SHAPING THE ROYAL IMAGE: GERRIT VAN HONTHORST AND THE STUART COURTS IN LONDON AND THE HAGUE, 1620-1649

by

Michele Lynn Frederick

A dissertation submitted to the Faculty of the University of Delaware in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in Art History

Summer 2019

© 2019 Michele Lynn Frederick
All Rights Reserved

SHAPING THE ROYAL IMAGE: GERRIT VAN HONTHORST AND THE STUART COURTS IN LONDON AND THE HAGUE, 1620-1649

by

Michele Lynn Frederick

Approved: _____

Lawrence Nees, Ph.D.
Chair of the Department of Art History

Approved: _____

John Pelesko, Ph.D.
Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences

Approved: _____

Douglas J. Doren, Ph.D.
Interim Vice Provost for Graduate and Professional Education and Dean of the Graduate College

I certify that I have read this dissertation and that in my opinion it meets the academic and professional standard required by the University as a dissertation for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

Signed: _____

H. Perry Chapman, Ph.D.
Professor in charge of dissertation

I certify that I have read this dissertation and that in my opinion it meets the academic and professional standard required by the University as a dissertation for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

Signed: _____

David M. Stone, Ph.D.
Member of dissertation committee

I certify that I have read this dissertation and that in my opinion it meets the academic and professional standard required by the University as a dissertation for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

Signed: _____

Monica Dominguez Torres, Ph.D.
Member of dissertation committee

I certify that I have read this dissertation and that in my opinion it meets the academic and professional standard required by the University as a dissertation for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

Signed: _____

Christopher D.M. Atkins, Ph.D.
Member of dissertation committee

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Many generous colleagues and friends have contributed to the successful completion of this dissertation. First and foremost, I thank my advisor, H. Perry Chapman, without whose enthusiasm, unerring support, and sharp editorial eye this project would never have taken shape. I also thank my dissertation committee, David M. Stone, Monica Dominguez Torres, and Christopher D.M. Atkins. I thank Dr. Atkins, especially, for the extensive support, many conversations, and help coming to this topic in the first place.

For support toward the completion of this project, I thank the Center for Advanced Study in the Visual Arts. To Dean Elizabeth Cropper, Associate Deans Peter Lukehart and Therese O'Malley, and all of the senior fellows, research associates, staff, and especially my fellow predoctoral fellows at CASVA, thank you for cultivating such a supportive and intellectually stimulating community as I worked to finish this dissertation. For their support in the conceptualization and execution of this research I would also like to thank the Art History Department at the University of Delaware and the Delaware Public Humanities Institute (DELPHI), part of the Center for Material Culture Studies, particularly Professors Sandy Isenstadt and Martin Brückner.

Numerous colleagues in the United States and abroad have facilitated my research for this dissertation; I have tried to thank each individually, but please forgive any unintentional omissions. At the National Gallery of Art: Arthur K. Wheelock, Jr., Melanie Gifford, Alexandra Libby, Gregory Jecmen, and Dina Anchin. At the Museum of Fine Arts, Boston: Ronni Baer, Mary Feenan, and Lydia Vagts. Anne Wollett at the J. Paul Getty Museum and Amy Walsh and Claudine Dixon at the Los Angeles County Museum of Art. Jon Seydl at the Worcester Art Museum and Besty J. Rosasco and Bart J.C. Devolder at the Princeton University Art Museum. At the Mauritshuis, The Hague: Quentin Buvelot, Ariane van Suchtelen, Charlotte Rulkens, and Josh Summer. Anna Klarenbeek at Paleis Het Loo. At the Rijksmuseum: Gwen Tauber and Gerrit Albertson. Liesbeth Helmus and Marjan van Zijtveld at the Centraal Museum, Utrecht. Francisca Vullers at the Koninklijke Verzamelingen and Ellis van der Krogt-Dullaart, Michiel Francken, and the rest of the staff of the RKD. At the University of Leiden: Nadine Akkerman and Marika Keblusek. At the University of Amsterdam: Frans Grijzenhout, Judith Noorman, and Eric Jan Sluijter. Edward Town at the Yale Center for British Art. Catharine MacLeod, Ruth Slaney, Alexandra Shapley, and the archives staff at the National Portrait Gallery, London. Rosanna de Sancha, Hazel Vidler, Niko Munz, and Isobel Muir at the Royal Collection Trust. At

Historic Royal Palaces: Matthew Storey and Brett Dolman. Bart Cornelis at the National Gallery London. At the UK National Trust: David Taylor and Laura Gangadeen, and Rebecca Fuller at Ashdown House. The staff of the National Archives, Kew and The British Library. To Nicholas Cranfield, a collector who shares my admiration for Honthorst, I am especially thankful. Thank you to Blaise Ducos at the Musée du Louvre and Cécile Tainturier at the Fondation Custodia-Collection Frits Lugt. Finally, thank you to many colleagues throughout Germany, who made an intensive research cycle there easy: Dagmar Hirschfelder (Kurpfälzisches Museum, Heidelberg), Petra Reichelt (Schloss Caputh, Potsdam), Anja Sevcik (Wallraf-Richartz Museum, Cologne), Alexandra Bauer (Stiftung Preußische Schlösser und Gärten Berlin-Brandenburg), Jan Nicolaisen and Luisa Senkowsky (Museum der bildenden Künste, Leipzig), Heinrich Becker (Suermondt-Ludwig-Museum, Aachen), Justus Lange (Museumlandschaft Hessen-Kassel), Katharina Walter (Historisches Museum, Hannover), Sandra Pisot (Hamburger Kunsthalle), Antje-Fee Köllermann (Landesmuseum, Hannover), Katja Kleinert (Gemäldegalerie Alte Meister, Berlin), and Bernd Ebert (Alte Pinakothek, Munich).

Finally, thank you to friends and family who have provided support, shoulders, and advice throughout this process: Meghan C. Doherty, Jason E. Cohen, Leah Sherman, Nicole Cook, Galina Olmsted, Liz Simmons, Caitlin Hutchison, Hannah Seagrave, Katelynn Hobbs, Rozemarijn Landsman, Marjolein Dieltiens, Jun Nakamura, Willemijn van Noord, Margarita Karasoulas, Ashley Dimmig, and Gabriella Johnson. To Jon Negron and Stephanie Gitto, for being wonderful friends and helpful AutoCAD operators. To my husband, Dave, thank you for always being there.

This dissertation is dedicated to my mother, Donna, who never got the chance to read it.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES ix
LIST OF FIGURES x
ABSTRACT xxxiv

Chapter

1 INTRODUCTION 1

Growing into Reputation 1
Structure 11
Honthorst's Critical Fortunes 16
Objects as Agents 29

FIGURES 35

2 GERRIT VAN HONTHORST COURTS NEW PATRONS 44

Introduction 44
Honthorst's Color and Light in Courtly Taste 54

Color 54
Light and Shade 59
A Change of Taste 66

Honthorst's Working Practice 73

The Studio 73
1622 79
1623 93
1624 104
1625 109
1626 118
1627 122

Conclusion: Looking Across the Channel 127

Rubens and Buckingham 127
Elizabeth Stuart and Frederick V 129
Michel le Blon 131
Entrance Granted 135

FIGURES 138

3 CHARLES I, HONTHORST, AND THE POLITICS OF DISPLAY 237

Introduction: "An excellent piece of paint" 237
PART I: James, Henry, Charles, and the Transformation of Stuart Collecting 247

Virtuous Collecting and the Distinction of the Royal Portrait 247
James and Henry 256
Charles I: Heir (not so) Apparent 276
John and Thomas Smith 283

PART II: Gerrit van Honthorst and Stuart London 302

King Charles I 309
Apollo and Diana 321
Buckingham Group Portrait 339

Conclusion 349

FIGURES 355

4 BOHEMIA DISPLACED: ELIZABETH STUART, SELF-PROMOTION, AND THE ART OF DIPLOMACY 414

Introduction 414
PART I: The Queen of Hearts: From London to Prague Castle to Kneuterdijk 421

A Royal Wedding 422
Propaganda 438
Keeping Court in The Hague 444
The Strategic Diplomacy of *Seladon and Astraea* 451

PART II: The Visual Program of Rhenen Palace 468

Vestibule 474
Elizabeth's Privy Chambers 515
Frederick's Cabinet 532
Dining Hall 540

Conclusion: The Queen of Hearts Returns to England 545

FIGURES 550

5 CODA: HONTHORST, RUBENS, AND VAN DYCK 645

Introduction: Trimming the Shadow 645
London 657
The Hague 664
Conclusion 675

FIGURES 677

REFERENCES 707

Appendix

A HOUSE OF STUART FAMILY TREE 780
B SEVENTEENTH- AND EIGHTEENTH-CENTURY BIOGRAPHIES OF HONTHORST 782
C LETTER FROM HONTHORST TO DUDLEY CARLETON 790
D USE OF GROUNDS IN PAINTINGS BY HONTHORST AS EXAMINED BY AUTHOR, DIVIDED BY TYPE 792
E PAINTINGS BY HONTHORST IN THE BOHEMIAN COLLECTIONS, THE HAGUE 795

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1 PAINTINGS BY HONTHORST IN THE BOHEMIAN COLLECTIONS, THE HAGUE..... 795

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1. 1 Abraham Bloemaert, *Apollo and Diana Punishing Niobe by Killing her Children*, 1591. Oil on canvas, 203 x 250 cm. Copenhagen, Statens Museum for Kunst..... 35

Figure 1. 2 Abraham Bloemaert, *The Preaching of Saint John the Baptist*, 1590-1610. Oil on canvas, 139 x 188 cm. Amsterdam, Rijksmuseum (SK-A-3746). 36

Figure 1. 3 Gerrit van Honthorst, after Caravaggio, *Crucifixion of Saint Peter,* 1616. Oslo, Nasjonalmuseet..... 37

Figure 1. 4 Michelangelo Merisi da Caravaggio, *The Crucifixion of Saint Peter,* 1601. Oil on canvas, 230 x 175 cm. Rome, Cerasi Chapel, Santa Maria del Popolo..... 38

Figure 1. 5 Gerrit van Honthorst, *Susanna and the Elders*, 1655. Oil on canvas, 157 x 213 cm. Rome, Borghese Gallery. 39

Figure 1. 6 Gerrit van Honthorst, *Madonna and Child with Saints Francis of Assisi and Bonaventura and Princess Colonna-Gonzaga,* 1618. Oil on canvas, 370 x 233 cm. Albano, Church of the Capuchins. RKD Image no. 1001135536..... 40

Figure 1. 7 Frederik Bloemaert, after Abraham Bloemaert, *Frontispiece, Het Tekenboek,* 1650-56. Engraving, woodcut, color, 33.3 x 42.33 cm. London, British Museum (L,83.2). 41

Figure 1. 8 Francesco Albani, *Saint Catherine and the Hermit,* c. 1603. Oil on canvas, 138 x 121 cm. Sold Palais Dorotheum Vienna, Old Master Paintings, 6-17 October 2012, Lot no. 557. 42

Figure 1. 9 Peter Paul Rubens, *Presentation of Marie de' Medici's Portrait to Henry IV,* 1622-25. Oil on canvas, 394 x 295 cm. Paris, Musée du Louvre..... 43

Figure 2. 1 Gerrit van Honthorst, *The Adoration of the Shepherds*, 1622. Oil on canvas, 164 x 190 cm. Cologne, Wallraf-Richartz Museum (WRM 2122). 138

Figure 2. 2 Gerrit van Honthorst, *The Concert*, 1623. Oil on canvas, 123.5 x 205 cm. Washington, D.C., National Gallery of Art (2013.38.1)..... 139

Figure 2. 3 Gerrit van Honthorst, *Saint Sebastian*, about 1623. Oil on canvas, 101 x 117 cm. London, National Gallery (NG4503). 140

Figure 2. 4 Dirck van Baburen, *Saint Sebastian Tended by Irene*, ca. 1623-24. Oil on canvas, 108.8 x 153.5 cm. Hamburg, Kunsthalle (inv. 788)..... 141

Figure 2. 5 Jan van Bijlert, *Saint Sebastian Tended by Irene,* 1624. Oil on canvas, 113 x 100 cm. Rohrau, Schloss Rohrau, Graf Harrach'sche Familiensammlung. 142

Figure 2. 6 Hendrick ter Brugghen, *Saint Sebastian Tended by Irene,* 1625. Oil on canvas, 149 x 119.4 cm. Oberlin, Allen Memorial Art Museum (AMAM 1953.256). 143

Figure 2. 7 Gerrit van Honthorst, *Christ Before the High Priest,* about 1617. Oil on canvas, 272 x 183 cm. London, National Gallery (NG3679). 144

Figure 2. 8 Gerrit van Honthorst, *The Beheading of John the Baptist,* 1617/18. Oil on canvas, 345 x 215 cm. Rome, Chiesa di Santa Maria della Scala..... 145

Figure 2. 9 Gerrit van Honthorst, *St. Paul Caught up into the Third Heaven,*1618. Oil on canvas, 400 x 250 cm. Rome, Santa Maria della Vittoria..... 146

Figure 2. 10 Gerrit van Honthorst, *The Dentist*, 1622. Oil on canvas, 147 x 219 cm. Dresden, Gemäldegalerie Alte Meister (Gall 1251). 147

Figure 2. 11 Gerrit van Honthorst, *The Tooth Puller*, 1627. Oil on canvas, 137 x 200 cm. Paris, Musée du Louvre (RF 2852). Photo by author..... 148

Figure 2. 12 Gerrit van Honthorst, *Merry Company*, c. 1619-20. Oil on canvas, 144 x 212 cm. Florence, Galleria degli Uffizi. 149

Figure 2. 13 Gerrit van Honthorst, *St. Cecilia Playing the Organ*, ca. 1623. Oil on canvas, 89.5 x 116 cm. Kassel, Schloss Wilhelmshöhe, Gemäldegalerie Alte Meister (GK 182). Photo by author..... 150

Figure 2. 14 Gerrit van Honthorst, *The Merry Fiddler,* 1623. Oil on canvas, 107.2 x 88.3 cm. Amsterdam, Rijksmuseum (SK-A-180)..... 151

Figure 2. 15 Gerrit van Honthorst, *Steadfast Philosopher*, 1623. Oil on canvas, 151.5 x 207.5 cm. Vienna, Kunsthistorisches Museum, on loan from the Hohenbuchau Collection. 152

Figure 2. 16 Gerrit van Honthorst, *Satyr and Nymph*, 1623. Oil on canvas, 104 cm x 131 cm. Amsterdam, Rijksmuseum, On loan from the Broere Charitable Foundation (SK-C-1759). 153

Figure 2. 17 Gerrit van Honthorst, *Satyr and Nymph*, c. 1623. Oil on canvas. Kassel, Schloss Whilhelshöhe, Gemäldegalerie Alte Meister (damaged WWII). Photo by author. 154

Figure 2. 18 Gerrit van Honthorst, *The Liberation of Peter*, 1616-18. Oil on canvas, 131 x 181 cm. Berlin, Gemäldegalerie (ID No. 431). Photo © Staatliche Museen zu Berlin, photographer Jörg P. Anders. 155

Figure 2. 19 Hendrick ter Brugghen, *The Calling of Saint Matthew*, 1621. Oil on canvas, 162.6 x 129.2 cm. Utrecht, Centraal Museum (Inv. 5088). 156

Figure 2. 20 Michelangelo Merisi da Caravaggio, *Calling of Saint Matthew,* 1599-1600. Oil on canvas, 127.5 x 134 cm. Rome, San Luigi dei Francesi, Contarelli Chapel. (c) 2006, SCALA, Florence/ART RESOURCE, N.Y. 157

Figure 2. 21 Hendrick ter Brugghen, *Crucifixion with the Virgin and Saint John,* ca. 1624-25. Oil on canvas, 154.9 x 102.2 cm. New York, The Metropolitan Museum of Art (56.228). 158

Figure 2. 22 Raphael, *The Entombment,* 1507. Oil on panel, 184 x 176 cm. Rome, Galleria Borghese. 159

Figure 2. 23 Michelangelo Buonarroti, *Holy Family (known as the Doni Tondo),* 1505-06. Tempera grassa on panel, 120 cm d. Florence, Galleria degli Uffizi (Inv. 1890 no. 1456). 160

Figure 2. 24 Pierre de Rochefort, Illustration of the distribution of shadows on objects (The Bunch of Grapes). Engraving. From Roger de Piles, *Cours de peinture par principes* (1708) p. 382. 161

Figure 2. 25 Paulus Moreelse, *Shepherdess*, 1626. Oil on panel, 70 x 55.5 cm. Schloß Weißenstein, Pommersfelden. 162

Figure 2. 26 Lorenzo Lotto, *Saint Nicholas in Glory with Saints John the Baptist and Lucy,* 1527-29. Oil on canvas, 335 x 188 cm. Venice, Santa Maria dei Carmini. 163

Figure 2. 27 Abraham Bloemaert, *Theagenes and Chariclea in the Midst of the Murdered Pirates*, 1625. Oil on canvas, 95 x 118 cm. Potsdam, Schloss Sanssouci. 164

Figure 2. 28 Abraham Bloemaert, *Theagenes Receiving the Palm of Honour from Chariclea*, 1626. Oil on canvas, 157.2 x 157.7 cm. The Hague, Royal Picture Gallery Mauritshuis (Inv. no. 16). 165

Figure 2. 29 Rembrandt van Rijn, *Portrait of Amalia van Solms*, 1632. Oil on canvas, 69.5 x 54.5 cm. Paris, Musée Jacquemart-André (no. 172). 166

Figure 2. 30 Gerrit van Honthorst, *Portrait of Amalia van Solms*, after 1631. Oil on panel, 74 x 55 cm. The Hague, Dutch Royal Collections. 167

Figure 2. 31 Rembrandt van Rijn, *Simeon's Song of Praise*, 1631. Oil on panel, 60.9 x 47.9 cm. The Hague, Royal Picture Gallery Mauritshuis (Inv. no. 145). 168

Figure 2. 32 Gerrit van Honthorst, *Musical Group on a Balcony,* 1622. Oil on panel, 309.9 x 216.4 cm. Los Angeles, J. Paul Getty Museum (70.PB.34)..... 169

Figure 2. 33 Floorplan of 6 Domplein, Utrecht. Figure 8 from Jos A. L. de Meyere, *Nieuwe gegevens over Gerard van Honthorst's beschilderd plafond uit 1622* (Utrecht, 1976). 170

Figure 2. 34 Detail of Figure 2.32, showing signature. 171

Figure 2. 35 Orazio Gentileschi and Agostino Tassi, *Casino delle Muse*, 1611-12. Fresco. Rome, Palazzo Pallavicini Rospigliosi. 172

Figure 2. 36 Agostino Tassi, Giovanni Lanfranco, and Carlo Saraceni, *Salone dei Corazzieri,* 1616. Fresco. Rome, Palazzo del Quirinale. 173

Figure 2. 37 Paul Bril, *Loggia della Pergola,* 1610-12. Rome, Palazzo Pallavicini Rospigliosi..... 174

Figure 2. 38 Paul Bril, *Detail, Loggia della Pergola,* 1610-12. Rome, Palazzo Pallavicini Rospigliosi. 175

Figure 2. 39 Jacopo Bassano, *The Adoration of the Shepherds,* 1590-91. Oil on canvas, 421 x 219 cm. Venice, San Giorgio Maggiore. 176

Figure 2. 40 Gerrit van Honthorst, *Adoration of the Child*, circa 1620. Oil on canvas, 95.5 x 131 cm. Florence, Galleria degli Uffizi (739). Photo by author. 177

Figure 2. 41 Gerrit van Honthorst, *The Adoration of the Shepherds,* 1632. Oil on canvas, 121.9 x 99.1 cm. Toledo Museum of Art (1993.57). Photo by author..... 178

Figure 2. 42 Gerrit van Honthorst, *Merry Company*, 1622. Oil on canvas, 132.8 x 196.5 cm. Munich, Alte Pinakothek (inv. 1312).. 179

Figure 2. 43 Michelangelo Merisi da Caravaggio, *Lute Player*, 1595-96. Oil on canvas, 94 x 119 cm. St. Petersburg, The State Hermitage Museum (ГЭ-45). 180

Figure 2. 44 Hendrick ter Brugghen, *Fife Player,* 1621. Oil on canvas, 71.3 x 56 cm. Kassel, Schloss Wilhelmshöhe, Gemäldegalerie Alte Meister (GK 179). 181

Figure 2. 45 Hendrick ter Brugghen, *Recorder Player,* 1621. Oil on canvas. Kassel, Schloss Wilhelmshöhe, Gemäldegalerie Alte Meister..... 182

Figure 2. 46 Gerrit van Honthorst, *Smiling Young Man Squeezing Grapes,* 1622. Oil on panel, 83.3 x 66.7 cm. Worcester Art Museum (1968.15)..... 183

Figure 2. 47 Gerrit van Honthorst, *King David Playing the Harp,* 1622. Oil on canvas, 81 x 65 cm. Utrecht, Centraal Museum (8670)..... 184

Figure 2. 48 Gerrit van Honthorst, *Emperor Otho,* 1620-25. Oil on canvas, 68 x 53 cm. Potsdam, Schloss Caputh - Berlin, Stiftung Preussische Schlösser und Gärten Berlin-Brandenburg..... 185

Figure 2. 49 Robert van Voerst after Titian, *M. Sylvius Otho,* c. 1632. Engraving, 33.6 x 25.7 cm. London, British Museum (1874,0808.1936)..... 186

Figure 2. 50 Hendrick Ter Brugghen, *Claudius,* 1620. Oil on canvas. 69 x 25 cm. Potsdam, Schloss Caputh - Berlin, Stiftung Preussische Schlösser und Gärten Berlin-Brandenburg..... 187

Figure 2. 51 Dirck van Baburen, *Titus,* 1622. Oil on panel, 69.9 x 52.7 cm. Berlin, Stiftung Preussische Schlösser und Gärten Berlin-Brandenburg (SPSG GK I 1982). 188

Figure 2. 52 Peter Paul Rubens, *Julius Caesar,* 1619. Oil on canvas, 69 x 52 cm. Berlin, Stiftung Preussische Schlösser und Gärten Berlin-Brandenburg (SPSG GK I 972). 189

Figure 2. 53 Abraham Bloemaert, *Domitian,* c. 1625. Oil on canvas. Potsdam, Schloss Caputh - Berlin, Stiftung Preussische Schlösser und Gärten Berlin-Brandenburg (SPSG GK I 983)..... 190

Figure 2. 54 Detail of Figure 2.10, showing pickpocketing. Photo by author. 191

Figure 2. 55 Detail of Figure 2.10, slight raking light showing impasto. Photo by author..... 192

Figure 2. 56 Adriaen van de Venne, *A Game of Balloon*, c. 1626. Watercolor with bodycolor, over black chalk, heightened with silver and gold. London, British Museum (1978, 0624.42.18). 193

Figure 2. 57 Detail of Figure 2.2, showing gray mid-tones in shadows..... 194

Figure 2. 58 Detail of Figure 2.2, showing abutting of flesh tone and lute..... 195

Figure 2. 59 Detail of Figure 2.2, showing juxtaposition of light-over-dark and dark-over-light painting technique. 196

Figure 2. 60 Detail of Figure 2.2, showing dragging of paint strokes in feather..... 197

Figure 2. 61 Dutch or German, *Berkemeyer Glass with Four Rows of Punts,* ca. 1625-75. Clear, dark green glass, 17 x d 14.8 cm. Amsterdam, Rijksmuseum (BK-NM-4021). 198

Figure 2. 62 Gerrit van Honthorst, *Shepherdess Holding Two Plums,* c. 1622-23. Oil on canvas, 77.8 x 63.5 cm. Private collection, sold Woolley & Wallis, Salisbury, 9 November 2018, lot. 219. RKD image no. 1001459002. . 199

Figure 2. 63 Gerrit van Honthorst, *Laughing Violinist,* 1624. Oil on canvas, 81 x 64.2 cm. Private collection, Sold Sotheby's New York, 29-30 January 2009, Lot 31. 200

Figure 2. 64 Gerrit van Honthorst, *The Concert*, 1624. Oil on canvas, 168 x 178 cm. Paris, Musée du Louvre (inv. 1364)..... 201

Figure 2. 65 Gerrit van Honthorst, *Woman Tuning a Lute,* 1624. Oil on canvas, 83 x 67 cm. Paris, Musée du Louvre (Inv. 1368; on loan to Musée National du Château de Fontainebleau)..... 202

Figure 2. 66 Gerrit van Honthorst, *Woman Playing a Guitar,* 1624. Oil on canvas, 82 x 58 cm. Paris, Musée du Louvre (Inv. 1369)..... 203

Figure 2. 67 Detail of Figure 2.64, showing signature. Photo by author. 204

Figure 2. 68 Gerrit van Honthorst, *Lute Player,* 1624. Oil on canvas, 84 x 66.5 cm. St. Petersburg, The State Hermitage Museum (ГЭ-718)..... 205

Figure 2. 69 Installation of Figure 2.2, National Gallery of Art, Washington, D.C., July 2016. Photo by author..... 206

Figure 2. 70 Installation of Figure 2.64, Musée du Louvre, May 2018. Photo by author..... 207

Figure 2. 71 Installation of Figure 2.2, *Utrecht, Caravaggio, and Europe*, Centraal Museum, January 2019. Photo by author..... 208

Figure 2. 72 Gerrit van Honthorst, *Solon Before Croesus,* 1624. Oil on canvas, 168.5 x 214 cm. Hamburger, Kunsthalle (HK-772). Photo: Elke Walford © Hamburger Kunsthalle / bpk. 209

Figure 2. 73 Gerrit van Honthorst, *Granida and Daifilo*, 1625. Oil on canvas, 144 x 179 cm. Utrecht, Centraal Museum (5571)..... 210

Figure 2. 74 Detail of Figure 2.73, showing flower crown. Photo by author..... 211

Figure 2. 75 Detail of Figure 2.73, showing signature. Photo by author. 212

Figure 2. 76 Attributed to Jacob Matham after Hendrick Goltzius, *Corydon and Sylvia,* 1601/11. Engraving, 47.7 x 34.3 cm. Chicago, Art Institute (1972.430). 213

Figure 2. 77 Pieter Lastman, *Pastoral Scene (Granida and Daifilo?),* 1624. Oil on panel, 53 x 47 cm. Gdańsk, National Museum (MNG/SD/282/M). 214

Figure 2. 78 Bartholomeus van der Helst, *Anna du Pire as Granida,* 1660. Oil on canvas, 70 x 58.5 cm. Prague, National Gallery. 215

Figure 2. 79 Gerrit van Honthorst, *Smiling Girl, a Courtesan, Holding an Obscene Image,* 1625. Oil on canvas, 81.3 x 64.1 cm. Saint Louis Art Museum (63:1954). 216

Figure 2. 80 Detail of Figure 2.79, showing inscription..... 217

Figure 2. 81 Frontispiece from Crispijn de Passe the Younger, *Miroir des plus belles courtisanes de ce temps*, 1631..... 218

Figure 2. 82 Gerrit van Honthorst, *The Procuress*, 1625. Oil on panel, 71 x 105 cm. Utrecht, Centraal Museum (10786)..... 219

Figure 2. 83 Gerrit van Honthorst, *Shepherdess with Doves,* ca. 1625. Oil on canvas, 80.1 x 65.3 cm. Utrecht, Centraal Museum (6499)..... 220

Figure 2. 84 Gerrit van Honthorst, *Portrait of a Lady (Catherina Elizabeth von Hanau?) as a Shepherdess,* ca. 1628. Oil on canvas, 75.4 x 62 cm. Baltimore, The Walters Art Museum (37.2457). 221

Figure 2. 85 Gerrit van Honthorst, *The Violin Player,* 1626. Oil on canvas, 84.5 x 66.1 cm. The Hague, Royal Picture Gallery Mauritshuis (Inv. 1107). Photo by author..... 222

Figure 2. 86 Theodor Matham after Gerrit van Honthorst, inscription by Petrus Scriverius, *Woman (Phyllis) Playing a Violin,* 1626. Engraving. Hollstein XI, p. 253, no. 39..... 223

Figure 2. 87 Gerrit van Honthorst, *Merry Violinist,* 1624. Oil on canvas, 84 x 66.5 cm. St. Petersburg, The State Hermitage Museum (ГЭ-717). 224

Figure 2. 88 Theodor Matham after Gerrit van Honthorst, inscription by Petrus Scriverius, *Man Pointing to a Glass in his Left Hand,* 1627. Engraving, 21 x 15.9 cm. Amsterdam, Rijksmuseum (RP-P-BI-5571X)..... 225

Figure 2. 89 Gerrit van Honthorst, *A Young Woman Playing a Viola da Gamba,* c. 1626. Oil on canvas, 84 x 66.5 cm. Private collection, sols Christie's New York, 26 January 2001, "Important Old Master Paintings," Lot 178: The Property of Gayfryd and Saul Steinberg. 226

Figure 2. 90 Detail of Figure 2.79 showing brushwork in sleeve. 227

Figure 2. 91 Detail of Figure 4.69 showing brushwork in dress. Photo by author, mid treatment..... 228

Figure 2. 92 Detail of Figure 4.74 showing brushwork in dress. Photo by author.... 229

Figure 2. 93 Gerrit van Honthorst, *Diana and her Companions Resting after the Hunt*, ca. 1627-32. Oil on canvas, 97 x 160 cm. Private collection, exhibited TEFAF Maastricht 2005, dealer Johnny van Haeften, London. 230

Figure 2. 94 Gerrit van Honthorst, *Diana at the Hunt,* 1627. Oil on canvas, 190 x 132 cm. Formerly Berlin, Jagdschloss Grunewald, destroyed WWII. With inset: later 19th century copy showing probable coloring (RKD image number 1001171005). 231

Figure 2. 95 Gerrit van Honthorst, *Singing Shepherdesses,* 1629. Oil on panel, 113 x 95 cm. Leipzig, Museum der bildenden Künste (inv. no. 1616). Photo by author..... 232

Figure 2. 96 Gerrit van Honthorst, *A Shepherdess Adorned with Flowers,* 1627. Oil on canvas, 110.6 x 101.1 cm. Seattle Art Museum (61.156). 233

Figure 2. 97 Gerrit van Honthorst, *Allegory of Love,* 1624-c.1626. Oil on canvas, 129.3 x 114 cm. Sold Christie's London, Important Old Master Paintings from the Eric Albada Jelgersma Collection: Evening Sale, 6 December 2018, Lot 5. 234

Figure 2. 98 Michel Le Blon, *Crest,* 17th century. Engraving. Washington, D.C., National Gallery of Art (1943.3.9445)..... 235

Figure 2. 99 Michel Le Blon, *Two Knife Hilts,* 1597-ca. 1626. Etching, 9.1 x 6.5 cm. Amsterdam, Rijksmuseum (RP-P-1893-A-17851). 236

Figure 3. 1 Anthony van Dyck, *Charles* I, 1635-before June 1636. Oil on canvas. 84.44 x 99.4 cm. London, Royal Collection Trust (RCIN 404420)..... 355

Figure 3. 2 Gian Lorenzo Bernini, *Bust of Louis XIV of France,* 1665. Marble, 105 x 99 x 46 cm. Château de Versailles, on display in the Salon de Diane. . 356

Figure 3. 3 Gerrit van Honthorst, *King Charles I*, 1628. Oil on canvas, 76.2 x 64.1 cm (30 x 25.25 in). London, National Portrait Gallery (NPG 4444). ... 357

Figure 3. 4 Gerrit van Honthorst, *Apollo and Diana*, 1628. Oil on canvas, 357 x 640 cm. London, Royal Collection Trust (Hampton Court Palace, RCIN 405746). 358

Figure 3. 5 Installation of the exhibition "Charles I: King and Collector," at the Royal Academy of Arts, London, April 2018. Photo by author. 359

Figure 3. 6 Gerrit van Honthorst, *George Villiers, 1st Duke of Buckingham with his Family*, 1628. Oil on canvas, 132.5 x 192.8 cm. London, Royal Collection Trust (RCIN 406553). 360

Figure 3. 7 *The senses according to Avicenna*, c. 1310. Cambridge University Library, MS G.g.I.i, fol. 490V. 361

Figure 3. 8 William Hole after Isaac Oliver, *Henry, Prince of Wales, Practicing with the Pike*, 1612. London, British Museum. 362

Figure 3. 9 Robert Peake, *Henry Frederick, Prince of Wales, with Sir John Harington*, 1603. Oil on canvas, 201.9 x 147.3 cm. New York, Metropolitan Museum of Art (44.27)..... 363

Figure 3. 10 Illustration from George Gascoigne, *The Noble art of venerie or hunting* (Published London, Thomas Purfoot, 1611). 364

Figure 3. 11 *Collar of the Order of the Garter with the Great George*, one of a set believed to have been made for William Compton, 1st Earl of Northampton, 1628-29. Gold and enamel, 150 cm (l). London, British Museum (1980,0201.1, 2). 365

Figure 3. 12 *Lesser George of the Order of the Garter*, one of a set believed to have been made for William Compton, 1st Earl of Northampton, 1628-29. Gold, enamel, ruby, diamond, 8.4 x 3.7 cm. London, British Museum (1980,0201.3). 366

Figure 3. 13 Robert Peake, *Henry, Prince of Wales with Robert Devereux, 3rd Earl of Essex in the Hunting Field*, c. 1605. Oil on canvas, 190.5 x 165.1 cm. London, Royal Collection Trust (RCIN 404440). 367

Figure 3. 14 Crowned "CR" brand used to mark Charles I's paintings, raking light photograph on the reverse of *Anamorphic Portrait of King Edward VI*, attributed to William Scrots, 1546. Oil on panel, 42.5 x 160 cm. London, National Portrait Gallery (NPG 1299). 368

Figure 3. 15 Crowned "HP" brand used to mark Henry Frederick, Prince of Wales's paintings. Photograph of brand on reverse of *A Boy Looking through a Casement*, Unknown Flemish School, c. 1600-10. Oil on panel, 73.8 x 61.6 cm. London, Royal Collection Trust (RCIN 404972)..... 369

Figure 3. 16 Joos de Momper and Jan Breughel the Elder, *Landscape with Skaters*, 1615-25. Oil on panel, 58 x 84 cm. Madrid, Museo Nacional del Prado (PO1588). 370

Figure 3. 17 Joos de Momper and Jan Breughel the Elder, *A Farm*, seventeenth century. Oil on panel, 42 x 68 cm. Madrid, Museo Nacional del Prado (PO1590). 371

Figure 3. 18 Pietro Tacca, *Trotting Horse*, 1600. Bronze, 27.3 x 28.0 x 11.5 cm. London, Royal Collection Trust (RCIN 35467). 372

Figure 3. 19 Hyacinthe Rigaud, *Portrait of Louis XIV, King of France*, 1701. Oil on canvas, 277 x 194 cm. Paris, Musée du Louvre (INV. 7492). 373

Figure 3. 20 Title page for Thomas Middleton's *A game at Chess*, c. 1624. 374

Figure 3. 21 Titian, *Emperor Charles V with a Dog*, 1533. Oil on canvas, 194 x 112.7 cm. Madrid, Museo Nacional del Prado (P000409). 375

Figure 3. 22 Peter Paul Rubens, *Minerva Protects Pax from Mars ('Peace and War')*, 1629-30. Oil on canvas, 203.4 x 298 cm. London, National Gallery (NG46). 376

Figure 3. 23 Peter Paul Rubens, *Daniel in the Lion's Den*, c. 1614/16. Oil on canvas, 268 x 374.7 cm. Washington, D.C., National Gallery of Art (1965.13.1). 377

Figure 3. 24 Titian, *Jupiter and Antiope (Pardo Venus)*, 1535-40, reworked c. 1560. Oil on canvas, 196 x 385 cm. Paris, Musée du Louvre. 378

Figure 3. 25 Titian, *Rape of Europa,* 1562. Oil on canvas, 178 x 205 cm (70 1/16 x 80 11/16 in). Boston, Isabella Stewart Gardner Museum (P26eI). 379

Figure 3. 26 Titian, *Diana and Callisto*, 1556-9. Oil on canvas, 187 x 204.5 cm. London, National Gallery (NG6616). 380

Figure 3. 27 Titian, *Diana and Actaeon*, 1556-9. Oil on canvas, 184.5 x 202.2 cm. London, National Gallery (NG6611). 381

Figure 3. 28 Hans Holbein the Younger, *Sir Henry Guildford*, 1527. Black and colored chalks, pen and ink on paper, 38.2 x 29.4 cm. London, Royal Collection Trust (RCIN 912266). 382

Figure 3. 29 Raphael, *Saint George and the Dragon*, c. 1506. Oil on panel, 28.5 x 21.5 cm. Washington, D.C., National Gallery of Art (1937.1.26). 383

Figure 3. 30 Polaroid photograph of CR stamp on reverse of canvas, Figure 3.3, before relining 1983/4. Photo by author, March 2017. 384

Figure 3. 31 Copy after Gerrit van Honthorst (?), *Portrait of Charles I*. Oil on canvas, 46 x 40.5 cm. Current whereabouts unknown. Sold Sotheby's London, "Old Master and Early British Paintings," 30 October 2008, Lot 178. 385

Figure 3. 32 Thomas de Keyser, *Portrait of Constantijn Huygens and his (?) Clerk,* 1627. Oil on panel, 92.4 x 69.3 cm. London, National Gallery (NG212). 386

Figure 3. 33 Daniel Mytens, *Portrait of Charles I*, 1620s. Oil on canvas, 76.2 x 61.6 cm. New York, Private Collection. 387

Figure 3. 34 Anthony van Dyck, *Charles I and Henrietta Maria with their two eldest children, Prince Charles and Princess Mary (The Greate Peece),* April-August 1632. Oil on canvas, 303.8 x 256.5 cm. London, Royal Collection Trust (RCIN 405353). 388

Figure 3. 35 Jacques Callot, *La Noblesse: Le Guerrier au Chapeau Orné d'une Grande Plume*, c. 1625. Etching, 14.4 x 9.4 cm. Williamstown, MA, Sterling and Francine Clark Art Institute (1955.2025). 389

Figure 3. 36 Gerrit van Honthorst, *Frederick V as King of Bohemia*, 1634. Oil on canvas, 212 x 143 cm. Heidelberg, Kurpfälzisches Museum (L 156). . 390

Figure 3. 37 Paulus Moreelse, *Shepherd with Pan Pipes,* 1620s. Oil on panel, 73 x 57.8 cm. New York, Private Collection. 391

Figure 3. 38 Paulus Moreelse, *Shepherd with Flowers*, 1627. Oil on panel, 71.5 x 55 cm. Schwerin, Staatliches Museum. 392

Figure 3. 39 Detail of Figure 3.3. 393

Figure 3. 40 Detail of Figure 3.3. 394

Figure 3. 41 Detail of Figure 3.3. 395

Figure 3. 42 Gerrit van Honthorst, *King Charles I of England and his Wife Queen Henrietta Maria as Apollo and Diana*, c. 1628. Pen, dark grey wash, white chalk highlights, on a preliminary sketch in black chalk, on paper, 38.2 x 58.3 cm. Rotterdam, Museum Boijmans Van Beuningen..... 396

Figure 3. 43 Titian, *Ecce Homo*, 1543. Oil on canvas, 242 x 361 cm. Vienna, Kunsthistorisches Museum, Gemäldegalerie (GG73)..... 397

Figure 3. 44 Orazio Gentileschi, *Penitent Mary Magdalene*, c. 1622/28. Oil on canvas, 163 x 208 cm. Vienna, Kunsthistorisches Museum, Gemäldegalerie (GG179). 398

Figure 3. 45 Inigo Jones, *Banqueting House, Whitehall Palace, London, Western Façade*, 1622..... 399

Figure 3. 46 Southern wall showing throne and canopy reconstruction, Banqueting House Main Hall, Figure 3.46, probable original placement of Figure 3.4. Photo by author, February 2016..... 400

Figure 3. 47 Pierre Regnier, *Medal Commemorating the Marriage of Charles I and Henrietta Maria*, 1625. Silver, 24 mm (d). London, British Museum (M.7081)..... 401

Figure 3. 48 Raphael, *Christ's Charge to Peter*, Cartoon for Sistine Chapel Tapestries, 1515-16. London, Victoria and Albert Museum (on long-term loan from Royal Collection). 402

Figure 3. 49 Peter Paul Rubens, *Landscape with St. George and the Dragon*, 1630-35. Oil on canvas, 152.5 x 226.9 cm. London, Royal Collection Trust (RCIN 405356). 403

Figure 3. 50 Photograph of Figure 3.4 during a previous restoration campaign, mid-treatment. The Hague, Netherlands Institute for Art History (RKD). .. 404

Figure 3. 51 Jan de Bray, *Abraham Casteleyn and his Wife, Margarieta van Bancken*, 1663. Oil on canvas, 83 x 106.5 cm. Amsterdam, Rijksmuseum (SK-A-3280). 405

Figure 3. 52 After Gerrit van Honthorst, *The Duke of Buckingham and his Family*, after 1628. Oil on canvas, 145.4 x 198.1 cm. London, National Portrait Gallery (NPG 711). 406

Figure 3. 53 Anthony van Dyck, *Queen Henrietta Maria*, before August 1632(?). Oil on canvas, 109 x 86.2 cm. London, Royal Collection Trust (RCIN 404430). 407

Figure 3. 54 Robert van Voerst after Gerrit van Honthorst, *Princess Elizabeth, Queen of Bohemia and Electress Palatine*, early 17th century. Line engraving, 41.2 x 30.2 cm. London, National Portrait Gallery (NPG D26455). 408

Figure 3. 55 Daniel Mytens after Isaac Oliver, *Henry, Prince of Wales*, c. 1628. Oil on panel, 79 x 61.5 cm. Private collection. 409

Figure 3. 56 Raphael, *The Holy Family, or 'The Pearl'*, ca. 1518. Oil on panel, 147.4 x 116 cm. Madrid, Museo Nacional del Prado (P000301)..... 410

Figure 3. 57 Peter Paul Rubens, *Self-Portrait*, 1623. Oil on panel, 85.7 x 62.2 cm. London, Royal Collection Trust (RCIN 400156). 411

Figure 3. 58 Daniel Mytens, *Self-Portrait*, c. 1630. Oil on panel, 68.3 x 58.9 cm. London, Royal Collection Trust (RCIN 404431). 412

Figure 3. 59 Anthony van Dyck, *Self-Portrait*, 1635-41. Oil on canvas. Private collection, on long-term loan to the Rubenshuis, Antwerp. 413

Figure 4. 1 Robert Peake the Elder, *Princess Elizabeth (Elizabeth of Bohemia, 'The Winter Queen'), aged seven,* 1603. Oil on canvas, 135.9 x 95.2 cm. Greenwich, National Maritime Museum (BHC4237). 550

Figure 4. 2 Adam Willaerts, *Embarkation at Margate of the Elector Palatine and Princess Elizabeth,* 1623. Oil on canvas, 122 x 197.2 cm. London, Royal Collection Trust (RCIN 404994). 551

Figure 4. 3 Adam Willaerts, *The Arrival of Frederick and Elizabeth at Flushing, April 29, 1613,* 1623. Oil on canvas, 115.3 x 181.5 cm. Greenwich, National Maritime Museum (BHC4176). 552

Figure 4. 4 Jacques Fouquières, *View of Heidelberg Castle,* 1619. Heidelberg, Kurpfälzisches Museum. 553

Figure 4. 5 Salomon de Caus, *Elisabethentor (Elizabeth Gate),* 1615. Heidelberg Castle. 554

Figure 4. 6 Peter Snayers, *Battle of White Mountain, 8 November 1620.* 555

Figure 4. 7 Detail from *The consecrated, and thank God, still continuing Palatine Bohemian Lion, who began as a Winter-Lion and is becoming a Summer Lion,* 1620. Etching and letterpress, 15.7 x 23.1 cm (image only). London, British Museum (1880,0710.398). 556

Figure 4. 8 Detail from *A true Picture of the Winter King,* After September 1620. Oxford, Ashmolean Museum, Sutherland Collection, 169, folio 17. ... 557

Figure 4. 9 Bohemian Coat of Arms. 558

Figure 4. 10 *Europa Regina* in Sebastian Münster's *Cosmographia*, 1644 (originally published 1588). 559

Figure 4. 11 Detail from *The Palatine's Furlough,* 1621. Oxford, Ashmolean Museum, Sutherland Collection, 169, folio 12. 560

Figure 4. 12 Detail from *Secret Hints concerning the Presumptive King,* 1621. Oxford, Ashmolean Museum, Sutherland Collection, 169, folio 16. ... 561

Figure 4. 13 Adriaen van de Venne, *A Game of Billiards with Elizabeth Stuart, Amalia van Solms, and Frederik Hendrik,* c. 1620-1626. Watercolor,

bodycolor, black chalk, and gold on paper, 9.6 x 15.1 cm. London, British Museum (1978,0624.42.28). 562

Figure 4. 14 Jan Lievens, *Prince Charles Louis of the Palatinate with his Tutor Wolrad von Plessen in Historical Dress,* 1631. Oil on canvas, 104.5 x 97.5 cm (41 1/8 x 38 3/8 in.). Los Angeles, The J. Paul Getty Museum (71.PA.53). 563

Figure 4. 15 Workshop of Rembrandt van Rijn, *A Young Scholar and his Tutor,* About 1629-1630. Oil on canvas, 104.6 x 88.9 cm (41 3/16 x 35 in.). Los Angeles, The J. Paul Getty Museum (84.PA.570). 564

Figure 4. 16 Hans Coenraet Brechtel, *Goblet of the Winter Queen* (and case), 1641. Gilt silver, 79h x 29.1d cm. Leiden, Museum De Lakenhal (3192). 565

Figure 4. 17 Anthony van Dyck, *Charles I of England,* c. 1632/35. Oil on canvas, 123 x 96.5 cm. Dresden, Gemäldegalerie Alte Meister (Gall 1038)..... 566

Figure 4. 18 Gerrit van Honthorst, *Seladon and Astraea*, 1629. Oil on canvas, 304 x 480 cm. Formerly Castle Marienberg, Coll. Prince Ernst August von Hannover, current location unknown. 567

Figure 4. 19 Claude Deruet, *Portrait of Julie d'Angennes, Duchesse de Montausier, as Astrée,* 1630s. Strasbourg, Musée des Beaux-Arts. 568

Figure 4. 20 Anthony van Dyck, *Charles I with M. de St Antoine,* 1633. Oil on canvas, 370 x 270 cm. London, Royal Collection Trust (RCIN 405322)..... 569

Figure 4. 21 Aegidius Sadeler II after Titian, *Caesars,* Before 1629. Line engravings. London, Wellcome Collection. 570

Figure 4. 22 Workshop of Giulio Romano, *Two Emperors on Horseback*, c. 1536-39. Oil on panel, 86.9 x 49.5 cm (left) and 87.0 x 50.5 cm (right). London, Royal Collection Trust (RCIN 404729, 404730). 571

Figure 4. 23 Anthony van Dyck, *Lady Mary Villiers, later Duchess of Richmond and Lennox,* 1637(?). Oil on canvas, 186.7 x 137.2 cm. London, Royal Collection Trust (RCIN 404402). 572

Figure 4. 24 Anthony van Dyck, *George Villiers, 2nd Duke of Buckingham, and Lord Francis Villiers,* 1635. Oil on canvas, 137.2 x 127.7 cm. London, Royal Collection Trust (RCIN 404401). 573

Figure 4. 25 Jacopo Palma il giovane, *Prometheus Chained to the Caucasus,* c. 1570-1608. Oil on canvas, 184 x 160.6 cm. London, Royal Collection Trust (RCIN 406075)..... 574

Figure 4. 26 Titian, *Tityus,* ca. 1565. Oil on canvas, 253 x 217 cm. Madrid, Museo del Prado (P000427)..... 575

Figure 4. 27 Guido Reni, *Hercules on the Pyre,* 1617-19. Oil on canvas, 260 x 192 cm. Paris, Musée du Louvre (Inv. 538)..... 576

Figure 4. 28 Caravaggio, *Death of the Virgin,* 1605-06. Oil on canvas, 369 x 245 cm. Paris, Musée du Louvre (Inv. 54)..... 577

Figure 4. 29 Otto Heinrich von Bonn, *Front Façade, Royal Palace of Rhenen in the Dutch Province of Utrecht,* 1748. Reproduced from the original in the Staatsarchief, Hannover, in Samuel Muller, "Het Koningshuis te Renen," *Bulletin van den Nederlandschen Oudheidkundigen Bond* Year 4, series 2, no. 2 (1911): p. 67. 578

Figure 4. 30 Otto Heinrich von Bonn, *Rear Façade, Facing the Rhine, Royal Palace of Rhenen in the Province of Utrecht,* 1748. Reproduced from the original in the Staatsarchief, Hannover, in Samuel Muller, "Het Koningshuis te Renen," *Bulletin van den Nederlandschen Oudheidkundigen Bond* Year 4, series 2, no. 2 (1911): p. 68. 579

Figure 4. 31 Otto Heinrich von Bonn, *Floorplan, Royal Palace of Rhenen,* 1748. Reproduced from the original in the Staatsarchief, Hannover, in Johann Kretzschmar, "Das kurpfälzische Schloß zu Rhenen." In *Mitteilungen zur Geschichte des Heidelberger Schlosses*, vol. IV (1903): plate XV. 580

Figure 4. 32 Cornelis Cornelisz. van Haarlem, *Venus, Bacchus and Ceres,* 1614. Oil on canvas, 154 x 184 cm. Dresden, Gemäldegalerie Alte Meister (Gall 851). 581

Figure 4. 33 Hendrick Cornelisz. Vroom, *The Arrival of Frederick V of the Palatine and Elizabeth Stuart in Flushing on 29 April 1613,* 1623. Oil on canvas, 203 x 409 cm (225 x 431 cm including frame), Haarlem, Frans Hals Museum (os I-346). 582

Figure 4. 34 Adam Willaerts, *Embarkation of Frederick and Elizabeth at Margate, April 25, 1613,* 1623. Oil on canvas, 101 x 164 cm. Greenwich, National Maritime Museum, Caird Collection (BHC0266). 583

Figure 4. 35 Adam Willaerts, *The Arrival of Frederick V, Elector of the Palatinate, in Vlissingen on May 5, 1613*, 1623. Oil on canvas, 123.5 x 236.5 cm. Europe, private collection. 584

Figure 4. 36 Roelandt Savery, *Birds in a Landscape,* Current location unknown. As reproduced in Hoogsteder 1986, Deel III, fig. 198 from Sale Sotheby's London, *Important Old Master Paintings*, Dec. 03, 1969 (lot 41). 585

Figure 4. 37 Roelandt Savery, *Lions in a Landscape,* 1622. Oil on panel, 28.3 x 39.8 cm. London, Royal Collection Trust (RCIN 405627)..... 586

Figure 4. 38 Cornelis van Poelenburgh, *Seven Children of the King and Queen of Bohemia,* c. 1628. Oil on canvas, 39.3 x 66 cm. London, Royal Collection Trust (RCIN 403558). 587

Figure 4. 39 Cornelis van Poelenburgh, *Children of Frederick V and Elizabeth Stuart,* 1628. Oil on panel, 37.9 x 65.3 cm. Budapest, Szépművészeti Múzeum. 588

Figure 4. 40 Gerrit van Honthorst, *Adversities of Elizabeth Stuart,* 1635/36. Oil on canvas, 205.5 x 208.5 cm. Heidelberg, Kurpfälzisches Museum. 589

Figure 4. 41 Gerrit van Honthorst, *Triumph of Elizabeth Stuart,* 1636. Oil on canvas, 313 x 478 cm. Brookfield Arts Foundation (20090825.4), on long-term loan to the Museum of Fine Arts, Boston (Photo courtesy of the MFA Boston). 590

Figure 4. 42 Antonio del Pollaiuolo, *Hercules and the Hydra,* c. 1475. Tempera on panel, 17 x 12 cm. Florence, Galleria degli Uffizi (N Inv 828). 591

Figure 4. 43 Salomon de Caus, *Great Gallery of the Hortus Palatinus,* 1620. In De Caus, *Hortvs Palatinvs: A Friderico Rege Boemiae Electore Palatino*, plate 25. 592

Figure 4. 44 Detail of figure 4.43, showing metopes with scenes from the life of Hercules, with the slaying of the Hydra at center. 593

Figure 4. 45 Peter Paul Rubens, *Arch of Hercules,* 1634. Oil on canvas, 103 x 72 cm. St. Petersburg, State Hermitage Museum. 594

Figure 4. 46 *Hercules Killing the Hydra*, from the entry of Henri IV into Lyon. (Banach Plate 100). 595

Figure 4. 47 Obelisk with scenes from the life of Hercules, including the killing of the Hydra, from the entry of Henri IV into Rouen, 1596. (Banach Plate 102). 596

Figure 4. 48 Circle of Toussaint Dubreuil, *Portrait of Henry IV as Hercules Overcoming the Lernaean Hydra,* c. 1600. Oil on canvas, 91 x 74 cm. Paris, Musée du Louvre (R.F. 1997-13)..... 597

Figure 4. 49 Hans Herman after Hans Holbein the Younger, *Luther as Hercules Germanicus*, 1522. Woodcut. Zürich, Zentralbibliothek 598

Figure 4. 50 Gerard Hoet, *Allegory of the Reign of Emperor Leopold I,* c. 1690. Innsbruck, Porträtgalerie Schloss Ambras (26-01-05/19)..... 599

Figure 4. 51 Peter Paul Rubens, *The Perfect Reconciliation of the Queen and her Son after the Death of Constable Luynes (Medici Series XX),* 1622-25. Oil on canvas, 394 x 295 cm. Paris, Musée du Louvre (Inv 1788). Photograph by author..... 600

Figure 4. 52 Detail of signature, Figure 4.41. Photo by author. 601

Figure 4. 53 Details of figures under chariot, Figure 4.41. Photos by author. 602

Figure 4. 54 Gerrit van Honthorst, *Portrait of Elizabeth Stuart,* 1635. Private collection, formerly Hoogsteder & Hoogsteder, The Hague. 603

Figure 4. 55 Scaled version of Figure 4.31, with dimensions (m). 604

Figure 4. 56 Scaled Vestibule from Figure 4.31, with dimensions (m) for each wall. 605

Figure 4. 57 Peter Paul Rubens, *Hagar Leaves the House of Abraham,* 1615-17. Oil on panel, 62.8 x 76 cm. St. Petersburg, State Hermitage Museum (ГЭ-475). 606

Figure 4. 58 Peter Paul Rubens, *Venus and Adonis,* c. 1610. Oil on canvas, 276 x 183 cm. Düsseldorf, Museum Kunstpalast, on loan to Sammlung der Kunstakademie Düsseldorf (in. no. M 2300). 607

Figure 4. 59 Gerrit van Honthorst, *Elizabeth Stuart, Queen of Bohemia,* 1642. Oil on canvas, 205.1 x 130.8 cm. London, National Gallery (NG6362). 608

Figure 4. 60 Gerrit van Honthorst, *Portrait of Elizabeth Stuart,* c. 1642. Oil on panel, 74.3 x 62.5 cm. Hannover, Historisches Museum (VM 030095). 609

Figure 4. 61 Studio of Gerrit van Honthorst, *Portrait of Elizabeth Stuart,* c. 1642? Oil on panel, 74 x 59.5 cm. Apeldoorn, Paleis Het Loo. 610

Figure 4. 62 Gerrit van Honthorst, *Portrait of Elizabeth Stuart,* 1650. Oil on canvas, 72.4 x 59.1 cm (28 ½ x 23 ¼ in). National Trust Collections (NT 493054; Berkshire, Ashdown House). 611

Figure 4. 63 Gerrit van Honthorst, *Portrait of Princess Elizabeth of Bohemia,* 1642. Oil on panel, 73.5 x 58.4 cm. London, Private Collection, previously with Philip Mould, London. Photo by author..... 612

Figure 4. 64 Gerrit van Honthorst, *Princess Elizabeth of Bohemia,* 1636. Oil on panel, 75 x 60 cm. The Hague, Koninklijke Verzamelingen. Photo by author. 613

Figure 4. 65 Gerrit van Honthorst, *Princess Louise Hollandine of Bohemia,* 1636. Oil on panel, 74.5 x 60 cm. The Hague, Koninklijke Verzamelingen. Photo by author..... 614

Figure 4. 66 Gerrit van Honthorst, *Princess Henrietta Maria of Bohemia,* 1636. Oil on panel, 74.5 x 60 cm. The Hague, Koninklijke Verzamelingen. Photo by author..... 615

Figure 4. 67 Gerrit van Honthorst, *Princess Elizabeth of Bohemia,* c. 1636. Oil on panel. Heidelberg Castle. Photo by author..... 616

Figure 4. 68 Detail of lace collar, Figure 4.64. Photo by author. 617

Figure 4. 69 Gerrit van Honthorst, *Willem II and Mary Stuart,* 1647. Oil on canvas, 302 x 194.3 cm. Amsterdam, Rijksmuseum (SK-A-871)..... 618

Figure 4. 70 Gerrit van Honthorst, *Mary Stuart,* c. 1647. Oil on panel. Hannover, Landesmuseum (KM 254). Photo by author. 619

Figure 4. 71 Gerrit van Honthorst, *Portrait of Mary Stuart,* After 1647. Oil on panel, 73.7 x 59.1 cm (29 x 23 ¼ in). National Trust Collections (NT 493052; Berkshire, Ashdown House). 620

Figure 4. 72 Gerrit van Honthorst, *Portrait of Mary Stuart,* 1648. Oil on canvas, 218 x 143 cm. The Hague, Koninklijke Verzamelingen (SC/0041)..... 621

Figure 4. 73 Gerrit van Honthorst, *Portrait of Henriette Francisca of Hohenzollern,* 1649. Oil on canvas, 132.5 x 95 cm. Markiezenhof Museum, Bergen op Zoom. 622

Figure 4. 74 Gerrit van Honthorst, *Frederik Hendrik, Amalia van Solms, and their three youngest daughters,* about 1647. Oil on canvas, 267 x 353.5 cm. Amsterdam, Rijksmuseum (SK-A-874). 623

Figure 4. 75 Gerrit van Honthorst, *Friedrich Wilhelm, Elector of Brandenburg, with his wife Louisa Henriette,* 1647. Oil on canvas, 302 x 194.3 cm. Amsterdam, Rijksmuseum (SK-A-873). 624

Figure 4. 76 Anthony van Dyck, *Willem II and his bride Mary Stuart,* 1641. Oil on canvas, 182.5 x 142 cm. Amsterdam, Rijksmuseum (SK-A-102). 625

Figure 4. 77 Anthony van Dyck, *Amalia van Solms,* 1631-32. Oil on canvas, 105 x 91 cm. Madrid, Museo del Prado (P001483). 626

Figure 4. 78 Gerrit van Honthorst, *Willem II, Prince of Orange,* c. 1640. Oil on canvas, 218 x 215 cm. London, Royal Collection Trust (RCIN 404406). 627

Figure 4. 79 Anthony van Dyck, *Mary Stuart,* 1637. Oil on canvas. London, Historic Royal Palaces (Hampton Court)..... 628

Figure 4. 80 Anthony van Dyck, *Princess May, Daughter of Charles I,* about 1637. Oil on canvas, 132.1 x 106.3 cm. Boston, Museum of Fine Arts (61.391). 629

Figure 4. 81 Anthony van Dyck, *Portrait of Princess Mary Stuart*, 1641. Oil on canvas, 158.2 x 108.6 cm. Budapest, Museum of Fine Arts (acquired 2018). 630

Figure 4. 82 Willem Jacobsz. Delff after Michiel Jansz. van Miereveld, *Sophia Hedwig von Brunswijk-Wolfenbüttel,* 1631. Engraving and etching, 42.2 x 31.1 cm. Amsterdam, Rijksmuseum (NG-552-A). 631

Figure 4. 83 Michiel Jansz. van Miereveld, *Frances Coke, Viscountess Purbeck,* 1623. Oil on panel, 68.6 x 60.3 cm (27 x 23 ¾ in). National Trust Collections (NT 493069; Berkshire, Ashdown House)..... 632

Figure 4. 84 Gerrit van Honthorst, *Two Shepherdesses.* Oil on canvas, 109.22 x 88.9 cm. Current location unknown (last sold Christie's London, Dec. 13, 1985, Lot. No. 34). 633

Figure 4. 85 Gerrit van Honthorst, *Portrait of Amalia van Solms and Charlotte de la Trémouille as Diana and a Nymph,* 1633. Oil on canvas, ca. 120 x 167 cm. Apeldoorn, Paleis Het Loo. 634

Figure 4. 86 Gerrit van Honthorst, *The Four Eldest Children of the King and Queen of Bohemia,* 1631. Oil on canvas, 173.5 x 214.8 cm. London, Royal Collection Trust (RCIN 404971). 635

Figure 4. 87 Michiel Jansz. van Miereveld, *George Villiers, Duke of Buckingham,* 1625-6. Oil on panel, 69.5 x 57.5 cm. Adelaide, Art Gallery of South Australia (0.2115). 636

Figure 4. 88 Willem Jacobsz. Delff after Michiel Jansz. van Miereveld, *Ernst Casimir, Count of Nassau-Dietz,* 1628. Engraving and etching, 69.5 41.8 x 29.9 cm. Amsterdam, Rijksmuseum (NG-553-A). 637

Figure 4. 89 Michiel Jansz. van Miereveld, *Horace Vere, Baron Vere of Tilbury,* 1629. Oil on panel, 86.9 x 64.9 cm (34 ¼ x 25 ½ in). London, National Portrait Gallery (NPG 818). 638

Figure 4. 90 Michiel Jansz. van Miereveld, *Sir Horatio de Vere, Baron Vere of Tilbury,* 1629. Oil on panel, 68.6 x 57.1 cm (27 x 22 1/2 in). National Trust Collections (NT 493060; Berkshire, Ashdown House). 639

Figure 4. 91 Michiel Jansz. van Miereveld, *Edward Cecil, Viscount Wimbledon,* 1631. Oil on panel, 68 x 58.7 cm (26 7/8 x 23 1/8 in). London, National Portrait Gallery (NPG 4514). 640

Figure 4. 92 Willem Jacobsz. Delff after Michiel Jansz. van Miereveld, *Portrait of Gaspard de Coligny,* 1631. Etching and engraving, 41.4 x 29.2 cm. Amsterdam, Rijksmuseum (NG-595). 641

Figure 4. 93 Michiel Jansz. van Miereveld, *Portrait of Charles Morgan,* 1630. Oil on panel, 67.5 x 53 cm. Current location unknown (Sold from the Craven Collection Sotheby's, London, Nov. 27, 1968, lot no. 100; RKD image no. IB00070404). 642

Figure 4. 94 Michiel Jansz. van Miereveld, *Portrait of Willem Pijnssen van der Aa,* 1630. Oil on panel, 64 x 53.4 cm. Delft, Museum Prinsenhof (NK1837) Loan Cultural Heritage Agency of the Netherlands. Photographer: Fotostudio Frans van Loon..... 643

Figure 4. 95 Gerrit van Honthorst, *Portrait of Elizabeth Stuart,* 1631. Oil on canvas, 212 x 143 cm. Heidelberg, Kurpfälzisches Museum. 644

Figure 5. 1 Paulus Pontius after Anthony van Dyck, *Portrait of the Painter Gerard van Honthorst*, 17th century. Engraving, 23.8 x 17.1 cm. Fine Arts Museums of San Francisco (1990.1.407). 677

Figure 5. 2 Peter Paul Rubens, *Prometheus Bound*, begun c. 1611-12, completed by 1618. Oil on canvas, 242.6 x 209.6 cm. Philadelphia Museum of Art (W1950-3-1). 678

Figure 5. 3 Peter Paul Rubens and Studio, *The Devotion of Artemisia,* ca. 1615-16. Oil on panel, 98 x 105 cm. (originally c. 119 x 145 cm.). Potsdam, Schloss Sanssousci - Berlin, Stiftung Preussische Schlösser und Gärten Berlin-Brandenburg (GK I 7596). 679

Figure 5. 4 Peter Paul Rubens, *Equestrian Portrait of the Duke of Buckingham*, 1625-27. Oil on canvas, 307 x 337 cm. Oxford, Collection Earl of Jersey Osterly Park (destroyed by fire 1949). RKD Image no. 1001196764. . 680

Figure 5. 5 Peter Paul Rubens, *The Apotheosis of the Duke of Buckingham*, after 1625. Oil on canvas, 541 x 498 cm. Oxford, Collection Earl of Jersey Osterly Park (destroyed by fire 1949). 681

Figure 5. 6 Anthony van Dyck, *The Continence of Scipio*, 1621. Oil on canvas, 183 x 232.5 cm. Oxford, Christ Church Picture Gallery (JBS 245). 682

Figure 5. 7 Daniel Mytens, *Portrait of Philip Herbert, later 4th Earl of Pembroke*, c. 1625. Oil on canvas, 132 x 102 cm. Collection The Marquess of Salisbury. 683

Figure 5. 8 Anthony van Dyck, *Thomas Howard, 2nd Earl of Arundel,* 1620-21. Oil on canvas, 102.6 x 79.7 cm. Los Angeles, The J. Paul Getty Museum (86.PA.532). 684

Figure 5. 9 Gerrit van Honthorst, *Allegory of Painting,* 1648. Oil on panel, 138 x 113 cm. Sacramento, Crocker Art Museum. 685

Figure 5. 10 Pieter de Jode II after Gerrit van Honthorst, *Gerrit van Honthorst,* 17th century. Etching and/or engraving, 16.8 x 11.5 cm. Fine Arts Museums of San Francisco (1990.1.277). 686

Figure 5. 11 Hendrik Jacobus Scholten, *Gerard van Honthorst Shows Amalia van Solms the Drawings of his Pupil Louise van Bohemen,* 1854. Oil on panel, 48 x 39.5 cm. Amsterdam, Rijksmuseum (SK-A-1830). 687

Figure 5. 12 Louise Hollandine, Princess Palatine (attr.), *Self-Portrait Holding a Mahlstick,* c. 1650. Oil on panel, 74.5 x 59 cm. Sold Sotheby's London, "Ashdown House: The Winter Queen and the Earl of Craven," 27 October 2010, lot no. 33. 688

Figure 5. 13 Cesar van Everdingen, *Girl in a Large Hat,* c. 1645-1650. Oil on canvas, 92.2 x 81.7 cm. Amsterdam, Rijksmuseum (SK-A-5005). 689

Figure 5. 14 Anthony van Dyck, *Sir George Villiers and Lady Katherine Manners as Adonis and Venus,* c. 1620. Oil on canvas, 223.5 x 160 cm. Private collection. 690

Figure 5. 15 Peter Paul Rubens, *The Apotheosis of the Duke of Buckingham*, before 1625. Oil on panel, 64 x 63.7 cm. London, National Gallery (NG187). 691

Figure 5. 16 Peter Paul Rubens, *Equestrian Portrait of the Duke of Buckingham*, 1625. Oil on panel, 69.9 x 74.6 cm (27 ½ x 29 3/8 in). Fort Worth, TX, Kimbell Art Museum (AP 1976.08)..... 692

Figure 5. 17 Gerrit van Honthorst, *Artemisia,* ca. 1632. Oil on canvas, 170 x 147.5 cm. Princeton University Art Museum (y1968-117). 693

Figure 5. 18 Gerrit van Honthorst, *Meleager and Atalanta,* 1632. Oil on canvas, 220 x 165 cm. Potsdam, Schloss Sanssouci - Berlin, Stiftung Preussische Schlösser und Gärten Berlin-Brandenburg (GK I 2357)..... 694

Figure 5. 19 Peter Paul Rubens, *Atalanta and Meleager,* ca. 1616. Oil on panel, 133.4 x 106.7 cm. New York, Metropolitan Museum of Art (44.22). 695

Figure 5. 20 Gerrit van Honthorst, *The Disembarkation of Mary Stuart, Greeted by Willem II,* 1649. Oil on canvas, 327 x 206 cm. The Hague, Huis ten Bosch, Oranjezaal. 696

Figure 5. 21 Gerrit van Honthorst, *Venus and Adonis*, 1641. Oil on canvas, 149 x 162 cm. Sold Christie's London, Old Master Pictures, 16 December 1998, lot no. 37. 697

Figure 5. 22 Lucas Vorsterman the Elder, after Anthony van Dyck, *Anthony van Dyck, from* The Iconography, ca. 1630-40. Engraving, 24.5 x 15.6 cm. Fine Arts Museums of San Francisco (1963-04-09). 698

Figure 5. 23 Govaert Flinck, *Allegory of the Memory of Frederik Hendrik,* 1654. Oil on canvas, 307 x 189 cm. Amsterdam, Rijksmuseum (SK-A-869). 699

Figure 5. 24 Jan Sadeler I after Cornelis Ketel, *Allegory of Hope,* 1550-1600. Engraving, 22 x 19.9 cm. London, The Courtauld Gallery (G.1990.WL.1717). 700

Figure 5. 25 Peter Paul Rubens, *Venus and Adonis*, 1610-11. Oil on panel, 83 x 90.5 cm. St. Petersburg, The State Hermitage Museum (ГЭ-462). 701

Figure 5. 26 Peter Paul Rubens, *Diana and Her Nymphs Departing for the Hunt,* c. 1615. Oil on canvas, 216 x 178.7 cm. Cleveland Museum of Art (1959.190). 702

Figure 5. 27 Jacob Jordaens, *The Triumph of Frederik Hendrik*, 1652. Oil on canvas, 728 x 755 cm. The Hague, Huis ten Bosch, Oranjezaal. 703

Figure 5. 28 Gerrit van Honthorst, *The Marriage of Frederik Hendrik and Amalia van Solms*, 1651. Oil on canvas, 318 x 755 cm. The Hague, Huis ten Bosch, Oranjezaal. 704

Figure 5. 29 Gerrit van Honthorst, *The Steadfastness of Frederik Hendrik,* 1649-51. Oil on canvas, 320 x 201 cm. The Hague, Huis ten Bosch, Oranjezaal. RKD Image no. 0001344351. 705

Figure 5. 30 Peter Paul Rubens, *The Arrival of Marie de' Medici in Marseilles,* c. 1622-25. Oil on canvas, 394 x 295 cm. Paris, Musée du Louvre (Inv. 1774). 706

ABSTRACT

In the first half of the seventeenth century, the Dutch painter Gerrit van Honthorst (1592-1656) developed a new method of picturing the courtly persona. My dissertation analyzes his contact with and commissions from Charles I of England and his sister Elizabeth Stuart, the exiled Queen of Bohemia in The Hague, to reformulate our understanding of the display and reception of early modern portraits as part of the enterprise of self-making. Previous literature has emphasized Honthorst's early, Caravaggesque work and has overshadowed the importance of his later, courtly paintings. My research brings the international contributions of the major part of his career into focus and better conceptualizes the role of the Netherlands in European court culture. Situating Honthorst as a piece within and product of the larger European system, this study insists on the transnationality of court culture and painters, further developing the international turn in scholarship on the history of Netherlandish art. It explores networking systems between courts by placing Honthorst and his paintings as a fulcrum around which such networks operated, providing new insight into the currency of art in the early modern era. The dissertation follows Honthorst's contact with and production for various courts from his return to Utrecht from Italy in 1620 to Charles's execution in 1649, which temporarily dissolved the Royal Collection. This project thus elucidates the role of art in the relationship between Charles and Elizabeth through the lenses of court culture, family relationships, and the work of a single artist. By thinking critically across Honthorst's body of work, we may better understand how he positioned himself in relation to his patrons and his patrons to one another.

Chapter 1

INTRODUCTION

> The Apelles of painting and favorite of kings, holds up this stone. But as heroic virtue is everlasting, the goddess of fame will announce his name to an astonished posterity.[1]
>
> — Gravestone of Gerrit van Honthorst, Catarijnekerk, Utrecht

Growing into Reputation

Gerrit van Honthorst (1592-1656) was a painter of kings and princes. His fame in this regard is attested to, even emphasized, in the various seventeenth- and early eighteenth-century accounts of his life. To Giulio Mancini (1558-1630), he was the supplier of images to Cosimo II de' Medici, Grand Duke of Tuscany (r. 1609-21).[2] To Joachim von Sandrart (1606-88), he brought the heights of art from Italy back to his birthplace, Utrecht, from where his rising fame carried him to the courts of Charles I

---

[1] Translation based on the German one found in Braun 1966, p. 59. Full Latin transcription from p. 381 no. 98 reads [Gerardus van Honthorst obit V kalendas may MDCLVI aet: 65 (?) M.5. diews: 23 / Conjux et liberi superstites memoria Luctuosa ergo hoc maestissimi posuerunt. / Pictorum Appelles Regibusque dilectus hac tabet urna nec tamen viri heroa virtus putrescit, quam stupentibus pare regina fama latius perennabit.]

[2] Giulio Mancini, *Considerazioni sulla pittura* (Rome: Accademia nazionale dei Lincei, 1956): p. 134.

of England (r. 1625-49), Christian IV of Denmark (r. 1588-1648), and the Princes of Orange (first Maurits [1567-1625] and then Frederik Hendrik [1584-1647]).[3] To Samuel van Hoogstraten (1627-78), he was a prosperous Hague court painter.[4] To Filippo Baldinucci (1625-97), he was in the service of "Cardinals and other Princes."[5]

Honthorst first trained with the Utrecht painter Abraham Bloemaert (1566-1651), who around the turn of the century was moving away from the Dutch Mannerist type of densely-populated images of well-muscled figures, such as his *Apollo and Diana Punishing Niobe by Killing her Children* (Fig. 1.1; Copenhagen, Statens Museum for Kunst) and towards a more direct study of nature.[6] In these mid-career works, Bloemaert's palette lightened and his interest in portraying landscape increased (Fig. 1.2; Amsterdam, Rijksmuseum). Unfortunately, no documentation or works survive from Honthorst's early phase in Utrecht. From Bloemaert's studio he went to Italy, which in the early modern period was viewed as an essential step toward the completion of an artistic education.

Honthorst's success in Rome came from the study of its contemporary painters, with Michelangelo Merisi da Caravaggio (1571-1610) chief among them. His

---

[3] TA 1675, II, Book 3, pp. 303-4.

[4] Van Hoogstraten 1969, p. 234.

[5] Filippo Baldinucci, *Opere di Filippo Baldinucci*, Vol. 12 (Milan: Società tipografica de' Classici italiani, 1808): p. 96.

[6] Judson/Ekkart 1999 place the beginning of Honthorst's training with Bloemaert at ca. 1606 (p. XXXIII).

earliest dated work is a drawing completed there in 1616, a copy after Caravaggio's *Crucifixion of Saint Peter* (Figs. 1.3, 1.4).[7] To Caravaggio's naturalism and tenebrism, Honthorst introduced the visible light source, drawing the admiration of biographers, critics, and, most importantly, Italy's cultural elite. In that country, Honthorst worked not just for Cosimo II de' Medici, as Mancini reported, but also the Benedetto (1554-1621) and Vincenzo (1564-1637) Giustiniani, and Cardinal Scipione Borghese (1576-1633). In Rome, Honthorst completed nightworks such as *Christ Before the High Priest* (Fig. 2.7), which was done for Vincenzo Giustiniani and specifically praised by Sandrart. He returned to Utrecht from Italy in 1620, just before the expiration of the Twelve Years' Truce that had temporarily halted hostilities between the Northern and Southern Netherlands and so facilitated travel. Upon his return to the Netherlands, candlelit paintings were his principal type of production, including many of his well-known merry companies, such as the *Procuress* of 1625 (Fig. 2.82). These night pieces, fitting nicely into the historiography of naturalism in Dutch painting, have consequently obscured the importance of Honthorst's court paintings, characterized overall by brighter coloring, even lighting, and a high degree of idealization.

