The throne is backed with the upper part of a sphinx's body whose left leg forms the support of the armrest. The guard wears classical-style buskins (caligae) with contrasting tops; the left boot is done up with a dark red lace. He wears dark red drawers beneath a greenish tunic, above he wears a cuirass and a yellow cloak, held at his waist over his tunic, and which is thrown over his left shoulder. He leans with his right hand on a shield (cassis).

The grain of the support runs vertically. There are six retouched openings, of which two may be original joins. A report of 1952 stated that the support was made up of three main members, 16.4 cm., 11.2 cm. and 20.2 cm. wide 'with two narrow strips giving an additional 1.8 cm.' The latter strips are on the left-hand side; neither may be original.

The reverse of the support shows slight beveling at the top and bottom. The support is branded with the coat of arms of the City of Antwerp and there are ? traces of the monogram MV, which is that of the panel maker Michiel Vriendt.

The left and right sides have been retouched, including part of the step and the King's right index finger. The face of the guard may have been retouched; it is featureless and unsatisfactorily covered with black paint and incomprehensible dabs of crimson. The three main areas, not worked on by Rubens, give a messy impression due perhaps to retouching of losses in, and to the priming or imprimatura. The condition of the area occupied by the shield also seems questionable. Cleaning and restoration at the Museum was completed in 1988.

A reserve was left in the King's robe to allow for the guard's left arm, and for the guard's legs beneath his cloak. It seems likely that the sphinx was completed after the execution of the guard; the curtain may have been executed after
the sphinx and the execution of James I's robe, the outline of which was added after it.

There appears to be *pentimenti* in the royal robe beneath the right arm, where its fall has been extended, as has the fold over the right leg.

There can be no reason to doubt Rubens's authorship of the present work. It was probably executed as two discrete figural *modelli* - after the compositional *modelli* (Nos. 5c and 5d) - of James I with the sphinx and of the guard, as a larger-scale rehearsal of and aid to the transfer of the figures on to the Canvas and as a guide for a collaborator. The King's hands, and his position relative to the sphinx indicate that it depended on No. 5c (Fig. 98), although the amount of ermine displayed has been reduced. The artist was not here concerned with the spatial relationship between the two main protagonists; the guard was placed higher and more to the right than had been settled in the compositional *modelli* (Nos. 5c and 5d) so that he could be fitted in on the support.

For a discussion of the scene enacted, the composition, the appearance of the King, and for the guard, see No. 5, *Iconography* and under catalogue No. 5.

A chalk drawing in the Louvre (Fig. 23) has been associated with Rubens's development of the pose of the guard, and has long been thought a copy by Rubens after Correggio. Jeremy Wood, however, believes it to be an original by Annibale Carracci, which Rubens reworked in red wash and white heightening. It should primarily be associated with the development of the pose of the standing guard in the *modello* for the *Esther before Ahasuerus* designed for one of the ceiling compartments of the Jesuit Church (Fig. 22). In the drawing (whether the making of a counterproof, suggested by Burchard and d'Hulst as the figure faces right was necessary or not), Rubens was concerned with the foreshortened view of the hand resting on the hip, which was repeated in the Jesuit Church *modello*. Also followed there, is the foreshortened arm, which was retracted. But so far as concerns the present *modello*, by twisting the body of the guard, which meant that the arm was now pushed forward, and embellishing his uniform with a cloak gathered in by his left hand, Rubens would have gained little by a study of the drawing he had reworked. However, it may well have suggested the idea of the cloak slung over the guard's nearside shoulder, which was not used in the earlier *modello* for the Jesuit Church.

1. Burchard Documentation. The entry, buyer, and price were first published by Burchard, *Cat. Wildenstein*, 1950, see below.
2. Letter of 23 August 1950, from Mary Woodall, of the Birmingham Museum and Art Gallery, in Burchard Documentation. For the price, see Burchard Documentation, and, for instance, the priced sale catalogue in the Frick Art Reference Library.
3. Contrary to the view in Held, Sketches, 1980, I, pp. 204-205.
4. The raised, folded-over tops are placed at the front of the left leg and at the rear of the right. For commentary on Rubens's rendering of classical-style military footwear, see Van der Meulen, *Antique* (CRLB). 1994, I, p. 127 and n. 47.
5. See the report by Stephen Rees-Jones of the Courtauld Institute of 4 December 1952 in the Birmingham Museum and Art Gallery archive. The author thanks Jane Farrington, Keeper of the Department of Art, at the Birmingham Museum and Art Gallery and Hayden Roberts in providing information about, and access to, the sketch.
7. See the conservation dossier in the Birmingham Museum and Art Gallery archive.
8. Held, Sketches, 1980, I, p. 208, under no. 138, stated that the guard was executed before the King; his view does not allow for the use of reserves.
11. The idea of an hypothetical Correggio prototype, proposed by Glück and Haberditzl, see above, but questioned by M. Jaffe ('Rubens' Drawings at Antwerp', *The Burlington Magazine*, XCIX, 1956, p. 317) and rejected by A. Popham (Correggio's Drawings, London, 1957, p. 130), was sustained for as long as 1977: see *Roulunds, Rubens Drawings*, 1977, no. 180, and A.-M. Logan, 'Rubens Exhibitions 1977,' *Master Drawings*, 15, 1977, p. 412. Logan was later to reject both Correggio and Annibale Carracci (proposed by Jaffe) as the author of the prototype; see A.-M. Logan, 'Rubens...
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12. Letter of 18 April 1996; the author thanks Jeremy Wood for communicating his views about the drawing. He connects it with a figure (in reverse) in The Building of the Argo in the Story of Jason frieze in the Palazzo Fava, Bologna, though he believes that it may originally have been made for a different purpose. See also J. Wood, [Cat. Exh.], cited in previous note.


15. Burchard-d'Hulst, Drawings, 1963, loc. cit., believed that the drawing in red chalk 'belonged to Rubens's Italian period' while the re-working with the brush should be dated round 1630. The head, arm, and cloak are all reworked with the brush. Jeremy Wood, cited in note 11, associated Rubens's reworking with the Jesuit Church and the Banqueting House commissions, allowing a dating for it of between 1620 and 1630.'

5g. The Sergeant-at-Arms (with Mercury: Mercury and 'Argus'): *Modello* (Figs. 63 and 94)

Oil on inset, cradled ? oak support; 61 x 48.3 cm.

Boston, Museum of Fine Arts. Inv. no. 42.179. The authenticity of the present work was accepted by Burchard but is doubted by the present author.

For Provenance, Exhibitions and Literature, see under No. 3g.

The sergeant-at-arms occupies the lower field of the Mercury and 'Argus'. For a discussion of the Boston sketch, which is retained in the sequence of preparatory works out of deference to Burchard's opinion, see under No. 3g. It is proposed here that like Mercury, 'Argus' – the sleeping figure in the Boston picture – derives from a lost, figural *modello* for the sergeant-at-arms, executed as a larger-scale rehearsal of, and aid to, the transfer of the figure to the Can­vas and as a guide for a collaborator. The prototype is likely to have been made after the Hermitage *modello* (No. 5c; Fig. 98), because the position of what was the mace is the same and because its spherical top is still evident.

For a discussion of the event enacted, the composition and the sergeant-at-arms, see under No. 5, Iconography, and under catalogue, No. 5.

The rugged, bearded physiognomy of the sergeant-at-arms, clumsily conveyed in the Boston sketch, but evident in photographs of the Canvas (Fig. 92), is so idiosyncratic as to suggest that it results from a study from the life made in London, see p. 57. If this was the case (there is no record of such a study), it would have been made perhaps in pen and ink – details of the uniform and staff of office would perhaps also have been noted, as in the earlier drawing of Robin the Dwarf, made ten years earlier in Antwerp1 or in chalk, like the studies of the Gerbier children, made in London.2

1. For the drawing, see Burchard-d'Hulst, Drawings, 1963, 1, no. 127, and II, pl. 127.

2. For the drawings, see Burchard-d'Hulst, Drawings, 1963, under no. 146.

5h. The Union of the Crowns of England and Scotland: *Modello*

Support and measurements unknown.

Whereabouts unknown (recorded in a copy).

COPY: Painting (Fig. 95), St Petersburg, The State Hermitage Museum, inv. no. 2576; on wood support, 29 x 19.5 cm., inscribed with an inven­tory number 1375, (pendant to No. 3h, Copy). PROV. Acquired by the Empress Catherine II (the Great) (1729-1796) of Russia before 1774 as
one of the 'Two designs for ceilings' by Rubens; transferred from the Hermitage to Gatchina Palace, near St Petersburg in 1799; returned to the State Hermitage Museum in 1926 available for sale through Antiquariat, September 1931, no. 3. EXH. Old Master Pictures in Private St. Petersburg Collections, The Hermitage Museum (?), St Petersburg, 1908, no. 355 (the exhibition did not open); London, 2003-04. LIT. J. von Schmidt, 'Gemälde alter Meister in Petersburger Privatbesitz, Die Ausstellung der Staryje Gody in St Petersburg', Monatsheft für Kunstwissenschaft, II, 1909, 4, pp. 176-177; Varshavskaya, Rubens, 1975, p. 192; Gritsay, 'Sketches', 2003, pp. 45-46 and colour plate 35.

King James I perhaps indicates his grandson, the infant Charles, Prince of Great Britain. He brings together personifications of the kingdoms of England and Scotland – who hold circlets that are tied together by Minerva, the goddess of Wisdom – and trampolines on accoutrements of War, that are being set ablaze by the genius of Friendship (?). Above two amorreti carry an escutcheon, below, on either side of the approach to the throne, an English and a Scottish nobleman and the sergeant-at-arms and a guard.

Schmidt, see above, recognised the importance of the St Petersburg painting (see under Copy) for the light it throws on the development of the composition. He believed it was the work of a studio hand; but it may well have been done a good deal later, although scientific analysis suggests that this rather crudely executed work was made before c. 1760. Burchard's view that it is a copy after a modello executed subsequently to the Hermitage modello (No. 5c; Fig. 98) can be refined: the prototype would appear to have been executed after the composition recorded in the presumed copy of the lost modello (No. 5d; Fig. 99), because while it agrees in most essentials with the final Canvas, there are key differences between them. These would seem to establish that the work derives from another modello, which constituted a further, distinct phase in Rubens's development of the composition. And it seems likely –

as with the present work's pendant (No. 3h) – that that phase marked Rubens's response to criticisms made in London of the design set out in the lost Overall Modello (No. 2), which had been sent to London for Charles I's approval. Other changes may also have stemmed from new information concerning the size of the opening in the ceiling.

For a discussion of the event enacted, the protagonists, the composition and it constituent parts, see No. 5, iconography and under catalogue No. 5.

The present copy is probably a good deal smaller than the presumed, lost prototype. The degree of accuracy is impossible to estimate, but attention has been paid to detail, for instance, in the form of the pink ribbon round the swag of foliage hanging from the escutcheon and of the uniform of the sergeant-at-arms.

The key differences – that is, the motifs that follow the supposed copy (Fig. 99) of the second modello (No. 5d), but which were not adopted in the final Canvas (Fig. 86) – are: the crowns being joined are still circlets, the wing of the amorretto supporting the escutcheon on the left is a bird's, and the sweep of the entablature.

The most significant iconographical alteration was the likely deliberate omission of the quiver from the boy's side, which allowed his identification no longer as Cupid, but as the infant Prince of Wales – then known as the Prince of Great Britain – the future King Charles II, see above, pp. 212-213. No attempt seems to have been made to delineate the sceptre held by James I, perhaps because it was only faintly indicated in the prototype, nor, perhaps for the same reason, was the sphinx included. A second, important iconographic alteration may have been to adjust the composition in order to accommodate 'some of the nobility of England & Scotland', specified in the Projects, see Appendix I.1 and I.2, and omitted in the earlier compositional modelli. To do this, Rubens had recourse to his earlier modelli for Esther before Ahasuerus (Fig. 22) to find room for those two spectators – now representatives of the English and Scottish nobility – he had to move the group of the King, sergeant-at-arms and guard to the right,
to abandon the fold of the robe beneath James I's right hand, and to compress the group opposite. Two further changes were made to James I. Introduced was the conceit of his left hand leaning on the orb — hitherto for the King crucially absent — Rubens should rather have had it displayed with more formality; while the fall of the King's robe over his left arm was simplified.

There were a number of formal alterations in the composition. In the foreground, the position of the sergeant-at-arms's mace was altered so that it lay diagonally across his body to act as a repoussoir; the arsenal was reduced; a second step in the approach to the throne was introduced, and the base beneath the throne was simplified. Adjustments were made to the architecture: two columns replaced the pilaster, the subsidiary arch was moved further to the left, while the column on the extreme left was abandoned. The absence of triglyphs did not yet allow the Order to be identified as Doric.

In order to deepen the illusion of depth toward the top of the composition, Rubens elevated the canopy above the throne, deepened the curve of the entablature, and raised the motif of the escutcheon. This last was subject to several other changes: it was now set at latitudinal rather than longitudinal angle, so as — in Held's words describing the final Canvas — 'accenting, as a powerful repoussoir, the immensity of the space enclosed by the architecture'.

The amoretti — soon to be so increased in size — were now better placed to manoeuvre the escutcheon into its intended place on the 'back' of the canopy or the tester, the fall of the far curtain of which was altered. Rubens replaced the right-hand amoreto with a variant of that sketched in the Hermitage painting (No. 5c; Fig. 98), in a pose, which was similar to that used for amoretti in the Apotheosis (No. 4) and Procession II (No. 11). The fall and shape of the festoons were changed, and the position of the left hand of the other amoreto was adjusted to support the festoon.

2. See Gritsay, op. cit., p. 45.
3. It was available for sale through Antiquariat (no. 3), 28 September 1931, as N. Gritsay interpreted an inscription on the reverse; she had kindly shown this picture and its pendant to the compiler in the reserve of the Hermitage. Burchard was shown a photograph by the Handelsdelegation in Berlin in January 1931 (Burchard Documentation).
4. Gritsay, as in n. 1, p. 50, n. 9.
5. Verbal information kindly provided by Gritsay.
7. See Martin, Ceiling Paintings (CRLB), 1968, pp. 112-116, nos. 17a-17b, and the discussion above, pp. 224 and 234.
9. The pose repeats in reverse that of an angel beneath the Virgin in the modello (The Royal Collection) for the Assumption of the Virgin, which may have been that submitted as an alternative proposal for the High Altar of Antwerp cathedral in 1611; see Held, op. cit., I, no. 375 and II, pl. 366, and in the Assumption of the Virgin in Vienna, K.d.K. ed. Oldenbourg, 1921, p. 206.

The Paintings for the Corner Compartments, Nos. 6-9

The Antecedents

By suggesting (not necessarily correctly) that Giambologna's Samson slaying a Philistine was the source for one of the oval compositions, which occupy the corners of the ceiling, Burchard also indicated by implication the generic source for these paintings. They were described by Held as 'allegorical actions moulded according to the time-honoured pattern of virtues triumphing over vices'. More specifically, they derive from the sixteenth-century revival of triumphal psychomachiae exemplified by Michelangelo's Vittoria, originally intended for the Tomb of Julius II, but placed in the Palazzo Vecchio in Florence in 1564.

Rubens had adapted both medieval and sixteenth-century examples of psychomachiae before he considered the proposals of Project A, see Appendix I.1. Such were the sources for the St Athanasius overcoming Arius, designed to occupy a compartment of one of the ceilings of the Jesuit Church, Antwerp. Rubens's slightly later modelli for sculptures of St Michael subduing Lucifer and St Norbert overcoming Tancrel exhibit a more hieratic restraint associated with
medieval depictions of struggles between the virtues and vices. More relevant, because set in a contemporary 'political' context, is the motif of the female personification struggling to bestride the personification of Envy or Discord, see below under No. 6, who tries to pull down the Duke of Buckingham in Rubens's ceiling painting of Minerva and Mercury conducting the Duke of Buckingham to the Temple of Honour and 'Virtus' (Fig. 19), which was probably ready for despatch to England in September 1627.

Previous interpretations of the subject matter of the paintings in these compartments have ranged from the moral to the political. DaCosta Kaufmann has shown how what was originally a means of illustrating the conflict between, and victory of, a virtue over a vice became adapted to illustrate political conflict. Rubens himself used the formula in a political context to explain Charles I's attitude to the Duke of Savoy and to his ambassador, the Abbé Scaglia, following the Duke's switch of allegiance from Spain to France. An etymological study of the concepts used in Project A, see Appendix I.1, a review of Rubens's adaptations of them, and a perusal of fashionable compendiums of conceits illustrated by quotations from Classical authors - as were produced by, for instance, Ripa or Cartari - show that both moral and, in a very generalised way, political meanings were attached to individual virtues and vices. However, Morford strained the evidence by claiming that the influential, neo-Stoic doctrine of Justus Lipsius determined the choice of virtues in the Banqueting Hall cycle.

Rubens's attitude to such anthologies has not been much discussed. The enlarged third edition of Ripa's Iconologia was published in Rome in 1603, some three years before Rubens with his elder brother engaged in archeological and Classical studies in that city, which would establish them both as leading experts of their generation. Rubens never refers to Ripa, or any of the other popularisers, in his correspondence; and while he may have been aware of the use to which Ripa was put by fellow artists, his attitude to them may have been more dismissive than that of Charles I and his entourage, with whom, it is presumed, he discussed the programme for the Banqueting Hall ceiling.

The influence of this body of emblematic literature in England has been studied. Ben Jonson and then Inigo Jones, who supplanted him as chief iconographer at the British court, are known to have used Ripa's Iconologia. It is moot as to whether Project A, in which the Christian content is less than in Project B, is dependent on a reading of Ripa. Noteworthy, however, is the fact that one key conceit taken from Ripa was to be abandoned, presumably as a result of Rubens's influence. Further, not all the ideas that were developed from Project A for the corner compartments are to be found in Ripa. Indeed, the identities of some of the personifications remain uncertain, and their precise literary sources (if any) have still to be traced, see below.

It is likely that the wide-ranging, moralising interpretations and inferences, found in Ripa, would have been uppermost in the minds of those who discussed the programme for the ceiling with Rubens. As agreement was worked out on the programme under - we may imagine - the artist's guidance, these ramifications of meanings might well have been considered relevant. For this reason, the extended interpretations found in Ripa and, for instance, in Vincenzo Cartari's Le Imagini, are indicated, but not exhaustively, in the entries below.

Held believed that the meaning of each pair of allegorical triumphs was connected with the subject matter of the paintings at the 'lower' and 'upper end' of the ceiling, which they flank. Apart from the elaboration of two of the ideas expressed in Project A, see below, two of the conflicts were also interchanged: Liberality overcoming Avarice, see under No. 9, was made to exchange places with Knowledge overcoming Ignorance, see under No. 7. Donovan has drawn attention to the difference between the two sets of ovals. In those at the southern end, the virtue has triumphed, while the contest continues in the set at the other end. Gordon drew attention to the link between Hercules and Minerva not only in legend but also in their combined association with the qualities necessary
for the statesman as shown in Rubens’s design for the engraved Allegorical Portrait of the Count-Duke of Olivares.\textsuperscript{22} Liberality and Temperance are also linked as contrasting forms of exemplary behaviour; their opposing vices were the two pretended faults that for Shakespeare should debar Malcolm from becoming King of Scotland.\textsuperscript{23}

The alteration and amplification of the specifications of Project A thus introduced a new coherence; they were also probably made to illustrate and advertise significant aspects of the subjects, which were to be depicted in the paintings they flanked, see under No. 1. Thus Apollo’s bestowal of Liberality may bring out the significance of the King’s gesture in the adjacent Canvas (No. 3), which depicted his wise rule; so did Temperance give added meaning to the role of Minerva in the same Canvas. At the ‘lower end’, Minerva overcoming Ignorance and Hercules triumphing over Discord, drew attention to those qualities that enabled the King to foster the union of England and Scotland (No. 5). However, the ideas expressed in these oval compartments are too generalised to allow any more specific associations, and they were probably never intended to do so.


7. See Katzenellenbogen, \textit{Allegories}, 1939, passim.


9. In Joachim von Sandrart’s interpretation, two \textit{putti} personifying Virtue and Love expel personifications of Envy and Hate at the bottom left of Honthorst’s \textit{Apollo and Diana} of 1628 (The Royal Collection, Hampton Court). The subject of this work was a panegyric on the contemporary state of the arts in England and on the Duke of Buckingham’s central role as their promoter; the picture may have been hung in the Banqueting Hall, until it was moved to the ‘little Store Roome in the beare gallorie’, where Van der Doort listed it, perhaps before the redecoration of the room in 1633-35 (for which see pp. 79-80). For the painting and Sandrart’s statement concerning its original location, see \textit{White, Dutch Paintings}, 1982, no. 74, pp. 53-56, pls. 62, 63; J. Judson and R. Ekkart, \textit{Gerrit van Honthorst, Doornspijk}, 1999, pp. 107-108, no. 92, pls. 45, 45a. Judson wondered (ibid., n. 5) whether the Honthorst could not have influenced the \textit{Hercules crushing Discord} (No. 6).

10. See under the entries below.


12. See under the entries below.


19. See p. 38 above.
21. Ibid., p. 182.
23. See under Nos. 8 and 9.

6. Hercules crushing Discord

The Iconography

Project A prescribed that ‘envy stryving with vertue’ should occupy the second oval at the lower, northern end of the ceiling. With its pendant of the triumph of Liberality, it was to accompany a painting showing Peace and the Arts flourishing in the reign of King James I, see Appendix I.1 and p. 34. Possibly as a result of a decision to alter the subject matter of the central paintings at both ends, the conceit was amplified in the Multiple Bozzetto to depict Hercules overwhelming a figure with serpents in its hair (Nos. 1 and 6a; Figs. 52 and 106). There it was sketched in position C, towards the bottom right-hand corner, perhaps indicating the place it was to occupy in the ceiling, adjacent to the Union (No. 5), see p. 149.

The ideas set out in the bozzetto (No. 6a) were to be refined until, in the Canvas, the attributes of Hercules had been elaborated, the identity of his opponent made more specific, and the conflict heightened by directly involving in it one of the emblems of his evil adversary. Associated with this process is an oil sketch in Boston (No. 6b; Fig. 107). The final design was transformed into an independent, but still relevant work of art in the form of a woodcut by Christoffel Jegher (No. 6d; Fig. 104); this is the only print made under Rubens’s supervision that derives from one of the compositions of the cycle.

Hercules is readily recognisable in the bozzetto (No. 6a), chiefly by his muscular body and club, and, in the Canvas (Fig. 103), by the lion’s pelt, which replaced the cloak.1 The hero replaced ‘vertue’ (the feminine Virtus), which is understood as ‘the sum total of all corporal or mental excellencies in man’.2 It was towards the temple of the goddess of Honour and Virtus that Rubens had earlier depicted the Duke of Buckingham being lifted in the ceiling canvas he had recently painted for the royal favourite (Fig. 19).3 Because of the hero, Hercules’s choice of virtue as opposed to vice, his strength came to be regarded as both moral and physical:4 he was thus understood to embody Heroic Virtue,5 the moral constituents of which were wide-ranging.6 Rubens probably proposed the replacement of Virtus by Hercules, because he would make the most appropriate personification of a triumphant, male protagonist.

The concept of Heroic Virtue came to be occasionally entertained and applauded in the English court by the 1630s. For Ben Jonson, the concept was rooted primarily in Homer; in The New Inne, published in 1631, Lord Beaufort is thus praised: ‘He had ... / But great Achilles, Agamemnon’s acts, / Sage Nestors counsels, and / Vlysses slightes, / Tydides fortitude, as Homer wrought them / in his immortal phant’sie, for examples / of the Heroick vertue’.7 In contrast, Inigo Jones considered that it represented the essence of sovereignty: ‘In Heroic Virtue is figured the king’s majesty, who therein transcends as far common men as they are above beasts, he truly being the prototype to all the kingdoms under his monarchy of religion, justice, and all the virtues joined together’.8 This interpretation of course would have given a further justification for the introduction of Hercules.

Thomas Carew considered Heroic Virtue one of the hallmarks of the idealised Caroline court, which admired ‘Such virtues only as admit excess, / Brave bounteous acts, regal magnificence, / All – seeing prudence, magnanimity / That knows no bound, / and that Heroic Virtue / For which antiquity hath left no name, / But patterns only, such as Hercules, Achilles, Theseus’.9 On the Continent of Europe, its contemporary relevance is denoted by Ludwig Camerarius, the councillor of the Elector Palatine, when he wrote of Gustavus II Adolphus (1594-1632), the King of Sweden and Protestant champion: ‘I cannot praise adequately the heroic virtues of that King; piety, prudence, resolution. He has no equal in all Europe’.10
Hercules's appearance in a cycle decorating a royal audience chamber could have been expected, as the hero had long been seen to be a (political) force for the good. He had been an exemplar for the Duke Cosimo I de' Medici, and then for King Henri IV of France. The figure of Hercules dragging Cerberus up from the underworld was interpreted in 1591 as 'the prince [by his resplendent virtue] subdues and expels vices from his nation with just and hal­lowed laws'. Perhaps also noteworthy is Stewart's view that the hero's introduction into the ceiling programme was probably of particular relevance to his British audience because of the tradition that the British monarchy descended from Aeneas, who had been, due to the influence of Virgil, assimilated with Hercules.

Rubens had already used Hercules as a suitable means to describe the personality of a military commander and of a statesman in the framework surrounds of the oval formats of the Portrait of Charles de Longueval, Count of Buc­quoy and of the Portrait of the Count-Duke of Olivares, respectively. In the former, Rubens, inspired by the Farnese Hercules, retained his formula of depicting the hero as calmly triumphant. His portrayal of Hercules as violently dominant seems first to have been employed in the Multiple Bozzetto (No. 1); several years later, Rubens showed Hercules strenuously assisting Minerva in the cause of peace, and in a pose comparable to that adopted in No. 6, in Hercules's killing the dragon Ladon at the top of the Front Face of the Arch of the Mint for the Pompa Introitus Ferdinandi.

The specification in Project A described Virtue's victim as Envy (see Appendix I.1), for which there were well-known precedents, recorded—for instance—by Ripa. The question has now to be addressed as to the identity of Hercules’s victim in the Canvas; she has been called both the personification of Envy and of Discord. Indeed, it is possible that just as Rubens discarded Virtue (the goddess Virtus) for the hero Hercules, the personification of Heroic Virtue, so he abandoned the all-embracing vice of Envy for the more specific evil of Discord.

The four characteristics with which the victim is endowed—serpent-infested hair, a snake as a familiar, femininity and youthfulness (Fig. 105)—are not together specific to either Envy or Discord. There has not been agreement over the identification of evil women endowed with some or one of such characteristics in Rubens's oeuvre. A figure with serpent-infested hair is one of the evil-doers who pulls open the door of the Temple of Janus in the frontispiece that Rubens designed for Book III of the Annales Ducum seu Principum Brabantiae Tottusque Belgii by Franciscus van Haer of 1623. This has been identified as Discord. A similar figure attempts to pull down the Duke of Buckingham in Rubens's allegory showing the Duke being transported to the Temple of Honour and Virtus, which was executed between 1625-1627 (Fig. 19). The present author’s identification of this figure as Envy is to a degree validated by a report of a masque, performed at the Duke's official London residence before Charles I and his consort, on the eve of the Duke's departure for the Isle of Ré as leader of a British force to relieve the Huguenots then besieged by the army of Louis XIII in nearby La Rochelle: 'wherein first comes the Duke, after him Envy... next came Fame'. From this it is clear that for the Duke and his entourage, at this critical moment in his and his country's affairs, Envy was seen as the chief factor working against his success. Envy had earlier been introduced into a political allegory as one of the forces working against peace in the Conclusion of Peace in the Marie de Médicis cycle. In this work, Envy is clearly recognisable—as she eats her heart—more so than in the Buckingham allegory, where her identification has been qualified by Held.

Most similar to Hercules's victim in the Canvas is the figure dragged along by Charity (Caritas) in Rubens’s destroyed Equestrian Portrait of the Duke of Buckingham, painted between 1625-1627 (Fig. 17), whose identification as Envy by Vlieghe, is not clear-cut.

Relevant to the meaning Rubens intended to be attached to Hercules's victim are the artist's identifications of the two females who wrench open the door of the Temple of Janus in the mod-
ello of 1634 for the stage of the Temple of Janus (Fig. 26) in the Pompa Introitus Ferdinandi; of these Discord has serpents in her hair and the other Tisiphone, one of the Furies, holds a snake. The attributes are here combined as Held has pointed out. Virgil described Discord as one of the monsters at the gates of Hell: 'and savage Strife (sic = Discord), her snaky locks entwined with bloody fillets'; while Statius related how Tisiphone spread envy, fear, fury, love of power, bad faith, ambition, and discord — 'not otherwise does furious discord enrage the proud brothers' — between the brothers Eteocles and Polynices, with snakes falling from her hair and holding a funereal flame and a live snake, with which she beats the air. The attributes of the woman in the Canvas do not exactly fit either Virgil's Discordia or Statius's Tisiphone. But given the general character of the Banqueting Hall cycle, a likely presumption is that the meaning intended was Discord, and more precisely Civil Discord, a proposal made the more likely in view of the derivative woodcut by Jegher (No. 6d; Fig. 108), which has the added motif of Hercules being awarded the civic crown (corona civica), for which see under No. 4. Thus while the identification of Hercules's victim in the Canvas as Discord is not certain, it is sufficiently likely as not to merit its qualification.

James I blamed Puritans and Papists as the chief fomentors of civil discord, and, in the later part of his reign, those members of the Lower House who sought to encroach on the royal prerogative. These groups were the objects of royal polemic. The conflicts between Charles I and members of the Lower House critical of his policies in the Parliamentary sessions in the first four years of his reign were common knowledge, and have since been much written about. It is noteworthy that Charles I in his speech on 10 March 1629 justifying to the House of Lords his sudden dissolution of Parliament blamed 'some few Vipers' in the Lower House 'that did cast this mist of undutefulness over most ... [of the members'] eyes'. Rubens's awareness of, and attitude towards, this opposition to the King is shown by his account of one such 'viper', the scholar, lawyer, and politician John Selden, who had been imprisoned for his actions in the House of Commons during the 1629 session of Parliament. Rubens wrote in a letter from London to Pierre Dupuy of 18 August 1629: 'I am very sorry that Selden, to whom we are owe the publication as well as the commentary on these texts [in Selden's Marmora Arundeliana...], London, 1629] has abandoned his studies immiscet se turbis politicis [to become involved in political turmoil]. Politics is a profession so alien to his noble genius and profound learning, that he must, blame Fortune, if in popular unrest provocando regis indignantis iram [provoking the wrath of an indignant monarch], he has been thrown into prison with other Parliamentarians'.

1. See, for instance, Ripa, Iconologia, 1603, pp. 506-507; and Le Imagini de' Dei de gli Antichi...raccolta dal...Cartari, Venice, 1580, pp. 543 and 545.
3. See Martin, Buckingham, 1966, pp. 313-317, fig. 21 (with a different title); Martin, Cat. National Gallery, 1970, p. 147, under no. 187; Held, Sketches, 1980, I, pp. 390-391, no. 291. The work was destroyed in 1949, when in the collection of the Earl of Jersey, having been at Osterley Park, Middlesex.
5. See Ripa, Iconologia, 1603, and Cartari (as in note 1), p. 349. Morford, Stoics, 1991, p. 208, pointed out that Hercules 'was a very common exemplum of Stoic virtue', who exhibited both strength or bravery (fortitudo) and patience or endurance (patientia), the last of which was one of Lipsius's princely virtues.
pfälzische Exilregierung im dreissigjährigen Krieg; Zeitschrift für Geschichte des Oberrheins, CII, 1984, p. 672.


12. For St John Chrysostom, Hercules was the destroyer of tyrants and the protector of governments; see Seward, Medici, 1982, p. 105, and n. 107 on p. 282.


15. C. Vivanti, loc. cit., translating Antonius Ricciardus of Brescia, Commentaria Symbolica, Venice, 1591, p. 33 (volume not cited); his n. 29, p. 30, for the Latin original.


17. Vlieghe, Portraits (CRLB), 1987, no. 82.


19. See the works cited in Held, Sketches, 1980, under nos. 243, 294, and 295, and the red chalk drawing in the British Museum, for which see Held, Drawings, 1986, no. 148. L. Rosenthal, 'Manhood and Statehood: Rubens's Construction of Heroic Virtue', Oxford Art Journal, XXVI, 1, pp. 100-102, argued that these interpretations of Hercules were inspired by Justus Lipsius's De Constantia and Politiorum sive civitatis doctrinae libri sex, which advocated the self-discipline on the part of rulers that is found in Ripa's description of heroic virtue, for which see above.

20. See Held, Sketches, 1980, I, no. 244, and II, pl. 254, and I, under no. 244, for the gouache in the Louvre.


22. See Ripa, Iconologia, 1603, p. 242, quoting from Petrarch, Rime parse: 'Oh envy enemy of virtue' (O invidia nemica di virtute).

23. See under the entries below; the early nineteenth-century key-plan identified the figure as Envy, see pp. 120-122.


25. See n. 3.


27. See K.J.K. ed. Oldenburg, 1921, p. 261; and Held, Sketches, 1980, I, p. 120, under no. 78, White-Crawley, Drawings, 1994 described this figure as Discord.


29. See Vlieghe, Portraits (CRLB), 1987, under no. 81.


34. Donovan, Whitehall, 1995, pp. 177-179, pointed out that women with snake infested hair 'were sometimes shown to represent Discord in emblem books' and referred to Hadrianus Junius, Emblemata, Antwerp, 1565, emblem LIV. The figure with snakes in its hair immediately beneath the warrior in the Kassel and Vienna versions of The Crowning of the Victor has also been identified as Discord: see K. Schütz, in W. G. Marshall (ed.), The Formation of Realms in the Buen Retiro, Turnhout, 1997, p. 114, dated the National Gallery picture 'around the middle of the [third] decade.'
pp. 26-27: 'Take heed... to such Puritanes, verie pestes in the Church and Common-weale, whom no deserts can oblige, neither oaths or promises binde, breathing nothing but sedition and calumnies'. On the Pope's claimed power to depose rulers, see the King's *Triplici nodo, triplex cuneus...*, 1608 (first edn), ibid., pp. 85 ff. For the King's justification for dissolving the 1621 session of Parliament, see *His Maiesties Declaration...*, 1622, ibid., pp. 250 ff., in which, p. 266, he described his opponents as 'these mutinous and discontented spirits, never giving over their wicked purpose, [who] began anew to stirre the coles of discontentment'.


37. See J. Rushworth, *Historical Collections... 1618... 1629*, I, London, 1659, p. 662. Parliament was dissolved after members of the Lower House had forcibly held the Speaker in his chair.

38. Selden (1584-1654) had already been imprisoned for views expressed in the 1621 session of Parliament. He was imprisoned with eight other members of the Lower House in March/April 1629 and was not granted his full freedom until 1635, never having been brought to trial. For his treatment by the King, see B. Berkowitz, *John Selden's Formative Years*, Washington-London-Toronto, 1988, pp. 230-292.


6. Hercules crushing Discord: Ceiling Painting (Pl. 5 bottom and Figs. 103-105)

Oil on canvas adhered to canvas laid down on a laminated wood support, oval; 549 x 239 cm.


**COPIES:** (1) **Painting** (small), whereabouts unknown. **LIT.** *Rooses, Oeuvre*, 1886-92, III, p. 288, under no. 771 (as 'une petite copie insignificante' in the Cologne Museum, no. 619).

(2) **Engraving by Simon Gribelin II** (Fig. 109; see Appendix VI).


Hercules, the personification of Heroic Virtue, crushes the personification of Discord (*Discordia*), who falls, twisting and grimacing, as the snake she holds bites Hercules's calf.
Hercules is dark-haired, bearded and mustachioed; he holds his club and wears the pelt of the Nemean Lion. Discord, whose thigh is covered by a falling dark drapery, holds a snake; two serpents are in her dark hair.

The Canvas as delivered was probably marginally too wide and not quite long enough, see pp. 85-87 and Appendix IX. It is uncertain as to whether it has since been reduced. Perhaps lost, for instance, is part of Discord’s right foot.

The undated report made after cleaning and restoration in 1946/47-50 recorded many small areas of damage, but nothing of more serious consequence. Three Pentimenti are evident in the outline of Discord’s right foot and in the drapery covering her, which was first less extensive (Fig. 105).

The light falls from the top left.

The Canvas was painted under Rubens’s direction, probably after he had laid in the design, and following his verbal instructions and his example, by an assistant, perhaps Jan van den Hoecke, see pp. 75-78. Rubens’s retouching of Hercules may have been quite extensive and he may have executed the lion’s pelt. Whether Rubens was responsible for the alteration in the outline of Discord’s right foot is impossible to say: the result seems clumsy as does Hercules’s right foot; both may possibly be the work of a later restorer. The print by Jegher and the ? copy after Rubens (Nos. 6d and 6b; Figs. 107 and 108) seem to show more of Discord’s back; this suggests that the alteration in the drapery is by another hand, perhaps working during installation or during Walton’s cleaning campaign, see pp. 110-112, as its present appearance accords with that in Gribelin’s engraving where the drapery has been endowed with more folds (Fig. 109 and Appendix VI).

Burchard pointed out that the pose of Hercules is partially inspired by that of Cain in Titian’s Cain Slaying Abel in the ceiling of the sacristy of S. Maria della Salute, Venice (since 1656, but previously in S. Spirito in Isola, Venice). The artist particularly follows the placement of Cain’s legs; in the Titian, the upper part of Cain’s body is seen more in silhouette and the club is held lower. Rubens had earlier used the Titian as a source for David in the David and Goliath designed for one of the ceiling compartments of the Jesuit Church. He was to return to it when depicting Hercules at the top of the Arch of the Mint in the Pompa Introitus Ferdinandi.

The pose of Discord as first devised in the bozzetto (No. 6a; Fig. 106) was reminiscent (but for one arm) of the figure (in reverse) at the base of Minerva and Mercury conducting the Duke of Buckingham to the Temple of Honour and ‘Virtus’ (Fig. 19). Burchard suggested that the source of the pose was the Philistine in Giambologna’s Samson slaying a Philistine in the Victoria and Albert Museum. Closer – so far as the upper part of the body is concerned, though the arms are reversed – is the pose of Avarice in Adriaen de Vries’s Empire triumphant over Avarice in the National Gallery of Art, Washington.

The pose in the Canvas is similar to that devised by Rubens for the devil in the Devil cast out by St Gregory of Nazianzus destined for one of the ceiling compartments of the Jesuit Church, of which a variant occurs (in the same direction) in Paul Pontius’s print of 1631 after a lost Crucifixion by Rubens.

As the compositions of the paintings for the corner compartments followed a two-figure formula with which Rubens was quite familiar, the character of his preparatory work for No. 6 is relatively uncomplicated. The design was first sketched in oil wash in an oval format in the Multiple Bozzetto (No. 6a), and although there may have been a different early idea for the pose of Discord, it must be moot whether the artist would have found it necessary to make any earlier drafts. At all events, none is recorded. The modello is generally assumed to be the painting in Boston (No. 6b); however, its authenticity is here doubted. But as Rubens’s working procedure for the other corner paintings involved the execution of a modello – chiefly figurative – it is likely that one was executed in rectangular format, preparatory to the execution of the Canvas. This must be assumed to be lost, as is the Overall Modello (No. 2), sent to London for Charles I’s approval. It is possible that the former modello was the prototype for the Boston sketch. If this was the case, the amoretto with a
crown of oak leaves could have been a discrete, figural *modello* intended for the *Wise Rule* (No. 3), but then abandoned, see p. 166 and below.

Rubens’s chief formal preoccupation when executing the Canvas may well have been the degree of foreshortening and the compression of the composition so as to fit the oval. Perhaps prompted by requests from London following the royal examination of the lost *Overall Modello* (No. 2), Rubens also adjusted both Hercules’s and his opponent’s attributes, altering the latter’s pose so as to make her recognisably young and female.

In the Canvas, Rubens abandoned a sloping foreshortening by increasing the degree by which Hercules bends over his victim and by having his foot placed directly on the side of Discord’s face so that the sole of his foot is no longer visible. The composition was compressed by making the thrust of Hercules’s club more vertical and by lowering the right leg of Discord. In order to clarify the attributes of Discord, her body is twisted so that her breast is visible, and her face tilted downwards; both the breast and face are those of a young woman (Fig. 105). To heighten the fierceness of the contest, Discord’s right arm is bent so that the snake she holds can bite Hercules’s left calf. Two adjustments have been made to attributes: Hercules’s cloak has been replaced by the lion’s pelt, and in place of the myriad of serpents in Discord’s hair in the *bozzetto* (No. 6a; Fig. 106), only two remain, one uncoiling and falling, the other uncoiling and poised sideways in the air.

1. Imperial measurements published by the Ministry of Works in 1950: 18 ft. x 7 ft. 10 in. [548.6 x 238.8 cm.]. Those published in 1907 were: 19 ft. 2 in. x 7 ft. 10 in. [584.2 x 238.8 cm.]; see p. 123, n. 101 and p. 126.
2. According to Rainer Budde, of the Wallraf-Richartz Museum, no such work is recorded as having been in the collection (verbal information kindly provided in 1995).
3. See the MS. condition report by W. Hampton at present in the English Heritage Studio Archive, Regents Park, London (typescript at Historic Royal Palaces, Hampton Court Palace, Surrey). As with the other canvases, nail holes were revealed round the edges, where the support had been nailed to the front of the stretcher, see further p. 123, under n. 101.
5. *Martin, Ceiling Paintings (CRLB)*, 1968, p. 71, no. 5 (where the position of David’s legs is reversed from the Titian).
7. See n. 3, p. 247.

6a. **Hercules crushing Discord:**

*Bozzetto* (Fig. 106)

Oil on ? oak support, see under No. 1.

Located beside the left edge towards the top of the *Multiple Bozzetto* (No. 1; Fig. 46), in position C (Fig. 52).

For Provenance, Exhibitions, Literature and Commentary, see under No. 1.

Hercules, the personification of Heroic Virtue, wears a cloak that billows behind his back and between his legs; he bears down on the personification of Discord (*Discordia*) with his uplifted club held aslant, his left foot on her neck and kneels with his right on her thigh. Discord falls backwards; her partially draped left arm is bent to cushion her fall while her right reaches up to ward off the club. She holds a snake; serpents are entwined in her hair. Her thighs are probably open as the right leg extends upwards and sideways.

Reduction of the edge of the support, see under No. 1, truncated Hercules’s right elbow,
the top of his club, Discord’s right hand, and the left-hand side of the encompassing oval. The top outline of Hercules’s left arm is rubbed as is the area of white impasto above him. Retouched losses are in Hercules’s left hand, forehead, and to the right of his left arm; there are three retouched losses in the body of Discord and an area of loss beneath the oval; much of the paint there is unreliable.

Rubens may first have thought of showing Discord falling head first (as in, for instance, Giorgio Vasari’s painting in his house in Arezzo); this is suggested by two bulbous forms in the area of her shoulder blades that may have been her breasts, and left unexpunged when the pose was abandoned. The design was first sketched in thin, brown oil wash; it was then cursorily encompassed by an oval drawn in chalk. The oval cut through Hercules’s left calf, his billowing cloak, and Discord’s right calf. The design was then heightened *en grisaille*, some of which also extended beyond the confines of the oval: for instance, Hercules’s fingers and left heel.

The light comes from the top right.

For a discussion of the scene enacted, the protagonists, the composition, and its constituent parts, see No. 6, *Introduction* and under catalogue No. 6.

A sloping foreshortening has been adopted here, which is indicated by the depiction of the sole of Hercules’s foot. At this stage, Rubens no longer considered it necessary to make explicit the sex of Hercules’s victim, whom he probably always intended to be female.


### 6b. Hercules crushing Discord: *Modello* (Fig. 107)

Oil on inset cradled ? oak support; 62.3/4 x 47 cm.

*Boston, Museum of Fine Arts. Inv. no. 47.1543.*

The authenticity of the present work was accepted by Burchard but is doubted by the present author.

**PROVENANCE:** Fontaine-Flamant of Lille, sale, 1 Paris (Georges Petit), 10 June 1904, lot 67 (as attributed to Rubens), bt. by Sedelmeyer for 1000 fr.; the dealer Charles Sedelmeyer, sale, Paris, 3–5 June (1st day) 1907, lot 42; Marczell de Nemés, sale, Paris (Dubourg), 19 March 1919, lot 19 (as studio of Rubens), bt. by Monod for 1800 fr.; the dealer Rothman, London, 1946, from whom acquired by the dealer Thomas Agnew & Sons; sold by Messrs. Agnew’s in 1947 to the Museum of Fine Arts, Boston.

### ? COPY:

**Painting.** whereabouts unknown; canvas, c. 67.7 x 51.4 cm. PROV. Chanoine Wouters, Canon of the Collegiate Church of St Gomer, Lierre, sale (?), Brussels (Jardin de St Georges), 1 April 1794, lot 38 (as ‘Hercules overcoming the Hydra crowned by a putto after Rubens, 25 x 19 pouces’ [67.7 x 51.4 cm.]).


Hercules, the personification of Heroic Virtue, crushes the personification of Discord (Discordia); above is an amoretto with a crown of oak leaves.

Hercules, dark haired, bearded and mustachioed, holds a club and wears a cloak or pelt over his right shoulder; Discord holds a snake and serpents are in her hair.

Much worn are Hercules’s hair, club, and cloak or pelt, the amoretto’s hair and wing, and the base on which the action takes place; perhaps unnecessarily strengthened over the priming or imprimatura are the areas in shadow notably Discord’s back, Hercules’s thighs, neck, and armpit.

There is a pentimento in the outline of Hercules’s right calf and perhaps in the amoretto’s wing.

Executed with reserves. The sky is painted up to the edges of the design – as with the other modelli for the cycle where it is introduced – and thus after the execution of the figures.

Cleaned by Isepp c. 1946 in London,6 and at the Museum in 1987.7

The present work has been generally accepted as the modello for the Canvas (No. 6; Fig. 103),8 and in deference to Ludwig Burchard’s views, it is here given its appropriate place in the sequence of Rubens’s preparatory work. It has also been discussed in relation to Jegher’s woodcut (No. 6d; Fig. 108).9 In several respects it differs from both. Held in 1980 commented on ‘the less than satisfactory appearance of the work’,10 which the 1987 cleaning and restoration have not improved. He considered that the outlines of the figures had been crudely and pedantically reinforced, and that Hercules’s left foot was ‘rather clumsily’ related to the leg.11 Among other weaknesses is the rendering of Discord’s face and of Hercules’s right hand gripping the club. The authenticity of the work was not fully accepted in the 1904 and 1919 sale catalogues in which it appeared (see above). Although doubts may not be unanimously harboured, Rubens’s authorship of the sketch is here once again questioned. If such doubts are justified, it would mean that, as Rubens prepared for all the other corner Canvases with a figural modello, such a modello for this Canvas should be deemed to be lost.

For a discussion of the scene enacted, the protagonists, and the composition and its constituent parts, see No. 6, Iconography and under catalogue No. 6.

The formal relation of the present work to Rubens’s development of the composition is not immediately apparent as it omits both Discord’s left thigh and the motif of the snake biting Hercules’s calf, both defining features of the Canvas and repeated in the Jegher’s woodcut. The artist probably never intended to include an amoretto crowning Hercules in the Canvas, because the oval format would not have allowed sufficient space. As the amoretto appears in the sketch (No. 6b), it might suggest that it was made in preparation to the print; but so far as is known, Rubens’s practice when collaborating with Jegher was to provide prototypes in pen and ink on paper.12

However, the possibility should be considered that the two main figures in the Boston painting could be a copy of a lost figural modello, and that the amoretto is a copy of what was originally executed as a discrete, figural modello and fortuitously placed on the same support – made in preparation for the right-hand bearer of the triumphal crown in the Wise Rule (first essayed in the Vienna modello and of which a variant had also been considered for the Union: see under Nos. 3b and 5d-e; Figs. 60, 99 and
CATALOGUE NOS. 6b and c

101). It was to be subsequently abandoned but for its subtle adaptation for Jegher’s woodcut. If this was the case, the prototype would be the only example of a support for a figural *modello*, chiefly made in preparation for one of the corner ovals, being used for a secondary purpose. It could be supposed that the prototype did not include the leafy crown, whose introduction in the present work could have been inspired by that devised for Jegher’s print (see Nos. 6c and 6d). The lack of engagement of the *amoretto* in his supposed task in the present sketch would seem to support this contention. The proposal remains speculative, thus the sketch of the *amoretto* (as a separate entity) has not been formally inserted in the sequence of preparatory work for the Wise Rule (No. 3), see also p. 166.

The clumsiness of handling evident in the Boston picture may be an indicator of the presumed copyist’s relatively poor accuracy. But if the record is faithful, it would show that, following the execution of the bozzetto (No. 6a), Rubens’s chief preoccupation had been with the pose of Discord and with the reduction of the foreshortening of Hercules, the fall of whose cloak was altered so as to expose his thighs. It would also show that Rubens developed the motif of the biting snake (having already reduced to two the nest of serpents in Discord’s hair) and decided on the inclusion of Discord’s left thigh while at work of the Canvas itself; the first motif may have been a suggestion that emanated from London, following examination of the Overall Modello (No. 2). Then, too, he could have added the lion’s head to the pelt. What the present sketch exhibits, like the *modelli* for the other corner compartments, is a tendency to broaden the composition.

The identity of the presumed copyist responsible for the present work remains unknown. Its undistinguished handling would seem to rule out an attribution to Jan van den Hoecke, who, it is suggested, was Rubens’s most frequent assistant in the execution of the Canvases; the handling differs too from that in the *Mercury and Argus* sketch, also in Boston, which may have been his work, see under No. 3g, and Fig. 63.

---

6c. Hercules crushing Discord: Drawing

Pen and ink on ? paper; measurements unknown.

*Whereabouts unknown.*

**PROVENANCE:** William II, King of the Netherlands, sale, 12 ft. August 1850, lot 296 (as ‘Hercule tuant l’Hydre. Belle esquisse à l’encre de Chine’).


1. According to the introduction of the sale catalogue, Fontaine-Flament, whose collection had been on view in Lille early in 1904, had been collecting for forty years.

2. See the marked sale catalogue in the R.K.D.

3. No buyer’s name is given in the marked catalogue in the R.K.D. Burchard Documentation gives the buyer’s name.

4. Information kindly provided, orally, by Christopher Kingzett of Agnew’s, autumn 1995.

5. Burchard suggested that the compiler of the catalogue may have made a mistake in describing Discord (?) as the Hydra against whom Hercules was so often depicted in combat, though such a confusion may seem unlikely. See also under No. 6c, below.


7. See the Museum dossier, kindly made available by Jim Wright, head of the Conservation Department in the Museum of Fine Arts. Rhona MacBeth, Alain Goldrach, and Peter Sutton are here also thanked for their help.

8. See under *Literature* cited above, and Burchard Documentation.


11. This among other criticisms; see *Held, Sketches*, 1980, loc. cit.

12. See under No. 6c.
modello for the woodcut by Jegher (No. 6d). If it is correctly associated with this composition, the subject was mistakenly given in the sale catalogue. This may on the face of it seem improbable for the appearance of the Hydra would have been well known to the cataloguer, although Burchard pointed to another perhaps similar confusion having earlier occurred concerning what could be a related painting (see under No. 6b). Rubens's practice, when working with Jegher, was to execute a prototype in pen and ink on paper of the same size as the intended woodcut. Held has suggested that Rubens would have provided such a modello for the print. He also perhaps retouched proofs.