As soon as he returned to the north, Honthorst was angling for an *entrée* into courtly circles. He began with Sir Dudley Carleton, British Ambassador to The Hague (1573-1632), who would provide the key to Honthorst's court patronage. As will be

---

[7] Judson/Ekkart 1999, p. 331, cat. no. D16.

discussed in greater detail in Chapter 2, in 1621 Carleton sent a painting by Honthorst to the prominent British courtier and collector Thomas Howard, Earl of Arundel (1586-1646). Carleton praised Honthorst as an artist on the rise, describing him as "growing into reputacon," having been "for some years at Rome & other parts of Italy to mend his art…consisting much in night works," and Arundel responded enthusiastically to the painting, saying that it had "much of y^{e} manor of Caravagioes colouringe."[8]

Though Carleton provided a connection with the court of the stadtholder in The Hague and that of Elizabeth Stuart (1596-1662) and her husband Frederick V (1596-1632), the deposed Queen and King of Bohemia and Electress and Elector Palatine living there in exile, Honthorst's 1621 Caravaggesque painting for Arundel failed to produce an overture from a reigning European monarch. An invitation, to the court of Charles I, Elizabeth's brother, would eventually materialize, but in the intervening eight years between his return from Italy and trip to London, Honthorst worked to fashion his painting style into something less tied to Rome. Moving away from the Caravaggesque, Honthorst sought a new way to appeal to noble and royal patrons and, eventually, a new way of picturing the courtly persona.

His courtly production, specifically that for the Stuart monarchs Charles and Elizabeth, is the subject of this dissertation. Chronologically, this study spans from

---

[8] Sainsbury 1859, pp. 290-292.

Honthorst's return to Utrecht in 1620 through Charles's execution in 1649. Honthorst's court paintings form the majority of his output, just as his work for the courts occupied the better part of his career, from 1621 through his death in 1656. Portraiture, for example, which he did not take up in earnest until his time in England in 1628, totals over 40% of his roughly 519 paintings. This number, taken from the catalogue raisonné published in 1999 by J. Richard Judson and Rudi Ekkart, includes references to lost paintings, but does not incorporate the many variations and copies of Honthorst's court portraits, which could number more than twelve for a given work.[9] To this must also be added the allegorical, history, genre, and pastoral paintings that Honthorst continued to produce for courtly patrons while the majority of his output turned to portraiture. This includes the sets of paintings that Honthorst completed for Christian IV of Denmark: a suite of eight in 1635 followed by a commission for forty-five more in 1641. For Amalia van Solms (1602-75), he completed a set of twenty-three portraits in 1636, a group of paintings for Huis ter Nieuburg in 1639, and six monumental works for the Oranjezaal at Huis ten Bosch around 1650. With these, the proportion of court works climbs to include well over half of his output.

Judging by the number of surviving paintings, the range and status of his sitters, the comments of later biographers, and his accumulated wealth—at the end of his life he owned two large centrally-located houses, one in The Hague and one in

---

[9] The portraits begin with Judson/Ekkart 1999, cat. no. 295.

Utrecht—Honthorst achieved great success among his contemporaries. It is surprising, then, that our understanding of his artistic practice has been skewed or obscured by his limited production within a Caravaggesque mode. As a result, we have a fundamentally incomplete understanding of his court paintings as well as of the ways in which they functioned within the context of their production. This is not to say, though, that Honthorst's courtly style is opposed to the Caravaggesque. Throughout this dissertation I argue the opposite: that Honthorst arrived at his innovations in court painting by admixing various techniques from naturalism and idealism to tenebrism and the pastoral, repackaging subjects from biblical history to the faces of Europe's elite. The static or tranquil appearance of many of his figures combined with these techniques to present the royal persona in new forms: controlled, majestic, and enduring.

Another factor in the eclipse of Honthorst's court paintings in our modern understanding is his contemporaneity with Peter Paul Rubens (1577-1640) and Anthony van Dyck (1599-1641). He likely met them both: Rubens visited Honthorst in Utrecht in 1627 and Van Dyck visited The Hague in the 1630s. While Sandrart reports that Rubens's visit was at some length and included a discussion of the paintings that Honthorst had on hand in the studio, our understanding of his relationship with Van Dyck is more vague.[10] Van Dyck probably made a portrait

[10] TA 1675, II, Book 3, p. 291; See also Appendix B, no. 2.

drawing or painting of Honthorst for inclusion in his *Iconography* (Fig. 5.1), but there is no other contemporary document of contact between the two. Honthorst furthermore did not overlap with either of the two Flemish painters in London. Van Dyck was there in 1620-21 and then again from 1632 to his death in 1641, while Rubens arrived there just after Honthorst's departure, in 1629. The primary interaction that Honthorst had with them, therefore, was through their paintings. The stylistic divergences between the works of Honthorst and that of Rubens and Van Dyck have subsequently impeded considerations of the three in concert, as addressed in Chapter 5.

It is, furthermore, necessary to consider the relationship between the style and the visual impact of Honthorst's court paintings. That is, while his figures often appear stilled or frozen to modern eyes, they carried an impact that appealed quite strongly to seventeenth-century patrons and viewers. Characteristic examples of this type of immobile or tranquil portrait are found in Honthorst's image of *The Duke of Buckingham with his Family* (Fig. 3.6) and his *Adversities of Elizabeth Stuart* (Fig. 4.40). In the former, the Duke of Buckingham (1592-1628), his wife, and their eldest daughter maintain their calm demeanors even as the Duchess of Buckingham (1603-49) holds her smiling infant son as he lunges for a cluster of flowers. The latter, though damaged, shows Elizabeth Stuart and several of her children locked into a static, idealized family group. Even her son Edward, dressed in red and striding forward with his garment flowing, keeps his face calm and his person is firmly anchored in place.

The immediate legibility of many of Honthorst's court paintings makes their decorative functions clear: they are meant to be "read" quickly and easily in the dim lighting of a seventeenth-century interior. Their bright illumination and harmonious compositions facilitate a pleasurable viewing experience in keeping with the decorative schemes of the rooms in which they were hung and with much of the gaiety of courtly activity and pastime: hunting, music-making, galas, and theater productions (Fig. 2.2). The location of Honthorst's figures, invariably close to the picture plane, more often than not life-size, promotes a sense of humanity among them and encourages identification between viewer and subject, enhancing both the immediacy and the efficacy of the work. In the case of Honthorst's numerous (mostly) individual portraits, though their immobile poses present them at an idealized remove from the viewer, they offer a refined vision of the subject projecting out before a darker, nondescript background, a format that apparently held great appeal to courtly patrons (Fig. 4.60). They are undeniably visions of a moment past: their clothing is often generically contemporary or even theatrically old-fashioned. In these carefully posed, deliberately spaced, and meticulously colored scenes, time is slowed down, as if making a critique of the previous generation of Roman painters and even of artists like Frans Hals (ca. 1581-1666). In this way Honthorst is approaching the elegance of Van Dyck, but moving in even slower motion. There is less of a sense of timelessness, or a view into a specific moment in time, than that of encountering a memorial.

This memorializing function is key to the enterprise of royal portraiture as we will see throughout this dissertation. Despite the cultivation of intimacy in some of

Honthorst's portraits, such as *King Charles I* (Fig. 3.3), the meticulous idealization of his figures presents us unequivocally with their *public* image. That is, while their individualized features are still preserved, their calm gazes and immobile statures give an image of enduring majesty, not the living, interrupted moment sought by other portraitists (Fig. 4.59). In this sense, Honthorst's stylistic approach to the royal image might better be compared with that of Thomas de Keyser (1596/7-1667), Michiel Jansz. van Miereveld (1567-1641), or Daniel Mytens (ca. 1590-before 1648) than Rubens or Van Dyck.

The perception of stiffness in Honthorst's courtly figures is a characterization that comes not only in comparison with those by Rubens and Van Dyck in particular but also from seventeenth-century and later viewers accustomed to greater naturalism. Samuel van Hoogstraten, writing more than twenty years after Honthorst's death in his *Inleyding tot de hooge schoole der schilderkonst* (1678) critiques his using the language of maturation and decline. Van Hoogstraten laments that Honthorst's once-lively manner [*wakker pinseel*] had been lulled to sleep by his success and that he had fallen into a stiff smoothness [*stijve gladdicheyt*].[11] Van Hoogstraten's comments constitute a significant early document of the reception of Honthorst's court paintings, but it is important to keep in mind that Van Hoogstraten is writing after the more

---

[11] Van Hoogstraten 1969, p. 234: [*Hondhorst* gelukkich Haegs hofschilder had in zijn bloeijende tijdt een wakker pinseel gevoert; maer, 't zy om de juffers te behaegen, of dat hem de winst in slaep wiegde, hy verviel tot een stijve gladdicheyt.]

lively and life-like style of portraiture developed by Rembrandt (1606-69), Van Dyck, Hals, and even Bartholomeus van der Helst (1613-70) had taken hold. Van Hoogstraten is not, therefore, contemporary with the earlier and more traditional aspects of portraiture undertaken by Honthorst and others and favored in court circles in the first half of the seventeenth century.

Moreover, as Ann Jensen Adams has demonstrated to great effect in her study of Dutch portraiture in this period, an immobile figure was not without meaning and appeal to the seventeenth-century viewer. Adams has shown how static portraiture actually belongs to a long theoretical and philosophical tradition of *tranquilitas*, a cultivated and performed self-regulation and control that was esteemed for its association with intellectual virtue and with the ruling class.[12] It is in keeping with this tradition that the calm appearance of the royalty in many of Honthorst's portraits are presented as authoritatively sober, just as such figures were often described interpersonally within their lifetimes. Conveying the same type of neo-stoicism that Adams applies to portraits of this period, Charles I wrote to his son in 1648 that, "We have learnt to own ourself by retiring into ourself."[13] Likewise, the effectiveness of

---

[12] Ann Jensen Adams, *Public Faces and Private Identities in Seventeenth-Century Holland: Portraiture and the Production of Community* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2009): Ch. 2, esp. pp. 79-90.

[13] Sir Charles Petrie, ed., *The Letters, Speeches, and Proclamations of King Charles I* (London: Cassell and Company Ltd., 1935): p. 240. Letter to the Prince of Wales from Newport, Wales, November 29, 1648.

Elizabeth's public image was invoked by a poet around the time of her exile in 1621: "that face doth figure thee / And shew thy vndiuided majestie, / Which miserie cannot vntwist, but rather / Addes to the vnion, as lights, to gather / Splendors from darkenes."[14] Herbert's poem indicates that it was the "undivided majesty," or the untarnished resilience, of her image that so enthralled converts to her cause. Could these values of self-regulation and idealization also have been applied to Honthorst's static figures in other genres, such as his musicians in *The Concert* (Fig. 2.2) or his *Shepherdesses* in Seattle (Fig. 2.96)? The shepherdess was, after all, a popular identification figure for the courtly viewer desirous of an escape from the quotidian.

Structure

In moving beyond the dismissal of Honthorst's court paintings and their eclipse by those of Rubens and Van Dyck, this project reincorporates this major part of his career, bringing his international contributions into focus and better conceptualizing the role of the Netherlands in European court culture. In trying to push at the boundaries of earlier conceptions of Honthorst's courtly production, this dissertation is divided into five chapters.

---

[14] Ted-Larry Pebworth, "George Herbert's Poems to the Queen of Bohemia: A Rediscovered Text and a New Edition," *English Literary Renaissance* 9, no. 1 (Winter 1979): pp. 117-118.

The remainder of this first chapter examines Honthorst's critical fortunes in order to clarify and summarize the major previous scholarly approaches to the artist and provide the larger historiographic framework on which this project builds. It then establishes the ways in which my approach sets itself against such preceding studies: by considering Honthorst's courtly production in terms of both their objecthood and agency, it seeks to recover Honthorst's studio practice through close looking and technical analysis, and to investigate the systems of self-presentation in which these paintings participated.

Chapter 2, "Gerrit van Honthorst Courts New Patrons," lays the foundation for his development of a style combining classical refinement and Caravaggesque dynamism together with the accoutrements of the pastoral or antique between his return to the Netherlands from Italy in 1620 and invitation to London in 1628 (As in *Granida and Daifilo*, Fig. 2.73). The first part of the chapter situates this change in relation to the larger cultural dynamics of taste at work in the European courtly system in this period. It addresses the notions of light and shade, *kracht* [force], and color as they were utilized in art theoretical and descriptive writings of the period, to open up the ways in which Honthorst's paintings operated in relation to these dialogues. Working against the notion of Honthorst's style as evolving or deteriorating in one direction or the other, the second part of the chapter closely considers several paintings from the years 1622 to 1627, as no dated works survive from 1620 or 21. The range of works presented in each of the six sections (one for each year)

problematize our understanding of this period of Honthorst's self-fashioning to appeal to new patrons.

Chapter 3, "Charles I, Honthorst, and the Politics of Display," explores the use of art as political, social, and sometimes actual currency at the court of Charles I, where Honthorst produced seven paintings that both served Charles's appetite for continental painters and fostered relations within Charles's circle and abroad. The first part of the chapter reconstructs the cultural context from which Charles's court and his interest in pictures emerged. This consists of analyses of the virtues of collecting and the potency of the court portrait, the court of Charles's father James I (r. 1603-1625), and the collecting and intellectual pursuits of his late elder brother Henry Frederick (1594-1612), whose premature death at age eighteen memorialized and mythologized his efforts to transform Stuart court culture. The personal circumstances surrounding Charles's emergent interests in art are also considered, to better understand the functioning of his court around the exchange of paintings and his efforts to bring continental painters to England. These cultural contexts set the stage for Honthorst's arrival in London, addressed in the second part of the chapter. This discussion is anchored around the paintings that Honthorst produced in London, particularly the three that are still extant (*King Charles I, Apollo and Diana,* and *George Villiers, 1st Duke of Buckingham with his Family*; Figs. 3.3, 3.4, 3.6, respectively). This analysis incorporates both close examinations to understand Honthorst's working method and the characteristics of this court paintings, as well as the broader contexts of the display and reception of the pictures at Charles's court.

Chapter 4, "Bohemia Displaced: Elizabeth Stuart, Self-Promotion, and the Art of Diplomacy," turns to Honthorst's time at Elizabeth's court, where he remained a vital link between Elizabeth and Charles through the gifting of paintings and crafted a unique courtly identity that promoted the legitimacy of the Bohemian monarchs across Europe. This chapter examines Elizabeth's court-in-exile, where Honthorst and his studio produced more than one hundred works throughout almost three decades in her service. Like the previous chapter on her brother Charles, this one considers Elizabeth's strategic use of imagery, particularly portraits, in two parts. The first part surveys the political and social circumstances surrounding her relationship to imagery throughout the formative periods of her life: before her marriage, during her time in Heidelberg and Prague, and finally in exile under the onslaught of Habsburg propaganda targeting her family. Second, it examines her strategic direction of a painting by Honthorst, commissioned by Charles, in order to create a visual exhortation to her brother for financial, political, and military support (*Seladon and Astraea*; Fig. 4.18). The reputational damage that Elizabeth suffered, recounted in the chapter's first part, forms the basis of the second part, which deals with her attempts to recover that image. This is based primarily on a 1633 inventory of Rhenen Palace, the residence that Elizabeth and her husband scraped together funds to build in 1630. This inventory, completed after her husband's death in 1632, is the only surviving document of the Bohemian picture collections made during her lifetime. It demonstrates that portraits formed a vital part of Elizabeth's visual identity, and the chapter concludes by reconstructing several rooms within the palace to suggest how

she marshalled limited resources to augment her destitute circumstances and construct a simulacrum of monarchy in exile (*Triumph* and *Adversities of Elizabeth Stuart*; Figs. 4.40, 4.41).

Chapter 5 is a brief Coda that raises the question of Honthorst's self-fashioning in relation to Peter Paul Rubens and Anthony van Dyck. The issue of Rubens's and Van Dyck's impact on Honthorst's courtly production is a complex one, addressing similar themes to many of those found in the preceding chapters, including the impact of patronage and effectiveness of painting styles. Integrating discussion of Rubens and Van Dyck into the three main body chapters, however, poses the danger of collapsing these relationships onto those of Honthorst and his patrons. The Coda seeks to trim the shadow of Rubens and Van Dyck over Honthorst's practice within his lifetime, clarifying their influence on him while qualifying that, somewhat counterintuitively given the enduring supremacy of Van Dyck's portraiture, it was Rubens and not Van Dyck that more strongly impacted Honthorst's production in The Hague. The difference in style between Honthorst and the Flemish masters has precluded or discouraged thoughtful comparisons of their paintings, when in fact they were consistently juxtaposed throughout the artists' lifetimes. By opening up such a comparison, this section suggests the potential of Honthorst's court paintings for broader study and works, by way of conclusion, to further contextualize these images with those of his contemporaries.

Honthorst's Critical Fortunes

Around 1625, when Honthorst's production for the Bohemian and Orange courts in The Hague was increasing, his output turned definitively toward the pastoral. It was then that he produced works such as *Granida and Daifilo* (Fig. 2.73), whose bright lighting and coloration and static main figures align it with many of the characteristics of his later court paintings as recounted throughout this chapter. In her landmark study of pastoral art in the Dutch Golden Age, Alison McNeil Kettering commented on the genre's exclusion from previous art historical literature, which she attributes to the entrenched emphasis on realism in Dutch painting and the consequent lack of attention or interest in "styles more in tune with foreign artistic movements."[15] The court was an inherently transnational mixing place of nobility, artists, artisans, diplomats, agents, and other figures, which fostered the development of the pastoral in the Northern Netherlands.[16] Kettering goes on to argue that the similarities between the cultures of The Hague and Utrecht gave the Netherlands, at Utrecht, a kind of second, satellite court, from which pastoral imagery issued at a rapid pace.[17]

---

[15] Kettering, *The Dutch Arcadia: Pastoral Art and its Audience in the Golden Age* (Totowa, NJ: Allanheld and Schram, 1983): p. 3.

[16] On the simultaneous transnationalism and nationalism of the court in the sixteenth century, see Sheila ffolliott, "'La Florentine' or 'La bonne Françoise': Some Sixteenth-Century Commentators on Catherine de' Medici and Her Patronage," in Christina Strunck, ed., *Medici Women as Cultural Mediators (1533-1743)* (Milan: Milano Silvana, 2011. Conference proceedings.): pp. 17-37.

[17] Kettering, *The Dutch Arcadia*, p. 4.

Countering the relegation of pastoral art, and indeed much of what would come to be called 'classicist' painting, to the realm of frivolity or insipidness was at the core of Kettering's project. It is also at the core of my own.

In his well-known but incomplete *De Imitatione Statuarum*, probably written soon after his return to Antwerp from Italy in 1609, Rubens mused on the proper use of Antiquity's model, imploring that painted figures should "not in the least smell of stone."[18] It was perhaps in this same spirit that various nineteenth- and twentieth-century scholars discussed and dismissed Honthorst's court paintings—too classicized for the Dutch canon—as "somewhat ludicrous," "frozen," and "congealed" (as Fig. 2.94 has been described). However, as this introduction and my dissertation more broadly seek to demonstrate, Honthorst's stilled figures and bright palette not only served a purpose but were well-received by the highest level of patrons.

Though Honthorst was one of the most successful court painters of the seventeenth century, for many near-contemporary commentators and later scholars the

---

[18] Translation from De Piles 1743, p. 87. Steven J. Cody, "Rubens and the 'Smell of Stone': The Translation of the Antique and the Emulation of Michelangelo," *Arion* 20, no. 3 (Winter 2013): pp. 39, 41. As Cody notes on p. 53n1, Rubens's tract was first published in 1708, in De Piles's *Cours de peinture par principes*. De Piles was in possession of Rubens's notebook at the time, but it has since been lost. On *De Imitatione Statuarum* see also Jeffrey M. Muller, "Rubens's Theory and Practice of the Imitation of Art," *The Art Bulletin* 64, no. 2 (1982): pp. 229-247; and Andreas Thielemann, "Rubens' Traktat *De imitatione statuarum*," in Ursula Rombach and Peter Seiler, eds., *Imitatio als Transformation: Theorie und Praxis der Antikennachahmung in der Frühen Neuzeit* (Petersberg: Michael Imhof Verlag, 2012. Conference proceedings.): pp. 95-150.

only paintings by him that are worthy of study were produced in a Caravaggesque mode. In the writings of early art critics Roger de Piles (1635-1709) and André Félibien (1619-1695), for example, Honthorst's noble patronage is emphasized but the discussion of his actual artistic production highlights the nocturne, with Félibien focusing in particular on his "maniere forte & noire."[19] In 1829, the art dealer John Smith (1781-1855) published the first of what would become a nine-volume series, the *Catalogue Raisonné of the Works of the Most Eminent Dutch, Flemish, and French Painters*. Through its conclusion in 1842, and for many decades afterwards, this catalogue shaped the canon of seventeenth-century Dutch painting.[20] Honthorst was not included in Smith's work, nor were any of Honthorst's major Utrecht contemporaries.[21] Their relative sidelining within the canon of Dutch art led to a

---

[19] Félibien 1864, pp. 226-227: "une maniere forte & noire. Il représentoit ordinairement ses sujets dans une nuit, ou dans une grande obscurité, éclairez de la lumiere de feu." De Piles 1699, pp. 413-414, describes Honthorst as a "Disciple de Blomart" and then speaks mostly about his noble patrons. On Félibien and De Piles and the formation of the Dutch canon in French theoretical thought, see most recently Everhard Korthals Altes, "Félibien, de Piles and Dutch seventeenth-century paintings in France," *Simiolus: Netherlands Quarterly for the History of Art* 34, no. 3/4 (2009/2010): pp. 194-211; and Olivier Bonfait, "Les Pays-Bas dans Littérature Artistique en France au XVIIe Siècle," in Michèle-Caroline Heck, ed., L'Histoire de l'Histoire de l'Art Septentroinal au XVIIe Siècle (Turnhout: Brepols, 2009): pp. 81-98.

[20] Quentin Buvelot, "Frans van Mieris' Reputation," in Quentin Buvelot, ed., *Frans van Mieris 1635-1681* (Zwolle: Waanders Publishers, 2005. Exh. cat.): p. 12.

[21] Smith 1829-42. The tendency toward religious, pastoral, and historical subject matter among Honthorst and his contemporaries may have been the reason for their omission from Smith's volumes. In his selection of artists, Smith favored the dynamic

tripartite recovery effort in the late 1950s, through the work of Benedict Nicolson on Hendrick ter Brugghen (1588-1629) in 1958, J. Richard Judson on Honthorst in 1959, and Leonard J. Slatkes on Dirck van Baburen (ca. 1592/3-1624) in 1965.

Still, when they are discussed at all, the court paintings of Gerrit van Honthorst have not fared well in the opinions of critics and art historians. In 1858 the art critic Étienne-Joseph-Théophile Thoré (1807-1869; nom de plume William Bürger, known usually as Thoré-Bürger) said that Honthorst,

> rarely paints with such strength. One finds his style cold, empty, and rather vulgar in his numerous portraits at Huis ten Bosch in The Hague, and in his compositions in the Orange Room [Oranjezaal]. Perhaps many of these portraits are by Willem and not Gerard; the two brothers painted a lot in collaboration.[22]

Thoré-Bürger seems to be trying to isolate the moment when Honthorst's artistic genius was at its peak, before the "deformation" of Italian and Baroque influences. Thoré-Bürger is, of course, credited with the rediscovery of Johannes Vermeer (1632-75).[23] Accordingly, he preferred genre paintings of Vermeer's type, setting the tone

---

works of Rubens, Van Dyck, and Rembrandt as well as a general interest in those that produced the art of the everyday: landscape, seascape, genre, still life, and cityscape.

[22] Thoré-Bürger 1858-60, II, pp. 202-203: [Honthorst est rarement de cette force-là. On le trouve froid, vide, assez vulgaire, dans ses nombreux portraits au Pavillon du bois à La Haye, et dans ses compositions à la Salle d'Orange. Peut-être plusieurs de ces portraits sont-ils de Willem et non de Gerard; les deux frères ont beaucoup peint en collaboration.]

[23] For Thoré-Bürger's impact see Frances Suzman Jowell, "Vermeer and Thoré-Bürger: Recoveries of Reputation," *Studies in the History of Art* 55, Symposium Papers XXXIII: Vermeer Studies (1998): pp. 35-57; Jowell, "Thoré-Bürger and the Revival of Frans Hals," *The Art Bulletin* 56, no. 1 (March 1974): pp. 101-117;; and

and exemplifying the critical favoring of Dutch art that was "true to life" and that eclipsed much of Dutch history, classical, religious, and court painting. In the case of Honthorst, a clear hierarchy is established: the court portraits are lowest, outranked by the most 'Baroque' of the Italian type, and the most 'Dutch', the genre scenes, occupy the top rank. Consequently, then, in Thoré-Bürger's view, Honthorst's courtly works are so inferior that they cannot really be by Honthorst.

In his 1924 catalogue of twenty-eight Honthorst paintings, art historian G.J. Hoogewerff describes the *Apollo and Diana* (Fig. 3.4), one of the artist's most successful court paintings, with a great deal of disdain. He calls it "rather inauspicious" and blames this on the circumstances of royal patronage, saying, "We may be pretty certain that it was precisely these and similar orders that induced Gerrit to devote himself to this shallow, court-work, rather than give full rein to his native genius."[24] The lamentation of Honthorst's abandonment of 'genius' is a theme of Hoogewerff's study. We can see Hoogewerff struggling here to reconcile the facts of Honthorst's paintings with his conception of what Honthorst's work—and perhaps Dutch art as a whole—should be. He goes on to bemoan, for example, the Borghese *Susanna and the Elders* (Fig. 1.5), describing it as, "still in some parts rather crude and

---

Alison McQueen, *The Rise of the Cult of Rembrandt: Reinventing an Old Master in 19th-Century France* (Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, 2003): especially Chapters 1 and 2.

[24] Hoogewerff 1924, p. 8.

the light unnatural. How far we have wandered from the youthful, elevating picture in the Capuchin Church at Albano! [Fig. 1.6]…we may conclude…that whilst *Honthorst* is worthy of commendation in several points, it is upon « Gherardo delle Notti » that the praise and admiration of modern lovers of Art is justly bestowed."[25] Hoogewerff here invokes Honthorst's reported Italian nickname—*Gherardo delle Notti* [Gerard of the Nights], by which he is still sometimes identified among art historians—as emblematic of his best output.[26] However, not only did the artist sign most of his paintings *G.Honthorst*, including the Italian pictures, but also Matthew D. Lincoln has recently demonstrated that all of the surviving references to Honthorst from his lifetime simply refer to him by name or, in Italy, as Flemish or Dutch.[27]

Commentary on Honthorst is generally lacking in the art historical literature until 1952, when Horst Gerson included the artist in his study of northern followers of Caravaggio.[28] Gerson writes of Honthorst's post-Italian paintings that, "he adapts

---

[25] Hoogewerff 1924, p. 9-10.

[26] See, for example, Gianni Papi, *Gherardo delle Notti: quadri bizzarissimi e cene allegre* (Florence: Giunti, 2015. Exh cat.). Christopher Brown, *Utrecht Painters of the Dutch Golden Age* (London: National Gallery Publications Limited, 1997. Exh. cat.): p. 32. The traditional group of Utrecht Caravaggisti includes Dirck van Baburen, Hendrick ter Brugghen, and Jan van Bijlert (ca. 1597-1671). Ter Brugghen returned to Utrecht in 1614, Honthorst in 1620, Baburen in 1621 and Van Bijlert in 1624.

[27] Matthew D. Lincoln, "Sources for Gerrit van Honthorst's Italian Nickname," *Notes in the History of Art* 35, no. 3 (Spring 2016): esp. pp. 245-246: he is frequently called "Gherardo Fiammingo" or "Gherardo Olandese" in early Italian inventories.

[28] In the landmark exhibition of Dutch art held in London at the Royal Academy of Arts in 1929, for example, Honthorst was represented by only one painting, the more

himself again to the careful, cold Dutch technique, and then soon becomes the chief exponent of smooth Classicism. The decorative ceiling piece from 1622 already shows the new style."[29] Invoking the Getty *Musical Group* (Fig. 2.32) at the end of this passage, Gerson was one of the earliest authors to call Honthorst's court paintings classicist. This designation proved to be a particularly virulent yet ambiguous descriptor.

An article published in 1954 by the British art historian Oliver Millar was the first study of Honthorst as a painter to Charles I, and provided the first direct comparison of his work with that of Anthony van Dyck. Millar writes almost entirely about the commissioning and later display of *Apollo and Diana* (Fig. 3.4), connecting the painting to Honthorst's "fully Caravaggesque phase." Millar concludes that the picture is ambitious, but that there is "an innate and paradoxical lack of grace" inherent to Honthorst's painting style, and ends with speculation on Charles's delight

---

Caravaggesque *Smiling Girl* now in St. Louis (Fig. 2.79): Royal Academy of Arts, *Exhibition of Dutch Art 1450-1900* (London: Royal Academy of Arts, 1929. Exhibition catalogue.): p. 170, cat. no. 363, as *Portrait of a Laughing Girl*.

[29] Horst Gerson, "Die Ausstellung Caravaggio und die Niederlande," *Kunstchronik* 5 (1952): p. 289: [Aus Italien zurückgekehrt, paßt er sich wieder der sorgsamen, kalten holländischen Technik an, um dann bald zum Hauptvertreter des geschmeidigen Klassizismus zu werden. Das decorative Plafondstück von 1622 zeigt bereits den neuen Stil.] Judson (1959, p. 249) translates this passage as "showing Honthorst's new cold Dutch technique which will soon turn into the metallic classicism of his courtly style."

at being able to "attach to his service" Rubens and Van Dyck after Honthorst's departure.[30]

Seymour Slive, Jakob Rosenberg, and E. H. ter Kuile are quite explicit in their distaste for courtly paintings, particularly those of Honthorst. In their 1966 *Dutch Art and Architecture 1600-1800*, they write that "Honthorst came back to the north in 1620 imbued with an uncomplicated kind of classicism which indiscriminately regularized and generalized forms." Transferring these disappointed expectations onto the whole of the Utrecht school, they lament that, "in its latest phase [it] lost its vitality, and it ended in a dry classicism. This is particularly true of Honthorst. However, his disintegration as a creative artist did not affect his international reputation. He continued to be in demand as a court painter, and was popular as a teacher."[31] Their comments highlight the vast gulf between the opinions of

---

[30] Millar, "Charles I, Honthorst, and Van Dyck," *The Burlington Magazine* 96, no. 611 (February 1954): p. 39. In his 1965 monograph on Dirck van Baburen, Leonard J. Slatkes is less virulent in his criticism than many of his contemporaries, but uses three forms of the term classicism in the same sentence, showing how it can be stretched and made to incorporate every disparate moment of Honthorst's career: "The more classically oriented compositions found in Honthorst's early works eventually gave rise, first to a refined form of classical mannerism, and finally, as his court contacts increased, to a purer more pastoral classicism, as in his 1625 *Granida and Daifilo*, in the Centraal Museum, Utrecht." (Leonard J. Slatkes, *Dirck van Baburen [c. 1595-1624]: A Dutch Painter in Utrecht and Rome* [Utrecht: Haentjens Dekker & Gumbert, 1965]: p. 15.)

[31] Jakob Rosenberg, Seymour Slive, and E.H. ter Kuile, *Dutch Art and Architecture 1600-1800* (Baltimore: Penguin Books, 1966): p. 24. Slive and Rosenberg return to this criticism again in the 1995 edition of the text. Turning next to Honthorst's time in London, characterizing Honthorst as a poor substitute for Van Dyck: "Charles rewarded him handsomely, but did not keep him. The king did well to postpone the

Honthorst's patrons in the seventeenth century and those of later scholars. As argued above, it was not just the smooth style of Honthorst's paintings that evidently appealed to them, but also the visual impact of their tranquil figures. In Honthorst's compositions, the royal image is made still in an idealized present along with the forms of shepherdesses and goddesses.

Francis Haskell, writing in 1989, described *Apollo and Diana* (Fig. 3.4) with clear distaste, even disdain, in comparison with Van Dyck:

> All these favored friends and relatives of Charles were included in the two very ambitious (and somewhat ludicrous) mythologized portraits which Honthorst painted for him – or which were given to him. In *Apollo and Diana*, which was kept (understandably enough) in store at Whitehall, Mercury – in the guise of the Duke of Buckingham – and Grammar – personified by his bare-breasted wife – lead Logic, Rhetoric and the other Liberal Arts to pay homage to Apollo and Diana (the King and Queen) who sit on a cloud above them…Fortunately for Charles's reputation as a patron it was just at this time that he was able to make arrangements for introducing into England a decidedly more convincing example of the most sophisticated aristocratic art of contemporary Europe.[32]

---

appointment. In 1632 he knighted Van Dyck and made him 'principalle Paynter in ordinary to their Majesties'." Slive and Rosenberg, *Dutch Painting: 1600-1800* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1995): p. 27.

[32] Francis Haskell, "Charles I's Collection of Pictures," in Arthur MacGregor, ed., *The Late King's Goods: Collections, Possessions, and Patronage of Charles I in the Light of the Commonwealth Sale Inventories*. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1989): pp. 222-23. The other group portrait that Haskell references in this passage, excerpted here for clarity, is *Seladon and Astraea* (Fig. 4.18).

The myopic nature of Haskell's comments, particularly regarding *Apollo and Diana*'s location in storage in Whitehall, will be addressed in my discussion of the painting in Chapter 3.[33]

A major issue in our understanding of Honthorst's critical reputation, however, lies not just in the perceived lack of liveliness of his brush, but also in the problematic use of the term classicism itself.[34] For Albert Blankert, the first to group Utrecht artists, including Honthorst, together under this designation, classicism was a reactionary style, moving from the excesses of Mannerism or Caravaggism to something more moderate and balanced.[35] In Blankert's usage, the term classicism is applied neither to artists with a noted interest in antiquity nor to those who paint in a sculptural fashion. Furthermore, neither of these descriptions can be applied to Honthorst's paintings in a systematic sense. Indeed, it becomes clear that Blankert's

---

[33] In 1990 Oliver Millar revisited *Apollo and Diana*, echoing Haskell and Rosenberg/Slive when he wrote that the king, "stands on an almost crudely defined stage…In Honthorst's huge canvas on the queen's staircase at Hampton Court the heavy forms are frozen in a 'still' from a clumsily orchestrated masque. In Van Dyck's great royal portraits, on the other hand…we are caught up in another world, full of poise, allusion, flickering light, and a palpable atmosphere." Millar "Van Dyck in London," in Arthur K. Wheelock, et al., *Anthony van Dyck* (Washington: National Gallery of Art, 1990. Exh. cat.): p. 57.

[34] The word was first applied to painters of the Utrecht school by Albert Blankert in 1980. Later, in 1999, Blankert expanded upon these ideas in the catalogue *Dutch Classicism in Seventeenth-Century Painting*, the first serious study of works that had been neglected in the art historical literature. See Blankert 1980, p. 186; Blankert 1999, pp. 13-15.

[35] Blankert 1999, p. 15.

insistent use of classicism thinks ahead to Gerard de Lairesse's (1640/41-1711) works of the 1680s or even to Jacques Louis David's (1748-1825) Neo-Classicism of a century later.[36] The ahistorical term is therefore deployed to neatly segregate and avoid what many later scholars have considered the less compelling and less authentically "Dutch" stylistic characteristics of Honthorst's court paintings: pale complexions, bright tones, smooth brushwork, foregrounded compositions, and idealized, tranquil, and upright figures.[37]

Classicism and its variations continue to be applied to Honthorst, but mostly by rote, deployed as a blanket term to characterize his smooth manner of painting (also practiced by Caravaggio) and what appears to be a modern distaste for the lack of liveliness in his paintings compared to such portraitists *par excellence* as Rembrandt

---

[36] This is clear when Blankert describes Honthorst's 1627 *Diana* (Fig. 2.89) as having "its energy congealed, as it were, into taut lines, the work seems to anticipate Jacques Louis David." (Blankert 1999, p. 24). See also Elizabeth Cropper and Charles Dempsey, *Nicolas Poussin: Friendship and the Love of Painting* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1996): p. 25, where they argue that Neo-classicism (itself "an *ex post facto* coinage of the mid-nineteenth century") is based on Winckelmann's qualitative distinction between Greek and Roman art.

[37] On the ahistoricity of the term see Westermann, "Dutch Classicism," pp. 186-187. Xander van Eck, "Review," p. 75. Indeed, as Cropper and Dempsey point out, the concept of "classicism" was an invention of the nineteenth century, and that neither of Wöllflin's terms ("classical" or "baroque"), "has any part to play in artistic discourse of the seventeenth century." (See Cropper and Dempsey, *Nicolas Poussin,* Chapter 1, esp. pp. 24-26). For the use of the term in England see Lucy Gent, "Introduction," in Lucy Gent, ed., *Albion's Classicism: The Visual Arts in Britain, 1550-1660* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1995): pp. 5-7.

and Frans Hals.[38] Hals and Rembrandt were, furthermore, considered "modern" in their time and were working for a largely urban merchant and professional clientele. Honthorst seems conservative by comparison, and thus may be more readily likened to Van Miereveld, De Keyser, Mytens, and even English court painters before Van Dyck, like Robert Peake (ca. 1551-1619), as mentioned at the beginning of this introduction.

Classicism is also rarely employed to describe an actual preoccupation with subjects or motifs drawn from classical antiquity.[39] Honthorst's paintings infrequently appear sculptural, though his arrangement of figures and sometimes his techniques can resemble sculpted reliefs, as discussed in more detail in Chapter 2 (see, for example, Fig. 2.2). Honthorst is furthermore not an archaeological painter in the sense of some

---

[38] For further instances of Honthorst being labeled a classicist, see Horace Shipp, *The Dutch Masters* (New York: Philosophical Library, Inc., 1953): p. 29; W. Kuyper, *Dutch Classicist Architecture: A Survey of Dutch Architecture, Gardens, and Anglo-Dutch Architectural Relations from 1625 to 1700* (Delft: Delft University Press, 1980): p. 60; Christopher Brown, *Scenes of Everyday Life: Dutch Genre Painting of the Seventeenth Century* (London; Boston: Faber and Faber, 1984): p. 82; Blankert, Slatkes, Marten Jan Bok, et al., *Nieuw licht op de Gouden Eeuw: Hendrick ter Brugghen en tijdgenoten*/*Holländische Malerei in neuem Licht* (Braunschweig: Limbach, 1986. Exh. cat.): pp. 37-39; Paul Huys Jannsen, *Jan van Bijlert, 1597/98-1671: Catalogue Raisonné* (Amsterdam; Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 1998): p. 55; Christopher Brown, *Scenes of Everyday Life: Dutch Genre Paintings from the Mauritshuis* (Oxford: Ashmolean Museum, 1999. Exh. cat.): p. 16; Leonard Slatkes, "Honthorst, Gerrit [Gérard] (Hermansz.) van." Oxford Art Online, 2003; Gero Seelig in Helmus, Liesbeth M., et al., *The Bloemaert Effect: Colour and Composition in the Golden Age* (Petersberg, Germany: Michael Imhof Verlag, 2011. Exh. cat.): pp. 136-138, cat. 50; and Arthur K. Wheelock, Jr., "Gerrit van Honthorst/*The Concert*/1623," *Dutch Paintings of the Seventeenth Century*, NGA Online Editions.

[39] Van Eck, "Review," p. 78.

others, such as Rubens, with a notable interest in antiquity. Honthorst's small *oeuvre* of surviving drawings consists of mostly preparatory studies for paintings and contains not a single image of an ancient object. We know from the frontispiece of Bloemaert's *Tekenboek* (Fig. 1.7; engraved and published mostly posthumously by his son Frederik) that Honthorst's early education probably involved drawing from casts of antique sculpture and sculptural fragments, as was standard. However, Honthorst did not seem interested in suffusing antique source material throughout his paintings or even including direct quotations of well-known sculptures. Rather, his classicist label is used to deal with the stylistic particularities of his court paintings.

The critical reception of Honthorst in this case accentuates a naturalism-classicism opposition that was not applied to Honthorst's paintings in his lifetime. That this type of false dichotomy is not limited to analyses of Dutch painting, the Caravaggists, or even the seventeenth century is demonstrated in the Introduction to the catalogue accompanying the exhibition *The Renaissance Nude* at the J. Paul Getty Museum (2018).[40] The authors analyze the historiography of the nude in Renaissance art as that organized around "sets of terms often framed as opposed…not least the differentiation most famously elaborated by Kenneth Clark between the 'naked' and the 'nude.'" Through an analysis and juxtaposition of works in the exhibition and its

[40] Jill Burke, Stephen J. Campbell, and Thomas Kren, "Introduction: The Renaissance Nude, 1400-1530," in Thomas Kren, ed., *The Renaissance Nude* (Los Angeles: The J. Paul Getty Museum, 2018. Exh. cat.): p. 1.

catalogue, the authors and organizers demonstrate that "categories like 'idealized' and 'realist,' 'humanist' and 'Gothic,' [are] more fluid than static and often complementary, overlapping, or even congruent." This is exactly the type of problematizing that I wish to bring to our understanding of Honthorst's court paintings with the present study.

Objects as Agents

In analyzing Honthorst's courtly production, it is vital to think in terms of agency. By this I mean it is essential to recognize Honthorst's intentionality in creating these pictures rather than seeing in them an abandonment of "artistic genius," as many later critics characterized. It is also vital to understand the agency of his patrons in commissioning the works, fostering an atmosphere in which certain stylistic features dominated, and displaying these objects in varying configurations. Lastly, we must consider the agency of the objects in these displays, where they act and are acted upon in different ways depending on the viewer, location, neighboring objects, and innumerable other factors. In this system, many of Honthorst's later courtly paintings were designed to serve as part of an ensemble that could be inscribed and re-inscribed with meaning over the life of an object. In this ever-changing structure of noble identity formation, there was room for a variety of types and modes of painting, demonstrating a breadth of taste. By the end of the 1620s, however, there was clear preference in The Hague for the bright and legible paintings of Honthorst and several of his contemporaries.

Throughout this project, I have attempted, wherever possible, to incorporate close looking and technical evidence in my quest to seek answers regarding Honthorst's working process and trends therein through the objects themselves. Most of my examinations of paintings have been either in museum galleries or storage spaces rather than conservation labs, but I have made a concerted effort to discuss paintings with conservators and/or access conservation files where permitted. To those ends, when conservation information has been published or gathered by me, I have tried to include or at least reference it in my analysis of the relevant paintings. One of the most consistent pieces of evidence that I have been able to gather is regarding Honthorst's use of various types of grounds, which I have listed in an appendix to this dissertation. The far from comprehensive and conclusive status of our technical understanding of Honthorst's paintings marks the general lack of interest in a systematic conservation study of his work. As it stands, few museums have undertaken a technical study of paintings by Honthorst in their collections, fewer a full conservation treatment of said paintings, and even fewer still have published the results. I hope that this research project as well as recent and upcoming exhibitions on the theme will begin to change that conversation.

My approach to Honthorst's court paintings is also informed by multiple recent interventions into court studies. First and foremost, this project builds upon Nadine Akkerman's *Courtly Rivals* (2014)—the only serious study of Elizabeth's court—and the work of cultural historians on Charles I's collecting practices, to provide a more complete picture of Stuart patronage, particularly as it relates to contemporary Dutch

art. Volumes such as Fiona Donovan's *Rubens and England* (2004) and Gregory Martin's *Rubens in London* (2011) go far in examining Rubens's work in international diplomacy. However, studies of court artists tend to emphasize the painter and his impact, while studies of court culture focus on the role of the patron.[41]

This project, by contrast, develops a new method for understanding the role of the painter, locating court culture at the intersection between artistic self-fashioning and the particular desires of the patron. My project positions Honthorst at the intersection of several networks, for which the change in his style is evidence. Throughout, Honthorst is placed as a fulcrum around which the dynamics of patronage at the Stuart courts can be better understood. Viewed in this context, the objects at the center of this research prompt a reconsideration of what style means as well as the way we think about it. In this sense, Aneta Georgievska-Shine and Larry Silver's *Rubens, Velázquez, and the King of Spain* (2014) serves as a model for the collaborative and interdependent relationship between artist and patron in the expression of courtly ideals. Recent creative approaches to art and diplomacy are also fundamental, such as Michael Auwers's "The Gift of Rubens" (2013), which frames Rubens's 1629 visit to

---

[41] See for example Graham Parry, *The Golden Age Restor'd: The Culture of the Stuart Court 1603-42* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1981), and Kevin Sharpe and Peter Lake, eds., *Culture and Politics in Stuart England* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1993).

London, rather than his paintings, as the gift from one monarch to another.[42] Auwers's study in particular highlights the growing importance of art and the flexibility of its currency in the first decades of the seventeenth century. These questions are at the center of my approach to Stuart patronage, in which the exchange and display of art objects dominate in the formation of royal identity.

Gail Feigenbaum's activation of display and its function in *Display of Art in the Roman Palace* (2014) is a vital methodological model for this project. Feigenbaum unpacks the accretion of meaning onto objects through their display and I take her metaphor of display-as-text to its conclusion, where paintings can be read as pages or chapters with the artists as authors and the patrons as editors.[43] This approach elucidates the key role of Honthorst's paintings in the formation of identity through display at the Stuart courts. Indeed, Frances Gage has taken up Feigenbaum's notion to great effect in her work on Giulio Mancini and the efficacy of painting, when she characterizes a collection as "filled not with inert objects but with agents that, under the command or guidance of the collector, may produce varied effects upon distinct

---

[42] Michael Auwers, "The Gift of Rubens: Rethinking the Concept of Gift-Giving in Early Modern Diplomacy," *European History Quarterly* 43, no. 3 (2013): pp. 421-441.

[43] Feigenbaum "Introduction: Art and Display in Principle and in Practice," in Feigenbaum and Francesco Freddolini, eds., *Display of Art in the Roman Palace, 1550-1750* (Los Angeles: The Getty Research Institute, 2014): pp. 1-24.

classes in accordance with the nature of the object, the space, and the beholder."[44] The transformative effects of art, moreover, were often commented upon in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, and even sometimes represented, as in Francesco Albani's (1578-1660) *Conversion of Saint Catherine of Alexandria*, where a hermit holds up an image of the Madonna before Catherine, prompting her religious conversion (Fig. 1.8).

The idea of objects as agents is particularly potent when considering royal portraiture—the majority of Honthorst's courtly output—as such images not only served a specific salutary purpose but also promoted a corporeal presence of the monarch in the space of the viewer. This is demonstrated firstly by instances of a person showing deference to the royal image as if it were the monarch him/herself, as will be recounted in Chapter 3. Secondly, the agency of portraits is deployed in the courtly realm by the image of the king or the monarch's beloved. In moments of separation the portrait serves as a shadow of the person in absentia: Charles I was said to have "fed his eyes" on the portrait of his future wife Henrietta Maria (1609-69); Frederick V kissed the mouth of the miniature of Elizabeth Stuart that he wore on military campaigns; and the first contact between Henry IV (r. 1589-1610) and Marie de' Medici (1575-1642) in Rubens's great Louvre painting cycle is that of viewing Marie's portrait, presented almost as if Henry is looking in a mirror (Fig. 1.9).

---

[44] Frances Gage, *Painting as Medicine in Early Modern Rome: Giulio Mancini and the Efficacy of Art* (University Park, PA: The Pennsylvania State University Press, 2016): p. 6.

On the one hand, as Gage demonstrates in relation to Mancini, these are codifications of existing practices such as wearing a portrait miniature or trading portraits as part of marriage negotiations.[45] On the other, they are evidence of the reverence paid to portraits, and of the particular power they were capable of exerting. This means that portraits held an important place in early modern systems of display and exchange, as I argue throughout this dissertation. As objects of display, they memorialized the sitter and documented a family line or diplomatic circle. As objects of exchange, they carried the sitter's presence to far-flung locations and served as a constant reminder of the reciprocity required of such a gift. Indeed, early modern responses to portraiture demonstrate that they were anything but passive.

---

[45] Gage, *Painting as Medicine*, p. 5.

FIGURES

ALL IMAGES REMOVED DUE TO COPYRIGHT

Chapter 2

GERRIT VAN HONTHORST COURTS NEW PATRONS

Introduction

Within three years of returning to his native Utrecht from Rome and within a year of each other, Gerrit van Honthorst produced two strikingly different paintings. The first, an *Adoration of the Shepherds* (Fig. 2.1; 1622; Cologne, Wallraf-Richartz Museum) in which the titular figures gather around a luminous Christ Child on a cold night, is a Caravaggesque nocturne.[46] The second, a *Concert* (Fig. 2.2; 1623; Washington, D.C., National Gallery of Art,), is anything but a night piece. In this brightly-colored painting, a sextet of brilliantly-dressed musicians gather around a table, singing merrily before a light, neutral background. Beyond being produced at life-size around the same time by the same artist, they have one important thing in common: already by 1632 they were in the same collection, that of stadtholder Frederik Hendrik in The Hague. Both paintings, then, appealed to courtly circles in that city, but it is the latter type that gained Honthorst enormous international success

---

[46] See Judson 1959, cat. no. 20, pp. 152-153; Judson/Ekkart 1999, cat. no. 23; Magreta 2008, p. 200.

as a court painter in the first half of the seventeenth century. This chapter charts the beginnings of that success and the experimentation that facilitated it.

When Honthorst returned to Utrecht in 1620, he did so with quite a reputation. After spending nearly a decade in Rome working for esteemed collectors such as Benedetto and Vincenzo Giustiniani, Cardinal Scipione Borghese, and Cosimo II, Grand Duke of Tuscany, Honthorst was welcomed back with pomp and circumstance.[47] The Utrecht humanist Aernout van Buchell (1565-1641) describes a homecoming *fête* in Honthorst's honor at the inn Het Poortgen [The Little Gate].[48] This party, attended by prominent artists Abraham Bloemaert, Paulus Moreelse (1571-1638), Gysbert Gillisz. de Hondecoeter (1604-1653), one of the Van Vianen family of goldsmiths (probably Adam, ca. 1600-1667), the art dealer Herman van Vollenhove (1611-1627), and Crispijn de Passe the elder (ca. 1565-1637), was the first step toward Honthorst's reestablishment in northern artistic circles.[49]

---

[47] Brown, *Utrecht Painters*, p. 43. See also Seymour Slive and Jakob Rosenberg, *Dutch Painting: 1600-1800* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1995): p. 22; and Weller et al., *Sinners & Saints*, p. 127. Weller places Honthorst in Rome 1610-11, while Judson lists his entry into Rome at c. 1613 (Judson/Ekkart 1999, p. XXXIII).

[48] TA 1675, II, Book 3, p. 303. Van Buchell 1940, entry July 26, 1620, pp. 1-2: "26. In Porticella fuimus Moreels, Blom, Pas, Gijsbertus, Vianius, Vollenhoven et qui nuper Rome venerat Honthorstius, qui in re pictoria laudabatur, aderant Colini fratres cum filio item pictore Roma r[ediente] et Adamo. Illi artem et ingenium Rubenii elevabant, plus illi profuisse fortunam quam industriam sustinebant."

[49] The reference in the entry to "Adamo" could be either Adam van Vianen or Adam Willaerts, another Utrecht painter and dean of the St. Luke's guild in 1620 (Van Buchell 1940, p. 2n2). In her recent book on Hendrick ter Brugghen, Natasha T.

Having already worked for noble clients in Italy, from the beginning of this second Dutch period Honthorst seems to have had his eye on the lucrative avenue of the courts in The Hague, which uniquely numbered two. One was that of the stadtholder, first Maurits and then, in 1625, Frederik Hendrik and his wife Amalia von Solms. Beginning in 1621, The Hague also hosted the court of Frederick V and Elizabeth Stuart, former Elector and Electress Palatine and King and Queen of Bohemia. By accepting the Bohemian crown, Frederick and Elizabeth had found themselves on the wrong side of the powerful Spanish Habsburgs, who conquered their territories and forced them into exile, as detailed in Chapter 4. As not only an ousted queen, but also a woman of royal lineage—she was the daughter of King James I of England (r. 1603-1625)—Elizabeth was the highest-ranking woman in The Hague and her presence there conferred a higher status onto the activities of the stadtholder's court, a *de facto* royal blessing.[50] Their residence encouraged not only greater

---

Seaman notes that this party, which Ter Brugghen is not recorded as attending, may well have been "a sort of ground zero for the widespread interest in Caravaggism in Utrecht," and that his most Caravaggesque works, *Doubting Thomas* (Amsterdam, Rijksmuseum) and *Calling of Matthew* (Utrecht, Centraal Museum) appeared the following year (*The Religious Paintings of Hendrick ter Brugghen: Reinventing Christian Painting after the Reformation in Utrecht* [Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2012]: p. 55).

[50] Van der Ploeg and Vermeeren, "Art and the Princes of Orange to 1625," in Van der Ploeg and Vermeeren, eds., *Princely Patrons: The Collection of Frederick Henry of Orange and Amalia of Solms in The Hague* (Zwolle: Waanders, 1997. Exh. cat.): p. 17. Though Maurits and his successor Frederik Hendrik styled themselves the Princes of Orange, this was a noble, not royal title, and Frederick and Elizabeth technically outranked them. (See Marika Keblusek and Michèle Hendricks, trans., "The Bohemian Court at The Hague," in Marika Keblusek and Jori Zijlmans, eds., *Princely*

opulence in court ceremony, but also in court decoration, spurring increased collecting activity particularly from Frederik Hendrik and Amalia.[51] As Peter van der Ploeg and Carola Vermeeren have demonstrated in their study of the stadtholder's court, Frederik Hendrik and Amalia were the first in over a century to make a concerted effort to cultivate the art collections, perhaps inspired by the diverse, international character of Frederik's early court life in France and England.[52] That is not to say that his predecessor Maurits did not commission anything, but the ongoing war with Spain lessened his financial resources and his interests seem to have been limited.[53]

Describing the artist's time in Italy, Giulio Mancini characterizes Honthorst's style as being formed in "Rome at that period when the manner of Caravaggio was frequently adopted," and that one of his paintings for Cosimo II de' Medici contained "certain reflected and broken lights due to the [use of] double illumination, show[ing]

Display: The Court of Frederik Hendrik of Orange and Amalia van Solms [Zwolle: Waanders, 1997. Exh. cat.]: p. 50.)

[51] While relations between the Orange and Bohemian courts were initially quite close, over the years a complex rivalry evolved between Amalia and Elizabeth in their quest for advantageous marriages for their children. For the authoritative discussion of this dynamic between Amalia and Elizabeth, see Nadine Akkerman, *Courtly Rivals in The Hague: Elizabeth Stuart (1596-1662) & Amalia von Solms (1602-1675)* (Venlo: VanSpijk/Refaka Publishers, 2014); see also Keblusek, "The Bohemian Court at the Hague," p. 50; and Hoogsteder 1984-86, I, p. 102.

[52] Van der Ploeg and Vermeeren, "Art and the Princes of Orange," p. 17.

[53] Van der Ploeg and Vermeeren, "Art and the Princes of Orange," p. 16.

much skill."[54] That same mode appears to have been his primary type of production upon his return to Utrecht. Within a year of his homecoming, in mid-June 1621, Honthorst had attracted the attention of Dudley Carleton, English Ambassador to The Hague, who wrote to the prominent collector and powerful courtier Thomas Howard, Earl of Arundel, in London. Carleton reports that,

> wee have now a yong man growing into reputacon in these parts who began wth Bloomer of Utrecht (where he dwells likewise) & hath bene for some yeares at Rome & other parts of Italy to mend his art…consisting much in night works.[55]

Carleton then alludes to Honthorst's enterprising nature, detailing how the artist sought him out in order to demonstrate his skill in nocturnes: "he desired of me an invention to my minde wherby to make tryall of him in y^{t} w^{ch} I might rest assured was no copie."[56] It seems significant that, at this early stage in his career, Honthorst was eager to assure Carleton of the originality of the painting, its status as a *principaal*. Though Carleton determined the subject ("invention to my minde"), Honthorst was likely swearing to the novelty of the composition as well as the autograph nature of the

---

[54] As translated in Judson 1959, p. 134. Judson's translation is largely based on Denis Mahon.

[55] Sainsbury 1859, pp. 290-291. Letter from The Hague dated June 12/22, 1621. Also cited in Judson/Ekkart 1999, p. XXXIII; Christopher White, *The Dutch Pictures in the Collection of Her Majesty the Queen* (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 1982): p. xxiii; and Oliver Millar, "Charles I, Honthorst, and Van Dyck," p. 36.

[56] Sainsbury 1859, p. 291.

work, so Carleton would know it was "no copie" in every sense of the word.[57] In light of Carleton's keen appreciation for the presence of the artist's hand, it is perhaps not surprising that much of Honthorst's production in this early period is emphatically stamped with his authorship: "GHonthorst fecit."

Carleton commissioned a painting (now lost) of Aeneas fleeing the sack of Troy, which he sent to London in order to gain Arundel's favor.[58] This posturing was to Honthorst's advantage, however, as it introduced his work to the collectors and nobility of London. Upon receiving the work Arundel responded:

> I thinke the painter hath expressed y^{e} story wth much arte & both for the postures & y^{e} colouringe, I have seene fewe Duch men arrive unto it, for it hath more of y^{e} Itallian then the Flemish & much of y^{e} manor of Caravagioes colouringe, w^{ch} is nowe soe much esteemed in Rome; soe

---

[57] Carleton had, after all, proven a skilled negotiator with Peter Paul Rubens (1577-1640) just a few years earlier, in a 1618 exchange of his paintings for Carleton's ancient marbles. On 27 April Carleton wrote to Rubens: "I do not dispute the prices of [the paintings], esteeming them reasonable, since they are not copies, nor the work of scholars [students], but all from your hand, just as the whole of my antiques show the hand of the master." (Sainsbury 1859, p. 31, letter dated 27 April / 7 May 1618.) Not long after, Carleton appears to have changed his mind about the authenticity of the pictures, and demanded a lower price, to which Rubens responded: "Y.E. [your excellency] must not think that the others are mere copies, but so well retouched by my hand that with difficulty they would be distinguished from originals, notwithstanding which they are put down at a much lower price." (Sainsbury 1859, p. 33, letter dated 2/12 May 1618).

[58] As historian Robert Hill has shown, Carleton had resolved to use works of art for his betterment since 1614. For him, a primary function of art was that of a commodity that he could either profit from or use to attain a higher social status and rank. Hill, "Sir Dudley Carleton and his Relations with Dutch Artists 1616-1632," *Leids kunsthistorisch jaarboek* 13 (2003): p. 255-257, 270.

> as it hath noe fault but only that it is too good a present for me, but since y^{r} Lo^{p} thinks it not soe, I doe receive it wth many thankes.[59]

Arundel's immediate identification of Caravaggio as Honthorst's stylistic antecedent and his praise of this contemporary mode indicates the Earl's keen interest in the artistic production of the continent. Despite this enthusiastic reception, Arundel did not commission any pictures from Honthorst; indeed, a 1655 inventory of his collection lists no works by Honthorst, or even by Caravaggio, suggesting that there was little about this "Roman style" that appealed to him personally.[60] In fact, Honthorst would not gain his desired invitation to England until 1628.

Lacking such an invitation and evidently understanding the limits of the night piece, Honthorst began to change his style in order to appeal to the existing customer bases in The Hague and Utrecht, particularly the stadtholder and the Bohemian monarchs. Though not the most prolific chapter of his career, the years following

---

[59] Sainsbury 1859, pp. 291-292; from SP 14/122/30.

[60] Inventory as translated, restructured, and reproduced in Mary F. S. Hervey, *The Life Correspondence & Collections of Thomas Howard, Earl of Arundel, "Father of Vertu in England"* (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 1921): Appendix V, pp. 473-500. It should be noted, as Hervey does in her introduction to the inventory (p. 273), that the original of 1655—compiled in Amsterdam the year following the death of the Countess of Arundel—is now missing and presumed destroyed, and that, though it contains the bulk of the pictures that the Earl and Countess brought with them to the Netherlands when they fled Civil War England, the absence of some pictures known to be part of the Arundel collection means that the inventory cannot be assumed to be exhaustive,. A (seemingly verbatim) transcription of the original inventory, in Italian, can be found in Lionel Cust and Mary L. Cox, "Notes on the Collections Formed by Thomas Howard, Earl of Arundel and Surrey, K. G.," *The Burlington Magazine for Connoisseurs* 19, no. 101 (August 1911): pp. 278-286.

Honthorst's return from Italy were some of his most ambitious and experimental. Indeed, his early success can be attributed to his introduction of new styles and subject matters into the realms of courtly tastes; there is no secure court portrait that can be placed in this period. While he would eventually offer a new method of picturing the courtly perona to the monarchs of Europe, between 1620 and 1627 his production consists almost entirely of genre and history painting.

The goal of this chapter is to complicate the traditional narrative of Honthorst's *oeuvre* by examining his development of a style and way of painting with force that would suit courtly patrons. This will be principally achieved through the addition of outliers to the simplified canon of Honthorst as a painter of nocturnes and bawdy half-lengths and then as a producer of idealized pastorals. Indeed, it seems that more often than not Honthorst's output resists being placed into a clean narrative of the evolution of style. Where, for instance, should we locate the *Saint Sebastian*, one of his most sculptural and affecting paintings (Fig. 2.3; London, National Gallery)? This work was completed around the same time as both the Washington *Concert* (Fig. 2.2) and Rijksmuseum *Merry Fiddler* (Fig. 2.14), yet the smoothness of the paint application, sense of *pathos*, and uncompromising realism are unequalled by almost every other painting that Honthorst produced.[61] This suggests that Honthorst adjusted his style and

[61] The slumped position of Honthorst's figure is generally cited as the principal inspiration for the similar poses used by his fellow Utrecht painters in their renderings of the subject, see for example Van Baburen's (Fig. 2.4; Hamburg, Kunsthalle), Van

handling for his subject matter, or perhaps for the patron or location of the finished work.

The experimentation that this chapter traces in Honthorst's paintings of the 1620s, moreover, has the court at its core. Honthorst's interaction with the courts in The Hague has been consistently cited by scholars as the cause of a dramatic shift in his painting style and a resulting precipitous drop in the quality of his pictures. As this chapter will argue, the story is much more complicated. Not only were the later hallmarks of Honthorst's courtly modality inchoate in some of his Italian paintings, but also he continued to inject Caravaggesque and provocative elements into his work throughout the period under consideration.

Around 1625, when Joachim von Sandrart joined his studio, Honthorst's success seems to have been expanding at a rapid pace, along with it his number of pupils. As the years went on, he parlayed his initial courtly connection into a position at the intersection of networks between patrons, including Dudley Carleton, Elizabeth Stuart, and Amalia van Solms, which ensured a reliable stream of clients. To serve this increasingly interested group of patrons, Honthorst both responded to and influenced their tastes by admixing the pastoral with the Caravaggesque. As we will see throughout this chapter, the line between these two modes of painting was fuzzy at best, at least in this early period. His stylistic change was furthermore not a straight

---

Bijlert's (Fig. 2.5; Schloss Rohrau), and Ter Brugghen's (Fig. 2.6; Oberlin, Allen Memorial Art Museum).

line, nor was it a move between opposites. If it could be graphed at all, the transition would appear messy and staccato, and the idea of a clean break from Caravaggism is antithetical to Honthorst's actual artistic practice, particularly in the 1620s and 30s.

Providing a more complete picture of the ways in which Honthorst situated himself to respond to the changing tastes of the court and nobility allows us to reconsider how we approach questions of style as they relate to Honthorst and to courtly taste in the early modern period more generally. Close consideration of the paintings reveals Honthorst's combinatory approach to constructing pictures, and that style is not an independent factor of the artist's disposition, as it is so often framed in relation to Honthorst. He combined modes, motifs, and types in order to find those that would appeal to diverse and changing courtly tastes: decorative yet forceful, pleasurable yet polished.

In considering Honthorst's paintings between his return from Italy and journey to England, this chapter begins with an analysis of theoretical approaches to color and light. In examining seventeenth-century attitudes toward their roles in producing *kracht* [force] or *rilievo* [a sense of relief] in a painting, this section suggests how the changes in Honthorst's style were designed to appeal to a network of patrons interested in a range of types. The chapter then investigates Honthorst's studio and working method based on early biographies. This section continues in six parts, one for each year between 1622-27, as no dated works by Honthorst survive from 1620 or 21. Within, the particularities of Honthorst's courtly mode are discussed as they relate to or depart from his output up to that point: pale complexions, bright tones, smooth

brushwork, foregrounded compositions, and static poses. Relevant works of an assumed or probable but not exact date within this period will be considered whenever possible in an effort to complicate our understanding and present a comprehensive picture of this moment of Honthorst's self-fashioning.

Honthorst's Color and Light in Courtly Taste

In the years between 1620 and 1627, Honthorst experimented with and swung between styles as he sought the correct formula to appeal to various court patrons. In tending toward bright color and minimizing light/dark contrasts through even illumination, he seems to have succeeded. Brightening his palette promoted greater readability among his pictures, which when done for courtly patrons were intended for insertion into decorative ensembles within palatial display spaces. When paired with the lessening of shadows, light and color in Honthorst's court paintings worked to produce a more subdued form of *kracht* or force than the tenebrism of works by Caravaggio or Rembrandt. Tending toward the bright and clear, Honthorst's paintings of the 1620s testify to the shifting threads of courtly taste and place him within the broad phenomenon of stylistic shifts among European artists throughout the seventeenth century.

Color

Honthorst's paintings in this post-Italian period are characterized by a variety of color schemes that evidence his interaction with an older generation of Dutch

masters such as Abraham Bloemaert and Pieter Lastman, Italian painters like Caravaggio, the Carracci, Orazio Gentileschi, Domenichino, Bronzino, Pontormo, and Andrea del Sarto, as well as the late Mannerist style of the schools at Fontainebleau.[62] Honthorst's post-Italian pictures can be read as a ravenous combination of modes rather than a rejoinder to any of them.[63] Though the contrast between works such as the *Adoration of the Shepherds* (Fig. 2.1) and *The Concert* (Fig. 2.2) appears to signal an abrupt shift in style, this was not in fact the case. Especially in this early period, Honthorst moved quite easily between what has traditionally been described as the two poles of Caravaggio's tenebrism and the Carracci's idealization.[64] Indeed,

---

[62] On Mannerist color, particularly in relation to Fiorentino, Del Sarto, and Raphael, see Linda Caron, "The Use of Color by Rosso Fiorentino," *The Sixteenth Century Journal* 19, no. 3 (Autumn 1998): pp. 355-378. The importance of the pictorial cycles at Fontainebleau should not be underestimated here. Though it is unclear whether Honthorst saw them, we know that several of his patrons and contemporaries were familiar with the distinctive style and coloring of these works. Frederik Hendrik spent several formative years there as a young man, Charles I spent time in the picture galleries on his way to Madrid in 1623, and Honthorst's teacher Abraham Bloemaert spent more than two and a half years training there, according to Karel van Mander (*The Lives of the Illustrious Netherlandish and German Painters*, translated and edited by Hessel Miedema [Davaco: Doornspijk, 1994]: vol. 1, p. 449). The Galerie de Diane at Fontainebleau has furthermore been proposed as a model for the Diana cycle at Honselaarsdijk (Van der Ploeg and Vermeeren, "'From the 'Sea Princes' Monies': The Stadholder's Art Collection," in *Princely Patrons*, p. 44).

[63] For Blankert and Classicism see Chapter 1, pp. 22-23.

[64] On the problem of relying on these oppositions in the analysis of a change of style, see David M. Stone's important study of the theoretical context surrounding the production and reception of Guercino's paintings. Guercino's work similarly underwent a change from 'naturalistic' to 'classicist' from his early to late career, and Stone reconstructs the complexity of this shift, breaking down the notion of a conflict or reaction between the two styles. *Theory and practice in Seicento art: The example*

throughout this period and his *oeuvre* as a whole the marked change is not one of his manner of painting but rather one of first tone and then subject matter. Even the change in Honthorst's palette, seemingly vast when considering the two works mentioned above, was not irrevocable or unexpected.

Fitting well into a traditional narrative are Italian-period paintings like *Christ before the High Priest* (Fig. 2.7; London, National Gallery) and *Beheading of Saint John the Baptist* (Fig. 2.8; Rome, Santa Maria della Scala), from which *The Concert* of 1623 appears a sudden leap.[65] In reality, however, Honthorst was already experimenting with the combination of these two modes of painting in Italy, or at the very least bounding between them. Works like *Saint Paul Caught up to the Third Heaven* in Santa Maria della Vittoria in Rome have long been acknowledged as exhibiting Honthorst's familiarity with the paintings of the Carracci (Fig. 2.9).[66] The scene is well- and evenly-illuminated, and the bright blues and reds of the foreground

---

of Guercino (PhD diss., Harvard University, 1989): see especially pp. 62-65, 143-144, 147-150, 170-171, 252, 332, 369, 394.

[65] The National Gallery London canvas was painted for the Marchese Vincenzo Giustiniani, in whose collection Sandrart saw it. It was also listed there in a 1638 inventory, no. 125. TA 1675, II, Book 3, p. 303; see also Judson/Ekkart 1999, p. 80, cat. no. 58. Judson records twenty-two painted variations and copies. He does not list a version in the Alte Pinakothek, Munich, which is the same scale as the National Gallery picture but is almost completely destroyed.

[66] Judson 1959, pp. 172-73, cat. no. 57.

are contrasted not with deep shadow but with the pastel robes of the musicians occupying the central register surrounding the titular Saint.

Furthermore, looking closely at some of Honthorst's Italian and early Utrecht paintings does much to qualify the dramatic appearance of his shift: it is not always the coloring itself that changes, but rather the tone as an effect of the light. The later paintings are often brighter, as if the lights have been turned on in a tenebristic tavern, or the party has been moved out of doors. This effect is best illustrated by the discussion of the Louvre and Dresden *Dentists* (Figs. 2.10; 2.11) below, but already in the Italian paintings Honthorst's later palette is emergent. In *Merry Company with a Lute Player* at the Galleria degli Uffizi (Fig. 2.12), the female figure to the proper right of the lutenist wears an elaborately trimmed gown with a matching feathered hat, both of which are a distinctive shade of bright purple. This is akin to the purple worn by the toasting celebrant in the center background of the 1623 *Concert* (Fig. 2.2). Similarly, the bright blue garment of the woman feeding ham to the merrymaker in the right foreground of the Uffizi canvas is repeatedly utilized in Honthorst's light and dark paintings of this period, where it is often juxtaposed with a rich, mossy green. This is found not only in the 1623 *Concert*, but also in the *Saint Cecilia Playing the Organ* (Fig. 2.13; Kassel, Gemäldegalerie Alte Meister Schloss Wilhelmsh*öhe), the Merry Fiddler in the Rijksmuseum* (Fig. 2.14; 1623)*, The Steadfast Philosopher* (Fig. 2.15; 1623; Vienna, Kunsthistorisches Museum), *Satyr and Nymph* (Figs. 2.16, 2.17; 1623; Amsterdam, Rijksmuseum; and Kassel, Gemäldegalerie Alte Meister Schloss

Wilhelmshöhe), and *The Liberation of Saint Peter* (Fig. 2.18; c. 1618; Berlin, Gemäldegalerie).[67]

Several paintings by Honthorst's fellow Caravaggists also exhibit a bright or high-key color shift upon their return from Italy, though its adoption is less consistent. This is particularly true of Hendrick ter Brugghen, whose works are often characterized by almost otherworldly coloring. Examples include the bright pastel garments of three figures in his *Calling of Saint Matthew* (Fig. 2.19; Utrecht, Centraal Museum) with its composition directly lifted from Caravaggio's work of the same subject in the Contarelli Chapel of San Luigi dei Francesi in Rome (Fig. 2.20), the greenish body of Christ in *Crucifixion with the Virgin and Saint John* (Fig. 2.21; ca. 1624-25; New York, The Metropolitan Museum of Art), and the overall pastel tone of *Saint Sebastian Tended by Irene* (Fig. 2.6; 1625; Oberlin, Allen Memorial Art Museum).[68]

---

[67] There are generally fewer examples after 1630. Beginning in the middle of that decade Honthorst's history and pastoral paintings decrease as his production of portraits increase, and though his palette remains similar, particularly in the pastoral images, the tone of the colors gradually becomes less bold.

[68] There was also a tradition of bright coloring in Renaissance painting that exists apart from the complex evolution of Mannerist color as a form of new expression. On the politics of Mannerist aesthetics see Stephen J. Campbell, "Counter Reformation Polemic and Mannerist Counter-Aesthetics: Bronzino's 'Martyrdom of St. Lawrence' in San Lorenzo," *RES: Anthropology and Aesthetics* 46, Polemical Objects (Autumn, 2004): pp. 99-100, 113. Works such as Raphael's (1483-1520) *Entombment* (Fig. 2.22; 1517; Rome, Galleria Borghese), Michelangelo's (1475-1564) *Holy Family [Doni Tondo]* (Fig. 2.23; 1505-6; Florence, Galleria degli Uffizi) and Papal commissions such as Michelangelo's Sistine Chapel Ceiling and Raphael's Vatican *Stanzas* demonstrate a deep well of interest in the expressive potential of color. On

Light and Shade

Honthorst's shifting palette also demonstrates that the perception of color is bound up with the depiction of light and shade, a key producer of value in painting. The ability of a color or light/shadow imbalance to offend the eye is an ancient idea and is elaborated upon by Franciscus Junius (1589-1677), who warns of heavy light-dark contrasts. In the Dutch edition of *The Painting of the Ancients* [*De schilder-konst der oude*], Junius's commentary includes the striking metaphor of a chessboard that is absent from the earlier English or Latin editions:

> Since everyone knows that those paintings that are smeared with coarse patches of various colors, as if they were chessboards, are justly deemed very ugly and despicable, one can easily conclude that hard browns should not be put directly beside clear lights…Those paintings that put black and white carelessly next to each other appear from afar as marble slabs or chessboards.[69]

---

seventeenth-century criticisms of Raphael's style as "stony," see Lorenzo Pericolo, "Statuino: An Undercurrent of Anticlassicism in Italian Baroque Art Theory," *Art History* 38, no. 5 (November 2015): pp. 862-889 and Philip Sohm, *Style in the Art Theory of Early Modern Italy* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001): p. 123.