1. For a brief discussion of drawings by Rubens owned by William II, King of the Netherlands, see E. Hinterding and F. Horsch, 'A Note of William II's Collection of Drawings', Simiolus, XIX, 1989, p. 54.

2. Burchard Documentation.


4. One such is in the Louvre, Département des Arts Graphiques, according to Bodart, Incisione, 1977, no. 155.

6d. Hercules crushing Discord: Print by Christoffel Jegher (Fig. 108)

Woodcut; 603 x 358 mm. Signed and inscribed: Cl. / Christoffel Jegher sc. / P.P. Rub. delin. & exc / CVM PRIVILEGIIS.

COPIES: (1) Drawing, whereabouts unknown, pen and brush in brown ink with white high-lighting, measurements unknown. PROV: Graphische Sammlung, Staatsgalerie Stuttgart (missing since 1945).

(2) Drawing, whereabouts unknown, red and black chalk, 51.3 x 36.8 cm. PROV: Anon. sale, London (Christie's), 26 June 1974, lot 562.


Hercules, the personification of Heroic Virtue, is about to be invested with a crown of oak leaves (corona civica) as he triumphs over the personification of Discord (Discordia).

Jegher (1596-1652/53) became a master in the Antwerp guild of St Luke in 1627/28; he had entered Rubens's studio as an engraver in wood by July 1633.

The print follows in reverse the design for the Canvas but for the inclusion of an amoretto about to invest Hercules with a crown of oak leaves. There are other differences, most notably more is visible of Discord's left (in the print) leg, the lion's pelt is shown billowing behind Hercules, and the coiled serpents are twisting to attack. The club is held slightly less aslant. The base on which the action takes place and the sky also differ.

The differences result from Rubens's final consideration of the design. It has been suggested that the print was made while the artist was working on the cycle. Held discussed the print in relation to the Boston painting (No. 6b), as have others. He observed that if the composition of this work was 'tilted' some 45 degrees and the amoretto some 90 degrees, Jegher could be said to have followed it 'rather faithfully'. But this would have been a strange way to go about making a print.

However, the connection between the design...
of the print and that of the Boston painting (No. 6b; Fig. 107) is undeniable and clear, and thus calls for some explanation. If the latter is a copy of the figural *modello* for the Canvas (No. 6), on which was also included an unused figural *modello* for a crown bearing *amoretto* in the *Wise Rule* (No. 3b) playfully placed close to the main protagonist, see under 6b, then it can be surmised that Rubens adopted the pose of the *amoretto* so that the award of the oak leaf crown in the print was the more convincingly conveyed.

The inclusion of the *amoretto* about to crown Hercules makes this into an independent composition, in which Hercules’s triumph is about to be recognised and is thus foretold. Thematically closely related is a drawing in the British Museum, which shows a triumphant Hercules, his victim clutching a snake – thus to be identified as Discord – lying beneath his club, about to be invested with a *laurel crown* by two *amoretti*; it has been dated by Held c. 1621.6

The crown of oak leaves was the classical *corona civica*, for which see p. 188.

1. For the measurements, see Rowlands, *Rubens Drawings*, 1977, no. 181.
4. M. Meyers, ‘Rubens and the Woodcuts of Cristofel Jegher’, *The Metropolitan Museum of Art Bulletin*, Summer 1966, pp. 22-23. Fig. 27, dated the print to while Rubens was executing the commission, that is, according to her, 1633-34, with which Bodart, *Incisione*, 1977, no. 155, agreed.

## 7. Minerva overcoming Ignorance

### The Iconography

Project A prescribed that ‘knowledge, vnder whose feete lyeth ignorance’ should occupy the first oval compartment at the upper, southern end of the ceiling. With its pendant of Modesty triumphant over Impudence it was to accompany the painting celebrating James I’s learning, see Appendix 1.1. The first conceit was exchanged with the triumph of Liberality, possibly as a result of the alteration of the subject matter of the rectangular paintings at either end; in the *Multiple Bozzetto* (Nos. 1 and 7a; Figs. 46 and 114), an amplified rendering was sketched in position C (Fig. 52), towards the left-hand corner, perhaps indicating the place it was to occupy in the ceiling, adjacent to the *Union* (No. 5), see p. 149.

The original conceit, which illustrated an aphorism as ‘knowledge has no enemy but ignorance’,1 may have been changed so as to make the painting a more appropriate pendant to the *Union* by substituting Minerva, the goddess of Wisdom, for a personification of Knowledge. Minerva also provided an obvious allusion to James I, who was famed for his wisdom, see p. 154. Rubens had earlier considered such a quality as meriting emphasis in his allegorical *Portrait of the Count-Duke of Olivares*,2 where Minerva’s attributes were prominently displayed; given equal prominence on the other side of the oval, containing the bust length portrayal of Olivares, were the attributes of Hercules, whose triumph over Discord is the present composition’s pendant (No. 6; Fig. 103).

Minerva’s victim is not so easily identifiable. Evidently female, her distinctive attributes are otherwise slight, particularly as her head, not clearly legible in the *bozzetto* (No. 7a; Fig. 114) – but more so in the *modello* (No. 7b; Fig. 115) – was mutilated in the Canvas when it may have been reduced, see below and Fig. 113. As a result she has been variously named.3 However, in the *modello*, she can be detected as possessing a grotesque face with an ass’s ear – an equine ear can be made out in the *bozzetto* (Figs. 115
and 114) — which suggests that while her conqueror, as specified in Project A, had been amplified, she may have remained unchanged as Ignorance. Ripa provided a readily accessible locus for Minerva’s power over Ignorance, which was considered more of a failing than a vice.\(^4\)

The traditional way of depicting Ignorance as a man with an ass’s head still found in early seventeenth-century allegories, showing destructive mobs of such figures threatening rooms exhibiting collections of art by Frans Francken II,\(^6\) has, it would seem, been modified, as Ignorantia is feminine. Indeed, Ignorance appears as a woman in depictions of the Calumny of Apelles, but was not usually endowed with striking characteristics. Exceptionally, Lorenzo Leonbruno depicted her as a fat, naked, and ugly crowned woman.\(^7\) Lucian had specified in his description of Apelles’s picture that the credulous judge or ruler had ass’s ears like those awarded to King Midas by Apollo.\(^8\) Because in the present composition, a woman struggles energetically against Minerva, the personification could either be of the singular shortcoming of Ignorance or of the several failings found in the credulous judge or ruler, who believes Calumny, and — as in Zuccaro’s treatment — is restrained by Minerva as he succumbs to Fury (Furor).\(^9\)

The face of Minerva’s victim — which would provide the only clue to her identification — is likely to have been displayed in the Canvas as in the modello, see below, in such a way as to enable the prominent display of an ass’s ear and ugly features. The latter indeed points to her identification as Ignorance by reference not only to Leonbruno’s personification, but also to Ripa’s prescription for Ignoranza.\(^10\) Perhaps of relevance, too, is the figure with an ass’s head which Ripa devised to personify a person ignorant of all things (‘ignorante di tutte cose’).\(^11\) As much of the face in the Canvas has been lost, a small degree of qualification should be admitted in the identification.

Cartari, quoting Ovid, described the manner in which Minerva was depicted by Classical authors: Make her with the spear and with the shield, and arm her head with a helmet and her bosom with a breastplate.\(^12\) In the bozzetto, because of the sloping perspective, the breastplates are not evident. But the owl, specific to Minerva, was included.\(^13\) In the Canvas (Fig. 112), further attributes were added: the owl held an olive wreath\(^14\) and an olive clasp decorated her helmet — the olive tree being also specific to Minerva — while a miniature Medusa head decorates a brooch that holds the breastplates together. Perseus after slaying Medusa gave the head to Minerva, who placed it on her shield.\(^15\) As the shield held by Minerva was seen from the back, the head could not be shown, hence perhaps the transformation of the Medusa-head as a decoration of the brooch.

Gordon believed that Minerva here personified not so much Wisdom as Prudence, ‘a practical sagacity’.\(^16\) Morford also believed that Minerva was here intended as ‘an allegory [sic] of prudence (prudentia)’, which was ‘the fundamental attribute of a Stoic prince’.\(^17\) But this attribute should be seen as being represented in addition to, rather than to the exclusion of, Wisdom, to which James I laid particular claim. It is thus this wide-embracing virtue that the goddess probably here personifies, rather than any particular aspect of it.

3. From personifying Lust to Sedition, see under the entries below: Held, Sketches, 1980, I, p. 214, under no. 142, disposed of Palme’s view that the contour of the defeated antagonist’s body ‘sketches the map of Great Britain’; see Palme, Triumph, 1956, pp. 238-239.
4. Ripa, Iconologia, 1603, p. 443, referring to Minerva’s shield, which showed that: the wise man should cut away all bad habits from himself, and demonstrate by showing to the ignorant how they [can] flee from such habits and reform themselves (‘il sapiente deue troncare tutti gli habiti cattiui da se stesso, & dimostrare, insegnando a gli’ignoranti, accioche il fuggano, & che si emendino’).
5. In psychomachiae, Sapientia and Prudentia, of which Minerva was also the goddess (see, for instance, Cartari, Imagini, 1571, pp. 358-60), were the enemies of the vice Stultitia, see Katzenellenbo-
7. Minerva overcoming Ignorance: Ceiling Painting (Pls. 5 top, 11 detail, and Figs. 111-113)

Oil on canvas adhered to canvas laid down on a laminated wood support, oval; 549 x 239 cm.


COPY: Engraving by Simon Gribelin II (Fig. 110; see Appendix VI).


Minerva, the goddess of Wisdom, with her owl carrying an olive wreath in its talons above her, bears down on the personification of Ignorance (Ignorantia) with her lance at her victim’s throat.

Minerva wears a grey-crested helmet, decorated with an olive clasp, breastplates held together by a Medusa-headed brooch, a pink cloak, yellow gown, and dark grey skirt. Igno-
rance is partially covered by red drapery, which falls beneath her.

The Canvas as delivered was probably a bit too wide and not quite long enough (see pp. 85-87 and Appendix IX). It is uncertain as to whether it has since been reduced. Lost may have been part of the owl’s wing, Ignorance’s left foot and much of her face, the edges of Minerva’s mantle and gown, and the drapery to the left of Ignorance.2

The report made after cleaning and restoration in 1946/47-50 described the condition as ‘remarkably good’.3

The light falls from the top right.

The Canvas was painted under Rubens’s direction, probably after he had laid in the design, and following his verbal instructions and his example, by an assistant, perhaps Jan van den Hoecke, see pp. 75-78. Rubens may well have retouched his assistant’s work where he saw fit.

The general configuration of the design probably ultimately derives from the familiar Byzantine formula for the rendering of the triumphant St Michael,4 which was subsequently adapted to depict medieval Virtues triumphant.5 Rubens had previously depended on this tradition in the design for the St Athanasius overcoming Aries, destined for a compartment of one of the ceilings of the Jesuit Church, Antwerp.6 There, as in medieval examples, the crozier is held in the right hand raised above the right shoulder and is made to strike diagonally; for the pose adopted here, the artist may have been inspired too by that of Victoria – part of the Tomb of Mario Navi by Ammanati.7 The placing of Ignorance’s arms may have been partly inspired by Raphael’s design of St Michael known from an anonymous engraving:8 there Satan reaches up with his right arm while his left hand is at his neck trying to remove the Saint’s foot.

As with the other paintings for the corner compartments, see under No. 6, the character of Rubens’s preparatory work for No. 7 is relatively uncomplicated. The design was first sketched in oil wash for an oval form at in the Multiple Bozzetto (No. 7a; Fig. 114); there the bottom left-hand area covers some incomprehensible pentimenti, but these probably are the result of an earlier unconnected use of the support (see under No. 1), and are not to be interpreted as alterations to the pose of Ignorance. It must remain moot as to whether Rubens felt it necessary to make earlier drafts of the design, of which none is recorded. In the chiefly figural modello of rectangular format (No. 7b; Fig. 115), Rubens adjusted the foreshortening and widened the composition in order perhaps better to determine the configuration of the two poses, and both were altered as a result.

Perhaps to satisfy requests from London, following examination there of the design in the lost Overall Modello (No. 2), Minerva was to be endowed with more attributes than in the modello where the owl no longer appears, see under No. 7b. In the Canvas, it was endowed with an olive wreath, which it holds in its talons. New too was the olive wreath on Minerva’s helmet and the brooch decorated with the Medusa head.

In the Canvas (Fig. 111), the artist had to return to a more compact formulation of the design to fit the oval format chiefly by referring selectively to both the bozzetto and modello and otherwise by modifying ideas set out in the modello, which also formed the basis for the costume and draperies. For Minerva, the foreshortening of the modello was retained; but for the placement of her head, arms, aegis, and lance Rubens referred to the bozzetto. The pose of Ignorance was made more compact by raising and straightening the right leg and setting the left arm in sharper foreshortening; for the right arm, the bozzetto’s proposal was re-adopted, as was the idea that Minerva should bear down directly on Ignorance’s flesh. The drapery covering Ignorance was now extended so as to fill the cusp of the oval.

1. Imperial measurements published by the Ministry of Works in 1950: 18 ft. x 7 ft. 10 in. [548.6 x 238.8 cm.]. Those published in 1907 were: 19 ft. 2 in. x 7 ft. 10 in. [584.2 x 238.8 cm.]; see p. 123, n. 101, and p. 126.
2. This led Burchard, Cat. Wildenstein, 1950, under no. 24, to state that it was unlikely that the ‘canvas was painted by Rubens in the way it now appears’, a supposition that Held, Sketches, 1980,
I, under no. 142, was unable to understand. See also M. Jaffe, ‘Painting and History I’, History Today, Jan. 1951, p. 71. See pp. 86-89, above.

3. See the MS. condition report by W. Hampton at present in the English Heritage Studio Archive, Regents Park, London (typescript at Historic Royal Palaces, Hampton Court Palace, Surrey). As with the other canvases, nail holes were revealed round the edges, where the support had been nailed to the front of the stretcher, see further p. 123, under n. 101.

4. As was kindly suggested by Ruth Rubinstein of the Warburg Institute.

5. See Katzenellenbogen, Allegories, 1939, figs. 19, 21, and particularly 22, a reproduction of a French illuminated initial of the late twelfth century, in which the pose is particularly close to that of Minerva.


7. See P. Kinney, The Early Sculpture of Bartolomeo Ammanati, New York–London, 1976, figs. 106 ff. As Kinney, pp. 69-71, recounted, Vittoria was moved from SS. Annunziata, Florence, to the adjacent cloister, after the tomb, which ‘had enjoyed considerable repute’, was dismantled.

8. By AV, see Illustrated Bartsch, XXVI (formerly XIV, part 1), p. 139, no. (94).

7a. Minerva overcoming Ignorance: Bozzetto (Fig. 114)

Oil on ? oak support, see under No. 1.

Located beside the right edge towards the top of the support of the Multiple Bozzetto (No. 1; Fig. 46), in position C (Fig. 52).

For Provenance, Exhibitions, Literature and Commentary, see under No. 1.

Minerva, the goddess of Wisdom, bears down on the twisting body of the personification of Ignorance (Ignorantia); her triumph is being won by the thrust of her lance and the force of her foot pressing on the rump of her victim, who kicks upwards and grasps the goddess’s gown and with her other hand pulls at the lance, as she defiantly turns to face the goddess.

Reduction of the edge of the support (see under No. 1) to a small degree truncated the aegis, the head of the antagonist, and of much of the right side of the encompassing oval.

The design was first sketched in thin, brown oil wash; it was then cursorily encompassed by an oval drawn in black chalk. The owl and Ignorance’s drapery extended beyond its confines. The design was then heightened en grisaille, some of which also extended beyond the oval’s confines, notably Minerva’s right arm, part of her gown, and Ignorance’s left calf and arm.

The drapery between Ignorance’s legs is adjacent to, and overlaps, a passage in the central oval of the Multiple Bozzetto (No. 1; Fig. 46), which was an area subject to much — now incomprehensible — alteration by Rubens, see under No. 1.

The light falls from above.

For a discussion of the scene enacted, the protagonists, and the composition and its constituent parts, see No. 7, Iconography and under catalogue No. 7.

Rubens has adopted a sloping foreshortening, accentuated by Ignorance’s right leg.

7b. Minerva overcoming Ignorance: Modello (Fig. 115)

Oil on wood support transferred to canvas, marouflaged onto a composite support of oak and cork, the edges concealed by masking tape; 62.8 x 48.7 cm.

Antwerp, Koninklijk Museum voor Schone Kunsten. Inv. no. 802.

PROVENANCE: Dealer Christianus Johannes Nieuwenhuys, sale (+). Brussels (Galerie Saint-Luc), 4 May 1883, lot 26, bt. by H. Le Roy for 7000 fr.;2 De Potemkin, Brussels, 1893;3 the dealer Lampe, Brussels, 1895;4 Valentin-Roussel of Roubaix, sale, Brussels (Le Roy), 14 June 1899, lot 26, bt. by Delahaye for the Koninklijk Museum van Antwerpen (now the Koninklijk Museum voor Schone Kunsten, Antwerp).5

COPIES: (1) Painting, whereabouts unknown; canvas, measurements unknown. PROV. With the dealer M. Brandt, New York, c. 1955. LIT.
Held, Sketches, 1980, I, p. 214, under no. 142, where he noted that the composition fitted into a longitudinal oval.

(2) Painting, whereabouts unknown, including the owl and more drapery beneath Ignorance; canvas, laid down on panel, 45.7 x 30.5 cm. PROV. Crew collection; with the dealer D.M. Koetsier, London, 1959 (photograph in the Witt Library, London).


Minerva, the goddess of Wisdom, bears down on the personification of Ignorance (Ignorantia) and thrusts her lance at her victim’s throat.

Minerva wears a light pink wrap, yellow mantle drawn in above the waist over a grey gown, a helmet decorated with a white plumed crest; the lower part of Ignorance is partially covered with red drapery.

There is evidence of a join in the original wood support c. 21.8 cm. from the left-hand edge.

Many areas of paint seem unreliable; the sketch may have been made to appear more finished than it was originally left. Much of the sky is probably later and then retouched; the only untouched area of background seems to be that immediately beneath Minerva’s right arm. Infilled is the yellow mantle behind Ignorance’s right foot, the inner side of the aegis and the drapery over Ignorance’s thigh. Retouched to varying degrees is the dark paint above Ignorance’s right breast, her hair, and the red drapery beneath, Minerva’s grey gown in shadow over her right leg, and perhaps her face, neck, and left hand.

The light falls from the top right.

In spite of the present, less than satisfactory appearance of the sketch, there is no reason to doubt its authenticity, as did Dillon and the 1927 Antwerp exhibition catalogue, see above. It has indeed been accepted by all later authorities. As the owl appears in Copy (2), it is probable that it has been overpainted. The present work, presum ably executed as chiefly a figural modello, so that Rubens could elaborate his ideas in rehearsal for the transfer of the design onto the Canvas, as an aide-mémoire during that process, and as a guide for an assistant during the execution of the Canvas. Rubens made no allowance for the lower cusp of the oval, which he was to fill with drapery falling from between Ignorance’s legs.

For a discussion of the scene enacted, the protagonists, and the composition and its constituent parts, see No. 7, Introduction and under catalogue No. 7.
Minerva has the same attributes as in the bozzetto (No. 7a; Fig. 114), but for the absence of the owl (see above) and the inclusion of the breastplates. Ignorance now has the suggestion of a hideous face together with the long, equine-like ear. This was probably originally more recognisably an ass's ear.8

In the present work of a rectangular format, Rubens readjusted the fall of light, altered the foreshortening and widened the composition. Minerva was depicted leaning further forward, while Ignorance was shown falling less steeply with her right leg lowered and her body no longer in such violent contrapposto. These alterations required further changes: Minerva's foot was moved to Ignorance's thigh, her lance slanted away from her, which involved an adjustment to both her arms. Ignorance's right arm was set at an angle, while the new position of her face made the features more evident.9

For the new pose of Ignorance, Rubens probably developed his formulation for the most prominent of the rebel angels in The Fall of the Rebel Angels – designed for a compartment in one of the ceilings of the Jesuit Church, Antwerp10 – although the position of the arms is quite different.

1. It was already noted as having been transferred from panel to canvas in 1883. See the MS. note in the Nieuwenhuys sale catalogue of that year; see under Provenance.
2. For the price, see the marked catalogue in the R.K.D. The buyer is given by Rooses, Oeuvre, 1886-92, III, p. 287, no. 770-2.
4. See Burchard, Cat. Wildenstein, 1950, under no. 24;

5. Ibid.
6. See also Held, Sketches, 1980, I, p. 213, under no. 142.
7. Held, Sketches, 1980, loc. cit., gave a shorter and slightly differing account of the condition; he concluded that 'The repainted areas give a leaden quality to the picture'.
8. Held, loc. cit., recognised the 'long flopping ears', but dismissed the identification of Ignorance.
9. This amplifies the account given by Millar, White-

hall Ceiling, 1956, p. 263, who considered that there was a loss of drama as Rubens developed the composition, and by Held, op. cit., p. 213, under no. 142.
10. Martin, Ceiling Paintings, 1968, nos. 1 and 1a, fig. 16.

8. Temperance triumphant over Intemperance

The Iconography

Project A prescribed that 'modesty & at her feet impudence' should occupy the second oval at the upper or southern end of the ceiling. With its pendant of the triumph of Knowledge, it was to accompany the rectangular painting celebrating King James I's learning, see Appendix I.1. Possibly as a result of the alteration of the subject matter of the rectangular paintings at either end of the ceiling (Nos. 3 and 5), the conceit was altered to depict Temperance triumphant over Intemperance – an identification recently made by several authorities1 and its location remained unchanged in the Multiple Bozzetto (No. 1; Fig. 51). There it was sketched in position B, towards the top right-hand corner, perhaps thus indicating the place it was to occupy in the ceiling, adjacent to the Wise Rule (No. 3), and as a pendant to the triumph of Abundance, see under No. 9.

It is noteworthy that this is the only painting to occupy one of the corner compartments in which the protagonist was not personified by a classical god or hero, but by a Cardinal Virtue. Modesty (see Project A), defined in a different and wider sense than it is today, was esteemed as a Moral Virtue.2 It was considered a necessary ingredient in the character of the good ruler, who should act without exaggeration and moderately, and show clemency and mildness.3 The word was thus used in 1581 as 'A prince ... must use his authority modestly',4 and in 1585 as 'He governed with all modesty to the great contentment of the inhabitantes'.5 Impudence was understood to mean shamelessness or immodesty; it was thus used in 1548: 'Inso-muche that he ioyned impudence and un-
There was therefore an inherent opposition between Modesty and Impudence to justify the proposed conflict. Impudence did also then have political or ethical connotations; it was used in this sense in 1629: ‘Governours and Subjects ... stryving as it were with other [sic] in an impudentnesse therein’,7 and (a year earlier) ‘For those impudencies, Those riots and those other foule offences’.8 But Impudence seems not to have been considered a vice per se; and it finds no place, for instance, in Ripa, as requiring an emblematic illustration.

This was, perhaps, a matter of discussion between Rubens and Charles I, and may have led to the alteration of the envisaged conflict. Such is hinted at in the bozzetto (No. 8a; Fig. 116) and in the modello (No. 8b; Fig. 120), where the virtue holds what are probably reins. Only in the final Canvas (No. 8; Fig. 117) does this become clear: depicted is a bridle, part of the harness of a horse. This allows the identification of the virtue as Temperance9 – one of the four Cardinal Virtues – whose similar attribute of reins and bit was famously employed by Raphael in the Stanze della Segnatura.10

Ripa may have accurately summarised the quality of Temperance: to restrain and moderate the appetites of the soul.11 Similar usage is found in English: thus in 1590 ‘He ... calm'd his wrath with goodly temperance’.12 Apposite, and perhaps even a crucial factor in the decision to adopt Temperance may have been James I’s emphasis on it in the Basilicon Doron: ‘I need not to trouble you with the particular discourse of the foure Cardinall vertues ... but I will shortly say ... make one of them, which is Temperance, Queene of all the rest within you ... I meant of that wise moderation, that first commanding your selfe, shall as a Queene, command all the affections and passions of your minde, and as a Phisician, wisely mixe all your actions according thereto’.13

The vice crushed by Temperance has no distinctive attribute in the Multiple Bozzetto (Nos. 1 and 8a; Figs. 46 and 116) other than the explicitly Mannerist pose,14 whose suggestive immodesty15 and impudence – in the sense of the lack of shame – was further developed in the modello (No. 8b; Fig. 120), where the legs are open. The sex of the vice is not made clear, but it is probably female. An attribute is evident in the modello in a shape – suggestive of a garment – falling from the raised right arm. This could in some way be connected with the idea of Intemperance tearing her clothes;16 Katzenellenbogen records one medieval depiction in the psechomachia of a conflict between Temperantia and Intemperantia, in which the latter tears her clothes.17 The likely reduction of the Canvas, see below, inhibits speculation as to whether this motif was there elaborated or clarified, but traces of it – in light coloured paint – are visible in photographs taken after the post-World War cleaning (Fig. 119). On balance it seems likely that the identification of Temperance’s victim as Intemperance is correct, though an element of caution should be admitted. Further justification of it is found in Shakespeare’s Macbeth, where Malcolm cited his pretended voluptuousness as a characteristic that debarred him from becoming King of Scotland, to which Macduff replied: ‘Boundless intemperance / In nature is a tyranny: it hath been th’untimely emptying of the happy throne, / And fall of many kings’.18

The political and ethical consequences of a ruler succumbing to the vice are perhaps underscored by Rubens’s inclusion of the barking dog in the Canvas (Fig. 119). There is no suggestion of the animal in the bozzetto. As the artist had insufficient space in the modello to develop his ideas for the bottom of the composition (see below), there is no means of knowing whether he then intended that a dog should be included. It could have been introduced, at the suggestion from London after examination of the Overall Modello (No. 2), in the Canvas as a counterpart to the vice’s hanging arm; dogs feature prominently in modelli for two of the ceiling compartments of the Jesuit Church.19

Their presence there may have been decorative; but in the present Canvas, the dog, which leaps upwards, teeth bared as if growling or barking, may have served as a political allusion. In the emblem of civil discord introduced in the 1625 edition of Ripa were two dogs at the feet of the main protagonist; their presence was thus
explained: 'Dogs ... serve as a symbol of civil sedition, because although they are domestic animals ... nonetheless they usually fight to get nourishment ... with barking and growling, teeth bared'. A barking dog is alone among the forces of evil to offer resistance to their expulsion by Apollo and Minerva in The Council of the Gods in the Marie de Médicis cycle. Finally, 'divers open-mouthed dogs' heads, representing the people's barking' followed behind Envy in pursuit of the Duke of Buckingham in a masque performed at York House before the Duke's departure for the Isle of Ré in the late spring of 1627.

1. Various identifications of the protagonists have been advanced, for which see under the entries below. E. Haverkamp Bogemann in Cat. Exhib. Rotterdam, 1953-54, no. 91, seems to have been the first to propose Temperance and Intemperance, with which Jaffe, Millar (also considering Reason for the virtue), and d'Hulst (for references see below) have agreed. More recently, Held, Sketches, 1980, no. 144, preferred Wantonness to Intemperance; see also Morford, Stoics, 1995, pp. 206-207.

2. Katzenellenbogen, Allegories, 1939, p. 20, n. 5.

3. See OED. 1884-1928, VI, pp. 574-575, under 'Modesty' and 'Modestly'. The Italian 'modestia' has a similar meaning; see Battaglia, Grande Dizionario, X, pp. 661-662, under 'Modestia'.


5. T. Washington's translation of N. de Nicolay, The Navigations..., 1585, in ibid., p. 29, under 'Modesty'.

6. OED. 1884-1928, V, p. 121, under 'Impudence'; quotation from Nicholas Udall, The first token or volume of the paraphrase of Erasmus upon the newe testament, xxvi, p. 117. A similar meaning attached to the Italian 'Impudente', see Battaglia, Grande Dizionario, VII, 1972, p. 542.

7. Sir Edwin Sandys, Europae Speculum, 1629, quoted in OED. 1884-1928, V, p. 121, under 'Impundness'.

8. G. Wither, Britain's Remembrancer..., 1628, quoted in ibid., under 'Impudence'.

9. See Ripa, Iconologia, 1603, p. 481.


11. Ripa, Iconologia, 1603, p. 481: 'e di rafrenare & moderare gli appetiti dell’animo'.

12. E. Spenser, The Faery Queen, quoted in OED. 1884-1928, IX, Part II, p. 161, under 'Temperance'.


14. Described by Millar as 'foetal'; see Millar, Whitehall, 1956, p. 263.
1859, lot 73; left to the National Gallery, Oslo, by Beers, 1903-1904. Lit. Nationalgalleriet Katalog over utenlandsk Malerkunst, Oslo, 1973, pp. 179-180, no. 423; Held, Sketches, 1980, I, p. 216, under no. 144.2

(2) Engraving by Simon Gribelin II (Fig. 122; see Appendix VI).


The personification of Temperance (Temperantia), seated, pushes down the personification of Intemperance (Intemperantia), who lies beneath her, subdued by the bit of the bridle above her, as, beneath, a dog leaps upwards, teeth bared.

Temperance wears a retracted, white veil over her head and shoulders, a grey gown and rests her arm on the top of an armrest, which is covered with red drapery. Intemperance her backside exposed, lies on a ruckled, mauve cloth.

The Canvas as supplied was probably marginally too wide, and not quite long enough, see pp. 85-87 and Appendix IX. It is uncertain as to whether it has been since reduced. Reduction at installation may have rendered the bridle at the left edge illegible. Also lost may be some of the drapery on either side of Temperance, the right-hand part of the left hand of Intemperance, and part of her gown.

The report made after cleaning in 1946/47-50 is missing; a study of photographs taken during cleaning indicates that on the whole the condition seems quite good but for some small losses and thinness notably in the right arm of Intemperance. The hair of both figures seems strengthened, as does the drapery between the dog and Intemperance’s left hand.3

The light comes from the top right.

The Canvas was painted under Rubens’s direction, probably after he had laid in the design, and following his verbal instructions and his example, by an assistant, perhaps Jan van den Hoecke, see pp. 75-78. Rubens may have retouched his assistant’s work where he saw fit; there may have been a later alteration to his design, see below. The physiognomy of Temperance, fuller cheeked and wider eyed in the Canvas than in the modello (No. 8b), is similar to that of the Sybilla Persica by Jan van den Hoecke (Fig. 36),4 and, fortuitously or not, compares with that of the Personification of Music by Theodoor van Thulden of 1652.5

Both the poses may owe something to Michelangelo: Temperance may have been partly inspired by the Prophet Joel in the ceiling of the Sistine Chapel, while Intemperance was probably inspired by the recumbent Israelite in the Brazen Serpent at the opposite corner of the ceiling.6

As in the case of the other paintings for the corner compartments (see under No. 6), the character of Rubens’s preparatory work for No. 8 is relatively uncomplicated. The composition was first sketched in oil wash in the bozzetto in the Multiple Bozzetto (No. 1, Fig. 46; and No 8a, Fig. 116), and although there appear to be no major pentimenti, it must remain moot as to whether he felt it necessary to make any earlier drafts. At all events, no preparatory drawing is known. In the rectangular modello (No. 8b; Fig. 120), Rubens made no allowance for the bottom of the composition, an omission that left a larger featureless area than in, for instance, No. 7.
This he decided to fill either in the design in the lost Overall Modello (No. 2), or during work on the Canvas itself, by extending the falling arm of Intemperance, the drapery on which she lies, and, perhaps following promptings from London, by introducing the dog. In the chiefly figural modello, Rubens widened the composition, perhaps the better to work out the poses he had devised; the composition had to be compressed when transferred to the oval Canvas. Rubens also adjusted the foreshortening and the pose of Temperance in the modello.

The final design relied more on the modello than the bozzetto, though Temperance once again looks at the spectator. That Temperance’s left elbow rests on a solid form is indicated by fall of the drapery over what could be an armrest. Temperance’s veil now appears folded back onto the top of her head. Her left knee is lower than in the modello, thus elongating the design. The pose of Intemperance’s right arm has been altered so that it is drawn inwards, thus reducing the width of the design, and she lies on a mauve rather than yellow cloth (whether this alteration was made by Rubens or results from a later intervention is impossible to say).

A major alteration in the deployment of the bridle took place. In the Canvas, it rests on Temperance’s left knee and part of the harness falls onto Intemperance’s raised arm. The arrangement results from an adaptation of the clenched right hand of Temperance, which was originally devised to hold the bridle suspended from it and not to hold the end of the reins, which her left hand had been designed to do.

The question must therefore arise as to whether the switching of the harness was decided on by Rubens in his Antwerp studio, or resulted from improvisation when the Canvas was being installed. The likely reduction of the Canvas at installation, see above, may not have made an alteration inevitable, as was probably the case in the pendant where the pose of Avarice had to be altered, see under No. 9; nevertheless the harness suspended from Temperance’s hand may have been perilously close to the new edge of the support. However, the manner of its execution (Figs. 118-119) seems different to that of the left hand of Avarice (No. 9; Fig. 126), so if the alteration took place during installation, it may have been effected by another assistant, perhaps from a London studio. Against this is the sense that the handling accords well enough with the objects falling from Apollo’s cornucopia (No. 9). This could be an argument in favour of the change being one decided on by Rubens in Antwerp, perhaps prompted by comments from London about the design in the lost Overall Modello (No. 2); it may have been felt that the bit should be dangled closer to Intemperance’s face so that she would be more thoroughly tamed.

1. Imperial measurements published by the Ministry of Works in 1950: 18 ft. x 7 ft. 10 in. [548.6 x 238.8 cm.]; Those published in 1907 were: 19 ft. 2 in. x 7 ft. 10 in. [584.2 x 238.8 cm.]; see p. 123, n. 101, and p. 127.

2. Judging from a black-and-white photograph, Fig. 121, this would appear not to be contemporary with the Canvas. It could be of the eighteenth or early nineteenth century. Held (see above) referred to it as having been listed as a copy of the modello (No. 8b; see below), but suggested that it is a copy after the finished Canvas ‘as it contains a dog at the bottom’. In fact, it seems to derive both from the modello, which was in England at least by c. 1800 (see below), and the Canvas: deriving from the modello are Temperance’s gaze, her veil, folds of drapery to the left of Intemperance and the white garment on the right arm; deriving from the Canvas are the lower position of Temperance’s left knee, and the position of the bit. This last does not follow the Canvas exactly, as it does not rest on Temperance’s left knee. In her right hand, Temperance holds a pair of scales. More drapery over Intemperance’s right hand is shown than is now visible. This fanciful copy may thus have been made by an artist who knew both the modello and had studied the Canvas or Gribelin’s print (Copy [2]; Fig. 122).

3. Photographs are held at the English Heritage Studio Archive, Regents Park, London and at Historical Royal Palaces, Hampton Court Palace, Surrey. As with the other canvases, nail holes were revealed round the edges, where the support had been nailed to the front of the stretcher, see further p. 123, under n. 101.

something the drapery covers is not possible to
tell, but this is suggested by the placement of
the arm.

8b. Temperance triumphant over
Intemperance: Modello (Fig. 120)

Oil on oak support, 48.9 x 41.2 cm.

Private collection, Switzerland.

PROVENANCE: In an English collection together
with The Meeting of King Ferdinand of Hungary
and the Cardinal Infant Ferdinand at Nördlingen
according to a label on the reverse; the two
sketches must have been sold and then separat­
ed before 1824; Etienne-Edmond-Martin, Baron
de Beurnonville (1825-1906), 3, rue Chapital,
Paris, by 1880, when exhibited (see below), his
sale, Paris (Pillet), 13 May 1881, lot 440 (as 'le
bon Gouvernement dominant le démon de la
Discorde'), bt. by the dealer Bourgeois of
Cologne for 13000 fr., by whom sold to Baron
Albert von Oppenheim (1834-1912), Cologne,
his sale, Berlin (Lepke), 19 March 1918, lot 33
(as 'Der Sieg der Eintracht über die Zweitracht'),
b. by Nemès for 162,000 marks; Rudolf Chilling­
worth, Nuremberg, his sale by order of liquida­
tors, Lucerne (Galerie Fischer et al.), 5 Septem­
ber 1922, lot 22 (as 'Victoire de la Concorde sur
la Discordie'), bt. by Dr Bodmer-Abegg for
60,000 Swf.; thence by descent.

COPY: Engraving by H. Toussaint in the de
Beurnonville sale catalogue (see above).

EXHIBITED: Exhibition de Tableaux de Decoration et
d'Ornement, Musées des Arts Décoratifs, Paris,
July 1880, no. 147; Exposition de Tableaux de
Maitres Anciens, Académie Royale, Brussels,
1886, no. 192; L'Art Belge du XVIIe siècle, Brus­
sels, 1920, no. 351; Ausländische Kunst in Zürich,
Kunsthaus, Zürich, 1943, no. 155; Europäische


The personification of Temperance (Temperantia) rests her elbow on an armrest, her foot rests on the thigh of the recumbent personification of Intemperance (Intemperantia). Temperance has long, brown hair and wears a retracted, yellowish white veil over her head and shoulders, and a grey mantle over a dark grey gown. She leans against a reddish brown cloth. The last remaining part of Intemperance’s white raiment falls from her raised right arm; she is only partially covered by white drapery and lies on a yellow cloth.

The support is made up of two members; the grain runs horizontally; the lower member is c. 23 cm. high. The support is stamped with the coat of arms of the City of Antwerp and the panel maker’s monogram MV (Michiel Vriendt).7

The top and left sides are bevelled; remnants of the ground are present on this latter edge. The ground has run over the top and bottom edges; there is no sign of bevelling at the bottom edge. The right side has been sawn, as is evident from the splintering in the grain and from absence of any traces of spilt ground.

There are a few small retouchings along the join of the support. But areas where some retouching might have been suspected – in the top left-hand corner where the dark cloud is over an unexplained reddish hue; in Temperance’s dark dress to the left of her right calf and in the greys and reddish browns to the right of her left knee – were not confirmed in examination under ultra-violet and infra-red light. These showed no significant areas of repaint or damage.

Three pentimenti are evident in the execution of Intemperance: above her right arm, indicating either that the arm was first intended to have been less bent or that the white garment was to have had a greater volume; beneath her left shoulder (the upper part of the left arm may also first have not hung vertically but splayed out sideways to the right); and in the yellow cloth against the base of her left thigh. There is a pentimento in the folds of the veil on Temperance’s left arm.8 An unexplained and unrelated broken vertical line of black paint can be made out at the edge of the drapery on which Temperance’s arm rests.

The light falls from the top.

There can be no reason to doubt Rubens’s execution of the present work. It was presumably executed chiefly as a figural modello so that the artist could elaborate his ideas in rehearsal for the transfer of the design on to the Canvas, as an aide-mémoire during that process, and as a guide for an assistant during the execution of the painting. In the bozzetto (No. 8a; Fig. 116), Rubens circumscribed the base of the oval just beneath Intemperance, and perhaps for this reason he made no allowance for the bottom area of the composition in the rectangular modello. It is unlikely that the support of the modello has been reduced at its base.

For a discussion of the scene enacted, the protagonists, and the composition and its constituent parts, see No. 8, Iconography and under catalogue No. 8.

There are significant differences in the design of the modello and the bozzetto. In the modello
Rubens readjusted the fall of light so that it came from the right and realigned the sloping foreshortening by making Temperance lean further forward. She now looks down to her right, and wears a retracted veil over her head and shoulders; her right leg is depicted from straight on, and her left knee is lower so that her left foot rests on Intemperance’s chest. The position of Intemperance’s arms is indicated (though much of her left arm is absent); her legs are open and her right foot juts forward.

As in the bozzetto, Rubens did not bother to delineate the harness.

1. A label inscribed in a late 18th or early 19th century hand is on the reverse: ‘One (?) Rubens, allegorical Temperance – It is the first Study for one of the / Compartments in the Ceiling of the Banqueting house at Whitehall / The other is the Interview of the three Ferdinands after the Battle of / Nordlingen on the Danube’. The inscription was first transcribed by Held, Sketches, 1980, I, p. 215, n. 144. Held identified the sketch of the meeting of the three [sic] Ferdinands as his no. 147 (see also Martin, Pompa (CRLB), 1972, pp. 63-64, no. 4a).

2. The latter was in the collection of Sir Abraham Hume (1749-1838) by that date. See A Descriptive Catalogue of a Collection of Pictures, [collected by Sir Abraham Hume ...], 1824, no. 96; as Held recorded, it was in the Sir Abraham Hume sale, London (Christie’s), 1 June 1876, lot 44, bt. in; it passed by descent to the 3rd Earl Brownlow, Ashridge, his sale (?), London (Christie’s), 4-5 May 1923, lot 122.

3. See marked catalogue in R.K.D. The name M. de Beurnonville is inscribed on the reverse.


5. See marked catalogue in the R.K.D. The number 33 is inscribed on the reverse.

6. See marked catalogue in the R.K.D. The number 22 is inscribed on the reverse; Held and Jaffé, both cited under Literature, incorrectly gave the name of the purchaser as the then owner.


8. The author thanks Thomas Becker, Konservator-Restaurator in the Abteilung Kunsttechnologie of the Schweizerisches Institut für Kunstwissenschaft, Zürich, for his help in the technical examination; the owner for generously releasing the painting to spend time at the Swiss Institute; and Annette Bühler who contributed substantially towards the expense involved.

9. Apollo bestowing Royal Liberality suppresses Avarice

The Iconography

Project A specified that ‘liberality, & vnder her feete Avarice’ should occupy the first oval at the lower, northern end of the ceiling. With its pendant of Envy striving with Vertue, it was to accompany the rectangular painting showing Peace and the Arts flourishing in the reign of King James I, see Appendix 1.1. The first conceit was exchanged with the triumph of Knowledge, possibly as a result of the alteration of the subject matter of the rectangular paintings at either end (Nos. 3 and 5); in the Multiple Bozzetto (No. 1; Fig. 51) an amplified rendering was sketched in position B towards the left-hand corner (No. 9a; Fig. 123), perhaps was thus indicated the place it was to occupy in the ceiling, adjacent to the Wise Rule (No. 3; see under No. 1), as a pendant to Temperance triumphant over Intemperance (No. 8; Fig. 117).

James I was notorious for his unrestrained liberality, although he had as King of Scotland recommended its measured use in the Basilicon Doron. In her analysis of the then current, Senecan justification for the Jacobean and Caroline practice of patronage and sale of office, Levy Peck has described the modello (No. 9b; Fig. 127) for the Canvas, as the celebration ‘of godlike largess [sic] [which] ... denies and denigrates self interest. Such an image marked the ascendance of the Classical theory of royal bounty and God’s free gift of grace’.

The concept of the conflict between Liberality and Avarice was old; it was early given expression by Fra Giordano (Giordano da Pisa, 1260-1311): Avarice has as its opposite the virtue of liberality. The identity of the victim, whom Rubens was to depict crouching and submitting with a grimace, as Avarice, was firmly established in the modello (No. 9b).

Rubens’s first conceit for the attribute of the vice was at best an oblique reference to avariciousness, perhaps partly because of lack of space, see No. 9a; it was only when he came to execute the modello (No. 9b) that he elaborated
his ideas by reference (probably requested) to Ripa, as his personification is very similar to that there described: 'A pallid, ugly woman with black hair, make her emaciated and wearing a servant's costume ... she should be shown with breasts full of milk.' Like Ripa, Rubens depicted Avarice with a purse, of a type seen in Netherlandish painting from Jan van Hemessen to David Teniers II and similar to one already depicted by Rubens in a thematically related oil sketch.

Rubens precisely followed the specification of Project A concerning the vanquished vice, see Appendix I.I. Along with Intemperance, Avarice was the fault singled out by Malcolm in Shakespeare's Macbeth, that would debar him from becoming King of Scotland: 'With this there grows / In my most ill-composed affection, such / A stanchless avarice, that were I king, I should cut off the nobles for their lands'. To this Macduff replied: 'This avarice / Sticks deeper, grows with more pernicious root / Than sum­mer-seeming lust; and it hath been / The sword of our slain kings'. In contrast, Rubens's concept of the triumphant virtue, as it developed, is not such as could be defined simply as Liberality. His ideas continued to evolve until the execution of the Canvas. Sir Joshua Reynolds, who owned the modello (No. 9b; Fig. 127), described the main protagonist as 'Apollo in the guise of Plenty'; however, the early nineteenth-century key-plan (Fig. 9, see pp. 117-118) had identified the figure as Royal Bounty; this is followed by Held, and, in the modified form of 'bounty', by Millar. Both the noun and the phrase were then current as meaning royal largesse; but Project A's use of the noun 'liberality' puts in question both Millar's and Held's actual titles (although they mean much the same).

In considering the Project's specification of the triumphant virtue, Rubens would of course have been aware of the accepted modes of depicting Liberality, as, for instance, described by Ripa. In the winter of 1634, Rubens was to depict a personification of Royal Liberality on the rear face of the Arch of Ferdinand for the Pompa Introitus Ferdinandi in the form of a woman pouring coins from an upended cornucopia (Fig. 33). His first idea in the bozzetto (No. 9a; Fig. 123) had been different; there a woman, wearing a crown of leaves, poured fruit from an upended cornucopia, and thus she is best understood as Abundance or Copiousness (translations of the Latin Ubertas). This alteration to the specification of the Project may have been in response to an indirectly relayed reservation expressed by King Charles I, conscious of his father's excessive liberalità. The new King's critical attitude was of sufficiently wide currency for it to be relayed by the Venetian Ambassador Extraordinary in a draft Relazione of 1626, in which he stated that the late King had come 'to beggary by his excessive prodigality'. But evidently as it came to be agreed that a personification of Plenty or Abundance was to appear in the accompanying canvas (No. 3), an alternative personification had to be devised to avoid repetition.

Thus Charles I seems to have withdrawn his reservation and agreed to adhere to Project A's triumphant virtue; thus in the modello (No. 9b; Fig. 127), Rubens amplified the contents of the cornucopia and altered the protagonist who emptied it. He had earlier, in the Felicity of the Regency in the Marie de Médicis cycle, introduced the idea of a woman holding an upended cornucopia whose contents were a mixture of precious objects, a laurel crown and fruit; this symbolised, as Rubens explained, 'the liberality and the splendor of Her Majesty'. Now in the modello (No. 9b), the contents from the upended cornucopia are also a mixture: from it fall a sceptre, coins and coronet, followed by fruit. Thus are combined the contents of the two cornucopias held by Liberality in Ripa's conceit, which together symbolised the abundance of wealth ('l'abondanza delle ricchezze'), or of Amalthea's two cornucopias. In the Canvas,
the contents were again altered (insofar as its reduction, see below, allows a safe judgment) for excluded are the fruit and prominently introduced is an orb, perhaps by serendipity as it — in Flemish, a ‘rijksappel’ — replaces the apple; the orb which joins a coronet, coins, a chalice, and what may have been a sceptre.

The triumphant figure in the modello has been described as male and as female, see below. The beautiful face and quite prominent breasts leave the matter to a degree open. However, it seems more than likely that in the Canvas (Fig. 125) — as it has appeared since Gröbelin's engraving (Fig. 129; see Appendix VI) — that a muscular youth is depicted (pace Palme and Gordon who believed the figure was female, see below). He shares with the figure in the modello beauty, blonde hair, and a laurel crown, set off by an auroreole of light. These distinctive attributes allow an identification of the youth in the Canvas and by extension the figure in the modello as the god Apollo.25

The artist had given another formulation to the ideas, so far expressed, in a sketch dated by Held c. 1625-28, an Allegory of Copiousness (or Abundance),26 in which a woman holds a cornucopia from which amorettes gather fruit, as her foot tramples on a purse (Fig. 25). In the sky above is the smiling sun (with human features). This Apollo-Sol is here introduced as the divine spirit that enables Copiousness to overcome Avarice, just as in the present modello where the god himself pours the contents of the horns of Amalthea over the purse held by Avarice. Connected with this role apportioned to Apollo are literary descriptions of the statue of Apollo on the island of Delos, in which the god was shown holding the Three Graces in his right hand.27 This was interpreted as showing the god’s ‘willingness to confer favours on good men’.28

However, no classical or early source has been traced which would justify the appropriation of the god Apollo as the personification of Liberality. And it is not likely that this was Rubens’s intention here; rather the introduction of Apollo was intended perhaps to show the all-embracing scope of the Liberality, as in Shakespeare’s description of King Henry V, boosting the morale of his troops before the battle of Agincourt: ‘A largess universal, like the sun / His [King Henry’s] eye doth give to everyone / Thawing cold fear’.29

Further, the introduction of Apollo established the source of Liberality by virtue of the association of the god with royalty; this is as the early nineteenth-century key-plan had proposed, see above. Well before King Louis XIV of France’s adoption of Apollo as his device to orchestrate his persona as the ‘roi soleil’, Apollo had been chosen by rulers, partly for astrological reasons, as a suitable emblem. Agnes Joly has traced the antecedents of King Louis XIV’s use of the sun, and thus Apollo as his device, to antiquity, and in France to King Charles VI (1368-1422); it became increasingly popular following the accession of the house of Bourbon to the throne, and reached its pre-Louis XIV height in the entry of King Louis XIII into Lyons in 1622, an account of which was published in 1623.30

Such a programmatic use of Apollo in England was not unknown;31 the association of Apollo with royalty would have been understood thanks to contemporary French usage. Indeed, for Sir John Davies in his poem mourning the death of James I and celebrating Charles I’s accession, see p. 35, the god was synonymous with James I. Even more recently and more notoriously, Charles I was portrayed in the guise of Apollo in Honthorst’s Apollo and Diana of 1628, a work which seems to be (and may consciously have been) a much edited, updated elaboration of Project A’s prescriptions for the main paintings at either end of the ceiling, see Appendix 1.1, but in which exceptional prominence was accorded to the Duke of Buckingham. The painting may have been on display in the Banqueting House when Rubens was in London.32

The apple falling from the cornucopia, changed in the Canvas into an orb, and the sceptre, present in the modello and probably in the Canvas, should both be understood as illustrative of the type of Liberality depicted. The orb and sceptre — inalienable emblems of kingship — should not be seen so much as being
bestowed by Apollo; they are, it is suggested, included to indicate the royal source of the Liberality that has subdued Avarice for the benefit of the King’s subjects.

1. As he was to confess in his speech to both the Houses of Parliament, on 31 March 1607: ‘For my Liberalitie, I haue told you of it heretofore: my three first yeares were to me as a Christmas’. See James VI and I, Political Writings, 1994, p. 166. For a discussion of the King’s extravagance and its consequences, see Lockyer, James VI and I, 1998, pp. 78-99.

2. See James VI and I, Political Writings, 1994, p. 48.


4. See Battagio, Grande Dizionario, IX, p. 5: ‘L’Avarizia hae per contrario la virtu dell liberalita’.

5. Ripa, Iconologia, 1603, p. 29: ‘Donna pallida, & brutta con cappelli negri, tara macilente, & in habito di serva ... Mostrera le mammelle ignude piena di latte’.

6. Ibid., p. 32.

7. For example, in the Calling of St Matthew in the Kunsthistorisches Museum, Vienna, for which see M. Friedländer, Early Netherlandish Painting, with comments and notes by H. Pauwels and C. Lemmens, Leuven–Brussels, 1975, XII, pls. 104-105.