[69] [Overmids dan ieder een bekent staet dat de stucken die schaeckberds-wijse met groove ende verscheyden verwighe placken bekladt sijn, niet t' onrechte voor gantsch leelick ende verfoeyelick worden gehouden, soo en kanmen daer uyt lichtelick afnemen, dat het harde bruyn sich teghen het klaere licht niet en behoort schielick aen te stouten…De Schilderyen die het swarte en't witte losselick aen een klampen, schijnen van verde eenen marmer-steen ofte een schaeck-berd te ghelijcken] Translated in Thijs Weststeijn, *Art and Antiquity in the Netherlands and Britain: The Vernacular Arcadia of Franciscus Junius (1591-1677)*, Studies in Netherlandish Art and Cultural History (Leiden: Brill, 2015): pp. 129-133, my Dutch transcription taken from Junius 1641, pp. 269-270, and checked against that in Weststeijn, *Art and Antiquity*, p. 392n103. The corresponding passage in the English text (Junius 1638) is p. 281.

Samuel van Hoogstraten directly lifted this idea from Junius when he wrote in his *Inleyding* (1678) that,

> Junius, from whom we borrow this, rebukes the hard contrasts of light and shadow, and says, that such paintings resemble chessboards. In addition, he wishes people to use the power of shadows in moderation, as one takes honey with the tips of the fingers, and not with the whole hand; because this will certainly resemble chess- or checkerboards, full of lights and brown shadows.[70]

Already in *Het schilder-boeck* of 1604, Karel van Mander (1548-1606) suggested that grouping shadows together was essential to the production of good history paintings, but the smooth transition between areas of light and shade was of utmost concern, for which he advocated the use of half-tints.[71] This idea would be adapted in the latter half of the century into the metaphor of a bunch of grapes, first by Charles-Alphonse Dufresnoy (1611-ca. 65; *De arte graphica*, 1668) and then Roger de

---

[70] Van Hoogstraten 1969, p. 305: [En Junius, van wien wy dit gemelde ontleenen, berispt de harde aeneenstooting van lich ten bruin, en segt, dat dergelijke Schilderyen wel shaekberden gelijken. Vorder wil hy, datmen de macht van schaduwen matich gebruike, gelijk alsmen den honich met ‘t uiterste der vingers, en niet met de geheele hand neemt; want dit zullen gewis wel schaek- of damberden gelijken, die vol van lichten en bruine schaduwen geplakt zjin.] A few phrases of this passage are translated in Margriet van Eikema Hommes and Ernst van de Wetering, “Light and Colour in Caravaggio and Rembrandt, as seen through the eyes of their contemporaries,” in Duncan Bull, et al., *Rembrandt, Caravaggio* (Zwolle: Waanders, 2006. Exh. cat.): p. 175. The rest of the translation is my own.

[71] Ulrike Kern, *Light and Shade in Dutch and Flemish Art* (Turnhout, Belgium: Brepols, 2014): p. 29.

Piles (*Cours de peinture par principes*, 1708; Fig. 2.24).[72] De Piles, following Dufresnoy in the false attribution of the concept to Titian (ca. 1488-1576), writes of the power of grouped shadows, that

> the distribution of objects forms masses of *clair-obscur*, when one disposes them by an industrious economy in such a way that their lit parts are combined on one side and their dark parts are combined on the other, and that this massing of lights and shadows prevents the dissipation of our viewing. This is what Titian called the bunch of grapes, because…if they are gathered together in a bunch, so forming one mass of light and one mass of shade, the eyes embrace them as a single object.[73]

In 1641, Philips Angel (ca. 1618-64) had described this principle as an army of shadows, recommending that an artist must properly arrange light and shade together,

> as with a scattered band of soldiers and widely separated war heroes. They can have no hope of victory unless they come together and apply their concerted strength to achieve victory by force. So it is with our divided shadows, which cannot capture the eye of art-lovers while they are scattered.[74]

For Angel, the proper deployment of light and shadow were integral to the production of force [*kracht*] in a painting.[75] The importance (and unstable meaning) of *kracht* are found in an anecdote related by Jacob Campo Weyerman (1677-1747) in his *De*

---

[72] Kern, *Light and Shade*, p. 28.

[73] De Piles 1708, pp. 366-67. As translated in Kern, *Light and Shade*, p. 28.

[74] Angel 1641, p. 224. See also Kern, *Light and Shade*, p. 27.

[75] For *kracht* see Kern, *Light and Shade*, pp. 38-41.

levens-beschryvingen der Nederlandsche konst-schilders (1729), where he describes at length a competition between paintings by Rembrandt and Jacob van Campen (1595-1657), from whose life the story comes. Particularly important for my consideration of Honthorst is that Van Campen's painting (as described it is more akin to a work by Paulus Moreelse now in Pommersfelden; Fig. 2.25) depicts a shepherdess, and thus the competition is a direct theoretical discussion of the two dominant modes of painting before 1650: the pastoral style of the Utrecht and Hague schools, and Rembrandt's naturalism.

Weyerman characterizes Van Campen's painting as a "shepherdess soberly dressed up with a straw hat on her head…dressed in a stiff corset, coloured blood red, and a yellow overskirt, both strong colours." After inviting "all the best connoisseurs," to compare his painting with Rembrandt's portrait of a woman,

> he asked them…what is the most forceful part of the piece? As soon as they had replied, the face and the hands, he said: It is in this that the art consists, Gentlemen, not in tanning everything over or making it black in order to make a face or a pendant stick out, as our famous Rembrandt does. I have picked out the two colours that outcry all others and nevertheless the head of my shepherdess, and her hands, triumph: and there is blood in her cheeks and hands, while the figures by R.v.Rijn mostly look like bloodless phantoms.'
>
> In our view he was partly right, partly wrong, because it is true that one could see the blood running through the cheeks of the graceful nymph, and that everything was treated pleasantly, but the portrait by *Rembrandt van Rijn* was so forceful and intelligent in its lights and shadows, and he paid especial attention to the *houding*, that one saw the piece by *Rembrandt* immediately on entering the coffeehouse, and had to look for the painting by the artist *J.v.Campen* afterwards.[76]

---

[76] Weyerman 1729, III, pp. 217-219. As translated in Kern, *Light and Shade*, pp. 40-41. On the term *houding*, which generally refers to the cultivation of three-

Key to Weyerman's distinction between Van Campen and Rembrandt is the different types of force that their paintings exerted: one with color and one with light. While Rembrandt's was immediately striking, Van Campen's shepherdess more directly evoked a *living presence*. The idea of captivation as related by Angel and Weyerman hints at the potential emotional power of shadows as well. If heightened contrasts lead to greater viewer investment in or identification with an image, then it follows that these higher contrast paintings could elicit a stronger emotional reaction. It is no surprise then, that an artist like Rembrandt, a master of emotionality, was also so skilled in the use of directed light.[77] Perhaps Weyerman is arguing for the ideal of painting as something combining the life-like coloration of Van Campen with the *kracht* of Rembrandt.

If light and shade contribute to the force and emotionality of a painting, they also work to produce *rilievo*, or the effect of relief or three-dimensionality. The *rilievo* effect appeals to our sense of touch and is the product of good modeling, where in its

---

dimensionality in a painting, see Paul Taylor, "The Concept of *Houding* in Dutch Art Theory," *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes* 55 (1992): pp. 210-232.

[77] The ability of shadow to produce *kracht* undoubtedly contributed to what H. Perry Chapman has called Rembrandt's "sustained…interest in exploring the expressive power of darkness." Chapman, "Rembrandt and Caravaggio: Emulation without Imitation," in Lorenzo Pericolo and David M. Stone, eds., *Caravaggio: Reflections and Refractions* (Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2014): p. 277.

absence figures appear flat or, worse, stone-like.[78] The biggest inhibitor of *rilievo*, for Junius and numerous ancient and early modern authors, is a strong contour. In his *L'Aretino* (first published 1557), art theorist Lodovico Dolce (1508/10-1568) includes a discussion of the effects of coloring, contours, and *rilievo* on the success of a painting:

> Fabrini: Of these bad colors I see a very notable example in a painting by Lorenzo Lotto, here in Venice in the Church of Carmini. [Fig. 2.26]
> Aretino: We have no shortage of examples of other painters, who, if I were to mention them, would twist their noses. Now the mixture of colors must be blended [*sfumata*] and united in fashion, which represents the natural, and there remains nothing that offends the eyes: how are the lines of the contours, which must be avoided (which nature does not do) and the darkness, by which I mean the bold and dis-united shadows. These lights and shadows, placed with judgment and art, make the figures round, and give them relief, which is searched for: lacking this *rilievo* the figures seem, as you say, painted, because the flat surface remains.[79]

---

[78] Many of Caravaggio's early biographers, including Mancini, make clear that his harsh lighting effects were chosen to produce a convincing evocation of *rilievo*: Van Eikema Hommes and Van de Wetering, "Light and Colour in Caravaggio and Rembrandt," pp. 171-74.

[79] Dolce 1863, pp. 42-44: [Fabrini: Di queste cattive tinte parmi che si vegga assai notabile esempio in una tavola di Lorenzo Loto, che è qui in Venezia nella chiesa de' Carmini. Aretino: Non ci mancano esempi d'altri pittori, dei quali se io facessi in lor presenza menzione, essi torcerebbono il naso. Ora bisogna che la mescolanza dei colori sia sfumata ed unita di modo, che rappresenti il naturale, e non resti cosa che offenda gli occhi: come sono le linee de'contorni, le quali si debbono fugire (che la natura non le fa) e la nerezza, ch'io dico dell'ombre fiere e disunite. Questi lumi ed ombre posti con giudizio ed arte fanno tondeggiar le figure, e danno loro il rilievo, che si ricerca: del qual rilievo le figure, che sono prive, paiono, come ben diceste, dipinte, perciocchè resta la superficie piana.]

It follows, then, that the lack of strong shadows in Honthorst's post-Italian paintings would produce a sense of shallower relief, the opposite of the strong *rilievo* produced by a pronounced light-dark juxtaposition. This coupled with the brightness of his palette indicates that he was trying to achieve an impact different from that elicited by an artist like Rembrandt. These characteristics contributed to the pleasing, decorative appearance of many of his court paintings, made to fulfill functions from the ceremonial to the leisurely in early modern palaces.[80] However, artists like Raphael had already demonstrated that *rilievo* could also be produced by high-key tonal contrasts.[81] As we will see in the discussion of Honthorst's paintings below, his works are often carefully arranged to produce an orderly sense of pictorial depth, more akin to low-relief than the deeply-carved illusionistic spaces of Caravaggio's paintings.

---

[80] Eric Jan Sluijter (*Rembrandt's Rivals: History Painting in Amsterdam, 1630-1650* [Oculi, Studies in the Arts of the Low Countries, Volume 14. Amsterdam; Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 2015]: p. 88) opposes "decorative" paintings with Rembrandt's "emphatic emotionality," arguing that these two modes constituted "entirely different conceptions of how to make a good painting."

[81] Van Eikema Hommes and Van de Wetering, "Light and Colour in Caravaggio and Rembrandt," p. 172.

A Change of Taste

The complexity of the questions of color and light raised by Honthorst's paintings testify to a pattern of courtly tastes that was multi-directional but ultimately effected a shift toward the bright and decorative. The change seen in Honthorst's courtly production from the Caravaggesque to the pastoral evidences both his self-transformation—he shifted his subjects and modes of painting in seeking court commissions—and situates him as part of a broader phenomenon in which courtly taste is characterized by trends or preferences rather than embargoes against certain types of paintings. This shift was more codified by mid-century, but before that there was great diversity in what constituted a courtly commission, and that diversity is reflected in the changeability found in Honthorst's production of the 1620s.

Looking at some of the collecting activities of the Orange court testifies to the multidirectional nature of courtly taste in the 1620s and 30s. The first commission that Honthorst's former teacher Abraham Bloemaert received from the stadtholder's court, for example, was *Theagenes and Chariclea in the Midst of the Murdered Pirates* (Fig. 2.27; Potsdam, Schloss Sanssouci). Completed in 1625, probably on the occasion of Frederik Hendrik and Amalia's marriage given the amorous themes of the textual source, the ancient Greek love story *Aethiopica*, *Theagenes and Chariclea* is dominated by similar dark tones and intertwined bodies as Bloemaert's more mannerist works, such as *Apollo and Diana Punishing Niobe by Killing her Children* (Fig. 1.1). Frederik Hendrik and Amalia like the work so much that they commissioned two more paintings based on the *Aethiopica* from Bloemaert, which

were completed in 1626 and 1628. *Theagenes Receiving the Palm of Honour from Chariclea*, now in the Mauritshuis (Fig. 2.28), is characterized by brighter coloring, more even lighting, and a regularized arrangement of figures, defining features of much of Honthorst's production for the court as well.[82]

At the same time, though, Frederik Hendrik and Amalia were buying more naturalistic and tenebristic works by artists like Rembrandt and Lievens. In 1632, for example, the somber *Portrait of Amalia* (Fig. 2.29; Paris, Musée Jacquemart-André), which is sometimes (erroneously) presented as a pendant to Honthorst's *Portrait of Frederik Hendrick* (Fig. 2.30; The Hague, Dutch Royal Collections) was commissioned from Rembrandt, though he was better known in court circles as a history painter.[83]

Though he never became consistently attached to the court, Rembrandt continued to produce paintings for the stadtholder and his circle, though his works never found a place in Elizabeth's collection, likely due to cost. By 1632, Frederik Hendrick had also acquired Rembrandt's *Simeon's Song of Praise* (Fig. 2.31; 1631; The Hague, Mauritshuis), which was probably bought as a gift for the stadtholder from Constantijn Huygens and serves as a prime example of the dramatic light effects,

---

[82] Van der Ploeg and Vermeeren, *Princely Patrons*, pp. 104-107, cat. no. 3.

[83] Honthorst's painting is much larger than Rembrandt's, and they were not hung together or considered as a pair in the seventeenth century. See Van der Ploeg and Vermeeren, *Princely Patrons*, pp. 135, cat. no. 9b.

powerful emotionality and narrative, and smoother brushwork of Rembrandt's Leiden period.[84] There is also the well-known example of the *Passion* series, the first two paintings of which, *Elevation of the Cross* and *Descent from the Cross* (both Munich, Alte Pinakothek) which were delivered in 1633.[85]

Nevertheless, bright and idyllic paintings, often based on contemporary literature such as Honthorst's *Granida and Daifilo* (Fig. 2.73) dominated the works acquired by the court in this period. An amorous *Banquet of the Gods* by Cornelis van Poelenburgh was part of the Dutch gift to Amalia in 1627, and Poelenburgh would become one of the most well-represented artists in the stadtholder's collection throughout the decades that followed.[86]

As Frances Gage has demonstrated recently, Giulio Mancini's *Considerazioni sulla pittura* (1617-20) was a treatise on the salutary efficacy of art. In Mancini's opinion, new trends had negatively impacted the legibility of painting. Artists like Caravaggio and others who paint directly from life, Mancini argues, are painters of the multitude; that is, they fail to accurately portray the edifying *affetti* (motions of the

---

[84] Rembrandt also sold three paintings to Carleton, who sent them to Charles I as gifts. Van der Ploeg and Vermeeren, *Princely Patrons*, pp. 184-186, cat. no. 21. Evocative of the back-and-forth of court commissions between Lievens and Rembrandt in this period are the former's *Samson and Delilah* and *Portrait of Constantijn Huygens*, the latter's *Samson and Delilah* (Berlin), and of course the *Passion* series.

[85] Van der Ploeg and Vermeeren, *Princely Patrons*, p. 192, cat. no. 23.

[86] Van der Ploeg and Vermeeren, *Princely Patrons*, p. 222.

soul) in their naturalistic style. Painters of the multitude, for Mancini, render paintings as mere commodities that are antithetical to what Gage calls "a legible, harmonious, and cohesive social order."[87] Gage's work makes clear the interdependence of painting and politics in Mancini's *Considerazioni*: the hierarchical exchange and production of paintings in the court allowed painting to ascend to the realm of a liberal art, rising above mere market valuations to produce social and political influence. Mancini's preference for clarity, then, seeks to elevate the status of painting. That this status was conferred by royal preference for the medium helps to explain why the principles articulated by Mancini, among others, were predominant features of courtly taste.

As Junius's project demonstrates, the expanding interest in and awareness of ancient sources in the Netherlands in this period also influenced what was considered appropriate, decorous, and decorative in painting. It was not necessarily a matter of the courts being more conservative than urban elite buyers, but more one of searching for an international pictorial language of the ancient roots and refined tastes of the nobility. Thijs Weststeijn has demonstrated that Junius's *Painting of the Ancients* did not simply repeat and record but was a living document of the principles of imagined forefathers and the aesthetic values that dominated their cultural life.[88] In England,

---

[87] Gage, *Painting as Medicine,* pp. 121-22.

[88] Weststeijn, *Art and Antiquity*, p. 27.

too, the Ancients served as a living example. In a letter of 1626 Arundel's supporter Sir Thomas Roe (1581-1644) wrote that, "they carry in them a shadow of eternity, and kindle an emulation of glory, by seeing dead men kept long among the living by their famous deeds."[89]

In its trajectory from dark to light, Honthorst's path echoes that of Simon Vouet (1590-1649), who also began his career as an emulator of Caravaggio. Vouet's later works are similarly characterized by a smooth style of painting, bright lighting, and bold yet gentle coloring, a pioneering introduction to French art that directly inspired later grand manner Academic painting and its most famous advocate, his pupil Charles Le Brun (1619-1690).[90] Honthorst, however, arrived at this combination several years before Vouet, whose success in Italy was redirected to the court of Louis XIII (r. 1610-1643) when he was recalled there in 1627.[91] The monumental figures

---

[89] Thomas Roe to Lucy Countess of Bedford, December 1626, as quoted in Ruth Guilding, *Owning the Past: Why the English Collected Antique Sculpture, 1640-1840* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2014): p. 26.

[90] On Charles Le Brun's pictorial philosophy see Jennifer Montagu, *The Expression of the Passions: The Origin and Influence of Charles Le Brun's* Conférence sur l'expression générale et particulière (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1994): especially Chapters 2 and 3.

[91] The date of Vouet's return to France is almost always given as 1627, but in their recent book on the Le Nain brothers, C.D. Dickerson and Esther Bell state that he arrived back in Paris in November of 1626 (*The Brothers Le Nain: Painters of Seventeenth-Century France* [San Francisco: Fine Arts Museums of San Francisco; New Haven: Yale University Press, 2016. Exh. cat.]: p. 48). Félibien 1690 (p. 181) gives the date as 1627 and specifies that his return was ordered by Louis XIII and coupled with the offer to become the "premier Peintre" to the king.

with bright, flowing draperies and carefully composed (often outdoor) settings characteristic of Vouet's French period appear with increasing frequency around 1640, when the artist was developing his courtly style under the demands of Louis XIII and his courtiers.[92]

That both Honthorst and Vouet arrived at similar stylistic traits says something significant about courtly aesthetic interests in this period. While a deep-rooted sense of nationalism coupled with an interest in religious separatism and mild xenophobia permeated most early modern courts, there existed at the same time an overwhelming movement toward the international.[93] In the collecting of old masters, commissioning of contemporary artists, and the intellectual exercises of display and connoisseurship, the artistic activities of a court aimed to equalize it with its peers throughout Europe.

---

[92] See, for example, *Diana* (London, Royal Collection Trust), done in 1637 as a gift for Charles I; *Venus and Adonis* (About 1642; Los Angeles, J. Paul Getty Museum); *Allegory of Wealth* (c. 1640; Paris, Musée du Louvre); *Heavenly Charity* (c. 1640; Paris, Musée du Louvre); *Presentation in the Temple* (1640-41; Paris, Musée du Louvre); and *Toilet of Venus* (ca. 1640; Pittsburgh, Carnegie Museum of Art). Vouet's work for the French elite was so extensive that the court historian and biographer André Félibien bragged that, "there are hardly any churches, palaces, or great houses in Paris that are not decorated with his works." [Il n'y a gueres d'Eglises, de Palais & de Maisons considerable à Paris qui ne soient ornées de ses ouvrages.]. Félibien 1690, p. 186 (septième entretien).

[93] See, for example, Charles's ambivalent relationship with Spain as discussed in Chapter 3, the opposition to the idea that Elizabeth Stuart would marry a Catholic instead of a Protestant as discussed at the beginning of Chapter 4, or Erin Griffey's account of the anti-Catholic and anti-French suspicion that surrounded Henrietta Maria's household, as well as the role of national identity in her cultivation of magnificence (*On Display: Henrietta Maria and the Materials of Magnificence at the Stuart Court* [New Haven: Yale University Press, 2015]: pp. 63-81).

This fostered an atmosphere of competition, rivalry, and emulation in which the courtly ideal was constantly being redefined. While this competitive exuberance elevated Peter Paul Rubens to the most successful court painter of the first half of the century, it also made space for the development of a style—smooth, polished, a decorous, decorative manner of painting—that pushed against the idea of a national school. Of course, the ideal of a style that tilts toward the universal did not remain as such: the decorative programs of Honthorst and others became intrinsic to the ruling identity of the Princes of Orange while Vouet's style became, via Le Brun, an image of France writ large.

Nevertheless, both Vouet and Honthorst seem to have telegraphed and further developed this trend. This can help to explain why artists were constantly being imported, exported, and traded to serve various courts: Honthorst and Daniel Mytens from the Netherlands, Vouet and Orazio Gentileschi (1563-1639) from Italy, Rubens and Anthony van Dyck from Flanders. This continued a fashion that had proliferated in some Mannerist circles of the sixteenth century, where the Flemish Bartholomeus Spranger (1546-1611) transformed the court culture of Holy Roman Emperor Rudolf II (r. 1576-1612) and especially in France at the royal Château de Fontainebleau, where painters such as Abraham Bloemaert experienced the grand decorative schemes of Rosso Fiorentino (1494-1540), Nicolò dell'Abate (1509/12-71), and Primaticcio (1504-70). While artists sought the consistency, generosity, and fame of court patronage, monarchs sought the intellectual and cultural domination that accompanied

primacy in the visual arts.[94] In this context the Earl of Arundel's response to Honthorst's *Sack of Troy* makes additional sense. In describing the picture as having "much of y^{e} manor of Caravagioes colouringe, w^{ch} is nowe soe much esteemed in Rome," Arundel was paying particular attention to the *international* character of Honthorst's painting, albeit an international style that waned quickly throughout Europe in the face of this shift in taste.

Honthorst's Working Practice

The Studio

Various seventeenth-century accounts give us some idea of what a visit to Honthorst's studio may have been like. Mancini addresses the artist's comportment and working practices, writing that he was,

> very reserved and melancholic, but none the less is well-mannered and courteous in showing his paintings to studio visitors, and does not even object to working in their presence…he is a man of his word who can be trusted to deliver a painting on the date promised- a quality not so common among painters.[95]

---

[94] Barbara Brejon de Lavergnée ("Vouet, Simon." Oxford Art Online, 2003, <https://doi.org/10.1093/gao/9781884446054.article.T090199> [Accessed 1 March 2019]) notes that Parisian aristocrats "saw in Vouet a painter capable of decorating their hotels and chateaux in a manner that would rival the palazzi of their Italian counterparts."

[95] As translated in Judson 1959, p. 134. Mancini devotes part of his biography to the prices that Honthorst obtained for his paintings. On Mancini's preoccupation with finances see Richard E. Spear and Philip L. Sohm, *Painting for Profit: The Economic Lives of Seventeenth-Century Italian Painters* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2010); and Gail Feigenbaum, "Introduction."

This view of Honthorst as calm, reserved, and reliable seems out of step with the raucous merry companies that he painted so frequently in Italy and in the first years of his return to Utrecht. In fact, Honthorst was more than familiar with the workings of brothels and the lively activities therein. On 11 June 1619 he was arrested at four or five am in the house of Vittoria da Rieti, a prostitute with whom he had been consorting for at least nine months. This relationship, explained in Honthorst's allocution given the next day in Italian, was not the source of his legal trouble. He was arrested for carrying his sword, which he had official permission to do in public, but not in brothels [*casa di puttan*] or forbidden places [*luoghi prohibiti*].[96]

---

[96] Information and Italian terms taken from ASR, Curia di Brogo, vol. 749-1631, costituti 1 marzo – 25 agosto 1619, XII giugno 1619, where Honthorst is referred to as "Gherardus ontos flander"; see also Cavazzini, "Le milieu de Simon Vouet: les peintres à Rome entre l'Académie de Saint-Luc et les tribunaux romains de la première moitié du Seicento," in Olivier Bonfait et Hélène Rousteau-Chambon, eds., *Simon Vouet en Italie* (Rennes: Presses universitaires de Rennes; Paris: Institut national d'histoire de l'art, 2011): p. 143. This incident was brought to my attention by Liesbeth Helmus during a discussion of this chapter on 23 August 2018 and is published in her newest volume on Utrecht Painters: "The Utrecht Caravaggisti: Imitation and Improvement," in Bernd Ebert and Helmus, eds., *Utrecht, Caravaggio and Europe* (München: Hirmer Verlag GmbH, 2018. Exh. cat.): pp. 55-56. It had not, until 2015, been published or even mentioned in the Honthorst literature, when Gianni Papi discussed and transcribed the record in "Gerrit van Honthorst fra Italia e Olanda," in Gianni Papi, ed., *Gherardo delle Notti: quadri bizzarissimi e cene allegre* (Florence: Giunti, 2015. Exh cat.): p. 40, transcription p. 258. It was first published, to my knowledge, by Patricia Cavazzini, in "Artemisia and the Other Women in Agostino Tassi's Life: Attitudes to Women's Improper Sexual Behaviour in Seventeenth-Century Rome," in Judith W. Mann, ed. *Artemisia Gentileschi: Taking Stock* (Turnhout, Belgium: Brepols, 2005): pp. 43, 48n36.

Describing Rubens's visit to Utrecht in 1627, Sandrart echoes Mancini and recounts how Honthorst happily spent a long time showing Rubens everything he had on hand in the studio, with the Flemish master taking particular interest in a painting of Diogenes for which Sandrart assumed partial credit.[97] By the time Sandrart came to Honthorst's studio (ca. 1625), there were twenty-four or -five pupils, who paid the master the staggering sum of 100 guilders each year to be taught by him.[98] Unfortunately Sandrart places only a few artists in Honthorst's studio, a space presumably located in a large, north-facing room on the upper floor of Honthorst's house at 6 Domplein, Utrecht.[99] He officially purchased the house in 1627 but his relatives had lived there since 1596, and Honthorst could have occupied the house before purchasing it, becoming the primary resident as early as 1621, when the first of

---

[97] TA 1675, II, Book 3, p. 291; See also Appendix B, no. 2. After this, Sandrart took Rubens to see the studios of Bloemaert, Poelenburgh, and others when Honthorst was taken ill, though Honthorst later threw a banquet in Rubens's honor to mark the occasion of his visit. Peter Hecht ("Dutch Painters in England: Readings in Houbraken, Weyerman, and Van Gool," in Simon Groenveld and Michael J. Wintle, eds., *The Exchange of Ideas: Religion, Scholarship, and Art in Anglo-Dutch Relations in the Seventeenth Century* [Zutphen: Walburg Instituut, 1994]: p. 155) interprets Sandrart's account as the younger artist seizing upon the opportunity of Honthorst's illness to escort Rubens around the city as part of a plan to gain entrée into the royal circles of England.

[98] TA 1675, II, Book 3, p. 303. Sandrart's tenure in Honthorst's studio was c. 1625-1628, according to Christian Klemm in his commentary on Sandrart's *Lives* (Sandrart and Klemm 1995, p. 870, n 538, 2).

[99] For these pupils see Chapter 3, p. 167.

these relatives died.[100] At the time of Sandrart's apprenticeship, however, Honthorst may still have lived in his previous, more modest home on the Snippevlucht in Utrecht.[101]

Sandrart uses the term *unser Academia* [our academy] not in his life of Honthorst, but in his shorter descriptions of some of Honthorst's pupils: Jan and Andries Both (ca. 1618-52; 1611/12-41), Robert van Voerst (1597-1635/6), Jan van Bronchorst (ca. 1603-before 1661).[102] The use of the term *Academia* implies a gathering organized for the transmission of knowledge, while Sandrart's designation of the group as *our* academy indicates a coming together with common purpose. Several masters in Utrecht, including Honthorst's former teacher Bloemaert, had joined together to provide teaching services, usually life drawing, as had been done in

---

[100] Honthorst purchased his home on the Domplein in Utrecht in 1627 from the estate of his relative, the Oudmunster canon Robert van Honthorst, who had purchased the house in 1596 and had shared it with his brother Hendrick since 1615. Robert died in 1621, and Hendrick in 1624. See Sandrart TA 1675, II, Book 3, p. 267; Judson/Ekkart 1999, p. 223, cat. no. 286; Samuel Muller, "Twee Utrechtsche klaustrale huizen," *Oud Holland* 35 (1917): pp. 210-211; Marten Jan Bok, *Nieuw licht op de Gouden Eeuw,* p. 277; Ger Luijten, ed., et al., *Dawn of the Golden Age: Northern Netherlandish Art, 1580-1620* [*Dageraad der Gouden Eeuw: Noordnederlandse Kunst, 1580-1620*] (Amsterdam: Rijksmuseum; Zwolle: Waanders; New Haven: Yale University Press, 1993. Exh. cat.): pp. 155-156; and Jos A. L. de Meyere, *Nieuwe gegevens over Gerard van Honthorst's beschilderd plafond uit 1622* (Utrecht, 1976): pp. 20-21.

[101] He moved into this residence the year of his marriage to Sophia Coopmans, in 1620. Judson/Ekkart 1999, p. XXXIII; Joaneath A. Spicer et al., *Masters of Light: Dutch Painters in Utrecht during the Golden Age* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1997. Exh. cat.): pp. 88-89.

[102] TA 1675, II, Book 3, pp. 312, 360, 317.

Haarlem under Van Mander, Hendrick Goltzius (1558-1617), and Cornelis Cornelisz. van Haarlem (1562-1638).[103] If Honthorst did participate in a wider collaborative effort, it was likely the drawing academy that had been established by Bloemaert and Paulus Moreelse in 1612. This type of arrangement also allowed artists to skirt guild records and regulations, expanding their number of pupils or the size of their workshop beyond what was technically allowed.[104] It is unclear from Sandrart's uses of the term throughout the *Teutsche Academie* whether he is always referring to an established academy such as those of the Carracci or the city of Florence, or to a more

---

[103] Judith Noorman ("On Truth and Beauty. Drawing Nude Models in Rembrandt's Time," in Judith Noorman and David de Witt, eds., *Rembrandt's Naked Truth: Drawing Nude Models in the Golden Age* [Zwolle: WBooks, 2016. Exh. cat.]: esp. pp. 13-14) designates the term *Academia* as used by Sandrart and others, like Van Hoogstraten, as describing a private and above all informal drawing group; see also Holm Bevers, "Drawing in Rembrandt's Workshop," in Holm Bevers et al., eds., *Drawings by Rembrandt and His Pupils: Telling the Difference* (Los Angeles: J. Paul Getty Museum, 2009. Exh. cat.): pp. 1-30, especially pp. 2-4; Claartje Rasterhoff, *Painting and Publishing as Cultural Industries: The Fabric of Creativity in the Dutch Republic, 1580-1800* (Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, 2017): pp. 229-230; Marten Jan Bok, "'Nulla dies sine linie': De Opleiding van Schilders in Utrecht in de Eerste Helft van de Zeventiende Eeuw," *Zeventiende eeuw: cultuur in de Nederlanden in interdisciplinair perspectief* 6, no. 1 (1990): p. 59; and Hessel Miedema, "Kunstschilders, gilde en academie Over het problem van de emancipatie van de kunstschilders in de Noordelijke Nederlanden van de 16de en 17de eeuw," *Oud Holland* 101, no. 1 (1987): pp. 13-21.

[104] On Bloemaert's "Academy" and the extensive networks of collaboration in Utrecht see Elizabeth Ann Nogrady, *Abraham Bloemaert (1566-1651), the "Netherlandish Academy" and Artistic Collaboration in Seventeenth-Century Utrecht* (PhD diss., New York University, 2009): Ch. 1, especially p. 29.

informal collective.[105] In his discussion of Rubens's visit with Honthorst in 1627, Sandrart uses neither the term *Academia* nor studio, making the distinction or commonality between the two ambiguous. If they were separate entities, it is unclear whether Honthorst participated in the Utrecht academy or ran his own, though the large sums that Sandrart notes he drew from his students indicates an independent venture.

Mancini's and Sandrart's accounts indicate a studio environment bustling with activity yet dedicated to the completion of tasks under the eye of a fastidious master. Prepared with a stock of paintings on hand to demonstrate his breadth of skill and willing to perform his craft for interested parties, Honthorst comes across as taciturn yet entertaining when need be. The atmosphere of Honthorst's studio was likely less florid than that of Rubens, who in 1621 was observed by the Danish doctor Otto Sperling painting while simultaneously dictating a letter and having Tacitus read to him.[106] Nevertheless wishing to create a lasting impression upon his visitors, Honthorst quickly undertook an ambitious piece in 1622, *Musical Group on a*

---

[105] He refers to both the Carracci's academy and Florence's academy using the same term: "Academia des Caraccio in Rom" (TA 1675, II, Book 2, p. 191) and "Academia zu Florenz" (TA 1675, II, Book 3, p. 342.

[106] Wolfgang Stechow, *Rubens and the Classical Tradition* (Cambridge, MA: Published for Oberlin College by Harvard University Press, 1968): pp. 8-9.

Balcony, the same year that he became a master in the Utrecht Guild of St. Luke (Fig. 2.32; Los Angeles, J. Paul Getty Museum).[107]

1622

Though a remarkable number of paintings by Honthorst are dated, no works survive that can be definitively placed in 1620 or 21. For my purposes, then, his earliest post-Italian paintings date from 1622, one of his most productive of these early years. At that moment, he produced *Musical Group on a Balcony*, the first painting that bears all the hallmarks of his later courtly modality (Fig. 2.32), and the vastly different Cologne *Adoration of the Shepherds* (Fig. 2.1), his only surviving nocturne to enter the collection of the Dutch stadtholder. At the same time, he received early courtly commissions in *David Playing the Harp* and *Emperor Otho* (Figs. 2.47, 2.48) and completed one of his most dramatically-lit, Caravaggesque scenes with the Dresden *Dentist* (Fig. 2.10).

The demonstration piece mentioned above, *Musical Group on a Balcony*, is preserved in a diminished state in the J. Paul Getty Museum (Fig. 2.32) and is the first documented Italianate, illusionistic ceiling painting produced in the Northern Netherlands. The painting is dated 1622, the same year that Honthorst became a

---

[107] He also served as the Guild's dean in 1625, 26, 28, and 29. See Samuel Muller, *De Utrechtsche Archieven I: Schilders-Vereenigingen te Utrecht* (Utrecht: Rijksarchief in de Provincie Utrecht, 1880): pp. 116, 119, and 128.

master in the St. Luke's Guild, meaning this ceiling could well have served as his 'masterpiece' for entering the guild. As such, this work would have announced Honthorst's capacity for creative design and meticulous execution.

In 1976, Jos de Meyere convincingly argued that the painting once hung on the ceiling of the hallway off the vestibule of Honthorst's home at 6 Domplein in Utrecht, installed when he purchased the residence in 1627.[108] Assuming that the studio was on an upper floor of the house, this passageway would have been the ideal place for such a masterpiece: it connected the entrance of the house with the only staircase and thus the only means of accessing the upper floors (Fig. 2.33). Though as discussed above there is no evidence that Honthorst occupied this house before 1627, the work could have been designed for a similar space in his house on the Snippevlucht and then moved. Indeed, it has been cut down and altered several times over the years (including serving as doors at one point in the nineteenth century) so a dimension change at an early date is conceivable, as is the possibility that it was a gift for or commission from his wealthy relatives at 6 Domplein.[109] Remarkably, Honthorst's

---

[108] De Meyere, *Nieuwe gegevens*, pp. 21-23.

[109] The painting is comprised of a number of panels (some better described as planks), and has been reduced in size by at least half, having suffered extensive damage in the course of its various reformattings. The figure in the upper right is actually a portrait of a previous owner, who had himself inserted into the image before hanging it on the ceiling above his gilded, seashell-shaped bed. Curatorial files, J. Paul Getty Museum, examined 23 June 2017.

signature survives intact, a declarative statement just right of center on the underside of the lower balustrade: "GHonthorst. Fe 1622" (Fig. 2.34).

In constructing space within *Musical Group on a Balcony,* Honthorst was thinking back to several ambitious *di sotto in sù* ceiling paintings that he had seen in Rome. For his palace on the Quirinal Hill in Rome, the Palazzo Pallavicini-Rospigliosi, Cardinal Scipione Borghese commissioned an ambitious illusionistic fresco program from Orazio Gentileschi and Agostino Tassi (ca. 1579-1644) at the end of 1611.[110] The room, now known as the *Casino delle Muse* after the painted figures that occupy it, boasts an impressive construction of fictive architecture (Fig. 2.35). In Tassi's scheme, an elaborate balustrade supports piers with composite columns that form an upper gallery open to the sky, above which soars a painted ceiling with faux coffers, stone-, and plaster-work. Gentileschi populates this grand colonnade with nineteen mostly female musicians and bystanders. These figures sit on, lean over, or otherwise overlap Tassi's imagined balustrade while their instruments are held against the sky in harmony.

Honthorst could have easily viewed this ceiling, as he completed at least two paintings for Borghese between 1617 and 1618.[111] He may have even seen Gentileschi

---

[110] Daniela di Castro, Anna Maria Pedrocchi, and Patricia Waddy, *Il Palazzo Pallavicini Rospigliosi e la Galleria Pallavicini*, Archivi de arte antica (Torino: Umberto Allemandi, 1999): p. 66.

[111] See Judson/Ekkart 1999, cat. nos. 36, 72.

and Tassi's ceiling in progress, as he arrived in Rome circa 1613. Though Honthorst's 1622 painted ceiling is a simplified approach to the subject, in keeping with what would become his more austere courtly mode, the source of his inspiration seems clear.[112] This supposition has added weight when considering the original format of Honthorst's painting: a fully realized rectangular balustrade, with more of the architecture and figures shown on all sides.

In Honthorst's image, a musical company dressed in a mixture of semi-theatrical, semi-*all'antica* costumes gather in a song conducted by the woman in yellow at lower right. As in the *Casino delle Muse*, their instruments and persons are silhouetted against the sky, drawing attention to the painting's harmonious theme. The outdoor setting may well have been the impetus behind this earliest surviving instance of Honthorst's bright palette and clear, even illumination. The conspicuous parrot in Honthorst's painting may have found an analogue elsewhere in the Palazzo Pallavicini-Rospigliosi: Paul Bril's (1554-1626) *Loggia della Pergola* (Fig. 2.37).[113] In Bril's luminously colored fictive pergola, birds and flowers of all species are set

---

[112] A fresco cycle in Pope Paul V Borghese's (1550-1621) Palazzo del Quirinale may have been an additional source of inspiration. In the *Salone dei Corazzieri* [Salon of the Cuirassiers], depicts, in its upper register, eight dramatized diplomatic missions to Paul V's Rome. Done under the direction of Tassi, Giovanni Lanfranco (1582-1647), and Carlo Saraceni (ca. 1579-1620) and completed in 1616, the fresco shows groups of foreign diplomats leaning animatedly over fictive, carpet-draped balustrades and through archways, beyond which the sky is visible (Fig. 2.36).

[113] DiCastro, Pedrocchi, and Waddy, *Il Palazzo Pallavicini Rospigliosi e la Galleria Pallavicini*, pp. 23-38.

against a sky much brighter than Gentileschi and Tassi's. These include a parrot perched on one of the upper roundels (Fig. 2.38). In the Getty ceiling, Honthorst also seems to have excerpted the chorus of angelic musicians that surrounded Saint Paul in his previous altarpiece (Fig. 2.9). These figures, bedecked in pastel and silhouetted against the clouds, thus came to occupy a secular setting just four years later.

The same year that he was completing the *Musical Group on a Balcony*, Honthorst also produced a large-scale, deeply Caravaggesque *Adoration of the Shepherds* (Fig. 2.1). Probably kept in the studio for several years after its completion as a demonstration piece before entering the stadtholder's collection, this would become the only work by Honthorst in the Orange collections that can be definitively linked to the type of painting for which he initially became famous: a nocturne.[114] In it, three shepherds in various states of amazement and reverence gather before Mary,

---

[114] This is based on a conversation in front of the painting with Anja Sevcik, Head of the Department of Baroque Painting at the Wallraf-Richartz-Museum, Cologne, on 21 September 2017. Magreta 2008*,* no. 101, p. 269: "A chimneymantel with gilt borders, the green ground also the same as the ceiling, in it a painting of the shepherds coming to greet Christ, done by Honthorst." [*Eenen schoorste[e]nmantel vergult met biesen, den gront groen gelijck mede de solderinge, daerinne een schilderie daer de herders Christus comen begroeten, door Hondthorst gedaen.*] In the same gallery as the *Adoration* hung "A painting of Venus and Ceres with various satyrs by Honthorst." (Magreta 2008, p. 200, no. 102: [Een schilderije van Venus en Ceres met verscheyden satyrs door Hondthorst]). This entry is sometimes associated with a work of c. 1623-24, *Without Ceres and Bacchus, Venus would Freeze*, now in Pommersfelden (Schloss Weissenstein) and indeed, this is the only surviving painting by Honthorst containing both Venus and Ceres (Judson/Ekkart 1999, cat. no. 99, pp. 110-111). Judson/Ekkart 1999 list the painting described in the inventory as cat no. 151, p. 134, whereabouts unknown.

Joseph, and the Christ Child. The baby's ethereal glow serves as the painting's only light source, illuminating among other things the frigid setting through the steaming breath of the cow at right. This painting, like Honthorst's rowdy tavern scenes, demonstrates his biggest contribution to the Caravaggesque in the inclusion of a visible light source. Though he did not invent this device—it had been employed more than thirty years earlier, for example, by Jacopo Bassano (ca. 1510-92) in his altarpiece for San Giorgio Maggiore in Venice (Fig. 2.39)—it was one of Honthorst's favored compositional strategies in works of this subject. He used it just a few years earlier in an *Adoration* for Grand Duke Cosimo II de' Medici, now in the Uffizi (Fig. 2.40). The similarities between the Uffizi and Cologne paintings indicate that Honthorst reused or repurposed a style that had gained him success with a high-level Italian patron. The change in Honthorst's approach to the subject over the course of the next decade is demonstrated by his *Adoration of the Shepherds* in the Toledo Museum of Art, which is done at much smaller scale and exhibits the bright, even illumination of heavenly light, streaming in from the upper left (Fig. 2.41).

Deriving from Caravaggesque merry companies (Fig. 2.42; Munich, Alte Pinakothek) and works like Caravaggio's *Lute Player* (Fig. 2.43), Honthorst and his fellow Utrecht painters introduced the type of the half-length, single figure merrymaker or musician around 1621 (Figs. 2.39, 2.40; Kassel, Schloss Wilhelmshöhe). The majority of these paintings have overtly erotic connotations, and many of Honthorst's images of this type are no different (see, for example, *Smiling Young Man Squeezing Grapes*; Fig. 2.46; Worcester Art Museum). At the same time,

however, Honthorst produced *King David Playing the Harp* (Fig. 2.47; Utrecht, Centraal Museum), which adopts the same format of a half-length musician against a neutral background but adds historical specificity in the costume and attitude of the figure. His crown, pearl-trimmed shirt, and ermine-lined damask robe make clear that the painting depicts the biblical King David. He is shown in the midst of singing and playing the harp, eyes cast up as he acknowledges God as the giver of his musical talent and thus the ability to bring comfort to Saul as he is tortured by an evil spirit. In this image, the entirety of David's adult life seems collapsed into a single moment: playing the harp for Saul comes early in the biblical narrative, but his crown indicates that he is king already, which comes much later.[115]

As evidenced by later inventories, *King David* was probably owned by Elizabeth Stuart, for whom the Old Testament subject matter may have held personal significance. In the 1866 catalogue of the pictures at Coombe Abbey, number 365 is described as "David Playing on his Harp . . . *G. Honthorst*", and the Utrecht painting is signed "G Honthorst fe. 1622."[116] As will be discussed in Chapter 4, Coombe Abbey was the seat of the Earls of Craven beginning in the seventeenth century and William, 1st Earl of Craven (1608-1697), was a close friend and supporter of Elizabeth Stuart. Craven inherited her papers after her death in 1662, and her sons Rupert (1619-

---

[115] 1 Samuel 16:14-23

[116] Combe Abbey 1866, p. 22; See also Hoogsteder 1984-86, II, p. 12.

82) and Charles Louis (1617-80) placed him in charge of most of Elizabeth's paintings. Her sons were interested in monetizing the better part of her possessions for reinvestment into the Palatinate, so Craven seems to have taken the opportunity to absorb many of Elizabeth's paintings into his collection. As such, a large portion of Elizabeth's collections can be traced through that of the Earls of Craven.[117] Thus, *King David*'s presence in the 1866 Combe Abbey inventory is one strong argument for its presence in the Elizabeth's collection in The Hague, perhaps as early as 1622.

A second is the date of 1622 itself. In that year, Dudley Carleton—the British Ambassador to The Hague who had sent Honthorst's *Aeneas Fleeing the Sack of Troy* to the Earl of Arundel the previous year—was also engaged in art dealing on Elizabeth's behalf. When sending the *Aeneas* in 1621, Carleton first reported to Arundel that he was traveling about the Netherlands with Elizabeth and Frederick looking at paintings.[118] In 1622 Carleton also encouraged the ambitious Flemish merchant Daniel Nijs (1572-1647), who would play a prominent role in helping to acquire the Gonzaga collection for her brother Charles I the following year, to aid in Elizabeth's acquisitions of paintings. Nijs responded to Carleton in July: "I had almost decided to abandon my interest in pictures, but having seen from you that the Queen

---

[117] Hoogsteder 1984-86, I, pp. 52-53.

[118] Sainsbury 1859, p. 290, letter from The Hague dated 12/22 June 1621: "Having wayted lately on y^{e} K. & Q. of Bohemia to Amsterdam, I there saw y^{e} picture of Holbens yo^{r} L^{p} desires."

[of Bohemia] takes pleasure in them, I shall see that I bring a fine selection with me, and also my cabinet, which is much enriched since your Excellency saw it."[119] That Carleton had consistent, close contact with Elizabeth and Frederick during this period is evidenced by several accounts in the financial rolls from Charles's court. This includes at least one instance where Carleton served as the intermediary between Elizabeth and the Crown's financier Filippo Burlamacchi, from whom Carleton received money for the upkeep of the "houshould of the said Lady Elizabeth Electrise Pallatino for the □onths of November December and January 1622."[120]

A third argument for Elizabeth as a patron or early owner of *King David* is the work's subject matter and its thematic connection to her husband, Frederick. Elizabeth's bedchamber at Rhenen was decorated with a set of six tapestries recounting the history of Joseph.[121] If, as I argue in Chapter 4, these tapestries depicted the Joseph of the New Testament, King David's position as one of Joseph's ancestors would directly connect Honthorst's painting with this suite of tapestries,

---

[119] SP 84/107/72, f. 173A, 19/29 July 1622; See also Robert Hill, "Ambassadors and art collecting in early Stuart Britain: The parallel careers of William Trumbull and Sir Dudley Carleton, 1609-1625," *Journal of the History of Collections* 15, no. 2 (2003): p. 219, 228n93; and Christina M. Anderson, *The Flemish Merchant of Venice: Daniel Nijs and the Sale of the Gonzaga Art Collection* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2015): pp. 92-93.

[120] AO 1/5/3: roll spanning 1 December 1620 through the end of March 1629. For Burlamachi see Ch. 4, p. 248n601.

[121] Kretzschmar 1903, p. 107.

displayed in Elizabeth's privy chambers. This is reinforced by the frequent associations of Frederick V with King David, particularly after his struggles with the Spanish began. In a sermon given in the Palatinate in 1619, strong associations were made between the two: the Protestants (Frederick and the Bohemian people) were compared with the children of Israel and their persecution under King Saul (the Habsburg Emperors).[122] Honthorst's painting therefore works to both emblematize David's (Frederick's) current state of subservience to Saul (the Spanish) while simultaneously forecasting his rise to power, in this case the wearing of his future crown, providing an analogue for the hopes of Frederick and Elizabeth.

To this first period of post-Italian activity, one of Honthorst's early court commissions must be added. The work, *Emperor Otho* (Fig. 2.48; 1620-25; Potsdam, Caputh Palace), is not of a secure date, but was done for the stadtholder, as part of a series believed by many to have been commissioned by Maurits rather than Frederik Hendrik.[123] This set of twelve Imperial portraits was probably commissioned around

---

[122] Sara Smart, "From Garter Knight to Second David: The Palatine Portrayal of Friedrich V," in Sara Smart and Mara R. Wade, eds., *The Palatine Wedding of 1613: Protestant Alliance and Court Festival* (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz in Kommission, 2013): pp. 194-95. This trope also appeared in contemporary songs.

[123] Spicer, *Masters of Light,* p. 216, cat. no. 28: Both Northern and Southern Netherlandish artists between 1616 and 1625 completed the series of twelve imperial portraits to which Honthorst's belongs. Because of the early date of series, Prince Maurits may have commissioned them. See also Van der Ploeg and Vermeeren, "Art and the Princes of Orange," p. 16; Braun 1966, p. 169; and Magreta 2008*,* pp. 140-150. Magreta further posits (pp. 146-47), that the series was conceived during the "period of Maurits's greatest power, and the crucial rise to Prince of Orange is the defining impetus for this series." He notes that Honthorst's and Bloemaert's emperors

1618 and contributed to over the course of seven years, until 1625. Measuring Honthorst's depiction of the first century CE Emperor against that of Titian (Fig. 2.49; c. 1632), done for the Palazzo Ducale in Mantua, Honthorst's idealization of his subject is immediately apparent. He utilized the angle of Otho's head and the strong shadow that falls on the proper left side of his neck and chest to disguise the jowls and thick upper body that characterize Titian's and other images of the emperor.

Honthorst's fellow 'Caravaggisti' Hendrick ter Brugghen and Dirck van Baburen also contributed to the series. Both Ter Brugghen's *Claudius* (Fig. 2.50) and Van Baburen's *Titus* (Fig. 2.51) exhibit a greater sense of naturalism and interest in surface texture, particularly the ruddy complexion, stubbled chin, and gleaming armor of Van Baburen's *Titus*. Likewise, the low, furrowed brow and rough texture of the face in Ter Brugghen's canvas demonstrate an almost uncompromising realism in these portraits of long-dead emperors. Though *Otho*'s red cheeks and the gleaming highlights on his forehead, nose, and chest achieve the illusion of living skin, Honthorst's image also lacks the sense of liveliness and *pathos* in Rubens's *Julius Caesar*, qualities that are served by the Flemish painter's dynamic brushwork (Fig. 2.52). While Honthorst's technique should not be considered *fijn*, his approach to the

---

are the subject of attribution debates but does not provide further information on this or put forth his own opinion on the matter. Magreta also makes the tantalizing argument (pp. 149-50) that Dudley Carleton provided the essential link between Maurits and the various artists involved with the series. *Emperor Otho* is not included in Judson/Ekkart 1999, though Judson 1959 mentions it as an attribution to Bloemaert (p. 93n4).

figure is decidedly smoother than Rubens's, just as it exhibits neither the rich tonality of Ter Brugghen's nor the almost faceted coloring of Van Baburen's.[124]

Indeed, of all of the portraits in the series, Honthorst's most closely resembles that of his teacher Abraham Bloemaert (Fig. 2.53). Though compositionally Bloemaert's *Domitian* relates to Ter Brugghen's—theirs are the only two emperors to appear in true profile—Bloemaert's influence on Honthorst's emperor is immediately apparent. The two paintings find similarities in the smooth handling of paint, in the pale, luminous quality of the skin, in the clear, vivid tones of the red mantles, and the overall brightness of the palette. Honthorst's use of a three-quarter profile and the contrasts he constructs between bright highlight and deep shadow lend his composition more dynamism, with Bloemaert's figure resembling the low-relief of an ancient Roman coin.

---

[124] The terms *rouw* and *fijn*/*net* changed with prevailing tastes and thus had unstable meanings throughout the century. For the first discussion of them as art theoretical terms in seventeenth-century discourse see Jan Emmens, "Natuur, onderwijzing en oefening. Bij een drieluik van Gerrit Dou," in Josua Bruyn et al., eds., *Album Discipulorum J. G. van Gelder* (Utrecht: Haentjens Dekker & Gumbert, 1963): pp. 125-136. The term *fijnschilder* originates in the nineteenth century, and during the seventeenth century (particularly in the second half), such works were praised as *net* [neat or smooth] as opposed to the *rouw* [rough] manner of painters like Rembrandt and Hals. In the seventeenth century, *fijn-schilder* was used primarily as a distinction between 'fine-art painters' and house painters [*kladschilder*]. See Ronni Baer, "The Life and Art of Gerrit Dou," in Ronni Baer, ed., *Gerrit Dou 1613-1675: Master Painter in the Age of Rembrandt* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2000. Exh. cat.): p. 43n1. For an excellent discussion of the term *rouw* as applied to Hals as a virtuoso painter, see Christopher D.M. Atkins, *The Signature Style of Frans Hals: Painting, Subjectivity, and the Market in Early Modernity* (Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, 2012): pp. 89-101.

One final example demonstrates the mercurial shifts in Honthorst's style in this intermediary period, beginning in 1622. *The Dentist* (Fig. 2.10) exemplifies his Caravaggesque capabilities as well as what some have called the particular "Dutchness" of Utrecht paintings of this type.[125] Though rendered quite sinister by the deep shadows and fiery candlelight, Honthorst's scene is infused with rustic comedy, from the gaping mouths of the assembled onlookers mirroring that of the roughly-dressed patient, to the quack doctor's smirk that emphasizes the ridiculousness of his chain of honor and theatrical costume, to the Caravaggesque pickpocketing at left just barely illuminated by candlelight (Fig. 2.54). Honthorst's figures are shoved into the foreground as if to underscore the comedic, theater-like staging of the moment while passages such as the collection of hands at center testify to the artist's mastery of light-defined forms.

An ideal counterpoint to the Dresden *Dentist* is the painting of the same subject now in the Louvre, completed just five years later in 1627 (Fig. 2.11). What seems at first to be a completely different conception of the scene is, after further consideration,

---

[125] Helmus, "The Utrecht Caravaggisti: Imitation and Improvement," pp. 51-64; Helmus, "The Dutchness of Utrecht Caravaggism," in Helmus and Volker Manuth, eds., *Utrecht et le Mouvement Caravagesque International* (Paris: Paris Tableau, 2015): pp. 30-33; Mariët Westermann, "Dutch Classicism. Rotterdam and Frankfurt," *The Burlington Magazine* 142, no. 1164 (March 2000): p. 187; and Benedict Nicolson, *Caravaggism in Europe*. 2nd ed., Archivi di storia dell'arte (Torino: U. Allemandi, 1990): pp. 23-24.

merely as if the lights in the theater had been turned up.[126] Though presented at a more oblique angle to the picture plane and with their costumes ever so slightly altered, the figures of the moaning patient and smirking doctor appear essentially unchanged. So too do the fascinated observers and the theft happening at far left. Without the dynamism of the hidden candlelight to animate the scene, Honthorst's second *Dentist* appears more as a pregnant moment before everything dissolves into chaos. Rather than screaming in agony, the patient appears to not yet feel the doctor's pressure on his tooth, just as the old woman has yet to notice her basket's weight shift dramatically as the rogue at left steals an entire duck. The Louvre painting's more even lighting contributes to a greater sculptural quality of the figures overall, as it draws attention to such surface details as the still life of dead fowl in the foreground, the old woman's hat, the gleaming, bald head of the doctor, and his fake certification with its absurd number of seals in the upper right. This document not coincidentally bears Honthorst's signature, presenting him as the author of this farce.

Most importantly, it is not so much the manner of painting or the color scheme that separates these two *Dentist*s, but rather the color's tone as an effect of the light. Both are relatively thinly painted; the only real uses of impasto in Honthorst's works are in those scenes with candlelight, a wonderful example of which can be seen in the Dresden *Dentist*, where the profile of the boy who holds the candle is virtually carved

---

[126] My thinking along these lines was aided by conversations with Blaise Ducos in front of this painting on 9 May 2018.

out in low relief (Fig. 2.55). Honthorst was an economical painter who often utilized the warm gray tones of his underlayer in the shadows and half-tones of his surface layer and used colored glazes to evoke the changing effects of light across the costumes of his figures. In the Dresden *Dentist*, these glazes are evident on the arms of the boy holding the candle, while the doctor's costume in the Louvre picture exhibits a less dramatic example of this effect owing to the more even light. Likewise, both paintings contain bright colors (red, yellow, green, blue), but the dark tone of the Dresden canvas gives the palette a more muted character overall. Though the above examples demonstrate already diverging branches of taste, we will continue to see that the differences between these types of painting are not as stark as they might first appear.

1623

In 1623 Honthorst was already serving one of his several terms as President of the Utrecht Saint Luke's Guild, while his painting style continued to move unfixed among systems of lighting and tone. It was in this year that he produced one of his most successful and ambitious early court paintings, *The Concert* now in the National Gallery of Art, Washington (Fig. 2.2). At the same time, he completed some of his most provocative and best-known works. *The Steadfast Philosopher* (2.11) presents an encounter rife with tension between the acceptance and refusal of advances, and the *Merry Fiddler* (Fig. 2.14) showcases Honthorst's Caravaggesque joviality with theatrical flair. Despite this variety, commonalities can quite easily be found between

all three, demonstrating that already in 1623, Honthorst had refined a number of the techniques that would mark his courtly paintings after 1628.

The bold, ambitious, inventive, and large-scale *Concert* was probably commissioned by the Bohemian monarchs for the Dutch stadtholder, in whose collection it appears as early as 1632, placed in Noordeinde Palace in The Hague and described as "A painting for the fireplace mantle made by Honthorst, being a music" (Fig. 2.2).[127] This inventory description has been previously linked with a *Concert* by Honthorst dated 1624, now in the Musée du Louvre, and of wholly different character than the present work (Fig. 2.64).[128] As the Washington painting did not resurface from a private collection until 2009, it was unknown to previous writers on Honthorst and thus does not appear in either Judson/Ekkart's or any of the earlier monographs on the artist.[129] In his comprehensive recent catalogue entry on the painting, however, Arthur Wheelock makes in my mind an undeniable case for the early Dutch

---

[127] [*Een schilderie voor schoorsteenmantel door Honthorst gemaeckt, sijnde een musijck*]: S. W. A. Drossaers and Th. H. Lunsingh Scheurleer, eds., *Inventarissen van de inboedels in de verblijven van de Oranjes en daarmede gelijk te stellen stukken, 1567-1795*, 3 vols. (The Hague, 1974–1976): vol. 1 (Inventarissen Nassau-Oranje, 1567-1712; inventory no. GS147), p. 207, no. 611. See also Wheelock, "Gerrit van Honthorst/*The Concert*/1623;" and Magreta 2008, p. 297, no. 611.

[128] Judson/Ekkart 1999, pp. 207-209, cat. no. 273; Judson 1959, cat. no. 189; Van der Ploeg and Vermeeren, "'From the 'Sea Princes' Monies'," p. 39; and Magreta 2008, p. 200.

[129] For associations of the Louvre painting with this 1632 inventory description see (for example), Judson 1959, no. 189; Braun 1966, pp. 188-89, no. 54; Judson/Ekkart 1999, cat. no. 273; and Magreta 2008, p. 297, no. 611.

provenance of the Washington Honthorst. He connects the painting with one transferred from Noordeinde to Prince Willem V's (1748-1806) paintings cabinet in the Buitenhof in The Hague and from there taken by French forces during their occupation of the Netherlands in 1795 and described as, "A concert of several men and women musicians, life size, half-length on canvas by G. Honthorst, 4 feet 5 inches [by] 6 feet 5 inches."[130]

As Wheelock goes on to argue, the Bohemian monarchs and the stadholder Prince Maurits were the two likely patrons of such a large, ambitious commission in 1623. As discussed above, Maurits was never an active patron of the arts, being preoccupied with waging war against the Spanish during this period. Many of the paintings that he did receive were given to him as gifts from various allies and municipalities. As one of the Bohemian's major financial and political supporters, Maurits was a fitting candidate for such a grand gift, particularly in 1623, the tenth anniversary of Frederick and Elizabeth's marriage and their arrival in the Netherlands on their wedding journey, where they were received by Maurits. Not only were

---

[130] Wheelock, "Gerrit van Honthorst/*The Concert*/1623": [Een Consert, van verscheide speelders en speelsters Leevens groote halverlijf op doek door G. Honthorst, 4 voet 5 duim 6 voet 5 duim.] According to Wheelock (note 18): "In 1795 a French commission, under the leadership of the botanist André Thouin, decided which paintings to send to Paris take from the Netherlands. The list of paintings taken from the Galerie Willem V in The Hague appears in Beatrijs Brennikmeyer-de Rooy and Arthur Hartkamp, "Oranje's erfoed in het Mauritshuis: De lotgevallen van de collecties van het Huis van Oranje in de period 1795-1816, en het maecenaat van Koning Willem I," *Oud Holland* 102, no. 3 (1988): p. 181-233. The painting by Honthorst is no. 69 on the list.

Elizabeth and Frederick well-positioned to commission this picture from Honthorst through their close relationship with Dudley Carleton, but they had a vested interest in further ingratiating themselves with Maurits at this moment when their situation was very much precarious yet hopeful. In the early modern courtly culture of gift-giving, not only were impressive objects such as *The Concert* emblematic of the senders' affection but they also took part in a system of reciprocity in which they served as constant reminders of the givers' hope for acts of kindness in return.

Along with the emphatically courtly nature of the instruments pictured—they include a bass viol, violin, lute, and bandora—they may have even belonged to a distinctly English tradition.[131] This points again to Elizabeth, an English princess, as the work's originator. The conductor, his back turned toward the viewer while pointing his bow at an open book of music, provides the final piece of evidence. The specificity of this figure's long hair and beard indicate that it may be a portrait, and the resemblance to a likely image of Frederick V in a picture album done around the same time by Adriaen van de Venne (1589-1662; Fig. 2.56; London, British Museum) is quite striking.[132] The role of the conductor in ensuring the musical performance proceeds without incident is furthermore aligned with Frederick's role as the leader of

---

[131] Dutch musicologist Louis Peter Grijp has pointed to this as well as the rarity of the combination. Private correspondence with Grijp quoted in Wheelock, "Gerrit van Honthorst/*The Concert*/1623."

[132] Wheelock, "Gerrit van Honthorst/*The Concert*/1623."

the Protestant cause against the Spanish and with broader concepts of leadership as the crafting of harmony from discord.[133]

In addition to the complex political and courtly networks which Honthorst's painting navigates, it is also one of his boldest and most ambitious compositions, joining striking coloration with the Caravaggesque half-length collection of merrymakers around a table (including a *repoussoir* figure) and a subtle and economical construction of space. Evidencing Honthorst's ongoing emulation of Caravaggio, this image's inventiveness comes from the pointed remaking of the Caravaggesque type into a new kind of brilliantly colorful picture. The painting is in excellent condition; when it entered the National Gallery of Art's collection in 2013 the only treatments were the removal of a yellowed varnish and the repair of slight damage along the top left edge.[134] Close looking reveals a carefully arranged composition and the thoughtful juxtaposition of modeling techniques within the painting, helping to explain the creation of such visual impact within a shallow pictorial space.

---

[133] Wheelock, "Gerrit van Honthorst/*The Concert*/1623."

[134] This and all of the technical information about *The Concert* which follows was given to me by Melanie Gifford, in conversation in front of the painting in the National Gallery of Art, Washington, on 13 July 2016. Cusping around all four edges confirms that the painting has never been cut down, and thus that its closed composition is what the artist originally intended.

The layering of broad colored areas indicates that the painting was executed back to front, and the lack of pentimenti evidences that the composition was thoroughly worked out and that the painting was methodically executed, probably with the aid of a painted sketch.[135] There is a warm, tan ground that was used as the base for the carpet, with the gray background on top of that used as mid-tones in some areas, such as the shadows on the sleeves of the white undergarment worn by the woman with the lute (Fig. 2.57). The idea that a painted sketch was used to help lay out the composition is reinforced by the exact alignment of broad areas of paint, such as in the bust of the woman in pink, where the flesh tone is taken right up to the edge of the instrument with almost no overlap (Fig. 2.58). This avoids the "halo" effect that sometimes accompanies the brushing or reinforcing of contours around elements within a painting, a technique that can then disrupt the spatial illusion.[136]

In this work, as in others, Honthorst demonstrates a smooth handling but is not a *fijn* painter.[137] In the case of the woman at right, the shadows are painted as glazes

---

[135] The only change visible in imaging of the painting was the expansion of the lute, seen in x-ray. Additionally, a dark pigment is visible between the green of the sleeve and the gray background color, suggesting a painted compositional guide peeking through abutting layers of paint. This is also found along the bottom edge of the lute, where a darker pigment is sometimes visible beneath the edge of the lighter ochre of the lute's face.

[136] Additionally, the top and bottom strings of the lute at right have been lightly incised, probably to act as a guide along with the sketch.

[137] There are few areas of impasto, limited to a strong highlight on the left shoulder of the woman with a lute and the lace at the edge of her collar, which was painted as a final detail wet-on-dry and stands proud of the surface. The music is painted wet-in-

over broad areas of lighter color. This abutting of light and shade heightens the contrast between the two values, though not so starkly as to resemble a chessboard. These are often paired with figures executed in the opposite technique, where the highlights are opaquer and more concentrated, and are placed on top of the darker areas of fabric. The man in green's arm is a showcase for this technique, as it is directly set against the sleeve of the woman in blue, whose garment is painted dark-over-light (Fig. 2.59). This juxtaposition of techniques can emphasize or even exaggerate spatial relationships between the figures.

The large feather in the hair of the woman in pink was executed with delicate individual strokes where it overlaps the hand of the man in purple (Fig. 2.60). These were then dragged over with a blending brush to slightly diffuse the paint and give it a softer texture. This also serves to subtly define the spatial relationships within the painting and is a technique that Honthorst would return to a number of times over the course of his career.[138] The two background figures are more softly painted, muted, and shadowed to clarify their place behind the other musicians, but they are otherwise fully worked up and are not left partially finished because of their location father in the background.

---

wet, which we will see with subsequent paintings and chapters is a hallmark of Honthorst's depiction of minute details. Though some of the music notations are quite clearly rendered, it is not possible to identify the music that these musicians are reading. Wheelock, "Gerrit van Honthorst/*The Concert*/1623."

[138] See, for example, the discussion of Fig. 3.3, Chapter 3 pp. 170-80.

The carpet is depicted with summarily painted areas of color over the tan ground. Its highlights are dotted on top of their base color, a technique intended to suggest a tufted rather than a flat-woven carpet, but the overall effect of the textile is relatively flat. This is probably a pictorial strategy used to contrast the more finely painted and sculptural figures, anchoring them more firmly in space and giving them a stronger sense of three-dimensionality as they project forward more than the weaving or the table that it covers.[139] This and the techniques of spatial arrangement discussed above contribute to the gentle *houding* of the picture: it neither fools the eye into believing the painting is a window onto reality nor does it appear flat or stone-like. At the same time, the vivid coloration and luminous flesh produce a sense of *kracht* as in the living presence elicited by Weyerman's description of Van Campen's Shepherdess rather than Rembrandt's portrait.

Strikingly, *The Steadfast Philosopher* (Fig. 2.15) shares many elements with *The Concert* (Fig. 2.2). Not only is the core organizing principle a carpet-covered table with figures around, but also these are set against a neutral background that allows those figures to project forward even though they are in a shallow space. The strong, even lighting in this case reflects powerfully off the pale, naked flesh of the woman at right, and even her costume and hairstyle closely align with the woman holding the

---

[139] The highlights on the green areas of the carpet are blue, suggesting some shift in the balance between the two colors from the original hue, though the exact nature of this shift cannot be determined without further analysis.

lute in the same position within *The Concert*, though that painting strikes a more decorous, if still playful, tone. *The Steadfast Philosopher*, sometimes called Lais and Demosthenes after an anecdote recounted by the 1st century CE philosopher Sotion, could in fact refer to any number of ancient legends following the *topos* of the man of wisdom refusing the advances of a *hetaera*, or courtesan.[140] In Honthorst's painting, a man wearing an 'antique' multi-colored turban and cloak sits in a high-backed chair behind a table piled with books and manuscripts. In his right hand he holds a quill, interrupted in his note-taking by the prostitute at right. Her profession is marked by the feathers in her hair and her pearl earrings, while her intentions are signaled by the freshly discarded garment gathered around her hips. The man turns away from her and toward his books, bringing up a hand to disengage hers from his shoulder.

The lush carpet is conspicuously lifted to display two important details. The first is Honthorst's signature, "Ghonthorst f 1623," placed at the center of the table ledge, and the second is the form of the table's leg, only revealed with a cleaning treatment in 1985: the face of a man. In light of this discovery, first reported by E.K.J. Reznicek, the table leg has been alternately described as grimacing and leering in the

---

[140] These include Phryne and Praxiteles, Xenocrates, and Apelles; Thais and Alexander the Great followed by King Ptolemy of Egypt; and multiple prostitutes named Laïs (from Corinth, Hyccara, and other cities), who counted among their lovers Demosthenes and Aristippus. See Noël Schiller, "Desire and dissimulation: laughter as an expressive behavior in Karel van Mander's 'Den grondt der edel vry schilder-const' (1604)," *Nederlands Kunsthistorisch Jaarboek* 60 (2010): pp. 90-92.

courtesan's direction.[141] However, this detail seems to perform a function beyond signaling an exact ancient subject matter, and I believe Noël Schiller's description of the carving as "directed at" the woman requires further elaboration. The figure is positioned quite intentionally between the woman's knees and its gaze is pointedly fixed upwards between her legs. This detail, then, might undermine the painting's outward theme of resisting temptation in favor of learned stoicism. Its place at the center of the painting, directly below Honthorst's signature and closer to the beholder's eye level, prompts the viewer's identification with the carving rather than the philosopher. This figure seems to point toward the fallibility of man's steadfastness, making clear that for the viewer (and perhaps for the philosopher as well) objectification is the painting's true intention.[142]

---

[141] These two differing interpretations both led to the same supposition: that the painting depicts the philosopher Xenocrates rejecting the advances of Phryne, one of the most famed *hetaerae* of antiquity, who upon the rejection retorted, "I thought I was dealing with a man, not a statue." The story of Phryne and Xenocrates was recounted by Valerius Maximus. E.K.J. Reznicek ("The Significance of a Table Leg: Some Remarks on Gerard van Honthorst's 'Steadfast Philosopher'," *The Hoogsteder Mercury* 11 [1990]: p. 25), described the carving as grimacing, while Schiller ("Desire and dissimulation," p. 90) describes him as leering. Judson/Ekkart 1999, p. 138, cat. no. 157, does not mention the table leg, saying that "because there are no details that help to identify specific characters, it is currently impossible to identify the subject."

[142] Honthorst's *Nymph and Satyr* (Fig. 2.16) is of similar ilk to *The Steadfast Philosopher* (Judson/Ekkart 1999, pp. 120-121, cat. no. 122 list five copies of the painting, number (2) is the work in Kassel [Fig. 2.17]. The Kassel painting seems to be of good quality but was heavily damaged in World War II and then folded and is not fit for display.) In this painting, which features perhaps the same female model having cast off the same clothing, the relationship is one of mutual seduction. She appears in at least one other painting made in 1623, now lost. See Peter C. Sutton, and Johann Kräftner, ed., *The Hohenbuchau Collection: Holländische und Flämische Gemälde*

The same year, Honthorst produced his most well-known painting today in the Netherlands, *The Merry Fiddler* in the Rijksmuseum (Fig. 2.14). In this painting, what appears to be the same carpet as that covering the table in *The Steadfast Philosopher* now functions as a curtain. The carpet is pushed aside by a grinning musician projecting through a stone opening to lift both his violin and wine-filled *berkemeyer* glass in toast to the viewer (Fig. 2.61).[143] This lone merrymaker is theatrically dressed in a satin, blue-and-white striped doublet with coordinating feathers in his cap, and his open mouth, semi-closed eyes, and flushed cheeks leave little doubt that he has already been sampling the wine. The thicker overall application of paint, particularly in the violin and on the highlights of the fiddler's proper right sleeve, as well as the

---

aus dem Goldenen Zeitalter (Wien: Liechtenstein Museum: C. Brandstätter, 2011) p. 216; Judson/Ekkart 1999, p. 138. She may in fact be the same model at right, holding a lute in *The Concert* of the same year. She leans back on a system of faceted drapery nearly identical to that worn by the female lutenist at right in *The Concert*, the dark background providing a kind of natural tenebrism that contrasts the evenly-lit figures. The satyr's modesty is preserved by thickly painted leaves that overlap many of the forms below, suggesting that they were among the last details added. This is a technique that Honthorst would return to several times in his later pastoral and courtly paintings.

[143] Honthorst's male half-length musicians often move more aggressively within their frames and exhibit greater freedom of gesture and expression. This is true in the case of the *Laughing Violinist*, sold at Sotheby's in 2009 (Fig. 2.63). In this image, the figure's instrument is tucked, unused, beneath his arm while his left hand opens to accommodate his right forearm in an unmistakably vulgar gesture. His crinkled nose, upturned mustache, and open mouth contribute to the virtually audible cackling that pervades the image. Isolated against a dark background, this chortling character projects strongly into the viewer's space as he turns to direct his joke to a missing, certainly female, pendant figure. Sotheby's New York, "Important Old Master Paintings, Including European Works of Art," 29-30 January 2009, lot no. 31.

strong shadows cast by the figure relate this image more closely to the Caravaggesque paintings that Honthorst produced the same year, such as the *St. Cecilia Playing the Organ* (Fig. 2.13), while at the same time it is directly related to the lighter and more light-hearted half-length musicians and shepherdesses being done around the same time (Fig. 2.62; *Shepherdess Holding two Plums*, c. 1622-23). These half-length figures eventually evolved into Honthorst's pastoral and historiated portraits, which would become a hallmark of his courtly production after 1628.

1624

In 1624, Honthorst produced some of his best-known and most provocative images of concerts and musicians. Though many of these paintings are not what would come to characterize Honthorst's courtly production by the end of the decade, some nevertheless found a place within the stadtholder's collection in The Hague. Among these are three works now in the collection of the Musée du Louvre: *The Concert* (Fig. 2.64), *Lute Player* (Fig. 2.65), and *Guitar Player* (2.66). Using many of the same techniques as those found in the Washington *Concert* of the year before (Fig. 2.2) and even as some of his Italian-era works, in 1624 Honthorst also produced one of his most ambitious history paintings, *Solon Before Croesus*, which contains both a delight in surface texture and a moral lesson for an unknown patron (Fig. 2.72).