11. See below, No. 9b, Provenance.


16. For bounty, see OED, 1884-1928, I, p. 1024, under ‘Bounty (4)’, which refers to Nicholas Udall’s translation of Erasmus, Apophthegmatia, Apophthegymarys ... translated into English by NU, 1542, p. 215a: ‘Bountie and largesse is befallyng for kynges’; Held, Sketches, 1980, I, p. 215, found the phrase ‘royal bounty’ used in the King James translation of the Bible, where significantly it is a trait of Solomon. See 1 Kings 10:13: ‘besides that which [Solomon] gave her of his royal bounty’; see also Donovan, Whitenall, 1995, p. 186. This may have been the source for the phrase in the early nineteenth-century key-plan. The Oxford English Dictionary gives the reign of Queen Anne as the period when the phrase became popular.

17. Ripa, Iconologia, 1603, pp. 290-293.


19. See the identification in Gevartius, Pompa, 1641, p. 138, of the woman holding an upended cornucopia on the Temple of Janus, where a distinction is made between abundantia and ubertas.


24. In the frontispiece of De Malebœuf’s Légatus, completed by 1638. Robens depicted two cornucopias linked by a bow; one contained fruit, the other crowns and sceptres. He referred to these as ‘Cornua Amaltheae corones sceptres et varii fructibus referta’ (see Joudon–Van de Velde, Title-Pages (CRLB), 1978, I, pp. 344-348, no. 84, fig. 286, and II, p. 501), although there is no classical precedent for this. Only one of Amalthea’s horns, having accidently broken off, was placed among the stars as the cornucopiae or cornucopia, the emblem of fruitfulness and abundance; see C. Lewis and C. Short, A Latin Dictionary..., Oxford, 1933, p. 471, under ‘Cornu’.

25. Cartari, Imagini, 1571, p. 58, for the god’s youth and blonde hair, p. 69, for the laurel crown.


9. Apollo bestowing Royal Liberality suppresses Avarice: Ceiling Painting (Pl. 4 top, and Figs. 124-126)

Oil on canvas adhered to canvas laid down on a laminated wood support, oval; 549 x 239 cm.


COPY: Engraving by Simon Gribelin II (Fig. 129; see Appendix VI).


Apollo, the sun-god, holding an upended cornucopia, bestrides the personification of Avarice (Avaritia).

Apollo wearing a laurel crown and illuminated by an aureole, his legs covered by red drapery, bestrides Avarice, who wears a grey gown and white undergarment, pulled open to reveal her breasts.

The Canvas as supplied was probably marginally too wide and not quite long enough, (see pp. 85-87 and Appendix IX). It is uncertain as to whether it has been since reduced. Probably lost are the upended base of the cornucopia, some of its contents including the top of the sceptre, some of Apollo’s drapery and Avarice’s gown.

The report made in 1948 after cleaning and restoration described the condition as ‘fairly good’. It described Avarice’s gown as dark green.2

The light falls from the top left.

The Canvas was painted under Rubens’s direction, probably after he had laid in the design and following his verbal instructions and his example, by an assistant, perhaps Erasmus Quellin II, see p. 78. Rubens may well have retouched his assistant’s work where he saw fit. For a probable, later alteration, see below.

There has not been recent unanimity over the sex of the main protagonist, whom Palmel,3 Gordon,4 and Burchard-d’Hulst5 took to be female. Smith6 and Rooses7 opined that Apollo bore a likeness to King James I, a view also entertained by Malcolm Smuts8 as the features reminded Levy Peck9 of ‘Buckingham’. It seems most improbable that Rubens intended any identifiable portrait in the god’s features.

The pose of Apollo may well have been inspired by Michelangelo's Ignudo between Jonah and the Libyan Sibyl in the ceiling of the Sistine Chapel,10 as can be inferred from Burchard-d’Hulst.11 The pose of Avarice has not yet been traced. It can be compared to the bound captive on the right in ‘The Trophy’, one of the
Constantine tapestry designs,¹² and may derive from a similar source.

As with the preparatory work for the paintings of the other corner compartments, the character of that for No. 9 is relatively uncomplicated. But exceptionally—to avoid repetition, see above—a quite fundamental iconographic change was made as work proceeded in that the triumphant protagonist was changed from a woman to the god Apollo as the contents of the cornucopia were elaborated. The attributes of Avarice were elaborated and then reduced; this last alteration may not have been of Rubens's doing, it being possibly improvised as it was found that the width of the Canvas had to be reduced at installation.

Rubens's first extant draft of the design was executed in oil wash in a bozzetto in the Multiple Bozzetto (No. 1; Fig. 46; and No. 9a; Fig. 123). In the chiefly figural modello (No. 9b; Fig. 127), which has a rectangular format, the triumphant protagonist has been changed from a woman to the god Apollo, whose victim is now clearly identifiable as Avarice. The foreshortening was also adjusted. Burchard-d'Flulst were the first to propose that Rubens reworked a counterproof of his copy (Fig. 27) of an ignudo by Michelangelo on the Sistine Chapel ceiling in preparation for his execution of the modello for further discussion, see under Nos. 9a and 9b.

Rubens continued to develop the design as work proceeded on the Canvas, where he turned chiefly to the modello but also made references to the bozzetto. The composition, previously elaborated in a rectangular format, had now to be compressed to fit the oval shape of the Canvas. Promptings from London, based on a study of the lost Overall Modello (No. 2), which Rubens had sent to Charles I for his approval, may have resulted in an iconographical alteration to the contents of the cornucopia. Its contents now consist of symbols of earthly power and wealth, which have been amplified to include: a coronet, sceptre, orb, chalice (?), coins and/or medals. The majority of the formal alterations may have been due to the artist himself. The top of the cornucopia is set in the opposite direction. The new position of the cornucopia required an adjustment to Apollo's right hand. The upper part of Apollo's body is depicted more frontally. The bozzetto was followed in Apollo's look to his left (but not downwards), in his raised left elbow, in the set of Avarice's head and position of her legs. The money-bag was placed in the crook of Avarice's left arm.

The main changes to the design were the repositioning of the cornucopia and the money-bag. The former may have been decided on to make Apollo's action more dramatic. The latter may have resulted from Rubens's realisation that a repeat positioning of the money bag in the modello could not be fitted into the oval format required for the Canvas. More likely is that he did manage to adjust the design and repeated the placement of the motif; then its alteration would have been improvised at installation when it was found that the Canvas had to be reduced. This may have resulted in the physical loss of Avarice's right hand holding the money-bag (as in the modello, Fig. 127) and of the dramatic impact of the contents of the cornucopia falling onto the money-bag. If this was the case, the repositioning of the money-bag and the addition of Avarice's hand and thumb to hold it could have been the work of the assistant, sent over by Rubens to supervise the installation of the Canvas. This assistant, chosen at the last moment to go to London, was probably a member of Rubens's studio, and has eluded sure identification, see pp. 83-84 and 88. A study of photographs suggests an artist not working under Rubens's direct supervision or even in his idiom (the money-bag and hand (Fig. 126) seems not executed in the same way as the harness in No. 8; Fig. 117), but perhaps more under the influence of Anthony van Dyck, who was then active in London.

1. Imperial measurements published by the Ministry of Works in 1950: 18 ft. x 7 ft. 10 in. [548.6 x 238.8 cm.]. Those published in 1907 were: 19 ft. 2 in. x 7 ft. 10 in. [584.2 x 238.7 cm.]; see p. 123, n. 101, and p. 126.

2. See the MS. condition report by W. Hampton at present held in the English Heritage Studio Archive, Regents Park, London (typescript at Historic Royal Palaces, Hampton Court Palace, Surrey). As with the other canvases, nail holes where
revealed round the edges, where the support had been nailed to the front of the stretcher; see further p. 123, under n. 101.

3. Palme, Triumph, 1956, pp. 244-245.


9. Ibid.

10. C. de Tolnay, Michelangelo II. The Sistine Ceiling, Princeton, 1945, pls. 105 and 125.


12. For the modello of which, see Held, Sketches, 1980, I, no. 44, and II, p. 46.


9a. Plenty or Abundance suppressing Avarice: Bozzetto (Fig. 123)

Oil on ? oak support, see under No. 1.

Located at the left-hand edge towards the top of the support of the Multiple Bozzetto (No. 1; Fig. 46), in position B (Fig. 51).

For Provenance, Exhibitions, Literature, and Commentary, see under No. 1.

A seated woman, the personification of Plenty or Abundance (Abundantia), wearing a leafy crown, the upper part of the body naked, her thighs and legs clothed, and looking down to her left, rests an upended cornucopia against her right shoulder and holds it against her right knee with her right arm. Fruit falls from the cor-}

nucopia. She bestrides a young crouching woman, the personification of Avarice (Avaritia), fully covered, who looks upwards; her left arm is twisted behind her back.

Reduction of the support (see under No. 1) has resulted in the loss of the left-hand side of the oval drawn in black chalk, the left edge of the mouth of the cornucopia, and some of the fruit falling from it.

The design was first sketched in thin, brown oil wash; it was then cursorily encompassed by an oval drawn in black chalk. The upended base of the cornucopia, Abundance's gown, and the lower part of the arm and rump of Avarice extend beyond its limits. The design was then heightened en grisaille, some of which also extended beyond the confines of the oval.

There is a pentimento in the upended base of the cornucopia by the head of Abundance; it was at first higher.

The light comes from the top left.

The leafy crown, the upended cornucopia from which falls fruit, and the arm shown twisted round the back of Avarice are the only clues to the allegory Rubens here had in mind. The triumphant woman pouring fruit from a cornucopia may have been intended as Liberality, but by analogy with the personification in an earlier Allegory of Copiousness (Fig. 25) would be more satisfactorily identified as Copiousness, Plenty or Abundance. Although the edge of the support may have been marginally reduced, there is no indication that the vice's right arm was depicted; thus the only means by which the young victim could be identified is by her having her arms behind her back, which would suggest an unwillingness to give, and hence is likely indeed to have been an early proposal for Avarice.

For a discussion of the scene enacted, the protagonists, and the composition and its constituent parts, see No. 9, Iconography and under catalogue No. 9.

Burchard-d'Hulst suggested that a counter-proof of a copy by Rubens after the Ignudo by Michelangelo between Jonah and the Libyan Sibyl in the ceiling of the Sistine Chapel (Fig. 27) was reworked and used by Rubens in preparation for his own version.
for the Canvas. They considered, as did later Held,3 that the drawing showed closer connections with the *modello* (No. 9b) than the *bozzetto* (No. 9a). However, perhaps the closest similarity is with the upper part of the *Ignudo's* body in near profile as it is rendered here in the *bozzetto*; see below for further discussion.


**9b. Apollo bestowing Royal Liberality suppresses Avarice: Modello (Fig. 127)**

Oil on oak support; 46.2 x 30.7 cm.


PROVENANCE: Sir Joshua Reynolds, PRA (1723-1792) by April 1791;1 his sale (†), London (Christie's), 17 March 1795,2 lot 37 (as 'Apollo in the character of Plenty, triumphing over Avarice. A sketch for the ceiling at Whitehall'), bought by Agace for 13 gns.;3 probably John Campbell, 2nd Marquess of Breadalbane (1796-1862) at Taymouth Castle, Perthshire,4 who died without direct heirs and was succeeded by his fourth cousin twice removed; his son was created Marquess of Breadalbane, and died in 1922, also without direct heirs;5 by descent to Lieutenant Colonel Thomas George Breadalbane Morgan-Grenville Gavin at Langton, Duns, Berwickshire; his sale, London (Christie's), 27 March 1925, lot 139 (as 'Pomona with a Cornucopia of Fruit', on panel, 18 x 11 1/2 in. [45.7 x 31.8 cm.]), bt. by H.M. Clark for £ 99 = 15 sh.;6 the dealers Blumenreich and Zatzenstein;7 sold by the dealer Francis Mathiessen to Dr Alfred Friedman, Berlin, 1926-1927;8 sold by the dealer Cassirer to Franz Koenigs, Haarlem, the Netherlands, June 1927;9 on loan to the Boymans Museum, Rotterdam, by 1937;10 Koenigs collection in the charge of Kramarsky Bank sale, the dealer Goudstikker, Amsterdam, April 1940;11 1,900 U.S.$ offered for it and Rubens's *The Conversion of St Paul* by Count Antoine Seilern, then in Stockholm, via the art-historian Jan van Gelder;12 offer of U.S.$ 1,800 for both pictures accepted 30 April 1940;13 stored at the Amsterdam Bank N.V., until 8 August 1945 when collected by Count Seilern;14 Count Antoine Seilern (1901-1978), 56, Princes Gate, South Kensington, London;15 by whom bequeathed as part of the Princes Gate Collection to the Trustees of the Home House Society, now the Samuel Courtauld Trust, and exhibited in the Courtauld Gallery (formerly the Courtauld Institute Gallery), London.


Apollo, the sun-god, emptying a cornucopia, which rests on his shoulder, bestrides a crouching woman — the personification of Avarice (Avaritia) — who holds a money-bag.

Apollo, whose blonde hair is illumined by an aureole, wears a laurel crown and a reddish pink drapery; from the cornucopia pour a sceptre (?), coins, and coronet followed by fruit. Avarice wears a black gown over a white undergarment pulled open to reveal her breasts.

The support is made up of two members, joined horizontally, of almost similar size. The grain runs horizontally; a crack in each member springs from the left edge, that towards the bottom edge runs right across the support.

The reverse of the panel shows traces of bevelling on the left edge. The top edge looks to have been roughly planed perhaps to make good a small loss to the support. The right-hand edge has been cut as part of the coat of arms of the City of Antwerp — the castle — is stamped near it, indicating that the panel was sawn through the coat of arms, leaving the two hands on the other piece. That this was done in the studio before the application of the ground is indicated by a blob of the mixture on the right edge; traces of red paint are also evident there indicating that the support was reduced to its current dimensions before being used.

X-radiographs show no significant pentimenti.

Apollo was first shown looking down to the right (Fig. 128).\(^{17}\)

The paint of the background goes up to the edges of the design and was added after its near completion. But outlines to the design go over it, so that it is by and large original. The aureole was first indicated by leaving the priming or imprimatura to show up; yellow streaks and some strands of Apollo’s hair were probably added over the background paint. A vertical scratch c. 5.5 cm. running down from beneath Apollo’s left armpit has been retouched.

The light falls from the top left.

There can be no reason to doubt Rubens’s authorship of the present work. Rubens presumably executed this chiefly figural \textit{modello} in a rectangular format so that he could develop his ideas in rehearsal for the transfer of the design onto the Canvas, as an aide-mémoire during that process, and as a guide for an assistant during the execution of the painting.

The aureole, crown of laurels, and beautiful face identify the triumphant figure as Apollo. The ugly face, exposed breasts, and money-bag now allow a clear identification of his victim as Avarice. To fruit falling from the cornucopia, Rubens has added symbols of earthly power and wealth, thus combining the contents of Amalthea’s two horns of plenty, see above.

For the scene enacted, the protagonists, and the composition and its constituent parts, see No. 9, \textit{Iconography} and under catalogue No. 9.

Several alterations were made to the composition sketched in the \textit{bozzetto} (No. 9a; Fig. 123). The main figure, now Apollo, bends forward in less pronounced foreshortening, and his body is depicted more frontally. The cornucopia, the top of which curls round Apollo’s shoulder, hangs more vertically so that his right hand could be included. The position of Apollo’s left leg is altered so that he bears down more vertically onto Avarice. He looks downwards. Avarice’s right knee has been raised so as to conceal Apollo’s right foot, and her face is seen in less pronounced foreshortening so that she stares upwards to her left. Her right hand holding a purse has been introduced. An aureole has been introduced behind Apollo’s head, and Avarice’s breasts are now exposed.

Burchard-d’Hulst,\(^{18}\) followed by Rowlands\(^{19}\) and Held,\(^{20}\) associated the reworked counter-proof of a copy made by Rubens after Michelangelo’s \textit{Ignudo}, between Jonah and the \textit{Libyan Sybil} in the ceiling of the Sistine Chapel (Fig. 27), with the execution of the figure of Apollo in the \textit{modello}. In three respects, the drawing connects with the figure in the \textit{bozzetto}: the chest is seen almost in profile (but not as much as in the drawing), the right hand is omitted, and the
procession of the left leg is similar; the drawing is
closer to the modello in the less pronounced fore­
shortening. While there is a correspondence in
the pose copied from Michelangelo with that of
the triumphant protagonist destined for the ceil­
ing, it can perhaps best be described as an influ­
sential source.

The making of the counterproof and its
reworking has been dated c. 1630-33, but this
may at least partially rely on the supposed date
of execution of No. 9b. A date of c. 1630 would
not strain the stylistic evidence, and would
allow the possibility of its being more contem­
poraneously executed with the Multiple Bozzetto
(No. 1; Fig. 46). However, it seems unlikely that
the reworking of the counterproof was made at
any stage in conscious preparation for this oval
of the ceiling.\textsuperscript{21}

1. See below, under Exhibited.
2. The sale was originally scheduled to take place
on 8 March 1794; it was postponed until 14 March
1795 and then by three days until 17 March. See
A. Graves and W. Cronin, \textit{A History of the Works of
Joseph Farlington attended the sale; see \textit{The Diary
of Joseph Farlington}, eds. K. Garlick and A. MacN­
James Dallaway in \textit{Anecdotes of Painting in Eng­
land ... collected by the late George Vertue ... published
by the honorable Horace Walpole...}, London, II, 1826,
p. 175, stated that Calonne (Charles Alexandre de
Calonne) owned a sketch of ‘Apollo in the char­
cacter of Plenty’, although no painting of this
description was in his sale of 23 March 1795.
4. Possibly previously at the Marquess’s apart­
ment in Holyrood Palace, Edinburgh, to which he
may have been entitled as Lord Chamberlain of
the Household (a post held twice between Sep­
tember 1848-February 1858. The frontispiece of
the Gavin sale catalogue (1925, see below) stated
that the majority of the pictures was the property
of the 2nd Marquess of Breadalbane at Taymouth
Castle, Perthshire, and that some had earlier been
in the Marquess’s apartments at Holyrood Palace.
Edinburgh. Waagen saw the Marquess’s small
collection of pictures in London in 1850-51; see
\textit{Waagen, Treasures}, II, 1854, p. 239. For the
Marquess of Breadalbane and his heirs, see G.E.
Cockayne, \textit{The Complete Peerage ...}, London, 1910-
59 (2nd edn).
5. He also served in the Royal Household, being fin­
ally Keeper of the Privy Seal of Scotland 1907-
22, and so may also have been entitled to a lodg­
ing at Holyrood Palace.

10-11. Processions in Celebration of
the Happiness brought about by King
James I’s Union of the Crowns of
England and Scotland and by his
Wise Rule

The Iconography

For the sake of brevity, the Procession on the
west side of the ceiling is referred to as Process­
ion I, and that on the east side as Procession II.

Project A specified that in the ‘two Squares [sic]
on the sydes of the great OuaW should be
depicted ‘children with Cornucopias & fes­
tones with beasts of severall natures yoked
together, shewing the effects of publique vnion’,
see Appendix I.1. As these compartments
flanked the central oval, which was intended to contain a portrayal of King James I uniting the crowns of England and Scotland, there can be little doubt that the public union referred to was the union of the crowns.

James I was largely frustrated in realising a greater degree of union between the two kingdoms of England and Scotland than that obtained by his Proclamation of 1604, see pp. 208-209. The matter was no longer an issue in the 1620s, as the King's plans had been blocked by the English Parliament. That both projects laid such an emphasis on the union reflects the importance still attached to it by him and by his successor Charles I. And that both Projects expressed a positive assessment of the 'effects of publick union' was inevitable and uncontroversial. While James I was denied the degree of union he had sought, the benefits of the limited union achieved were reputedly undeniable and evident if only in the diminution of national tensions or rivalries, and in improved security in the Borders (the region near the old frontier of the two countries). Very probably after discussion with Charles I, Rubens was to arrive at an even fuller celebration of the effect of the union than that proposed in the two projects, even though, because of the introduction of the Apotheosis (No. 4), the processions were no longer to flank the commemoration of it. Thus they should be see as celebrating the happiness brought about by James I's reign as a whole, through, in particular, the Union (No. 5) and his Wise Rule (No. 3). That this happiness was sustained, after the death of Buckingham, by the rule of Charles I made even more apposite the congratulatory message of the two Processions.2

The specifications of the Projects for the two compartments were hardly elaborate. They concentrated chiefly on the traditional, Biblical source for illustrating temporal happiness and peace; indeed, the author, or authors, of Project B, see Appendix I.2, found it sufficient simply to quote the relevant verses from Chapter XI of the Book of Isaiah. Project A, see Appendix I.1, had been more vaguely allusive both to this Messianic prophesy and in addition to what Rubens would have interpreted as the Classical Roman topos of Happiness of the Times (Temporum Felicitas) by no more than mentioning 'chyldren with Cornucopias & festones'. The artist was greatly to enlarge on these ideas and add motifs (for there was much space to fill) illustrative of the Golden Age and of the triumphant power of love, as clearly he disdained the thought that merely the verses of Isaiah should suffice as the subject matter of the Canvases.

It has long been evident that the two Canvases were thematically linked; but their meaning has remained obscure until recently. Gordon in 1967 seems first to have hinted at their common literary source,3 which Baumstark was correctly to specify;4 he also elaborated on the Classical source of Happiness of the Times5 already indicated by Held.6 Rubens was later to illustrate this concept by depicting 'the play of the frolicking and exulting little boys',7 who were to appear in the Stage of Welcome in the Pompa Introitus Ferdinandi,8 and in the frontispiece designed by 1638 for F. de Marselaer's Legatus.9 Gevartius did not give a Classical source; this Baumstark, in his commentary on the designs for the Pompa Introitus Ferdinandi, provided by referring to the reverse of a coin of Caracalla, illustrated in Erizzo's compendium of antique medals and coins, and inscribed FELICIA TEMPO-RA. This medal was struck ... out of simple glorification and praise of this Prince, to demonstrate the happiness of the period of his rule, by these four figures.10

The relevant verses in Isaiah were only loosely followed by Rubens. Thus it can be concluded that he preferred the generalised specification of Project A, which had only laid down that 'beasts of severall natures [be] yoked together'. The reason, and precedents, for the choice of a ram with a wolf and a lion with a bear to be yoked or harnessed together are not clear.12 But Isaiah's text was suggestive by linking a wolf and a lamb, whose antipathy is self-evident. Maarten van Heemskerck chose a sheep as a wolf's victim in his print of the Patriarch Benjamin;13 Rubens's substitution of a ram in place
of the sheep could be justified as being more suited as a draught-animal. The pairing of a lion and bear may rather have been suggested by 1 Samuel, XVII, vv. 34-37, where David told Saul how he had slain 'a lion and a bear', which had taken 'a lamb out of the flock'. And certainly they are 'beasts of several natures', as are the swallow and hawk (if such are the birds depicted in Procession II), but no literary source – if one be necessary – illustrating their incompatibility has yet been traced, although both a bear and a lion are listed linked by implication as feeding together in the relevant verse of Isaiah.

Rubens does partly allude to Isaiah's 'a little child shall lead them' by showing the amoretto in Procession II pulling at the ram’s horn; but the source for the children riding on the lion, tigress and ram (for the last see also below) is not connected with Isaiah or depictions of the Happiness of the Times (Temporum Felicitas). Baumstark observed a similar motif in the middle ground of the Golden Age executed by Francesco Morandini after a programme devised by Vincenzo Borghini; this motif was thus itemised in the manuscript programme: 'in the meadow I saw different wild and domestic animals, but all docile, [one] that rode a lion which lay down'.

Baumstark proposed that the artist’s introduction of children riding animals was an allusion to the Golden Age and its return. A reference to this commonly espoused ideal was evidently under consideration when the Projects were being devised, for it was introduced in Project B. There it was proposed that the central compartment at the ‘lower end’ should show the King conducted by Religion and Concord receiving Minerva and Astraea. The inclusion of the goddess Astraea in this part of the scheme may have been the reason for the exclusively Biblical prescription for the paintings in the flanking compartments of the central oval. Perhaps to compensate for the abandonment of Astraea in the overall programme finally agreed on, the subject matter of the Processions was broadened to embrace a different allusion – the children riding animals – to the return of the Golden Age.

The children riding on the lion and tigress probably also illustrate the Classical concept ‘Cupid, the god of Love, subduing a Lion’ (‘Amor leonem domans’), although the children cannot be specifically identified as cupids as Gordon would have it. The late choice of a tigress (see below) in Procession II may partly have been inspired by Seneca’s Hippolytus, in which the power of love is described in animals, among which are mentioned the striped Indian tigers and African lions. The demeanour of the lion may also derive from this passage: ‘African lions toss their manes and by their roarings give token of their engendered passions. When Love has roused them, then the forest groans with their grim uproar’.

A probable alteration, due to the Canvas of Procession I (No. 10) having to be reduced (discussed below), discoloured varnish, and a growing ignorance of the sources on which Rubens depended, resulted in motifs towards the rear of the Procession being among the most misunderstood passages in the whole ceiling decoration. The roles of the boy on the lion and the amoretto immediately above the bear were already obscure to the author of the early nineteenth-century key-plan (Fig. 9), see above pp. 117-118. His misreading (which in a very general way evoked the power of love) of the motifs proved for long influential; indeed, both Held and Strong relied on it. In fact, Madsen in 1917, describing a picture which he believed to be a sketch for the Procession (see Derivative Works, (3), pp. 302-304; Fig. 162), had correctly identified the object held by the amoretto as a yoke.

Rubens may originally have intended to show the amoretto above the chariot holding reins attached to the yoke, see below, which was to couple the lion and bear. The first motif would have constituted a further allusion to the power of love by an extension of Alciati’s illustration of the motto: Love the most powerful state of mind (‘Potentissimus affectus amor’) (Fig. 130), while the motif of the amoretto yoking together a lion and bear could well have been seen as an elaboration of the idea depicted in Crispijn de Passe’s engraving Love conquers all (‘Omnia vincit amor’), in which Cupid is seen
holding the reins of a lion that has been harnessed. The inscription reads: I saw that it is hard to restrain a lion: I saw that love alone can master with a rope. As it was probably Rubens’s intention that these children should be taken for putti, then these references to the power of love should be linked with the role assigned to Cupid in the Union (No. 5; see pp. 211-212). Thus further emphasis would have been given to the Jacobean and Caroline belief in the crucial role and importance of love in the ethical (and political) sphere(s).