Seemingly just as inspired by Gentileschi and Tassi's frescos in the Palazzo Pallavicini-Rospigliosi as Honthorst's *Musical Group* of 1622 (Fig. 2.32), in the Louvre *Concert* a quintet of rosy-cheeked merrymakers stand behind, lean, and sit on

a thick balcony away from which bright red curtains have been drawn (Fig. 2.64). As he did in the *Musical Group*, here Honthorst has emphatically stamped the balcony below the theorbo player at left with his signature: "Ghonthorst fe. 1624" (Fig. 2.67). This figure is even dressed similarly to the lutenist at right in the Washington *Concert*: a rich blue gown dominated by yellow accents and a rose-colored lower layer with a white linen underdress. The similarities between the Louvre and Washington concerts is unsurprising considering the closeness of their themes and dates of execution. They are, moreover, often associated with the same inventory entry that located a concert by Honthorst above a mantle in Noordeinde Palace. The comparatively steeper angle of the Louvre *Concert* and its opening directly onto a beamed roof indicate that it might well have been hung higher than a mantlepiece, in a decorative scheme located in the upper register of a gallery, again recalling Gentileschi and Tassi's frescos. The prominent display of skin and décolletage in the Louvre painting, particularly in the case of the lute player at right, render this painting less decorous in appearance than the Washington canvas as well. However, the laurel-bearing *putti* floating above in the Louvre picture make clear the edifying possibilities of the enjoyment of music.

The vulnerability of the experience of a painting to a change in its environment is emphasized by the respective current displays of the Washington and Louvre *Concerts*. In the National Gallery of Art, Honthorst's painting is set against warm wood paneling, which brightens and complements the painting's background and the high-key costumes of its occupants (Fig. 2.69). The Louvre, by contrast, hangs its painting against a more dramatic bright purple wall (Fig. 2.70). This color enhances

the darker palette of the Louvre painting and complements the warm red curtains that frame Honthorst's figures. A recent exhibition at the Centraal Museum in Utrecht further emphasized this mutability, where a blue ombré wall and different lighting made the Washington painting appear darker, its figures more sculptural and it colors more jewel-like (Fig. 2.71).

Honthorst's *Woman Playing the Guitar* (Fig. 2.66; c. 1624) and a *Woman Tuning a Lute* (Fig. 2.65; 1624), also in the Louvre's collection, were certainly intended as pendants. They are listed, for example, as numbers 50 and 51 in the 1632 inventory of Frederik Hendrik's Gallery at Noordeinde along with a *Backgammon Game* by Honthorst.[144] While the *Guitar Player* is undated, the *Lute Player* is signed at bottom right, "G. Honthorst fec 1624." The *Guitar Player* wears virtually identical costume to a female lutenist in the Hermitage, though the two paintings to not appear to depict the same model (Fig. 2.68; 1624). The Hermitage and Louvre musicians, with their bared shoulders, instruments, and slightly bent postures also recall the rightmost figure in the National Gallery's *Concert* (Fig. 2.2). Divorced from a larger

---

[144] Magreta 2008, pp. 200; nos. 50, 51, 66 (pp. 259-60, 263): no. 50: "A painting of a nymph playing a lute, with an ebony frame, made by Honthorst." [*Een schilderie zijnde een nimphe speelende op de luyt, met eenen ebben lijst, door Hondthorst gemaeckt*.]; no. 51: "A painting of a nymph playing a guitar, with an ebony frame, made by the previously named Honthorst." [*Een schilderije sijnde een nimphe speelende op een bandoor, met eenen ebben lijst daertoe, door den voors. Hondthorst gemaeckt.*]; no. 66: "A painting with various people in which two are playing triktrak [backgammon], made by Honthorst." [*Een schilderije met verscheyden persoonagien daervan twee staen verkeeren, door Hondthorst gemaeckt.]*

context and isolated against a neutral background, these half-length musicians present a jovial yet more personal cast of characters. Together, paintings like the Louvre guitar and lute players formed a more moveable, changeable ensemble, able to frame a doorway—allowing the participation of the viewer in moving between them—or another painting that held the potential to reinforce or inflect their meaning.

Honthorst's *Solon before Croesus* (Fig. 2.72; Hamburg, Kunsthalle), also produced in 1624, strikes quite a different tone from the above-discussed concerts and musicians. Where in the Getty *Musical Group* and Louvre *Concert* Honthorst placed his signature on balustrades below comely musicians, in this image it is inscribed on the ground beneath the feet of Solon. As first recounted by Herodotus around 450 BCE, the wise man Solon visited the ancient king Croesus and was unimpressed by the opulence and military might that the latter displayed, insisting that it is not wealth but rather humility that promotes happiness. In Honthorst's image, virtually everything alludes to the king's prosperity: the varied silver goods scattered across the foreground; half-naked captives, the female of which bends down to kiss Croesus's feet; the richly clad young man at left who snickers at the old man's foolish convictions; the ermine-lined robe and glittering scepter, chain, and crown of the king; the man unpacking a trunk of fine linen; and the retinue of whispering courtiers all in appropriately antique and exotic dress for a scene set in ancient Lydia.[145]

---

[145] For the typological antecedents of some of Honthorst's figures, see Judson/Ekkart 1999, pp. 126-128, cat. no. 137.

The self-referential gesture of Croesus and his wrinkled forehead indicate that he is arguing his side while Solon, unmoved, gestures toward the viewer as if to clarify that the intended recipient of this lesson in modesty is not just the king, but also the now-unknown owner of the painting. Solon's role as the anchor of this didactic scene is emphasized by his bright costume and his hierarchical positioning higher than the other figures. His bare feet, an emblem of humble righteousness, are echoed on the other side of the picture by those of the bound captive. This figure's hands and feet are slightly darker than the rest of his body, as is his neck, suggesting he lives a life of labor. His feet are placed with their soles facing the viewer, together with his kneeling position recalling the uncompromising realism of Caravaggio's *Crucifixion of Saint Peter*, which Honthorst had sketched in 1616 (Figs. 1.3, 1.4).

The picture is brightly and evenly lit, particularly at left and right to highlight the captive man and Solon. The fictive space is shallow and crowded, a fact somewhat mitigated by Honthorst's subtle variations in tone, scale, and level of finish. The foreground figures together with the king in his bright pink tunic project the most immediately in contrast to their surroundings. This is aided by the dark-clad men in the middle register, whose slightly smaller scale and more subdued tone make them appear further in the background. This spatial relationship is reinforced by the cluster of four figures in the right background who are rendered more palely and thinly, locking them in position furthest from the picture plane like the lowest relief of an ancient frieze.

Honthorst previously employed this technique in the *Concert* of 1623 (Fig. 2.2), as a means of clarifying the positioning of figures in a crowded composition. Even closer to *Solon Before Croesus* are the two groups of figures behind the titular characters in *Christ before the High Priest*, one group at left in the mid-ground and the second barely visible in the right background (Fig. 2.7). *Solon Before Croesus*, then, serves as another example of Honthorst's mercurial style, excerpting and reconfiguring elements used at different stages of his career to create something entirely new. It contains, at the same time, brightly-colored figures arranged in clearly defined registers across an evenly-lit composition, and direct references to Caravaggio and Honthorst's Caravaggesque paintings.

1625

In 1625, Honthorst made his first prominent turn toward the pastoral with *Granida and Daifilo*, and likely did so at the direct prompting of a court patron (Fig. 2.73; Utrecht, Centraal Museum). At the same time, though, he continued to produce the provocative half-lengths that had apparently already found their foothold in the market, including his confrontational *Smiling Girl, a Courtesan, Holding an Obscene Image* (Fig. 2.79; St. Louis Art Museum). This work can nevertheless be connected with surprising ease to those pastoral and musical half-lengths which appealed to the stadtholder, who owned the Louvre *Lute* and *Guitar* players (Figs. 2.65, 2.66).

Granida and Daifilo is Honthorst's first multi-figure pastoral painting (Fig. 2.73). Stunning in its coloring and the sensitive rendering of its protagonists, animals,

and landscape, this picture remains the epitome of Honthorst's pastoral output. Though it is first documented at the Orange court (it is listed as a mantlepiece in Huis Honselaarsdijk in 1707), it is unclear whether Frederik Hendrik was its commissioner.[146]

The work depicts the titular princess and her shepherd lover from P.C. Hooft's (1581-1647) *Granida* (1605), specifically Act II, Scene 5, after the two have eloped from the court to live in the countryside. Granida exalts her new pastoral home, singing

> Farewell scepters, farewell lofty thrones,…
> Farewell oppressive garments and far too heavy crowns,…
> I am leaving you, discordant court, and choose instead other ties
> One already much stronger, but oh how much sweeter a tie! …
> Fresh dewy little flowers, and you blooming roses,
> Who have just opened your green mantles now,
> Welcome, and thank you for your refreshing my weary
> And exhausted mind with your sweet breath.[147]

---

[146] As Kettering points out, by the time of the 1707 inventory the subject had been lost, and it was misidentified as a scene from Ariosto's *Orlando Furioso* (*The Dutch Arcadia*, p. 105). The inventory note, as transcribed in Judson/Ekkart 1999, p. 159, cat. no. 189, reads: "His Majesty's waiting room on the ground floor No. 55. 130 Mantel painting by Honthorst being the fable from Ariosto of Angelica and Medor. [Sijne Majestijts antichambre aan de parterre Nr. 55. 130 Schoorsteenstuck van Honthorst sijnde de fable uijt Ariosto van Angelica en Medor.]" See also Van der Ploeg and Vermeeren, "The Stadholder's Art Collection," p. 35; and Magreta 2008, pp. 201, 233-236.

[147] As translated in Kettering, *The Dutch Arcadia*, p. 104, from P.C. Hooft, and F.A. Stoett and Pieter Leendertz, eds. *Gedichten van P.C. Hooft: volledige uitgave*. Vol. 2 (Amsterdam: Van Kampen, 1900): p. 200.

In the only surviving image of this scene, Honthorst fittingly shows Granida and Daifilo in the midst of this love song, caressing each other's faces in respective stages of undress. Her courtly crown has been replaced by one composed of the flowers she so praised, bedecked with roses and a blooming iris (Fig. 2.74). Daifilo has spread his humble brown cloak over the ground to provide something for the lovers to collapse upon in the company of goats, sheep, and a ram. His *houlette* lies similarly discarded across the foreground of the painting, pointing the viewer's gaze to his emphatically dirty feet.[148] The juxtaposition of these emblems of the pastoral and the Caravaggesque in this image demonstrates again how permeable the boundary between the two was in Honthorst's work of the 1620s. With this detail, Honthorst has moreover declared himself as the documenter of the pastoral, placing his signature exactly in the center of the painting and inscribing "Ghonthorst. Fesit 1625" on the *houlette*'s shaft (Fig. 2.75).

---

[148] The *houlette*, a frequent but under-explained addition to many seventeenth-century pastoral images, was a common accoutrement of both shepherds and shepherdesses. It was a staff used to fling a divot of dirt in the direction of a sheep to prevent it from straying from the herd. See L.F. Salzman, "Some Notes on Shepherds' Staves," *The Agricultural History Review* 5, no. 2 (1957): pp. 92-93. Salzman's definition is confirmed by the entry on the subject in Émile Littré and Amédée Beaujean's *Dictionnaire de la langue française, avec un supplement d'histoire et de géographie. Abrégé du dictionnaire de É. Littré par A. Beaujean* (8th ed. Paris: Librarie Hachette, 1886): p. 560: [HOULETTE—Bâton que porte le berger, et au bout duquel est une plaque de fer en forme de gouttière, qui sert pour lancer des mottes de terre aux moutons qui s'écartent et de la sorte les faire revenir. || Fig. et poétiq. L'état, la condition de berger.]

Honthorst's composition is drawn from the longer tradition of lovers lounging in a landscape, such as a print after Goltzius of another pastoral couple, *Corydon and Sylvia* (Fig. 2.76; 1601/11; Art Institute of Chicago).[149] The most immediate influence on *Granida and Daifilo*, though, was a work by Pieter Lastman (1583-1633) completed just a year earlier (Fig. 2.77; Gdańsk, National Museum). From Lastman's *Pastoral Scene*, Honthorst transmitted the positioning of the figures (particularly that of Daifilo's feet) and animals within the landscape, though he has reversed the male and female characters and moved the cluster of trees from right to left. In Honthorst's *Granida and Daifilo* we even find several inquisitive animals staring back at us, as with the group of sheep in Lastman's painting. Honthorst's image is, however, much larger than Lastman's, presenting these pastoral characters at almost life size and compressing the pictorial space by giving only the barest hint of the landscape beyond.

Though Honthorst's painting revels in the amorous connection between its protagonists, their happiness is short-lived. In Hooft's *Granida* and Honthorst's painting alike, their respite is interrupted by a character named Artabanus and several of his friends, seeking revenge for a man Daifilo murdered earlier in the play. Though the story ends with Daifilo being named a prince and the two given permission to marry, as Honthorst would in the Louvre *Dentist* (Fig. 2.11), he has again depicted the moment before chaos breaks loose. The men are about to round the corner and

---

[149] Kettering, *The Dutch Arcadia*, pp. 106-107.

discover the lovers, after which Artabanus will rip Daifilo from Granida's arms and beat him.[150]

This group of intruding guards is painted in the pale, low-relief style that Honthorst often utilized for his background figures, reinforcing their secondary place in the narrative and location in the background.[151] Likewise—as in the *Nymph and Satyr* (Fig. 2.16)—the flowers on top of Granida's head and the leaves and small flowers populating the fore- and backgrounds were all painted relatively thickly in the uppermost compositional layers. That is, they were placed according to aesthetic concerns rather than advanced planning, as Honthorst tended to do with the minute details of costumes or the final, embellishing elements of a scene. This ensures that the spatial relationships between parts within his paintings maintain their logic—that a leaf is not overlapped by something meant to be behind it—as well as adding a sense of depth, immediacy, and the hand of the artist to Honthorst's meticulously planned works.

---

[150] Granida and Daifilo's first encounter in Act I presented an iconographic element that eased the path for later *portraits historiés*. Struck with love at first sight of the princess, he gives her a shell full of water to ease her discomfort. This shell becomes an easy identifier of Granida in portraits such as Bartholomeus van der Helst's (1613-1670) of 1660 (Fig. 2.78; Prague, National Gallery). See Kettering, *The Dutch Arcadia*, p. 105.

[151] Judson/Ekkart 1999 notes a few Bolognese precedents for this relief-like composition, though none are done with the same character and abrupt change of tone found in Honthorst's use of the device (p. 160, cat. no. 189).

The date in particular and its prominent placement within the painting indicate that this might have been a gift celebrating the marriage of Frederik Hendrik and Amalia van Solms, in 1625. The amorous subject matter and pastoral theme would certainly have been appropriate for a wedding gift and in keeping with the couple's taste. In 1627, a gift of four paintings given to Amalia by the states-general of Utrecht included a shepherd and shepherdess by Paulus Moreelse, so her preference for the subject matter was at that point well known.[152] As Arthur Wheelock argued in his case for Bohemian patronage of the Washington *Concert* (Fig. 2.2), at the time of *Granida and Daifilo*'s production Elizabeth Stuart and Frederick V were particularly well-positioned and eager to gain the stadtholder's favor through the commissioning of large and innovative paintings from artists like Honthorst.[153] Furthermore, in 1625 the relations between the Bohemian and Orange courts in The Hague were quite close: Elizabeth and her husband signed Amalia and Frederik's marriage certificate on 4 April and may have been the commissioners of Adriaen van de Venne's album of miniatures now in the British Museum (as in Fig. 2.56).[154] Elizabeth, furthermore,

---

[152] Kettering, *The Dutch Arcadia*, p. 1.

[153] Bohemian patronage to celebrate Frederik Hendrik and Amalia's wedding was first suggested by Jos de Meyere in 1988 (*"Granida en Daifilo": (1625) van Gerard van Honthorst: onderzeok en restauratie* [Utrecht: Centraal Museum, 1988]: p. 23).

[154] Martin Royalton-Kisch, *Adriaen van de Venne's Album in the Department of Prints and Drawings in the British Museum* (London: Published for the Trustees of the British Museum by British Museum Publications, 1988): pp. 108-110. See also Akkerman, *Courtly Rivals*, pp. 30-34, 37- 42.

served as godmother to the couple's first child, Willem II (1626-50).[155] *Granida and Daifilo* therefore presents a tantalizing possibility for a third instance of Bohemian patronage of Honthorst in the first half of the 1620s, one furthermore intended to solidify friendship through exchange with another court.

In 1625 Honthorst also completed one of his best-known yet most enigmatic half-lengths, *Smiling Girl* (Fig. 2.79).[156] The directness of the sitter's eye contact and the specificity of her features suggest that this may well be a portrait. The jaunty feathers in her hair and her particular type of revealing costume indicate that, if so, this is a portrait of a prostitute.[157] Emphasizing her status is the miniature that she holds in one hand and points to, laughing, with the other. Featuring a nude woman sitting on a ledge and facing away from the viewer, the image bears the inscription, "Who knows my ass from behind? [Wie kent mijn naers van afteren?]" (Fig. 2.80). This teasing

---

[155] Keblusek, "The Bohemian Court at The Hague," p. 50.

[156] The painting appears, for example, on the cover of the recent exhibition catalogue from the Frans Hals Museum in Haarlem: Anna Tummers, et al., *The Art of Laughter: Humour in Dutch Paintings of the Golden Age*. Zwolle: Waanders Uitgevers, 2017. Anna Tummers notes in her catalogue entry (p. 9) that the St. Louis painting survives in at least eight early copies, testifying to its popularity. The exhibition recognized the irreverent humor characteristic of many of Honthorst's early paintings, which were represented by three works.

[157] This is the interpretation adopted by the St. Louis Art Museum (see object page: <https://www.slam.org/collection/objects/1059/> [accessed 20 February 2019]). See also Judson/Ekkart 1999, pp. 173-74, cat. no. 215.

allusion to the availability of her company for purchase makes this image one of Honthorst's most blatantly sexual works.[158]

Not only did guidebooks for brothels in various cities and countries appear throughout the century, but also in 1631 Crispijn de Passe the Younger (ca. 1597-ca. 1670), documented the use of portraits in these spaces.[159] In the frontispiece to De Passe's *Le Miroir des plus Belles Courtisannes de ce Temps*, we see the front room of a brothel populated by customers and saleswomen (Fig. 2.81). Along the upper part of the rear wall hangs a series of half-length female portraits. That these images present the available hostesses is attested to by the scene in the foreground, where a lounging customer is being shown one such portrait for inspection and acceptance or refusal. The transaction depicted in the left foreground of De Passe's frontispiece bears striking similarities to Honthorst's *Procuress* and other tavern scenes (Fig. 2.82; 1625) where a prostitute is presented to a client, a prominent candle highlighting the wares

---

[158] Even given the confrontationally sexual nature of the image, a copy of the work was sold in 1922 with a Coombe Abbey provenance, meaning that it may have once belonged to Elizabeth Stuart. Judson/Ekkart 1999, p. 173, cat. no. 215 (6). See also Appendix E, no. 6.

[159] De Passe was the son of the artist of the same name who had attended Honthorst's welcome home party at Het Poortgen in 1620. See, for example, *'t Amsterdamsch Hoerdom*, published by an anonymous author in 1681. In nearby Amsterdam, when prostitution was banned at the end of the sixteenth century, small brothels and eventually musical houses proved to be its most lucrative form of survival. See Lotte van de Pol and Liz Waters, trans., *The Burgher and the Whore: Prostitution in Early Modern Amsterdam* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011): p. 29: The most famous music hall, *De Meniste Bruiloft* [The Mennonite Wedding] was a major tourist attraction in the 1630s and 40s.

on display. That the *Smiling Girl* is the type of figure used to populate Honthorst's merry companies is evidenced by what appears to be the same model in the rightmost position of at least two other paintings, the *Procuress* of the same year and the Louvre *Concert* of the year prior (2.59).[160]

In Honthorst's paintings of the 1620s, the wholly Caravaggesque types of the *Smiling Girl* and *Procuress* were easily transformed into those of the pastoral, as in the *Shepherdess with Doves* (Fig. 2.83; Utrecht, Centraal Museum) completed around the same time.[161] Changing the sitter from a prostitute to a shepherdess is achieved with a few simple additions. Rather than isolated against a dark background, she is now positioned in front of a tree, with clusters of leaves at the upper right and lower left and a vine winding its way up the trunk the only other indications of the landscape setting.[162] The cluster of feathers marking the *Smiling Girl*'s profession have been

---

[160] She seems to appear for a third time, at right and wearing virtually identical costume including the sash, in a *Merry Company (The Dissolute Student)* (Fig. 2.42), signed and dated the same year and now in the collection of the Munich Alte Pinakothek. In the Munich painting her features are more in shadow and harder to make out.

[161] In this painting, the model's rosy cheeks, exposed nipples, and the animated pair of doves she holds reveal the amorous, enticing purpose of the image. On the erotic connotations of birds in the northern visual tradition see Eddy de Jongh, "Erotica in Vogelperspectief: De Dubbelzinnigheid van een Reeks 17de eeuwse Genrevoorstellingen," *Simiolus: Netherlands Quarterly for the History of Art* 3, no. 1 (1968-69): pp. 22-74.

[162] For the definitive study of the development of this genre see Kettering, *The Dutch Arcadia*, especially Ch. 1, "Pastoral Art as a Social and Cultural Phenomenon," on the landscape in the Utrecht *Shepherdess with Doves* see p. 45.

replaced by a wide-brimmed straw hat topped with flowers, including a rose and lily of the valley. These, along with the *houlette* cradled in her left arm distinguish her as a shepherdess, an inhabitant of the pastoral *idyll* that existed as the tempting alternative to quotidian burdens. When Honthorst took up portraiture with increasing frequency after his return to the Netherlands from the court of Charles I in 1628, this shepherdess type was easily and malleably adapted to produce pastoral portraits. One such example, *Portrait of a Lady (Catherine Elizabeth von Hanau?) as a Shepherdess* (Fig. 2.84), features greater refinement in the figure's clothing and adornments, while still prominently displaying a *houlette* and a blue, straw-lined hat with its brim partially turned back and topped with a cluster of flowers.

1626

Only one painting by Honthorst survives that is dated to 1626, the *Violinist* now in the collection of the Mauritshuis (Fig. 2.85). Though it should therefore not be given too great an emphasis in the trajectory of Honthorst's stylistic experimentation, it nevertheless embodies many of the trends that he developed while striving for court patronage, as observed throughout the preceding sections. As discussed above in relation to the *Steadfast Philosopher*, Louvre *Guitarist* and *Concert*, Washington *Concert*, Hermitage *Woman Tuning a Lute*, Utrecht *Procuress*, and the St. Louis *Smiling Girl*, the repetition of costumes, poses, figures, and even stages of undress in Honthorst's paintings throughout this period evidence the creative assemblage and re-assemblage of models, studio props, and parts of previous paintings in order to appeal

to an evolving customer base. This is true also of the Mauritshuis *Violinist*, who bares one shoulder from beneath a multi-layer garment, sports feathers in her hair, wears the often-repeated multi-colored sash, and regards the viewer with a friendly smile as she raises her instrument in the midst of playing.

In attitude, costume, and accessories, this figure belongs firmly to the tradition that this chapter has touched on of prostitutes in Honthorst's work. However, she might also be connected to a pastoral tradition through an allusion to the shepherdess Phyllis.[163] A 1626 print by Theodor Matham (1605/6-1676) after a lost painting by Honthorst (Fig. 2.86) depicts a woman with similar dress and hairstyle who is also

---

[163] Judson/Ekkart 1999, p. 180, cat. no. 225. In 1627 Matham engraved another painting by Honthorst (Fig. 2.87; St. Petersburg, The Hermitage State Museum), adding an inscription by Scriverius: "Pamphilus under the influence of the flower of the foolish Lyaeus [wine of Bacchus]. / So in love, and what for? So Phyllis loves also." (Fig. 2.88): As translated in Judson/Ekkart 1999, p. 190n2, original p. 189, [Pamphilius insani percussus flore Lya'i / Sic amat. et quorsum? sic quoque Phillis amat]. Though they appear to have complementary compositions in print, these two paintings would be facing opposite directions in reality and thus were probably not conceived as pendants. This pair seems to have been constructed as such after the fact by Matham's prints and Scriverius's texts through allusions to characters from romantic and pastoral literature, though I have not found a textual source that mentions both Phyllis and Pamphilus. The closest connection that I have found is as follows. In the seventeenth century, both were (believed to be) figures in Ovid's poetry. Phyllis appears in Ovid's *Heroides*, deeply in love with Demophoon. When he betrays their agreement and does not return to her she dies of grief (Siegfied Wenzel, "Ovid from the pulpit," in James G. Clark, et al., *Ovid in the Middle Ages* [Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011]: pp. 166). Pamphilus is the titular figure in the *Pamphilus de amore*, one of the most influential pseudo-Ovidian texts of the middle ages. In this comedic text, Pamphilus is hopelessly in love with Galatea, whom he attempts to woo throughout the elegy with the help of a procuress. *Pamphilus de amore* was probably written in twelfth-century France (Vicente Cristóbal, "Ovid in medieval Spain," in *Ovid in the Middle Ages*, p. 241).

playing the violin.[164] Her hat is of the pastoral type that we have seen in previous examples, and a poem added beneath the print by Petrus Scriverius (1576-1660) identifies the figure as Phyllis, describing "Phyllis luxurious in facial expression, voice, violin and dress. What do you think Pamphilus that she really wants? A husband."[165] Judson identifies the referenced Phyllis with a shepherdess in Daniel Heinsius's (1580-1655) poem *Pastorael* (1616), who is seduced and corrupted by the metropolitan evils of The Hague.[166] However, the reference to Pamphilus in Scriverius's inscription makes the identification with the Phyllis of *Pastorael* difficult, as Phyllis's lover is named Coridon and the name Pamphilus is mentioned nowhere in the text. In the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, moreover, Phyllis could also refer to a virtuous shepherdess.[167]

---

[164] Judson/Ekkart 1999, p. 180, cat. no. 226 (1).

[165] As translated in Judson/Ekkart 1999, p. 180, cat. no. 226: "Vultu, voce, chely, vestitu prodiga Phyllis. / Pamphile, quid credas hanc sibi velle? virum."

[166] Kettering, *The Dutch Arcadia*, p. 51; Poem found in Daniël Heinsius, "Pastorael," in *Nederduytsche poemata* (Facsimile of 1616 edition; Bern, Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 1983): pp. 26-33.

[167] She appears as such in, for example, Jacob Cats's "Harders-liedt" (1618); see Kettering, *The Dutch Arcadia*, p. 51. There was also a long tradition of Phyllis as the fair shepherdess in British poetry and madrigals of the late sixteenth century. In 1593 Thomas Lodge (1558?-1625) published *pastoral sonnets*, a compendium of verses dedicated to Phyllis, who is specifically noted as a shepherdess ("Phyllis hath a gallant flock") in sonnet XV, while sonnet XXII is dedicated entirely to her beauty (Thomas Lodge, *Phillis: honoured vvith pastorall sonnets, elegies, and amorous delights : VVhere-vnto is annexed, the tragicall complaint of Elstred* [London, 1593]). Better known today is the 1599 madrigal by John Farmer, "Fair Phyllis I saw," where her lover is named Amyntas (Florence Malhomme, "Le Madrigal Anglais: Influences et

Honthorst's *Young Woman Playing a Viola da Gamba* (Fig. 2.89; Private collection) is often designated as a pendant to the Mauritshuis *Violinist*, in part because they are virtually identical in size and have complementary themes and compositions. Though Judson dates the former to 1626 in his catalogue raisonné, the work itself is not dated, and in the entry he categorically states that the painting style (a rougher application) is more characteristic of Honthorst's work around 1623.[168] However, as this chapter has demonstrated, the line between Honthorst's slightly rougher style and his later courtly smoothness is not as quick or direct as Judson's comments imply. In fact, the sleeve of the *Smiling Girl* in St. Louis demonstrates some rough, visible brushstrokes (Fig. 2.90). This is indeed quite characteristic of Honthorst's description of garments throughout the course of his career. Often occurring in the depiction of yellow fabric—possibly due to an inherent characteristic of lead tin yellow—I argue in the discussion of the *Duke of Buckingham with his Family* (Fig. 3.6) in Chapter 3, that this was a compositional device used to draw the viewer's attention to the upper body and face of the portrait figure. This technique is visible, for example, in all three of Honthorst's large group portraits in the

---

Age d'Or [1593-1622], Problématique générale et approche analytique," *Musurgia* 4, no. 4 [Dossiers d'analyse, 1997]: p. 20).

[168] Judson/Ekkart 1999, pp. 178-179, cat. no. 224. The work was sold from the Steinberg collection at Christie's New York, 26 January 2001, "Important Old Master Paintings: The Property of Gayfryd and Saul Steinberg," lot 178.

Rijksmuseum, which were executed around 1647 (Figs. 4.69, 4.74, 4.75; details Figs. 2.91, 2.92).

Judson also states that the *Violinist* and *Viola da Gamba* could not be pendants because the figures do not make eye contact with each other. Indeed, their near identical sizes cannot alone make an argument for the works as pendants, as many of Honthorst's half-lengths are of similar sizes and are thematically close, making definitive pairings difficult. Though Judson acknowledges that a later copy including both musicians in a single composition indicates that they may have once hung together, to my mind this also demonstrates how closely aligned the prostitute and shepherdess types were among Honthorst and his contemporaries.[169] The *Viola da Gamba* player, in fact, wears both the hat of a shepherdess and the feathers and revealing corset of a courtesan.

1627

It is in 1627 that Honthorst makes his most fervent move in the direction of the pastoral with several multi-figure productions: images of *Diana Resting* (Fig. 2.93) and *Diana at the Hunt* (Fig. 2.94) as well as several paintings of shepherdesses, one done in 1627 (Fig. 2.96) and two more around the same time (Figs. 2.95, 2.97). Not coincidentally, in January of that year we find his first documented commission from

---

[169] Judson/Ekkart 1999, pl. 126.

the stadtholder's court in The Hague: £700 for two mantlepieces for Huis Honselaarsdijk.[170] While both Elizabeth's and Amalia's patronage of Honthorst truly gained momentum after his return from England in 1628, there was evidently a fair amount of interest from the stadtholder's court in this pre-English period. Honthorst's expanding success with the court was, furthermore, fundamental to his financial security. In April 1627, three months after he received that payment from Frederik Hendrik, he bought the large home at 6 Domplein in Utrecht.

The referenced mantlepieces are generally assumed to be two complementary images of Diana, of which Honthorst created at least three circa 1627.[171] One of these

---

[170] Judson/Ekkart 1999, p. XXXIII; Neither here nor in Judson 1959 does he note a source for this figure. In both texts it is listed in the timeline that forms part of the front matter. The source is an Ordinance Book at the NL-HaNA, Nassause Domeinraad vanaf 1581, 1.08.11, inv. 1036, f. 153v; Date 00-00-1627: "The council and treasurer-general has paid the sum of 700 p. about the dispensing, which was done in the month of January of the year of this account for the building at HONSELERSDIJK, consisting of two paintings by Honthorst to be placed for mantelpieces in that case declaring the monthly account of the January domains prescribed fol. VI" [De raad en tresorier-generaal heeft betaald de som van 700 p. over de dispensie, die in de maand januari van het jaar van deze rekening t.b.v. van het gebouw te HONSELERSDIJK gedaan is bestaande in twee schilderijen van Honthorst om voor schoorsteenmantels aldaar gesteld te worden uitwijzende de maandrekening van de domeinen januari voorschreven fol. VI].

[171] Judson/Ekkart 1999, cat. nos. 107-109. The whereabouts of cat. no. 108 are currently unknown, and there is no known image of the work. In the analysis of the Orange-Nassau collections in his PhD dissertation, Todd Jerome Magreta describes the commission as being for two mantelpieces of "'Diana' subjects," even though the documentary evidence for the commission does not in fact mention a subject matter (Magreta 2008, p. 201). He then goes on to firmly assert that the painting described in the inventory is *Diana Resting with Shepherdesses and Two Greyhounds* (Fig. 2.93). Magreta seems to be basing his designation on Judson. In his 1959 catalogue, Judson translated the inventory note, specifically the phrase "*staende een schilderije van*

is *Diana Resting with Shepherdesses and Two Greyhounds* (Fig. 2.93; Private Collection), one has no known image, and the third, *Diana at the Hunt*, was photographed in black and white before being destroyed in World War II (Fig. 2.94; Formerly Berlin, Schloss Grünewald).

Given their close visual similarities, it is probable that these two images of Diana (Figs. 2.93 and 2.94) were the works commissioned in 1627 for Honselaarsdijk. The inventory of the stadtholder's quarters at Noordeinde in 1632 lists a picture that could easily be applied to either of these images: "a painting of Diana with some shepherdesses and two greyhounds, made by Honthorst of Utrecht."[172] Indeed, both works feature similarities in the dress and appearance of the subjects, as well as containing the exact same pair of greyhounds. Together they form a complementary pair depicting the same cast of characters during and after the hunt. As this inventory item is the only Diana ascribed to Honthorst and the description does not note Diana as being at rest, it could credibly refer to either painting.

Diana," as "an upright painting of Diana" (Judson 1959, p. 185, cat. no. 81). In 1999, Judson stated that "it is now clear that the picture recorded…is not this painting formerly in Berlin [Fig. 2.94]," because, "'Staende' cannot be read as 'upright'." (Judson/Ekkart 1999, p. 115). In fact, *staende* is used quite frequently in the inventory's other entries and cannot be interpreted as unequivocally referring to vertical format paintings; the description could therefore refer to either image of Diana.

[172] As quoted and translated by Magreta 2008, pp. 258-59, no. 44: [Eenen houten schoorsteenmantel, vergult op eenen groenen gront, daerinne is staende een schilderije van Diana met eenige harderinnen ende twee winden, door Hondthorst van Utrecht gemaeckt.]

The 1632 inventory lists another painting by Honthorst that might date to 1627: "A chimneymantel, gilded on a red lacquer ground, therein a painting decorated with shepherdesses, made by Honthorst."[173] This item probably describes one of two paintings of the subject that Honthorst produced before 1632: *Shepherdesses* now in Seattle (Fig. 2.96; 1627) and Leipzig (2.95; 1629). To this duo a third painting completed around the same time should be added, though it is unlikely to have been identified in the above-quoted inventory as a picture of shepherdess*es* as it contains only one (Fig. 2.97; ca. 1626). All three of these paintings are either firmly or tentatively dated to the second half of the 1620s, and testify to the marked interest among Honthorst and his patrons for multi-figure, purely pastoral paintings.[174] Without any obvious mythological or textual source, they demonstrate the expanding boundaries of pastoral subjects at this moment, from the earlier, isolated single figure to more complex compositions placed in a (sometimes only slightly) more developed setting.

---

[173] Magreta 2008, p. 201; p. 259 no. 44; p. 277 no. 223: [Eene schoorsteenmantel, vergult op eenen rooden lacken gront, daerinne een stuck schilderie verciert met harderinnekens, door Honthorst gemaeckt.]; See also Judson/Ekkart 1999, p. 113, cat. no. 107. Regarding the Seattle *Shepherdesses*, see Judson/Ekkart 1999, cat. no. 208, which identifies the Seattle painting with another one mentioned in the 1632 inventory as the mantelpiece in Amalia's Gallery in Noordeinde Palace.

[174] See Judson/Ekkart 1999, pp. 168-171, cat. nos. 207-209. Judson has argued, to my mind convincingly, for cat. no. 207 as an Allegory of Love and has suggested that cat. no. 208 and 209 could constitute vague or generic references to seventeenth-century pastoral literature writ large.

Indeed, all three contain familiar elements from Honthorst's previous pastoral and non-pastoral paintings alike. The woman in yellow in both the Leipzig and Seattle paintings wears the same multi-patterned, striped sash that appears on many of Honthorst's prostitutes and shepherdesses. The *houlette* and straw hat with partially folded brim features in both the Leipzig and Seattle paintings as similar trees, flower crowns, and bared shoulders proliferate across all three.[175] It is tempting, moreover, to identify the woman in red in Fig. 2.95, in the hat in Fig. 2.96, and in yellow in Fig. 2.97 as the same model, painted in different positions. By the end of the decade, then, it seems that The Hague courts' interest in nocturnes was waning.

Several more paintings of similar subjects and themes were eventually added to the stadtholder's collections, appearing frequently in the 1632 and later inventories and testifying to the increasing popularity of Honthorst's style at the Orange court.[176] Frederik Hendrik and Amalia's collecting interests received a boost in 1628 when the Dutch West India Company captured a Spanish convoy with goods valued at approximately twelve million guilders (*f*), of which Frederik Hendrik could claim 10% as admiral and commander-in-chief of the Dutch fleet.[177] The "Sea Prince's monies"

---

[175] Honthorst's signature and date appears in the Seattle painting on the *houlette* just above the carrier's hand, while on the Leipzig canvas it is inscribed on the back cover the songbook.

[176] See, for example, Judson/Ekkart 1999, cat. nos. 108, 113-114, 120, 128, 132-133, 151, 153, 189, 208, 220, and 222.

[177] Van der Ploeg and Vermeeren, "The Stadholder's Art Collection," p. 34.

continued to fund courtly art commissions more than a decade later when Honthorst received 6,800 *f* for paintings for Huis ter Nieuburg in Rijswijk.[178] These and other commissions demonstrate to the increasing frequency of Honthorst's court patronage beginning in 1627, opportunities that awaited him in even greater volume when he returned from London.

Conclusion: Looking Across the Channel

Rubens and Buckingham

Despite the enthusiasm with which Arundel responded to Honthorst's *Aeneas Fleeing the Sack of Troy* in 1621, it was George Villiers, Duke of Buckingham and favorite of the king, who became Honthorst's first English patron, inviting him to London in 1628. This often-repeated art historical narrative—of Carleton's facilitation, Arundel's praise and inaction, and Buckingham's redemptive offer—does not account for the seven-year gap between Honthorst's introduction and invitation to England and insufficiently explores the roles of several key figures. One of these is Rubens, who sought out Honthorst when he visited Utrecht in 1627, having just completed a grand allegorical scene for the ceiling of Buckingham's Great Chamber at

[178] Payment recorded in the Orange-Nassau Ordonnance Books: "to be paid *from the 'Sea Prince's' monies* to Gerard van Honthorst the sum of 6,800 carolus guilders for painting the large room at Huis ter Nieuburg in Rijswijk…16 May 1639." As quoted in Van der Ploeg and Vermeeren, "The Stadholder's Art Collection," p. 34.

York House in London (Fig. 5.5).[179] Rubens, who had also corresponded with King James I, could have mentioned the increasingly popular Honthorst to the Duke, who was continuously seeking gifts for Charles I in the form of both paintings and painters.[180] Indeed, as Michael Auwers has recently demonstrated in relation to Rubens, the facilitation of introductions with artists could be a key component of international courtly relationships and even the practice of diplomacy.[181] Moreover, Buckingham was in The Hague in 1625, where he commissioned a portrait from Michiel van Miereveld (Fig. 4.87; Adelaide, Art Gallery of South Australia).

Carleton may have even acted as the intermediary in the production of these portraits, which would help to explain why Buckingham's invitation reached

---

[179] Arthur Wheelock suggested this connection in a discussion of this topic on 12 May 2014. Sandrart reports Rubens' visit to Honthorst in Utrecht in 1627 (TA 1675, II, Book 3, p. 252). See also Ivana May Rosenblatt, *Libeling Painting: Exploring the Gap between Text and Image in the Critical Discourse on George Villiers, the First Duke of Buckingham* (MA thesis, The Ohio State University, 2009): pp. 25-27. Jeremy Wood ("Orazio Gentileschi and Some Netherlandish Artists in London: The Patronage of the Duke of Buckingham, Charles I and Henrietta Maria," *Simiolus: Netherlands Quarterly for the History of Art* 28, no. 3 [2000-2001]: p. 113), states that the York House ceiling was probably begun around May 1625 and completed in September 1627.

[180] David Howarth, *Images of Rule: Art and Politics in the English Renaissance, 1485-1649* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1997): p. 123. In 1623 James I solicited Rubens to create a decorative scheme for the ceiling of the new banqueting hall at Whitehall, but the commission stalled due to challenges on the Medici Cycle in the Louvre. Charles I finally got Rubens to paint the ceiling in 1635.

[181] Michael Auwers, "The Gift of Rubens," pp. 421-441.

Honthorst through the ambassador.[182] It is possible, furthermore, that Buckingham met Honthorst when he was in The Hague, as at some point he acquired Honthorst's *The Dentist* (Fig. 2.10). This could have been as early as 1622, the work's date, but seems more likely to have occurred between Buckingham's visit in 1625 and Honthorst's invitation to London in 1628, when, as I argue in Chapter 3, he may have lodged in York House.[183]

Elizabeth Stuart and Frederick V

Elizabeth Stuart may also have had a hand in Honthorst's invitation to London in 1628. Elizabeth, who had established her court-in-exile in The Hague in 1621, maintained a particularly close correspondence with her brother and the Duke of Buckingham, as well as with Dudley Carleton.[184] Honthorst likely met Elizabeth and

---

[182] Hill, "Sir Dudley Carleton," p. 259. Carleton seemed to have wielded immense power in The Hague, and by extension the entire Dutch Republic. Houbraken relates the complexities of artistic exchange between courts in his life of Jan Lievens in the *Groote Schouburgh*: in 1631 Lievens apparently painted a portrait that so pleased stadtholder Frederik Hendrik that he gave it to Dudley Carleton, who in turn sent it to Charles I in England, who then invited Lievens to England (Houbraken 1718-21, p. 297).

[183] Judson 1959, cat. no. 191, p. 242: the provenance begins, "Sold at Auction Duke of Buckingham Collection, Antwerp, 1648, to the Emperor at Prague." From Prague the painting went to its current location in Dresden.

[184] As discussed in Chapter 4, Buckingham was one of the first people Elizabeth turned to convince her father James to support the Bohemian cause, and one of Elizabeth's prized paintings, Rubens's *Hagar Leaves the House of Abraham* (Fig. 4.57), was a gift from Dudley Carleton.

her husband Frederick in The Hague in 1621, during his dealings with Carleton regarding the Arundel *Sack of Troy*.[185] He subsequently seems to have made several paintings for them, including *The Concert* (Fig. 2.2), *King David Playing the Harp* (Fig. 2.47), and *Granida and Daifilo* (Fig. 2.73).

Frederick and Elizabeth were also known to travel frequently throughout their host country. On one trip to Utrecht in 1626, they visited Abraham Bloemaert, Honthorst's teacher, from whom Elizabeth purchased a picture.[186] It seems unlikely that Elizabeth and Frederick—especially under the direction or encouragement of Carleton—would seek out Bloemaert and not Honthorst on their visits to Utrecht. His reputation was significant enough, after all, that Rubens paid him a visit in 1627. Elizabeth was in Utrecht again in March of 1628, just weeks before Honthorst's invitation to London came.[187] She was there to see Carleton off on his return to England and, as the 1628 invitation demonstrates, Carleton was the one who

---

[185] Braun 1966, p. 213, no. 72. See also Kettering, *The Dutch Arcadia,* pp. 67, 150n23, 172.

[186] According to the younger Dudley Carleton (1559-1654; nephew of the ambassador of the same name), "a true original picture of her dog Babler w^{ch} she hath bought." Quoted in Sainsbury 1859, p. 293n24: letter Dudley Carleton to Sir Dudley Carleton 15/25 October 1626. Carleton the younger says that she intended to send the painting to Carleton, "that you may give your opinion."

[187] Akkerman 2015, p. 662: Prince Frederick Henry writes from The Hague to Elizabeth.

accompanied Honthorst to England.[188] As will be discussed in greater detail in Chapter 4, Elizabeth would go on to be one of Honthorst's most important patrons, and he her favored painter. Over the course of three decades, Honthorst produced more than one hundred paintings for Elizabeth, and his works were instrumental in constructing her visual identity of the wronged, exiled monarch in her palace at Rhenen, outside Utrecht.

Michel le Blon

One final figure, Michel le Blon (1587-1656), provides a potential point of contact between Honthorst and courtly circles in The Hague and testifies to the expansive networks being cultivated there. Le Blon was the cousin of Joachim von Sandrart, based in Amsterdam but part of an elite cultural network and working since about the late 1620s as an agent for the Swedish Chancellor Axel Oxenstierna (1583-1654) in The Hague.[189] Born in Frankfurt but settled in Amsterdam as an engraver and goldsmith by about 1610, Le Blon became well-connected among the city's upper

---

[188] See Ch. 3 p. 166. Addressing Carleton, Gerbier says "I trust you will not forget to bring Mr. Honthorst," making clear that Carleton is the one accompanying the artist across the channel.

[189] For Sandrart's biography of Le Blon see TA 1675, II, Book 3, p. 358. See also Sluijter, *Rembrandt's Rivals*, pp. 72-73; and Noldus, "Loyalty and Betrayal," p. 56.

classes.[190] In May of 1632 he began working (officially) as an agent of Oxenstierna, who had already had a series of residents in The Hague beginning in 1614.[191]

Le Blon served as Oxenstierna's first informant in Amsterdam, and his widespread, reliable network evidently justified the odd choice of an artist as agent. Le Blon sent *avvisi* with remarkable volume, sometimes as many as two to three a week with information accumulated from correspondents in Brussels, Paris, Antwerp, The Hague, Cologne, Portugal, Moscow, Madrid, London, and beyond.[192] It is likely that Carleton and Elizabeth Stuart were also familiar with this network of Swedish agents. Not only did Carleton conduct frequent visits to artists and operators in Amsterdam but also Elizabeth was particularly close to the Swedish King Gustav II Adolf (r.

---

[190] Eric Jan Sluijter (*Rembrandt's Rivals,* p. 72) states categorically that Le Blon was in Amsterdam starting in 1612. Badelock Vera Noldus argues that, though the exact date of Le Blon's settlement there is unknown, he was certainly in Amsterdam in 1610, when he produced is first Dutch print, the frontispiece for Jan van Ghelen's pamphlet *de opstandinghe van mars* ("A Spider in Its Web: Agent and Artist Michel le Blon and His Northern European Network," in Keblusek and Noldus, eds., *Double Agents: Cultural and Political Brokerage in Early Modern Europe*, Studies in Medieval and Reformation Traditions, Volume 154 [Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2011]: p. 163).

[191] These were Jan Rutgers in 1623, Ludwig Camerarius (1573-1651) following Rutgers' death in 1624, and Peter Spierinck (c. 1595-1652), replacing Camerarius in 1636. Noldus, "Loyalty and Betrayal: Artist-Agents Michel le Blon and Pieter Isaacsz., and Chancellor Axel Oxenstierna," in Hans Cools, Keblusek, and Noldus, eds., *Your Humble Servant: Agents in Early Modern Europe* (Hilversum: Verloren, 2006): pp. 52-53. For Spierinck see Noldus, "An 'Unvergleichbarer Liebhaber': Peter Spierinck, the Art-Dealing Diplomat," *Scandinavian Journal of History* 31, no. 2 (2006): pp. 173-185.

[192] Noldus, "Loyalty and Betrayal," p. 54.

1611-1632), for whom she named her youngest son and with whom her husband fought for restitution of the Palatinate.[193] After Gustav Adolf's death, Elizabeth wrote to Oxenstierna, that the

> closeness of blood, joined with such interests, made this loss so acute for me that I did not know how adequately to express my regrets, and the death of the King, Monsieur my husband, coming incontinently thereafter made my grief and sadness completely overflow measure.[194]

Le Blon was the Swedish agent at Charles I's court beginning in early 1635, at which time Elizabeth stated in a letter to Thomas Roe that she did not know him.[195] However, in his next letter to her Roe admits that he "mistook *the* name of *the* Sueds Agent, then expected, since arriued. It is Bloome: a man well knowne in Holland."[196] It is entirely possible, then, that Elizabeth already knew Le Blon from his dealings in Amsterdam and The Hague.

---

[193] Gustav Adolf was even a former suitor to Elizabeth, when his father, Karl IX, proposed on Gustav's behalf in 1609, shortly followed by Prince Maurits, Elizabeth's eventual protector in the Netherlands. For this see Akkerman 2015, p. 9. Elizabeth's son Gustavus Adolphus was born in 1632 and died in 1641, at age eight.

[194] Akkerman 2011, p. 150, letter no. 70, Elizabeth to Oxenstierna, 20 December 1632.

[195] Akkerman 2011, p. 318, letter no. 181, Elizabeth to Roe, 21 February 1635: "I know not that Bawne, I pray continue to doe all you can between these two nations, for I wish a good peace there".

[196] Akkerman 2011, p. 327, letter no. 185, Roe to Elizabeth, 15 April 1635. Roe continues, implying that by this time certain factions at English court knew Le Blon well and severely distrusted him: "but I thinke I did >not< mistake his condition, and relations; for many report him not right, and doe wonder at the election of such a man."

Moreover, Le Blon belonged to the Flemish rhetoric society ‘’t Wit Lavendel’, with which the poet Joost van den Vondel (1587-1679) was also affiliated. This association together with his artistic and cultural activities in Amsterdam resulted in an extensive, elite network which not only facilitated his news gathering but also garnered design commissions for things such as coats of arms, frontispieces, and dagger hilts (Fig. 2.98; Washington, D.C., National Gallery of Art; Fig. 2.99; Amsterdam, Rijksmuseum).[197] Judging by his correspondence, Le Blon was also active in The Hague, the residence of both Carleton and Elizabeth. Jacob van Dijck (1567-1631), once the Swedish ambassador to that city, may even have served as an initial connection between Oxenstierna and Le Blon. Not only did they have a mutual friend in Vondel, but also Van Dijck enjoyed welcoming artists and writers to his “Swedish House.”[198]

Le Blon’s relationship with Sandrart is typically discussed in terms of the latter’s settlement in Amsterdam in 1637, but they were evidently close before this, as Le Blon accompanied Sandrart on his voyage to Italy immediately following his work with Honthorst in London in 1628.[199] In the Netherlands, Le Blon’s (and Sandrart’s)

---

[197] Noldus, “A Spider in Its Web,” p. 163.

[198] Noldus, “A Spider in Its Web,” p. 165. Noldus goes on to suggest (p. 166) that Le Blon could have been self-identifying as a Swedish agent as early as 1627, and that Sweden possibly had contacts as early as 1618, the year they first approached the States General for a loan.

[199] Noldus, “A Spider in Its Web,” p. 162.

circles included poets and composers such as P.C. Hooft, Vondel, Constantijn Huygens (1596-1687), the art dealers Jan (1601-46) and Gerard Reynst (1599-1658), as well as painters such as Peter Paul Rubens, Jacob Jordaens (1593-1678), Willem van de Velde the Elder (1611-93), Simon de Vlieger (1601-53), and many more. To this group the name of Gerrit van Honthorst, so interested in society patronage, may perhaps be added, and it was this collective and widespread courtly network that carried Honthorst to London in 1628.

Entrance Granted

Honthorst's rapid move to approach Dudley Carleton in 1621 demonstrates that he was aiming for an *entrée* to British courtly circles from the beginning, which was one of the only ways for a Netherlandish painter to succeed in England.[200] This chapter has likewise had the court at its center, as Honthorst's contact with various courtly factions was both a precipitator and mark of his rising fame. Successfully positioned at the intersection of international networks of patronage, Honthorst then stretched and modified his style and subject matter in order to carve his own niche with those patrons. Continuing to inject Caravaggesque and provocative elements into

[200] Peter Hecht demonstrated this well in "Dutch Painters in England," p. 159: "Time and again the early biographies reveal how terribly difficult it was for the many minor emigrant artists to find their way economically, and time and again we are given to understand that a handful of privileged court painters, like Lely and Kneller, were in charge of much of the rest of the local market as well."

his work throughout the period under consideration, Honthorst worked to repackage his pictures for a new audience.

Paintings such as the Washington *Concert* (Fig. 2.2), produced in the same year as the more Caravaggesque *Merry Fiddler* (Fig. 2.14), show Honthorst as restlessly experimental, mixing parts of previously successful paintings with new approaches as he sought the most lucrative and steady client base. Nevertheless, it is certainly true that in his first major commissions for the court (Fig. 2.2, Fig. 2.73), there is a marked absence of the nocturne and a definitive turn toward the pastoral. By 1627, these features become more consistent in his production although, as we will see in Chapter 3, the most important painting that he produced at the court of Charles I is one of his most tenebristic (Fig. 3.4).

Honthorst was a prolific painter, and to the few examples selected here many more could be added. Nevertheless, the cases traced throughout this chapter evidence his self-transformation into a court artist. In this capacity, Honthorst produced images of antique identification figures as in *Emperor Otho* (Fig. 2.48), boldly-colored and subtly sculptural merry companies such as the Washington *Concert* (Fig. 2.2), romantic pastoral scenes such as *Granida and Daifilo* (Fig. 2.73), idyllic images of shepherdesses (Figs. 2.95, 2.96), and *Diana at the Hunt* (Fig. 2.94), the latter the favored courtly pastime of patrons such as Elizabeth Stuart.

The more complete picture that this chapter has presented of the ways in which Honthorst molded himself into a court painter in the years between 1620 and 1627 allows us to reconsider how we can situate and interpret his courtly paintings. As

evidence of his self-fashioning to appeal to the court, they also mark the primacy of court patronage in the life of an artist. Indeed, Honthorst's trip to London was the beginning of a new stage in his career. For Charles I, he would be asked to push his methods even further by completing not just individual portraits, but one of the most ambitious group *portraits historiés* of his career. In providing a basis for Honthorst's subsequent courtly production, this chapter has aimed to open a new perspective onto the formation of his international courtly mode.

FIGURES

ALL IMAGES REMOVED DUE TO COPYRIGHT

Chapter 3

CHARLES I, HONTHORST, AND THE POLITICS OF DISPLAY

That the First Charles does here in triumph ride,
See his son reign where he a martyr died,
And people pay that reverence as they pass,
(Which then he wanted!) to the sacred brass,
Is not the effect of gratitude alone,
To which we owe the statue and the stone;
But heaven this lasting monument has wrought,
That mortals may eternally be taught
Rebellion, though successful, is but vain,
And kings so killed rise conquerors again.
This truth the royal image does proclaim,
Loud as the trumpet of surviving fame.

- Edmund Waller, *On the Statue of King Charles I at Charing Cross* (1674)

Introduction: "An excellent piece of paint"[201]

In late 1635, three years into his tenure as Principal Painter in Ordinary to Charles I and Queen Henrietta Maria, the Flemish painter Anthony van Dyck executed a triple portrait of the king (Fig. 3.1; London, Royal Collection Trust). A letter from Charles to Gian Lorenzo Bernini (1598-1680) reveals that the purpose of the painting

---

[201] James Yonge and F. N. L. Poynter, ed., *The Journal of James Yonge [1647-1721]: Plymouth Surgeon* (Hamden, Conn.: Archon Books, 1963): p. 172; as quoted in White and De Sancha 2015, p. 180.

was to serve as a model from which Bernini would make, "Our Portrait in Marble, after the painted portrait which we shall send to you immediately."[202] The resulting bust was presented to the monarchs at their palace at Oatlands, outside of London, on 17 July 1636, sometime after which it was transported to Whitehall Palace. Bernini kept the painting, which reentered the Royal Collection in 1822, but the bust was destroyed in a fire in 1698.[203]

In keeping with the almost mythical status that surrounded Charles I after his execution in 1649, an ominous legend quickly rose up around the bust.[204] The writer and antiquarian John Aubrey (1626-1697) recounted in his *Miscellanies Upon Various Subjects* (first published in 1696, just before the fire), that "The bust of King Charles I.

---

[202] Letter dated 17 March 1636. As quoted in the object description, Royal Collection Online: <https://www.royalcollection.org.uk/collection/search#/4/collection/404420/charles-i-1600-1649> (accessed 27 September 27, 2018): "il Nostro Ritratto in Marmo, sopra quello che in un Quadro vi manderemo subiito." See also Stanislao Fraschetti, *Il Bernini, la sua vita, la sua opera, il suo tempo* (Milan: U. Hoepli, 1900): pp. 110-111.

[203] On the arrival of the bust in England see Karen Serres, "Henrietta Maria, Charles I and the Italian Baroque," in Desmond Shawe-Taylor, et al., *Charles I: King and Collector* (London: Royal Academy of Arts, 2018. Exhibition catalogue.): p. 174.

[204] On posthumous attitudes toward Charles see Andrew Lacey, *The Cult of King Charles the Martyr* (Rochester, NY: Boydell Press, 2003); Steven N. Zwicker, *Lines of Authority: Politics and English Literary Culture, 1649-1689* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1993): pp. 37-59; Elizabeth Skerpan-Wheeler, "The First 'Royal': Charles I as Celebrity," *PMLA* 126, no. 4 (October 2011): pp. 912-934; Robert Wilcher, "What Was the King's Book for?: The Evolution of 'Eikon Basilike'," *The Yearbook of English Studies* 21, Politics, Patronage and Literature in England 1558-1658 (1991): pp. 218-228.

carved by Bernini, as it was brought in a boat upon the Thames, a strange bird (the like whereof the bargemen had never seen) dropped a drop of blood, or blood-like upon it; which left a stain not to be wiped of."[205] Writing over forty years later, the conservative priest Zachary Grey (1688-1766) expands the legend. After invoking an eyewitness to demonstrate the truth of his account, Grey relates that Bernini was "unaccountably dilatory" in his completion of the bust and that,

> [Bernini] said, that he had set about it several times, but there was something so unfortunate in the Features of the Face, that he was shocked every time that he examined it, and forced to leave off his Work; and if there was any Stress to be lay'd on Phisiognomy, he was sure the Person whom the Picture represented, was destined to a violent End.[206]

---

[205] Aubrey 1857, p. 41.

[206] Grey's relating of the tale is overall more poetic than Aubrey's: "As [the King with a train of nobility] were viewing [the bust], an Hawk flew over their Heads with a Partridge in its claws, which he had wounded to Death. Some of the Partridge's Blood fell on the Neck of the Statue, where it always remained without being wiped off, and was seen by Hundreds of People as long as the Bust was in being. It was put up over the Door of the King's Closet at White-Hall, and continued there, till it was burnt in the Fire, which consumed that Palace about forty Years ago." Grey 1738, p. 50n*i*. On this see also Horace Welby, *Predictions Realized in Modern Times* (London: Kent and Co. Paternoster Row, 1862): p. 71; and Jan Koenderink, Andrea van Doorn, and Johan Wagemans, *Painting to Marble* (De Clootcrans Press, 2012): p. 2. The bust, among many others, was bought at the Commonwealth Sale in 1651 by Emmanuel de Critz (1608-1665), former Serjeant Painter to Charles I. The works that De Critz purchased were returned to the royal family upon Charles II's (r. 1660-1685) restoration in 1660, along with as many as could be located or had been squirreled away by Royalists in the hopes of just such an event. Bernini's image of the king was probably placed in Whitehall at this moment, where Grey could have seen or heard of it being, and where it was destroyed in 1698. See Arthur MacGregor, "The King's Goods and the Commonwealth Sale. Materials and Context," in *The Late King's Goods,* pp. 17-18.

Beyond the fantastical nature of Grey's and Aubrey's narratives, they reveal much about early modern attitudes toward the image of the king. Foremost, that the king's likeness was endowed with a physical presence and in that embodiment lay an inherent, terrible power to predict or manifest harm to the monarch's corporeal body. In this case, Van Dyck's painting of Charles displayed—in retrospect—physiognomic traits of the violent end that would befall him, reinforced later in the narrative by the drop of blood falling on the statue's neck, which signaled Charles's eventual execution by beheading. Moving beyond this posthumous, mythologizing view of Van Dyck's and Bernini's portraits, however, the story of the bust demonstrates the persistent capability (indeed necessity) of the royal image to memorialize. Grey's account of Bernini's working method aligns with seventeenth-century comments on the sculptor's process; Paul Fréart de Chantelou (1609-94) and Filippo Baldinucci both describe Bernini's almost obsessive need to observe his subjects at length in order to capture their character.[207] Regardless of Bernini's efforts to depict a true likeness and aspect,

---

[207] Filippo Baldinucci and Catherine Enggass, trans., *The Life of Bernini* (University Park and London: The Pennsylvania State University Press, 1966): pp. 77-78: "He said that in making a portrait from life everything consisted in being able to recognize the unique qualities of individuality that nature gives to each person rather than the generality common to all. In choosing a particularity one must pick one that is beautiful rather than ugly. In order to achieve this end Bernini had a practice very different from the general run. He did not want the person he was drawing to remain immobile. Rather he wished him to move about and talk, since he said he then could see all his beauty and, as it were, capture it. He said that a person who poses, fixed and immobile, is never as much himself as he is when he is in motion, when those qualities which are his alone and not of a general nature appear. Such individuality gives a portrait its likeness."; Chantelou 1885, p. 36: "I forgot to say that the King asked him to do his portrait. He told S.M. that it was a difficult thing, and that would hurt her,

his portrait of Charles I would have been idealized in the same way as his later *Bust of Louis XIV* (r. 1643-1715; Fig. 3.2). Indeed, Van Dyck's great skill as a royal portraitist was that he combined idealization with a feeling of intimacy, giving the viewer a sense of seeing the person even though the image was at quite a remove.

Comparing Van Dyck's painting of Charles I with one by Honthorst, done seven years earlier in 1628, reveals the variability in the efficacy of royal portraiture. Though Honthorst's Stuart portraits in general read more as idealized monuments than immediate views, *King Charles I* (Fig. 3.3; London, National Portrait Gallery) is one of Honthorst's most engaging portraits. In this painting Charles, in everyday dress, directs a serene gaze toward the viewer while leaning forward onto a cushion and holding an open letter in his hands. The closeness of the figure to the picture plane, his life-size scale, and the sense of stillness within momentary action contribute to the relatability of the scene. Underscoring this painting's appearance as a document of a real encounter is the cushion on which the king leans, perhaps a method of easing the discomfort a long portrait sitting. Despite this seeming intimacy, Charles's gaze appears aloof, and Honthorst's smooth painting style contributes to the sense that the figure of the king has been made flawless, at a perfect remove from the earthly realm of the viewer.

---

because he would need to see her twenty times, and two hours each time." [J'oubliais de dire que le Roi l'a prié de faire son portrait. Il a répondu à S.M. que c'était une chose difficile, et qui lui donnerait de la peine à elle, parce qu'il aurait besoin de la voir vingt fois, et deux heures chaque fois.]

The striking differences in Honthorst's and Van Dyck's portraits of Charles is indicative of their divergent painting styles. In Van Dyck's *Charles I* the king appears appropriately older, the topography of his face more defined as he stares almost listlessly out of the painting. Though both paintings were clearly finished works in their own right, it is important to take into account that Van Dyck's and Honthorst's paintings were used for the same purpose: as the basis for a subsequent work. As will be discussed in greater detail below, Honthorst's *King Charles I* probably served as the model for the portrait of the king in his grand *Apollo and Diana* (Fig. 3.4; London, Royal Collection Trust).

In *Apollo and Diana,* we can see how Honthorst translates the smaller portrait of Charles into a large-scale allegorical image of the king. Though still life-size, Charles is now at a greater remove from the viewer, both physically in being situated further from the foreground and allegorically in his presentation as the god Apollo. One of the boldest and most complex historiated portraits of the seventeenth century, *Apollo and Diana* was one of seven paintings that Honthorst completed during his eight months in London in 1628. By the time he arrived in England and began to paint the *Apollo and Diana*, Honthorst was already an artist of international reputation, but this allegory of the flowering of the arts under Charles, intended for the new Banqueting House of Whitehall Palace, marks the beginning of his career as royal portraitist. Honthorst occupied this role for more than thirty years, over the course of which his style, subject matter, and the display of his paintings shaped, and were shaped by, the demands of the royal image.

Serving the king's ambition to rival the courts of Europe and fueling his voracious appetite for continental painters, *Apollo and Diana* depicts Charles and Henrietta Maria as the titular mythological figures while the royal favorite the Duke of Buckingham, as Mercury, offers personifications of the seven liberal arts. Combining dramatic, Caravaggesque lighting with a balanced, classical composition, this painting offered a way of picturing the royal person that showcased the drama of the Stuart masque. It tempers the moody chiaroscuro of Caravaggio's followers with a harmonious allegory that presents Charles, Henrietta Maria, and Buckingham as classical deities and as virtuous patrons of the arts. The choice of these fictional guises in particular engages with a representational trope of Charles's reign and thus draws on established modes for depicting the monarch in order to expand the boundaries of the royal image. Furthermore, the work's continental style and its display in the ceremonial center of Charles's court increased the influence of contemporary European art in England and helped to codify the importance of paintings for Caroline courtiers.

Our knowledge of Charles's extensive activities as a collector is due in large part to Abraham van der Doort (ca. 1575-1640), Charles's court antiquary and the compiler of the 1637-40 inventory of Charles's collection cited throughout this dissertation. When Van der Doort was created Keeper of the King's Cabinet in 1625, his duties included,

> the colecting, Receiving, delivering soarting placeing remoaving or causing of making by our appointing such things as wee all thinke fit

> and allsoe to keepe a Regester booke of them and all other sarvices as hee shall know from our selfe or Receave Direction.[208]

In accordance with this charge, Van der Doort often took pains to record the character, display, and history of the collection in as much detail as possible. Compiled room by room throughout Charles's palaces, this document serves as an early kind of collections catalogue, providing an unequalled window for generations of scholarly inquiries into Charles's tastes, systems of display, and collecting practices.

The importance of Van der Doort's inventory to the ongoing fascination of scholars with Charles's collection is born out in the most recent exhibition on the monarch, *Charles I: King and Collector* (London, Royal Academy of Arts, 2018), which explored the assembly of the collection and its display within the king's lifetime. In the exhibition and its catalogue Honthorst is almost entirely absent. Though he is mentioned more frequently in Van der Doort's inventory than Rubens (11 times to Rubens's 10), Honthorst was represented in the exhibition by just one painting, the half-length *King Charles I* (Fig. 3.3), which was hung on a wall introducing "The Royal Portrait." The painting was positioned next to a label and explanatory text, neither of which mentioned the character or display of Honthorst's paintings in Charles's palaces (Fig. 3.5). This gap is emblematic of a greater trend, particularly among British art historians, in which Honthorst is dismissed as an

---

[208] As quoted in Millar 1960, p. xiii, from Sainsbury 1859, pp. 349-50.

inferior placeholder for Van Dyck. Though in one sense completely justified—Honthorst worked for the court only briefly, was a different type of painter, and produced far fewer portraits of Caroline courtiers—in another this skews our understanding not only of Honthorst's place within court culture and among court painters of the first half of the seventeenth century, but also of the breadth of Charles's interest in and patronage of contemporary Northern European artists.

Though both Van Dyck and Rubens's work and reputation loomed large over Honthorst at court, he overlapped with neither of them there. Though Honthorst met Rubens in Utrecht in 1627, as related in Chapter 2, he would not meet Van Dyck until the Flemish painter visited The Hague, in 1631-2. Already by Honthorst's arrival in London in 1628, however, both artists had had an impact among Charles's courtiers, particularly the Duke of Buckingham. Discussed in greater detail in Chapter 5, the large-scale figural compositions by both Rubens and Van Dyck in Buckingham's collection would be instrumental in his conception of *Apollo and Diana*.

Before the present analysis, scholars have incompletely understood the scope and context of Honthorst's London paintings. The majority of such studies have been limited to only the *Apollo and Diana*, including Oliver Millar's 1954 "Charles I, Honthorst, and Van Dyck," the first consideration of Honthorst's work in the context of the Stuart court. Treating the seven paintings Honthorst made in London as a discreet group that both inflected and answered to the demands placed on paintings in this period reveals the extent to which these objects participated in the complex patronage network established by Charles and his circle. Charged with conveying

abstract and invisible virtues within the recognizable visage of the king, Honthorst prioritized a sense of idealization and decorous noble bearing in his depictions of both monarch and courtier alike.

This chapter explores the politics of display and the use of art as currency at Charles's court. It seeks to understand the ways in which portraits functioned more directly than but in concert with other genres in the larger enterprise of projecting identity. It anchors this discussion around Honthorst's seven paintings, which were all commissioned by or intended for the king: *Apollo and Diana* (Fig. 3.4), *King Charles I* (Fig. 3.3), a portrait of Buckingham and his family (Fig. 3.6), and two pairs of pastoral portraits (whereabouts unknown). An analysis of these paintings and their display in the royal palaces reveals how Honthorst's portraits embody the dynamics of status central to artistic production for the Stuart monarchs. Beginning with a discussion of Charles's father James I and his elder brother Henry Frederick, whose short life and premature death had an indelible impact upon the House of Stuart, this analysis then expands to include the personal characteristics of and struggles within Charles's early life, which informed his adult behavior and collecting practices. The second part of the chapter addresses each of the three extant paintings in turn. They are studied in the context of their production, display, reception, and condition, in order to clarify the particularities of Honthorst's court style and, more important, to reinsert his work into the culture of Charles I's London.

PART I: James, Henry, Charles, and the Transformation of Stuart Collecting

Virtuous Collecting and the Distinction of the Royal Portrait

In the early modern period, art collecting and the practice of connoisseurship were directly linked to the cultivation of those virtues essential to a nobility of mind and bearing. Within this system, the royal portrait held a particularly important place and compelled deference as if to the monarch him/herself, in return providing a salutary benefit to the viewer by serving as an *exemplum virtutis*. This idea of the virtuous example is explicitly invoked by Henry Peacham (1578-ca. 1644) in his courtesy book *The Compleat Gentleman* (1622, 1634), the best-known British response to Baldassare Castiglione's (1478-1529) *Book of the Courtier* (Venice, 1528). Addressing the young noblemen of England, Peacham suggests the Ancients as a model for the present, "in whom you shall see the patterne of a brave Prince…and whatsoever else were to be wished in Maiesty."[209] By occupying themselves with the evaluation, study, and sometimes even practice of painting at this moment of the emergence of connoisseurship, the nobility demonstrated their scholarly virtue and gentility. Franciscus Junius called such connoisseurs "lovers of art" or, in Dutch, *liefhebbers*.[210] Charles's concern with amassing an art collection marks his participation in this larger discourse on princely behavior.

---

[209] Peacham 1634, p. 48.

[210] See, for example, Junius 1641, pp. 34, 54, 68, and 166.

The interests of royalty in painting legitimized the prominence sought for the art as monarchs were considered the height of earthy authority and empowered by God. In his thirteenth chapter, "Of Drawing, Limning, and Painting," Peacham again invokes the Antique, stating that "in ancient times, Painting was admitted into the first place among the liberall Arts," and was intrinsic to a noble education.[211] He then goes on to make an explicit connection to the contemporary:

> Neither was [painting] the exercise of Nobility amoung the ancients onely, but of late dayes and in our times we see it practiced by the greatest Princes of *Europe*, without præjudice to their Honours.[212]

Peacham then reproduces several biographies of Italian painters, which are largely copied from Karel van Mander's *Schilder-Boeck* (1604), as Giorgio Vasari's (1511-1574) *Vite* (1550) was not widely available in England at that time.[213] Works such as Van Mander's had done much to promote the preeminence of painting in the north, in part by emphasizing the its noble associations.[214] Peacham relates some of these

---

[211] Peacham 1634, p. 125.

[212] Peacham 1634, p. 126.

[213] Peacham 1634, p. 154: "If you would reade the lives at large of the most excellent Painters, as well Ancient as Moderne, I referre you unto the two volumes of *Vasari*, well written in Italian (which I have not seene, as being hard to come by)…and *Calvin Mander* in high *Dutch*; unto whom I am beholden, for the greater part what I have here written, of some of their lives."; See also Ronald Lightbown, "Charles I and the Tradition of European Princely Collecting," in *The Late King's Goods*, p. 60.

[214] See, for example, Van Mander's Lives of Jan and Hubert van Eyck, where he compares their relationship with Philip of Burgundy to Alexander the Great and Apelles (Miedema, trans., *The Lives of the Illustrious Netherlandish and German*

encounters as well, telling how Giotto (1266/67-1337) was deemed by the Pope to surpass "all men of his time in excellency," and how Raphael was "sirnamed the *Wonderfull*" and "was fought for and employed by the greatest Princes of *Europe*."[215]

The enterprise to elevate the status of painting and painters also has its roots in Ancient thought. Critics were virtually unanimous in asserting that painting's similarity to poetry alone should grant it serious consideration as a liberal art, based on Horace's expression *ut pictora poesis* [as is painting so is poetry].[216] Following the new theories about painting that first gained traction in the Renaissance, the concurrent increase in the collecting passions of European royalty led to the rise of the prince-connoisseur.[217] In an often-dizzying chain of praise, artists were hailed as saviors of painting, for which their skill earned them great fame and rewards from the

---

Painters, p. 61). The comparison with Apelles and other ancient painters is found throughout the *Lives*, including those of Hans Holbein and Frans Floris.

[215] Peacham 1634, pp. 142, 152-153.

[216] For a complete study of this theory see Rensselaer Lee, *Ut Pictura Poesis: The Humanistic Theory of Painting*. New York: W.W. Norton, 1967.

[217] Auwers, "The Gift of Rubens," pp. 425-426. See also Jonathan Brown, *Kings & Connoisseurs: Collecting Art in Seventeenth-Century Europe* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1994): Ch. 6, "Prestige of Painting"; and Zirka Zaremba Filipczak, *Picturing Art in Antwerp, 1550-1700* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1987): especially "Conclusions."

royalty of Europe, by whose acknowledgement painting was elevated beyond a "mechanical and lowly art."[218]

The endeavor of princely collecting itself had origins in Antiquity. Suetonius (c. 69-after 122 CE; translated into English in 1606) writes of Julius Caesar, that "to get and buy up precious stones, engraved and chased peeces, Images, and painted Tables of antique worke, he was ever most eager and sharp set."[219] In his *Natural History* (translated into English in 1601), Pliny the Elder (23-79 CE) specifically references the ability of art to allow for indirect conquest, dominance via knowledge and possession rather than physical occupation. In Book 36, Pliny's encomium of Rome is performed through the systematic cataloging of the famous collections of

---

[218] That phrase is used in Giovanni Pietro Bellori's Life of Rubens, whom Bellori names "a light…which ennobled painting," and for which Rubens was sought after by "the greatest princes of Europe." *The Lives of the Modern Painters, Sculptors and Architects*, translated by Alice Sedgwick Wohl, notes by Hellmut Wohl (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2005): pp. 193-194.

[219] Suetonius, and Philemon Holland, trans., *History of the twelve Caesars* (1606; Edition London: D. Nutt, 1899): p. 50. Timothy Wilks ("Princely Collecting," in Catherine MacLeod, ed., *The Lost Prince: The Life and Death of Henry Stuart* [London: National Portrait Gallery Publications, 2012. Exh. cat.]: p. 118) notes in support of Henry's knowledge of the text, that it was dedicated to John Harington's mother.

Greek art in the Eternal City.[220] Implicit in this list—and by extension in collecting as a practice—is that ownership not only leads to understanding, but also supremacy.[221]

Based on these ancient principles of universal knowledge, the diverse objects in European collections of the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries were displayed in relation to one another rather than in the distinct categories found in modern museums. Though they were grouped and organized, the fascination and value of these objects was in their arrangement in dialogue with one another.[222] By the early seventeenth century, however, painting and sculpture were assuming dominant places in the collections of Europe, and especially after mid-century displays would become

---

[220] Sorcha Carey, "The Problem of Totality: Collecting Greek Art, Wonders and Luxury in Pliny the Elder's *Natural History*," *Journal of the History of Collections* 12, no. 1 (2000): p. 3.