The infant Bacchus has been claimed to be present in both Processions: astride the ram in Procession II (No. 11) and reclining in the chariot in Procession I (No. 10). The former identification can be rejected, for while the tiger in the procession could allude to Bacchus, the animal which the infant rides is not the god’s familiar goat, but a ram. Nor is the god usually shown holding a lit torch; such could rather allude to Ceres (as could the wheat held by the adjacent amoreto and child), the goddess intimately connected with Peace.

The figure on the ram in the Canvas is anyway problematic insofar as the top part of his body is likely to be a reconstruction of the eighteenth century, see below under No. 11. As it agrees with the figure in Gribelin’s engraving (Fig. 159; see Appendix VI), the engraving was probably used in making the reconstruction. He is shown wingless holding a torch and perhaps another torch or a staff, with drapery attached to his shoulder, and makes his first appearance in the first modello (No. 11b; see Fig. 156), rather than in the bozzetto (No. 11a; Fig. 155). There he appears winged and holding what are likely to be two torches, the top part of one being truncated by the edge of the support. That it was the artist’s intention at least to imply that the winged child should carry two torches is indicated by his likely source, namely the Cupid holding two torches in the engraved Frieze with the Triumph of Love after Raphael (Fig. 44), see under No. 11.

The pair of torches seems to be a rare iconographic feature; but a print by Giulio Bonasone in Bocchius’s Symbolicarum Quaestionum enables the figure’s identification as Divine Love (Fig. 131). The child in the print is winged, as he is in the preparatory work for the Canvas; and it may be assumed that the wings were already obscured, when Gribelin made his engraving after it. For Bocchius, Divine or Platonic Love - the ‘Saintly Child’ - liberates mortals from the sadness that oppress them and provides a more direct and secure course to life. It would also renew the wonderful harmony of the Creation, and - more significantly in the context of the programme for the processions - would restore the Golden Age. The cult of Platonic love was particularly espoused by, and found favour in, Queen Henrietta Maria’s circle at court.

The identification of the child on the chariot in Procession I (No. 10) as Bacchus is less than certain. The presence of the god, depicted as young, happy and beautiful and thus personifying the temperate consumption of wine, would have been appropriate in such a festive procession. Indeed, Rubens’s first idea, as set out in the first extant bozzetto (No. 10a; Fig. 139), had other Bacchic associations in the thyrsi carried by two amoretti. Such associations were sustained by the pose Rubens developed for the child, see under No. 10. In the Canvas, apart from the figure’s youth and beauty, the close proximity of the grapes, and the satyr’s head, which forms part of the decorative mounting of the chariot, add further force to the identification. However, the child does not obviously advertise any of the god’s other attributes, and he appears winged in one record of a preparatory modello (No. 10c; Fig. 141), which suggests that Rubens did not then have the young Bacchus in mind. Thus in our present state of knowledge, the identification of the child reclining on the chariot as the infant Bacchus is broached but not adopted.

Millar suggested that the subject matter of the two Processions was taken up and developed by Inigo Jones in his design for the ‘frontispiece’ for William D’Avenant’s masque Salmacida Spolia, which was first performed in the new masquing hall in Whitehall Palace before their Majesties in January 1640. Included were several groups of children, but only one seems
directly related: namely the winged child ‘riding on a furious lion, which he seems to tame with reins and a bit’, who, with two companions holding an antique ensign and a palm, expressed ‘the victory over the perturbations’.37

Held first observed that the compositions of the paintings to fill these lateral compartments were intended to be processions; he suggested that it would have been most appropriate if these processions were designed so as to head towards James I in the painting depicting his ‘good government’ (No. 3): ‘carrying swags of fruit, driving chariots laden with the goods of the earth they [the children] bring these symbols of prosperity and happiness to lay them at the feet of the prince to whom they owe them’.38 Held’s account of the iconographic role of the Processions seems persuasive. The action of the children and amoretti should be compared with that of the children and amoretti preparing to hang the second swag of fruit and vegetables on the architrave above the statue of Ceres in the picture in the Hermitage.39 But there has been a good deal of uncertainty and inconsistency in the setting of these Canvases in the ceiling, and Held’s positing of the destination of the Processions is no longer convincing, see pp. 135-136.

The two chariots are the Roman biga (two horse) type,40 but as they are not drawn by horses, the word has not been used. Rubens had copied a biga when he was in Rome;41 the spiritedly executed mountings on the chariots in both Processions were probably fanciful.

2. The King’s Declaration showing the Causes of the late Dissolution, 19 March 1629, referred to ‘the great peace and quietness which everyman enjoyeth under his own vine and fig tree’. For the declaration see S. Gardiner, The Constitutional Documents of the Puritan Revolution, 1625-1640, Oxford, 1899 (edn), p. 99.
3. Gordon, Renaissance Imagination, 1975, p. 64 (and Contents page for the date of the relevant lecture): ‘The imagery [of Rubens’s composition] echoes familiar texts from Virgil and Isaiah: this is the Golden age of peace & plenty’.
5. Ibid., p. 145.
9. Judson–Van de Velde, Title-pages (CRLB), I, pp. 344-348, no. 84; II, fig. 286.
10. Baumstark, Kriegsallegorien, 1974, p. 145, and fig. 11, referring to Sebastiano Erizzo, Discorsi ... sopra le Medaglie degli Antichi, Venice, eds. of 1568 and 1571, for the text, see p. 214, n. 186: ‘Questa medaglia fu battuta ... per simile gloria et adulatione di questo Principe, dimostrandoci la felicità del tempo del suo Imperio, per queste quatro figure’.
11. Baumstark’s explanation is to be preferred to Fredlund’s identification of the children as being the ‘amoris et amicitiae genii’, who appear beside the open door of the Temple of Janus (Fig. 26) in the design for the Pompa Intratius Ferdinandi. See Fredlund, Iconography, 1976-78, pp. 46-47.
15. Ibid., p. 122 under n. ‘a’: ‘pel prato vorrei divertirsi animali fieri e domestici, ma tutti mansueti [un piuttosto che cavalcassi un leone che giacesse]’.
17. See above p. 154.
18. See J. Becker, ‘Amor vincit omnia’; on the closing image of Goethe’s Novelle’, Simiolus, XVIII, 1988, p. 146, with a confused reference to Inigo Jones’s description of the proscenium for William D’Avenant’s masque Salmacida Spolia, see below. Becker gives a review of this particular theme illustrating the power of love, pp. 141-146, as does Savard, Medici, 1982, pp. 74-76. For Rubens’s earlier use of this motif, see Held, Sketches, 1980, I, pp. 106-107, under no. 64.
10. Procession of Children and Amoretti with a Festoon and a Lion and a Bear drawing a Chariot; Ceiling Painting (Pls. 3 top, 14 detail, and Figs. 132a and b, and Figs. 133-138)

Oil on canvas adhered to canvas laid down on a laminated, wooden support; 239 x 1204 cm.1

London, Whitehall, The Banqueting Hall in the Banqueting House, in the western compartment flanking the central oval.

COPY: Engraving by Simon Gribelin II (Fig. 142; see Appendix VI).

EXHIBITED: The Orangery, Kensington Palace, London, December 1950, the central and northern sections after cleaning and restoration.


An aerial procession, consisting of eleven members, is about to start and is starting off. It is led by six amoretti and a boy carrying a festoon of fruit and vegetables. In the centre is an amoretto who is yoking a bear to a lion; the lion growls and paws the air as he is urged on by a child on his back to start hauling the chariot that is being loaded by a child and two amoretti – one of whom holds the end of the festoon – with the contents of an upended cornucopia.
The Canvas as delivered was probably too wide and not long enough, see pp. 85-87, Appendix IX, and below. It is uncertain as to whether it has since been reduced.

The Canvas and its support were sawn into three sections in 1940 to enable its removal, see p. 127.

The report made after the cleaning and restoration in 1946/47-50 recorded that much of the sky required repainting except towards the front of the procession. The figures were said to have suffered varying degrees of paint loss, notably the body of the second amoretto from the front (Fig. 138), the legs of the amoretto yoking the bear (Fig. 135), the abdomen of the child lying on the chariot (Fig. 134), and the amoretto at the rear (Fig. 133). The chariot, lion, and bear were said to be in better condition. The arm of the child at the upper edge of the canvas above the bear was reported to have been thinly painted over leaves in the festoon; it and much of the rest of this figure are heavily restored (Fig. 135).

A cursory examination of part of the painting, in situ early in 1996, confirmed that details of the chariot's decorative mountings and the head of the lion (Pl. 14) were well preserved, while the bear may have been painted rather thinly; retouched wearing was evident in much of the children's hair. The heads – that of the amoretto above the chariot was only lightly touched by the brush leaving visible large areas of priming or imprimatura – seemed quite well preserved.

The light comes from above.

The Canvas was painted under Rubens's direction probably after he had laid in the design and following his verbal instructions and his example, perhaps by Jan van den Hoecke, see pp. 75-78. Rubens may well have retouched his assistant's work quite extensively where he saw fit, notably in the mountings of the chariot, the hair of some of the protagonists, and the head of the lion. The festoon of fruit may have been the work of yet another specialist collaborator.

As the Canvas as delivered was too 'high' or wide, see p. 87, it had to be cut down for installation, with the result that the procession as devised by Rubens was probably quite drastically altered. It was evidently decided that the reduction should be made at the top of the Canvas. The chief casualty of this operation was the child hovering above the bear, who was originally designed to hold the binding ribbon(s) at the end of the festoon (Figs. 141 and 145). This is suggested by: 1) the child's right arm was thinly painted over leaves of the festoon indicating that no reserve was left for it; 2) the leafy end of the festoon is far longer at the rear than at the front of the procession; 3) the amoretto above the chariot was made to hold the end of the festoon rather than reins attached to the yoke (indeed, while the chariot's pole, the yoke and girth – round the lion – are depicted, there is now no evidence of reins as part of the harness). Further, the child above the bear now hardly has a raison d'être and appears squashed between the festoon and the edge of the support. However, the handling of the festoon seems homogenous enough; cursory inspection in 1996 suggested that it was rather roughly executed. It may have been repainted when it was extended, or it may have suffered from repainting during one or more of the conservation campaigns.

It was also probably found at installation that there was a shortfall in the length of the Canvas, see Appendix, IX. No additions to the support were detected during the 1946/47-50 cleaning campaign, it is likely that the shortfall was made good by painting over the tacking edges at either end and then adding to them.

Taxonomy requires that each Procession (Nos. 10 and 11) be treated separately, although the Projects treated them as one, and Rubens designed them as iconographic and thematic pendants. The chief formal difference derives from his decision to depict in the fronts of the processions a festoon in one and a cornucopia in the other; because the latter was shorter, he was able to introduce a third animal ridden by a child, but in most other respects the two processions complement each other. The hindmost part of each is a chariot – of the Roman biga type – into which fruit is being poured. Both are drawn by beasts of different species, the most prominent of which – the lion and wolf – both have a raised forepaw.
The tradition on which Rubens in part depended when devising the two processions was that of 'putti charioteers' ('amoretti circenses') on Roman sarcophagi. In Procession I (No. 10), ideas that he had previously developed for infant bearers of festoons in the Munich Children with a Garland of Fruit and in the grouping on the left of the St. Petersburg Statue of Ceres decorated with Garlands of Fruit and Vegetables provided a general reference for the right-hand part of the composition as it came to be developed from a design that appears in the first bozzetto (Fig. 139) to have had Bacchic overtones. At about the same time that the artist was preparing for the cycle, he developed the theme of putti with festoons as a decorative motif in the Achilles series of tapestry designs.

Some individual motifs may have ultimately been inspired by the antique. The pose of the child lying on his back is an abbreviation of that of Bacchus (?) recumbent on a chariot drawn by lions in a decorative frieze from the circle of Amico Aspertini (?) in the Pinacoteca in Bologna; a satyr holds grapes behind the chariot and a child rides one of the lions in an arrangement that recalls Rubens's general plan for the group. Rubens and the painter of the Bologna picture may have relied on a similar or the same antique source for the pose, perhaps that of Endymion on the sarcophagus in the Casino of the Palazzo Rospigliosi, Rome (Fig. 43); such an hypothesis is strengthened by the even closer similarity of the pose in a preparatory modello (No. 10c; Fig. 141). The pose had already been used by Rubens (in reverse) as appropriate for the sleeping Cupid in an earlier Cupid and Psyche, a variant of which was later to be created for the picture of the same subject for the Torre de la Parada. The motif of a child riding a large, feline animal is also found in Classical sculpture. Rubens's idea could have been suggested by a carved relief on a Roman sarcophagus of an Indian Triumph of Bacchus, where a child riding a panther occurs in the bottom right.

Three poses have a Raphaelian source. The child holding the basket on the chariot may have been inspired by the child holding the cat in the print of a Frieze with the Triumph of Love after Raphael, from which Rubens may have borrowed other motifs, see below. The amoretti originally intended to hold reins above the chariot may derive from that in the print of Two Putti in a Chariot after Giulio Romano. The amoretti seen from the back holding the festoon may have been inspired by that on the right in the sky in Raphael's Triumph of Galatea.

The pose of the amoretto yoking the bear and lion (Fig. 135) is similar to that of the Victory, upper centre right, in the Wise Rule (No. 3; Fig. 55), while the amoretti originally intended to hold the binding ribbon of the festoon in the centre (Figs. 140 and 141) was probably transferred from a preparatory modello (No. 3b; Fig. 60) for that Canvas, see below. The attitude of the boy with the festoon on his shoulders, who looks backwards (Fig. 137), is very similar to that of the boy holding a palm in the upper centre of the Minerva and Mercury conducting the Duke of Buckingham to the Temple of Honour and Virtus (Fig. 19), which was already in London when Rubens arrived there in 1629. This formulation and two others in Procession I were later to be used by Theodoor van Thulden, whose source may rather have been one of the figural modelli, see below.

Rubens's earliest known ideas for both processions were sketched en grisaille in the Multiplé Bozzetto (No. 1; Fig. 46). The bozzetti (Nos. 10a and 11a; Figs. 139 and 155) show that Rubens had already settled on the main elements of the compositions. Whether they were prepared for by drafts on paper must remain an open question, but granted the novelty of the designs, this must be a distinct possibility, although none is recorded. The compositions were to be refined and amplified both iconographically and formally in subsequent compositional modelli. Extant are presumed copies of what were probably two sets of such modelli (Nos. 10b, 10c and 11b, 11c), the first of which was probably in colour, as was certainly the second. The designs recorded in the pendant copies, listed under Nos. 10b and 11b, are substantially authenticated by Lucas Vorsterman II's engraving of the prototype of No. 11b (Copy

285
[2]; Fig. 157). Whether, as was the case with this engraver when he was copying a lost modello for the Apotheosis (No. 4b, Copy; Fig. 81), he understood all of Rubens’s intentions, or whether the artist’s ideas were difficult to interpret chiefly because of unresolved pentimenti, seems unclear, but in the case of the amoretto beside the bear the copyist may have misinterpreted the sketch.

The presumed copy of the second compositional modello (No. 10c; Fig. 141) shows that in developing one of the motifs – the boy reclining on the chariot – Rubens enthusiastically extended the pose; another motif was also expanded by endowing the child on the lion with wings. Rubens thus lengthened the composition perhaps in response to new instructions concerning measurements and/or as a result of confusion over them, or as a result of his innate exuberance. The expansion was then revoked by a return to the configurations of the first compositional modello when the design was transferred to the Canvas. Perhaps by then the question of the length of the Canvas (but not its width) had been correctly settled in Rubens’s mind.

New measurements, which could have led Rubens temporarily to expand the design for Procession I, may have been conveyed from London after study there of the lost Overall Modello, No. 2 (and coincided with the likely transmission of new measurements for the central oval, see No. 4). However, the Overall Modello (No. 2) itself does not seem to have provoked requests for iconographic alterations in the present composition; and it is likely that no further preparatory work was undertaken after its execution. Alterations to the designs of both Processions were – it is assumed – improvised by Rubens as he prepared for the execution of the Canvases.

There is ample evidence of figural modelli, although, pace Burchard (see No. 10d; Fig. 145), not one that is autograph has survived. Records exist of two, combining two motifs on two supports (Nos. 10d and 10f; Figs. 145 and 147), comparable to that of King James I and the guard for the Union (No. 5f; Fig. 102), and Mercury and ‘Argus’, (No. 3g; Fig. 63), and of one figure treated singly (No. 10e; Fig. 146); while tertiary evidence points to the existence of yet another single child sketched out independently, see below. It can be imagined, too, that some of the figural modelli were more elaborate, like that for King James I, Minerva, and Fury (?) for the Wise Rule (No. 3f; Fig. 64). It is here proposed that records of most of the lost modelli may be found in a composition, see Derivative Works, pp. 304-306, depicting an aerial procession that combined the protagonists of both Nos. 10 and 11. This combined procession is meaninglessly assembled; but, as the composition is known in four versions, it evidently enjoyed some popularity.

Just over a century after the installation of the Canvases, Vertue described them as ‘friezes’, an appellation that has proved both influential and durable. It ignores, however, the effort made by Rubens to avoid the impression of the confined space that a frieze implies, rather the processions he devised were unruly. They are depicted moving up and down and in and out of the pictorial space; indeed, the child riding the tigress moves deep into fictive space, as did the amoretto, as originally intended, holding the binding ribbon of the festoon in Procession I.

Of course, the comparatively narrow ethereal fields through which the processions had to progress militated against the creation of a deep, spatial illusion. In the bozzetti, this had been indicated by the foreshortened views of the chariots. Only one of the chariots was depicted in what could be records of figural modelli, see under Derivative Works, below; the suggestion there is that the degree of foreshortening was reduced. The artist had nevertheless early, selectively introduced quite pronounced foreshortenings accentuated by the bellies of the lion, wolf, and tigress, the poses of the amoretto and boy, holding the festoon to the right of the bear, of the amoretto pulling the ram, and of Divine Love and the charioteer.

**Summary of the proposed sequence:**

No. 10a. Compositional bozzetto at the base of the Multiple Bozzetto (No. 1; Figs. 46 and 139), executed in position C (Fig. 52).
No. 10b. First compositional modello. Whereabouts unknown (recorded in a Copy, Fig. 140, and known from descriptions in early auction sale catalogues, but see succeeding work).

No. 10c. Second compositional modello. Whereabouts unknown (recorded in a Copy, Fig. 141, and known from descriptions in early auction sale catalogues, but see preceding work).

No. 10d. Figural modello for the child holding the festoon's binding ribbon and for the amoretto yoking the lion (executed on the same support). Whereabouts unknown (recorded in a Copy (Fig. 145) which was accepted by Burchard as autograph).

No. 10e. Figural modello for the amoretto seen from the back. Whereabouts unknown (recorded in a Copy, Fig. 146, and predicated by its use elsewhere).

No. 10f. Figural modello for the amoretto riding the lion and the child holding the front of the festoon. Whereabouts unknown (recorded in a Copy, Fig. 147).

No. 10g. Figural modello for the amoretto bearing the festoon on his back. Whereabouts unknown (predicated by its use elsewhere).

No. 10h. Figural modello for the amoretto holding the festoon beneath his stomach. Whereabouts unknown (predicated by its use elsewhere).

No. 2. Proposed treatment in the Overall Modello. Listed in the catalogue of King Charles I's collection of c. 1639. Not included in the catalogue of preparatory work that follows. Whereabouts unknown, presumed destroyed.

No. 10. The Canvas in the ceiling. The Banqueting Hall, Whitehall (Figs. 132 a and b).

1. Imperial measurements provided by the Ministry of Works in 1950: 7 ft. 10 in. x 39 ft. 6 in. [238.3 x 1203.9 cm.]. Those published in 1907 were: 7 ft. 11 in. x 39 ft. 7 in. [241 x 1206.5 cm.]; see p. 123, n. 101, and p. 126.

2. See the MS. condition report by W. Hampton at present in the English Heritage Studio Archive, Regents Park, London (typescript at Historic Royal Palaces, Hampton Court Palace, Surrey). As with the other canvases, nail holes were revealed round the edges, where the support had been nailed to the front of the stretcher, see further p. 123, under n. 101.

3. For such sarcophagi, see L. Vogel, 'Circus Race Scenes in the Early Roman Empire', The Art Bulletin, LI, 1969, pp. 159 ff. For sixteenth- and early seventeenth-century interest in one of these friezes, see H. Wrede and R. Harprath, [Cat. Exh.] Der Codex Coburgensis, Kunstsammlungen der Veste Coburg (Coburger Landesstiftung, Coburg, 1986), no. 134, fig. 67.


5. Ibid., p. 83.

6. See Haverkamp Begemann, Achilles (CRLB), 1975, passim.


9. Jaffe, Catalogo, 1989, no. 120.


13. Illustrated Bartsch, XXXI (formerly XV, part 4), no. 12 (421); the figures in the engraving face left. The print was known to Rubens: he had used it long before as the source for the frieze in the Louvre Hercules and Omphale of c. 1606; see McGrath, History CRLB, 1997, II, p. 62 and n. 18, pp. 63-64.

14. Granau, Raphael, 1909, p. 108. The fresco was engraved by Raimondi and Goltzius. See Illustrated Bartsch, XXVII (formerly XIV, part 2), pp. 47-48, nos. 350 (262); and Illustrated Bartsch, III (formerly III, part 1), p. 237, no. 270 (83). The connection is close so far as the lower part of the body is concerned; the top part was adjusted by Rubens so that the festoon could be held. A variant was earlier devised by Rubens to fly in the sky to the right of the Virgin in the Brussels Assumption of the Virgin; see K.d.K. ed. Oldenburg, 1921, p. 120.
15. Jaffé, Catalogo, 1989, no. 795; Martin, Buckingham, pp. 613-617, fig. 21 (where a different title is given); Martin, Cat. National Gallery, 1970, pp. 147 ff., under no. 187; Held, Sketches, 1980, I, pp. 391 ff., no. 291. The picture was destroyed in 1949, when in the collection of the Earl of Jersey, having hung for over two hundred years at Osterley Park, Middlesex.


17. For instance, they are thus described by Baumstark, Kriegsallegorien, 1974, p. 143, Jaffé in Jaffé, Catalogo, 1989, nos. 1025 and 1026, and Donovan, Whitehall, 1995, p. 163.

10a. Procession of Children, Bacchants and Amoretti with a Festoon and a Lion and a Bear drawing a Chariot; Bozzetto (Fig. 139)

Oil on ? oak support, see under No. 1.

Located at the base of the Multiple Bozzetto (No. 1; Fig. 46), in position C (Fig. 52).

For Provenance, Exhibitions, Literature, and commentary, see under No 1.

COPY: Drawing, combining the compositions of Nos. 10a and 11a, whereabouts unknown; chalk heightened with white, on ? paper, 300 x 555 mm. PROV. J. Noll, sale, Frankfurt, 7 October 1912, lot 183.

An aerial procession consisting of seven members is led by a child holding a festoon under his left arm, it curls round in front of his body; his right arm is held by a child who holds the festoon on his shoulders as he looks back at an infant Bacchant who also holds the festoon, the end of which is twisted round a thyrsus held in his other hand. Below is another infant Bacchant with a thyrsus, above is a large bird. They are followed by a child who holds a prod and pulls at a lion, one of whose front paws and head are raised. A bear runs along beside him. Behind leaning back against a chariot is a child who assists another onto it; this child holds a basket of fruit. Above the front of the procession, but not part of it, are two children holding a festoon: one is seen from behind and the other turns back to his companion.

Three cracks springing from the edge of the support and the two joins have been retouched to make good very small paint losses. The first (from the left) crack (retouched in a thin triangular form) runs up by the edge of the chariot’s wheel and ends level with the top of the child’s thigh; the lines indicating the lower left part of the wheel are not reliable. Next is a join, the opening of which has resulted in small, retouched paint loss; it runs up through the lion’s shoulders. The base of the support is here retouched as far as and slightly beyond an adjacent crack, also retouched, which runs up through the lion’s head and just into the oval field. Thus parts of the lion’s mane, right leg, and left paw are unreliable. Adjacent is a retouched join: this runs up through the right foot of the first Bacchant to carry the festoon, and beyond. This foot is clumsily retouched. There is a short retouched crack beneath the penultimate child holding the festoon; its feet are probably not reliable. Reduction of the support has meant that part of the head of the child at the front of the procession has been lost.

The sketch is executed in thin, brown oil wash, strengthened with black oil paint with some areas of heightening in white.

The bozzetto consisted of nine amoretti, infant Bacchants and children, of these three were later to be abandoned: the child pulling at the lion, and the infant Bacchant and child holding the two ends of the festoon; these last were to be replaced in modified form by the two children sketched in the register above. The infant Bacchant below was to be moved to hold the end of the festoon at the far right. The design is in sloping foreshortening as, for instance, the base of the chariot is depicted.

The presence of the two infant Bacchants in the centre, who hold thyrsi and support and accompany the festoon, indicates that Rubens intended an association with a triumph of Bacchus. This was later to be suppressed. For a further discussion for the scene enacted, the protagonists, and the composition and its constituent
parts, see Nos. 10-11, Iconography and under catalogue No. 10.

The pose of the child carrying the festoon on his back, connects with that in the centre of Minerva and Mercury conducting the Duke of Buckingham to the Temple of Honour and Virtus and may have been indirectly inspired by Michelangelo’s Ignudo above Jeremiah in the Sistine ceiling, and that of the child holding the basket on the chariot may have had as a source the child holding the cat in a print by the Master of the Die (Fig. 44). In the upper register, the putto seen from the back may derive from that on the right in the sky in Raphael’s Triumph of Galatea. Also influential from the Farnesina frescoes – but from the Sala di Psiche – in the depiction of the child between the lion and the bear may have been the putto between the lion and hippocampus; further, the birds shown there may have inspired that included by Rubens in this bozzetto and those in Procession II (No. 11), see below. Finally, the disposition of the amoretti in the centre, who holds the end of the festoon, seems to be a reversed conflation of the two angels at the upper right- and left-hand sides of the fresco of the Four Cardinal Virtues by Orazio Samacchini in San Abbondio, Cremona.

1. A reproduction from the sale catalogue is in the R.K.D. The copy commences with the Procession in No. 10a in the bottom left-hand corner, and includes the right-hand child in the second register; then follows, above, that in No. 11a.


3. Mistakenly described by Held, loc. cit., as ‘the royal escutcheon surmounted by a crown’.

4. C. de Tolnay, Michelangelo II. The Sistine Ceiling, Princeton, 1945, pl. 108; for the Buckingham allegory, see n. 15, under cat. No. 10 above.


6. Gronau, Raffael, 1909, p. 108. The fresco was engraved by Raimondi and Goltzius. See Illustrated Barisch, XXVII (formerly XIV, part 2), pp. 47-48, nos. 350 (262) and 351 (264) and Illustrated Barisch, III (formerly III, part 1), p. 237, no. 270 (83). The connection is close so far as the disposition of the lower part of the body is concerned; the top part of the body was adjusted by Rubens so that the amoretto could hold the festoon, rather than shoot an arrow. See also previous n. 14.

7. See F. Hermanin, La Farnesina, Bergamo, 1927, pl. XXVIII (top), and for the birds, pls. XXVI and XVIII.


10b. Procession of Children and Amoretti with a Festoon and a Lion and a Bear drawing a Chariot: Modella

Oil on ? wood support, measurements unknown.

Whereabouts unknown (recorded in a copy).

PROVENANCE: For a possible early provenance, see under No. 10c.

COPY: Painting (Fig. 140), whereabouts unknown; canvas, 12 x 41.3 cm. PROV. Anonymous sale, London (Sotheby’s), 30 June 1965, lot 58 (with its pendant, see under No. 11b, as by Watteau after Rubens and described as: ‘putti in a golden chariot pulled by lions; other putti on the right dancing with a garland of flowers’), bt. by Picard for £700.

An aerial procession consists of twelve children and amoretti, six of whom support a festoon while one hovers above. At the rear is a chariot pulled by a lion, ridden by a child, and a bear; in the chariot two children unload a cornucopia, a third holds a rein; only the head of the last child is visible in the left-hand corner.

For a discussion of the scene enacted, the protagonists, and the composition and its constituent parts, see Nos. 10-11, Iconography and under catalogue No. 10.

As the pendant of this copy, No. 11b (Fig. 156), agrees with the composition engraved in reverse by Lucas Vorsterman II (Fig. 157), it follows, or it can be assumed, that this too is as authentic a record of a compositional sketch, whether en grisaille, in the form of a bozzetto, or – as is more likely – coloured and more fully worked up, in the form of a modella.
The lost prototype marked a defining moment in the development of Rubens's ideas for the composition, even if some motifs remained unresolved. The explicit Bacchic references in the *bozzetto* (No. 10a; Fig. 139) were abandoned as the composition was expanded to twelve protagonists. The chariot and its occupants and the rider on the lion (who replaced the boy with a prod pulling the animal along) are in what was to prove to be nearly their final form. Not yet worked out to the artist's satisfaction and/or unclear to the copyist because of pentimenti are the roles of the newly devised *amoretto* next to the bear, who appears to hold the end of the festoon round his shoulders, and of the flying *amoretto* above, imported from a *modello* for the *Wise Rule* (No. 3b; Fig. 60), who appears to hold up the festoon's binding ribbon. Still to be refined was the pose of the adjacent *amoretto* and of the *amoretto* further to the right, whose pose was a development of the second child in the upper register in the *bozzetto* (No. 10a; Fig. 139). The festoon's binding ribbon was now held by the *amoretto* who had held the *thyrus* at the base of the latter.

The *amoretto* introduced above the chariot was probably inspired by that in the engraved *Two Putti in a Chariot* after Giulio Romano.1 The child lying on his back in the front of the chariot is similar in attitude to that of Bacchus (?) recumbent on a chariot drawn by lions in a panel from the circle of Amico Aspertini in the Pinacoteca in Bologna;2 a satyr holding grapes behind and a child riding one of the lions also recalls Rubens's general plan for this group. Rubens and the anonymous artist may have relied on a similar or the same antique source for the pose of the recumbent child, perhaps that of Endymion on the sarcophagus in the Casino of the Palazzo Rospigliosi, Rome (Fig. 43).3 Rubens also introduced the child riding the lion, who was probably inspired by the same antique friezes as the child riding a lioness in *Procession II* (No. 11).4 The pose of the festoon-carrying child who looks backwards was developed from that in the *bozzetto* by reference to a presumed, lost drawing or oil sketch for the genius holding the palm in the upper centre of

the *Minerva and Mercury conducting the Duke of Buckingham to the Temple of Honour and ‘Virtus’* (Fig. 19).5

1. *Illustrated Bartsch, XXXI* (formerly XV, part 4), no. 12 (421). The protagonists in the engraving face left. See further under n. 13 to cat. No. 10 above.


5. See n. 15, under cat. No. 10 above.

10c. *Procession of Children and Amoretto with a Festoon and a Lion and a Bear drawing a Chariot: Modello*

Oil on ? wood support, measurements unknown.

Whereabouts unknown (recorded in a copy).

**PROVENANCE** (this could also refer to Nos. 10b and 11b): Sergeant-Painter Robert Streeter or Streater, sale (+), London, 13-14 December 1711, lot 126 (with its pendant);1 probably owned by William Kent (1684-1748);2 his sale (+), London, 1748/49 (1st day), lot 60 (as ‘Two original sketches for the Banqueting House Rubens’), bt. for £3 5 sh. by Lady Burlington3 (presumably The Lady Dorothy, [†] 1758, the wife of the 3rd Earl);4 with its pendant, No. 11c, perhaps, but very improbably, to be identified with the two works, on panel, 26.5 x 66.5 cm., on the London art market, 1947.5

**COPY:** *Painting* (Fig. 141), whereabouts unknown; canvas, 23.5 x 90.2 cm. **PROV.** N. Beets, Amsterdam, 1948; private collection, Paris, 1956; anonymous sale, London (Christie’s), 11 December 1984, lot 48 (as attributed to Watteau after Sir Peter Paul Rubens), sold for £16,200; anonymous sale, London (Sotheby’s), 6 December 1989, lot 251 (as a follower of Watteau after
An aerial procession consists of twelve children and amoretti, of which five carry a festoon, the binding ribbon of which is held by a hovering child. Beneath an amorettō yokes a bear and lion, which are to pull a chariot for which a reserve was left. The lion is ridden by an amorettō, as a second pushes at him with his foot, a third above holds the reins, and two children empty the contents of a cornucopia.

Mathey in publishing the present copy (Fig. 141, and the copy listed under No. 11c, Fig. 158) described it first as after a sketch by Rubens, and, then, as after one of the panneaux (sic) of the ceiling. His attribution of both works to Watteau is not the concern of this entry, but his first view that one is a copy – and thus by extension both are copies – after lost modelli is probably correct. Indeed, the present composition does not follow exactly the design of the final Canvas (Figs. 132a and b) and it omits the chariot. All the poses of the children reappear in a work, known in several versions, see below, pp. 302-304, under Derivative Works, combining both processions, whose composition probably derived from the present modello and from an indeterminate number of separate, lost, figural modelli, executed in oil on panel.

For a discussion of the scene enacted, the protagonists, and the composition and its constituent parts, see Nos. 10-11, Iconography and under catalogue No. 10.

The purpose of this lost, second modello seems to have been to clarify certain motifs and ideas and perhaps to respond to new instructions over the dimensions of the opening in the ceiling and/or as a result of confusion over them. Specifically and clearly arrived at was the idea of a lion and a bear being yoked together by the amorettō beside the bear. This enabled Rubens to endow the flying child above with the sole task of holding the end of the festoon’s binding ribbon. Rubens also altered protagonists both in and around the chariot and bearing the festoon. Round the chariot he gave greater prominence to the child holding the base of the cornucopia and made the child holding its mouth hover close by. Then with reference to a Classical source, perhaps the Endymion on the sarcophagus in the Casino of the Palazzo Rospigliosi, Rome (Fig. 43),6 he elaborated the pose of the recumbent child, who now nonchalantly pushes at the lion with his foot. These amplifications were made presumably because Rubens understood that a greater length of canvas was required; in the event, a clarification must have been made and they were abandoned but for the child holding the base of the cornucopia. For the bearers of the festoon, Rubens adjusted the pose of the child towards the centre by reference to that in the second register of the bozzetto (No. 10a; Fig. 139), thus confirming his recourse to Raphael (as it derives from a putto on the right in the sky in the Triumph of Galatea).7 Also adjusted were poses of the child bearing the festoon on his back and that of the child holding the front of the festoon; the latter alteration gave added length to the composition.

1. Noted by Burchard Documentation, where recorded as ‘Catalogue of Pictures of the late Sergeant Streeters [sic?] collection [London] 13 & 14th December 1711 ... 126 Two Sketches of Boys, of Rubens that are painted in the Banqueting House in White Hall’, communicated to O. Millar, see Millar, Whitehall, 1956, p. 264, under n. 21, who referred to ‘Robert Streater’, [Editorial], The Burlington Magazine, LXXXIV, 1944, pp. 3 ff.; the
CATALOGUE NOS. 10c and d

relevant entry in the sale catalogue there transcribed, p. 11, as '126 Two sketches of Boys, in the Banqueting house Rubens'. The vendor's names were the same as his father's (1624-1679), who had been appointed Sergeant-Painter by Charles II in 1660 and was succeeded by his son, who died 'a prosperous gentleman' see M. Edmond, 'New Light on the lives of miniaturists and large-scale portrait-painters working in London etc.', The Walpole Society, XLVII, 1978-80, 1980, p. 187.


3. Burchard Documentation. See also Sale Catalogues of the Principal Collections of Pictures ... Sold by Auction in England within the Years 1711-1759, MS. in the Victoria and Albert Museum Library (photostat in the National Gallery Library), II, p. 49. Kent died on 12 April 1748, but the precise date of the sale of the pictures is not known.

4. Lady Burlington's husband, the Earl of Burlington, the architect and great collector, died in 1753; his sole heir was his daughter, Charlotte, Marchioness of Hartington, who died at the end of 1754. Her father's possessions were thus inherited by the Cavendish family; her widower became the 7th Duke of Devonshire in 1755. However, the two sketches are not recorded 'in any Ms. or printed sources for the Devonshire or Burlington collections (inventories etc.)' as Peter Day, Keeper of Collections, the Devonshire Collections, kindly informed the author in a letter of 6 July 1999. He concluded that 'Lady Burlington must have disposed of or bequeathed them elsewhere'.

5. See Van Puyvelde, Sketches, 1947, p. 39 under no. 11; these are probably to be identified with the pair of pictures (originally on one support) listed below under Derivative Works: (4).

6. See above under cat. No. 10.

7. See above under cat. No. 10.

PROVENANCE: Georges Rath (1828-1905), Budapest, whose collection was left to the Hungarian State by his widow in 1905/06; J.E. Webber et al., sale, Brussels (Fievez), 7-8 July 1926, lot 138 (with a probably incorrect provenance of Warneck, Paris, for which see p. 301); Jean Decoen, Brussels, 1928; anonymous sale, Brussels (Georges Giroux), 11 March 1929, lot 77.


Burchard accepted the Rath sketch; he did not believe it was identical with that later on the Brussels market, a view contradicted by a comparison of photographs or reproductions in the R.K.D. Held's doubts concerning the authenticity of the present work are surely correct, judging from the photograph in Burchard Documentation. It is probably a copy, and the only extant copy after a preparatory work (whose whereabouts is unknown) for the Processions that is on panel; it is here listed in the catalogue sequence out of deference to Burchard's view.

For a discussion of the scene enacted, the protagonists, and the composition and its constituent parts, see Nos. 10-11, Iconography and under catalogue No. 10.

The prototype was probably used on two further occasions in Rubens's studio: for a Nativity (private collection; Fig. 35), in which the flying amoretto recurs as the angel on the left holding the swaddling cloth (this work traditionally thought to be by Rubens has been attributed by Arnout Balis to Jan van den Hoecke, working in Rubens's studio); and for The Education of the Virgin in the Koninklijk Museum voor Schone Kunsten, Antwerp, by Rubens and/or his studio (Fig. 143), in which the draped angel holding the crown of roses on the right above the Virgin follows the pose of the amoretto yoking the bear and lion (the other angel in this picture also probably derives from a figural modello probably made in preparation for this Procession, see below).

Rubens's execution of figural modelli to prepare for the protagonists in the two Canvases should not be doubted, especially when the

10d. The Child holding the Ribbon of the Festoon, and the Amoretto yoking the Lion: Modello (Fig. 145)

Oil on wood support; 38 x 31 cm.

Whereabouts unknown.

The authenticity of the present work was accepted by Burchard, but is rejected by the present author.
great scale in which they were to be executed is borne in mind. Presumed copies are extant of two such modelli (Nos. 10d and 10e) and perhaps of a third (No. 10f). The existence of two others – whether on single or shared supports is not known – is predicated by reference to them in other works by Rubens and/or his studio, see also Derivative Works, pp. 302-304 below.

Their existence is also affirmed by Theodoor van Thulden’s borrowing of poses of six of the amoretti. He probably studied the modelli when from 1634-35 he was associated with Rubens, particularly in the production of etchings after the designs for the Pompa Introitus Ferdinandi.7 Van Thulden would not have been present while work was being carried out on the Can­vases as he only returned from Paris to Antwerp in 1634, when from probably early that year they had been rolled up and stored in Rubens’s house, see p. 82.

The original modello, No. 10d (or a copy of it), was known to Van Thulden, as the flying amorettto appears at the top of his altarpiece of the Risen Christ Appearing to the Virgin Mary (Paris, Louvre) and in the modello for it in Copenhagen.8 Apart from that listed in No. 10e, borrowings from four other figural modelli for Procession I are found in other paintings by Van Thulden: of the child holding the mouth of the cornucopia in the top-most amorettto in the Venus Adorning the Arms of Aeneas, painted in 1650 for the Huis ten Bosch;9 of the child recumbent in the chariot in the angel above St Francis in the St Francis Adoring the Holy Sacrament of 1640-45 in Brussels;10 of the boy supporting the festoon on his head in the allegory of Peace of 1655 at Vienna.11 His modello for this latter painting had what is perhaps a recollection of the amorettto with the festoon on his back in the putto above the Elec­tor.12 see No. 10g.

It is noteworthy that Van Thulden seems only to have borrowed from figural modelli for Procession I (No. 10), and that no copies of figural modelli for Procession II (No. 11) appear to be extant, other than those – presumed copies – in the Derivative Works, see below. Also the influence of such modelli in paintings by other artists seems not as yet apparent. The significance of this must remain hypothetical only.

The purpose of the modelli, presumed to have been executed and to have been the prototypes for the works listed below, see also Derivative Works, below, would have been the same as that of the other figural modelli executed in preparation for the fulfilment of the commission: that is, to rehearse the transfer of the design onto the Canvas, to act as an aide-mémoire for that purpose, and to guide an assistant during the execution of the paintings.

4. Balis, Studio Practices, 1994, pp. 116 and 126, n. 197. The face of the angel in the centre of the Nativity probably derives from a lost modello for that above the chariot in the same Procession; in the presumed copies of the lost modello for the Procession and in the Canvas, the figure looks sideways, whereas in the Nativity he looks straight ahead.
8. O. Koester, Flemish Paintings 1600-1800, Statens Museum for Kunst, Copenhagen, 2000, no. KMSsp.253, pp. 256 ff., pl. 164 and fig. 36 (for the Louvre picture).
9. A. Roy (as in n. 7), fig. 59; as kindly pointed out by Arnout Balis, who also pointed out that the same figure occurs in Van Thulden’s Allegory of the Youth of Frederick I at Potsdam.
10. Ibid., no. 51, p. 260.
11. Ibid., fig. 100, p. 252.
12. Ibid., no. 74, repr. p. 253.
10e. The *Amoretto* seen from the Back. *Modello*

Support and measurements unknown.

Whereabouts unknown (recorded in a copy).

**COPIES:** (1) **Drawing** (Fig. 146), Paris, Musée du Louvre, Département des Arts Graphiques, inv. no. 725; red chalk on paper, 160 x 150 mm. **PROV.** Pierre-Jean Mariette (1694-1774) (L. 1852). **LIT.** P. Mantz, ‘Rubens’ (douzième article), *Gazette des Beaux-Arts*, XXXI, 1885, pp. 129, 130-131, repr. (as from the collection of A. Ch. H. His de la Salle, no. 209 of the catalogue by Both de Tauzia); *Lugt, Cat. Louvre*, 1949, II, p. 46, no. 1176.


The lost *modello*, or a copy of it, was known to Theodoor van Thulden, who, as Burchard noted, used the pose for the *amoretto* in the top right of the *Triumph of Galatea* at Potsdam.¹

Van Thulden presumably saw the lost original, or a copy, when from 1634-35 he was associated with Rubens, particularly in the production of prints after Rubens’s designs for the *Pompa Introitus Ferdinandi.*² It may also have been known to Jacob Jordaeens, as a *putto* in a comparable pose appears in the sky of his *Cupid and Psyche* in the Prado.³

Rubens executed the presumed original figurial *modello* to rehearse the transfer of the design onto the Canvas, to act as an aide-mémoire for that purpose and for it to act as a guide for an assistant during the execution of the painting.

For a discussion of the scene enacted, the protagonists, and the composition and its constituent parts, see Nos. 10-11, *Iconography* and under catalogue No. 10.


2. See above, under No. 10d.

3. For the Jordaeens, see R. d’Hulst, N. de Poorter and M. Vandeven, [Cat. Exh.], *Jacob Jordaeens, 1593-1678*, (Koninklijk Museum voor Schone Kunsten, Antwerp), 1993, p. 227 and fig. 171 b, p. 224.

10f. The *Amoretto* riding the Lion and the Child holding the Front of the Festoon. *Modello*

Support and measurements unknown.

Whereabouts unknown (recorded in a copy).

**COPY:** **Drawing** (Fig. 147), Paris, Musée du Louvre, Département des Arts Graphiques, inv. no. R.F.20.425; red chalk, 295 x 209 mm.; inscribed: 1632 van dyck; collection mark Pierre Crozat (L. 2952). **PROV.** Pierre Crozat (1665-1740). **LIT.** Lugt, *Cat. Louvre*, 1949, II, p. 46, no. 1176A.

In the drawing (Copy; Fig. 147), the two protagonists are shown as they appear in the presumed copy of the second compositional *modello*, No. 10c (Fig. 141). The right-hand figure is a girl, whose head and hair have been left incomplete, where it was concealed by the head of the contiguous *amoretto* in No. 10c. When Rubens came to work on the Canvas (Figs. 132a and b), he reverted to some solutions proposed in the preceding *modello*, No. 10b (see Fig. 140). The status of this drawing is not clear as the incomplete head might be thought to rule out a connection with the larger-scale *Derivative Works* listed at the end of the sequence (where the whole of the head is depicted, see pp. 304-306 and Figs. 161-162). Nevertheless the drawing is included here as a copy of a lost figural *modello*; as has been pointed out under Nos. 3g/5g, disparate motifs were apparently haphazard by combined on a single support in a manner that Rubens seems uniquely to have adopted in the preparatory work in oils for the commission.
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Rubens executed the presumed original figural *modello* to rehearse the transfer of the design onto the Canvas, to act as an aide-mémoire for that purpose, and for it to act as a guide for an assistant during the execution of the painting.

For a discussion of the scene enacted, the protagonists, and the composition and its constituent parts, see Nos. 10-11, *Iconography* and under catalogue No. 10.

**10g. The Amoretto bearing the Festoon on his Back: *Modello***

Support and measurements unknown.

Whereabouts unknown (predicated from its use elsewhere).

The existence of a figural *modello* is to be inferred from the use of the pose for the left-hand angel in the *Education of the Virgin* by Rubens and/or his studio in the Museum voor Schone Kunsten, Antwerp (Fig. 143).1

Rubens executed the presumed original figural *modello* to rehearse the transfer of the design onto the Canvas, to act as an aide-mémoire for that purpose and for it to act as a guide for an assistant during the execution of the painting.

For a discussion of the scene enacted, the protagonists, and the composition and its constituent parts, see Nos. 10-11, *Iconography* and under catalogue No. 10.


**10h. The Amoretto holding the Festoon beneath his Stomach: *Modello***

Support and measurements unknown.

Whereabouts unknown (predicated from its use elsewhere).

The existence of a figural *modello* is to be inferred from the use of the pose (but for the raising of the right arm) in the *Garden of Love* – usually dated to about the time when Rubens was working on the Banqueting Hall commission – in the Museo del Prado, Madrid (Fig. 144), as Burchard observed.2

Rubens executed the presumed original figural *modello* to rehearse the transfer of the design onto the Canvas, to act as an aide-mémoire for that purpose, and for it to act as a guide for an assistant during the execution of the painting.

For a discussion of the scene enacted, the protagonist and the composition and its constituent parts, see Nos. 10-11, *Iconography* and under catalogue No. 10.

2. Burchard Documentation.

**11. Procession of Children and Amoretti with a Cornucopia, a Tigress, and a Wolf and Ram drawing a Chariot: Ceiling Painting**

(Pl. 3 bottom, and Figs. 148a and b, and Figs. 149-154)

Oil on canvas adhered to canvas laid down on a laminated wood support; 239 x 1204 cm.1

London, Whitehall, The Banqueting Hall in the Banqueting House, in the eastern compartment, flanking the central oval.

COPY: *Engraving by Simon Gribelin II* (Fig. 159; see Appendix VI).
EXHIBITED: The Orangery, Kensington Palace, London, December 1950, the central and northern sections after cleaning and restoration.


An aerial procession, consisting of eight members, is about to start and is starting off. It is led by two amoretti holding a cornucopia from whose mouth drops fruit, at which pecks a parrot; behind is a child riding a tigeress: there follow a child holding wheat and looking up at a swallow and a bird of prey, which are part of the procession. Beneath the latter is an amoreto holding a sheaf of wheat, who, as he starts to run forward, pulls the horn of a ram, which is ridden by the personification of Divine Love; the ram is beside a wolf, both are harnessed to a chariot driven by a child: he holds aloft a whip and still slack ribbons that serve as reins; the wolf paws the air as he turns waiting, while an amoreto empties fruit from a basket into the chariot.

The light comes from above.

The Canvas was painted under Rubens's direction, probably after he had laid in the design, and following his verbal instructions and his example, by an assistant, perhaps Jan van den Hoecke, see pp. 75-78. Rubens may well have retouched his assistant's work, quite extensively where he saw fit: notably in the mountings of the chariot, the hair of some of the protagonists, and the lion's head (forming the knob of the chariot pole); Burchard, for instance, observed that the master had reworked the ram's head (Fig. 152). It seems likely that a specialist collaborator executed the fruit and parrot (Fig. 149).

As with Procession I (No. 10), it is likely that the width of the Canvas had to be reduced at installation, however its length may have had then to be extended. The reduction seems to have been effected without doing violence to the composition, though perhaps lost is part of the bird of prey's wing. It seems likely that the shortfall was made up by using the tacking canvas on which the fluttering drapery and the wing of the amoreto at the rear of the procession were extended, perhaps by the anonymous assistant, probably from Rubens's studio, sent over to supervise the installation, see p. 88. Like in the case of Procession I, the general tradition to which Rubens turned is that of 'putti charioteers' (amoretti circenses') on Roman sarcophagi. In Procession II a more specific source may also have been the print — Frieze with the Triumph of Love — after Raphael by the Master of the Die (Fig. 44). This shows Divine Love in a chariot drawn by two goats; a child turns to
feed one of these as he walks before it; he is preceded by a lion which turns to growl at the spectator. Both these motifs are developed by Rubens in Procession II, where the prominence given to the tigress’s hindquarters recalls the threatening lioness’s beneath the Duke of Buckingham in Minerva and Mercury conducting the Duke of Buckingham to the Temple of Honour and ‘Virtus’ (Fig. 19), which was painted for the Duke and probably ready for despatch in September 1627. The motif of the child riding a tigress derives ultimately from the antique; Rubens’s source could have been a carved relief on a Roman sarcophagus depicting an Indian Triumph of Bacchus, where there occurs a child riding a panther at the bottom right. The pendant of the print – Frieze with the Triumph of Love – also after Raphael – shows a crowned child riding a goat, which perhaps inspired the idea of depicting Divine Love on the ram (Fig. 45). No particular source has been traced for the children bearing the cornucopia, the complementary motif to the children bearing a festoon, in Procession I; here they are given less prominence because the size of the cornucopia was finite unlike the festoon whose length could be and was extended at will (but not by Rubens).

Just as in Procession I, the main characteristics of this, its pendant, were already established in the bozzetto (No. 11a; Fig. 155) in the Multiple Bozzetto (No. 1; Fig. 46). It may well have been preceded by drawings, but none is recorded or is known to have been made. The composition was to be amplified both formally and iconographically in two subsequent compositional modelli (Nos. 11b and 11c; Figs. 156 and 158). There are fewer records of preparatory work for Procession II than for Procession I, for no independent copies of figural modelli are extant. Further in the derivative compositions, see Derivative Works, pp. 302-304; Figs. 161-162, which combined both processions, records of the preparatory work for Procession II were only given a subsidiary place in the upper left-hand register. There no reference seems to have been made to a compositional modello, and omitted altogether are the ram, wolf, chariot, parrot, and one child, which latter, however, may only have made a first appearance at a late stage, during the execution of the Canvas. Significant is the print by Lucas Vorsterman II (No. 11b, Copy 2; Fig. 157) that authenticates the record of the first compositional modello.