[221] On this practice at work in the *Studiolo* of Francesco I de' Medici see Lia Markey, *The New World in Renaissance Italy: A Vicarious Conquest of Art and Nature at the Medici Court*, PhD diss., University of Chicago, 2008.

[222] As Martin Kemp observed, in such displays objects moved beyond obvious separations, particularly those between the natural and man-made: "'Wrought by No Artist's Hand': The Natural, the Artificial, the Exotic, and the Scientific in Some Artifacts from the Renaissance," in Claire Farago, ed., *Reframing the Renaissance: Visual Culture in Europe and Latin America, 1450-1650* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1995): p. 196. See also MacGregor (*Curiosity and Enlightenment: Collectors and Collections from the Sixteenth to the Nineteenth Century* [New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2007]: pp. 43-52) for a discussion of the types of objects in *Kunstkammern*, their organization, and the value placed on their craftsmanship. Alexander Marr ("Picturing Collections in Early Modern Europe," *Intellectual History Review* 20, no. 1 [2010]: p. 3) adds: "We find none of the concern for classification, nomenclature and taxonomy that so obsessed figures such as Fuchs and Conrad Gessner in the sixteenth century, or John Ray in the seventeenth."

increasingly categorized by medium. At the same time, however, painting (particularly portraiture), bumped up against various theological and theoretical debates about the morality of imagery in Post- and Counter-Reformation Europe. Defenders of painting adopted the Calvinist doctrine of election, arguing that artists are the elect of God, as evidenced by their skill, and thus have a divine right to nobility.[223]

According to ancient authors, virtues and vices were something concrete, and could be learned by regarding the proper examples. The loftiest of such models were royalty, who were regarded as an *exemplum virtutis* for their people. As the poet Claudian (c. 370-c. 404 CE) stated, "the world shapes itself after the ruler's example."[224] This idea was repeated or paraphrased in virtually every courtesy book beginning in the Middle Ages, and portraiture became the most potent vehicle for its transmission. In *Instruction of a Christian Prince* (1516), Desiderius Erasmus (ca. 1466-1536) wrote that "examples…should be carved in rings, painted on pictures, and

---

[223] John Peacock, "The Politics of Portraiture," in Kevin Sharpe and Peter Lake, eds., *Culture and Politics in Stuart England* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1993): p. 204: This argument is put forth explicitly in Nicholas Hilliard's (c. 1547-1619) *The Art of Limning* (c. 1600).

[224] As quoted in Kurt Johannesson, "The Portrait of the Prince as a Rhetorical Genre," in Allan Ellenius, ed. *Iconography, Propaganda, and Legitimation* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998): p. 12. The Latin original is "Componitur orbis regis ad exemplum".

written on genealogical trees…Noble minds are forcefully enkindled by examples of famous men."[225]

This evocative comparison, of impressing and inscribing *exempla*, has its roots in Medieval theories about sight and the power of images. Beginning in the thirteenth century, two oppositional theories of sight dominated scientific discourse: extramission and intromission. In the extramission theory the eye emits a ray that encounters the object to be viewed, is shaped by that object, then returns to and enters the eye. Intromission, Aristotelian in origin, instead maintains that the object itself emits rays that then go into the eye.[226] The physicality of both types of sight was then taken a step further, to the embedding of images in the back of the brain. In this final stage of the cognitive process of sight, externally viewed objects were impressed indelibly upon the viewer in the fifth, anterior chamber of the brain, known as the "storehouse of memory" (Fig. 3.7).[227] The power of images was such that pregnant

---

[225] As quoted in Johannesson, "Portrait of the Prince," p. 17.

[226] Cynthia Hahn, "Vision," in Conrad Rudolph, ed., *A Companion to Medieval Art: Romanesque and Gothic in Northern Europe* (Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell, 2010): pp. 46-47.

[227] Michael Camille, "Before the Gaze: The Internal Senses and Late Medieval Practices of Seeing," in Robert S. Nelson, ed., *Visuality Before and Beyond the Renaissance: Seeing as Others Saw* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000): pp. 198-203. In the Middle Ages, damage to the back of the head was believed to cause of memory loss, as the anterior cell is where the memory was located.

women were urged not even to look at pictures of misshapen monsters lest their fetus mimic the distorted form.[228]

This aspect of the efficacy of pictures could also net a positive result, an idea which goes back to antiquity. In *The Painting of the Ancients* (London, 1638), written by Franciscus Junius under the auspices of Thomas Howard, Earl of Arundel, the author recounts a particular use of pictures among the Spartans, taking the Greek historian Appian of Alexandria (c. 95 BCE – c. CE 165) as his source:

> For being a warrelike Nation, and knowing well-shaped proper bodies to be most fit for war, they were also most desirous to beget handsome children, representing unto their great bellied wives, the images of *Apollo* and *Bacchus*, the fairest among the gods; as also the pictures of *Castor* and *Pollux*, *Nireus*, *Narcissus*, *Hiacynthus*, young men of perfect beauty.[229]

By the seventeenth century this idea was often demonstrated through the affective power of the Prince's example. Indeed, Giulio Mancini's treatise, *Considerazioni Sulla Pittura*, was founded on and seeks to perpetuate the notion of painting as means of *producing* behavior rather than just modeling it. The mechanization, even weaponization of images, deployed in this sense to preserve the welfare of the general

---

[228] Camille, *The Medieval Art of Love: Objects and Subjects of Desire* (New York: Harry N. Abrams, Inc., Publishers, 1998): p. 28.

[229] Junius 1638, pp. 137-138. A few other examples of this practice are listed in the same section.

public, echoes other early modern modes of thought on the efficacy of the prince and his image.[230]

In 1592 Konrad Heresbach (1496-1576) developed Claudian's idea of the ruler as a "living example":

> The prince has to consider that he is sitting in a theatre, observed by everybody…Thus will the sight of him invite the people who were watching to imitate this example of virtue and become better human beings.[231]

James I echoes this view in the *Basilikon Doron*, first published in 1599 as a means of passing the wisdom of rulership on to his son and heir, when he states that the ruler must be a mirror to his people, in which the best qualities are reflected. However, to be a mirror the Prince must be seen, and here we encounter the problem of the limited availability of the royal body.

If visibility was considered essential, portraiture's increasing naturalism, its expanding sense of realism and plasticity, became a more effective means of allowing and inflecting this visibility. The rhetorical emphasis on expression and gesture in order to make the inner character visible meant that portraiture could be marshaled to serve as a distillation of such ideals. Reproducible, full of forceful presence, and easily transportable, portraits were positioned as the perfect *eloquentia corporis*.[232]

---

[230] Gage, *Painting as Medicine,* pp. 5-6.

[231] As quoted in Johannesson, "Portrait of the Prince," p. 19.

[232] Johannesson, "Portrait of the Prince," p. 28.

The proliferation of courtesy books specifically aimed at the education of princes would indicate that their minds required molding, and even that they were easily influenced and had to be protected lest bad examples be carved into them.[233] Yet there was also something inherently different about a prince, and the same divine right that served as the source of their authority also fostered their potential greatness, contributing to the notion that kings were born with their minds fully formed.[234] Nevertheless, the education of a Prince was a continual source of fascination, and his image was crafted to perpetuate and satisfy this hunger for information.

James and Henry

Historians had long considered the court of James I provincial, particularly in comparison with Charles's, which was viewed as the height of sophistication. Graham Parry has qualified this difference as one of temperament rather than refinement, underscoring two important points regarding the interpretation of court culture under James.[235] Firstly, after the anxiety surrounding Elizabeth I's (r. 1558-1603) final years,

---

[233] Johannesson, "Portrait of the Prince," p. 21.

[234] For an example of this related to Louis XIII of France see discussion below, p. 133.

[235] Parry, *Golden Age Restor'd,* p. 265. As Parry summarizes the essential difference in the iconography of these first two Stuart monarchs thusly: "James had attributes whereas Charles had roles." (p. 267) Though Parry's analysis reclaims James's status as cultural innovator by portraying Charles's patronage as budding megalomania, his study lends essential nuance to our understanding of patronage during this period.

the accession of the Stuarts was hailed as the beginning of a new golden age.[236] Secondly, the subsequent relaxation of hostilities between Protestant England and Catholic Europe encouraged a flood of continental influences that allowed great cultural innovation.[237] Furthermore, this ushered in a new courtly atmosphere and taste, with members of court such as his son and heir Henry Frederick leading new efforts to invigorate English art collecting and patronage.[238]

James's reputation as a collector ultimately suffers in comparison to those of his sons Henry and Charles, though, as he seems to have had neither a great interest in nor aptitude for art collecting. This is not to argue, however, that James had no understanding of the efficacy of portraits. On the contrary, even before his coronation—indeed, a mere month after Elizabeth I's death in March 1603—Secretary of the Venetian Embassy in London Giovan Carlo Scaramelli reported that portraits of Elizabeth were being replaced by those of Mary Queen of Scots (r. 1542-1587), James's mother. Mary was thought by many to be a martyr wrongfully executed by

---

[236] Parry, *Golden Age Restor'd,* p. x.

[237] Jonathan Brown places the start of English collecting in earnest at 1604, when conflicts between England and Rome were resolved, and its first champion as Thomas Howard (*Kings & Connoisseurs*, p. 17).

[238] Parry, *Golden Age Restor'd*, p. xi.

Elizabeth I, and after Elizabeth's death courtiers and other citizens utilized portraiture to make a statement of cooperation with the new regime.[239]

Even if we cannot believe Scaramelli's comments that James did not attend Elizabeth's funeral for fear that the sight of her body would bring about the painful memory of his mother's murder, it is easy to imagine that James would be eager to see her image restored throughout the kingdom, where portraits could be used to emblematize the triumph of the Stuarts. Indeed, Abraham van der Doort's inventory of Charles's collection, compiled between 1637-40, includes miniatures of Mary and her first husband, Francis II of France (r. 1559-1560), as well as several full-length portraits, some of which certainly date to the time of James I.[240] In total, Van der Doort records thirteen portraits of the Queen of Scots across media and throughout the various royal palaces, including "a defaced picture of Queen Mary of Scotland, in her white morning habit," which was traded for a Mantua picture with the Marquess of Hamilton.[241] Thus, Mary's image had such value that even those no longer

---

[239] Peacock, "Politics of Portraiture," p. 199.

[240] Millar 1960, pp. 110-111, nos. 32 and 33; p. 202, no. 1 lists a half-length portrait of Mary in a white veil hanging next to a Van Dyck portrait of Charles, Henrietta Maria, and two of their children; p. 1, no. 1 lists a full-length picture of the Queen of Scots, on display in Whitehall next to a picture of Charles as Prince of Wales by Cornelis van Poelenburgh. Van der Doort notes in the margins that the picture had been "Brought from Scotland and given to the King," which could as easily refer to James as to Charles.

[241] Millar 1960, p. 158, no. 7. The painting is described as the defaced picture of Mary Queen of Scotland in her white mourning dress in a different manuscript, *MS. Ash. 1514,* f. 87, which is not transcribed by Millar because it is a less complete duplicate

aesthetically valuable were seen as desirable gifts for the king, and other entries by Van der Doort reveal that such pictures held currency as gifts in the greater network of courtly relationships.[242]

James's cunning political sense and use of images should not be eclipsed by the romanticized vision of a son tortured by the execution of his mother to which Scaramelli's account alludes. Indeed, Van der Doort's inventory also lists seven portraits of Elizabeth I.[243] There is further evidence to suggest that Scaramelli's comments on James's disdain for his predecessor cannot necessarily be attributed to James. Indeed, for more than a decade before his accession, James savvily curried favor with Elizabeth I, demonstrated most prominently through his eldest daughter Elizabeth. Princess Elizabeth was named after Elizabeth I, who was also asked to serve as the baby's godmother.[244] James's ingratiation into Elizabeth I's affections

---

section, found in the working copy of the later, more developed versions of the inventory (Millar 1960, pp. xix, 61, 158n2).

[242] All of the portraits of Mary listed by Van der Doort are: Millar 1960, p. 1 no. 1 (gifted), p. 5 no. 18 (done by Mytens, who worked for both James and Charles), p. 66 no. 21 (gifted), p. 111 no. 33, p. 133 no. 28 (gifted), p. 136, no. 6 (a golden portrait medal), p. 158 no. 7, p. 160 no. 8 (traded with "the Lord of Holland" [probably Henry Rich, the Earl of Holland, but could also refer to the Dutch Stadholder] for "the King's picture in brass"), p. 179 no. 49, p. 202 no. 1, p. 216 no. 2, p. 220 no. 72, and p. 224 no. 20 (gifted).

[243] Millar 1960, p. 31 no. 56, p. 33 no. 65, p. 110 no. 31 (purchased), p. 112 no. 40 (gifted), p. 113 no. 42, p. 216 no. 2 (two miniatures).

[244] Rosalind K. Marshall, *The Winter Queen: The Life of Elizabeth of Bohemia, 1596-1662* (Edinburgh: National Galleries of Scotland, 1998. Exh. cat.): p. 18.

was so effective that he was later named heir. In a particularly morbid twist, after Elizabeth I's death James inherited—among other belongings—a large group of pearls that had been taken from Mary Queen of Scots after her execution.[245] At her father's death in 1625, Elizabeth Stuart inherited the set and, encouraged by a lifetime of strategic comparisons to her namesake, was often portrayed wearing them (Fig. 4.59).

In 1613 Antonio Foscarini, Venetian Ambassador to England, reported the depths of James I's despair over his son Henry's death:

> The King is doing all he can to forget his grief, but it is not sufficient; for many a time it will come over him suddenly and even in the midst of the most important discussions he will burst out with "Henry is dead, Henry is dead.[246]

According to Foscarini's dispatch, dated two months after the death of Henry Frederick, Prince of Wales and heir to the throne, it was only the occasion of Elizabeth Stuart's wedding that ended official court mourning.[247]

---

[245] Nadine Akkerman, "*Semper Eadem*: Elizabeth Stuart and the Legacy of Queen Elizabeth I," in *The Palatine Wedding of 1613,* p. 159. The set included six strings of large pearls and seven loose pearls of exceptional size.

[246] CSP Venetian XII, p. 472, dispatch dated 5 January 1613. Foscarini was Ambassador from 1611 to 1615.

[247] CSP Venetian XII, p. 472. Pushed forward with wedding arrangements by the Palatinate after Henry's death, the King ordered, "that every one is to go out of mourning on March the 14th and to don gala dress. The officers of the Court and of the Crown have issued the necessary orders for the solemn celebration of the marriage in a way that befits the only daughter of so great a King." The wedding actually took place a month earlier than this, on 14 February 1613. Foscarini further reports on Frederick's induction into the Order of the Garter. The Knighting ceremony took place on 31 December 1612 and was conducted with robes worn over mourning clothes.

To understand the impact of Henry's death, we must first examine his influence on the Stuart court. First as heir apparent and then as official successor, Prince Henry embodied the hope for a new Golden Age.[248] His premature death at age eighteen resulted in an uncomfortable relationship with this hope and a keen sense of nostalgia and opportunity lost.[249] As such, Henry was held up posthumously as the epitome of princely virtue; the extent of his patronage, collecting, and building projects are hard for the modern imagination to reconcile with someone who died at age eighteen.[250] Likewise, a posthumous print by William Hole (1600-1624) after a lost drawing by Isaac Oliver (ca. 1565-1617) of *Henry, Prince of Wales, Practicing with the Pike* (Fig. 3.8; 1612, London, British Museum) mythologizes the Prince's physical prowess, another essential component of princely virtue. This print was used

---

[248] There had not been a succession of a direct heir to the throne of England since that of Henry VIII in 1509 (Kevin Sharpe, "The Image of Virtue: The Court and Household of Charles I, 1625-1642," in David Starkey et al., *The English Court: From the Wars of the Roses to the Civil War* [London: Longman Group UK, 1987]: p. 226).

[249] Catharine MacLeod, "Portraits of a 'most hopeful Prince'," in *The Lost Prince,* p. 33. MacLeod cautions that all biographies of Henry are written posthumously and that, while the authors may have some first-hand knowledge, that their importance should not be overstated, given this unique context.

[250] Timothy Wilks, "Introduction," in MacLeod, *The Lost Prince*, pp. 11-17.

as a frontispiece for various volumes that were dedicated to Henry, both before and after his death.[251]

Henry serves as the bridge between the first two Stuart monarchs; he never ruled, but was beloved and respected for his determination to revive the Golden Age of Queen Elizabeth, as well as the cultish adoration of her royal person.[252] James, eager to impart wisdom to his heir, wrote the *Basilikon Doron* (1599), a book in three parts dedicated to Henry's instruction in "the heavie weight of your great charge."[253] At the time of the *Basilikon Doron*'s first publication, Henry was just five years old. Though he was only about sixteen when he was put in charge of two palaces and his collecting efforts were praised by the Venetian Ambassador as quoted below, he had been imbued with a double importance from birth as heir to the thrones of both England and Scotland, and as such was treated with dignity, seriousness, and fashioned into an image of princely virtue from a young age.[254]

---

[251] MacLeod, *The Lost Prince*, p. 89, cat. no. 26. On this aspect of Henry's public image see Timothy Wilks, "The Pike Charged: Henry as Militant Prince," in *Prince Henry Revived,* pp. 180-211.

[252] Parry, *Golden Age Restor'd*, p. 74. The touchstone study on this subject is Roy C. Strong, *The Cult of Elizabeth: Elizabethan Portraiture and Pageantry* (London: Thames and Hudson, 1977).

[253] James I, *Basilikon Doron* (1599), "The Epistle", p. 2.

[254] Wilks, "Introduction," p. 11.

As was Scottish custom, all three of the royal children were educated and raised separately from infancy: Henry with the Earl of Mar, Elizabeth with Lord Livingston in Linlithgow Castle, and Charles with Sir Robert Carey (ca. 1560-1639).[255] They were not reunited until their father came to the English throne and the family moved to London in 1603 when Henry was nine, Elizabeth seven, and Charles three years old.[256] Though it is true that training for children's future lives (and careers) as adults started much earlier in the early modern period than it does today, it is a myth or exaggeration that parents were unattached to or unemotional about their children, and that no space was reserved for play, especially before the age of ten.[257] However, by virtue of their status, royal children had a necessarily different experience of childhood, and were reared from the earliest age with consideration for tutors, the formation of households, and to understand the responsibility of their station and comport themselves accordingly. As historian Martha K. Hoffman recently

---

[255] Wilks, "Introduction," p. 11; Akkerman 2015, p. 5; Pauline Gregg, *King Charles I* (London: J.M. Dent & Sons Ltd., 1981): pp. 10-12.

[256] Marshall, *The Winter Queen*, p. 21.

[257] Jeroen Dekker, Leendert Groenendijk, and Johan Verberckmoes, "Proudly Raising Vulnerable Youngsters: The Scope for Education in the Netherlands," in Jan Baptist Bedaux & Rudi Ekkart, eds., *Pride and Joy: Children's Portraits in the Netherlands 1500-1700* (Ghent, Amsterdam: Ludion Press, 2000. Exh. cat.): pp. 43-60, especially pp. 54, 56-59. Trade training could start as early as seven or eight among the lower and middle classes, while those who attended college at eleven or qualified as lawyers at eighteen are exceptional cases. See also Martha K. Hoffman, "Childhood and Royalty at the Court of Philip III," in Grace E. Coolidge, ed., *The Formation of the Child in Early Modern Spain* (Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2014): p. 133.

argued in relation to the children of Philip III of Spain (r. 1598-1621), who enjoyed a more familial and fluid children's court, they were seen primarily as royalty and only secondarily as children.[258] This often had the effect of doubling the heartbreak at the loss of a royal child; not only was the structure of the family irreparably altered, but also this threatened the future of the country itself.[259] Throughout the early modern era, anxieties about the emotional and undisciplined qualities of children were expressed in the emphasis on their adult qualities or behaviors. This is particularly true about royal children such as Louis XIII, who was praised by a contemporary at the age of thirteen, four years into his reign by regency, "it is not with kings as with ordinary men. They do not grow with the passing of time, but are born complete…their minds being in flower when those of others are still in bud."[260]

---

[258] Though the basic structures of monarchical childrearing were consistent throughout Europe, there was much room for variation based on individual preference, personality, national or religious convention, and the size of the royal family, according to Martha Hoffman ("Childhood and Royalty," pp. 123-24).

[259] Hoffman also recently argued ("Childhood and Royalty," pp. 123-25), that the royal children of Philip III of Spain and Margaret of Austria were among the first class of children to be recognized and treated as such, while their health and education was obsessively monitored, as the royal family "saw in their children not just the survival of the family but the stability of the country and the defense of their faith."

[260] As quoted in Elizabeth Wirth Marvick, *Louis XIII: The Making of a King* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1986): p. xiii. One important touchstone for the transition from child to adult was marriage. Though, as diplomatic tools, negotiations for royal marriages often began when children were quite young (in the case of the Infanta Ana, daughter of Philip III, when she was ten years old, for Elizabeth Stuart when she was fifteen). This was furthermore for diplomacy and not an

Henry's concern with the reestablishment, revitalization, and control of the royal image in his efforts to materialize a new Elizabethan Golden Age fostered his cultural dominance at such a young age. In his patronage of artists like Robert Peake and his subsequent enlivening of British portraiture, Henry cleared a path for the international turn in Stuart court culture, encouraging a new, and worldlier, preoccupation with art. This was accomplished through a complex network of agents throughout the continent, most notably in Italy, where Henry acquired many works directly. Two such agents were Dudley Carleton, who from 1610-15 served as English ambassador to Venice, and the Earl of Arundel.[261] Henry's network remained open to Charles after his brother's death, and in Carleton's subsequent post as ambassador to the Northern Netherlands he would have an instrumental role in introducing Gerrit van Honthorst to England.

Under Henry, the increasing influence of the continent and the growing importance of paintings as objects of royal favor are borne out by two examples. In the early portrait of Henry and Sir John Harington (1592-1614) by Peake in the Metropolitan Museum of Art (Fig. 3.9), the pose, rich palette, and even hunting

---

acknowledgement of maturity. Philip III postponed Ana's marriage for several years because he felt she was too young (Hoffman, "Childhood and Royalty," pp. 136-37).

[261] Fiona Donovan, *Rubens and England*, pp. 43, 47-48 (see broadly Chs. 1 and 2); Eric Jan Sluijter ("The English Venture: Dutch and Flemish Artists in Britain 1550-1800," *Leids Kunsthistorisch Jaarboek* 13 [2003]: p. 16) notes that Carleton also may have had a hand in bringing Mytens to England in 1618, though he arrived as "a protégé of Thomas Howard."

portrait type were revolutionary introductions to large-scale English portraiture.[262] Beyond the status of hunting as the exclusive purview of the nobility, Peake's portrait shows a specifically royal moment in the hunt.

He depicts Henry, at age nine, in the act of sheathing his sword after making a ritual cut to the throat of an already dead deer.[263] Such a moment is described and pictured in a print from *The Noble Art of Venerie or Hunting*, where James (ed. 1611) is shown in the moment before this cut is made (Fig. 3.10).[264] The kneeling attendant in the woodcut closely matches the pose of the young John Harington in Peake's portrait, suggesting that he took some inspiration from this or another, now lost, version of the scene.[265] The painting is signed and dated 1603, the year of James's accession and Henry's induction into the Order of the Garter. The prince is shown wearing the Great George around his neck—a large, enameled figure of Saint George on horseback trampling the dragon (Fig. 3.11; 1628-29, London, British Museum)—part of the ceremonial insignia of the Order and not as common in portraiture as the

---

[262] MacLeod, *The Lost Prince*, p. 70, cat. no. 14.

[263] MacLeod, *The Lost Prince*, p. 70, cat no. 14.

[264] George Gascoigne, *The noble arte of venerie or hunting* (London: Printed by Thomas Purfoot, 1611, orig. 1575): p. 133. In the 1575 edition of the text, Elizabeth I is pictured rather than James.

[265] MacLeod, *The Lost Prince*, p. 70, cat. no. 14.

Lesser George, usually worn suspended from a blue riband (Fig. 3.12; 1628-29, London, British Museum).

A later variant of the Met painting in the Royal Collection in London demonstrates the growing elasticity with which images were circulated and repurposed to suit a variety of functions (Fig. 3.13; c. 1605). The London picture features a composition nearly identical to its predecessor, with departures most noticeably in the modified background and the presence of a different companion for the Prince. Replacing John Harrington is Robert Devereux (1591-1646), son of the late, disgraced 2nd Earl of Essex.[266] Devereux had just been restored his title of 3rd Earl of Essex, and the commissioning of this picture from the Prince's official painter may have been part celebration and part tribute to the house that had resurrected him.[267] The replication of Peake's painting foreshadows the increasing importance of the court painter—of his

---

[266] Devereux (the elder) was executed in 1601 for leading a failed uprising against Elizabeth: MacLeod, *The Lost Prince*, p. 70, cat. no. 14. On Robert Devereux, 2nd Earl of Essex's rise and fall, see Alexandra Gajda, *The Earl of Essex and Late Elizabethan Political Culture* (Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press, 2012) and Paul E. J. Hammer, *The Polarisation of Elizabethan Politics: The Political Career of Robert Devereux, 2nd Earl of Essex, 1585-1597* (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 1999).

[267] Macleod (*The Lost Prince*, p. 70, cat. no. 14) notes that James's reputation as being exceptionally fond of hunting—especially considering the painting's connection to *The Noble arte of Venerie*—means that the work was likely intended as a compliment to the king. Roy C. Strong ("Elizabethan Painting: An Approach Through Inscriptions – 1: Robert Peake the Elder," *The Burlington Magazine* 105, no. 719 [Feb., 1963]: p. 53) outlines the trajectory of Peake's career under the early Stuarts, first as painter to Henry, and then as Serjeant-Painter to James.

particular style, his 'brand'—in the manufacture and proliferation of the royal image. It also points to the effectiveness of such commissions in gaining royal favor, as Henry likely acquired the picture from Devereux.[268] Under Henry, this renaissance was not limited to the literal image of the monarch in paint, stone, or metal, but also to the image of the court, and its presence on the world stage.

Henry understood the role of art in this endeavor in a way that James did not and imparted the importance of art to the cultivation of princely virtue to his brother Charles.[269] Where Elizabeth I and James showed little interest in connoisseurship, Henry was adept at it from an early age. Just before Henry's death, in 1611, the Venetian Ambassador reported that the Prince "is paying special attention to the adorning of a most beautiful gallery of very fine pictures, ancient and modern, the larger part brought out of Venice."[270] This refers to Inigo Jones's (1573-1652)

---

[268] The Royal Collection asserts this in their provenance for the work, found here: <https://www.royalcollection.org.uk/collection/search#/2/collection/404440/henry-prince-of-wales-with-robert-devereux-3rd-earl-of-essex-in-the-hunting-field> (Accessed 15 January 2017).

[269] Parry, *Golden Age Restor'd*, p. 214. Parry further notes (p. 126) that the Earl of Arundel, Thomas Howard, in part created this climate in the wake of England's growing exposure to the conventions of the European continent.

[270] CSP Venetian XII, p. 106: Dispatch from Marc' Antonio Correr, Venetian Ambassador in England, dated 14 January 1611; Parry, *Golden Age Restor'd*, p. 79.

expansion, commissioned by Henry, of St. James's Palace to include a gallery and library for his rapidly growing collection.[271]

The nature of Henry's collecting in the early years of the seventeenth century reveals how particular aspects of his approach were encouraged by each of his parents. In the *Basilikon Doron*, James begins by emphasizing the importance of the appearance of the Prince, his public image. In the book's dedication, James stresses that Henry should be "a mirror viue [view] and faire," in which all things worthy about the office are reflected.[272] He goes on to warn that they might also be distorted, saying that, "your faulte shalbe aggravated according to the height of your dignitie."[273] Continuing this emphasis on the Prince's appearance, James adds that kings should share their God-given glory, "that their persones as bright as lampes of godlines and virtue, maye (going in and out before their people) give light to all their steps."[274] James thus related to his son that a king must be a mirror of virtue, reflecting worthiness (characteristics worth imitating) back to his people, and a lamp,

---

[271] Parry, *Golden Age Restor'd*, p. 79; Arthur MacGregor, "The King's Goods and the Commonwealth Sale," p. 23; and Timothy Wilks, "Introduction," p. 15.

[272] James I, *Basilikon Doron*, "Dedication."

[273] James I, *Basilikon Doron*, "Anent, A King's Christian Duetie Towards God," pp. 4-5.

[274] James I, *Basilikon Doron*, "Anent, A King's Christian Duetie Towards God," pp. 5-6.

illuminating the path to righteousness.[275] All this, furthermore, must be done with utmost care, lest the slightest misstep be magnified under the scrutiny of public office.

Henry's mother Anne of Denmark (1574-1619) was consumed by her interest in the visual arts. Under Elizabeth I, the strict control of the royal image and the dominant English painting style resulted in portraiture marked by extreme idealization rather than naturalism—seemingly taking to heart the Queen's motto *Semper eadem* [always the same].[276] Anne instituted a wholly different use for art. Bringing to the throne her more cosmopolitan (read: continental) tastes, Anne promoted royal power as the vehicle for modernizing the culture at court.[277] She furthermore modeled, for

---

[275] Johannesson ("The Portrait of the Prince," p. 21) further argues that James's intent is to underscore that subjects cannot see the prince within, they must judge his character from his outward appearance the company he keeps.

[276] On the limitations of Peake's portraiture see Gail Capitol Weigl, "'And when slow Time hath made you fit for warre': The Equestrian Portrait of Prince Henry," in Timothy Wilks, ed., *Prince Henry Revived: Image and Exemplarity in Early Modern England* (Southampton, UK: Southampton Solent University; London: in association with Paul Holberton Pub., 2007): pp. 152-153.

[277] Peacock, "Politics of Portraiture," p. 220. Anne of Denmark's reputation as a patron and political operator is currently undergoing a revitalization. See most recently Anna Whitelock, "Reconsidering the Political Role of Anna of Denmark," in Helen Matheson-Pollock, Joanne Paul, and Catherine Fletcher, eds., *Queenship and Counsel in Early Modern Europe* (Cham, Switzerland: Palgrave Macmillan, 2018): pp. 259-275; Wendy Hitchmough, "Queenship and the Currency of Arts Patronage as Propagnada at the Early Stuart Court," in Caroline Dunn and Elizabeth Donnelly Carney, eds., *Royal Women and Dynastic Loyalty* (Cham, Switzerland: Palgrave Macmillan, 2018): pp. 139-149; Catharine MacLeod, "Facing Europe: The Portraiture of Anne of Denmark (1574-1619)," in Jill Bepler and Svante Norrhem, eds., *Telling Objects: Contextualizing the Role of the Consort in Early Modern Europe* (Wolfenbütteler Forschungen, bd. 153; Wiesbaden, Harrassowitz Verlag, in Kommission, 2018): pp. 63-86; and Susan Dunn-Hensley, *Anna of Denmark and*

Henry, the important role of royal collections in cultural influence, specifically in relation to contemporary European painting.[278] Under Henry, ambitious displays of continental art became the vehicle through which the aspirations of the Stuart monarchy were expressed.[279]

In keeping with this, when Henry was created Prince of Wales, in 1610, at age sixteen, he immediately sought objects with which to decorate his new appointments of St. James's and Richmond Palaces. This practice fit into his broader efforts to establish new Stuart cultural policy, in which he actively pursued continental painters, and encouraged English artists to engage with artistic modes current in mainland Europe such as the realism found in portraits from the Netherlands. This program of patronage included both northern and southern European art and artists; the most well-known was a failed attempt to lure Michiel van Miereveld away from the Orange court in The Hague.[280]

Henrietta maria: Virgins, Witches, and Catholic Queens (Cham, Switzerland: Palgrave Macmillan, 2017).

[278] Peacock, "Politics of Portraiture," p. 220. See also Howarth, "Images of Rule," p. 127.

[279] Peacock, "Politics of Portraiture," p. 221.

[280] Peacock, "Politics of Portraiture," p. 221. See also Hill, "Sir Dudley Carleton and his Relations with Dutch Artists 1616-1632," p. 255. Eric Jan Sluijter has also recently added that Miereveld was merely the first in a line of successful Dutch painters who refused an invitation to London. Among others were Gerrit Dou and Caspar Netscher, who were both active around mid-century ("The English Venture," p. 16.)

Henry's interest in recruiting and retaining the artists of other courts is borne out by the career of Abraham van der Doort. He began as a wax-modeler in the employ of Rudolf II, Holy Roman Emperor, in Prague.[281] On a visit to England in the early seventeenth century, Van der Doort produced (for Rudolf) a life-sized, colored wax portrait head of Henry, who then refused to let go of either artist or bust. He reportedly implored Van der Doort to stay, "promissing that he – would give soe good entertaynm[t] as anye Emperour should," and offering him the position of Keeper of Medals in 1611.[282]

In paintings, books, sculpture, antique coins, medals, and gems, Henry's acquisitions were foundational for collecting at the Stuart court as well as for the later royal collections.[283] Most importantly, he diversified and reinvigorated the painting collections, which had previously been dominated by portraiture. There is no evidence that an inventory of Henry's collections was ever made, and if such a document did exist, it is no longer extant. However, at an unknown moment several paintings were marked on the reverse by various monograms that point to their manner of entry into the royal collections. The most common are those with Charles's royal stamp, which

---

[281] The 1637-40 inventory betrays many instances of familiarity with the artists of Rudolf's court.

[282] Van der Doort recounts this story in in the inventory. See Millar 1960, p. 154, no. 3. See also Lightbown, "Charles I and the Tradition of European Princely Collecting," p. 63.

[283] Timothy Wilks, "Princely Collecting," p. 118-119.

Van der Doort may have added to several pictures at the time of his inventory (Fig. 3.14). By far the rarest of these early Stuart markings is that which denotes Henry's ownership: a crowned "HP" [*Henricus Princeps*] (Fig. 3.15).[284] Works by Northern European artists appear to have been well represented in Henry's collection, including Hendrick Goltzius, Jacob Backer (1608-51), Jan Porcellis (ca. 1584-1632), Hans Vredeman de Vries (1527-ca. 1606), and Michiel van Miereveld. The provenance of some other paintings has only recently been discovered (Joos de Momper and Jan Breughel the Elder, *Landscape with Skaters*, Fig. 3.16; and *A Farm*, Fig. 3.17; Madrid, Museo Nacional del Prado).[285] These were accompanied by Italian, mainly Venetian,

---

[284] There is also a "CP" monogram found on certain works, presumably meant to mark those acquired when Charles was Prince. For the monograms see Millar 1960, p. xiv, fig. 3, n. 6. Here, Millar suggests that it was Van der Doort that applied the monograms to the backs of paintings, including those marked with Henry's. The monogram was also added to other objects belonging to the Prince, such as a gauntlet dating to c. 1608 in the Wallace Collection, London (no. A276). See also Wilks, "Princely Collecting," p. 119. Wilks further notes that many of Henry's books were rebound and had his arms, feathers, and initials gilded into these new bindings.

[285] Wilks, "Princely Collecting," pp. 118-119. Works include *A Storm at Sea* by Jan Porcellis (London, Royal Collection, RCIN 402633), and Van Miereveld's *A Bearded Old Man with a Shell* (London, Royal Collection, RCIN 403956), *A Boy Looking through a Casement* (Flemish School; London, Royal Collection, RCIN 404972). A small painting now in the J. Paul Getty Museum, an *Allegory of Passion* formerly attributed to Hans Holbein the Younger, also bears Henry's monogram (See Burton B. Fredericksen, "E Cosi Dsio Me Mena," *The J. Paul Getty Museum Journal* 10 [1982]: p. 24).

paintings—for which Charles also had a particular affinity—including those attributed to Titian, Tintoretto (1560-1635), and Leonardo Corona (1561-1605).[286]

One final example elucidates both the contents and importance of Henry's collection. Van der Doort lists a group of eighteen sculptures in the "Cabbonett roome" at Whitehall, whose contents had recently been moved from the Cabinet of St. James's Palace into this newly constructed section adjacent to the Privy Gallery.[287] Van der Doort notes that these once belonged to Prince Henry, and were inherited by Charles after his brother's death.[288] The bulk of these sculptures were probably acquired as a gift from the Medici, likely cast by Pietro Tacca (1577-1640), a pupil of Giambologna (1529-1608).[289] Only one of these bronzes remains in the Royal Collection today, the rest having presumably been sold at the liquidation of Charles's assets after his death in 1649, known as the Commonwealth Sale (Fig. 3.18).[290] The

---

[286] Wilks, "Princely Collecting," p. 119. On Charles's interest in Italian painting see David Howarth, "Charles I, Sculpture, and Sculptors," in *The Late King's Goods*, p. 86; Haskell, "Charles I's Collection of Pictures," p. 211; and Peacock, "Politics of Portraiture," p. 218.

[287] Millar 1960, p. 76.

[288] Millar 1960, p. 92. For this commission see Katharine Watson and Charles Avery, "Medici and Stuart: A Grand Ducal Gift of 'Giovanni Bologna' Bronzes for Henry Prince of Wales (1612)," *The Burlington Magazine* 115, no. 845 (August 1973): pp. 493-507, especially p. 501.

[289] Wilks, "Princely Collecting," p. 119. The attribution to Tacca is given in Watson and Avery, "Medici and Stuart," p. 501.

[290] Two such horses were illustrated in Watson and Avery in 1973 ("Medici and Stuart," p. 499, figs. 19 and 20) and said to be in the Royal Collection. One of these is

admiration that both brothers shared for these objects is evidenced by a surprisingly moving entry in Van der Doort's catalogue:

> Heere was placed nob [number]: 4. a little horse being
> one of the no: of 18^{en} w^{ch} your Ma^{ty} did send—
> for to Richmond in the last sicknes time and
> there yo^{r} Ma^{ty} gave it wth your owne hands to the Prince[291]

Evoking a tactile intimacy with an object small enough to be picked up and held, the statue—or what it represented—was apparently so significant to Charles that he brought it to his brother's deathbed.[292]

RCIN 35467, the other has subsequently been lost. Since 1990, three similar objects attributed to after Tacca have sold at Sotheby's (London, 8 December 2006, Lot 97; New York, 9 January 1990, Lot 68; and London, 13 January 1992, Lot 231), and a fourth attributed to Tacca's workshop was sold at Christie's (New York, 11 June 2010, Lot 82). It is generally agreed upon that all 18 were sold at the Commonwealth Sale (Watson and Avery, "Medici and Stuart," p. 503). These include the bronze [brass] horses listed in Millar 1972: p. 272, nos. 258 (unlikely), 259, and 260. Some objects are given more lengthy descriptions, and thus are easier to identify in both inventories, such as Millar 1960, p. 72, no. 9, which was sold in the Commonwealth Sale on October 1651 (Millar 1972, p. 323, no. 35).

[291] Millar 1960, p. 92, no. 4.

[292] The Royal Collection example is too large to be the sculpture handed to Henry by Charles, as described by Van der Doort. At 27.3 cm [10.7 in], the object is bigger than Van der Doort indicates. Though he does not give the exact dimensions for the sculpture in question, the next entry (Millar 1960, p. 92, no. 5) reads "a bigger horse upon a black ebbone wooden Peddistall", which measures 9 ½ inches tall. A small horse by Tacca in the Rijksmuseum (BK-16507) can perhaps give us some idea of what this object looked like (if we mentally remove the current gilding). The Rijksmuseum *Stallion* stands at 19.2 cm [7.5 in], though it is unclear from the museum's information whether this includes the rather large base.

Charles I: Heir (not so) Apparent

More than just embodying the kingly persona, a portrait also sought to idealize that image. As noted by Jonathan Brown, there was a long tradition in the courts of Europe for artists to "create an aura of majesty" around the "lackluster persons" of the ruling class.[293] Where in reality Charles was small, haughty, and spoke with a stammer, in the portraiture of his court he was transformed into the perfect ruler.[294] Ironically, those traits that contributed substantially to Charles's downfall in the 1640s were also some of the greatest motivators to his patronage in the 1620s.

Four days after his coronation, in 1626, Charles I uttered a statement of honest self-reflection to Parliament. His appraisal, "I know I am not very good to speak much," evokes the stammer that plagued his speech and references his well-known intractability.[295] The particularities of this monarch—one deeply invested in the potentialities of the royal image and the careful display of royal taste—fostered a unique courtly environment, attractive to ambitious continental painters such as

---

[293] Brown, *Kings & Connoisseurs*, p. 13.

[294] Brown, *Kings & Connoisseurs*, p. 13.

[295] William B. Bidwell and Maija Jansson, eds., *Proceedings in Parliament, 1626*. Vol. 1 (Yale Center for Parliamentary History. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1991-1996): p. 20. The full text of his introduction of this Session in the House of Lords, on 6 February 1626, reads: "Of my own nature I do not love long speeches and I know I am not very good to speak much. Therefore I mean to show what I should speak in actions and therefore I mean to bring in the old customs which many of my predecessors have used before me which is that my [Lord] Keeper should tell you at large what I should speak to you in this parliament."

Honthorst looking to push the boundaries of the image of the ruler. Charles's difficult and awkward personality often strained relationships with his courtiers, and his idiosyncrasies were expressed most directly in a love of aphorisms and obsession with decorum and ceremony.[296]

Historian Richard Cust describes a king who was consumed with issues of inadequacy, and often acted out in petty ways. For example, in 1626, when Charles had trouble securing the support of Scottish privy councilors on a particular issue, he complained that they had disobeyed him and "you durst not have done so to my father."[297] Even in the first years of his reign Charles was easily riled and seemed to be constantly on guard against slights, real or imagined.[298] His adolescence had been marked by sickness and a strained relationship with his father, particularly following Henry's death when Charles was just eleven years old.[299] It would be almost five years until Charles was granted Henry's former title and designation as heir apparent, Prince

---

[296] Richard Cust, *Charles I: A Political Life* (Harlow, U.K.: Pearson Longman, 2005): p. 28.

[297] Cust, *Charles I*, p. 25.

[298] Conrad Russell, *The Causes of the English Civil War*, The Ford Lectures Delivered in the University of Oxford (Oxford, U.K.: Clarendon Press, 1990): p. 204.

[299] Catherine MacLeod, "'Our Rising Sun is set': the Death of Prince Henry," pp. 160-61. See also Cust, *Charles I*, p. 25.

of Wales, even though Charles's intellectual acumen was compared favorably to that of Henry.[300]

Charles was also renowned among contemporaries for his self-control, for displays of patience verging on emotionlessness. Perhaps the most poignant demonstration of this inner calm comes from a letter written to his son, the future Charles II (r. 1660-85), on the eve of the Parliamentary vote that would condemn the king to death. Advocating forgiveness and sound judgment, Charles writes: "we bless God we have those inward refreshments, that the malice of our enemies cannot disturb. We have learnt to own ourself by retiring into ourself."[301] Through his education, Charles also took to heart the humanist, neo-stoic notion that honor was cultivated through self-control, wisdom, and virtue.[302] In particular, he absorbed the aristocratic principle that his word was his bond. Evidence for this is again found in his advice for his son Charles in 1648: "If He restore you to your right upon hard conditions, whatever you promise, keep…Do not think anything in this world worth obtaining by foul and unjust means."[303] As urged by James I in the *Basilikon Doron*,

---

[300] MacLeod, "Death of Prince Henry," pp. 160-161; Cust, *Charles I*, p. 17.

[301] Sir Charles Petrie, ed., *The Letters, Speeches, and Proclamations of King Charles I* (London: Cassell and Company Ltd., 1935): p. 240. Letter to the Prince of Wales from Newport, Wales, November 29, 1648.

[302] Cust, *Charles I*, p. 29.

[303] Petrie, *Letters*, p. 240.

Charles seems also to have readily adopted one of the central governing concepts of the Renaissance, that of the public and private king. Invoking Aristotle's distinctions between rulers and tyrants, James describes a "good king" as "a natural father" to his people, "subjecting his own private affections and appetites to the wealth and standing of his subjects, ever thinking the common interest his chiefest particular."[304] In the same 1648 letter, Charles reinforces this notion, telling his son:

> we do not more affectionately pray for you (to whom we are a natural parent) than we do…that all our subjects (to whom we are a political parent) may have such sober thoughts as to seek their peace.[305]

In addition to his various paranoias and neuroses, and in contrast to his late brother Henry, Charles was plagued by physical defects. While his health and strength gradually improved and Charles eventually became a skilled horseman, some symptoms of his early illnesses remained throughout his life. This included a slight bowing of the legs (probably the result of rickets) and a markedly short stature.[306] At

---

[304] James I, *Basilikon Doron*, pp. 20-21; as quoted in Cust, *Charles I*, p. 19.

[305] Petrie, *Letters,* p. 240.

[306] Gregg, *Charles I*, pp. 10-12. Rickets was so prevalent in Britain that on the European continent it was sometimes referred to as "the English disease." Sir Robert Carey (ca. 1560-1639) wrote of the newborn Charles in 1600: "when [visitors] did see how weake a child he was, and not likely to live, their hearts were downe, and none of them were desirous to take charge of him." In any case, Charles's legs were so weak that James wanted him to wear iron boots to strengthen his joints, though this never actually came to pass. Lady Carey advocated against this, but Charles did wear boots of Spanish leather and brass, which were more sturdy and helpful for weak ankles.

about 5’ 4”, though not particularly short for this period, Charles remained self-conscious about his height for the rest of his life and, especially in later portraits, contrived to appear taller.[307]

Much like his motor strength, Charles’s speech was also slow to develop. He had a pronounced stammer, which resulted in a hesitancy and deliberateness of speech that informed public attitudes about his personality as surly or standoffish.[308] Several treatments were attempted and proposed, all to no avail. For example, Charles practiced speaking with pebbles in his mouth, and at one point his father even suggested cutting the frenulum, or membrane connecting the tongue to the floor of the mouth.[309] This type of intervention was not uncommon, and was often performed on infant princes, such as the future Louis XIII of France.[310]

---

[307] Gregg, *Charles I*, p. 12. Gregg gives this height according to a suit of Charles’s armor preserved in the Tower of London.

[308] Gregg, *Charles I*, p. 12.

[309] Gregg, *Charles I*, p. 12.

[310] As an infant, Louis’s physician Jean Héroard (1551-1628) was concerned that he was not eating enough to maintain a healthy constitution. So, his frenulum was cut “in three places” to aid his swallowing, an intervention that possibly caused the stammer that plagued the king for life. Jean Héroard, *Journal de Jean Héroard sur l’enfance et la jeunesse de Louis XIII (1601-1628)*, ed. Eudore de Soulié and Edouard de Barthélemy (Paris, 1868): Vol. 1, p. 6-7, entry dated 28 September 1601. See also Marvick, *Louis XIII,* p. 11. On Louis’s speech impediment see Marvick p. 21.

Where James was known for his informality and accessibility, Charles was regarded as stiff, proud, and increasingly inaccessible and private.[311] While James preferred not to sit for a portrait and was not interested in collecting, Charles was dedicated to promoting and disseminating his image to serve as effigies of the king in absentia. Just as courtiers never turned their backs to Hyacinth Rigaud's (1659-1743) portrait of Louis XIV, which stood in the king's stead during absences from Versailles (Fig. 3.19; Paris, Musée du Louvre), so too was Charles's image put forth as a physical manifestation of the king.[312] That this was a break with previous tradition is demonstrated by the fact that English visitors to Paris had been puzzled by the custom of passersby doffing their hats at the equestrian portrait of King Henry IV on the Pont Neuf.[313]

---

[311] Sharpe, "The Image of Virtue," p. 227.

[312] Peter Burke, *The Fabrication of Louis XIV* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1992): pp. 8-9. Antoine de Courtin wrote in 1671 (*Nouveau traité de la civilité*, [Paris: L. Josee and C. Robustel, ed. 1712, Bibliothèque Nationale de France]: p. 47): "There are some who, having learned the refinement of civility in some foreign country, dare not in company neither to cover themselves, nor sit with their backs turned to the portrait of someone of eminent quality." [Il y en a meme qui ayant appris le rafinement de la civilité dans quelque païs étranger, n'osent en compagnie ni se couvrir, ni s'asseoir le dos tourné au portrait de quelque personne de qualité éminente.] Courtin continues (p. 49): "It is to expose yourself to an affront, to have your hat on your head, in the room where there is the canopy of the King, or the Queen." [C'est s'expposer à un affront, que d'avoir son chapeau sure la tête, dans la chambre où on a mis le couvert du Roy, ou de la Reine.]

[313] Howarth, *Images of Rule*, p. 138.

This etiquette eventually took hold in England.[314] In 1635, Lord Wimbledon (1572-1638), the Governor of Portsmouth—where a bust of Charles had recently been erected to mark the location of his return from Spain in 1623—wrote to the Mayor and Corporation of the city to complain that the sculpture was being overshadowed by signs on the High Street.[315] As a courtier, the Governor fought for the king's image, stating unequivocally that, "any disgrace offered His Majesties figure is as much as to himself."[316] Wimbledon seemed particularly eager to restore respect through the enforcement of decorum, continuing, "to which end I will, and command all the

---

[314] For the functioning of Van Dyck's 'Greate Peece' as the physical presence of the royal family, see Julia Marciari Alexander, "Portraiture and Royal Family Ties: Kings, Queens, Princes, and Princesses in Caroline England," in Naomi J. Miller and Naomi Yavneh, eds., *Gender and Early Modern Constructions of Childhood* (Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2014): p. 212; Millar, *Van Dyck in England* (London: National Portrait Gallery, 1982-1983. Exh. cat.): p. 46.

[315] The original inscription beneath the bust read: "King Charles the First, after his travels through all France and Spain, and having passed many dangers, both by sea and land, he arrived here the fourth day of October, 1623. There was the greatest applause of joy for his safety throughout this kingdom that ever was known or heard of." (In William Henry Saunders, *Annals of Portsmouth: historical, biographical, statistical, etc.* [London: Hamilton, Adams, & Co, Printed in Portsmouth, 1880]: p. 19). According to Charles Avery ("Hubert le Sueur, the 'Unworthy Praxiteles' of King Charles I," *The Volume of the Walpole Society* 48 (1980-82): p. 184), the final sentence is missing from the modern, recut inscription.

[316] Howarth, "Charles I, Sculpture, and Sculptors," pp. 88-89. See also Avery, "'Unworthy Praxiteles'," p. 183 (cat. no. 32D), which notes that the bust was paid for on 26 June 1635, "by his Majesty's command," and was set up prominently in a niche in the Square Tower, facing up the High Street.

officers and soldiers not to pass by it without pulling off their hats."[317] This adoption of French fashion was possibly also due to the increasing influence of Queen Henrietta Maria, daughter of Henry IV. Erin Griffey has recently demonstrated the instrumental role that Henrietta Maria played at English court and that, particularly following the death of Buckingham in 1628, she heralded an influx of French courtly fashions and customs.[318]

John and Thomas Smith

In 1623, Charles and Buckingham traveled—unsanctioned and under the false names John and Thomas Smith—to Madrid to jumpstart the negotiations for Charles's marriage to Anne of Austria (1601-1666), the Spanish Infanta. This trip, and Charles's resultant exposure to the Habsburg collections in Madrid forever changed the face of the royal collection.

As early as 1605 there were rumblings of a match between then-heir Henry and Anne of Austria.[319] These efforts incensed the Spanish opposition at court, and this outrage was compounded when James continued negotiations after Henry's death for a

---

[317] The letter is transcribed in its entirety in Saunders, *Annals of Portsmouth,* p. 20.

[318] Griffey, *On Display,* especially pp. 81-83.

[319] Elliott, "A Troubled Relationship," p. 21. In August of 1611 James was making secret overtures to the Spanish Ambassador to begin negotiations for Henry's marriage to the Infanta (CSP Domestic IX, p. 71).

match between Anne and Charles.[320] By the early 1620s, the assumption of an Anglo-Spanish match was so strong that Charles became virtually obsessed with thoughts of his Habsburg bride. In 1622 he had already begun learning Spanish in anticipation of his future wife, and, frustrated by the slow wheels of diplomacy, in 1623 Charles decided to force the matter through drastic action.[321]

Apparently plotting the move since December of the previous year, in the spring of 1623 Charles and Buckingham secretly left for Spain—without the seal or protection of the king—on a mission of love.[322] A vivid account of this trip, named "the most bizarre episode in the history of the Anglo-Spanish relationship" by historian John Elliott, can be found in the diary of the Puritan Baronet Sir Simonds d'Ewes (1602-1650).[323] D'Ewes reports that,

> The Prince happie in the imaginarie love of her hee never saw, and perhaps willing to prove famous for this noble venter, would defer the enjoying of his happie wishes noe longer…discuised with a false beard

---

[320] Malcolm R. Smuts, "Prince Henry and His World," in *The Lost Prince*, p. 19.

[321] Elliott, "A Troubled Relationship," p. 25.

[322] Simonds d'Ewes reports that "all Christmas time, the Prince and Marquesse did practice the putting on of false berds, for discuised they were resolved to goe." As quoted in Sir Simonds D'Ewes and Elisabeth Bourcier, ed., *The Diary of Sir Simonds d'Ewes (1622-1624): Journal d'un étudiant londonien sous le règne de Jacques 1er*, Publications de la Sorbonne (Paris: Didier, 1974): p. 119.

[323] Elliott, "A Troubled Relationship," p. 24-25; See for example D'Ewes and Bourcier, *Diary*, p. 43.

> as the Marquesse [Buckingham] was allsoe, this morning they sett foorth of London.[324]

Charles and Buckingham met Endymion Porter (1587-1649) and Francis Cottington (c. 1579-1652) outside of the city, and the four later embarked at Dover.[325] Traveling under the names John and Tom Smith, donning false beards, and posing as Porter and Cottington's servants, the Prince and Buckingham landed in Calais and proceeded from there to Paris and then to Madrid, where they arrived on 9 March.[326]

Charles and Buckingham were separated from Porter and Cottington, who were delayed by a day on the road to Madrid. Upon arrival, the two made their way covertly to the home of John Digby, Earl of Bristol (1580-1653) and English Ambassador to Madrid.[327] James Howell (c. 1594-1666), a historian and writer who was reportedly in Spain at the time,[328] recounts some of the drama that accompanied the sudden appearance of the British heir on Bristol's doorstep:

> to the wonderment of the world the Prince and the Marquis of *Buckingham* arriv'd at this Court a Friday last, upon the close of the

---

[324] D'Ewes and Bourcier, *Diary*, p. 119.

[325] These were strategic choices. Between 1609 and 1613, Cottington had served in various diplomatic posts in Spain, and Porter had grown up in Spain under the auspices of Gaspar de Guzmán, Count-Duke of Olivares (1587-1645).

[326] D'Ewes and Bourcier, *Diary*, p. 120. For the false names see p. 120, n. 233.

[327] Martin A. S. Hume, *The Court of Philip IV: Spain in Decadence* (London: Eveleigh Nash and Grayson, 1928): p. 67. See also Elliott, "A Troubled Relationship," p. 26.

[328] This is according to Hume, *The Court of Philip IV*, p. 72, n. 2.

> evening, they lighted at my Lord of *Bristolls* house, and the Marquis (M[r]. *Thomas Smith*) came in first with a Portmantle [portmanteau] under his arm, then (M[r]. *John Smith*) the Prince was sent for, who staid a while the to'ther side of the street in the dark, my Lord of *Bristoll* in a kind of astonishment brought him up to his bed-chamber, where he presently calld for pen and ink, and dispatcht a Post that night to *England* to acquaint his Majesty how in lesse then sixteen days he was come safely to the Court of *Spain*.[329]

After several months of frustrated negotiations and delaying tactics by the Spanish, Charles suddenly declared that he would accept any Spanish terms for the marriage, and began appearing in public with the new "Princesa de Inglaterra."[330] However, when further delays occurred, the Prince and Duke quickly understood that the match was not going to happen, and returned to England under the burden of many Spanish gifts.

By the time the intrepid travelers returned home, they had no further need of false beards, as reports Simonds d'Ewes:

> the Duke and Prince both were thus farr altered that now they had gotten berds, having none before they went into Spaine, and these were but ensignes of that admirable wisedome and policye they shewed ther, to come away fairelye, and soe to outstrip that great councell ther, the verye terror of Europe.[331]

---

[329] James Howell, letter to Sir Thomas Savage, in Howell 1645, section 3, letter XV, pp. 70-71.

[330] Elliott, "A Troubled Relationship," p. 26.

[331] D'Ewes and Bourcier, *Diary*, p. 163.

D'Ewes's anti-Spanish sentiment is revealed at the end of this passage, aligning with a large segment of the public that championed Charles's triumphant avoidance of Spanish clutches.[332]

The fascination of the public with Charles's escapades in Spain is played out in dramatic fashion in Thomas Middleton's (1580-1627) *A Game at Chesse* (Fig. 3.20). In this controversial satire of Spanish machinations Charles and Buckingham appear as the heroes; the White Knight and White Duke (or rook), respectively, who combat the sinister Spanish, the black game pieces. In Act IV, Scene II, the invective against the Anglo-Spanish marriage comes to the fore, when the Black Knight (based on Diego Sarmiento de Acuña, Count of Gondomar [1567-1626] and previously Spanish Ambassador to England) tells his pawn,

> I'm now about a masterpiece of a play
> T' entrap the White Knight, and with false allurements
> Entice him to the Black House…
> Then will our game lie sweetly.[333]

---

[332] Elliott, "A Troubled Relationship," p. 27. The match was effectively killed when Charles withdrew his authorization (two weeks ahead) for the proxy wedding in Madrid scheduled for 29 November 1623, and his insistence on the restitution of the Palatinate, which Spain continually refused.

[333] Thomas Middleton and A. H. Bullen, ed., *The Works of Thomas Middleton*, 8 vols (Boston: Houghton, Mifflin, 1885-86): vol. 7, p. 99.

At the conclusion of the game the treachery of the Black House is revealed, they are "given check-mate," and the black pieces are thrust into a bag to be put away forever.[334] The play's final words belong to the White King (James I), who declares,

> So, let the bag close now, the fittest womb
> For treachery, pride, and falsehood ; whilst we, winner-like,
> Destroying, through heaven's power, what would destroy,
> Welcome our White Knight with loud peals of joy.[335]

This echoes Simonds d'Ewes's account of the raucous celebrations that accompanied Charles and Buckingham's return from Madrid in 1623.[336]

Middleton's play was so popular among the English that it caused a stir with the Spanish. Indeed, the King's Men seemed to take special pains to make their criticism sting, even purchasing old items from Gondomar's wardrobe for the Black Knight's costume.[337] On 20 August 1624 Don Carlos II Coloma (1566-1637), who had succeeded Gondomar as Spain's English Ambassador, wrote in protest to the Count-

---

[334] Middleton and Bullen, *Works,* vol. 7, p. 132.

[335] Middleton and Bullen, *Works,* vol. 7, p. 135.

[336] D'Ewes and Bourcier, *Diary*, p. 163: "When the people once saw him, they showted marveiloslye criing out 'wee have him, wee have him!' The Prince…avoided the going thorough London…because the bonfires were soe thicke and soe manye as hee could not well passe."

[337] Melissa D. Aaron, *Global Economics: A History of the Theatre Business, the Chamberlain's/King's Men, and Their Plays, 1599-1642* (Newark, DE: University of Delaware Press, 2005): p. 120. Aaron further reports that the profits from *A Game at Chesse* were in line with the descriptions of its popularity (one contemporary account puts the total at least £900), indicating not only a great investment on the part of the theater company, but also a widespread appeal that went well beyond the court.

Duke of Olivares and favorite of the King of Spain. Coloma's anger over the production (in which he was not personally targeted) is palpable when he reports the event, "in order that the shamelessness of the English may be plainly seen, if indeed there is still any need of new examples of it."[338] Coloma's letter also preserves the popularity of the play in vivid detail:

> …there were more than 3000 persons there on the day that the audience was smallest. There was such merriment, hubbub and applause that even if I had been many leagues away it would not have been possible for me not to have taken notice of it…All this has been so much applauded and enjoyed by the mob that here, where no play has been acted for more than one day [consecutively], this one has already been acted on four, and each day the crowd is greater.[339]

Now a popular hero through his evasion of Spanish entrapment, Charles shifted his romantic hopes to Henrietta Maria, the youngest daughter of Henry IV, whom he married in 1625. Charles had first met the French Princess in early 1623 during a court entertainment in Paris, where he rested briefly on his way to Madrid.[340] Both before and after the wedding—for which Buckingham served as a proxy in

---

[338] Edward M. Wilson and Olga Turner, "The Spanish Protest against 'A Game at Chesse'," *The Modern Language Review* 44, no. 4 (Oct. 1949): p. 480.

[339] Wilson and Turner, "The Spanish Protest against 'A Game at Chesse'," p. 480. The play was performed for nine consecutive days before James shut the production down.

[340] D'Ewes and Bourcier, *Diary*, p. 120, n. 236.

Paris—mythological conceits were deployed to project an image of the couple as virtuous lovers, an idea to which I will return.[341]

The depths of the prince's passions for his bride were mythologized through portraits. During their courtship, Charles was said to have "fed his eyes" on Henrietta Maria's portrait, while she expressed a "passionate desiring" to see images of Charles. This fire apparently did not burn out upon marriage, as George Goring (1608-1657) reported to James Hay, 1st Earl of Carlisle (c. 1580-1636) that in Charles's absence after Buckingham's death Henrietta Maria could "take no rest in the same nights, but sighs for his return, till when she delights herself with his shadow [portrait] at her bedside."[342]

Whether truly romantic by nature or cultivating a persona of the virtuous lover for his court (perhaps both), Charles also practiced a type of courtly aloofness and stoicism in his interactions that was particularly associated with the customs of the Spanish court.[343] Van der Doort, furthermore, records several prominently and strategically placed pictures of Spanish monarchs, at a time when hostilities toward

---

[341] John Peacock, "The Visual Image of Charles I," in Thomas N. Corns, ed., *The Royal Image: Representations of Charles I* (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 1999): p. 188.

[342] As quoted in Griffey, *On Display*, p. 83.

[343] See Peacock, "The Visual Image," p. 176; and Parry, *Golden Age Restor'd*, p. 267.

Spain were virulent.[344] For example, Titian's (ca. 1488-1576) *Portrait of Charles V* (Fig. 3.21; 1533; Madrid, Museo Nacional del Prado), given by the Emperor's great-grandson Philip IV (r. 1621-65) to Charles during his visit to Spain, maintained a place of honor in the Bear Gallery in Whitehall.[345] There they hung next to Rubens's *Peace and War* (Fig. 3.22; 1629; London, National Gallery) and *Daniel in the Lions' Den* (Fig. 3.23; c. 1614/16; Washington, D.C., National Gallery of Art), suggesting that the authorship of these works and their place in proximity to each other was as important as their subject matter. The display furthermore invokes Rubens's reputation as the 'new Titian' in juxtaposing works by the two, incidentally both under the dominion of Habsburg patronage. We will see Charles return to this strategy of display again in the Gallery of St. James's Palace. In exhibiting portraits of Spanish monarchs by famous painters, Charles demonstrated his connoisseurial acumen and placed his collection on par with the Spanish Habsburgs.

The mores of courtly culture in the seventeenth century permitted Charles to both emulate and revile Spain. The seeming-paradox of this practice has resulted in a marked tone of surprise in some examinations of Charles's collection. For instance,

---

[344] For the relationship between England and Spain in this period see Jonathan Brown and J.H. Elliott, eds., *The Sale of the Century: Artistic Relations Between Spain and Great Britain, 1604-1655* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2002. Exh. cat.), especially John Elliot, "A Troubled Relationship: Spain and Great Britain, 1604-1655," pp. 17-38.

[345] Millar 1960, p. 4, no. 12.

Ronald Lightbown's observation that Charles's Privy Galerie at Whitehall "even included some of the Kings and Queens of Spain," calls attention to the contradictions of courtly collecting.[346] On the one hand, growing enmity between Spain and England precluded any thawing of the relationship between Charles and Philip. On the other hand, the monarchs existed in a princely realm above the concerns of state, in which not only did Charles aspire to equal and surpass Spain's cultural dominance, but also his connoisseurial interest in Titian outweighed any distaste for the Spanish crown.

The stark difference between his public and private personas is well demonstrated by Charles's reaction to the murder of Buckingham in August 1628.[347] When he received the news Charles was at prayer in the Chapel Royal and surrounded by courtiers. The king, seemingly unaffected, continued praying and remained until the end of service. Afterwards, in his private chamber, he wept uncontrollably and remained shut up for several days.[348]

Charles's public and private personas were bridged by his paintings. His collection revealed deeply personal concerns through which style and manner of display could be utilized to express self-fashioned public identities. Nowhere is this

---

[346] Lightbown, "Charles I and the Tradition of European Princely Collecting," p. 59.

[347] Villiers was stabbed to death at Portsmouth on 23 August 1628, by an angry veteran of the Duke's military expedition to Ile de Ré in 1627. (See Elliott, "A Troubled Relationship," p. 30.)

[348] Parry, *Golden Age Restor'd*, pp. 267-268. See also Russell, *Civil War*, p. 203.

more apparent than in Honthorst's *King Charles I* and *Apollo and Diana*, in which the artist transforms an intimate, almost everyday image of the king into the epitome of godly excellence: Apollo. In the development of his public, pictorial presentation, Charles's visit to Spain had an indelible impact upon his collecting identity. Scholars usually cite the Spanish visit as the beginning of Charles's admiration for Titian.[349] To my mind, not only was he awed by the Spanish collections, but also he was thrown into a type of envious panic. Desperate to catch up to Spain, Charles became interested in acquiring as many objects as quickly as possible.

Though his brother Henry had instilled in him a passion for art, Charles apparently had little room for sentiment, and traded or disposed of works inherited from both Henry and Anne of Denmark in pursuit of his ideal royal collection.[350] Francis Haskell has argued that Charles "did not feel any special admiration for his brother's pioneering efforts to bring recent Italian and Northern painting to

---

[349] See, for example, Sharpe, "Van Dyck, the Royal Image and the Caroline Court," in Karen Hearn et al., *Van Dyck & Britain* (London: Tate Publications, 2009. Exh. cat.): p. 16; Howarth, "Charles I, Sculpture, and Sculptors," p. 85; Jonathan Brown, "Artistic Relations Between Spain and England 1604-1655," pp. 45-50; Donovan, *Rubens and England*, p. 51; and Per Rumberg and Demond Shawe-Taylor, "'The Greatest Amateur of Paintings Among the Princes of the World,'" in *Charles I: King and Collector*, pp. 17-18.

[350] Timothy Wilks, "Princely Collecting," p. 119. A meaningful exception to this was the Tacca bronzes, discussed above, which seem to have remained in the Royal Collection (see note 287).

England."[351] However, an examination of Charles's patronage and collections directly contradicts Haskell's assertion, and Charles's activities fit within a long tradition of seeking to establish Northern artists at court.[352] While his 1623 journey to Madrid is typically cited as the catalyst for Charles's love of Titian, many scholars have neglected to include the importance of sixteenth-century Venetian painting in Henry's collections. Only recently explored in depth in a 2012 exhibition at the National Portrait Gallery, London, this interest was remarked upon by contemporaries and, despite a lack of attachment to specific objects, Charles fully embraced his brother's collecting strategies while trying to acquire better objects.[353]

---

[351] Haskell, "Charles I's Collection of Pictures," p. 209.

[352] These included Marcus Geerarts the Younger (1561-1635), Paulus van Somer (1576-1621; in London 1616), and Daniel Mytens (ca. 1590-before 1648; in London 1618). See Sluijter, "The English Venture," pp. 14-16: Geeraerts was paid as "His Majesties Painter" for portraits of James and Anne. See also Jeremy Wood, "Orazio Gentileschi," p. 109; Peacock ("The Visual Image," p. 221) reports that Mytens's role as court painter was confirmed in 1624 when James I awarded him a yearly pension of 50 pounds and a grant of denization. Mytens was not given an official, permanent title until 1625. Both orders are published in full in O. ter Kuile, "Daniel Mijtens: 'His Majesties Picture-Drawer," *Nederlands Kunsthistorisch Jaarboek* 20 (1969): pp. 26-27, 28-29. On Charles I, Mytens, and Van Dyck, see Millar, "Some Painters and Charles I," *The Burlington Magazine* 104, no. 713 (August 1962): pp. 323-330. See also Ch. 8, "The New Netherlanders" in Karen Hearn, ed., *Dynasties: Painting in Tudor and Jacobean England 1530-1630* (London: Tate Publishing, 1995. Exh. cat.): pp. 202-230. For some of Charles's efforts see Slive and Rosenberg, *Dutch Painting,* pp. 249, 254, 262, 269, and 278-79.

[353] See Macleod, *The Lost Prince*, 2012. See n. 265 above comment by Marc' Antonio Correr, Venetian Ambassador to England, on Henry's interest in Venetian paintings. For Charles and Italian paintings see Brown, *Kings & Connoisseurs*, p. 243; Millar, "Charles I, Honthorst, and Van Dyck," p. 42; Millar, *The Age of Charles I: Painting in England, 1620-1648* (London: Tate Gallery Publications, 1972. Exh. cat.): p. 21. For

After his visit to Madrid, he employed copyists to reproduce paintings by Titian in Spanish collections. He also had miniatures painted of the most famous works by Titian in the collections of his courtiers.[354] The sheer number of paintings that Charles almost pried out of Habsburg hands in 1623 testifies to his love of Titian and fascination with the Spanish royal collection. In addition to the master's *Portrait of Charles V* (Fig. 3.21) and the *Pardo Venus (Jupiter and Antiope*) [Fig. 3.24; 1535-40, Paris, Musée du Louvre], *The Rape of Europa* (Fig. 3.25; ca. 1560-62, Boston, Isabella Stewart Gardner Museum), *Diana and Callisto* (Fig. 3.26; 1556-9, London, National Gallery), and *Diana and Actaeon* (Fig. 3.27; 1556-9, London, National Gallery) were all offered to the prince before marriage negotiations broke down.[355] This demonstrates not only the power that Titian held over Charles, but also the desperation that Philip IV must have felt for an English match.

---

an overview and historical context of Charles's collecting strategy, see also Rumberg and Shawe-Taylor, "'The Greatest Amateur of Paintings Among the Princes of the World,'" pp. 17-25. On Charles's collecting of Northern and Southern Renaissance Painting, see David Ekserdjian, "Charles I and the Northern Renaissance," pp. 82-97 and (same author) "Charles I and the Italian Renaissance," pp. 100-123).

[354] Howarth, "Charles I, Sculpture, and Sculptors," p. 85.

[355] Haskell, "Charles I's Collection of Pictures," p. 210. See also Brown, "Artistic Relations," p. 45. Carducho also reports that Charles tried to claim possession of the entire set of Titian's *Poesie*, which were probably the most important pieces in the Spanish royal collections. The works were even crated to be shipped to London, only to be unpacked when the match was finally cancelled. Carducho further reports that Charles was presented with some 20 paintings by Spanish court officials. See also Donovan, *Rubens and England*, p. 51.

In addition, Charles was ambitious and eager in his acquisition of artists, paintings, and entire collections, as well as being an early collector of self-portraits; he was seeking out works of the highest caliber, ones that still hold important places in the art historical imagination today. While in Spain, for example, he completed arrangements for the purchase of Raphael's cartoons for the Sistine Chapel tapestries from a Genoese collection, which were to be used to produce versions of the tapestries at Mortlake.[356] In 1625, when Buckingham was in France negotiating for the marriage of Charles and Henrietta Maria, he visited the Château de Fontainebleau, where the Italian collector Cassiano dal Pozzo (1588-1657) records in his diary that the Duke made several pointed remarks about Charles's keenness to acquire the *Mona Lisa*, on display in the picture gallery there.[357] Each of these advances was rebuffed, much to Buckingham's ire. Upon Charles's accession in 1625, he wished to bring a famous

---

[356] Haskell, "Charles I's Collection of Pictures," p. 211. Haskell suggests that this purchase might have been initiated on Rubens's advice.

[357] Dal Pozzo also notes that in his disappointment at not acquiring the picture, the Duke even complained to Rubens: "Il Duca di Buchingam, mandato d'Inghilterra per condur la sposa al nuovo re, hebbe qualche intention d'haver questo ritratto, ma, essendone stato distolto il re dall'istanze fattegli da diversi, che messero in consideratione che S. M. mandava fuor del regno il più bel quadro che havesse, detto Duca sentì con disgusto questo intorbidamento e, tra quelli con chi si dolse fu il Rubens d'Anversa, Pittor dell' Arciduchessa." Transcribed in Eugène Müntz and Émilie Molinier, *Le chateau de Fontainebleau au XVIIe siècle d'après des documents inédits* (Paris, Nogent-le-Retrou: Impr. De Daupeley-Gouverneur, 1886): pp. 17-18. See also Daniela del Pesco, "Au château de Fontainebleau avec Cassiano dal Pozzo en 1625," in Vincent Droguet et al, *Fontainebleau: « La vraie demeure des rois, la maison des siècles »* (Paris: Swan éditeur; Fontainebleau: Château de Fontainebleau, 2015): p. 55.

Italian painter to court. He first approached Guercino (1591-1666), who, according to the biographer Carlo Malvasia (1616-1693), refused because he did not want to work for heretics or to put up with the English climate.[358] Most prominently, in the late 1620s Charles—under the direction of the ambitious Flemish merchant Daniel Nijs—acquired the Gonzaga collection of art and antiquities from Mantua.[359] The first objects from this acquisition, which almost independently made Charles's collection equal to Philip IV's, set sail for London aboard the *Margaret* in April 1628, the same month in which Honthorst crossed the North Sea at the request of the king.[360]

Charles, then, had assembled around him not only an art collection of unprecedented quality, scale, and importance, but also a network of courtiers and agents who, beyond an avowed passion for art, developed a keen interest in collecting's other uses: to demonstrate intellectual virtue, and to curry a unique type of favor with the king. Charles's voracious appetite for continental pictures and painters had suddenly elevated painting to the most potent form of currency.[361] In the midst of

---

[358] Haskell, "Charles I's Collection of Pictures," p. 211.

[359] For the Mantuan Sale and Nijs's role in it, see Anderson, *The Flemish Merchant of Venice*.

[360] Haskell, "Charles I's Collection of Pictures," p. 214.

[361] In 1635, for example, Cardinal Francesco Barberini received a suggestion from Henrietta Maria via her Papal agent, Gregorio Panzani, that Charles's goodwill could be readily accessed by gifting pictures. See Lightbown, "Charles I and the Tradition of European Princely Collecting," p. 61. Barberini's response is preserved in MS Barb. Lat. 8633, f. 226 in the Vatican Archives, letter dated 13 March 1635.

an advancing capitalist society, Charles's courtiers learned that art could be more valuable than the gold used to purchase it. Charles's relationship with his courtiers is characterized by a flurry of exchanges and purchases, in which he more readily paid for or traded objects than outright accepting them as gifts.[362] Designated the "Whitehall Group" by Jonathan Brown, this network constituted a kind of rising tide that lifted all ships, as those who successfully navigated this system gained or retained high status, and Charles's collection increased more than seventy-fold in fifteen years.[363]

A few examples testify to the complexity of this system, in which Charles's network understood that selling him art from their own collections or locating pieces on the market for him would please the king as much as or more than gifting them. Van der Doort's inventory records a number of advantageous swaps with and purchases from various members of court, the majority of which were for Italian

---

[362] Felicity Heal, *The Power of Gifts: Gift Exchange in Early Modern England* (Corby: Oxford University Press, 2014): p. 139.

[363] For the "Whitehall Group," see Brown, *Kings & Connoisseurs*, Ch. 1. My estimation of the rapid swelling of Charles's collection is based on Brown p. 33, and the difference between the 21 paintings owned (probably) by Charles when Prince of Wales in 1623-4, and the more than 1500 works owned by Charles at his death in 1649. Furthermore, the deterioration of the political and financial security of the crown was such that by 1638 Charles had all but withdrawn from the market, meaning most of the 1,400+ paintings were acquired between 1623 and 38 (Brown, *Kings & Connoisseurs*, p. 33). Buckingham's acquisition of pictures in this period is equally impressive. according to Brown (p. 32), he installed almost four hundred in York House in only five to six years, and about a hundred sculptures in his other property, Chelsea House.

paintings: a head of St. Peter by Guido Reni (1575-1642) purchased from Nicholas Lanier (1588-1666);[364] a naked woman by Titian exchanged with the Duchess of Buckingham for a Mantuan painting;[365] a *Holy Family* by Andrea del Sarto (1486-1530), exchanged for miniatures of the King and Queen with the Lord Chamberlain (head of the Royal Household);[366] an Antonis Mor (1512-16 – ca. 1576) *Portrait of Philip II*, purchased from Arundel when Charles was still Prince of Wales;[367] a *Diana and Actaeon* by Giorgione (1477-1510), bought from Endymion Porter;[368] an *Ecce Homo* by a Cantareno, bought from Lord Marshall, who in turn had bought it from Inigo Jones;[369] a Pordenone (1483/84-1539) self-portrait, exchanged with the Lord Chamberlain for a picture of Henrietta Maria in Blue by Van Dyck;[370] a *Portrait of a*

---

[364] Millar 1960, p. 10, no. 14. Unless otherwise stated, all identifications of courtiers are made by me. When they are tentative, I have tried to give supporting evidence.

[365] Millar 1960, p. 15, no. 4.

[366] Millar 1960, p. 22, no. 14. Van der Doort surprisingly gives a specific date for the exchange, 4 January 1638, at which time the Lord Chamberlain was Philip Herbert, 4th Earl of Pembroke (1584-1650).

[367] Millar 1960, p. 3, no. 9.

[368] Millar 1960, p. 42, no. 3.

[369] Millar 1960, p. 43, no. 8. In this case I believe Van der Doort's "my Lo: Marshall" most likely refers to the Earl of Arundel, who from 1622-46 served as Earl Marshal, master of court ceremony.

[370] Millar 1960, p. 45, no. 19. See n. 361 above on the identity of the Lord Chamberlain. Van der Doort does not give a specific date for the exchange, but

Gentleman by Tintoretto, exchanged with Sir John Travers (1555-1618) for a portrait of Ralph Winwood (c. 1563-1617);[371] a large nude *Venus* by Palma Vecchio (ca. 1479-1528), exchanged for a Mantuan Altarpiece with Endymion Porter;[372] and a *Leda and the Swan* by Veronese, exchanged with the Duchess of Buckingham for another Mantuan painting.[373] As Van der Doort usually gives few details about these exchanges beyond the party involved, and his inventory was compiled almost a decade after Honthorst's visit, it is difficult to reconstruct which of these pictures he would have seen. Of the above listed, only the *Philip II* by Antonis Mor, noted as having been bought by Charles when he was Prince of Wales, is thus securely located in his collection before 1628. Rather, the above examples provide a small enumeration of the frequent exchanges and complex machinations that characterized the relationship between Caroline courtiers and art.

Pembroke served as Lord Chamberlain from 1630-1641, so it is likely he is again the relevant party.

[371] Millar 1960, p. 49, no. 43. This is my identification of John Travers, an Irish politician, based on Van der Doort's description of "S^{r} John Trevarrs." Travers's son, Robert Travers (c. 1596-1647) was knighted by James I in 1625 and would later serve as a member of parliament. John Travers's date of death, in 1618, would place the exchange during Charles's tenure as Prince of Wales.

[372] Millar 1960, p. 59, no. 95.

[373] These examples are from just the first half of Van der Doort's inventory. Millar 1960, p. 59, no. 98.

Additionally, many of these objects continued to have marketable afterlives, further cementing relationships among the courtiers. We know, for example, that after he assumed the throne Charles exchanged a volume of Hans Holbein (1497/8-1543) portrait drawings inherited from Henry (Fig. 3.28; 1527, London, Royal Collection) with the Earl of Pembroke for Raphael's *St. George and the Dragon* (Fig. 3.29; 1504-06; Washington, D.C., National Gallery of Art). Pembroke, in turn, gave the drawings to Arundel, whose family had once owned the portfolio.[374] Several of these drawings were acquired by the restored Charles II in 1675, and so re-entered the Royal Collection.[375]

This activity did not just revolve around the king, but also revolutionized the culture of the court itself, and appeared in the dealings of courtiers independent of Charles. In 1624 Dudley Carleton, who was particularly savvy in his acquisition and circulation of art, deliberated on the timeliest moment to present Buckingham with a marble gate and chimneypiece in order to secure his exit from the Netherlands, into the post of Vice Chamberlain or ambassador to France.[376]

---

[374] Haskell, "Charles I's Collection of Pictures," p. 216.

[375] See, for example, the *Portrait of Sir Thomas More*, c. 1526-7, Royal Collection, London (RCIN 912268).

[376] Hill, "Dudley Carleton," p. 271; see also Philip McEvansoneya, "Some Documents Concerning the Patronage and Collections of the Duke of Buckingham," *Rutgers Art Review* 8 (1987): p. 31; and J. H. Barcroft, "Carleton and Buckingham: The Quest for Office," in H.S. Reinmuth, ed., *Early Stuart Studies* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1970): pp. 122-136.

There is a disjunction here between Charles's obsessive maintenance of hierarchy in his public life and his enthusiastic embrace of the market, as Felicity Heal argues in her study of gift exchange in Stuart England. In the expanding market for pictures in London, according to Heal, courtiers and dealers alike suddenly were engaging in equal exchange with their sovereign.[377] However, this is not strictly true. Though his appetite for art was a well-known proclivity, even weakness, the king seems to have gotten the better end of most trades, as the examples cited above demonstrate. This testifies to the intense motivation of his courtiers to appease his majesty, whether through an inequitable exchange or reluctant sale. Furthermore, Charles's persistent interest in bringing contemporary painters to court, not just acquiring a painting from them here or there, means that there was yet another way for courtiers to utilize painting—more specifically, painters—in the endless quest for royal favor. The circumstances surrounding Honthorst's invitation to London fall firmly within these dynamics of patronage.

PART II: Gerrit van Honthorst and Stuart London

Honthorst's invitation to London was the defining moment of his career. Mentioned by Sandrart as a mark of his rocketing fame, this achievement is recounted by many early biographers of the artist, including Filippo Baldinucci, Sebastiano Resta

---

[377] Heal, *The Power of Gifts,* p. 141.

and Johannes Meyssens (1612-70), and Arnold Houbraken (1660-1719).[378] As related in Chapter 2, Honthorst was angling for British patronage already in 1621, when he approached Dudley Carleton seeking the commissioning of a painting, which Carleton then sent to the well-known collector Thomas Howard, Earl of Arundel. Although he highly praised the picture, Arundel ordered nothing further from Honthorst, forcing the artist to look elsewhere for court commissions. He found a consistent ally in Carleton, who was on familiar terms with the king's sister Elizabeth as well as Rubens. Probably introduced to many of these key figures by Carleton, Honthorst had spent the years between 1621 and 1628 increasing his facility and familiarity with the preferences of the courts in The Hague as he worked to earn the *entrée* into English patronage that had failed to materialize in 1621.

In April or May of 1628 Carleton left his post and returned to England, just before which he received a letter reminding him to travel in the company of a certain artist. These instructions came in April on behalf of the Duke of Buckingham via his secretary, Sir Balthazar Gerbier (1592-1663), who included the following postscript in his letter to Carleton: "I trust you will not forget to bring Mr. Honthorst; for the Duke intends to employ him, as well as his Majesty, who will give him cause not to

---

[378] TA 1675, II, Book 3, p. 303; Baldinucci, *Opere,* volume 12, p. 96; Resta and Meyssens, *The true effigies of the most eminent painters* (London, 1694; first published in French 1649): p. 5, no. 51; and Houbraken 1718-21, pp. 149-150, no. 65.

complain of crossing the sea."[379] Honthorst apparently arrived in London soon thereafter, as he was able to paint two portraits of Buckingham before his assassination on 23 August.

Honthorst stayed less than eight months in London—he left Gravesend on 8 December 1628 and was back in Utrecht by the end of the month—but in that time he completed seven paintings, all commissioned by or for the king.[380] Honthorst's student Joachim von Sandrart, at age twenty-two, accompanied him to London as an assistant, and Sandrart's later biography of Honthorst provides much of the information about his time at Charles's court, including the length of his stay, a description of *Apollo and Diana*, and the rewards that Honthorst received for his service. It is unclear how many assistants beyond Sandrart accompanied Honthorst to London; as Sandrart is the sole narrator of Honthorst's British sojourn, scholarly inquiry into the subject has generally begun and ended with his account.

However, by returning to Sandrart's *Teutsche Academie* (1675), it is possible to determine another likely assistant. In his life of Robert van Voerst, Sandrart states

---

[379] Carpenter 1844, p. 180: postscript of a letter dated 5 April 1628. Also cited in White, *Dutch Pictures*, p. xxiii and Hill, "Sir Dudley Carleton," p. 263. In relation to this letter, White repeated an error in his source material, Carpenter's *Pictorial Notices*, in which only the postscript is transcribed, when White stated that Sir Balthazar Gerbier addressed the letter to Buckingham's Secretary. They are in fact the same person. Robert Hill ("Sir Dudley Carleton," p. 274, n. 36) corrects this error by referring to the original document (SP 84/137/22), which reveals that the letter was written from Gerbier directly to Carleton.

[380] Carpenter 1844, p. 181-82

that "he diligently joined our Academia" to learn the art of painting, "where I knew him in the years 1625 and 26, as well as afterwards when he left for London in the year 1628."[381] Sandrart's comments on who may have been a student of Honthorst's are the only evidence that remains to hint at the structure or scope of Honthorst's studio. In the 1999 catalogue raisonné of Honthorst's work, Judson and Ekkart list four such pupils, Jan Both, Van Voerst, Gerard van Kuijll, and Jan van Bronchorst, citing Sandrart.[382] However, there is no discussion of Van Voerst's possible role in London, and therefore the previous understanding of Honthorst's time there has remained incomplete.

Complicating this narrative even further, there is also no evidence about where Honthorst lived and painted at court. Van Dyck is the most well-known foreign artist in Stuart London and therefore the special circumstances of his housing at British court will be of limited help in determining where Honthorst might have lived. Edward Norgate (1581-1650), a court miniaturist, musician, and writer, provided for Van Dyck's food and lodgings when he arrived in London in 1632. He was later given a house at royal expense in the parish of St. Ann Blackfriars, in the eastern part of the

---

[381] TA 1675, II, Book 3, p. 360: [in der Mahler-Kunst gesellete er sich fleißig zu unserer Academia, allwo ich ihn Anno 1625. und 26. gekant/ wie auch hernacher zu Londen Anno 1628. gelaßen]. For a discussion of Sandrart's use of the term Academia see Chapter 2, pp. 56-57.

[382] Judson/Ekkart 1999, p. XXXIII.

city but easily reachable by boat from Whitehall, Charles's main residence.[383] This house was on the Thames-side of the parish and had a garden. An entry in the royal accounts of the Office of Works shows that in early 1635 a new, wide causeway and set of stairs leading directly into Van Dyck's garden were constructed so that the king could alight from the royal barge "to goe to S^{r} Anthony Vandikes howse there to see his paintings."[384]

---

[383] Wood ("Orazio Gentileschi," p. 119), says that Van Dyck stayed at Norgate's expense for only two months before his house in St. Ann's Parish was ready for him. Kevin Sharpe ("Van Dyck, the Royal Image and the Caroline Court," p. 16), dates Van Dyck's residence in Blackfriars to March 1635, by which time the artist was back from Brussels. The documentary evidence as laid out by Mary Edmond ("Limners and Picturemakers," *The Volume of the Walpole Society* 47 [1978-1980]: p. 125, 203n296), supports Wood's statement that Van Dyck was in residence there from 1632, and furthermore that he remained there until his death in 1641.

[384] Record of the staircase and causeway is preserved in two documents in the National Archives, Kew, in the Declared Accounts of the Public Record Office: AO 1/2427/64 and E 351/3268, which make clear that the work was done in Blackfriars, not Whitehall. The AO 1/2427/64 entry reads in full: "at the Blackfryers in making a new causeway, and a new set of staires for the kinge Ma^{ty} to land to goe to S^{r} Anthony Vandikes howse there to see his paintings in the monothes of June and July 1635." It is discussed in Mary Edmond, "Limners and Picturemakers," p. 125. Edmond transcribes from the document in question that the stairs led up into Van Dyck's garden. Barnes 2004 (p. 9) reproduces more of the text than Edmond, but it is still incomplete. Kevin Sharpe ("Van Dyck, the Royal Image and the Caroline Court," p. 16) describes it rather inaccurately as "a special staircase down to the Thames." It seems to me that Edmond's description, as a path to Van Dyck's house rather than from Whitehall, is more accurate. This causeway is not discussed in Stijn Alsteens otherwise comprehensive recent essay on the functioning of Van Dyck's studio: "A Portraitist's Progress," in Stijn Alsteens and Adam Eaker, et al., *Van Dyck: The Anatomy of Portraiture* (New York: The Frick Collection; New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2016. Exh. cat.): pp. 1-37. For Van Dyck's collection, see Christopher Brown and Nigel Ramsay, "Van Dyck's Collection: Some New Documents," *The Burlington Magazine* 132, no. 1051 (Oct. 1990): pp. 704-709; Ronald Lightbown, "Van Dyck and the Purchase of Paintings for the English Court,"

Honthorst and his assistants could have found (or been given) lodgings in the Westminster district of London, in close proximity to the other Netherlandish artists and artisans in the city. With the exception of Van Dyck and Daniel Mytens, who were named "Principal Painter in Ordinary" and "his Majesty's picture-drawer in ordinary" respectively, other artists were only loosely associated with the royal household, and were not considered official painters.[385] Therefore, it is more useful to reconstruct Honthorst's whereabouts through the typical patterns of foreign artists at court. Many Dutch artists in London resided in the western part of the city in the area belonging to the parish of St. Martin-in-the-Fields near Westminster, and all belonged to the reformed Austin Friars Church in the Broad Street Ward.[386] Indeed, Van Der Doort later lived in this parish, paying rent on a house from 1630/31 through 1640.[387] The district also previously housed Paulus van Somer and his assistant Abraham van Blyenberch (active 1617-22), with whom Van Dyck stayed for several months on his first visit to London in 1620.[388]

The Burlington Magazine 111, no. 769 (July 1969): pp. 418-421; and Jeremy Wood, "Van Dyck's 'Cabinet de Titien': The Contents and Dispersal of his Collection," *The Burlington Magazine* 132, no. 1051 (Oct. 1990): pp. 680-695.

[385] Wood, "Orazio Gentileschi," p. 109.

[386] Ter Kuile, "Daniel Mijtens," p. 3.

[387] Millar 1960, p. xv.

[388] Ter Kuile, "Daniel Mijtens," p. 3.

In 1624, Charles gifted Daniel Mytens a house in St. Martin's Lane, only 0.6 km from Whitehall Palace; this residence formerly belonged to Van Somer.[389] Van Voerst evidently stayed in London when Honthorst and Sandrart departed, or else returned later to work for the court.[390] In 1635 he was provided with yearly rent for a house by the Crown. Likewise, Cornelis van Poelenburgh (1594/5-1667) was given a house in St. Anne's Street near Westminster Abbey in 1637, and in 1638 was moved to another house in Westminster, where he lived near Alexander Keirincx (1600-1652). Housing for the Dutch silversmith Christiaen van Vianen (ca. 1600-1667) was provided in the same street, Orchard Street, between 1633 and 1640.[391]

It is possible that Honthorst stayed with Mytens at his home in St. Martin's Lane, just as Van Dyck had done in 1620. However, as Honthorst's invitation to London came explicitly from Buckingham, a likely possibility is that Honthorst lodged in the Duke's residence on the Strand, York House.[392] Starting sometime

---

[389] Ter Kuile, "Daniel Mijtens," p. 5 and appendix VII, pp. 27-28. Ter Kuile does not mention the location of this document. Wood ("Orazio Gentileschi," p. 119, n. 92), gives the location as British Library, Grants of Charles Prince of Wales, 1617-25, Harleian MSS 1718.

[390] TA 1675, II, Book 3, p. 360. Sandrart writes of the fame Robert van Voerst earned in London, particularly in his works for the King.

[391] Wood, "Orazio Gentileschi," p. 119.

[392] Wood ("Orazio Gentileschi," p. 113) is rather noncommittal about this possibility but does argue strongly for Buckingham as the patron of the *Apollo and Diana*, attributing Honthorst's decision to return to the Netherlands largely to Buckingham's death. For other artists whose lodgings were paid for by the crown, see Wood p. 118.

between January and August 1628, Orazio Gentileschi lived in a suite of rooms there, which included a large upper room that functioned as a studio.[393] Honthorst's residence in York House would also help to explain why he quit London just four months after Buckingham's death, as that may well have extinguished the bulk of the artist's English patronage.

King Charles I

Honthorst's *King Charles I* (Fig. 3.3) is a strikingly unconventional portrait of a king. Arresting in an intimacy not replicated in any of Honthorst's other royal portraits, this painting shows him searching for the proper way to depict a monarch, connecting the animation and format of Utrecht images of shepherds with the tranquility evocative of seventeenth-century neo-stoicism.[394] Charles is depicted at half-length, his body facing toward his left as he leans forward, holding a recently-

---

[393] Wood, "Orazio Gentileschi," p. 111. He was still living there in 1631 when the widowed Duchess of Buckingham complained that he was thoroughly inconveniencing her by remaining in the house: Anna Maria Crinò and Benedict Nicolson, "Further Documents Relating to Orazio Gentileschi," *The Burlington Magazine* 103, no. 697 (Apr. 1961): p. 145.

[394] Scholars have previously considered this work an *ad vivum* study for the likeness of the king in the *Apollo and Diana*. Millar, "Van Dyck in London," p. 57. Millar first advanced this idea in 1954 ("Charles I, Honthorst, and Van Dyck," p. 39n15). See also White, *Dutch Pictures*, p. xxv, n. 79; National Portrait Gallery, "Annual Report of the Trustees, 1965-66" (London: Her Majesty's Stationery Office, 1967): pp. 26-27; In *Charles I: King and Collector*, the work's role as a study for the *Apollo and Diana* is the extent of the catalogue's critical engagement with the portrait.

unfolded letter and resting both arms on a pillow. This type of 'reading portrait' does not fit cleanly with the established traditions of that subgenre. The king is neither reading from a visible inscription, to signal a specific intellectual pursuit, nor can the letter be meant to mark a specific moment in his life, such as a marriage. Rather, the presence of the letter may refer to the king more generally as a communicative intellectual, for which he was not known and therefore a view he may have wished to promote. The image frames Charles as a responsive king, attentive to the letters and concerns of his allies and his subjects.[395]

The work cannot be definitively connected with any entry in Van der Doort's inventory, so its display or context at Charles's court is unknown. However, there is evidence that Charles retained it for his collection.[396] When it was treated in 1983 the canvas was relined, during which the crowned "CR" monogram marking the painting as one of Charles I's was permanently covered. Fortunately, an image of this stamp on the canvas's recto survives in a Polaroid photograph in the Archives of the National Portrait Gallery (Fig. 3.30).[397] Furthermore, the existence of at least one early copy—a

---

[395] This interpretation was suggested by Arthur Wheelock in a discussion of an earlier version of this project on 12 May 2014. See following discussion about the only known copy of the work, Fig. 3.31. Judson/Ekkart 1999, cat. no. 415, list no copies or variants.

[396] Judson's provenance for the painting begins in 1950, when it was in the collection of a Paris art dealer. Judson/Ekkart 1999, p. 296, cat. no. 415.

[397] Image courtesy of the National Portrait Gallery Archives, London, registered packet for NPG 4444.

heavily damaged smaller version sold at Sotheby's in 2008 (Fig. 3.31)—indicates that it may have been reproduced for circulation to acquaintances and allies of the king.[398]

The decision to represent Charles with a letter might have been inspired by Thomas de Keyser's *Portrait of Constantijn Huygens and his Clerk*, completed just a year earlier (Fig. 3.32; 1627; London, National Gallery). Honthorst could have easily seen Huygens's portrait in The Hague in 1627. Huygens was there serving as secretary to stadtholder Frederik Hendrik, for whom Honthorst produced at least two paintings that same year.[399] In De Keyser's small-scale portrait, Huygens turns from an architectural plan laid out on the table in order to receive a letter. In contrast, Honthorst's employs the livelier format of the Utrecht Caravaggist half-length in his isolation of Charles I, depiction of him at life size, and placement of him shallowly in relation to the picture plane, thereby emphasizing the familiar nature of the scene as compared to De Keyser's more removed, encyclopedic portrait.

---

[398] White, *Dutch Pictures*, p. xxv, n79 and National Portrait Gallery, "Annual Report," p. 26 list a smaller-scale copy of the National Portrait Gallery Picture. White (n. 79) furthermore says that there is no evidence that either copy was in the king's collection and proposes that one might have been sent to the Queen of Bohemia in The Hague. As these sources do not give much information on the other version, there is no way to know whether the work sold at Sotheby's in 2008 is the same one. The catalogue (http://www.sothebys.com/en/auctions/ecatalogue/lot.pdf.L08035.html/f/178/L08035-178.pdf) notes that the painting was probably damaged in World War II and subsequently reduced in size from 27x23 in. to the present 18x16 in. This would make even the original size of the work smaller than the Portrait Gallery version.

[399] This is discussed at greater length in Chapter 2. See pp. 97-100.

As mentioned above in the introduction to this chapter, the cushion seems to proclaim that the work was made *ad vivum*, preserving the act of sitting for a portrait in providing a creature comfort for one required to hold a pose for a long period. Its presence enhances the remarkable informality of the scene and is unique in Honthorst's *oeuvre* as well as other portraits of Charles. His deeply-slashed green doublet lined with red also closely corresponds to items listed as his common manner of dressing in the Royal Wardrobe accounts, further supporting the conclusion that the portrait was indeed done after life.[400] Compared with portraits of the king by Daniel Mytens (Fig. 3.33; 1632, New York, Private Collection) and even Van Dyck (Fig. 3.34; London, Royal Collection Trust), Honthorst's image is strikingly intimate in its format, one never again replicated in his surviving body of work. Although it is often thought to be a study for the larger *Apollo and Diana* (Fig. 3.4), *King Charles I* does not resemble a painted study, of which not a single example by Honthorst survives.

Comparing the figures of Charles in this portrait and in the *Apollo and Diana*, the hair and expression of the king are quite similar but the position of the head and shoulders as well as the use of light differ slightly. Based on this comparison, *King Charles I* seems to have functioned as a kind of ur-portrait from which variations were

---

[400] Rudi Ekkart, et al., *Dutch Portraits: The Age of Rembrandt and Frans Hals* (Zwolle: Waanders, 2007. Exh. cat., National Gallery, London, and "Hollanders in beeld: Portretten uit de Gouden Eeuw," Mauritshuis, The Hague.) p. 4, cat. no. 31: As early as 1618-22 most of the king's clothes were made in a 'greene, sea-greene or willow collour', frequently trimmed with another shade of green or 'scarlet, crimson or carnation'."

meant to derive. Furthermore, the absence of any surviving portrait drawings underscores the notion that Honthorst produced portraits based on earlier finished paintings rather than studies.

In this image Charles's gaze is shifted to his right, but seems unfocused, almost as if he is staring past the viewer in a contemplative or even melancholic mood. The slashed or paned style of his doublet and soft falling lace ruff accord with contemporary fashion imported from France, depicted in an engraving by Jacques Callot (1592-1635) of about 1625 (Fig. 3.35; Williamstown, The Sterling and Francine Clark Art Institute).[401] Also in keeping with fashionable trends—and also seen in Callot's engraving—are his pointed beard and mustache as well as the long curled lock of hair falling over his left shoulder, known as a *cadenette*, or lovelock, for its show of dedication to a loved one.[402] The now-discolored blue sash that crosses the king's chest is that of the Order of the Garter. Marked by the pendant of Saint George slaying the dragon, the sash here most likely bore the more modest of the two options,

---

[401] Ekkart, *Dutch Portraits*, p. 4, cat. no. 31. This style of doublet was popular in France already in the early 1620s, as evidenced by Callot's engraving, and was imported to England on a the tide of French fashions and customs that accompanied Charles's marriage to Henrietta Maria in 1625. Jane Ashelford, *The Art of Dress: Clothes and Society 1500-1914* (New York: Harry N. Abrams; London: National Trust Enterprises Limited, 1996): p. 68. By the early 1630s this style of doublet and other French cuts was also popular among the fashion-forward in the Netherlands. See, for example, Thomas de Keyser's *Portrait of a Gentleman* from 1632 now in the Musée du Louvre (RF 1560). For De Keyser's portrait see Ekkart, *Dutch Portraits*, p. 152, cat. no. 35.

[402] Ekkart, *Dutch Portraits*, p. 4, cat. no. 31.

the lesser George (Fig. 3.12), as evidenced by a later portrait by Mytens (Fig. 3.33). The greater George was more ceremonial in nature, larger, and hung from an elaborate chain, as seen in a posthumous portrait of Frederick V of Bohemia by Honthorst (Fig. 3.36; Heidelberg, Kurpfälzisches Museum). Though the George is not visible in Honthorst's *Charles I*, the blue sash alone was enough to call the Order to mind for a contemporary viewer. However, the wearing of the lesser George should not indicate a sense of informality. According to historian Kevin Sharpe, beginning with his ascension to the throne in 1625 Charles exhibited a passionate interest in restoring the proprieties and ceremonies of the Order, as it represented his deeply held values of chivalry, piety, masculinity, and chastity.[403]

The type of court culture that Charles I sought to promote through his images was marked by a duality in which he presented publicly as both an ideal ruler and idealized lover, themes which find potent realization in Honthorst's portrait. Though Honthorst's *Charles I* contains more psychological depth than many other portraits of its type by him, the physical immobility of the sitter even in the midst of supposed movement presents him as the embodiment of the ideal neo-stoic state of *tranquilitas* achieved through rationality and self-control.[404]

---

[403] Sharpe, "The Image of Virtue," p. 241. On p. 242 Sharpe adds that, as told by one of Charles I's Bedchamber men, "Charles never failed to wear the George." See also Arthur K. Wheelock et al., *Anthony van Dyck* (Washington: National Gallery of Art, 1990. Exh. cat.): p. 420.

[404] Adams, *Public Faces,* p. 79.

In vogue among the burghers of Honthorst's native Holland and the nobility of the court alike, portraits evoking *tranquilitas* were especially popular for that value's association with those who rule.[405] As Ann Jensen Adams explains, tranquility was the product of "militant self-discipline" and a state of the highest moral virtue, recalling the evocation of the neo-stoic ruling principle to which Charles alluded when he wrote at the end of his life that he had learned to "own ourself by retiring into ourself" as quoted above.[406] The importance of the outward expression of such inner virtues was emphasized to Charles in his early education, including the *Basilikon Doron* of his father, James I. This portrait of Charles may therefore be seen as attempting to convey his public image, but was so singular and its impact so minimal that we might conclude that in that sense it was not successful. While *Apollo and Diana* is more obviously public in its connection to the masque and court ceremony, the differences in intimacy between these two paintings does not quite exemplify the public/private split notable in Charles's behavior after Buckingham's assassination.

That Charles's expression can be interpreted as subdued or even melancholic relates the image and his public persona more generally to broader ideas of character and leadership in this period. In the seventeenth century melancholy was often associated with nobility of mind and a disposition towards deep thought and

---

[405] Adams, *Public Faces*, pp. 79-81.

[406] Adams, *Public Faces*, p. 85. The notion of *tranquilitas* derives from the revival of Roman stoicism found in sixteenth-century humanist writings.

philosophical musings, and the contemplative shepherd—often pictured leaning forward and holding attributes in the embodiment of a role rather than presentation of a sitter (Fig. 3.37; New York, Private coll.)—personified the ideal, noble character in pursuit of gentle love.[407] Honthorst's image thus transforms the seductive, pastoral half-lengths with a stoicism and contemplation that casts the king as the impeccable monarch as well as idealized lover. Charles's ambitions to be portrayed as both simultaneously are demonstrated not only in Honthorst's images, but also in the masque performances of the Caroline court, discussed below in relation to the *Apollo and Diana*. Honthorst's *King Charles I* therefore presents an image of the king centrally connected to the court itself in addition to the neo-stoic *tranquilitas* befitting a European monarch, demonstrating a commitment to the king's ruling philosophy of self-regulation and restraint.[408]

Another four (no longer extant) paintings that Honthorst completed in London are particularly important in this regard. These were a pair of portraits of Charles and Henrietta Maria as a Shepherd and Shepherdess, whose commission was likely spurred by Poelenburgh's portraits of Frederick and Elizabeth that she had sent to

---

[407] Parry, *Golden Age Restor'd,* p. 222; Kettering, *Dutch Arcadia*, p. 35.

[408] Sharpe, "Van Dyck, the Royal Image and the Caroline Court," p. 17; Adams, *Public Faces*, p. 89: in addition to this concept's importance in Charles's court, William of Orange's motto was the neo-stoic sentiment SAEVIS TRANQVILLVS IN VINDIS [Calm in the Midst of Raging Seas], which was adopted as well by Fredrik Hendrik and demonstrated in an allegory by Honthorst of *The Steadfastness of Frederik Hendrik* (The Hague, Huis ten Bosch, Oranjezaal).

London in August 1628 as a gift for her brother.[409] Honthorst apparently painted two sets of these pastoral half-lengths, one of which was kept by Charles and the other sent with Honthorst to Elizabeth.[410] Honthorst alluded to the specific nature of the portraits that Charles sent to The Hague in a letter to Dudley Carleton on 29 December 1628, stating that he had

> delivered the letter and the two portraits from his Majesty to the Queen of Bohemia, and on opening them her Majesty expressed great satisfaction, and that it was very agreeable to see the Queen of England in that style of dress in which it is her pleasure to be painted, or in one of a similar fashion.[411]

Elizabeth confirms this enthusiasm, stating in January 1629 that, "I esteeme those [pictures] you did send me of the Queene and yours my cheef iewells [chief jewels]."[412] Elizabeth's enthusiasm for Honthorst's depictions and the artist's comments indicate that a previous pair of portraits by Poelenburgh that she sent to Charles may not have been pastoral in theme. Nevertheless, her brother knew of

---

[409] Elizabeth to Dudley Carleton in London, 26 August 1628, in Akkerman 2015, letter no. 483, p. 707 & 708n2. Akkerman also puts forth the idea that the portraits of Charles and Henrietta Maria were commissioned as a result of two Poelenburgh portraits (see p. 716n7).

[410] This is based on an entry in Van der Doort's inventory (Millar 1960, p. 175, no. 21): "In the Queens litle dressing roome. the Queens owne pictures in Sheephirds habbitt done by Hunthirst." Kettering (*Dutch Arcadia*, p. 67), and Judson/Ekkart 1999 (pp. 296, no. 416, and 297, no. 418) both state that the originals were retained for the Royal Collection and that Charles commissioned copies of the portraits to send to his sister.

[411] Carpenter 1844, p. 181

[412] Akkerman 2015, letter 489 postscript, p. 715.

Elizabeth's enthusiasm for the pastoral; she was a great admirer of the Dutch gift to Amalia van Solms in 1627, which included a Shepherd and Shepherdess by Paulus Moreelse (Fig. 3.38; Schwerin, Staatliches Museum).[413]

In any event, we can estimate that the portraits of Charles and Henrietta Maria were half-length and approximately life-size, based on the conventions of shepherd/shepherdess pictures in general and of pastoral portraits as an independent genre. These pastoral portraits would have emphasized the virtuous love of Charles and Henrietta Maria's marriage as well as evoking an air of courtly elegance with their pleasing, decorative effect.[414] If the pastoral portraits were indeed half-length and life-size, Honthorst's *Charles I* could have served as the basis for both pairs as well as for Charles's image in the *Apollo and Diana*. The prominent *cadenette*, moreover, supports its use for a romantic theme such as a pastoral pair.

Painted on a light gray ground that is visible in several places with the naked eye where the upper paint layers are cracking, the surface is in overall good condition. Honthorst appears to have painted the face and hair last, as was his typical practice. In order to blend the transitions between areas of different tones and provide the figure with a soft, delicate texture, Honthorst blended paint together using feather-like strokes or even a blending brush. This is visible most strikingly in Charles's proper

---

[413] Kettering, *Dutch Arcadia*, p. 67.

[414] Kettering, *Dutch Arcadia*, pp. 63-66.

left cheek, where his moustache merges fluidly with the skin and hair beneath it (Fig. 3.39). This technique is also seen on the left side of his collar, which completely fades into the only slightly darker background (Fig. 3.40). Moving across the collar toward the right side of the painting, the method of application changes gradually, so that the right edge of the collar is shaped by pure strokes of white paint that delineate the appearance of lace against the dark background (Fig. 3.41).

A precise but efficient painter, Honthorst often used the ground layer as a mid-tone, as he did here in many of the shadows which model the figure, including those that define the layers of lace in Charles's ruff. Some small *pentimenti* are visible to the naked eye, including the reduction of the contour of Charles's proper left sleeve. This indicates that Honthorst wrestled, at least minimally, with perfecting the work's composition even though there is no evidence that it was used for direct transfer.

The painting likely left the royal collection during the Commonwealth Sale; it was sold by Christie's in 1866 from the collection of Henry Farrer (1844-1903), a London-born artist then based in New York.[415] The work was probably looted by Nazi troops in World War II, and did not resurface until 1956, when it was exhibited at the Archives Nationales in Paris from the Collection of Ulysse Moussali.[416] In March

---

[415] Sale 15 June 1866, Lot 122.

[416] Provenance information courtesy of the National Portrait Gallery Archives, London, registered packet for NPG 4444. The exhibition was entitled "France-Ecosse," and the painting was no. 375.

1965 the painting came onto the market again, and was purchased by the London dealers Leggatt Brothers for the National Portrait Gallery.[417] Moussali was likely quite pleased with this outcome, as just six months prior he had called the National Portrait Gallery's director, Sir David Piper (dir. 1964-67) to convey his anxiety that the picture "should not go via dealers to the American market."[418]

As emphasized in Charles's early education and many treatises on comportment that proliferated during this period, *King Charles I* highlights the particular potential of increasingly naturalistic portraiture's ability to make invisible virtues visible in its transmitting, translating, reproducing, and disseminating of the royal image. *King Charles I* seems to have been conceived of as an independent portrait and indeed could have followed *Apollo and Diana* rather than serving as the basis for it. Though the painting is not signed, its quality suggests that it was a finished work in its own right, regardless of the reasons for its genesis.[419]

---

[417] Bill of sale dated 2 April 1965 is preserved in the National Portrait Gallery Archives, London, registered packet for NPG 4444.

[418] Typed memorandum dated 28 October 1964, signed "DP," in of the National Portrait Gallery Archives, London, registered packet for NPG 4444.

[419] A report by Anton Stanczyk dated January 1983 details his restoration of the picture, and notes that he "uncovered signature of G. Honthrost." A handwritten note on the report asks "where & in what manner?", but there is no further clarification, nor is there any present evidence of a signature on the painting. Report courtesy of National Portrait Gallery Archives, London, registered packet for NPG 4444.

Apollo and Diana

The largest and best-known product of Honthorst's time in London is the *Apollo and Diana* (Fig. 3.4), which today hangs at Hampton Court Palace. In his *Teutsche Academie* of 1675, Sandrart describes accompanying Honthorst to London and provides a reliable, first-person account of his time there. Sandrart recounts not only that Honthorst had been called to England specifically to paint *Apollo and Diana* but also records the work's original location in the Banqueting House at Whitehall Palace as well as the large sum (3,000 guilders [*f*]) which Honthorst received upon his departure.[420]

In the politics of portraiture at the Stuart court, Charles was seeking new visual forms to establish the king as virtuous both in rule and in love, and as a glorious patron of the arts. His interest in foreign artists is evocative of his ambitions to insert the Caroline image into the international language of court culture. Honthorst's *Apollo and* Diana, with its ambitious allegorical scheme, can be read as a response to Charles's collecting interests. Honthorst's command of Caravaggesque chiaroscuro in *Apollo and Diana* evokes Arundel's comments from 1621 when he described the *Sack of Troy* as being in "y^{e} manor of Caravagioes colouringe." This style is synthesized with a classical sensibility in the subject and arrangement of figures, resulting in a new type of international style that was particularly well suited to the work's placement

---

[420] TA 1675, II, Book 3, pp. 303-4.

and context. Though Gerbier's invitation, quoted above, indicate that both the king and Buckingham had commissions in mind for the artist, the latter was likely more crucial in the genesis of the Hampton Court picture.[421] Given the prominent place that gifts held in the uses of paintings at Charles's court, as well as the major role played by Buckingham in the painting itself, *Apollo and Diana* makes sense as a gift from Buckingham to Charles, evoking the close friendship between the two men and encapsulating the court culture and the ambitions of the king.

A preparatory drawing for the painting exists in Rotterdam (Fig. 3.42; Museum Boijmans van Beuningen), which, though sharing the same basic compositional elements, evidences that Honthorst made several changes to the costuming and arrangement of his figures and suggesting that there was a second preliminary stage before the construction of the final painting. In the finished image Charles and Henrietta Maria assume the mythological guises of Apollo and Diana and oversee Buckingham as Mercury as he presents personifications of the liberal arts. Immediately to his right is Grammar—possibly a portrait of Katherine Villiers, Duchess of Buckingham—holding a book with the alphabet of which Mercury and Apollo were thought to be the partial composers.[422] She reaches up toward

---

[421] Jeremy Wood states that Buckingham likely conceived of the *Apollo and Diana*, though the work was reputedly paid for by the king, likely referring to the large sum that the king awarded to Honthorst soon after his arrival ("Orazio Gentileschi," p. 113). See also Rosenblatt, *Libeling Painting,* p. 68.

[422] One account of this comes from the *Fabulae*, first published in Europe in 1535 and attributed to Gaius Julius Hyginus (c. 64 BC – 17 CE), a Latin author. In *Fabula* 277

Charles/Apollo with her right hand, extending the key to the liberal arts and thus an ideal court to the king.[423] A group of allegorical figures and their attributes—including Music, Astronomy, Mathematics and Architecture—unfolds behind Buckingham, the retinue surrounded by putti who trumpet and throw flowers.[424]

The painting's cost has been the subject of some confusion among art historians; in light of the available evidence it is not clear whether Honthorst was paid by £420 by Charles or £700 by Buckingham. Sandrart documents Honthorst's success in London and enumerates the rewards for his work, of which *Apollo and Diana* was the centerpiece. Upon his departure, Honthorst received 3,000 guilders (*f*), a silver service for twelve, and a costly horse.[425] Prior to this, he was awarded a lifetime pension of £100 per annum, and later was made an English citizen on 28 November

---

the author recounts: "The Parcae, Clotho, Lachesis, and Atropos invented seven Green letters—A B H T I ϒ. Others say that Mercury invented them from the flight of cranes, which, when they fly, form letters. Palamedes, too, son of Nauplius, invented eleven letters; Simonides, too, invented four letters—Ω E Z Φ; Epicharmus of Sicily, two—Π and Ψ. The Greek letters Mercury is said to have first brought to Egypt, and from Egypt Cadmus took them to Greece. Cadmus, exile from Arcadia, took them to Italy, and his mother Carmenta changed them to Latin to the number of 15. Apollo on the lyre added the rest." As translated in Mary Grant, ed., *The Myths of Hyginus* (Lawrence: University of Kansas Press, 1960): *Fabula* 277 (CCLXXVII), pp. 178-79.

[423] Parry, *Golden Age Restor'd*, p. 227.

[424] Parry, *Golden Age Restor'd*, p. 227 identifies the goat as satire, while Rosenblatt (*Libeling Painting*, p. 71n168) identifies it as base passion, and the other two figures as Envy and Hate.

[425] TA 1675, II, Book 3, p. 304.

1628.[426] Also in November, he was paid £420 by a warrant of the Privy Seal for work done for the king.[427]

The 3,000 *f* Honthorst received has sometimes been interpreted as payment for the *Apollo and Diana*.[428] However, Sandrart lists this amount after recounting that Honthorst completed "some pictures of the royal couple," so there is no reason to assume that this sum was for a single painting.[429] In order to gain a more complete picture of the monetary value placed on court paintings, it is worth looking briefly in detail at these two amounts, the £420 recorded by the crown and the 3,000 *f* that Sandrart mentions, to consider whether they might be the same payment, with Sandrart translating the amount into the more comprehensible currency of guilders in his *Teutsche Academie*.

The pound was relatively stable throughout the seventeenth century and had a high exchange rate with most other European currencies. If the exchange rate were seven or eight guilders for every English pound, then the £420 figure would be close

---

[426] Judson/Ekkart 1999, cat. no. 92, p. 108. For the pension see Millar, "Charles I, Honthorst, and Van Dyck," p. 36 (based on SP 39/27, pension grant 13 November 1628).

[427] Millar, "Charles I, Honthorst, and Van Dyck," p. 36 (based on PRO Ind: 6808): The warrant authorizes the payment of £500, £420 to Honthorst and £80 to Vroom. See also Judson/Ekkart 1999, p. 108 and Carpenter 1844, p. 179.

[428] See Millar, "Charles I, Honthorst, and Van Dyck," p. 36.

[429] TA 1675, II, Book 3, p. 303. See also Appendix B, no. 2.

to the 3,000 *f* quoted by Sandrart.[430] 3,000 *f*, if equivalent to or more than £420, would furthermore be a huge sum for a single painting, even one as large as the *Apollo and Diana*. In 1629, Honthorst's only slightly smaller *Seladon and Astraea* (Fig. 4.18) cost the king £210 and was later valued at £100 pounds in the Commonwealth Inventories.[431] As Buckingham was the probable patron or original designer of the picture, Charles would have paid for it in light of his friend's death rather than as part of a planned commission.

---

[430] That the exchange rate heavily favored the pound can be seen in Charles's negotiations with the Flemish painter Jacob Jordaens (1593-1678) for a series of canvases of the history of Cupid and Psyche for The Queen's House at Greenwich in 1640. As Buckingham's secretary Balthazar Gerbier wrote to the royal architect Inigo Jones, "Jordaens doth not know for whom the picture is & it will be well he remayns (as long as possible) in that thrifty ignorance for these men know that a pound sterling is more than a patacon." D. Schlugleit, "L'Abbe de Scaglia, Jordaens et l''Histoire de Psyche' de Greenwich-House (1639-1642)," *Revue belge d'archéologie et d'histoire de l'art* (1937): p. 142. Patacon refers to any number of silver coins used in the Spanish and Portuguese territories from the sixteenth through the eighteenth centuries, and makes sense in this discussion of Jordaens, who was working in Spanish-controlled Antwerp, in the Southern Netherlands: "patacon, n." OED Online, June 2017, Oxford University Press. <http://www.oed.com.udel.idm.oclc.org/view/Entry/138671?redirectedFrom=patacon > (Accessed July 19, 2017).

[431] Warrant of payment Sainsbury 1859, p. 295. *Apollo and Diana* does not appear in the Commonwealth Sale Inventories (1649), at least not in a description that may be securely connected to the present painting. Many of the paintings in the Inventories were valued somewhat low, as they were priced to move to recoup as much of Charles's massive debts as possible. *Seladon and Astraea* is probably the same as that described as "The family of y^{e} Q of Bohemia," which, at £100, was valued far higher than Honthorst's other paintings in the inventories (Millar 1972, p. 273, no. 274).

This would mean that Charles was following through on Buckingham's promised price for the painting and incorporated it into a payment for all the works that Honthorst produced for the crown. The £420 figure would then not be entirely out of character. In 1621, Buckingham had paid £275 for the large *Ecce Homo* by Titian (Fig. 3.43; Vienna, Kunsthistorisches Museum). Around 1629 he paid £300 to Orazio Gentileschi for his *Penitent Mary Magdalene* (Fig. 3.44; Vienna, Kunsthistorisches Museum), an exorbitant price given that equivalent works were valued between £50 and £80 in the Commonwealth Inventories. Furthermore, in 1625 Buckingham had paid another large sum to a living artist: £500 to Rubens for his now-destroyed equestrian portrait of the Duke (Fig. 5.4).[432] Thus, £420 for a painting of the scale and prominence of *Apollo and Diana* was well within Buckingham's established range around this time. Nevertheless, it makes more sense that the crown included in this sum at least a few of the six other paintings that Honthorst completed in London, making the price more reasonable.

An account from later in the century supports the argument for the painting as a gift from Buckingham to Charles but also points to another possible payment scenario: that Honthorst was given £700 by the Duke himself. The surgeon James Yonge (1647-1721) visited Hampton Court in 1681, where he describes seeing the *Apollo and Diana* at one end of a large gallery:

---

[432] Wood, "Orazio Gentileschi," p. 112.

> an excellent piece of paint, very large, given to K. Charles the First by the Duke of Buckingham, and was the picture of a Mask wherein the King and Queen, the Duke of Buckingham and his Duchess, and many ladies are done to the life. It cost the Duke £700.[433]

As discussed above, £700 would have been an astronomically high price for a single work, £200 more than the Duke paid to Rubens in 1625, and more than double the amount he paid for a Titian in 1621.[434] Yonge was born almost twenty years after the Duke's assassination, and therefore it is quite possible that his number is inflated. As argued above, furthermore, it is probable that it was the crown, and not Buckingham, who paid Honthorst for *Apollo and Diana*. Nevertheless, this account does provide concrete evidence for the legendary, even infamous status that the painting enjoyed after Buckingham, Charles, and even Honthorst's deaths: a work of impressive scale, skill, and price.

Apollo and Diana's placement in the seventeenth century and thus its initial reception at Charles's court is also insufficiently understood. Our knowledge of the work's first location comes from Sandrart, who states that it was hung in the Banqueting House at Whitehall Palace, finished in 1622 by Inigo Jones after fire

---

[433] Yonge and Poynter, ed., *Journal of James Yonge*, p. 180.

[434] Christopher White argues, in spite of the fact that Yonge did not witness this transaction directly, that it makes more sense than Sandrart's claim about the king's patronage. White furthermore argues, to me unconvincingly, that the claim that the Duke paid £700 for the painting frees the £420 payment to cover the other paintings that Honthorst completed for the Crown in 1628. White and De Sancha 2015, p. 182.

destroyed the previous Banqueting House in 1619 (Fig. 3.45).[435] Jones's classically inspired landmark is virtually all that remains of the seventeenth-century palace, which was destroyed by another fire in 1698.[436] As early as 1954 Oliver Millar questioned Sandrart's account of the work's placement, pointing to its location in storage at Whitehall in Van der Doort's 1637 inventory, though Millar considers the rest of the account to be accurate.[437] Judson rightly notes the reliability of Sandrart's narrative, particularly his description of *Apollo and Diana* (Fig. 3.4) as,

> a very large work, in which Apollo and Diana (in which the king and queen's pictures are given) sit on high in the clouds together and watch as Mercurius in the image of the Duke of Buckingham leads the seven liberal arts with him from the earth and introduces them to the King. It is very splendidly and reasonably drawn, and colorfully painted in the formation of every special property. By contrast, the harmful vices Envy and Hatred are overthrown by virtuous Love.[438]

Judson argues, furthermore, that the work was indeed originally hung in the Banqueting House and was removed from there in the late 1630s.[439] This is supported by Per Palme, who in his 1957 study of the Banqueting House argues that the obvious

---

[435] TA 1675, II, Book 3, p. 303. For the Banqueting House see Simon Thurley, *Whitehall Palace: An Architectural History of the Royal Apartments, 1240-1698* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1999): pp. 82-87.

[436] Thurley, *Whitehall Palace*, p. ix.

[437] Millar, "Charles I, Honthorst, and Van Dyck," p. 36.

[438] TA 1675, II, Book 3, pp. 303-4. See also Appendix B, no. 2.

[439] Judson/Ekkart 1999, p. 107, cat. no. 92.

placement for the painting was the central intercolumniation at the south end of the hall, above Charles's throne and canopy (Fig. 3.46).[440]

In the first edition of his catalogue of the Dutch pictures in the British Royal Collection, Christopher White suggests that the painting was cut down at some early date to adapt to various display spaces. As early as 1735 Vertue records the painting in its current position in the Queen's Staircase at Hampton Court, and if the measurements from an inventory done for Charles II (r. 1660-85) are correct (183 x 265 in), the painting would have had to be cut down to reach its current size (140.5 x 252 in; 357 x 640 cm).[441]

White also suggests, based on these early measurements, that the painting would have been just slightly too large for the southern intercolumnar space, as

---

[440] Per Palme, *Triumph of Peace: A Study of the Whitehall Banqueting House* (London: Thames and Hudson, 1957): pp. 263-264.

[441] White, *Dutch Pictures*, p. 54; White and De Sancha 2015, pp. 180-181. This inventory is referenced by several authors but no archival notations are given. Judson, for example, gives the date as ca. 1666-67 and *Apollo and Diana* as no. 195 (Judson/Ekkart 1999, p. 107), but does not indicate the location of the manuscript. In 2014 Griffey ("A brief description: the language of Stuart inventories," *Studi di Memofonte* 12 [2014]: p. 18) elucidated the matter, describing the inventory as "*King Charles II's Collection, An Inventory of All His Majesties Pictures in Whitehall, in Hampton Court and in Stoare, Copy of a contemporary MS. in the possession of H.M. The Queen*, transcribed by O. Millar, London 1922 (unpublished)." I thank Brett Dolman, curator at Historic Royal Palaces, for pointing me toward this inventory's location, in the Royal Collection Trust (RCIN 1112575), in correspondence about an earlier draft of this chapter on 16 November 2017.

suggested by Palme based on the work's present dimensions.[442] The painting would have exceeded this 22-foot distance by less than an inch (0.96 inches, not including a frame), but White's refutation of Palme presupposes one important thing. That even if the earlier dimensions are accurate, an inch means the same today that it did in the time of Charles II. This is of course impossible to know with certainty, as Britain did not adopt a constant national standard for the length of an inch until 1930.[443] Though White's argument that the painting was cut down is convincing on stylistic grounds and in comparison with the preparatory drawing (Fig. 3.42), it is not addressed in the extensive technical notes on the painting in the newest edition of the catalogue.[444] It is also probable that the painting has not been removed from its current place in the staircase's paneling for decades, even centuries, making in-depth examination difficult.

Sandrart's location of *Apollo and Diana* in the Banqueting House is important for considering the original context of the painting and its function for Charles and his courtiers. In that space, it would have resonated with the elaborate masques staged

---

[442] White, *Dutch Pictures*, p. 56.

[443] United States Department of Commerce and National Bureau of Standards, *Report of the Twenty-Fifth National Conference on Weights and Measures* (Washington: United States Government Printing Office, Miscellaneous Publication M156, 1936): p. 4.

[444] White and De Sancha 2015, pp. 181-182.

there.[445] These performances, featuring the king, queen, and members of court, were a vital fixture in Charles's London. These productions, which often presented the monarchs as mythological figures, were characterized by the movement from disorder to order precipitated by the arrival onstage of the king and queen as virtuous exemplars.[446] Seen as presenting higher truths in a spectacle that was as much about the courtly participants as anything else, the masques are equally present in Honthorst's painting, which features portraits of court members.[447]

While the masque overlapped the real and fictional by spatially dissolving the boundary between the two through the use of illusionistic stage sets, it also collapsed the two temporally by including recognizable figures in historic guise.[448] The

---

[445] For the definitive study of Inigo Jones's Stuart masques see Stephen Orgel and Roy C. Strong, *Inigo Jones. The Theatre of the Stuart Court*, 2 vols. (London: Sotheby Parke Bernet, 1973). For some historical and cultural studies of the masques see David M. Bevington and Peter Holbrook, eds., *The Politics of the Stuart Court Masque* (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 1998); Martin Butler, *The Stuart Court Masque and Political Culture* (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 2008); Sir James Knowles, *Politics and Political Culture in the Court Masque* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2015); Jerzy Limon and Agnieszka Żukowska, "Staging the Royal Blend: Time Structures in George Chapman's *Memorable Masque*," in *The Palatine Wedding of 1613,* pp. 319-338.

[446] Sharpe, "Van Dyck, the Royal Image and the Caroline Court," p. 16; see also Sharpe, "The Image of Virtue," pp. 258-59. Parry (*Golden Age Restor'd*, p. 184) describes that masques "act as a vindication of royal autocracy, not by an explicit defence of Charles's political actions, but by an assertion of powers so sublime that their exercise is inevitable, irresistible and benign."

[447] Rosenblatt, *Libeling Painting*, p. 69.

[448] Rosenblatt, *Libeling Painting*, p. 70.

inclusion of portraits in *Apollo and Diana* would have invited fascination and elicited a personal connection from a contemporary audience, who would experience the painting first and foremost as portraits of people they knew and only secondarily as the evocation of a masque. By including portraits of court members in a fantastical painted setting, Honthorst's image furthermore utilizes the masque's own language to codify the visual program of the Caroline dramatic allegory while also functioning as a living allegory in the manner of Rubens. As discussed in detail in Chapter 5, the large-scale compositions by both Rubens and Van Dyck that Honthorst saw in London would have an indelible impact upon his conception of the *Apollo and Diana*.

The appearance of the monarchs as Apollo and Diana also references a masque staged at Whitehall in 1625 on the occasion of the marriage of Charles and Henrietta Maria, *The Fortunate Isles and Their Union*, where Prince Charles, the chief masquer, was presented on a floating island—a large set that actually moved about the hall—in reference to the mythology of the Island of Delos, where the twins Apollo and Diana were born.[449] The masque's dialogue reinforces the theme of the two parties being linked as one: upon the appearance of the island the chorus rejoices, "Then, Up, with

---

[449] Peacock, "The Visual Image," pp. 188-189. The Island's name in Jonson's play, "Macaria," is a transliteration of the Greek for "Island of the Blessed," and its description as a floating island that is then tied down alludes further to Delos, which was initially free-floating but which Zeus later chained to the floor of the sea. For more on the etymology of Macaria and the tradition of the fortunate isles in British literature see Josephine Waters Bennett, "Britain among the Fortunate Isles," *Studies in Philology* 53, no. 2 (April 1956): p. 127.

their notes, they raise the Prince of Men. And sing the present Prophecie that goes Of ioyning the bright Lillie, and the Rose."[450] The Lily (Henrietta Maria) and the Rose (Charles) are joined in virtuous love, twinned like Apollo and Diana. This imagery in turn inspired the first medal of Charles's reign, produced later that year, in which the he and Henrietta Maria are again represented as Apollo and Diana (Fig. 3.47; London, British Museum).[451]

Albion's Triumph, a masque performed in celebration of Twelfth Night in 1632, continued this twinned imagery when it instructed that "Gods, Poets, and Priests ioyne, and sing a Valediction to Hymens Twin the Mary-Charles...And Mary-Charles whose mindes within, And Bodyes make but Hymens Twin, Long live they so, And Brest, to Brest, May Angels sing them to their Rest."[452] The invocation of Hymen, the ancient Greek god of marriage, explicitly connects Charles and Henrietta Maria's union to virtuous love, a strong secondary theme of Stuart masques.[453] The king and queen in various guises represented their romance as Platonic and chaste, triumphant

---

[450] Jonson 1625, image 12, left side.

[451] Peacock, "The Visual Image," pp. 188-189.

[452] Townshed 1632, p. 21.

[453] Anthony Miller, *Roman Triumphs and Early Modern English Culture* (Houndmills, Basingstoke, Hampshire; New York: Palgrave, 2001): p. 125. Miller argues that the evocation of Hymen here transforms Ovid's triumph of erotic love into something moral, "and elevated above any other version...The queen conquers even the sublimely virtuous king, not by the disruptive force of female sexuality but by feminine virtue."

over base appetites and embodying the self-regulation that equipped men to rule.[454] Thus in Honthorst's *Apollo and Diana*, as Sandrart described, Charles and Henrietta Maria sit ensconced in heavenly light while Envy and Hate are banished by Virtue and Love directly below.[455]

Apollo and Diana furthermore pays homage to the large, moveable sets of the masques. The cave from which the allegorical figures emerge at right bears a striking resemblance to many of the elaborate stagings designed for the Banqueting House by Inigo Jones, most notably one constructed in 1613 as part of the celebrations of Charles's sister Elizabeth's marriage: George Chapman's (c. 1559-1634) *The Memorable Masque of the Middle Temple and Lincoln's Inn*.[456] In the narrative description before the dialogue, Chapman introduces the major set-piece as "an Artificiall Rock, whose top was neere as high as the hall it selfe," from which some

---

[454] Sharpe, "Van Dyck, the Royal Image and the Caroline Court," p. 16; Sharpe, "The Image of Virtue," p. 259 emphasizes that through the masques and their manifold visual images, the king and queen exemplified love and union at court. Charles and Henrietta Maria's love for each other was well known among their contemporaries and the purity of their love and reign was often the subject of subtext of their visual imagery, as described by Parry (*Golden Age Restor'd*, p. 184).

[455] Judson/Ekkart 1999, no. 92, p. 107.

[456] *The Memorable Masque* was one of three masques and numerous other entertainments performed for Elizabeth's wedding. For these see the discussion in Chapter 4, pp. 222-23; on this masque in particular see Tucker Orbison, ed., *The Middle Temple Documents Relating to George Chapman's* The Memorable Masque (Oxford: Published for the Malone Society by Oxford University Press, 1983).

participants appear.[457] At the end of the first song, "the vpper part of the Rock was sodainly turn'd to a Cloude, discouering a rich and refulgent Mine of golde; in which the twelue Maskers vvere triumphantly seated: their Torch-bearers attending before them," causing their costumes to "spangle or spark."[458]

Knowledge of Apollo, Diana, and Mercury, and of the classical world more generally was furthermore important to the intellectual class in early modern England. Peacham's *Compleat Gentleman* (1634) urged that a gentleman's education was not "compleat" until he could "both heed and understand" antiquities like the Diana of Ephesus in Paris, and to "be able to distinguish...*Apollo* by his harpe, *Mercury* by his winges on his cap and feet, or by his Caduceus…[and] *Diana* by a crescent."[459] As the God of the sun, music, poetry, art, medicine, and the keeper of laws, Apollo was a potent identification figure for early modern rulers, most spectacularly in Louis XIV's incarnation as *Le Roi Soleil*.

Some art historians have interpreted *Apollo and Diana*'s location in storage in Van der Doort's inventory as evidence of the work's inferiority. Francis Haskell, for

---

[457] Chapman 1613, image 7, right side. The silver, pillared, octagonal Temple of Honour, symbolic of the Stuart Court, rested on the side of this rock.

[458] Chapman 1613, image 8, right side.

[459] Peacham 1634, pp. 105, 108-109; See also Margaret Aston, "Gods, Saints, and Reformers: Portraiture and Protestant England," in Lucy Gent, ed., *Albion's Classicism,* p. 208. On the use of Diana in British royal imagery since the time of Queen Elizabeth see Aston pp. 205-208.

example, calls the painting "somewhat ludicrous" and reads its storage as a marker of Honthorst's lack of skill and a consequent lack of appreciation for the painting. Haskell clearly finds certain elements of the painting disquieting: he refers to the figure of Grammar as being "personified by [Buckingham's] bare-breasted wife." He even goes so far as to rejoice in Honthorst's departure as the saving of Charles's "reputation as a patron," despite the fact that Charles continued to solicit work from the artist after his return to the Netherlands.[460]

In fact, the work's location "in Store at whit=hall…in y^{e} Passage roome betwene y^{e} Banquetting house & the privie lodgings", indicates that the painting could have been recently hung in the Banqueting House.[461] Haskell also does not take into account the other objects in the room, including two of Raphael's Cartoons for the Sistine Chapel Tapestries in a flat case (Fig. 3.48; London, Royal Collection Trust) and Rubens's *St. George* (Fig. 3.49; London, Royal Collection Trust), which, like the *Apollo and Diana*, were specifically purchased by the king.[462] The *St. George* is also

---

[460] Haskell, "Charles I's Collection of Pictures," p. 222.

[461] Millar 1960, p. 171.

[462] Charles purchased the seven extant tapestry cartoons in 1623 for replication at Mortlake, the Royal Tapestry Works. The cartoons had been cut into strips in the first quarter of the sixteenth century for the production of the original tapestries for the Sistine Chapel. They presumably arrived in England still in strips, but were probably (at least temporarily) reassembled in order to have copies made by the German artist Francis Cleyn (1582-1658), possibly in order to preserve the original cartoons from active use in the Mortlake workshops (Clare Browne, "The Cartoons at the Mortlake tapestry manufactory," in Mark Evans, Clare Browne, and Arnold Nesselrath, eds.,

noted as having been recently displayed in the "kings brekfast chamer," or in the Privy Lodgings, meaning that this storage room may have been used as a temporary staging area between the two spaces that it connects.[463] The interactions between the depicted figures—most of whose identities are no longer known—and their initial audience of Caroline courtiers could have gone so far as to affect reactions to and interpretations of the painting, and even when and where it was displayed.[464] In 1957 Palme made the suggestion that the painting was displayed or not displayed in the Banqueting House based on the occasion, as a depiction of a specific type of "royal reception."[465] Indeed, Erin Griffey's study of Henrietta Maria's place and presence at the Stuart court reveals the complex dynamics of such relationships when she describes *Apollo and Diana* as evidence that by 1628 Henrietta Maria was "worthy of representation on a big scale, alongside the king (and even with Buckingham, her erstwhile competitor for her husband's affections.)"[466]

Raphael: Cartoons and Tapestries for the Sistine Chapel [London: V&A Publishing]: pp. 54-56).

[463] Millar 1960, p. 171, no. 1 and p. 172, no. 2.

[464] The development of this idea was greatly aided by conversation and correspondence with Brett Dolman at Historic Royal Palaces on 10 and 16 November 2017.

[465] Palme, *Triumph of Peace*, p. 264.

[466] Griffey, *On Display*, p. 93.

This idea is reinforced by a note earlier in the inventory, where Van der Doort states that, "Heere followeth the number of yo^{r} Ma^{ts} Pictures and other things w^{ch} are—kept in store in severall places and: are as yet unplaced," indicating that "in store" was common parlance for the spaces where works were kept in the midst of curatorial changes.[467] This argument is supported by Griffey's recent analysis of the language of Stuart inventories, which notes a discrepancy between these documents and our modern understanding of display as governed by the idea that the highest quality is showcased while the lowest quality is hidden.[468] Another possibility to consider is that the painting was damaged and moved into storage while awaiting repair. The room also contained several damaged works, most notably five paintings from the Gonzaga collection that had arrived from Mantua badly damaged by mercury, or, as Van der Doort described, "utterlie ruined and Spoyled peeces by quicksilver."[469]

---

[467] Millar 1960, p. 156.

[468] Griffey, "A brief description," pp. 15-16.

[469] Millar 1960, pp. 173-174, nos. 10-14. Millar 1960, p. 172, no. 7 might also be included in this group, as it is described as a Mantua painting that is defaced. The paintings were unfortunately packed against a cargo of mercury, and when the *Margaret* sailed into a large storm several of the jars broke. (David Howarth, "'Mantua Peeces': Charles I and the Gonzaga Collections," in David Chambers and Jane Martineau, eds., *Splendours of the Gonzaga* [London: Victoria and Albert Museum, 1981. Exh. cat.]: p. 97). After 1632 Van Dyck was contracted to restore more than one of these damaged paintings (Wood, "Van Dyck's 'Cabinet de Titien'," p. 680).

Based on these possible reasons for storage, it is important to take the conservation history of the work into account. It is obvious even in reproduction that the condition of the painting is not pristine. The canvas has been lined, which might account for the exaggerated appearance of the seams, particularly near the bottom edge, where a pattern of losses is visible at center. The painting was cleaned in 1872, 1952, and 1978, and is currently in stable condition.[470] Black and white photographs documenting one of these previous restoration campaigns reveal extensive losses along the painting's central, horizontal seam, as well as another horizontal band of losses whose close proximity indicates that the painting was probably rolled or folded at some point (Fig. 3.50). Whatever the condition of the painting around the time of Van der Doort's inventory, it is clear that its location in storage does not necessitate the dismissal of its importance in Charles's picture collection and the culture of the Stuart court. Indeed, it both expanded the potential of the royal image and codified Honthorst's place as a transnational court painter.

Buckingham Group Portrait

The third and final extant painting that Honthorst completed in London, *George Villiers and his Family* (Fig. 3.6), has remained in Royal possession since 1628. Its subject matter, the family of Charles's murdered favorite, functioned to

---

[470] White, *Dutch Pictures*, p. 54; White and De Sancha 2015, pp. 180-181.

memorialize the men's friendship, while its display reveals the most intimate priorities of Charles's collection. In this image, as in *King Charles I* (Fig. 3.3) and the majority of Honthorst's later portraits, the sitters are positioned close to the picture plane across the foreground of the painting. At right is George Villiers, the eponymous 1st Duke of Buckingham, looking at the viewer while his body is angled to his right, toward his wife Katherine, infant son George (1628-87), and daughter Mary (1622-85). Buckingham sits in front of what seems to be a solid mass of stone or clouds, while his family is situated before a garden, the two landscapes divided by the tall rose bush rising behind Katherine.

As it did in *King Charles I*, the letter in Buckingham's right hand—in this case still folded—may connect this portrait with De Keyser's *Portrait of Constantijn Huygens and his Clerk*, with all three presented as men conducting ongoing and important business. The presence of a landscape behind Buckingham's family, on the other hand, fits in with several Dutch images where this dichotomy is presented as the wife's or family's luring a husband away from his higher moral and intellectual pursuits.[471] Throughout the century, images of this active/contemplative dichotomy could be deployed to present a positive, complex, and harmonious view of married life, as it is in Jan de Bray's (ca. 1627-97) *Abraham Casteleyn and Margarieta van*

---

[471] David R. Smith, "Rembrandt's Early Double Portraits and the Dutch Conversation Piece," *The Art Bulletin* 64, no. 2 (June 1982): pp. 276-78.

Bancken (Fig. 3.51; 1663; Amsterdam, Rijksmuseum).[472] Indeed, in Honthorst's painting all of the other members of Buckingham's family turn definitively away from him, with little George lunging enthusiastically for the bundle of flowers that his sister has brought in from the landscape beyond. However, Buckingham does not appear conflicted, turning calmly and without a hint of tension toward his family, existing just apart from them in the painted space but nevertheless angling his arm and body emphatically in their direction.

The palette of the *Duke of Buckingham* is closer to what would come to be associated with Honthorst's court paintings than anything else that survives from his London sojourn. Namely, the direct, even lighting that falls on the four figures, all positioned across the foreground, the smoothly and directly painted flowers held by Mary, and especially the bright yellow of the Duchess of Buckingham's gown are all hallmarks of Honthorst's courtly modality. The brightness of the painting's palette is somewhat diminished by the work's condition, including a discolored varnish. It was lined sometime before 1866, which affected the texture by exaggerating the coarse particles of the dark gray ground layer, a distortion made even more prominent by the general abrasion throughout, particularly in the figures, and series of losses along the edges and seams.[473] A seventeenth-century copy of the work in the collection of the

---

[472] Smith, "Rembrandt's Early Double Portraits," pp. 278-79.

[473] White and De Sancha 2015, p. 185.

National Portrait Gallery, London demonstrates the extent to which the paint of the Honthorst may have darkened (Fig. 3.52).[474] Despite its thick and brittle varnish, the Portrait Gallery copy nevertheless boasts an overall brighter appearance, particularly in the background, the Duke's costume, and the blue ribbon details decorating the clothing of all four figures.[475] Indeed, close examination of the Royal Collection painting reveals extensive degradation and subsequent strengthening of the background, particularly the sky at left and behind the figure of the Duke, which today exhibits a kind of halo as a result.[476]

The painting nevertheless has a high level of quality, particularly in the delicate execution of the smaller, decorative details that animate the otherwise stoic composition. The embellishment on Mary's red dress, the Duchess's falling lace collar, and several of the flowers were painted directly on top of the upper paint layers. This additive process of paint application is particularly effective in evoking the texture of garments. In particular, the details of Mary's dress virtually sparkle under

---

[474] Honthorst's *Duke of Buckingham* exists in several copies and variations. For these see White and De Sancha 2015, p. 185.

[475] Conservation report Helen White Conservation, 3 March 2004, courtesy of National Portrait Gallery Archives, registered packet for NPG 711. Baby George wears a gold-mounted finger of coral suspended from a blue ribbon. This was thought to protect the infant from illness and the evil eye as well as to promote the growth of teeth (see Kemp, "'Wrought by No Artist's Hand'," p. 182).

[476] My examination on 24 April 2017 was greatly assisted by the support and evaluations of Rosanna de Sancha, Paintings Conservator for the Royal Collection Trust.

close examination, rendered in quick, firm strokes of yellow, white, and red paint that only resolve into their final forms when viewing the work at some distance (as originally intended and replicated by its current place over a mantle at Windsor Castle). The brushwork becomes less tight and measured the closer one moves to the bottom of the dress, serving to focus the eye on the essential details of the upper part of the garment, closer to Mary's face. The same holds true in the treatment of Catherine's yellow dress, which is rendered in more detail at the top and dissolves into broad brushstrokes below her waist. Additionally, Honthorst sometimes utilized wet-in-wet painting in order to form the small, uppermost details of some objects. In this painting, for example, the only clear example of the technique is in the lily just below Mary's brooch, where the paint appears almost carved to shape the flower's stamen.[477]

Early in the inventory of Charles's collection, Van der Doort lists ten paintings "In the *ju M* Bedchamber" at Whitehall Palace.[478] All of the items on this list are described in unerring detail, including no. 8, *George Villiers with his Family* (Fig. 3.6). It reads:

> Item above the Chimney the duke of Buckingham with his Ladie and two children *wherebij a lantschip bing* half figu[rs] soe bigg as the life. In a Carved guilded frame *paijntit opan de raeht lijeht opan klaeht* [lit

[477] This detail was observed by Rosanna de Sancha during our examination of the painting on 24 April 2017.

[478] Millar 1960, p. 35.

> from the left painted on cloth/canvas] Done By: Hunthirst *auff ijtrecht* [of Utrecht].[479]

The italicized portions in the above quotation are Van der Doort's clarifying notes (written in a somewhat Anglicized version of his native Dutch and often placed by means of a caret) usually serve to add pictorial descriptions such as the direction of the lighting or the material of the support.[480] He closes this section with the note, "Thes are the io [10] *speciffijt* pictures w^{ch} are by *juw* [your] *M* appo=yntment placed in *ju M* Bedchamber."[481] This notation makes clear that the king dictated the contents and perhaps even the exact placement of the items in his bedchamber, among the most private spaces in the Privy Lodgings. Beginning with Charles's father James I's accession to the throne in 1603, the Privy Lodgings were put under the management of the Department of the Bedchamber, whose members, the Gentlemen of the Bedchamber, held coveted positions in the private life of the king, including dressing and undressing him. While there were still some courtiers present in the bedchamber, the use of the room was not in the least ceremonial; it was considered the sovereign's private space and this convention did not change until the restoration of Charles's son

---

[479] Millar 1960, p. 36, no. 8. For the uses of *pijntit opan de raeht lijeht* and *opan klaeht*, see Millar 1960, p. xix; Griffey, "A brief description," p. 16.

[480] For an image of the manuscript including these inserted comments, see Millar 1960, pl. I (Bodleian Library Ms. Ashmole 1514, f. 58).

[481] Millar 1960, p. 36.

to the throne in 1660.[482] We can therefore ascribe the prominent display of Honthorst's *Duke of Buckingham*, the only mantelpiece in the room, to Charles, and its meaning as highly personal to him.

To fully understand the importance of this painting we must also take into account the other paintings that were displayed in the bedchamber. Six of the ten pictures were portraits of Charles's immediate family and closest friends, and included a portrait of Henrietta Maria by Van Dyck (possibly Fig. 3.53, c. 1632; London, Royal Collection Trust), portraits of Frederick and Elizabeth by Honthorst (Fig. 3.54; London, National Portrait Gallery),[483] a posthumous portrait of Charles's brother Henry by Mytens after a miniature by Isaac Oliver (Fig. 3.55; Private Collection), and a small pastoral group portrait of seven of Elizabeth and Frederick's children by Cornelis van Poelenburgh (Fig. 4.39).[484] Speaking to the importance of his nieces and

---

[482] Thurley, *Whitehall Palace: The Official Illustrated History* (London: Historic Royal Palaces in association with Merrell, 2008): pp. 82-83.

[483] This is based on an item elsewhere in the inventory, Millar 1960, p. 148, no. 3: "yo^{r} Ma^{ts} Sisters picture done after Hunthurst w^{ch} at this instant is placed in yo^{r} Ma^{ts} Bedchamber in a black woodden frame. Engraven by your Ma^{ts} engraver Vorst." This print is the only example of a Van Voerst portrait of Elizabeth after Honthorst that I have found. Van der Doort's entry describing the painting specifies that it is bust length, or "to the Should^{rs}" (p. 35, no. 4). Willem-Jan Hoogsteder also identifies this print as the surviving replica of Honthorst's painting (Hoogsteder 1984-1986, I, pp. 100, 112, no. 33 and III, fig. 32).

[484] The Budapest Poelenburgh is one of two original variations; the other is in the Anhalt Castle Museum. Both are signed and dated 1628 and carry the brand of Charles I on the reverse. There is a seventeenth-century copy in the Royal Collection London

nephews is the fact that Charles hung their portrait in his bedchamber, but not one of his own children, who at that time numbered at least five.[485]

All of the four remaining paintings were by fifteenth- and sixteenth-century Italian painters, including Perino del Vaga (1501-1547), Parmigianino (1503-1540),[486] Raphael, and Correggio (ca. 1489-1534). The latter three paintings were all of religious subjects, the jewel of which was undoubtedly Raphael's depiction of the Madonna and Child with St. John the Baptist, displayed at the bedside and housed in a "newe guilded frame."[487] This painting was Raphael's *The Holy Family* or *La Perla* [The Pearl] (Fig. 3.56; ca. 1518; Madrid, Museo del Prado). Acquired by Charles in the 1620s through his purchase of the Gonzaga collection, the work's pride of place in Charles's bedchamber reflects not only its importance to him, but also its general art

---

(RCIN 403558), which was first recorded there in the time of Queen Caroline, in the early nineteenth century.