Having established the iconographic configuration of the procession in this modello by the introduction of Divine Love, seated on the ram, and the sheaf of wheat, Rubens reacted to new information concerning the dimensions of the Canvas in a way different to that in his preparations for Procession I. In the case of Procession II, he consistently expanded the motifs already deployed, and elaborated them further. He also probably introduced several new features so as to fill the extra space available, probably as he worked on the canvas. This late expansion of the composition would have been undertaken because Rubens realised that – for whatever reason – he had still failed to devise motifs of sufficient quantity or length to meet the requisite measurement of the Canvas.

Thus Rubens introduced the parrot and depicted more of the body of the amorretto holding the base of the cornucopia (Fig. 149). He changed the lioness into a tigress, raised her head and, returning to the bozzetto, reintroduced a twist to her tail (Fig. 148a). Behind the tigress, he introduced a child, half-length, holding wheat and looking upwards at the hawk (Fig. 151). The wolf was placed further back and the space thus created was filled by introducing the decorated knob of the chariot pole and Divine Love’s left leg (Fig. 152). The chariot was placed further away from the wolf so that the whole of the charioteer’s right leg could be depicted (Fig. 153). Finally, the amorretto emptying grapes into the chariot was embellished by fluttering drapery (Fig. 154), probably later to be further extended. Rubens was probably asked to change the lioness into a tigress following inspection of the Overall Modello in London to make it conform with Project A’s concept of ‘beasts of several natures’, see Appendix I.1, across the two processions, for otherwise the lioness would have seemed to ‘pair up’ with the lion in Procession I. Whether consciously or not, the pose of the child looking up (Fig. 151) – introduced at a
late stage behind the tigress – depends on the top half of the pose of the Infant Christ in Raphael’s Bridgewater Madonna.7

Summary of the proposed sequence:

No. 11a. Compositional bozzetto at the base of the Multiple Bozzetto (No. 1; Figs. 46 and 155), executed in position B (Fig. 51).

No. 11b. First compositional modello. Whereabouts unknown (recorded in two Copies, one a print, Figs. 156 and 157, and known from descriptions in early auction sale catalogues, but see succeeding work).

No. 11c. Second compositional modello. Whereabouts unknown (recorded in a Copy, Fig. 158, and known from descriptions in early auction sale catalogues, but see preceding work).

No. 2. Proposed treatment in the Overall Modello for the cycle. Listed in the catalogue of King Charles I’s collection of c. 1639. Not included in the catalogue of preparatory works that follows. Whereabouts unknown, presumed destroyed.

No. 11. The Canvas in the ceiling. The Banqueting Hall, Whitehall (Figs. 148a and b).

1. Imperial measurements provided by the Ministry of Works in 1950: 7 ft. 10 in. x 39 ft. 6 in. [238.3 x 1203.9 cm.]. Those published in 1907 were: 7 ft. 11 in. x 39 ft. 7 in. [241 x 1206.5 cm.]; see p. 123, n. 101, and p. 126.

2. See the MS. condition report by W. Hampton at present in the English Heritage Studio Archive, Regents Park, London (typescript at Historic Royal Palaces, Hampton Court Palace, Surrey). As with the other canvases, nail holes were revealed round the edges, where the support had been nailed to the front of the stretcher, see further p. 123, under n. 101.

3. See Burchard Documentation for a copy of Burchard’s letter to Christopher Norris, of 13 December 1950, in which he pointed this out; see p. 129.


5. Inffe, Catalogo, 1989, nos. 794-795; see also n. 15, under No. 10.


**11a. Procession of Children and Amoretti with a Cornucopia, a Lioness, and a Wolf and Ram drawing a Chariot: Bozzetto (Fig. 155)**

Oil on ? oak support, see under No. 1.

Located at the base of the Multiple Bozzetto (No. 1; Fig. 46), in position B (Fig. 51).

For Provenance, Exhibitions, Literature and commentary, see under No. 1.

**COPY: Drawing**, combining the compositions of Nos. 10a and 11a; see under No. 10a.

An aerial procession, consisting of six members, is headed by a child carrying a cornucopia on his shoulder; the base of the cornucopia is held under the arm of an amoretto flying above. He is followed by a child riding a lioness; behind runs an amoretto who turns to pull the horn of a ram. Beside him a wolf paws the air, both are harnessed to a chariot that is driven by an amoretto; his left arm is stretched out holding reins and his right rests on the rump of the wolf, while his left leg falls over the rim of the body of the chariot. Behind him, an amoretto tips the contents of a basket into the chariot; another child, beneath, waits with a basket (?) held above his head. Above the leader of the procession is another child carrying a basket on his right shoulder.

There are retouched losses over the join, which runs through the amoretto holding the ram’s horn. The face of this amoretto is lost, and the right side of his body, the left leg (but not the impasto), and left foot may not be reliable. The base of the support is retouched beneath the chariot; the top of the wheel and part of the chariot above it are not reliable. There are
retouchings over small losses in the *amoretto* with the basket on his head. These retouched losses continue above the design, into the oval. The reduction of both sides of the support has resulted in losses to the child at the right-hand edge, and to the child's head and the mouth of the cornucopia on the left.

The sketch was executed in thin brown oil wash, with some strengthening in black and heightening in white paint.

There are illegible *pentimenti* in the area of the rider and the lioness; some brushwork—particularly above and beneath this motif—perhaps relates to an earlier use of the support, see under No. 1.

The design is in sloping foreshortening, as, for instance, the base of the chariot is depicted. The lioness plunges down into the pictorial space. The procession consisted in six children or *amoretti*; that at the rear and in the second register were later to be abandoned.

For a discussion of the scene enacted, the protagonists, and the composition and its constituent parts, see Nos. 10-11, *Introduction* and under catalogue No. 11.

The main characteristics of the procession are already present in the *bozzetto*, although Rubens was subsequently to add to them. His sources of inspiration have been discussed above (see under No. 11); that the print after Raphael *Frieze with the Triumph of Love* (Fig. 44), which was perhaps to suggest to him the idea of introducing the personification of Divine Love seated on the ram, was also in his mind is suggested by the affinity between the child at the rear, rehearsed again in the upper register, and the child with the lamb on his back or the children with the birdcage in the same print. Rubens was to abandon the second child at the rear; this decision meant that when he subsequently had to expand the length of the procession, he had to introduce a child towards the middle to make it similar to the child second from the front in the *bozzetto* for Procession I (No. 10a; Fig. 139); the ultimate source for the pose may therefore be in common namely with Michelangelo's *Ignudo* above Jeremiah in the Sistine ceiling. The top half of the pose also seems to connect with that of the left-hand *putto* in Cherubino Alberti's print of 1576, *Festoons Held by Two Putti* after Polidoro da Caravaggio.

Rubens intended to show the procession getting under way, with the lioness already urged to walk behind the bearers of the cornucopia. The *amoretto* is starting to run and pull the ram, while the wolf, turning as the driver raises the reins, is about to start off after the grapes have been emptied into the chariot.


**11b. Procession of Children an Amoretto with a Cornucopia, a Lioness, and a Wolf and Ram drawing a Chariot. **

Oil on oak support (?), measurements unknown.

Whereabouts unknown (recorded in a copy and a print, listed under Copies).

**PROVENANCE:** For a possible early provenance, see under No. 10c.

**COPIES:**

1. Painting (Fig. 156), whereabouts unknown; canvas, 12 x 41.3 cm. Anonymous sale, London (Sotheby's), 30 June 1965, lot 58 (as 'a *putto* in a chariot drawn by a ram and a wolf, other *putti* to the left, one with a torch, another riding a lion', as by Watteau after Rubens and offered with its pendant No. 10b, Copy) bt. by Picard for £ 700.

2. Etching and engraving in reverse by Lucas Vorsterman II (Fig. 157); 96 x 385 mm. Inscribed, bottom left corner: *P.P. Rubens inue., in lower margin left: Lucas Vorstermanis junor fecit., and right: Franciscus vanden Wyngaerde excudit.* (1st state with the name of Rubens, before letters in lower margin; 2nd as above). LIT. V.S., p. 143, no. 62 (who incorrectly stated that
there was a second engraving by Vorsterman after Procession I); 2 H. Hymans, Histoire de la gravure dans l'école de Rubens, Brussels, 1879, p. 58, no. 118; Dutuit, Manuel, 1881-1885, p. 159, no. 14; Rooses, Oeuvre, 1886-92, IV, pp. 283, under nos. 765; Wurzbach, p. 818, no. 14; Van den Wijn- gaert, Preukunst, 1940, no. 763; Bodart, Incisione, 1977, p. 155, no. 335; Hollstein (Dutch and Flem­ish), XLII, no. 34.

An aerial procession is about to start and is starting off; it consists of seven children and amoretti, of which two at the front carry a cornu­copia. They are followed by a child riding a lioness, an amore­tto holding a sheaf of wheat, and the personification of Divine Love riding a ram which, with a wolf, is harnessed to a chariot; this is driven by a child and into it an amore­tto empties grapes from a basket.

For a discussion of the scene enacted, the protagonist, the composition and its constituent parts, see Nos. 10-11, Iconography and under catalogue No. 11.

Rubens definitively expanded the meaning attaching to the procession in this first modello by the introduction of the sheaf of wheat, probably at least partly allusive to the goddess Ceres, and of the personification of Divine Love, shown seated on the ram, for both of which, see above p. 281. He also extended and elaborated motifs already present in the bozzetto (No. 11a; Fig. 155): the contents of the cornucopia are visible; altered are the legs of the leading child, while more of his companion's body is shown; the rider of the lioness holds a prod and his mount's rear legs are stationary. The amore­tto pulling the ram holds a sheaf of wheat, his leg is shown in profile; the charioteer crouches as he holds the two reins attached to the necks of the ram and wolf. Finally, only one amore­tto is shown at the rear; he empties grapes from a basket into the chariot.

As the lioness's rear legs and ram's forelegs are depicted as stationary, it is clear that Rubens intended to show the procession at a slightly earlier stage of getting under way than in the bozzetto. The chariot is embellished with a carved swag and other decorative features.

1. For Lucas Vorsterman II, see under No. 4b. Frans van den Wyngaerde (1614-1674) was active in Antwerp as a printmaker.
2. Hans Vlieghe is thanked for searching in vain for this print.
3. Two lines on the hindquarters of the animal in Copy (2) might be suggestive of a tiger's stripes, but these should run vertically, and no stripes are evident in the painted copy above (Copy 1) or that of No. 11c.

11c. Procession of Children and Amoretti with a Cornucopia, a Lioness and a Wolf and Ram drawing a Chariot; Modello

Oil on oak support (?), measurements unknown.

Whereabouts unknown (recorded in a copy).

PROVENANCE: For a possible Provenance, see under No. 10c.

COPY: Painting (Fig. 158), Toronto, Art Gallery of Ontario, inv. no. 62/4; canvas, 21.5 x 78.7 cm.

PROV. Sir Frederick Cook Bt., Visconde de Monserrate (1844-1920), by descent to Sir Francis Cook Bt. and the Trustees of the Cook Collection, sale, London (Sotheby's), 25 June 1958, lot 116, bt. by the dealer Hans Calmann for £1100; with the dealer Colnaghi, London, 1961 (as by Watteau after Rubens). EXH. Brighton Art Gallery, 1957 (loan), see below. LIT. J.O. Kronig, A Catalogue of Paintings at Doughty House, Richmond...the Collection of Sir Frederick Cook Bt., II, Dutch & Flemish Schools, London, 1914, no. 342; Millar, Whitehall, 1956, p. 264 under n. 21; J. Mathey, Antoine Watteau, Peintures Réapparues, Paris, 1959, no. 84 (as by Watteau); F. Watson, [Review] 'J. Mathey, Antoine Watteau Peintures Réapparues', The Burlington Magazine, CIV, 1962, p. 126 (where the attribution to Watteau was accepted); Croft-Murray, Painting, 1962, p. 208, under no. 2 (where accepted as by Rubens and stated to have been exhibited at Brighton, 1957); E.C. Montagni, L'Opera Completa di Watteau, Milan, 1968, p. 127, under no. 8A (where the attribution to Watteau was rejected); Held, Sketches, 1980, I, p. 218 (as not by Rubens).
An aerial procession is about to start and is starting off; it consists of seven children and amoretti, of which two at the front carry a cornucopia. They are followed by a child riding a lioness, and an amorett holding a sheaf of wheat; behind is the personification of Divine Love on a ram, which with a wolf is harnessed to a chariot; this is driven by a child and into it an amorett empties a basket of grapes.

The manner of execution of this lightly coloured copy – in which sky and cloud are indicated, the bodies are skin coloured, while the animals and cornucopia are executed in brown paint, heightened with white – seems not as good as that of the presumed copy after the second modello for Procession I (No. 10c; Fig. 141). And although Mathey attributed both to Watteau, they are perhaps by different hands; that responsible for the copy after No. 10c being the more competent and closer to Rubens’s manner.

For a discussion of the scene enacted, the protagonists, and the composition and its constituent parts, see Nos. 10-11, Iconography and under catalogue No. 11.

The present, presumed copy shows that Rubens felt it necessary to alter nearly all the poses of the protagonists. The leading child’s contorted pose was abandoned in favour of a pose similar to that of the amoretti holding the escutcheon in the Union (No. 5; Fig. 88) and blowing the trumpet in the Apotheosis (No. 4; Fig. 73) Canvases. The child riding the lioness now prods downwards, with a bent right arm; the lioness walks away from the spectator, her backward-looking growl abandoned. The amorett pulling at the ram looks down at the spectator, while the head of the ram is no longer in profile. The personification of Divine Love sits more uprightly, with his left arm bent. The left arm of the charioteer is higher so the face can be in fuller view, and the right hand holding a whip is depicted. Finally, the basket of grapes is smaller.

1. According to Millar, Burchard regarded this as a ‘plausible sketch’, although it is categorised as a copy in Burchard Documentation.

? Related Works

(1): Painting, whereabouts unknown; medium and measurements unknown. PROV. Anonymous sale, London (Phillips), 3 May 1823, lot 100 (as ‘A finished sketch of Cupid, study for the ceiling of Whitehall Chapel’), sold (?) for £16 5sh. 6d.; anonymous sale, London (Stanley), 13 February 1824, lot 68 (described as above), sold for £7.1

(2): Painting, whereabouts unknown; panel, 35 x 27 cm. PROV. M. Warneck, Paris, by February 1885 (see below); estate of Madame Warneck, sale, Paris (Drouot), 10 May (1st day) 1905, lot 32 (as Rubens ‘Amours portant une guirlande de fruit ... fond de ciel’; according to the catalogue wrongly stated to be ex-de Beurnonville). LIT. P. Mantz, ‘Rubens’ (douzième article), Gazette de Beaux-Arts, XXXI, 1885, p. 130, where stated to differ from the compositions as engraved by Gribelin); Rooses, Oeuvre, 1886-92, III, p. 283, no. 764/765-1 (as ‘L’esquisse des deux frises appartient...à M. Warneck de Paris, elle diffère notablement de l’oeuvre’).

1. For sale references to the Related Works, Burton B. Frederiksen, editor of the Provenance Index, The Getty Art History Information Program, is thanked for his letter of 13 September 1993. W. Burger’s putative association of no. 588 of the Exhibition Art Treasures of the United Kingdom, Manchester 1857, in Trésors d’art exposés à Manchester en 1857, etc., Paris-London, 1857, p. 147, quoted by Rooses, Oeuvre, 1886-92, IV, p. 97, under no. 865, can be discounted. This copy recorded by H. Robels, Frans Snyders: Stilleben- und Tiermaler, 1579-1657, Cologne, 1989, p. 356, under no. 262, Buckinghamshire, Chequers, will be listed in vol. XII of the CRLB.
**Derivative Works**

A Chariot pulled by a Lion and a Bear with Children and *Amoretti*  
(from *Processions I and II*)

1. Painting (Fig. 161), Mexico, Tizapán, San Ángel, Museo Soumaya; canvas, 164.5 x 183 cm. PROV. Either George Byng, Member of Parliament for Middlesex for fifty-six years at his death in 1847 (he left Wrotham Park, Hertfordshire, England, to his brother, John who was created Earl of Strafford), or his nephew, George (1806-1886) also a Member of Parliament and inheritor of Wrotham and the earldom of Strafford, by 1845; thence by descent to Julian Byng Esq., Wrotham Park, his sale, London (Christie’s), 9 July 1993, lot 151. EXH. British Institution, London, 1845, no. 47 (as ‘Study for the ceiling at Whitehall Rubens’ lent by George Byng M.P.).

2. Painting, whereabouts unknown; canvas, 112 x 203 cm. PROV. High Legh Hall, near Knutsford, Cheshire, where said to have been admired by Sir Thomas Lawrence PRA (1769-1830); C.L.S. Cornwall-Legh, of High Legh Hall, Cheshire, sale, London (Sotheby’s), 21 May 1935, lot 32, bt. by Walton for £ 46; anonymous sale, London (Christie’s), 26 July 1946, lot 48, bt. by the dealer Dent for 480 gns.; the dealer Duits, London, 1947 (according to a MS. note on the Witt Library mount); the dealer P. de Boer, Amsterdam, 1950 (as by Jordens after Rubens).

3. Painting (Fig. 162), Gauno Castle, Copenhagen; canvas, 9 x 110 cm. PROV. The Counts Thott, Thott’s Palace (the Thott Palace) on the Kongens Nytorv, Copenhagen, perhaps from the time when the palace was owned by Ulrik Christian Gyldelev (1678-1719) – the bastard son of King Christian V of Denmark – and displayed first as a ceiling decoration then as an overdoor; by 1914 at Gauno Castle; by descent to the Executors of the late Baron Axel Reedtz-Thott, by whom offered at Christie’s, London, 2 July 1976, lot 40 (as by Watteau after Rubens), bt. in. EXH. The Kunstmuseum, Copenhagen, 1915; *Udstillingen af Belgisk Kunst*, Carlsberg Glyptotek, Copenhagen, 1931, no. 31; *Udvælget nederlandske Malerier*, Gaunø, 1966, p. 7 ill.; *Nederlænskt 1600-tals maleri*. Mästerverk från Gauno Slott, Lunds Konsthall, Lund, 1976, no. 44. LIT. K. Madsen and O. Andrup, *Fortegnelse over to hundrede af baroniet Gaunos malerier*, Copenhagen, 1914, pp. 41-42, no. 149 (as by Rubens); K. Madsen, ‘Et hidtil ukendt maleri af Rubens’, *Tilskueren Maanedsskrift*, Jan.-June 1915, pp. 18-31; K. Madsen, ‘Maleriasulitten paa Gaunø’, *Kunstmuseets Aarskrift*, 1917, p. 40 and rep. p. 41 (as by Rubens);* P. Lambotte, [Review] ‘Exhibition of Flemish & Belgian Art, Copenhagen’, *Apollo*, XIII, 1931, p. 381 (as by Rubens and showing ‘a delicious mastery of suppleness’).

4. Painting, whereabouts unknown; panel, 25.5 x 65.5 cm. (when first recorded already cut in half horizontally to form a pair). PROV. Probably Hugh Owen Esq., 1878 (see below); Frederick Cavendish Bentinck Esq., sale, London (Christie’s), 28 March 1947, lot 21 (2), bt. by the dealer Leger for 105 gns. (where – in modern parlance attributed to Rubens, identified as studies for the Banqueting Hall, and stated to have come from the collection of Sir William Abdy). EXH. Probably identical with the two pictures lent by Hugh Owen Esq. to *Exhibition of Works by the Old Masters*, Royal Academy, 1878, no. 255 (as ‘Rubens. Cupids floating in the air, one bestride an animal, others carrying fruit, panel, 10 x 25 (sic?) in. [25.4 x 63.5 cm.]), and no. 259 (as ‘Rubens. Cupids riding Clouds in a car filled with fruit and drawn by two lions which other Cupids bestride, panel, 10 x 25 (sic?) in. [25.4 x 63.5 cm.]). LIT. L. Van Puyvelde, *The Sketches of Rubens*, London, 1947, p. 39, under no. 11, with slightly different measurements; *Millar, Whitehall*, 1956, p. 264, under n. 21.

5. Painting, whereabouts unknown; medium and complete measurements unknown (c. 222 cm. wide). PROV. Charles-Alexandre de Calonne, Paris, see Thierry, op. cit. below, as ‘deux beaux Rubens...L’autre est une danse d’enfans grand sujet de sept pieds de largeur [229.39 cm.]’. Creditor of the Rt. Hon. Charles Alexander De Calonne, Skinner & Dyke [London], 23 ff. March 1795, 4th day, lot 54 (as ‘A Noble Study of Children, for the ceiling at Whitehall’), bt. by
The composition of paintings (1)-(4) begins with Procession I in the bottom left-hand corner and continues into the upper register on the right-hand side. Insufficient space was left available for Procession II, so it was only partially and fragmentarily recorded out of sequence. There are differences between them – for instance, whether the fruit is shown or not – while there were also varying attempts at making sense or improvements to detail – for instance in (1) the charioteer of Procession II holds the end of the festoon of Procession I. But all agree that the amorettino flying above the lion and the bear held at least one ribbon of the festoon.

The sequence followed depends on the same principle as that which inspired the drawn Copy after the first bozzetti (Nos. 10a and 11a), see above, a fact which may or may not be fortuitous. The principle probably depended on Rubens’s use of an upper register while executing the bozzetto of Procession I in the Multiple Bozzetto (No. 1; Fig. 46 and 139). At least paintings (1) and (3) could well be of the seventeenth century; indeed, painting (1) (Fig. 161), in the Museo Soumaya, could have been executed in Rubens’s studio. It thus may be claimed to be the prototype from which the others derive.

It might be suggested that this version may have been made with Rubens’s guidance as a spin-off, or to adopt Burchard’s phraseology, a ‘by-product’; whether such a concept has a valid application is discussed elsewhere, but in the case of the present composition it is hard to postulate Rubens’s direct involvement with anything so mistaken and incoherent, comparable in this respect to the present appearance of the Mercury and ‘Argus’ (Nos. 3g and 5g; Figs. 63 and 94). Of all the works connected with the Banqueting Hall commission, this group remains one of the most obdurate in defying a satisfactory explanation. Maybe the Soumaya version was no more than an assistant’s unauthorised exercise that obtained a spurious popularity (demonstrated by the other Copies).

The artist responsible had access probably to one of the second compositional modelli (No. 10c; Fig. 141) and to figural modelli. He may have relied chiefly on the former for the execution of the repeat of Procession I in the bottom register continuing into the right-hand half of the upper register, but most likely he turned to the figural modello at least for the flying amorettino holding the end of the festoon (see No. 10d; Fig. 145), the silhouette of the top half of whose body does not appear in the compositional modello (No. 10c, as recorded in the presumed copy, Fig. 141). That the anonymous artist studied the parallel compositional modello of Procession II (No. 11c; Fig. 158) seems improbable; there is no hint of its rhythmic flow as the protagonists are crammed into the left-hand half of the upper register. It is a moot point as to whether the existence of figural modelli may be thought to be established by the disorganised, disjointed appearance of the majority of the protagonists of Procession II in this area. The fact that there is no other apparent evidence that points to their existence has been judged sufficient not to warrant the award of a separate, block catalogue number for them.

Nevertheless, it would have been strange if Rubens altered his preparatory procedure in the case only of Procession II. And it can be argued that a record of them does exist, in the Derivative Works listed here. In what may have been the prototype – the Soumaya version (Fig. 161) – some of the presumed figural modelli have been crassly amplified: the personification of Divine Love is given flowers to hold, the charioteer holds the ribbon of the festoon, and the wheat carrying child pulls at the basket rather than the horn of the ram (which is absent). While Rubens may have anticipated in a figural modello the expansion to Divine Love by the inclusion of his left leg, the right leg of the charioteer and the lower part of the body of the amorettino carrying the cornucopia are not here represented.
DERIVATIVE WORKS

It is only possible to speculate as to which protagonists shared, and which were treated on independent, supports. But perhaps Divine Love and the amoretti with the cornucopia were sketched on one support in a configuration reminiscent of the Brussels modello of King James I, Minerva and Fury (?) for the Wise Rule (No. 3f; Fig. 64), while the wheat-holding child and basket-bearing amorettto also shared a support (thus enabling their misguided linkage), and the charioteer, lioness, and rider were treated independently. Perhaps nothing other than lack of space in the presumed prototype (painting [1]; Fig. 61) explains the absence of copies of the modelli for the chariot, ram, and wolf. However, as far as concerns the half-length child looking upwards and holding wheat (Fig. 151), for whom there is no record of a presumed figural modello (or trace in the compositional modelli), it seems likely that he was introduced to lengthen the composition, as work on the Canvas itself was being undertaken.

4. According to the entry in Christie’s sale catalogue, the attribution to Watteau was due to James Byam Shaw. It would be unlikely to gain general credence today: Arnout Balis, in discussions, suggested an attribution to Theodoor van Thulden.
5. The picture was probably temporarily displayed in the Kunstmuseum (now the Statens Museum for Kunst) following its cleaning by Mr Roenne, the Museum’s restorer, as Olaf Koester, Curator of Old Master Paintings and Sculpture at the Statens Museum for Kunst, has kindly indicated.
6. Madsen drew attention to recent restoration in the face of the genius with the yoke and of a circular hole bottom left.
7. Millar, Whitehall, 1956, p. 264, under n. 21, quoted Burchard as pointing out that these were originally on one support. This is confirmed by a photograph of a montage in Burchard Documentation.
8. If the measurement given by Thierry is to be believed, this painting was wider than the four other Derivative Works. It is listed here on the grounds that it seems likely that such a large support would only have been used to include the majority or all the figures; its appearance was probably similar to Nos. 1-4 above.
9. See manuscript note in the National Gallery copy of the sale catalogue by Viscount Ridley from whose descendants it was acquired.
10. As Arnout Balis – in discussions – believes.
11. See n. 36, p. 59.
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