[485] It is possible that as many as eight children were alive at this point. Princess Anne was born in 1637 and died in 1640, so it is possible that, depending on when the inventory of the Bedchamber was completed, she had either yet to be born or had already died. The same is true of Princess Catherine, stillborn in 1639 and Henry, who was born in July 1640.

[486] In the inventory Van der Doort identifies this artist as "Permensius," and notes that the artist was Italian. According to Sir Claude Phillips (*The Picture Gallery of Charles I* [London: Seeley and Company, Ltd., 1896]: p. 91), this was an attribution to Parmigianino. This is supported by a drawing of the *Finding of Moses* in the Bowdoin College Museum of Art, which bears the inscription "Francisco Permensis" and carries a traditional (now overturned) attribution to Parmigianino. <http://www.bowdoin.edu/art-museum/catalogues/old-masters/1811.29.shtml>.

[487] Millar 1960, p. 36, no. 9.

historical importance as a large example of that revered master's work. Its objective value was so well-known that the compilers of the Commonwealth Sale valued it the highest of any other painting in the inventory: £3,000.[488] The painting's Spanish nickname, *La Perla*, was given to it by King Philip IV, who treasured it as the pearl of his collections after acquiring it following Charles's execution.[489] Del Vaga's painting is described as "the picture of the Nyne naked Musees and=Nyne other Musees in apperell. with some Poeticall gods by in the clouds," which was brought back from Spain and given to the King by Francis Cottington, one of the three men who had accompanied Charles to Madrid in 1623.[490]

The paintings in Charles's bedroom included the historical and modern, Italian and Netherlandish, religious and secular. This small group speaks as much to his love for family and deeply held religious beliefs as to the preeminent nature of his collection's contents. The inclusion of Del Vaga's *Muses* further makes clear that artistic and cultural inspiration and familiarity with the classical world were among

---

[488] This was eventually reduced to £2,500, indicative of the problems the government had with liquidating Charles's estate. See Brown, *Kings & Connoisseurs*, p. 71.

[489] <https://www.museodelprado.es/en/the-collection/art-work/the-holy-family-or-the-pearl/f3d745b8-f800-437a-a664-9f3d065ce127?searchid=7d28a8a5-ee84-2f49-679c-ee7ee83c3a13> (Accessed 30 November 2018). See also Brown, *Kings & Connoisseurs*, p. 71.

[490] Millar 1960, p. 36, no. 5.

Charles's most personal reflections, complemented by the antique and pastoral themes of Poelenburgh's portrait of the Bohemian children.

As with the *Apollo and Diana*, an essential question of Honthorst's image of the Villiers family is the nature of its commission, as it is unclear whether Charles commissioned the picture or acquired it after Buckingham's death. It might seem obvious that the work was ordered by the sitter, Buckingham—likely to celebrate the birth of his first son, George, in January—and was probably intended from the beginning as a gift to the king. However, another scenario is equally likely. The king, who collected several portraits for display in his Privy Lodgings, could well have commissioned the painting soon after Honthorst arrived in London in April 1628, possibly even with its eventual destination in mind. Nevertheless, after the Duke's assassination in August the painting became an unplanned effigy to Charles's lost friend.

Indeed, the king's favor for the late Duke's family was well known, as after hearing of the murder Charles swore to be "a husband to his Duchess, a father to his children, a master to his servants, and an executor to pay his debts."[491] These debts were mostly paid off by 1630, and Charles's fondness for the Villiers family continued

---

[491] As quoted in Roger Lockyer, *Buckingham: The Life and Political Career of George Villiers, first Duke of Buckingham, 1592-1628* (London, New York: Longman, 1981): pp. 460-61.

to be remarked upon by contemporaries.[492] Van der Doort's inventory, in fact, records two paintings of the Villiers children on prominent display in the Gallery in St. James's, a portrait of Mary (Fig. 4.23), and a double portrait of the brothers George and Francis (Fig. 4.24), both by Van Dyck.[493] Spread throughout the king's palaces, images of the Villiers family maintained the legacy of the controversial royal favorite, who played such a large role in shaping Charles's early collecting as well as the character of his reign, for better or worse. Honthorst's family portrait boasted one of the most personal placements of Charles's entire collection. In this position, the painting memorialized the artist's time at court, the person who invited him there, and the system of gift exchange that would come to be one of the defining cultural characteristics of the Caroline era.

Conclusion

Abraham van der Doort's comprehensive inventory of Charles I's collections is one of the most important surviving documents for the history of early modern art and collecting. Not only does it preserve the exact nature and extent of Charles's collections at the height of his power, but also Van der Doort's antiquarian exactitude rendered his inventory one of the most useful in terms of matching pictures and reconstructing the systems of exchange that operated around the most well-known

---

[492] Lockyer, *Buckingham*, p. 461.

[493] Millar 1960, p. 227, no. 46 and p. 226, no. 7.

Stuart monarch. The inventory reveals that Charles's collection was a remarkable mirror of his personal interests.[494] Van der Doort records, again and again, Charles's involvement in the commissioning, exchange, placement, and rearrangement of his objects. This is borne out by examining the microcosmic example of Charles's pioneering efforts to collect artists' self-portraits. He owned at least twelve such pictures, dispersed throughout his various display spaces.[495] Van der Doort records only three of these paintings together: those by Rubens (Fig. 3.57; 1623; London, Royal Collection Trust), Mytens (Fig. 3.58; c. 1630; London, Royal Collection

---

[494] Jeremy Wood, "Connoisseurship at the Caroline Court," p. 35; and Karen Serres, "Henrietta Maria, Charles I and the Italian Baroque," p. 179.

[495] These include works attributed to Titian (Millar 1960, p. 16, no. 11); Rubens (p. 37, no. 2); Van Dyck (p. 38, no. 4); Mytens (p. 38, no. 5); Bronzino (p. 44, no. 5); Pordenone (p. 45, no. 19); Giulio Romano (p. 45, no. 19; Rembrandt (p. 57, no. 87); Joos van Cleve (p. 64, no. 13); Albrecht Dürer (p. 68, no. 30) a copy of Dürer's self-portrait (p. 159, no. 11); and Artemisia Gentileschi (RCIN 405551, commissioned after her invitation to London in 1638). That this collection was likely more extensive is testified to by a 1666 inventory of Charles II's collection, completed within a decade of his restoration (RCIN 1112575), in which a set of twenty-four portraits of artists are recorded as hanging in a hallway between the Green Room and the Closet at Whitehall (in the Privy Lodgings). At that point a work by Michiel van Miereveld (*Bearded Old Man with a Shell*, c. 1606, RCIN 403956) that had been in the collection of Charles's older brother Henry was listed as a self-portrait by the Dutch artist. In the Van der Doort inventory, however, Miereveld's picture is simply listed as an old man with a shell (Millar 1960, p. 194, no. 8).

Trust),[496] and Van Dyck (Fig. 3.59; 1635-41; Private Collection).[497] As he does throughout the inventory, when describing the self-portraits Van der Doort notes that these were often deliberately acquired: they entered via commission, purchase, gifting, and, in one instance, exchange. Rubens's portrait serves as a particularly good illustration of both Charles's reputation as a connoisseur and the impetus behind assembling such a collection in the first place. The painting was solicited by Lord Henry Danvers (1573-1644) specifically as a gift for Charles, in order to replace a previous work by the artist that Danvers had gifted but that was too little touched by Rubens's hand and so was returned. As such, the self-portrait is inscribed to assure the commissioner and the king that it was entirely by Rubens.[498]

---

[496] In 1625 Mytens had been given a permanent position and the title of "his Majesty's picture-drawer in ordinary," and it was probably on this occasion that Charles solicited a self-portrait from him. Ter Kuile, "Daniel Mijtens," pp. 26-29.

[497] That the recently surfaced Van Dyck self-portrait is the same as that identified in Van der Doort's inventory is highly likely. The Rubenshuis, where the painting is on long-term loan, describes it as "almost identical to that of The National Portrait Gallery in London," purchased in 2014 (<https://www.rubenshuis.be/en/page/anthony-van-dyck-1> [Accessed 3 December 2018]). While the Rubenshuis notes the primary difference between the two portraits as being the direction of Van Dyck's mustache, the real departure in the Private Collection canvas is the inclusion of more of the figure, including his self-referential left hand. Van der Doort describes the work as, "Item the Picture *opan de reht lijeht* of S^{r} Anthonie Vandike done by himselfe to the Should^{rs} with his left hand at his breast In an Ovall carved wodden frame." (Millar 1960, p. 38, no. 4).

[498] Van der Doort records the painting as a gift from Danvers (Millar 1960, p. 37). On the circumstances of Danvers' commission and the importance of assuring the authorship of the picture see the description given by the Royal Collection: <https://www.rct.uk/collection/400156/a-self-portrait> (Accessed 3 December 2018).

On the one hand, the production of these images relates to of one of the principal justifications for painting as a liberal art in the early seventeenth century: royal endorsement. That is, that the patronage and interest of noble persons offered a special privilege to painting that elevated it above a mechanical art form. As such, chains of honor were quite common in such images. In Rubens's portrait for Charles, a chain is just barely visible beneath his lace collar, and Titian, for example, wears one prominently in both of his surviving self-portraits.[499] On the other hand, they represented one of the principal justifications for princely collecting: to demonstrate intellectual acumen and the breadth of humanist knowledge. In this sense, a collection of artist's self-portraits was an advertisement of connoisseurial skill: a manifestation of both one's ability to tell the difference between these emblems of self-presentation and one's knowledge of the proper artists from whom to solicit or posthumously assemble such a series in the first place. Collecting life-size artists' portraits is, moreover, a particularly striking way of collecting the artists themselves, to be able to display them as part of a retinue along with their paintings and thereby increase one's status.

The inscription reads: Petrus Paullus Rubens / se ipsum expressit / A.D MDCXXIII / Aetatis Suae XXXXV.

[499] These are now in the Gemäldegalerie, Berlin (no. 163), and the Museo del Prado, Madrid (P000407). Van Dyck prominently displays his chain in the *Self-Portrait with a Sunflower* (c. 1633, Private collection).

Within the larger enterprise of showcasing the efficacy of the royal image and the flexibility of royal taste as traced throughout this chapter, Honthorst's smooth courtly mode operated between the refinement of Van Miereveld and the dynamism of Rubens and Van Dyck. His paintings for Charles continued the combinatory style of his post-Italian period, mixing the Caravaggesque with the smoothly-painted immediacy of works like *Granida and Daifilo* (Fig. 2.73). He captured the drama and essence of a Stuart masque so effectively in *Apollo and Diana* that there is hardly a mention of the painting that does not also reference these theatrical events. This image was deployed in the ceremonial center of Charles's court, capturing the centrality of both his relationship with Buckingham and the cultivation of new ways to mythologize Charles within his lifetime as the connoisseur-king. Honthorst's strikingly intimate half-length portrait of the king (Fig. 3.3), by contrast, presents a more immediate view of the monarch, yet the image's appearance of familiarity is itself a construct.

The half-lengths of Charles and Henrietta Maria as a shepherd and shepherdess are Honthorst's earliest documented pastoral portraits, combining his pictorial innovations of the 1620s with the new demand for proliferation of the royal image. Honthorst left London in 1628 with the directive that he should remain at the center of the patronage networks that had fostered the development of his unique courtly modality. That is, together Charles and Honthorst fashioned the artist's first pastoral portraits explicitly as a gift for Charles's sister, accompanied by the commission for three more pictures, as we will see in Chapter 4. Within hours of his return to his

native country, Honthorst sought out Elizabeth to carry out these orders, effectively sparking his rise to the upper echelons of court patronage. For Elizabeth, Honthorst magnified his enterprise in concert with hers, proliferating the image of her family as a necessary part of her political survival. Under Elizabeth, then, Honthorst's court painting would take on entirely new significance.

FIGURES

ALL IMAGES REMOVED DUE TO COPYRIGHT

Chapter 4

BOHEMIA DISPLACED: ELIZABETH STUART, SELF-PROMOTION, AND THE ART OF DIPLOMACY

> I humbly beseech your Ma.[tie] to accept my thanks for *the* greatest Jewells and honors I possess, in yours and his Ma.[ts] pictures, which all Nations haue come to see. Among others, the Emperours Agent beeing with mee, I forced *the* sight vpon him, When he had well beheld them, hee asked mee whose they were; I replyed, The king and Queene of Bohemia; and are not these worthy to haue a kingdome? Hee answered mee *Par que nom*? and so rose and departed, as if hee had broken a tooth. I will not flatter your Ma.[tie], your picture here doth conquer hearts; and I am infinitly satisfied, that no aduersity hath power to banish those smiles which yet smile vpon vs; Euery day wee honor them, they make my house a Court, and my Chamber a presence.[500]
>
> - Sir Thomas Roe in Constantinople to Elizabeth Stuart
> 30 March 1623

Introduction

In 1606, the French Queen Marie de' Medici sent her favorite Concino Concini (c. 1575-1617) to Italy with a package for her cousin. She wrote that the box contained "our portraits, which I send you to refresh your remembrance of us."[501] While Marie's

---

[500] Akkerman, 2015, letter no. 295, p. 419. Roe (c. 1581-1644) was from 1621 to June 1628 the English ambassador to the Ottoman Empire, stationed in Constantinople.

[501] Louis Battifol, "Marie de Médicis et les Arts," *Gazette des Beaux-Arts* 3, tome 35 (1906): p. 238.

comments are borne from one of the primary functions of portraiture—that of the memento or document of a person's likeness—they also reveal an important fact about the exchange of portraits in the early modern period: pictures were almost always accompanied by text. Whether delivered in person and commented upon in later correspondence, sent via a third party with a letter or note detailing the purpose of the gift, or the result of exacting negotiations regarding a commission or exchange, paintings are frequently mentioned in seventeenth-century correspondence. In the case of Elizabeth Stuart, the exiled Queen of Bohemia and Electress Palatine in the Netherlands, the text of inventories and the hundreds of letters she exchanged with supporters are the primary method of reconstructing her relationship to and uses of art objects. Elizabeth's collection was scattered after her death in 1662 and only a small proportion of it can be traced with any certainty today. As such, this study of her self-fashioning through pictures turns to such texts as one of its primary bodies of evidence.

As the daughter of a king, Elizabeth had little to no control over her public image in the years before her betrothal to Frederick V, Elector Palatine, in 1613. After the start of her married, adult life, Elizabeth frequently exchanged portraits in order to maintain the friendship of her correspondents throughout Europe, supplementing her increasing epistolary skills with the sending of pictures so that her friends might remember her better. In May 1619, for example, she wrote from Heidelberg to her father's chaplain John King (1559?-1621), "I haue sent you my picture in great…I am sorie it is not so well done as I would wish it but there is no good drawers in this

countrie I send it you that you may be assured I will euer call you my worthie chaplain."[502]

That same year, she and her husband were drawn into the eruption of longstanding religious tensions in Bohemia, part of the modern-day Czech Republic. After accepting the crown of Bohemia against the wishes of its reigning Habsburg king (and Holy Roman Emperor) Ferdinand II (1578-1637), Elizabeth and Frederick were deposed just over fifteenth months later, in late 1620. The brief and contentious nature of their reign—they lost the Palatinate as well as Bohemia at the hands of the Spanish—led to the derogatory nicknames of Winter King and Queen, by which they are most commonly known today.[503] They eventually settled into exile in the Netherlands in 1621, having endured a highly successful propaganda campaign launched to discredit them.

In her comprehensive, ongoing study of Elizabeth's letters, Nadine Akkerman notes that Elizabeth's diplomatic writing was her primary weapon for securing her children's future, and that the breadth of her correspondents cemented Elizabeth's key

---

[502] Akkerman 2015, p. 196, letter no. 143, dated 22 May 1619. Elizabeth wrote another letter to follow up on this exchange: (p. 253, letter no. 185, dated 15 September 1620): "My Lord I thanke yow very heartily for your letter, but needed it not to tell me how thankefully your Lo*rd* accepted the poore token I send yow."

[503] On the persistence of this nickname see, for example, the newest historical non-fiction book by Nancy Goldstone, *Daughters of the Winter Queen: Four Remarkable Sisters, the Crown of Bohemia, and the Enduring Legacy of Mary, Queen of Scots*, published in April 2018.

position within the religious, political, and cultural life of early modern Europe.[504] In her correspondence, Elizabeth certainly did not shy away from expressing her passion and tends to quite clearly make her priorities known. However, correspondence was not Elizabeth's only weapon in her fight for survival. Also vital was her use of pictures, particularly portraits, which allowed Elizabeth to establish and control her family's public image. The circulation of such objects, together with her letters, helped Elizabeth to establish and cultivate connections throughout Europe and beyond. It was also fundamental to maintaining the favor of her allies, particularly her brother Charles I once he became responsible for administering her monthly allowance and giving her husband military aid.[505]

---

[504] Akkerman 2015, p. 48.

[505] In this sense, Elizabeth was only one in a line of savvy female monarchs who leveraged portraiture in her mission to thrive within the highly codified system of courtly relationships. One such predecessor was Mary of Hungary, Queen consort of Hungary and Bohemia (1515-1526) and eventually Governor of the Habsburg Netherlands (1531-1555). A fierce opponent who raised and even commanded troops in her own right, Mary was a fervent patron of the arts who utilized it in her navigation of the complex relationships between her brothers, Holy Roman Emperors Charles V and Ferdinand I. Mary is a particularly interesting comparative study for Elizabeth, not only because they were both fond of hunting, but also because of Mary's insistence on being publicly portrayed as a widowed queen throughout her life (Kathleen Wilson-Chevalier, "Art patronage and women (including Habsburg) in the orbit of King Francis I," *Renaissance Studies* 16, no. 4 [December 2002]: pp. 474-524). On Mary of Hungary see also Daniel R. Doyle, "The Sinews of Habsburg Governance in the Sixteenth Century: Mary of Hungary and Political Patronage," *The Sixteenth Century Journal* 31, no. 2 (Summer 2000): pp. 349-360; and William Monter, *The Rise of Female Kings in Europe, 1300-1800* (New Haven, London: Yale University Press, 2012): especially Chapter 4, "Female Regents Promote Female Rule, 1500-1630."

The exchange of letters and pictures became increasingly important as Elizabeth entered exile and her political leverage dissipated. In 1623 she wrote to her Aunt Charlotte Brabantina (1580-1631):

> Monsieur Berthold told me that you would like my portrait. I would have it sent to you just now, but the artist is so devastated by the death of his son that he has not been able to paint me; but I hope to send it to you at the first opportunity. And if there is anything else by which I can demonstrate my friendship to you, I beg you to let me know, for I love and honour you entirely as, Your most affectionate niece[506]

In 1624 she combined her entreaties to allies at her father James I's court with the gifting of portraits. In February of that year she wrote to the Earl of Middlesex (1575-1645), James's Lord High Treasurer, asking him to use his influence to encourage her father to grant her husband an allowance, adding the marginal notation for Middlesex's wife: "I must intreat you to commend my loue to your Ladie, I haue sent her a little token of the worke of this countrie, which is onelie to assure her of my loue."[507]

---

[506] Akkerman 2015, p. 412, letter no. 291, dated 17 January 1623. "The artist" refers to Michiel van Miereveld, whose eldest son Pieter died in 1623.

[507] Akkerman 2015, p. 441, letter no. 310, dated 1 February 1624. The portrait was delivered by or via Dudley Carleton, who wrote to Elizabeth on 15 April 1624 (p. 455): "[My L^{d} Tresorer's] Lady receaued your Ma^{ties} picture sent by me with the greatest joy and contentment as was possible to expresse." For two further examples of such exchanges see Akkerman 2015, pp. 569-570, letter no. 396, dated 30 November 1625 to the Countess of Mar; and Akkerman 2011, p. 518, letter no. 281, dated 18 September 1636, Charles Louis to Elizabeth.

When Gerrit van Honthorst returned to the Netherlands in 1628 after eight months in London at the court of Charles I, he immediately brought a letter and a pair of pastoral portraits of Charles and Henrietta Maria to Elizabeth from her brother. Charles had charged Honthorst with the task of not only delivering these portraits, but also of painting at least three others: a pair of half-lengths of Elizabeth and her husband Frederick, and a group portrait of the couple with all of their children. The delivery of this letter is the first known instance of contact between Honthorst and Elizabeth, though their acquaintance was probably made already in 1621, as argued in Chapter 2.

Knowing of his success at the English court, Elizabeth availed herself of Honthorst to strengthen her bond with Charles, exploiting his demonstrated interest in the artist and his love for and support of her family. In this way, Elizabeth created painted versions of her written entreaties to her brother for support and crafted an artificial monarchy in exile. This chapter examines Elizabeth's court, where Honthorst produced at least one hundred works on royal commission over the course of more than three decades. It considers Elizabeth's strategic use of imagery, particularly portraits, in two parts. First, it examines how her insecure political situation and the experience of enemy propaganda fundamentally altered her relationship to the public image. Namely, that she depended more than most of her correspondents on the rising currency of paintings among Europe's royalty and nobility, that she came to rely on the reciprocity culture of early modern gift-giving in her establishment and cultivation of her network of allies, and that she *needed* to use art and words to reclaim her

family's status. In attempting to answer these questions, the first part of this chapter examines the political, cultural, and personal contexts that surrounded Elizabeth and Frederick from before their marriage through the beginning of their exile. It ends with an extended case study of an unusually well-documented exchange between Honthorst, Charles, and Elizabeth, referenced above regarding the commissioning of a group portrait (Fig. 4.18). This example gives evidence of Honthorst's working process, the priorities and influence that Elizabeth had in the development of the work, and its reception at Charles's court. This painting expressed in visual form Elizabeth's exhortations to her brother and, with its representation of the Bohemian family, was designed to appeal to Charles's fondness for Elizabeth's children.

The second part and bulk of this chapter examines the visual program of Elizabeth and Frederick's palace at Rhenen, completed in 1630. There, Elizabeth's display of pictures and tapestries was charged with reiterating the legitimacy of the Bohemian monarchs, in effect creating a court culture where there was none. Based on the only documentary evidence to preserve the Bohemian collections, a 1633 inventory of Rhenen palace done on the occasion of Frederick's death in 1632, Part II reconstructs the displays within several rooms to suggest how they were orchestrated to communicate Elizabeth's visual identity. Within this scheme, Honthorst produced, for her collection, both grand allegorical scenes and more than eighty portraits of the Queen's family and circle. The latter group pictured her legacy for herself and for the foreign courts to which their many variations were sent. The portraits emblematize her yearning for a restoration of status, while their volume testifies to Honthorst's

importance in the creation of the Queen's image. By thinking critically across Honthorst's body of work, we may better understand how he positioned himself in relation to his patrons and his patrons to one another as a microcosm within this broader network of relationships.

PART I: The Queen of Hearts: From London to Prague Castle to Kneuterdijk

Elizabeth Stuart was the second child of King James I, who reveled in indecorously calling her Bessie in public and referring to his children by the informal Scottish term, "the bairns."[508] As the only surviving daughter of the new King of England and Scotland, before her marriage Elizabeth had little to no control over her image and does not appear to have exerted the kind of influence her older brother Henry enjoyed as heir. Her early portraits accordingly belong to the older visual tradition favored by James, and are overwhelmingly static, frontal, and traditional, like the characteristic example by Robert Peake the Elder commissioned as a pendant to a portrait of Henry now in the Metropolitan Museum of Art (Fig. 4.1; 1603; Greenwich, National Maritime Museum). Many of these images are presentation pieces, making

---

[508] Marshall, *The Winter Queen,* pp. 22-23. Elizabeth spent her childhood separate from her two brothers, in the care of a courtier but away from the court itself (MacLeod, *The Lost Prince,* cat. no. 8, p. 59). Elizabeth's guardian was Alexander, Lord Livingstone, later Earl of Linlithgow, and was raised at Linlithgow Palace). Upon her father's accession to the English throne the family moved to London in 1603, when she was seven years old. Charles did not come to London until 1604, as he was considered physically unable to safely complete the journey (MacLeod, *The Lost Prince*, cat. no. 9, p. 60; see also Marshall, *The Winter Queen*, p. 21).

clear Elizabeth's greatest asset to the family: a diplomatic tool through which to garner a powerful marriage alliance.[509]

A Royal Wedding

When she was fifteen years old, serious planning for her marriage was underway.[510] Candidates from Catholic Spain, France, Savoy, and Milan were all advanced, much to the ire of various courtiers opposed to such "Popery."[511] With strong encouragement for a Protestant match, particularly a German one, a contract was finalized between Elizabeth and Frederick V, Elector Palatine, at the end of December 1612.[512] Their wedding took place in London on Valentine's Day 1613, a date that was chosen to further the romanticization of their union and would contribute to the later designation of Elizabeth as the Queen of Hearts.[513]

---

[509] MacLeod, *The Lost Prince,* cat no. 8, p. 59.

[510] Just three years earlier, in 1608, Elizabeth was given her own apartments at Hampton Court and Whitehall Palaces and established a household at Kew at the age of twelve (Akkerman, "*Semper Eadem*," pp. 151-152).

[511] See, for example, CSP Domestic IX, p. 97, entry December 1611: "Danger of encouraging Popery by introducing a daughter of Savoy or Spain into England." Another entry on the same page describes an "Opinion against a Spanish match for the Princess of England as dangerous to the life of the King; also against Italian matches, either for the Prince or Princess."

[512] CSP Domestic IX, p. 163: entry dated 31 December 1612, detailing a letter written to Dudley Carleton by his secretary Sir Isaac Wake (1580/81-1632).

[513] Appropriately, the first concrete connection between Valentine's Day and romantic love was established in England in the late fourteenth century, by Geoffrey Chaucer (c. 1343-1400) in the *Parlement of Foules*. For *Parlement of Foules* as the virtual

As discussed in the previous chapter, from her earliest days Elizabeth had been groomed in the image of her father's predecessor, Elizabeth I, and such comparisons gained strength and became more politically pointed as she approached adulthood.[514] What began as longings for the continuity of a peaceful reign and the inherent likeness of two royal women named Elizabeth became, around the time of her marriage, a system of symbols and metaphors signaling a rebirth of the Virgin Queen.[515] William Leigh (1550-1639) published a series of three sermons in 1612, dedicating them to the sixteen-year-old princess:

> Shee a Kings daughter, so are you: shee a maiden Queene, you a Virgin Prince: her name is yours, her blood is yours, her cariage is yours, her countenance yours, like pietie towards God, like pittie towards men: onely the difference stands in this; that the faire flower of her youth is fallen; yours flourisheth like a Rose of Saram, and a Lilly of the Valley.[516]

---

establishment of Valentine's poetry see Jack B. Oruch, "St. Valentine, Chaucer, and Spring in February," *Speculum* 56, no. 3 (July 1981): pp. 534-565. Possibly written in celebration of the marriage of Richard II (r. 1377-1399) and Anne of Bohemia (m. 1382), Chaucer's poem states, "For this was seynt Valentynes day, / Whan every foul cometh ther to chese his make [choose his mate]" (Chaucer 1721, p. 416, ll. 309-310).

[514] Akkerman ("*Semper Eadem*," p. 149) points out that with the premature death of Henry and the delay of a royal Catholic marriage to balance Elizabeth's Protestant one, the evocations of Elizabeth I gained a militantly Protestant bent.

[515] Akkerman, "*Semper Eadem*," pp. 150-152.

[516] Leigh 1612, "The Epistle: Dedicatoire; To the High and Mightie Princesse Elizabeth." Leigh continues further on in the Epistle, drawing a sharp distinction between the barrenness of Elizabeth I's reign and the fecundity of James's, emphasizing Princess Elizabeth's ability to expand the foothold of this dynasty: "supersitition withereth, with a Royall issue euer to liue, the onely remaine of our religious hope. One is easily ouercome, and two will make resistance, but this threefold gable is not lightly broken…wherewith the Church is honoured, the State is

A description by the travel writer Thomas Coryate (1577-1617) from a year earlier goes further in the conflation of Princess and Queen Elizabeth, addressing the former as a, "Most Peerelesse and Gracious Princesse…in whose name, sexe, and heroicall disposition me thinkes I see our great Queene Elizabeth reuiued and resuscitated vnto life from the very bowels of her graue."[517]

Perhaps the most well-known and evocative imagery in this regard is that of the phoenix. A mythical bird of which only one can exist at a time, the phoenix thus symbolized rebirth, purity, virginity, and solitude. The best-known element of the phoenix's mythos is that at the end of its life cycle it builds a nest and ignites it, reducing itself to ash so that a new phoenix can be born. This symbolism, of renewal and immortality, was an attractive metaphor for many early modern writers wishing for the rebirth of a previous monarch's virtues.[518]

---

strengthened, the subject is comforted…"; See also Akkerman, "*Semper Eadem*," pp. 150-51; Akkerman, *Courtly Rivals,* p. 1; Georgianna Ziegler, "A second phoenix: the rebirth of Elizabeth I in Elizabeth Stuart," in Elizabeth H. Hageman and Katherine Conway, eds., *Resurrecting Elizabeth I in Seventeenth-Century England* (Madison, NJ: Fairleigh Dickinson University Press, 2007): p. 127n5.

[517] Coryate 1776, Vol. 3, p. 186. The 1776 reprint is from the original edition of 1611 and was expanded with Coryat's papers and descriptions related to his life and travels. At the end of the third volume five orations are published, which are said to be the very words that Coryate spoke to the King, Queen, and three royal children "At the deliuerie of his Booke to each of them" (p. 176). The oration to Elizabeth is labeled, "To the Lady Elizabeth, Her Grace, In the Hovse of the Lord Harrington, at Kew, The seventh day of Aprill, being Sunday, about Noone" (p. 186).

[518] Ziegler, "A second phoenix," pp. 111-131; Akkerman, "Semper Eadem," p. 152.

The poet John Donne's (1572-1631) *Epithalamion Vpon Frederick Count Palatine and the Lady Elizabeth marryed on S^t^. Valentines day* (1613) takes up Geoffrey Chaucer's (c. 1343-1400) previous use of birds as evocations of the romance of Valentine's Day in its opening lines:

> Hayle Bishop Valentine whose day this is
> All the Ayre is thy Diocesse
> And all the chirping Queristers
> And other birds ar thy parishioners.
> Thou marryest every yeare.[519]

Donne goes on to describe Frederick *and* Elizabeth as phoenixes, leaving no doubt as to the violence of their affections and creatively solving the incongruity of a bird symbolic of virginity representing a young woman at her wedding:

> For thou this day couplest two Phænixes.
> …
> Two Phænixes whose ioyned brests
> Are vnto one another mutuall nests
> Whose motion kindles such fires as shall giue
> Young Phænixes and yet the old shall liue
> Where Love and Courage never shall decline
> But make the whole yeare through they day ô Valentine.[520]

---

[519] John Donne, and Gary A. Stringer, ed., *The Variorum Edition of the Poetry of John Donne, vol. 8: The epigrams, epithalamions, epitaphs, inscriptions, and miscellaneous poems* (Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press, 1996): p. 108, ll. 1-5.

[520] Donne and Stringer, *Poetry of John Donne*, p. 108, ll. 18, 23-28. This imagery of the bride and groom as twins joined at the heart would later be deployed in reference to Charles and his wife Henrietta Maria in the masque *Albion's Triumph*, as discussed in the previous chapter (see Ch. 3, p. 192). Donne continues by explicitly stating that he has solved a problem: "Now by this Act of these two Phænixes / Nature agayne restored is / For since these two are two no more / Theres but one Phænix still as was before" (pp. 108-110, ll. 99-102). On the resolution of a problem with the imagery see Akkerman, "Semper Eadem," p. 152.

The romanticization of their marriage was not just propaganda or dramatization, though. Venetian Ambassador to London Antonio Foscarini (c. 1570-1622) described their first meeting in vivid detail:

> he approached the Princess and boldly kissed her; the King look on approvingly at the spirit and grace with which this was done, and at the blush which suffused the Princess' face and enhanced her beauty. Then…he withdrew to the lodging prepared for him, leaving a most excellent impression behind him in all the Court, on their Majesties and above all on the Princess.[521]

This love match was widely celebrated and was marked by opulence in the ceremony at the Royal Chapel in Whitehall Palace and the subsequent celebrations.[522] A seventeenth-century description of the wedding is particularly poignant given Elizabeth's eventual appearance as Astrée (a French literary heroine named after Astraea, an ancient Greek celestial goddess of justice and purity) in a painting by Honthorst:

> …the Prince *Palatine* and that lovely *Princess*, the Lady Elizabeth, were married on Bishop *Valentines* Day, in all the *Pomp* and *Glory* that so much *Grandure* could express. Her *Vestments* were white, the *Emblem* of *Innocency*; her Hair dishevil'd hanging down her Back at length, an *Ornament* of *Virginity*; a Crown of pure Gold upon her *head*, the *Cognizance* of *Majesty*, being all over beset with precious *gems*, shining like a *Constellation*; her *Train* supported by Twelve young

---

[521] CSP Venetian XII, p. 443, dispatch dated 9 November 1612.

[522] The Lord Mayor of London and the Aldermen offered Elizabeth a "magnificent chain of oriental pearls" at the ceremony, in full civic array, as a gift from the city of London (Hervey, *Thomas Howard, Earl of Arundel,* p. 70). For a good accounting of the marriage celebrations see Barbara Kiefer Lewalski, *Writing Women in Jacobean England* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1993): pp. 52-54.

> *Ladies* in *white Garments*, so adorned with *Jewels*, that her Passage looked like a milky way.[523]

The celebrations of the royal marriage were numerous, including a performance of William Shakespeare's *The Tempest* and three masques: Thomas Campion's (1567-1620) *The Lord's Masque* (performed on the wedding day), Francis Beaumont's (1584-1616) *The Masque of the Inner Temple and Gray's Inn*, and George Chapman's *The Memorable Masque of the Middle Temple and Lincoln's Inn*

---

[523] Arthur Wilson, *The history of Great Britain: being the life and reign of King James the First, relating to what passed from his first access to the crown, till his death* (London: Printed for Richard Lownds, 1653): p. 64. In his commentary on the Epithalamion of Frederick and Elizabeth, Herbert J.C. Grierson (*The poems of John Donne. Edited from the old editions and numerous manuscripts with introductions & commentary*, 2 vols [Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1912]: vol. 2, p. 92) quotes this passage and attributes it to William Camden's (1551-1623) *Annales*, with no further information. In Volume 8 of his edition of Donne's poems, Gary Stringer also quotes this passage at length (p. 365), further confusing the matter by ascribing the quote to the wrong edition of Camden's *Annales*, that of 1625, or book four of his life of Elizabeth I, which ends in the year 1603 with her death. There are in fact another set of *Annales* detailing the reign of James I and attributed to Camden, but the earliest edition I have been able to find is the Latin volume of 1691, in which the *Annales* are bound with a long *vita* of Camden and numerous appendices: see Camden and Smith 1691. The wedding appears on p. 9 and its description is only a short sentence. Grierson's confusion might be attributed to a 1706 volume in which Camden's *Annales* of James I are reproduced immediately preceding Wilson's *History* (Edward Herbert, et al., *A complete history of England: with the lives of all the Kings and Queens thereof*, 3 vols. [London: Printed for Brab. Aylmer, et al., 1706]: wedding descriptions vol. II, pp. 643 [Camden], 690 [Wilson]). Another contemporary account described the party as "a skye of caelestial starres upon faire Pheobe" (quoted in Lewalski, *Writing Women*, p. 51, from John Nichols, *The Progresses, Processions, and Magnificent Festivities of King James the First, His Royal Consort, Family, and Court* (London: Printed by and for J. B. Nichols, Printer to the Society of Antiquaries, 1828): vol. II, p. 544.

(both performed in the Great Hall at Whitehall the next day, 15 February).[524] Related to the propensity of many Stuart masques to collapse the spatial and temporal boundaries between performer and audience, as discussed in the previous chapter in relation to Honthorst's *Apollo and Diana* (Fig. 3.4), Campion's *The Lord's Masque* concludes with the performers and audience turning to pay homage to Frederick and Elizabeth, who sat observing the masque even as they were referenced within it.[525] *The Memorable Masque*, as Jerzy Limon and Agnieszka Żukowska have recently argued, has a complex engagement with temporality, effecting not just a move from chaos to order, but also from physical time to allegorical timelessness.[526] *The Memorable Masque* began with a triumphal entry in which mythological, allegorical, and

---

[524] Inigo Jones did the designs for *The Memorable Masque* (Orbison, *The Middle Temple Documents,* p. 3). Ann Kronbergs, "The Significance of the Court Performance of Shakespeare's *The Tempest* at the Palatine Wedding Celebrations," in *The Palatine Wedding of 1613*, pp. 339, 348. For contemporary accounts of the wedding and its celebrations see John Chamberlain, and Norman Egbert McClure, ed., *The Letters of John Chamberlain*, 2 vols. (Philadelphia: American Philosophical Society, 1939): I, pp. 423-433; and Marika Keblusek, "Celebrating a Union: The Festive Entry of Friedrich, Elector Palatine, and Princess Elizabeth in the Netherlands," in *The Palatine Wedding of 1613,* p. 391; on the courtship and wedding, see also Nichols, *Progresses, Processions, and Magnificent Festivities,* vol. II pp. 463-467, 512-517, 522-611, and 624-626.

[525] Kronbergs, "The Significance of the Court Performance," p. 348.

[526] Limon and Żukowska, "Staging the Royal Blend," p. 324.

contemporary figures paraded through the actual streets of London, and several references to the artificiality of the masque are found throughout the text.[527]

The luxurious design and costuming of this production came with an incredible price tag for the two legal societies that presented it: the Middle Temple and Lincoln's Inn. Indeed, this was readily apparent to all who attended, as the Venetian Ambassador Foscarini reported to the Doge: "The number of lords and ladies, the richness of their robes and liveries, the whole preparations, have turned out successful beyond expectation. The expenses have been so great that, in spite of their being very rich, they will feel it for some time."[528] The financial rolls of both Inns of Court reveal that, combined, they spent a staggering £2,255, 8*s* (shillings), and 11*d* (pence), the equivalent of about £511,300 in modern currency.[529] The elaborate *Memorable Masque* was evidently worth it, as the Master of the Rolls, Sir Edward Phelips (ca. 1555/60-1614) reported to Dudley Carleton on 25 February that this masque was praised above all others, and that the king feasted with the members of the Inns.[530]

---

[527] Limon and Żukowska, "Staging the Royal Blend," pp. 327-330.

[528] CSP Venetian XII, p. 500, dispatch dated 1 March 1613.

[529] Orbison, *The Middle Temple Documents*, p. 7. This is considerably more than the king usually spent on a masque, on average £2,000. The modern figure was arrived at using the Bank of England's Inflation Calculator, available here: <http://www.bankofengland.co.uk/education/Pages/resources/inflationtools/calculator/default.aspx>.

[530] CSP Domestic IX, p. 172, letter dated 25 February 1613. Orbison (*The Middle Temple Documents*, p. 4) rightly points out that Phelips was one of the organizers of the masque, and therefore could be prone to exaggeration, but his account it supported

Heidelberg

On 25 April 1613 Frederick and Elizabeth embarked from the English coastal town of Margate on a protracted journey to Heidelberg, the seat of the Palatinate.[531] Four days later they arrived in the Netherlands at Flushing (Vlissingen), where they were met by Frederick's uncle Maurits, the Dutch stadtholder, who accompanied the couple to his palace there.[532] Two paintings by Adam Willaerts (1577-1664) capture the fanfare of the couple's departure and landing, ten years after the fact. *Embarkation at Margate* (Fig. 4.2; London, Royal Collection Trust) showcases the opulent ship the *Prince Royal*—originally built for Elizabeth's late brother Henry—and James I and Anne of Denmark are seen in the foreground of the large crowd lining the shore to see the couple safely off. In *Arrival at Flushing* (Fig. 4.3; Greenwich, National Maritime Museum), a retinue of Dutch ships in the foreground greets the *Prince Royal* and its

---

by a description given by John Chamberlain (Chamberlain and McClure, ed., *The Letters of John Chamberlain*, I, p. 414).

[531] This journey was recorded in abundant detail in *Beschreibung Der Reiß* (Heidelberg, 1613), on the basis of which Molly Taylor-Poleskey and Elijah Meeks at Stanford University are working to create a digital platform and interactive map: <https://web.stanford.edu/group/dhs/cgi-bin/prod/drupalspatial/?q=events>. For a discussion of this project see Taylor-Poleskey, "Mapping the Journey up the Rhine: Digital Representations of the Palatinate Wedding Route," in *The Palatine Wedding of 1613*, pp. 371-390.

[532] Beschreibung der Reiß 1613, pp. 74-75. Both Maurits and his successor as stadtholder, his half-brother Frederik Hendrik, are occasionally mis-identified as Frederick V's cousins. Frederick's mother, Louise Juliana of Orange-Nassau, was both Maurits and Frederik Hendrik's half-sister, making them both Frederick V's uncles.

entourage as the couple is rowed ashore in one of the barges at right. They were received with great pomp by their uncle and were given important gifts from the States-General and the States of Holland.[533]

After just one day in Vlissingen Frederick went on to The Hague, where he stayed a week, while Elizabeth toured several cities within the United Provinces and the Rhine Valley.[534] She was joined on and off by her husband, who left completely on 8 May to prepare for her arrival in Heidelberg.[535] At each successive step of her journey Elizabeth was greeted with loud shouts and cheers from the hundreds of citizens that lined the streets to greet the Princess, often accompanied by rounds of

---

[533] The *Beschreibung* recounts that the streets were lined with armored citizens and that the "triumph, joyful canon fire, and rejoicing of the whole Burgerschaft is beyond description." Translation by Molly Taylor-Poleskey, <https://web.stanford.edu/group/dhs/cgi-bin/prod/drupalspatial/?q=events>. See also Marika Keblusek, "The Bohemian Court at The Hague," p. 48: The States-General presented Elizabeth with a group of valuable diamonds, and the States of Holland gave the couple 40,000 guilders.

[534] Beschreibung der Reiß 1613, p. 80. Cities visited include Middelburg, Zierikzee, Ooltgensplaat, Wilhelmstadt, Dordrecht, Rotterdam, The Hague, Scheveningen, Utrecht, and Nijmegen. After Frederick left for Heidelberg, Elizabeth visited Leiden, Haarlem, Amsterdam, Arnhem, Emmerich am Rhein, Wesel, Düsseldorf, Duisburg, Deutz, Mülheim an der Ruhr, Mondorf-les-Bains, Königswinter, Bonn, Andernach, Braubach, Koblenz, Cologne, Gaulsheim, Bingen am Rhein, Mainz, Oppenheim, Worms, Frankenthal, and finally Heidelberg. The wedding gifts from the States-General included two sets of tapestries, one of the Deeds of Scipio and the other of Diana (Hanns Hubach, "Tales from the Tapestry Collection of Elector Palatine Frederick V and Elizabeth Stuart, the Winter King and Queen," in Thomas P. Campbell, ed., *Tapestry in the Baroque: New Aspects of Production and Patronage* [New York: Metropolitan Museum of Art, 2010. Conference proceedings.]: p. 113).

[535] Beschreibung der Reiß 1613, pp. 90-91.

celebratory cannon- or gunfire. From The Hague Elizabeth went to Leiden where the entirety of the town's citizens reportedly received her while clad in armor.[536] She then visited Haarlem, where she received a silver cradle and linen valued at 50,000 guilders (*f*) from the city to celebrate her marriage.[537] Amsterdam, not to be outdone, decorated entire sections of the city in her honor, built an elaborate triumphal arch for her entry, and gifted Elizabeth a gold and silver service worth a reported 150,000 *f*.[538]

Immediately upon Elizabeth's arrival at Heidelberg Castle in 1613, the couple began making improvements to the building, grounds, and collections, especially through the expansion of the gardens into a formal Italian style, designed by Elizabeth's former tutor Salomon de Caus (1576-1626) and known as the *Hortus Palatinus*.[539] These gardens are mostly destroyed today—the castle itself survives as a

---

[536] Beschreibung der Reiß 1613, p. 91. Mary Anne Everett Green, *Elizabeth: Electress Palatine and Queen of Bohemia*, 2nd ed., (London: Methuen & Co., 1909): p. 71.

[537] Beschreibung der Reiß 1613, p. 91; Green, *Elizabeth: Electress Palatine*, p. 71; See also Keblusek, "The Bohemian Court at The Hague," p. 48; and Cornelis Ascanius van Sypesteyn, *Het Hof van Boheme en Het Leven in Den Haag in de XVII^e Eeuw* (Amsterdam: J.C. Loman, Jr., 1886): p. 7.

[538] Beschreibung der Reiß 1613, pp. 90-91; see also Keblusek, "The Bohemian Court at The Hague," p. 48.

[539] Elizabeth's first letter from Heidelberg is dated 17 June 1613, written to her father. Transcribed and translated in Akkerman 2015, pp. 120-121, letter no. 76. On Elizabeth's experience of Heidelberg's collection and grounds, see Hubach, "Tales from the Tapestry Collection," pp. 105-106. On Elizabeth and Frederick's establishment of a court culture in Heidelberg see Klaus Winkler, "Musik und Tanz am Heidelberger Hof von Friedrich V. und Elizabeth Stuart," in Annette Frese, Frieder

partial ruin—but their scope is documented in a large-scale, birds-eye view of 1619 by the Flemish painter Jacques Fouquières (ca. 1580-1659; Fig. 4.4; Heidelberg, Kurpfälzisches Museum). Renovations to the *Hortus Palatinus* also included the Elizabeth Gate, or *Elisabethentor*. Preserved only as a fragmented portal, the gate was designed by De Caus and reportedly built, on Frederick's orders, in a single night as a birthday gift for Elizabeth (Fig. 4.5).[540] According to one of her courtiers at Heidelberg, Elizabeth thoroughly enjoyed the gardens and countryside: "Madame takes her pleasure in hunting and is become a second Diana of our shady Rhine-side woods."[541]

In January 1614, at Heidelberg, Elizabeth gave birth to her first of thirteen children, a son named for his father and late uncle: Frederick Henry (1614-29). His birth further cemented the Protestant succession in both Britain and the Palatinate. Bonfires were lit all the way in Edinburgh to celebrate the baby's arrival while mother and son were praised in the most glowing terms in reports sent back to James.[542]

Hepp, and Renate Ludwig, eds., *Der Winterkönig: Heidelberg zwischen höfischer Pracht und Dreißigjährigem Krieg* (Remshalden: B.A. Greiner, 2004): pp. 29-38.

[540] Peter Bilhöfer, "Instrumentalisierung der Antike in der Herrscherpräsentation am Beispiel des 'Winterkönigs' Friedrich von der Pfalz," *Thetis: Mannheimer Beiträge zur Klassischen Archäologie und Geschichte Griechenlands und Zyperns* 7 (2000): pp. 119-120.

[541] Marshall, *The Winter Queen*, p. 39.

[542] Marshall, *The Winter Queen*, pp. 39-40.

Frederick and Elizabeth passed several relatively calm years at Heidelberg until 1619, when they were drawn into the disintegrating political situation in nearby Bohemia.[543]

Prague

The five territories (estates) of Bohemia were predominantly Protestant, but the Kingdom had been ruled by the Catholic House of Habsburg since 1526. A law implemented in 1609 that was meant to avoid conflicts would instead begin the Thirty Years' War: the 'Letter of Majesty.' Allowing the Bohemian estates freedom of worship and the election of their own king, the Letter of Majesty was first tested in 1617, when the estates elected Ferdinand von Habsburg, nephew of the ageing King Matthias (1557-1619), as heir to the crown. Emboldened by the secure succession, Matthias and Ferdinand undertook increasingly harsh treatment toward Bohemian Protestants. A détente was held at Prague Castle in May of 1618, but the Protestant leaders were enraged by what they viewed as weak excuses for the Crown's actions and threw three members of Matthias's council out of a window. Though none of the three died from their 21-meter fall, the Defenestration of Prague escalated tensions to the point where they were set to explode upon Matthias's death in March 1619.[544]

---

[543] On the various tensions between Elizabeth and Frederick in this period see Akkerman 2015, p. 20.

[544] Akkerman 2015, pp. 21-22.

Matthias had also been Holy Roman Emperor—more often than not since the sixteenth century the King of Bohemia and the Emperor were one and the same—and Frederick V, as Elector Palatine, was one of the seven men responsible for selecting a new Emperor. Many believed the election of Ferdinand to the Imperial seat was a matter of course, but Frederick argued to protect the elective nature of the Imperial Crown by suggesting non-Habsburg candidates, including Protestants as well as Catholics.[545] When it became clear that Ferdinand would nevertheless receive an electoral majority, Frederick did not oppose him, and Ferdinand was unanimously elected on 28 August 1619. The next day, representatives of all five Bohemian estates deposed Ferdinand and elected Frederick as king.[546] Elizabeth wrote, unprompted, to her father, brother, and royal favorite the Duke of Buckingham in London seeking their support, but Frederick accepted the crown before either he or Elizabeth received confirmation of support from James or the Protestant Union.[547]

Though Elizabeth and Frederick took in the opulence of the grounds, collections, and court life of Prague with great pleasure, their political situation rapidly deteriorated as Frederick tried, and failed, to raise military support.[548] In spite of

---

[545] Akkerman 2015, p. 22.

[546] Akkerman 2015, p. 23.

[547] Akkerman 2015, p. 24

[548] Akkerman 2015, p. 27; Marshall, *The Winter Queen*, pp. 50-51; Keblusek, "The Bohemian Court at The Hague," p. 48.

increasing opposition to him, and the growing anger of the Habsburgs, Frederick refused to abdicate the crown and four armies were raised against him: those of the Spanish King Philip III (r. 1598-1621), a Habsburg, whose armies also invaded the Lower Palatinate in August 1620; the Count of Bucquoy (1571-1621), an Imperial General; the Duke of Bavaria (1573-1651), Frederick's Catholic cousin; and the Elector of Saxony (1585-1656), a Lutheran.[549]

Part of the Scots Brigade serving in the Netherlands was rallied to protect Bohemia's border, but Elizabeth was unable to persuade her father to give true British support. Frustrated, she again wrote to Buckingham for aid:

> this makes me write to you at this time because I am most confident of your affection, that you will moue his Ma[tie] now to shew himself a louing father to vs, and not suffer his childrens inheritance to be taken away…I ernestlie intreat you to vs your best meanes with the King that he would now assist vs, for he hath euer professed that he would not suffer the Palatinat to be taken from vs, I doe most confidentlie relie vppon your affection to me and [you] can shew it in nothing more then in this matter which I ernestlie recommend to you.

Elizabeth closes her letter with the forceful postscript, "I pray tell the King that the enemie will more regard his blowes then his wordes."[550] Elizabeth's entreaties succeeded, and further troops were rallied in Britain.[551] Other Protestant allies were

---

[549] Akkerman 2015, pp. 28-29.

[550] Akkerman 2015, p. 254, letter 186, Elizabeth to Buckingham, 25 September 1620.

[551] Akkerman 2015, p. 29: Elizabeth was apparently unaware of James's struggles with Parliament in his desire to intercede more forcefully on her behalf. See also Steve Murdoch, *Britain, Denmark-Norway, and the House of Stuart, 1603-1660: A Diplomatic and Military Analysis* (East Linton, East Lothian, Scotland: Tuckwell

unable or unwilling to intercede, and the decisive battle occurred on 8 November 1620 (Fig. 4.6). In the so-called Battle of White Mountain—Bílá Hora, where the battle took place, is actually a low plateau outside of Prague—Frederick's army was defeated in less than two hours.[552]

In order to avoid panicking her subjects, Elizabeth refused to flee Prague, even though she was about six months pregnant and Frederick had been trying to persuade her to leave for more than a month.[553] As their former Protestant allies disappeared under the weight of Habsburg ire, Elizabeth and Frederick moved about for more than six months, avoiding the enemy while seeking more permanent asylum.[554] Elizabeth nevertheless stood steadfastly beside her husband, writing to James in her first letter after White Mountain, "I do not know what will become of us: so I beg you still to have pity on us and not to abandon the King at this hour of need. For myself, I am

---

Press, 2003): p. 55; Thomas Cogswell, "Phaeton's chariot: the parliament-men and the continental crisis in 1621," in J. F. Merritt, ed., *The Political World of Thomas Wentworth, Earl of Strafford, 1621-1641* (Cambridge, New York: Cambridge University Press, 1996): pp. 25-26; and Cogswell, *The Blessed Revolution: English Politics and the Coming of War, 1621-1624* (Cambridge, New York: Cambridge University Press, 1989): pp. 3-5, 72.

[552] Akkerman 2015, p. 30.

[553] Akkerman 2015, pp. 30-32. Because of her refusal to leave, Elizabeth was almost captured by the enemy as they invaded the capital. In December 1620 the heavily pregnant Elizabeth was discouraged from seeking shelter with her brother-in-law, the Elector of Brandenburg, who made it clear she would have to leave as soon as she had delivered her child. See also Keblusek, "The Bohemian Court at The Hague," p. 48.

[554] Akkerman 2015, p. 31.

resolved never to leave him for if he perishes I too will perish with him."[555] Just as she would never give up the title of Queen of Bohemia, in these early days Elizabeth refused to give up hope, writing to Dudley Carleton just one month after White Mountain that, "I am not yet so out of hart, though I confesse wee are in an evill estate, but that (as I hope) God will give vs againe the victorie, for the warres are not ended with one battaile, & I hope wee shall haue better luck in the next."[556]

Propaganda

Elizabeth and Frederick named their newborn son Maurice (1621-52) after what seemed like their only continental ally, Frederick's uncle the Dutch stadtholder. However, before they even arrived in The Hague in April 1621, their enemies had launched a successful propaganda campaign to further discredit them.[557] The diminutive nickname by which they are most commonly known today, the Winter

---

[555] Transcribed and translated in Akkerman 2015, pp. 279-280, letter 203; Letter dated 23/13 November 1620. The original French reads [ie ne say se que nous deuiendrons, ie la supplie donc encore d'auoir pitie de nous et de n'abandoner le Roy ~~et~~ a cestheur qu'il en a si grand, besoing, pour moy ie suis resolue de ne le quitter car si il perit ie periray aussy auec luy.]

[556] Transcribed in Akkerman 2015, p. 285, letter 208, dated 7 December 1620.

[557] Beller 1928, p. 7, notes that the cost and prevalence of the (mostly) copperplate engravings indicated that they were part of a paid propaganda campaign, and that the verses were sometimes even translated into several languages to increase the circulation of the prints. Furthermore, the language of most verses is South German, meaning they were likely written in Bavaria, the duchy of one of Frederick's powerful enemies.

King and Queen, was allegedly invented by the Jesuits as early as January 1620, as Dudley Carleton reported to his frequent correspondent John Chamberlain (1553-1628):

> and now you shall have before long wth you the Baron of Dona[558] brother to him who carried the newes of the Bohemians election of a new k: for whom you – must doe more then pray or else he will be (as the Jesuits in Germanie call him) a k: onely for a winter.[559]

Frederick's defenders tried to turn the epithet on its ear, proclaiming that after being a fierce Winter Lion, he would become an equally successful Summer Lion. Supporters were also quick to publish materials, such as *The Consecrated, and thank God, still continuing Palatine-Bohemian Lion* (Fig. 4.7; London, British Museum). This 1620 broadside favorably interprets Frederick's prospects, and its verse reads in part:

> God will protect the Lion none-the-less
> In summer as well as in winter.

---

[558] This is probably Burgrave Christopher von Dohna (1583-1637), who was one of Frederick's advisors and served as his chamberlain in 1620.

[559] SP 84/94/2, f. 6 verso. This idea was misquoted and incorrectly cited by Samuel Rawson Gardiner (*History of England from the Accession of James I to the Outbreak of the Civil War, 1603-1642*, 10 vols. [London: Longmans, Green, 1904-09]: III, p. 317, n1), from which it is taken up by several other writers, who often refer to the Jesuit origins of the nickname. Gardiner uses the quote: "'He will only be a winter-king,' said the Jesuits. 'When the summer comes he will be driven from the field.'" and says it comes from a letter from Dudley Carleton to John Chamberlain, dated 3 Jan 1620; See also Hepp, "»Deß gewesten Pfaltzgrafen Glück und Unglück« Aufstieg und Fall des »Winterkönigs« im Spiegel der zeitgenössischen Flugblattpublizistik," p. 48.

The Winter-Lion has not departed,
The Summer-Lion has come.[560]

Despite the fact that Frederick did reign over the summer, losing his crown in the fall of 1620, his tenure was short-lived, as predicted, and following his deposition the pejorative connotations of the nickname held fast. See, for example, the less than flattering print *A true Picture of the Winter King*, published after September 1620, in which Frederick is depicted vomiting up land, cities, and his own crown as the result of imbibing too much Bohemian beer (Fig. 4.8; Oxford, Ashmolean Museum).[561]

In addition to the insulting epithet of Winter King, both enemies and supporters deployed the heart as a potent metaphor for Frederick and Elizabeth. In the above-mentioned broadside *The Consecrated* (Fig. 4.7), the double-tailed Bohemian lion (Fig. 4.9) and the single-tailed Palatinate lion are bound together at upper right by a chain weighted with a heart, a symbol of Bohemia itself. Sebastian Münster's (1488-1552) *Cosmographia* (orig. pub. German, 1544), contains an image of Europe personified as a queen, or *Europa Regina*, in which Bohemia appears unequivocally as the heart, connected to the Baltic Sea by the artery-like River Elbe (Fig. 4.10).[562]

---

[560] Transcribed in Beller 1928, p. 16, plate II.

[561] Beller 1928, p. 30, plate. IX: At left Imperial supporters replace the feathers plucked from the double-headed eagle by Frederick. The eagle's new feathers bear the names of Palatinate towns won by Don Ambrogio Spinola (1569-1630), one of the most famous commanders of the Spanish armies, in September of 1620, thus giving a *terminus post quem* for the print

[562] On this type see Peter Meurer, "Europa Regina: 16th Century Maps of Europe in the Form of a Queen," *Belgeo: Revue Belge de Géographie* 3-4 (2008): pp. 355-370.

Elizabeth was called the Queen of Hearts. This moniker seems to have begun in relation to Elizabeth and Frederick's establishment of a court-in-exile at The Hague, and by some accounts even on the march away from Prague, because of Elizabeth's charismatic and charming demeanor in the face of such hardship.[563] George Herbert's (1593-1633) 1621-22 poem dedicated to Elizabeth supports this perception of the Queen as destitute but enthrallingly regal:

> And though starres shot from Heauen loose their light,
> Yet thy braue beames, excluded from theyr right,
> Maintayne their lustre still, and shining cleare,
> Turne watrish Holland to a crystal spheare.
> Meethings in that Dutch optick I doe see
> Thy curious vertues much more visibly.
> …
> But that face,
> Whose native beauty needes not dresse or lace
> To set it forth, and being strip'd of all,
> Is self sufficient to be the selfe thrall
> Of 1000. hearts; that face doth figure thee

Europa Regina first appeared in Münster's text in an updated version in 1588, and was reproduced in all subsequent versions, through 1628.

[563] Pebworth, "George Herbert's Poems to the Queen of Bohemia," p. 110. James Howell writes, in a letter to his father dated 19 March 1621 in his epistolary novel *Familiar Letters or Epistolae Ho-Elianae* (first ed. 1645): "the Lady Elizabeth, which in the Low Countries and some parts of Germany is called the Queen of Bohemia, and for her winning princely comportment, the Queen of Hearts." (Howell 1645, section ii, p. 15). Lewalski (*Writing Women*, p. 58) states that the title was first given to her during her bridal progress but offers no contemporary account or citation. See also Elizabeth Benger, *Memoirs of Elizabeth Stuart, Queen of Bohemia, Daughter of King James the First. Including Sketches of the State of Society in Holland and Germany, in the 17th Century*, 2 vols. (London: Printed for Longman, Hurst, Rees, Orme, Brown, and Green, 1825): vol. II, p. 113; Akkerman 2015, p. 4 (see also Akkerman 2011, p. 245, letter no. 179 Sir Thomas Roe to Elizabeth, 17 June 1620); and Carola Oman, *The Winter Queen: Elizabeth of Bohemia* (London: Phoenix, 2000): p. 255.

And shew thy vndiuided majestie,
Which miserie cannot vntwist, but rather
Addes to the vnion, as lights, to gather
Splendors from darkenes.[564]

Elizabeth's disposition was so engaging that Frederick, who was prone to depressive bouts of melancholy, was often compared unfavorably to her. This is especially true as his confidence waned in the ongoing fight for the Palatinate, while hers grew through her increasing epistolary acumen. Frederick's uncle Prince Maurits reportedly spoke on the subject with candor, saying: "The Queen of Bohemia is accounted the most charming princess of Europe, and called by some the queen of hearts; but she is far more than that,—she is a true and faithful wife, and that, too, of a husband who is in every respect her inferior."[565]

Detractors, meanwhile, invoked the heart not as a symbol of Bohemian vitality, but as one of the four suits of playing cards, symbolizing the flimsy nature of Frederick's reign.[566] One such example is *The Palatine's Furlough*, printed in 1621 (Fig. 4.11; Oxford, Ashmolean Museum). In the central image Frederick, Elizabeth,

---

[564] Pebworth, "George Herbert's Poems to the Queen of Bohemia," pp. 117-118.

[565] Baroness Marie Blaze de Bury, *Memoirs of the Princess Palatine, princess of Bohemia, including her correspondence with the great men of her day, and memoirs of the court of Holland under the princes of Orange* (London: R. Bentley, 1853): pp. 84-85; also quoted in Oman, *The Winter Queen*, p. 277 and Lewalski, *Writing Women*, p. 58.

[566] Marshall, *The Winter Queen*, p. 64.

and three of their children wander isolated through the landscape, mocked by a throne in the right middle-ground decorated with a crown and four playing-card finials. In the fourteen-verse commentary surrounding the image, the intent of the cards is made clear, with Frederick mockingly called Fritz:

> O Fritz, winter is approaching,
> Wouldn't you like to be a king again
> Just as you were a year ago?
> I do not advise you to try it, you are ruined,
> Stay away, stay away!
> There is great danger in it,
> Spare yourself that!
>
> At Shrovetide you were king of diamonds,
> In summer you acted the part of king of spades
> For the sake of your children,
> You were king of clubs in the autumn
> And here you spoiled all,
> You were king of hearts in winter
> And worthless.[567]

In other prints Elizabeth is presented as a lioness and the children her cubs, as in *Secret Hints concerning the Presumptive King* (Fig. 4.12; 1621; Oxford, Ashmolean Museum), where the Queen has built a nest for her cubs out of feathers plucked from the Imperial eagle.[568] The children are often invoked as acute victims of Frederick's ambition; he had a wife of royal lineage who provided him with enough heirs so that his line would not soon die out, but now they are forced to live poor and in exile. The children appear in human and animal form in many of these satirical prints, a fact that

---

[567] Translated in Beller 1928, pp. 38-39, pl. XII.

[568] Beller 1928, p. 22, pl. V.

likely further encouraged the vehemence with which Elizabeth pursued a positive pictorial image of her family, an attempt to counter the character assassination of the previous years.

And so, having lost the crowns of both Bohemia and the Palatinate, and with their reputations in tatters, the monarchs arrived in the United Provinces. Greeted by a large triumphal procession and banquets moving through Rotterdam and into The Hague, they were settled into the same apartments in the Binnenhof that they had occupied on their honeymoon trip seven years before.[569] As these apartments actually belonged to Maurits's half-brother Frederik Hendrik, who could not be deprived of them permanently, a suitable alternative was soon found in two mansions, formerly in private ownership and conveniently located side by side on the nearby Kneuterdijk: the Wassenaer Hof. Elizabeth occupied the Wassenaer Hof for forty years, paying rent on the house from 1623 until she quitted it in 1661.[570]

Keeping Court in The Hague

Upon their arrival in The Hague, Elizabeth and Frederick's finances were dire, especially considering what was required to support their royal household of over

---

[569] Oman, *The Winter Queen,* p. 247.

[570] Oman, *The Winter Queen*, pp. 248-49: in 1621, the house belonged to Cornelius Van der Myle, who was a political exile. The States told Van der Myle's wife that she could remain in the house but had to move to an inferior set of apartments. House is described in Sypesteyn, *Het hof van Boheme*, iii, p. 729.

220.[571] While the States-General provided significant financial and military support, the bulk of their income came from the Stuart Crown: a stipend of £21,150 a year that was supplemented with another £6,000 to maintain the children's court in Leiden. Payments were irregular, however, and in 1626 the Crown agreed to send £10,000 to make up for lost income but the money does not appear to have arrived until 1628. Over the years, various influxes of capital helped to improve the couple's fortunes for brief periods, so much so that by 1630 they (with aid from the States-General) were able to construct a palace designed by Bartholomeus van Bassen (ca. 1590-1652) in the town of Rhenen.[572]

---

[571] Marshall, *The Winter Queen*, p. 71: Elizabeth pawned or sold most of her jewelry while in The Hague.

[572] Akkerman 2015, pp. 35-38. In 1624 Frederick sold the Lordship of Lixheim, a Palatinate territory bordering Lorraine, to the Duke of Lorraine for £20,000, which he housed in the Bank of Holland against interest. On Prince Maurits's death in 1625 Elizabeth inherited some shares of the West Indies Company, and the Duke of Buckingham left some jewels in bond in Amsterdam in May of 1626. They had a value of £11,400, which yielded £798 per year in interest. Akkerman estimates that, when payments were received on time, the exiled court had an annual income of £27,800. Though this seems like a large amount, it was likely well insufficient to maintain a truly royal court. By comparison, Frederik Hendrik's court in The Hague controlled roughly £65,000 per annum. Keblusek ("The Bohemian Court at The Hague," p. 48) gives a very different set of figures, much higher than Akkerman, but still emphasizes the Bohemian court's mounting debt. Oman (*The Winter Queen*, p. 291; and Keblusek, "The Bohemian Court at The Hague," p. 48) both point out that around 1628 Frederick owed more than £12,000, which Charles agreed to take over. Oman (*The Winter Queen*, p. 310) further notes that by 1630, Elizabeth's creditors were so desperate they were stopping her in the streets to ask for repayment. On Elizabeth's finances see also Green, *Elizabeth: Electress Palatine*, p. 306.

Despite their tenuous financial situation, the ongoing struggle to reclaim the Palatinate, and the sometimes-icy atmosphere of The Hague, Elizabeth and Frederick carried on with as much opulence and grace as possible.[573] An inventory of Wassenaer Hof and Rhenen Palace, drawn up in 1661 for Elizabeth's departure for England, is unfortunately missing its account of the paintings, but the furnishings, fabrics, and metalwork testify to what, thirty years prior, was certainly a magnificence of display.[574] Tapestries covered the walls, while velvet and Turkish carpets accented the beds and tables. Velvet chairs embroidered with gold and silver embellished the chambers. Bed curtains, table covers, and tapestries glittered with silk, gold, and silver under the light of candles and flambeaus.[575]

A 1633 inventory of Rhenen Palace, drawn up after Frederick's death by the house's caretaker Anthoni Alberts de Beer, describes the lush furnishings in great

---

[573] Though Elizabeth was initially the highest-ranking woman at court, when Frederik Hendrik married Amalia, one of her ladies in waiting, in 1625, Elizabeth's tenuous position slipped even further, and relations between the two couples at court, though initially quite close, gradually diminished. See Keblusek, "The Bohemian Court at The Hague," pp. 50-56.

[574] See Hoogsteder 1984-86, I, pp. 51-53. Both inventories are reproduced in full in Hoogsteder 1984-86, II. See also Keblusek, "The Bohemian Court at The Hague," p. 54, which incorrectly states that the inventory was drawn up after Elizabeth's death in 1661. Elizabeth did not die until 1662.

[575] Keblusek, "The Bohemian Court at The Hague," p. 54.

detail.[576] It records 149 tapestries, many with gold, silver, and silk threads, twenty-four of which were of costly Brussels manufacture, and likely brought by the couple from Heidelberg.[577] In addition to representing a diverse number of subjects, to which I will return, it appears that in at least two instances such tapestries served as a room's sole decoration.[578] In Elizabeth's cabinet, furthermore, the walls had just been re-clad with new blue-and-gold stamped leather, replacing the previous red scheme.[579] The majority of the ten beds were richly decorated with silver and gold embroidery and a prevalence of [Palatine] blue damask.[580] The most elaborate were those found in

---

[576] The inventory is transcribed in full in Kretzschmar 1903, pp. 107-119, based on the original in the Königlich Hausarchiv Munich, no. 1022 ½.

[577] Kretzschmar 1903, p. 99. Kretzschmar describes this subset as Gobelins tapestries but in the inventory, they are described as *Brüsselische arbeit*. On the quality and characteristics of Brussels tapestry in this period see Campbell, "Development of New Centers," and "Disruption and Diaspora," in *Tapestry in the Baroque.* On the tapestry collection in Heidelberg see Hubach, "Tales from the Tapestry Collection," p. 105. Hubach relates that by 1613 the Electoral tapestry collection "well exceeded 500 pieces." For the sending of tapestries to Prague from Heidelberg see Hubach p. 115.

[578] Kretzchmar 1903, p. 108: several of the inventory entries describe the subject of the tapestries in terms of a "room", possibly suggesting an overall theme. Two of the entries, however, specify that it was a "Tapestry Room" [Eine Kammer Tapizerei].

[579] Kretzschmar 1903, p. 108, inventory nos. 17 & 18.

[580] Martin Royalton-Kisch (*Adriaen van de Venne's Album in the Department of Prints and Drawings in the British Museum* [London: Published for the Trustees of the British Museum by British Museum Publications, 1988]: pp. 158-9, cat. no. 8) notes that in one of his watercolors Van de Venne depicts a man wearing blue and yellow, the Winter King's livery. In cat. no. 6 Royalton-Kisch also describes a ship that flies the blue and yellow flag of the Winter King.

Frederick and Elizabeth's respective bedchambers. Frederick's was a blue damask canopy bed embroidered with orange and white flowers and plumes.[581] Elizabeth's chamber was bedecked in silver. Her bed was embellished with gold and silver trimmings and fringe, silverwork bed hangings, a rich floral canopy, headboard and blankets, and a large velvet cushion.[582]

---

[581] The assignment of this bed to Frederick's chamber is my own speculation. The description is based upon the transcription given by Kretzschmar 1903, p. 110. In the original as reproduced by Hoogsteder vol. II, there is a marginal notation that is difficult to read, but to me strongly resembles König. This is supported by the facts that it appears adjacent in the inventory to the bed clearly labeled as belonging to Elizabeth, that the two are the most thoroughly described, and that they are two of the six beds not taken to Heidelberg by Charles Louis in 1649. See also Keblusek, "The Bohemian Court at The Hague," p. 54.

[582] Description based on that given by Kretzschmar 1903, pp. 110-111. The fabric is described as floral Caffa [geblümbten Caffa]. That the bed was in Elizabeth's chamber is clearly noted in the margin of the original document as reproduced by Hoogsteder 1984-86, II. According to the OED, Caffa was a "rich silk cloth, apparently similar to damask, much used in the 16th century." <http://www.oed.com.udel.idm.oclc.org/view/Entry/26035?redirectedFrom=caffa#eid > (Accessed 8 December 2017). See also Keblusek, "The Bohemian Court at The Hague," p. 54. Keblusek bases her description on Hoogsteder but says that the bed in Elizabeth's chamber at Rhenen was blue. Neither Kretzschmar's transcription nor Hoogsteder's reproduction include a description of this bed as blue, though many of the beds throughout Rhenen were indeed blue. Later on that same page, Keblusek describes Elizabeth's "silver" chamber, and her description of the bed matches that described above fairly exactly, but Keblusek seems to assign this bed to Elizabeth's chamber at Wassenaer Hof based on the 1661 inventory. As far as I can tell by Hoogsteder's reproduction, there is no indication of where the beds were in the 1661 inventory, and indeed much of the furnishings left at Rhenen appear here again, as Keblusek notes. It seems to me that Keblusek is referencing the same bed twice, once incorrectly describing it as blue.

The exiled couple also thoroughly indulged in courtly entertainments, and both of their palaces included a billiard room, as captured by Adriaen van de Venne in one of his drawings of life at The Hague courts (Fig. 4.13; 1625-26, London, British Museum). Stadtholder Frederik Hendrik and his wife Amalia van Solms organized the more elaborate (and expensive) entertainments, with Frederick and Elizabeth always given places of honor. Tournaments, tilts, fireworks, plays, ballets, and *tableaux vivants* were all held at the various Orange palaces. The Wassenaer Hof also hosted its share of elaborate events, such as the meal that Elizabeth planned in 1625 to celebrate her brother's marriage.

After Frederick's death in 1632, Elizabeth's political situation became even more tenuous, and after Frederik Hendrik's death in 1647 life in The Hague became increasingly uncomfortable as her rivalry with Amalia deepened. To make matters worse, she received no allowance from England after the start of the Civil War in 1642; already in 1644 a member of her household noted that Elizabeth had not organized a party in a year.[583] Her hopes now rested even more firmly on finding advantageous marriages for her children, for which she had high expectations that were seldom realized.[584] Her letter declining Charles's invitation to London after

---

[583] Keblusek, "The Bohemian Court at The Hague," p. 56.

[584] Akkerman, *Courtly Rivals*, pp. 71-79. The most striking example is Elizabeth's wish to marry her son Charles Louis to her niece, the English Princess Mary Stuart. A match that should have presumably been easy, given her close relationship with Charles, was instead rebuffed, and Mary married Willem II, Amalia and Frederik

Frederick's death demonstrates her anxiety about the children's futures. It reads as an outpouring of despair at her situation and is worth reading at length:

> I know not how I can sufficiently express my most humble thanks for the two most affectionate letters which I received…They found me the most wretched creature that ever lived in this world, and this I shall ever be, having lost the best friend that I ever had, in whom was all my delight; having fixed my affections so entirely upon him, that I should have longed to be where he is, were it not that his children would thus have been left utterly destitute…I entreat you to pardon me, if I cannot at present obey your command and my own wishes…I doubt whether…I shall be able so soon to enjoy this happiness, until my poor children can be re-established in the empire, or at least in a fair way of being so.
> …
> I put no small constraint on my inclinations in not obeying your commands to come to you: for God knows that it would be my only comfort, but I must prefer the welfare of my poor children to my own satisfaction. The last request that their father made me, before his departure, was to do all that I could for them; which I wish to do, as far as lies in my power, loving them better because they are his, than because they are my own. Wherefore I must entreat you to take us all into your protection, for after God, our sole resource is in you. Pardon me that I write you this, instead of obeying your command—doing it against my will—but my misfortune constrains me; although, whilst I am in the world, it can never force me to be other than
> Your most affectionate, although most unfortunate sister and most humble servant
> Elizabeth[585]

At the time of her writing this letter none of Elizabeth's surviving children were married (only four of the eight that survived to adulthood would marry), and she

---

Hendrik's son. See also Keblusek, "The Bohemian Court at The Hague," pp. 50-53, 56; and Akkerman 2015, pp. 20-21.

[585] Akkerman 2011, pp. 151-152, letter no. 71 dated 14/24 December 1632. Charles's initial letter issuing the invitation is no. 68.

would never see her brother again. Charles was executed in 1649, the same year her son returned to the Palatinate as Elector and, by Elizabeth's professed standard, freed her to visit her homeland at last.

The Strategic Diplomacy of *Seladon and Astraea*

As discussed in Chapter 2, not only were the Bohemian monarchs probably familiar with Honthorst as early as 1621, but Elizabeth may have had a hand in orchestrating his invitation to London in 1628. Within hours of his return to the Netherlands from the court of Charles I, Honthorst was in The Hague seeking an audience with Elizabeth, as he relates to Dudley Carleton in a letter of 29 December 1628. In addition to the financial rewards with which he had returned after eight months in London, he also delivered, from Charles, a letter and portraits of the king and queen as a shepherd and shepherdess.[586] In the same letter recounting this delivery, Honthorst reports that Charles also commissioned a set of pictures in return: one of Elizabeth and all of her children, and a pair of portraits. This letter also evidences that Elizabeth was not merely a passive participant in this system of exchange. Honthorst stresses that she was eager to be portrayed in a pastoral manner, but that the commission was specifically intended to send to her brother. Elizabeth's

---

[586] Carpenter 1844, p. 181, letter from Honthorst to Carleton 29 December 1628. Honthorst writes that after arriving in Flushing from Gravesend he "passed over immediately to the Hague, where I applied and delivered the letter and the two portraits from his Majesty to the Queen of Bohemia."

involvement here was clever and strategic: Charles commissioned the picture, but she directed the subject matter towards the pastoral, seeking to complement and expand upon the style of picture that her brother evidently favored from Honthorst.

Charles's concern for Elizabeth's children was deep-rooted. In addition to financing their care and education, he was diligent in his attentions toward them, receiving a monthly report from Carleton on his eldest nephew's academic progress.[587] The children kept court in Leiden, where they received lessons in rhetoric, history, geography, drawing, music, and dancing.[588] The importance of the royal children's presence for Leiden tutors is evidenced by two related paintings now in the J. Paul Getty Museum (Figs. 4.14, 4.15; 1631, 1629-30). One, by Jan Lievens (1607-74), shows Charles Louis crowned with laurel in an elaborate, historicized golden robe with his tutor Wolrad von Plessen (1560-1631), who wears a chain of honor. Alluding to Aristotle's instruction of the young Alexander the Great, Lievens's life-size painting valorizes both teacher and pupil in a way that indicates the commission came

---

[587] Keblusek, "The Bohemian Court at The Hague," p. 50. Elizabeth's preoccupation with family connections is also evident in the names of several of her children: Frederick Henry, named for his father, Charles and Elizabeth's beloved late brother Henry Frederick, and Frederik Hendrik, the Dutch stadtholder and great uncle giving his family asylum; Charles Louis, named after his uncle Charles I; Maurice, named for Prince Maurits of Nassau, Frederik Hendrik's half-brother and the stadtholder who first offered the Bohemian family shelter in the Netherlands; and Henriette Marie, who shared her name with Charles's wife.

[588] Keblusek, "The Bohemian Court at The Hague," p. 50. The boys received additional tutoring in physical education and math, while embroidery was taught only to the girls.

from Von Plessen, probably as a gift to Elizabeth.[589] The identification of figures in the second Getty picture—previously attributed to Gerrit Dou (1613-75) and now given to Rembrandt's workshop—is more uncertain. While the boy is certainly another Palatine Prince, likely Rupert, the second oldest son, the tutor is unknown, unless it is another portrait of Von Plessen.[590] As the compositions of the two paintings are similar, they are close in size, share the same format, and the boys' costumes are both fantastical, Willem Jan Hoogsteder has suggested that they are the result of a competition between the two studios.[591] This could have been precipitated by several of the children's arrival in Leiden in 1628 after a prolonged separation, including Charles Louis.

The last of the children left Leiden in 1641, after which Elizabeth presented the city with an elaborate silver goblet as a token of her gratitude (Fig. 4.16; Leiden,

---

[589] Hoogsteder 2003, pp. 197, 200 (caption for fig. 10). Hoogsteder supposes that the commissions for both pictures came from the teachers themselves, and that Elizabeth and Frederick possibly took over the payment, giving the pictures to the tutors. Either way, Hoogsteder thinks it unlikely that the Leiden painters would have been engaged directly by the Bohemian monarchs, and the paintings do not appear in the Rhenen inventory. The Getty's provenance supports Hoogsteder's initial theory that the paintings were commissioned as gifts for Elizabeth and Frederick. Both paintings were first listed in the Craven collection, meaning that they likely entered with many of Elizabeth's paintings upon her death in 1662.

[590] Hoogsteder (2003, p. 197) notes that the figure might be Jan Jansz. Orlers (1570-1646).

[591] Hoogsteder 2003, p. 200.

Museum de Lakenhal).[592] Though they no longer maintained a separate court, the eldest continued to draw their pensions from England.[593] Additional monies were granted to the boys when they were inducted into the Order of the Garter, as Charles Louis was in 1633 after the death of his father, and Rupert was in 1642.[594] Speaking to Charles I's regard for his nephew Charles Louis is a portrait by Anthony van Dyck (Fig. 4.17; Dresden, Gemäldegalerie Alte Meister). It features the English King dressed somberly in black with a large, prominently displayed silver star bearing the cross of Saint George, part of the insignia of the Order. Charles sent the portrait to his nephew as a gift around 1633, commemorating the boy's induction into the Order as well as Charles I's mourning over the death of Frederick V.[595]

Elizabeth, eager to leverage both Charles's interest in continental painters—Honthorst being a recent and readily available example of such—and his love for her children, seems to have directed Honthorst's paintings toward the most advantageous subject matter. Elizabeth's letters to Charles around this time consistently juxtapose

---

[592] Keblusek, "The Bohemian Court in The Hague," p. 51.

[593] Green, *Elizabeth: Electress Palatine*, pp. 233, 238, 267. In 1624 Elizabeth had secured annual funds for her sons Frederick and Charles, and after the former's death in 1629 his pension was transferred to the latter, whose smaller pension was in turn given to Rupert, at which time the eldest daughter Elizabeth's allowance was increased to match Rupert's.

[594] Keblusek, "The Bohemian Court in The Hague," p. 51; Green, *Elizabeth: Electress Palatine*, p. 238.

[595] Adam Eaker in *Van Dyck: The Anatomy of Portraiture*, p. 200, cat. no. 70.

references to paintings with entreaties for support or forceful political language. Just a few weeks after Honthorst's return to the Netherlands, Elizabeth sent a short letter to Charles in which, after pressing him to "continue your loue and fauour to me, which is the greatest contentment I haue in this worlde," she includes a postscript reporting that "Hunthorst is busie to beginne his picturies I esteeme those you did send me of the Queene and yours my cheef iewells [chief jewels]."[596] These are most likely the half-length portraits that Honthorst completed two months later, as he reports in a letter to Dudley Carleton:

> I have spent some days in The Hague, where I made half-length portraits of Their Majesties the King and Queen of Bohemia, at the request of signore Carr on behalf on His Majesty of England.[597] I hope that if His Majesty, with Your Excellency, sees it, he will greatly enjoy it. In addition, I have made a *modello* of the portrait of Their Majesties of Bohemia with all of the princes and princesses, their children, about which Their Majesties were very pleased.[598]

These half-length portraits are most likely the two that Abraham van der Doort records as hanging in Charles's bedchamber at Whitehall Palace in his 1637-40 inventory.[599] Honthorst's letter also documents the creative process between artist and patron(s).

---

[596] Akkerman 2015, p. 715, letter no. 489, dated 2/12 January 1629.

[597] Hoogsteder 1984-86, I, p. 100: Sir Robert Kerr, 1st Earl of Ancram (c. 1578-1654).

[598] SP 84/139/30. For a full transcription and translation see Appendix C.

[599] Millar 1960, p. 35, nos. 2 and 4, both attributed to Honthorst. White (*Dutch Pictures,* pp. xxvi-xxvii) also assumes that these are the same portraits mentioned by Van der Doort as hanging in the King's bedchamber.

Though Charles had commissioned the group portrait, the *modello* was drawn from life under Elizabeth and Frederick's direction, and seems to have been shown only to them for approval before the full-scale painting was undertaken.[600]

The resultant painting, *Seladon and Astraea* (Fig. 4.18), was underway just over a month later, when Elizabeth again promoted it before its arrival in London. She wrote to Charles in April 1629: "Your honest fat henry Vane can tell you, how Hunthorst hath begunne our pictures, Where you will see a Whole table of munkeyes besides my proper self, Who will liue and die My onely deare brother."[601] These "monkeys" refer to Elizabeth and Frederick's eleven children who, living and dead, also occupy this pastoral setting. In this fascinating letter, Elizabeth reinforces her political strategy through a discussion of paintings; the description above comes at the close of a forceful policy discussion. Elizabeth and Frederick actively sought the restitution of the Palatinate and though this remained one of Charles's primary foreign

---

[600] This modello is listed as Braun 1966, p. 312, cat. no. 21. In Braun's discussion of *Seladon and Astraea*, the existence of the sketch is limited to one sentence, and the date of the letter is misidentified as 29 March 1629 (cat. no. 83, pp. 227-230). Judson/Ekkart 1999 (cat. no. 191), lists the *modello* in the paintings section, but says it is most likely a drawing, like the composition drawing for the *Apollo and Diana* preserved in the Museum Boijmans van Beuningen in Rotterdam (Fig. 3.42). The half-length of Elizabeth is likely the same as the one copied by Robert van Voerst for a print in 1631 (see an example in the Royal Collection Trust, RCIN 611119).

[601] Akkerman 2015, letter 507, pp. 742-744.

policy issues, she belabored the point in nearly every letter to her brother.[602] In this case, she entreats Charles to consider peace with Spain carefully, and that she is

> most confident that you Will conclude no peace With Spaine…without our full restitution. I am hartily glad to see you looke vpon their proceedings with open eyes, for that I haue seldome or euer heard that they haue euer parted from that by Treatie Which hath beene acquired by the sword, how euer I wish this Treatie may produce the contrarie.[603]

Elizabeth then begins discussing a previous exchange of portraits, implicitly connecting these gifts with her tenuous political situation. Regarding the "receite of your brothers picture and mine," Elizabeth explicitly connects them with thanks for Charles's support and hopes that it will continue (or increase): "that thankes You giue me for them, and the good vsage of those that come from You is more then I derserue, for I doe but what I ought in it, and am sorrie I am able to doe no more."[604] The description of Honthorst's painting, strategically including the pet term "monkeys," by which Charles must have known her children, closes the frank discussion.

The painting was finished by May of the next year, when Honthorst complained to Dudley Carleton that he had not been paid: though he was "glad to understand that his Ma^{tie} liketh well of the picture I have sent him by my brother," he begged Carleton's assistance in the "quicke dispatch" of repayment for his "great

---

[602] Elliott, "A Troubled Relationship," p. 29.

[603] Akkerman 2015, p. 742.

[604] Akkerman 2015, p. 743.

labour and charges" (£210) in completing to the picture.[605] As discussed in Chapter 3, Honthorst was probably paid £420 three years earlier for all seven of the paintings he completed for the king in London, including the large *Apollo and Diana*. £210 would also have been considered quite a high price for a single painting, even one as large as

---

[605] Reproduced in Carpenter 1844, p. 182, letter from Honthorst to Carleton dated 22 May 1630. Honthorst suggests that Carleton arrange an authorization of payment through "Mr. Burlamachi" in Amsterdam. This refers to Filippo Burlamacchi, an English Royal Exchanger, who together with Giovanni Calandrini founded a pan-European trading company in 1606. The Burlamacchi/Calandrini firm also operated as bankers handling large loans and had high credit (Ulrich Ufer, *Welthandelzentrum Amsterdam: globale Dynamik und modernes Leben im 17. Jahrhundert* [Cologne: Böhlau Verlag, 2008]: pp. 280-28; Charles Poor Kindleberger, *A Financial History of Western Europe* [London, Boston: Allen & Unwin, 1984]: p. 43). Filippo Calandrini, who later became Burlamacchi's brother-in-law, headed the firm's interested in Amsterdam. (Ole Peter Grell, "Merchants and Ministers: The Foundations of International Calvinism," in Andrew Petegree, Alastair Duke, and Gillian Lewis, eds., *Calvinism in Europe, 1540-1620* [Cambridge, New York: Cambridge University Press, 1994]: p. 261). Unbeknownst to Honthorst, the Crown had already issued a warrant of payment for "the some of two hundred and tenne pounds…in satisfaccon of a picture of o^{r} brother and Sister the King and Queene of Bohemia and theire Children by him made and sent unto us." Sainsbury 1859 (p. 295) reproduces a Royal Sign Manual dated 30 March 1631, and the previous warrant of the Privy Seal granting Honthorst the payment of £210 is referenced within, with the date of the first warrant given as 18 May 1630. Though Sainsbury supposes that this payment is for the *Apollo and Diana*, it is almost certainly the *Seladon and Astraea*, which was sent to England sometime in 1630. Sometime after the first warrant was issued Henry Vane, on one of his Ambassadorships to the Netherlands, had paid Honthorst the £210 out of pocket, after which the second Warrant was issued, cancelling the payment to Honthorst and authorizing repayment in the same amount to Vane. Honthorst's complaining letter to Carleton is dated 22 May, just four days after the £210 payment was approved by the crown on 18 May. It is probable that either Honthorst did not know yet about the authorized payment, or that his letter is dated 22 May new style, placing it ten days ahead of dating in London, meaning that it was still only 12 May there, and the Warrant had not yet been issued.

this, though it retained its value well, being priced at £100 in the Commonwealth Inventories, far higher than Honthorst's other paintings.[606]

Seladon and Astraea introduced a new type of *portrait historié* in the pastoral group portrait or, as Abraham van der Doort would later describe the painting, "in manner of storie."[607] It situates Frederick and Elizabeth, in the guise of contemporary romantic heroes, in a garden of love surrounded by their children, who present them and strew flowers at their feet. There are some similarities between the general arrangements of the figures in this and the *Apollo and Diana* (Fig. 3.4), and Honthorst may well have intended them to be complementary. This is particularly true of the central trio of Frederick, Elizabeth, and their sixth son Edward, in Elizabeth's outstretched right arm, Edward's stooping to lift his mother's train, and the general act of presentation to a figure situated above, in this case a statue of Nature.

Seladon and Astraea is also virtually unique among seventeenth-century paintings for its subject matter. Despite the success of the literary source material, Honoré d'Urfé's (1568-1625) *L'Astrée* (published in six parts between 1607 and 27) the subject did not enjoy popularity in pictures.[608] However, prose romance in general,

---

[606] Millar 1972, p. 273, no. 274.

[607] Kettering, *The Dutch Arcadia,* p. 101. Earlier (p. 67), Kettering characterizes Elizabeth's commissioning of *Seladon* as part of a competition with Charles, and describes the picture as, "the largest pastoral portrait ever executed"; Judson/Ekkart 1999, cat. no. 192, pp. 161-162.

[608] At the time of D'Urfé's death in 1625, only the first three books of the novel had been published, and there would be no illustrated edition until 1632-33. Jean-Marc

and French romances specifically, held great personal significance for Elizabeth; a later inventory reveals that the library of Elizabeth's palace at Rhenen contained over 100 such volumes.[609] The mythological referent of *L'Astrée* was also particularly meaningful to Elizabeth. Around the time of her marriage in 1613, poets lavished her with comparisons to Astraea, the same guise under which praise of Elizabeth I had often appeared.[610] We should recall that Astraea, a celestial Goddess believed to usher in a new Golden Age, was invoked in descriptions of Elizabeth's passage up the aisle when she was compared to a constellation, just as her godmother Elizabeth I's passage into heaven was described as the Queen having "rendered her celestiall soule to GOD."[611]

That D'Urfé's novel was deeply personal for Elizabeth and Frederick is demonstrated by three instances in which Frederick wrote to her referring to himself as Celadon. On 17 June 1622, he wrote

---

Chatelain and Delphine Denis, "*L'Astrée* d'Honoré d'Urfé: Fortune et Vicissitudes d'un *Best-Seller* au XVII^{e} Siècle," *Revue d'Histoire littéraire de la France* 117, no. 4 (Octobre-Décembre 2017): pp. 785-786. See also Louise K. Horowitz, "Pastoral Parenting: L'Astrée," *Studies in the History of Art* 36, Symposium Papers XX: The Pastoral Landscape (1992): p. 130. Additionally, there was at least one portrait where the sitter can confidently be identified as being portrayed in the guise of Astraea: Claude Deruet's *Portrait of Julie d'Angennes as Astraea* from 1641-45 (Fig. 4.19; Strasbourg, Musée des Beaux-Arts).

[609] Akkerman, *Courtly Rivals*, p. 45.

[610] Akkerman, *Courtly Rivals*, p. 45. See also Lewalski, *Writing Women,* pp. 45-46.

[611] Camden 1635, "The Author to the Reader."

> I feel myself most obliged to you for the trouble that it pleases you to take and that you **remember your poor Celadon** who will love you and honour you until death…may God preserve you for a very long time and that he does me the favour of seeing **my Astraea** soon.

On 4/14 August:

> My thoughts are with **my dear Astraea** whom I love entirely until death. God sends me many afflictions and not least of them is to be for so long apart from my dear heart, whose portrait is very carefully worn by me. I kiss the dear mouth a million times in imagination.

And on 30 September he characterized their love as friendship in a manner common throughout their letters:

> Continue always loving **your poor Celadon** and be assured that his thoughts are continually of **his Astraea** and that he is until death, Madam, Your most faithful friend and most affectionate servant.[612]

Frederick's allusions to *L'Astrée* are always coupled with laments about his and Elizabeth's prolonged separation while Frederick engaged in military campaigns in his efforts to reclaim the Palatinate. In *L'Astrée*, Celadon and Astraea's romance flourishes in spite of parental bans, misinformation, unfaithfulness, and ultimately a lengthy separation. As literary historian Kathleen Wine has argued, the principal

---

[612] See Akkerman 2015, pp. 366 (no. 265, letter dated 17 June 1622), 389 (no. 276, letter dated 4/14 August 1622), and 400 (no. 282, letter dated 30 September 1622). See also Akkerman, *Courtly Rivals*, p. 45. Frederick's references to *L'Astrée* are furthermore at the height of contemporary literature. The final volume would not come out until 1627 (published posthumously under the direction of D'Urfé's secretary Balthazar Baro (Chatelain and Denis, "*L'Astrée* d'Honoré d'Urfé," pp. 783-784.

action of D'Urfé's novel is that of efforts to reunite these two lovers.[613] Furthermore, in keeping with pastoral literary convention, D'Urfé's shepherds and shepherdesses are the descendants of nobility, who at some point in the past chose to quit the bonds of courtly life for the serenity of the countryside, their honorable peasantry defined in part by discussions of love.[614] This ideal of perfect, constant love is central to *L'Astrée*, the foremost pillar of the utopia that D'Urfé constructs and his characters and readers inhabit.[615] In Germany there was even an aristocratic tradition of passing the time between new installments of D'Urfé's story by dressing up as Celadon, Astraea, and other characters and playacting, thereby extending the escapist fantasy from the page into the real world in much the same way that Stuart masques collapsed reality and fiction, as discussed above and in the previous chapter.[616]

---

[613] Kathleen Wine, "*L'Astrée*: Tomb or Fountain?" *L'Esprit Créateur* 25, no. 1 (Spring 1985: Art, Architecture, Text: The Late Renaissance): p. 37.

[614] Horowitz, "Pastoral Parenting," pp. 130-131.

[615] Twyla Meding, "Pastoral Palimpsest: Writing the Laws of Love in *L'Astrée*," *Renaissance Quarterly* 52, no. 4 (Winter 1999): pp. 1089-1090. Meding continues by arguing that (pp. 1099-1100): "*L'Astrée* harks back then to a golden age of love founded on manly honor and virtue and supported by an integrity of *parole* shunned in the reader's fallen world of false love." See also Horowitz ("Pastoral Parenting," p. 133), who describes the connection between the two lovers thusly: "Celadon and Astrée exist in that mutual embrace, that state of fundamental, essential union beyond, or before scission."

[616] Horowitz, "Pastoral Parenting," p. 130.

At one point in the novel's second book, originally published in 1610, Celadon constructs a *Temple d'Astrée* in an attempt to cope with the separation from his beloved. The temple contains a life-size image of his shepherdess, what literary historian and linguist Twyla Meding described as, "an amplification of the miniature Céladon holds close to his heart at all times."[617] It is certainly no coincidence that Frederick describes his longing for Elizabeth in the same terms, describing how he wears a portrait of her so that he may "kiss the dear mouth a million times in imagination." Honthorst's portrait of Frederick and Elizabeth as Celadon and Astraea, then, can be seen as the amplification of the miniature that Frederick treasured when he was away on military campaigns. In this painted version of paradise, Elizabeth and Frederick—life-size—are together permanently. Honthorst's painting can also function in this way as a resolution to D'Urfé's story, a happy post-script for a text that purposefully frustrated a satisfactory ending.[618]

The success of this second of Honthorst's large *portraits historiés* is evidenced by the painting's prominent display in St. James's Palace after it was sent to Charles. There, it served as a celebration of the Stuart line in absentia, an encapsulation of

---

[617] Meding, "Pastoral Palimpsest," p. 1091. D'Urfé 1630, II, Book V, pp. 336-339 (originally published 1610).

[618] Horowitz, "Pastoral Parenting," pp. 130-131. Horowitz argues that if *L'Astrée* was left in an unfinished state, it "may be for reasons other than an untimely death [of the author]. Pastoral may require an 'unfinished' status, for consummation and conclusion rupture its inherent properties of wish, dream, and bearer of truth forever beyond resolution."

Frederick and Elizabeth's virtuous love, and a demonstration of the strength of the Bohemian family in their goal to reclaim the Palatinate. In his convincing analysis of the creative arrangement of pictures in Charles's palaces, John Peacock devotes the final example to the Gallery at St. James's, which he interprets as culminating in Anthony van Dyck's *Charles I and Monsieur de St. Antoine* (Fig. 4.20; London, Royal Collection Trust). This was preceded by important sixteenth-century Italian paintings, the most significant of which were Titian and Giulio Romano's respective portraits of the twelve Caesars (Figs. 4.21, 4.22; London, Wellcome Collection and Royal Collection Trust). For Peacock, these are the interpretive keys to the entire Gallery, in which we are prompted to view Charles as the "imperial heir" of the Caesars, and Van Dyck as the heir of the Italian masters.[619]

However, further scrutiny of the seventeenth-century account of this display does much to expand upon Peacock's interpretation.[620] Other than Van Dyck's equestrian portrait, only five other paintings by non-Italian artists were hung in the Gallery. Two are also portraits by Van Dyck (Figs. 4.23, 4.24; both London, Royal

---

[619] Peacock, "Politics of Portraiture," p. 226.

[620] Timothy Wilks, "'Paying special attention to the adorning of a most beautiful gallery' : The Pictures in St. James's Palace, 1609-49," *Court Historian* 10, no. 2 (December 2005): p. 155: this inventory was published as an appendix to Millar's edition of Van der Doort's catalogue in 1960. According to Millar (1960, pp. xxiii-xxiv), the inventory must have been compiled between June 1640 and May 1641 and thus it is impossible that it is by Van der Doort, who took his own life just prior to this.

Collection Trust). Two more are Flemish church interiors, and the last is *Seladon and Astraea*, described by Van der Doort as, "The King and Queene of Bohemia and their Children in manner of Storie done by Hunthurst."[621] Art historian Timothy Wilks has recently presented a convincing argument for the arrangement of the Gallery, based on this inventory and an early eighteenth-century plan of the palace, completed when the Gallery was still extant.[622]

If we take the order of the inventory, as Wilks does, as representative of how one would have moved through the space, then Van Dyck's *Charles I and Monsieur de St. Antoine*, listed as [1], would occupy the space at one end as a tribute not only to Charles, but also his late brother Henry, whose hanging scheme served as the basis for Charles's and whose faithful equerry, St. Antoine, appears in Van Dyck's painting.[623] Immediately next to it is [2], "A lyeing entire figure of Prome==theus done By Jaquama Palma the younger," which Henry had placed in the scheme (Fig. 4.25; London, Royal Collection Trust).[624] Palma's (ca. 1548-1628) reliance on Titian's *Tityus* (Fig. 4.26; Madrid, Museo del Prado) is so acute that Sir Henry Wotton (1568-1639) described the picture in 1608 as, "a figure (I take it) of Prometheus devoured by

---

[621] Millar 1960, p. 228.

[622] Wilks, "a most beautiful gallery," p. 155.

[623] Wilks, "a most beautiful gallery," p. 157. Indeed, the portrait's position there is confirmed by an observer in 1639 (see Wilks p. 157n39).

[624] Millar 1960, p. 226.

the eagle, done by Giacobo Palma in concurrence with Titiano, which for emulation between two painters (both of no small name) I dare almost say to be worth of a corner in one of your Lordship's galleries."[625] It is also certainly no coincidence that this picture, thought to be partially by Titian, whose *Tityus* formed an important part of the Spanish Habsburg collections, hung immediately beside Van Dyck's first equestrian portrait of Charles I.

This imperial theme, as Peacock argues, is reinforced by the Caesars, which are hung in chronological order beginning with Julius Caesar and ending with Otho. Furthermore, the arrangement of the Caesars sets up a kind of Roman-Venetian dichotomy. Partially preserving the original design at the Palazzo Ducale in Mantua in which the Romano paintings hung below those of Titian, the works were paired by subject, seemingly to invite comparisons of each master's portrayal of a specific emperor. This technique is repeated elsewhere in the Gallery, where works by Titian, Caravaggio, Tintoretto, and Van Dyck invite comparisons between regions, styles, subjects, and time periods. In addition, only part of both series of Caesars were on display, suggesting that aesthetic evaluation may have been equal to dynastic

---

[625] Letter from Wotton to Robert Cecil, 1st Earl of Salisbury (c. 1565-1612), as quoted in Wilks, "a most beautiful gallery," p. 151. For the emulation and impact of Titian's *Tityus*, see Christopher D. M. Atkins, *The Wrath of the Gods: Masterpieces by Rubens, Michelangelo, and Titian* (Philadelphia: Philadelphia Museum of Art in association with Yale University Press, 2015. Exh. cat.).

concerns.[626] The Caesars were interrupted by Guido Reni's *Hercules on the Pyre* (Fig. 4.27; Paris, Musée du Louvre), which Wilks suggests occupied the end wall opposite Van Dyck's equestrian portrait.[627] Hercules was a common and potent *exemplum* among royalty and nobility in the early modern period—a point to which I will return—and this depiction of the final, heroic moment before his apotheosis thus functions as a logical complement to the imperial and martial themes found throughout the Gallery.

As Wilks's main goal is to uncover the underlying armature of Henry's collection in Charles's c. 1640 display in St. James's, he mentions Honthorst's painting only in passing, situating it among other portraits as "reminders of Charles I's concern for his extended family."[628] Though Wilks describes it simply as hanging "close" to Van Dyck's Equestrian Portrait, *Seladon and Astraea* was in fact the last object listed in the inventory (no. 55), meaning that it hung next to or directly adjacent

---

[626] Wilks's argument supports this assertion ("a most beautiful gallery," p. 158), where he addresses the incomplete nature of the hang and points out that several of Titian's emperors, including *Vitellius* and *Galba*, were held in store for a long time at Whitehall, where they awaited various restoration campaigns to fix the damage done by a mercury spill *en route* from Mantua. See Ch. 3, n464.

[627] Millar 1960, p. 227, no. 27: "A Peece of Hercules lyeing on a Pile of Wood By Guido Bulloniza." Wilks, "a most beautiful gallery," pp. 158-160. The identification of Charles with Hercules here is reinforced by Reni's *Nessus and Deianeira* and *Hercules and the Hydra* occupying nos. 38 and 43 within the Gallery respectively.

[628] Wilks, "a most beautiful gallery," p. 169 and n105.

to Van Dyck's.[629] Rather than the display only culminating with Van Dyck, then, the two surviving children of James I and Anne of Denmark rather sat ensconced in glory side by side within the Gallery originally designed by their beloved late brother. Significantly, Caravaggio's arresting, 12 x 8-foot *Death of the Virgin* (Fig. 4.28; Paris, Musée du Louvre) also hung nearby *Seladon and Astraea*.[630] The juxtaposition of these two paintings must have highlighted how far Honthorst's court paintings had come from being "much of y^{e} manor of Caravagioes colouringe," as the Earl of Arundel had described Honthorst's work just nine years earlier.[631]

PART II: The Visual Program of Rhenen Palace

In her analysis of Elizabeth's identification with prose romance, Barbara Lewalski points out Elizabeth's increasing self-awareness, after marriage casting herself in "the role of warrior queen in support of the Elector's claims and the cause of international Protestantism."[632] What Marika Keblusek described as a "permanent

---

[629] Millar 1960, p. 228.

[630] Millar 1960, p. 228, no. 48: "A great Peece of our Ladie with the Apostles bewaileing By— Michael Angelo Carvagio." Charles had acquired the painting from the Gonzaga collection in the late 1620s.

[631] Arundel to Carleton, letter dated 20 July 1621 as reproduced in Sainsbury 1859, pp. 291-292. Though the inventory was made in 1640-41, only nine years separate Arundel's remark, made in 1621, and the completion of *Seladon and Astraea* in 1630.

[632] Lewalski, *Writing Women*, p. 47.

state of insolvency" in exile evidently did not stop Elizabeth from crafting and disseminating a royal image of her family through the works of Honthorst and other artists as part of this endeavor.[633] Unable to maintain consistent patronage, Elizabeth carefully marshalled her available resources to become a fierce advocate for her family's legacy, though she did not live to see her grandson come to the English throne as George I (r. 1714-1727).

De Beer's 1633 inventory of Rhenen Palace is the only one to preserve the scope of the Bohemian painting collection, although it gives few attributions and does not describe many paintings at length.[634] The inventories of 1633 and 1661 are furthermore organized by medium, meaning that they are of limited help in recreating the full visual program of either residence. However, in 1649 Elizabeth's son Charles Louis was restored as Elector Palatine and removed to war-torn Heidelberg Castle many of the furnishings of both Wassenaer Hof and Rhenen Palace, which he had inherited upon Frederick's death.[635] At that moment, De Beer made several additional notations on his 1633 inventory, marking the paintings, tapestries, and other

---

[633] Keblusek, "The Bohemian Court at The Hague," p. 56; Hoogsteder 2003, p. 204: suspects that most of the paintings were given as gifts, possibly many from individual towns as in the Dutch gift to Amalia on the occasion of her wedding, as in the inventory many of the attributions are accompanied by the artist's city.

[634] Hoogsteder 2003, p. 197: more than half of all non-portraits are given an attribution.

[635] Kretszchmar 1903, p. 100: of the Brussels-made tapestries, Charles Louis left only nine; he also took four of the ten beds and removed much of the furniture.

furnishings taken by the Elector. De Beer also included marginal notations on the location of many of the pictures, demonstrating that the picture inventory was mostly transcribed room-by-room through the palace.[636] However, the location of large groups of objects is only given for the paintings, making it difficult to reconstruct a decorative program. Nevertheless, many of the paintings and furnishings from the Wassenaer Hof were transferred to Rhenen in 1631 when Elizabeth and Frederick spent their first summer there after its completion.[637] This means that the 1633 inventory likely accounts for a large portion of Elizabeth's belongings or at least gives an accurate cross-section of the Bohemian collections.

De Beer's first inventory includes 127 paintings, of which a striking number were portraits: 68, or 53.5%. The collection of costly tapestries was even more extensive: twenty-one individual sets with 149 pieces in total. A majority of the tapestries represented biblical subjects (78, or 52.3%).[638] Some descriptions furthermore betray a thin façade of luxury. De Beer takes care to note when the textiles are new, or almost new, as well as describing some unfortunately damaged

---

[636] Hoogsteder 2003, p. 188: De Beer walked room by room to assemble the inventory, the marginal brackets listing locations were applied later, probably at the same time as the Heidelberg notations.

[637] Hoogsteder 2003, p. 188.

[638] My count is based on Kretszchmar's transcription of the inventory.

pieces.[639] This indicates a range of quality, which was unlikely to be resolved given the persistent lack of resources available to Elizabeth.

Even considering De Beer's 1633 inventory, a full understanding of the Bohemian picture galleries will remain a matter of some speculation, not least because the palace was demolished in 1812/13 and no seventeenth-century floor plan has survived.[640] Thankfully, a floor plan and front and rear elevations were recorded in 1748 by the architect Otto Heinrich von Bonn as part of an evaluation of the

---

[639] Kretszchmar 1903, p. 108, no. 15, for example, notes that a series of the history of Moses was almost new and had unfortunately been damaged by some holes. De Beer notes that only 8 of 9 pieces from No. 10, a set of hunting scenes, were taken to Heidelberg. This could be because the ninth piece was damaged somehow or otherwise in poor condition.

[640] The palace went by descent after Elizabeth's death to her children and grandchildren, first to Charles Louis, then Rupert, then Sophia, upon whose death it was inherited by her son George I. Already in the late seventeenth century the palace was empty and falling into disrepair, and with little funds or willingness to restore it, the decay continued. It was occupied by various Utrecht officials, and was surveyed in 1748, 1771, and 1802. After each of these surveys, combinations of restoration and partial demolition were proposed, but seem to never have been carried out. The palace was still standing in 1812, when it was being used as barracks. First George II and then George III wanted to sell the palace, but upon further investigation the clause set up by the States of Utrecht in their negotiations with Frederick in 1629 came to light, that the crown would have to pay 10,000 *f* to the states should they ever wish to sell the palace, so it was not sold. The property was bought in 1812/13 by four Rhenish burghers for the sum of 21,300 fl. It was almost immediately demolished. For the most complete account see Kretzschmar 1903, pp. 100-105; see also Muller 1911, pp. 72-73; and Van de Bunt 1959, p. 51. Muller mistakenly states that the property was sold for 10,000 *f* in 1812/13. Hendrik Enno van Gelder (1911, p. 234), responding to Muller 1911, was the first to identify Bartolomeus van Bassen as the architect of the Koningshuis, based on archival evidence.

property's condition (Figs. 4.29, 4.30).[641] Though the plan only shows one level of the palace, its title inscription notes that it represents the first and second floors, indicating an exact correspondence of rooms between the two levels (Fig. 4.31). Aided by this plan and the marginal notations made in 1649 by De Beer, I will analyze specific rooms of the *Palazzo Renense*, beginning with the most public and ending with the most private.

Based on this 1748 floor plan and the traditions of palace architecture, we can understand and assume several things about the layout of rooms in Rhenen Palace. Firstly, the central vestibule and the banqueting hall above it were the largest rooms, for which we are given the dimensions of 12.8 x 8.2 meters.[642] King's and Queen's chambers are traditionally mirror images of each other, with the general order of rooms going from the most public to the most private the further one moves from the main entrance; privy chambers were typically located on the second floor.[643] An 1802

---

[641] These drawings are in the Niedersächsisches Landesarchiv (NLA) Hannover, NLA HA Karten – Mappen Mappe Nr. 369 (formerly Hann. 76a Nr. 107). Kretzschmar 1903, p. 101; Overvoorde 1902-03, p. 75; and Muller 1911, p. 73.

[642] Kretzschmar 1903, p. 98; Overvoorde, 1902-03, p. 75.

[643] For this tradition regarding Whitehall Palace in the Tudor and Stuart eras, see Thurley, *Whitehall Palace,* pp. 46-50, 91-93. Wilks ("a most beautiful gallery," p. 155) also notes that the Gallery in St. James's was on the upper floor, and one end of the Gallery led towards the privy lodgings. Unfortunately, little is known of the arrangement of Elizabeth's chambers in Heidelberg Palace, which may well have had a direct influence on the building of Rhenen. At Heidelberg Elizabeth's rooms were in the *Englischer Bau*, possibly designed for her by Inigo Jones shortly after her arrival in Heidelberg. For Jones and Heidelberg see John Harris, "Inigo Jones and the Mystery of Heidelberg Castle: The Architects of the Englischer-Bau," *Apollo* 137, no.

survey of the property identified one of the rooms next to the side stairs in the west wing as the "Königskammer," or King's Room, so it is possible that Frederick's chambers were located in this west wing.[644] If Frederick's chambers were in the western wing of the palace, Elizabeth's would have been located in the eastern wing.[645] However, the contents of the king's and queen's cabinets are described successively in De Beer's inventory, which Hoogsteder interprets as meaning that the two sets of rooms laid adjacent to each other, possibly with a hallway in between.[646] Nevertheless, the symmetrical layout of the palace's wings, together with the somewhat piecemeal nature of the inventory supports the supposition that the king's and queen's chambers were mirrored rather than side-by-side. The main organizing principle of the inventory was by medium, and almost all of the locations were later

---

373 (March 1993): pp. 147-152; and Akkerman 2015, p. 18. Long destroyed, the layout of the *Englischer Bau* is difficult to reconstruct. Notes from the archive in Karlsruhe reveal that the residential rooms were to the south, facing the garden, and that when Charles Louis returned to Heidelberg as Elector the rooms in the *Englisher Bau* were cleaned and redecorated for continued use as living quarters: for this see Fritz Seitz, "Zur Baugeschichte des Heidelberger Schlosses," *Mitteilungen zur Geschichte des Heidelberger Schlosses* vol. 1 (1885-86): p. 251; and Heidelberger Schlossverein, "Aus den Akten des Großherzoglichen General-Landes-Archiv zu Karlsruhe [2]," *Mitteilungen zur Geschichte des Heidelberger Schlosses* vol. 1 (1885-86): pp. 204-05 (no. 168), p. 213 (no. 189).

[644] Kretzschmar 1903, p. 98.

[645] Kretzschmar 1903, p. 98: his cabinet was called the Königskammer in the 1802 evaluation of the property; Muller 1911, p. 71.

[646] Hoogsteder 2003, p. 191.

marginal notations, indicating that the recording of objects' placement may well have been an afterthought rather than a strict guideline.

Vestibule

In 1633, De Beer records about six paintings that seem to have hung in the vestibule, also called the *grossen saal*, or great hall. Displayed together in the most public of the palace's rooms and where most guests would be received, these works alluded to specific aspects of Elizabeth and Frederick's biography and courtly interests. Later, around 1636, two paintings by Honthorst were added to the vestibule's program: *Adversities of Elizabeth Stuart* (Fig. 4.40) and *Triumph of Elizabeth Stuart* (Fig. 4.41), which were the most important works that he produced for her and form the most potent visualization of her ambitions.[647] These paintings together with others

[647] Hoogsteder was the first to make a prolonged argument for the works as pendants, and indeed they are alike compositionally and were originally of similar size (Hoogsteder 1984-86, I, p. 107). Figure 4.41 is now referred to as the *Triumph of the Winter Queen: Allegory of the Just* by the Museum of Fine Arts Boston. This is title is closer in spirit to the imagery found throughout the work than that of Judson/Ekkart who, based on Hoogsteder's interpretation, label the works *Allegory of Injustice: The History of the Winter King's Family* (Fig. 4.40) and *Allegory of Justice: The History of the Winter King's Family* (Fig. 4.41); Judson/Ekkart 1999, cat. nos. 170, 171) as Elizabeth is the primary subject of both paintings and she commissioned them several years after Frederick's death. The MFA's titling of Fig. 4.41 as *Triumph of the Winter Queen* also seems somewhat innacurate, however. Though the name 'Winter Queen' does date to Elizabeth's lifetime, she does not seem to have self-identified as such. In light of the contemporary comments on the images, elaborated below, they may be better termed the *Adversities of Elizabeth Stuart* and the *Triumph of Elizabeth Stuart*.

throughout the palace testify to Elizabeth's desire to refashion her destitute circumstances in order to portray a simulacrum of magnificence in exile.

From the small and unassuming main doorway, a visitor would first enter the large vestibule, which provided the first and most prominent place for Elizabeth to project her identity through a program of pictures. Based on their low inventory numbers in De Beer's 1633 list, Hoogsteder identified a group of paintings that likely hung in this entrance hall.[648] Though it is difficult to determine (and Hoogsteder does not try) where this vestibule group might end, the first five paintings are all recorded in a similar manner. De Beer describes these paintings by subject and artist, as well as identifying the artist's city:

> Ein Stuck von Meister Cornelis von Harlem, venus, ceres und Bachus.
> Ein stuck von Schiffen von Abraham Wilges [Willaerts] von Utrecht.
> Ein Bancket von Vielen Persohnen von Bilart von Utrecht.
> Ein ander stuck von Schiffen, von Vroom von Harlem.
> Ein stuck von allerhand beesten von Saverj von Utrecht.[649]

---

[648] Hoogsteder 2003, p. 198. Hoogsteder's discussions of the arrangement of works in Rhenen Palace is just a small part of his research on the Bohemian art collection, based on his 1984-86 doctoral thesis, the only comprehensive study of the subject. Much of Hoogsteder's work serves as the basis for my analysis of Elizabeth's displays and many of my suppositions begin with his own, as he both produced a catalogue of the collection and published partial transcriptions and facsimiles of the relevant inventories.

[649] Hoogsteder 1984-86, II, p. 2 (inv. nos. R1-5).

These five works do share certain characteristics, though there is not much thematic consistency apart from the two seascapes. All are by contemporary Netherlandish painters, the majority of which are Utrecht-associated. The two Haarlem painters are both major artists, with Vroom among the most expensive and esteemed in the Netherlands. The fact that Utrecht artists are so well-represented in Elizabeth's collection (and that De Beer takes pains to identify them) could indicate that a number of important paintings were given as gifts by the states-general of Utrecht, possibly upon the completion of Rhenen palace, which was located in that municipality.[650] This would not be unusual: in 1627 Utrecht presented a gift of paintings to Amalia van Solms, and some of its contents strike a familiar chord. The group consisted of four works: a banquet of the Gods by Cornelis van Poelenburgh, animals and birds by Roelandt Savery (1576-1639), and a shepherd and shepherdess by Paulus Moreelse.[651] Thus Savery's animal piece and Jan van Bijlert's banquet could have easily been part of a similar gift, given around the same time to the other leading female patron at Dutch court.

As the most public space as well as one of the two biggest rooms in the palace, the great hall was presumably reserved for only the most significant, impressive paintings or, in the most practical sense, the largest. Though none of these five

---

[650] Hoogsteder 2003, p. 204.

[651] Kettering, *Dutch Arcadia*, p. 1.

paintings can be identified with certainty, probable or analog works can give us some idea of what once decorated this entrance hall. According to Hoogsteder, the *Venus, Ceres, and Bacchus* by Cornelis Cornelisz. van Haarlem was undoubtedly similar to the artist's version of the subject now in Dresden (Fig. 4.32; 1614). Set in a large-scale mythological concert, Cornelis's life-size nude deities must have made a striking impression regarding the artistic and intellectual acumen of the royal couple. At the same time, the painting's theme—derived from antiquity and adopted as a popular proverb in the seventeenth-century Netherlands—emphasizes those pleasures which are necessary to sustain love: food and wine.[652] Frederick and Elizabeth's love story was such an important part of their public image (literally given life in the form of their thirteen children), that the content of Cornelis's painting no doubt bolstered its important positioning.

Hoogsteder is convinced that the Hendrick Cornelisz. Vroom (1566-1640) mentioned by De Beer is the *Arrival of Frederick V and Elizabeth Stuart in Flushing on 29 April 1613* in the collection of the Frans Hals Museum (Fig. 4.33; 1623).[653] This is a tempting hypothesis and may in fact be the most logical assumption. However, De Beer only describes the painting in the most basic terms—a "piece with ships"—

---

[652] As far as I can tell the Dresden *Venus, Bacchus and Ceres* is unique for its type in that Bacchus is presented as the bearer of music rather than wine. He plays a lute that is positioned at the exact center of the painting, and this shift in theme is emphasized by the discarded violin in the lower right foreground.

[653] Hoogsteder 2003, p. 199.

without giving any dimensions or further information, so there is no way to firmly connect Vroom's *Arrival* with the picture in the great hall.

Nevertheless, Hoogsteder's supposition that it is this painting celebrating the tenth anniversary of Elizabeth and Frederick's first arrival in what would eventually become their permanent host country—the only known version of the scene done by Vroom—makes sense given the close proximity of a seascape by Adam Willaerts.[654] This suggests that the two hung in a thematic pair, a type of arrangement common throughout the inventory.[655] The presence of a Willaerts is certainly significant given that, of the seven existing versions of either Frederick and Elizabeth's *Embarkation* or *Arrival*—all completed in the 1620s and all by Dutch painters—four were done by Willaerts and only one by Vroom.[656]

---

[654] Though De Beer's inventory lists the painter's first name as Abraham, Adam Willaerts's son, Abraham is not known to have completed any version of the *Arrival* or *Departure*. At least one, the *Arrival* in the Royal Museums, Greenwich, is signed and dated "A. Willaerts 1623," something that could have easily led to confusion between father and son, who were both marine painters.

[655] Hoogsteder 2003, p. 199.

[656] Epco Runia, "« 494 » *The arrival of Frederik V of the Palatine and Elizabeth Stuart in Flushing on 29 April 1613*," in Neeltje Köhler, Pieter Biesboer, et al., *Painting in Haarlem 1500-1850: The Collection of the Frans Hals Museum* (Ghent: Ludion, 2006): pp. 638-640 (p. 640 n. 9). Willaerts seems to have completed two sets of the *Arrival* and *Departure*: one of each is in the collection of the National Maritime Museum, Greenwich (Figs. 4.3, 4.34); a *Departure* from 1623 is in the Royal Collection Trust, London (Fig. 4.2); and an *Arrival* was held by a London art dealer in 1995, though its current whereabouts are unknown (Fig. 4.35).

We can hardly underestimate the significance of the display of these paintings, which would together celebrate the couple's triumphant crossing of the channel at the beginning of their married life, emblematize their former glory, evoke the pomp they continued to elicit in the Netherlands, and serve as a beacon of the international reputation they hoped to reestablish. Given their meaningful content, such paintings would have furthermore been ideal gifts for the royal couple, the probable method through which most of their collection was acquired.[657] As the largest of Vroom's known works at almost 13.5 feet wide (409 cm), *Arrival* would have created a vivid impression of grandeur upon entering the palace.[658] Given its especially large size and Vroom's reputation, this work was undoubtedly done on commission, and would likely have been out of Elizabeth and Frederick's price range.[659]

It has long been assumed that the painting was commissioned by the city of Haarlem, as was the case with many of Vroom's large sea- and cityscapes. However, there is no documentary evidence to support this assertion, and the painting cannot be placed in the collections of the city of Haarlem until 1750.[660] *Arrival* was probably

---

[657] Hoogsteder 2003, p. 204.

[658] Runia, "*The arrival of Frederik V of the Palatine and Elizabeth Stuart*," p. 638.

[659] Hoogsteder 2003, p. 204.

[660] Runia, "*The arrival of Frederik V of the Palatine and Elizabeth Stuart*," p. 638-639. The manner of the work's acquisition by the city remains a mystery. The painting is recorded as hanging in the Prinsenhof in Haarlem in 1750. However, a 1667 inventory of the Prinsenhof makes no mention of the painting.

already in Haarlem in the seventeenth century, as that city's flag was painted in over those of two other cities at an unknown early date.[661] It is possible that during Elizabeth's efforts to leave the Netherlands in the late 1650s—when her debts were becoming a true impediment—that this valuable painting was sold or surrendered to cover sums owed to the city of Haarlem or to some other creditor. In any case, Vroom's painting did not travel to Heidelberg with Charles Louis in 1649, and apparently did not travel to England with Elizabeth either.[662] Furthermore, it would follow that if some of the paintings were sold their pairings might not remain intact, especially given the difference in the relative size of the two pieces (the largest of Willaerts's three *Departures* measures just 123.5 x 236.5cm, about half the size of the Vroom), and the higher prices attained for Vroom's pictures.[663]

---

[661] Runia, "*The arrival of Frederik V of the Palatine and Elizabeth Stuart*," p. 639. These early additions were discovered during a conservation treatment in 1983.

[662] For the fact that the painting did not go to Heidelberg see Hoogsteder 1984-86, II, p. 2, no. R 4. Checking Hoogsteder's (also vol. II) reproduction of the original document also clearly shows that the painting was not marked for transport to Heidelberg. It seems that only the Cornelis Cornelisz. was taken from Rhenen by Charles Louis.

[663] Fig. 4.35, see George S. Keyes, *Mirror of Empire: Dutch Marine Art of the Seventeenth Century* (Cambridge; New York: Cambridge University Press, 1990. Exh. cat.): pp. 204-206, cat. no. 54. On Vroom's prices see Marion Boers-Goosens, "Prices of Northern Netherlandish Paintings in the Seventeenth Century," in Amy Golahny, Mia M. Mochizuki, and Lisa Vergara, eds., *In His Milieu: Essays on Netherlandish Art in Memory of John Michael Montias* (Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, 2006): p. 61: In 1621, Vroom lost out on a commission for a painting of the *Battle of Gibraltar* from the Amsterdam admiralty, intended as a gift for Prince Maurits. Even though it was to be a large painting, he demanded the outrageously high price of 6,000 fl., which the admiralty rejected outright. See also Larry Silver, *Peasant Scenes and*

One final, unresolved aspect of Hoogsteder's identification of the Frans Hals Museum Vroom with the one mentioned by De Beer, is what is lacking in the description. Though most of the paintings in the inventory are not described at length, there are several instances in which they are specifically noted as being large. Given the massive size of Vroom's *Arrival*, it is difficult to imagine that this painting, probably much larger than the other four with which it is listed, would not also warrant this designation. It is entirely possible that the tedious task of cataloguing makes such consistencies difficult to maintain; that there was a smaller, unknown version of Vroom's arrival; or that the painting depicted an entirely different subject.

Hoogsteder identifies Savery's painting of "all kind of animals" with the picture of "Stork, Ducks, &c. (Dated 1637)" listed in an 1866 inventory of Coombe Abbey in Warwickshire, England and attributed to "*Sara V. E.*"[664] Since the early seventeenth century Coombe Abbey had been in the possession of the Craven family, whose best-known figure William, 1st Earl of Craven played a significant role in Elizabeth's life.[665] The two first met when Craven was a young soldier in The Hague,

---

Landscapes: The Rise of Pictorial Genres in the Antwerp Art Market (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2006): p. 221.

[664] Combe Abbey 1866, p. 25, no. 423; for Hoogsteder see 1984-86, I, p. 204.

[665] The title was created for him in 1663. See "Craven, Earl of (Craven) (Earl GB 1801)," in Patrick W. Montague-Smith, ed., *Debrett's Peerage & Baronetage*, 147th ed. (London: Debrett's Peerage Limited, 2008).

and according to popular legend he fell passionately in love with Elizabeth.[666] Craven never married and remained Elizabeth's close friend and political and financial supporter until the end of her life.[667] He was such an important figure to Elizabeth that upon her death, he inherited her papers.[668] Elizabeth's son Rupert inherited what remained of her paintings, but as all of them had been transported to England with her, he appointed Craven as his executor, giving him leave to sell or reinvest Palatine goods as he saw fit. It seems that Craven took the opportunity to incorporate much of Elizabeth's collection into his.[669] The Craven collections therefore provide the best evidence of the full contents and afterlives of Elizabeth's pictures.

---

[666] This is the story given, for example, by the National Trust in their history of Ashdown House, a country home that Craven reportedly built for Elizabeth in 1662 so that she could escape the pestilential air of London. Elizabeth died before the house could be completed: <https://www.nationaltrust.org.uk/ashdown-house/features/history-of-ashdown-house>. See also Sotheby's (London), *Ashdown House: The Winter Queen & The Earl of Craven* (Wednesday, 27 October 2010): p. 8.

[667] Elizabeth initially stayed with Craven in his house on Drury Lane in London upon her arrival, she found a house to rent on her own; Hoogsteder 1984-86, I, pp. 27-28, 33. See also Marshall, *The Winter Queen*, pp. 90-91.

[668] Marshall, *The Winter Queen*, p. 90; Akkerman 2015, p. 3; Sotheby's (London), *Ashdown House*, p. 8.

[669] Hoogsteder 1984-86, I, pp. 52-53: The Craven collection was sold off entirely over the course of the intervening centuries, first through badly-documented eighteenth- and nineteenth-century sales and then via auctions at Christie's London on 13 April 1923; Sotheby's London on 27 November 1968; Christie's London on 15 January and 19 February 1969; and Phillips London on 18 December 1984. See illustration facing Hoogsteder 1984-86 p. 52 for his complex chart of the distribution of Elizabeth's paintings after her death.

The other two paintings listed as being by Savery in the Rhenen inventory are specifically described as landscapes with hounds and were taken to Heidelberg in 1649.[670] There are, furthermore, no other paintings by Savery listed in the Coombe Abbey inventory. Even though the attribution given there is only a close approximation of Savery, it is the closest thing to his name found in the entire inventory. Hoogsteder argues that, because the transcription of Savery's name is so off, the compilers of the Coombe Abbey inventory must have been reading from a barely visible inscription.[671] This brings the validity of the 1637 date into question, which solves Hoogsteder's problem of equating a painting dated 1637 with one found in an inventory of 1633.

His assertion that the Rhenen and Coombe Abbey paintings are one and the same is nevertheless tempting, especially given the close correspondences between the Craven and Bohemian collections, and the fact that the Coombe Abbey painting categorically does not match the description of the only two other Savery paintings in Rhenen. Hoogsteder furthermore identifies the painting with one sold at Sotheby's in 1969 (Fig. 4.36), or one of its type.[672] This work consists mostly of birds arranged across the foreground, with clusters of trees at left and right framing the distant ruins.

---

[670] Hoogsteder 1984-86, I, pp. 205-206, nos. 209, 210; see also II, p. 4, nos. R 34 and R 35.

[671] Hoogsteder 1984-86, I, p. 204.

[672] Hoogsteder 1984-86, I, p. 204; III, fig. 198.

This would certainly fit with the description of "storks and ducks" given by Coombe Abbey in 1866, and at its last evaluation the painting was dated to about 1626.[673] It is unclear why Hoogsteder chose this painting as a likely approximation of the Coombe Abbey picture, though perhaps there are few paintings by Savery that feature ducks and storks so prominently. At 67 x 95 cm, this painting is also only of average size, less than half of some of Savery's largest.[674] This would disrupt Hoogsteder's claim that the vestibule paintings were all large, though the Rhenen painting could certainly have been of the larger size that Savery occasionally undertook.[675]

I would propose an additional candidate for the Rhenen Savery. In the British Royal Collection there is a signed and dated work of 1622 by Savery, of *Lions in a Landscape* (Fig. 4.37). It was already in England around 1637, as it appears in Van der Doort's inventory: "Item another little Landskipp peece wherein a lyons Denn with divers Lyons. Given to y^{e} king by the young Prince Ellecto^{r} Pallatine being done by Savory."[676] That Charles I valued the work is evidenced by its placement in the Chair

---

[673] Kurt J. Müllenmeister, *Roelant Savery, Kortrijk 1576-1639 Utrecht, Hofmaler Kaiser Rudolf II. in Prag: Die Gemälde mit Kritischem Oeuvrekatalog* (Freren: Luca Verlag, 1988): p. 271, cat. no. 162. The painting has no provenance before the Sotheby's sale.

[674] See, for example, works in the Hermitage, Georgetown, and Kortrijk (Müllenmeister, *Roelant Savery*, cat. nos. 82, 75A, 106/106A).

[675] Hoogsteder 2003, p. 198.

[676] Millar 1960, p. 63, no. 7.

Room of the Privy Gallery, situated close to the king's private cabinet.[677] This painting was likely acquired directly from Savery, who in 1622 had a large house on the Boterstraat in Utrecht, just 200 meters from Honthorst's home at no. 6 Domplein.[678] It could have been given as a gift to the exiled Bohemians and may well be the painting described by De Beer in his 1633 inventory, as it contains several lions and birds of various species. Around that time Charles Louis—who after his father's death in 1632 styled himself as the Elector Palatine, even though he did not truly hold the title until 1649—went to London with his brothers Rupert and Maurice, where he spent the majority of the decade at his uncle's court. The Savery was probably presented at this visit and could have been given by Elizabeth from her collection as a gift for her brother or acquired separately for the occasion. At only 39.8 cm wide, the painting is even smaller than Hoogsteder's suggestion for the vestibule picture, but nevertheless provides a tantalizing possibility that Elizabeth sacrificed a work from her collection to further her diplomatic relationship with her brother.

One more example serves to highlight the sometimes-piecemeal nature of the inventory. What Hoogsteder numbers R 80 (Rhenen painting number 80) is described by De Beer as "1. gross stuck ettlicher J.Mt. kinder hangen im grossen saal." [1. large

---

[677] Millar 1960, p. 62.

[678] Müllenmeister, "Roelant Savery, Kortrijk 1576-1639 Utrecht," in Ekkehard Mai, ed., *Roelant Savery in Seiner Zeit (1576-1639)* (Cologne: Das Museum, 1985. Exh. cat.): p. 36. Savery purchased the home in 1621.

piece of several of her majesty's children hanging in the great hall.][679] Inserted randomly between items in Elizabeth's cabinet this addition to the pictures in the vestibule adds a vital component to the visual program: portraiture. Hoogsteder supposes that this object is one of the five versions of Poelenburgh's portrait of seven of the Bohemian children (Figs. 4.38, 4.39).[680] However, as Hoogsteder acknowledges, Poelenburgh did not specialize in large-scale paintings, and his works were quite expensive, making the identification of a Poelenburgh group portrait with number R 80 problematic.[681] Though the inventory description fits the Poelenburgh well, and it is not difficult to imagine why Elizabeth would want to include images of her children in the great hall, the size of the main variations (just over two feet in length) hardly merits the label of "large piece."[682] In his 2003 article on the subject,

---

[679] Hoogsteder 1984-86, II, p. 7, no. R 80. According to Hoogsteder 1984-86, I, p. 234n28, "J.Mt" always refers to Elizabeth in the inventory while Frederick, who had recently died, was referred to as "J.Mt.Gedechtnis" or "Chf."/"Chff." This latter abbreviation is short for *Churfürst* or *Churffürst*, an archaic spelling of *Kurfürst* [elector].

[680] The best-known versions are those in the Royal Collection Trust, London (Fig. 4.38), and Szépművészeti Múzeum, Budapest (Fig. 4.39). The painting in Budapest was the one owned by Charles I, and bears his "CR" brand on the reverse. See Hoogsteder 1984-86, I, pp. 191-192. See also Hoogsteder 2003, p. 192.

[681] Hoogsteder 2003, p. 196.

[682] The painting in Budapest measures 37.9 x 65.3 cm, that in the Royal Collection almost the same at 39.3 x 66 cm. Nicolette Sluijter-Seijffert's comprehensive catalogue of Poelenburgh's paintings confirms this problem of size: a 1713 inventory of Paleis Het Loo counts eight paintings by Poelenburgh in King Willem III's collection, "including the exceptionally sizeable – for him – rendering of the mythological story of *Mercury and Herse*" (cat. no. 134), which is on canvas (also

Hoogsteder suggests that R 80 might refer to a copy or smaller variation of Honthorst's *Seladon and Astraea* (Fig. 4.18), the original of which was sent to Charles I in 1630.[683] However, the idea that the *Seladon and Astraea*, in which Frederick and Elizabeth are clearly the central focus, would be described as a painting of "several of her majesty's children" is unconvincing.

One final element of the vestibule's program must be examined, and it is arguably the most important. This is the last entry in De Beer's list of paintings, Hoogsteder's number R 118: "(Heid[elberg]) 1. large painted piece with Her Majesty the Queen and all of her children." [(Heid.) 1. gross stuck schillerei mit Jher. Mt. die Königin und dero samptliche kinder.].[684] I argue that this references one or both of a

---

exceptional), and measures 155 x 113 cm. Sluijter-Seijffert adds, that "virtually all of his other works are on copper or wood panels of small to modest dimensions ranging from 9x5 to 66x85cm." Sluijter-Seijffert, and Jennifer M. Milian and Katy Kist, trans., *Cornelis van Poelenburch, 1594/5-1667: The Paintings* (OCULI: Studies in the Arts of the Low Countries, vol. 15. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 2016): p. 34.

[683] Hoogsteder 2003, p. 196.

[684] Hoogsteder 1984-86, II, p. 9. The use of *schillerei* here is strange. It seems to be a variation on the Dutch *schilderij*, meaning painting, rather than any of the common German words for painting: *Gemälde*, *Malerei*, or *Bild*. It is likely De Beer's idiosyncrasy to include a pseudo-Dutch word. It appears once more in the inventory: in number R 48 with the same wording, "Ein gross stuck schillerei." The title of this section of the inventory, paintings, is in fact labeled *Schillereijen*. A variation appears in R 56: "geschildert in die lengde," but *geschildert* has a direct German translation of "portrayed." Indeed, a search in the Getty Provenance Index for *schillerei* and its variations returns no results, while a search for *schild* and its variations returns over 49,000. *Dero* is an archaic genitive plural article, indicating possession. In this case it refers to the children as Elizabeth's (See Joseph Wright, *Historical German*

pair of paintings done in 1636 but appended to the inventory in 1649 when one or both went to Heidelberg with Elizabeth's son, as a means of documenting the fact that they were sent. The two images, *Adversities of Elizabeth Stuart* and *Triumph of Elizabeth Stuart* (Figs. 4.40, 4.41; from here on *Adversities* and *Triumph*) combine to form the most authoritative pictorial propaganda produced for Elizabeth and were the most important works that Honthorst completed for her throughout his almost thirty years in her service. Before addressing the complicated history of the painting(s) to which I believe this description refers and making an argument for their placement within Rhenen Palace, we must first examine their visual form and meaning.

The imagery of these two paintings is not just complementary but seems to form a kind of chronology or narrative, akin to a triumphal procession, in which Elizabeth and her family are presented with obstacles in one painting (*Adversities*; Fig. 4.40) and overcome them in the next (*Triumph*; Fig. 4.41). Hoogsteder dated *Adversities* to about 1635 based on the ages of the figures. The canvas is unsigned but has been cut down on all four sides to about half of its original size, is heavily damaged and overpainted, and has been aggressively relined.[685] It is now in the

---

Grammar: Vol. I, Phonology Word-Formation and Accidence [London, New York, Toronto: Oxford University Press, 1907]: p. 224).

[685] Judson/Ekkart 1999, cat. no. 170. Judson/Ekkart estimate *Adversities* as 305 x 457 cm, taken directly from Hoogsteder based on the dimensions given by Vertue in 1731. Judson/Ekkart curiously do not include the present dimensions of the work, which is 205.5h x 208.5w cm, according to the Kurpfälzisches Museum. This means that the work was cut roughly 99.5 cm along the top and bottom edges and 248.5 cm along the left and right sides. *Triumph* measures 313 x 478 cm and is on what may be its

collection of the Kurpfälzisches Museum, Heidelberg, just 1.5 km away from the palace that Frederick and Elizabeth shared for five years before their ruinous accession to the Bohemian throne. *Triumph*, on the other hand, recently underwent a full conservation treatment at the Museum of Fine Arts Boston. Though the difference in their quality and the unfortunate loss of more than half of *Adversities* complicates comparisons between the two, together they still evoke something of the majesty of their original installation.

Thankfully, in 1731 George Vertue (1684-1756) recorded *Adversities*' location as well as its original appearance. He writes:

> at Cassioberry Erl of Essexs a large family *peice* [sic] <by Gerard Honthorst>[686] of the widow Queen of Bohemia with all her children about her. she setting in Mourning under a black Canopy the three Eldest Sons with spears in their hands &c are before her in driving away the hydra a dragon & other evil & hideous spirits. behind the Queen is standing 2 other younger sons. and 4 daughters, the youngest of the 4 is a flying cupid with Zephyrs wings holding up the Curtain. in the Clouds at the right upper corner. appears the King of Bohemia. with a laurel in his hand directing the Goddess Belona to defend the cause of the Queen. by him is his eldest son. who dyd before him. <Q[u]. Honthorst.> this picture is about 15 f. by. 10.[687]

---

original stretcher. This suggestion was made by Lydia Vagts during a discussion about this painting on 17 October 2016. The circumstances and dates surrounding the damage to the canvas are unknown, and it currently sits unframed in the Kurpfälzisches Museum's too-full storage, with little chance for conservation treatment in the near future.

[686] According to Vertue 1935-36, p. 16n7-7, this was noted in the margin.

[687] Vertue 1935-36, pp. 16-17.

Vertue's description reveals that *Adversities* once depicted a grand allegorical scene in which Elizabeth looks on as her three eldest sons (Charles Louis, Rupert, and Maurice) battle a hydra, dragon, and likely some undesirable allegorical figures, such as Death, Envy, or Hate. The extent of obstacles to be fought on Elizabeth's behalf highlights the mountainous resistance to her cause of reclaiming the Palatinate. Fortunately, she receives aid not only from her eldest sons (the heirs to the throne), but also—from beyond the grave—from her late husband and son. Frederick V directs Bellona, the goddess of war, to aid Elizabeth in her quest to restore her family to power. Though Vertue does not mention this, Frederick Henry was probably joined in the clouds by his siblings Louis (b. 1623) and Charlotte (b. 1628), who died at one and three years old, respectively. Vertue also does not mention the placement of Elizabeth's youngest son, Gustavus Adolphus, who was just three years old at the time of *Adversities'* execution. All that remains of the canvas is the rightmost group of Elizabeth and six of her children, part of the black canopy that shelters them, and a partial balustrade with landscape beyond.

Elizabeth appears somber and weary beneath the shadow of her mourning veil. Her eyes are cast upward and her arms are held out before her, seemingly both welcoming the assistance offered and beseeching more. Her two younger sons, Edward and Philip, stand in the immediate foreground. They are dressed *all'antica*, with bows and arrows at the ready as they watch their older brothers battle for familial glory. Edward, the older of the two boys, seems particularly eager to join the fray, striding forward and nocking his arrow. His sisters Elizabeth (1618-80), Louise

Hollandine (1622-1709), and Henriette Marie (1626-51) stand behind their mother, with Princess Elizabeth looking directly out at the viewer. Little Sophia (1630-1714), Elizabeth's youngest daughter and the future mother of George I of England, flutters in the upper right corner, holding back the edges of the black canopy and revealing her family's sufferings for the sympathy of the viewer.

The inclusion of a hydra at left possibly found direct inspiration in a poem by Isaac Barré Messin, a French teacher and writing master at The Hague, dedicated to Elizabeth on the occasion of Frederick Henry's death in 1629.[688] Barré Messin implores Elizabeth to maintain fortitude in the face of this tragedy, describing her as the,

> Great Queen who has
> In spite of all fates,
> Tamed the Hydras of adversity
> Which have crossed your years[689]

Barré Messin anthropomorphized Elizabeth's misfortunes in the form of a hydra, tamed but not defeated, still fully capable of rearing its ugly heads. Elizabeth's adversities were compounded when she lost her husband shortly after her son, in 1632. It can hardly be a coincidence that four years later Honthorst completed this grand

---

[688] Messin 1629.

[689] Messin 1629, stanza X. [Grand'Royne qui auez dompté / Malgré toutes les destinées, / Les Hydres de l'aduersité / Qui ont trauersé vos années] This first part of the stanza was first reproduced, without any citation other than Barré Messin's name, in Green, *Elizabeth: Electress Palatine*, p. 267n4. Also quoted in Hoogsteder 1984-86, I, p. 107, again without a full citation.

allegory of the trials that Elizabeth has faced, in which her eldest sons attack a hydra with spears, aiming to kill it once and for all.

Additionally, in an earlier stanza Barré Messin describes Frederick Henry as "a royal sacrifice from the English crown on the altars of Justice."[690] After musing on whether they would allow their pain to drown their courage in an ocean of tears [Permettrons nous que nos douleurs / Facent perir nostre courage / Dedans L'Ocean de nos pleurs?],[691] Barré Messin goes on to insist that Frederick Henry is not dead, but that his soul is living and bright before our eyes, and it is necessary to move beyond grief to triumph once more.[692] The invocation of Justice in connection with Frederick Henry's death and Elizabeth's overcoming of her personal hydra is a powerful one, especially given the appearance of both a hydra and Frederick Henry's living spirit in Honthorst's subsequent painting.

It is furthermore important to examine the uniqueness of Honthorst's inclusion of a hydra in *Adversities*. The most immediate association is of course with Hercules, the demigod of Greek and Roman mythology whose second of twelve labors was to slay the many-headed Lernaean Hydra. Hercules's most common attributes were the knotted club (his preferred weapon) and the skin of the Nemean Lion (his first labor),

---

[690] Messin 1629, stanza V.

[691] Messin 1629, stanza IX.

[692] Messin 1629, stanza XIIII.

both beautifully and precisely depicted in Antonio del Pollaiuolo's (1431/32-1498) *Hercules and the Hydra* of c. 1475 (Fig. 4.42; Florence, Uffizi Gallery). However, in the early modern period, Hercules in general and the Hydra in particular were inflected by various political and religious meanings, especially when coupled with the portrait of a ruler. The most common identification of a monarch with Hercules was through a *portrait historié*, a genre that presented no real challenge to the mostly male rulership of Europe. Beginning in the Renaissance, Hercules was adopted as an *exemplum virtutis*, a virtuous hero whose power and moral fortitude a prince could learn from and, in the case of identification portraits, literally embody.[693]

Hercules was furthermore associated with Frederick and Elizabeth at an early date. The *Hortus Palatinus* of Heidelberg Castle, commissioned by Frederick for Elizabeth in 1614, included a "Great Gallery" with a frieze of ten metopes above a system of small grottoes (Fig. 4.43). These metopes depicted some of the deeds of Hercules, though from the image De Caus published in 1620 as part of a volume on the gardens it is hard to discern what is contained in each metope.[694] What seems to be

---

[693] For this phenomenon see Friedrich Polleross, "From the *exemplum virtutis* to the Apotheosis: Hercules as an Identification Figure in Portraiture. An Example of the Adoption of Classical Forms of Representation," in Allan Ellenius, ed., *Iconography, Propaganda, and Legitimation* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998): esp. pp. 37-40.

[694] De Caus 1620, ill. 25. See also Bilhöfer, "Instrumentalisierung der Antike," p. 124; and Andrew L. Thomas, *House Divided: Wittelsbach Confessional Court Cultures in the Holy Roman Empire, c. 1550-1650* (Leiden, Boston: Brill, 2010): p. 98.

an image of Hercules killing the Hydra with his club in a manner similar to Pollaiuolo's painting appears fourth from the right (Fig. 4.44). In addition, Elizabeth owned at least one painting of a Herculean subject: a mantel piece featuring the demigod in one of the rooms of Rhenen Palace.[695]

The identification with Hercules, both figuratively as an exemplar and literally through historiated portraits, was also a popular device for the ephemeral decorations celebrating rulers' triumphal entries. In 1635, Rubens portrayed Cardinal-Infante Ferdinand of the Spanish Netherlands (r. 1633-1641) as the titular figure at the center of his *Arch of Hercules* for Ferdinand's entry into Antwerp (Fig. 4.45; Saint Petersburg, The State Hermitage Museum). The French monarch Henry IV was particularly fond of using the image of Hercules, especially for his triumph over the Hydra. We see this not only in the decorations for his entries into Lyon in 1595 (Fig. 4.46) and Rouen in 1596 (Fig. 4.47), but also in the remarkable *Portrait of Henry IV as Hercules Slaying the Lernaean Hydra* of circa 1600, from the circle of Toussaint Dubreuil (1561-1602), a member of the mannerist second School of Fontainebleau (Fig. 4.48; Paris, Musée du Louvre). In Dubreuil's portrait, an impossibly muscular Henry stands victoriously atop a dying hydra, several of its heads already detached and still more writhing in pain beneath the king's calm and exaggerated contrapposto. In the context of portraits like Dubreuil's and that of Henry's triumphal entries, the

---

[695] Hoogsteder 1984-86, II, p. 3, no. R 17: "1. stuck von Hercules am Camin."

hydra takes on the added meaning of the virtuous sovereign controlling the rebellious nature of his subjects.[696]

In literary, religious, and political discourses beginning in the early sixteenth century, the hydra also came to symbolize an intense and ongoing struggle. It was deployed, for example, in Hans Holbein's 1522 woodcut *Hercules Germanicus*, which portrays Martin Luther doing battle against his many-headed scholarly challengers (Fig. 4.49).[697] Catholics, too, utilized the hydra as a symbol of their tenacious foes. The Catholic royalist poet Pierre de Ronsard (1524-1585) depicted the rival Huguenots as hydras in two compositions: *L'hydre desfaict* (1569) and *Les elemens ennemis de l'hydre* (1578). In *L'hydre desfaict* Henry, Duke of Anjou (1551-1589) and brother to French King Charles IX (r. 1560-1574), is praised for cutting off the heads of the Huguenot-hydra.[698]

---

[696] Corrado Vivanti, "Henry IV, the Gallic Hercules," *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes* 30 (1967): p. 184. This meaning is also found in other Herculean images, such as that of the demigod leading Cerberus, the three-headed hound that guarded the gates to the Underworld, on a leash. See also Takashi Nishi, *The Representations of Hercules and Hydra in Shakespeare's* Coriolanus (PhD diss., Birkbeck, University of London, 2014): Chapter 2, especially p. 84.

[697] Daniel J. Nodes, "A Hydra in the Gardens of Adonis: Literary Allusion and the Language of Humanism in Egidio of Viterbo (1469-1532)," *Renaissance Quarterly* 57, no. 2 (Summer 2004): p. 501. For the hydra as the embodiment of a generic scholastic struggle see Nodes pp. 494-500, on the early sixteenth-century commentary by Augustinian friar Egidio of Viterbo.

[698] Ronsard 1914, pp. 434-440. See also Nishi, *Representations of Hercules and Hydra*, p. 88.

Charles I, in a 1634 letter to Thomas Wentworth, 1st Earl of Strafford (1593-1641), says of one of his foes at court: "but as for that Hydra, take good heed, for you know that here I have found it as well cunning as malicious."[699] For Charles, the hydra embodied the venomous political struggles which he faced constantly during his Personal Rule. Thirty-one years earlier his father, James I, addressed the "Hydra of diverslie enclined spectators" at the beginning of his *Basilikon Doron* (1603).[700] Again associating ruling with the taming of a hydra (and by extension identifying with Hercules), James lays out his multi-pronged strategy for dealing with the hydra of his people.[701] According to James, the monarch must become a kind of hydra in order to survive.

In England, the metaphor of the hydra was often joined with that of the dragon in service of the British traditions of Saint George and King Arthur, both renowned dragon-slayers. The humanist scholar Desiderius Erasmus's *Praise of Folly* (*Morae Encomium*, 1509), completed while he was staying in London, mused on the connections between Hercules and St. George, writing that: "Nay, they have gotten an

---

[699] Petrie, *Letters,* p. 95, letter dated 17 April 1634.

[700] Basilikon Doron 1603, "To the Reader", this section does not appear in the 1599 edition of the *Basilikon Doron*, printed in Edinburgh.

[701] Basilikon Doron 1603, "To the Reader": James lauds his "plainnesse, patience, and sinceritie: plainnesse, for resolving and satisfying of the first sort: patience, for to beare with the shallownesse of the next: and sinceritie to defye the malice of the third whithall. Though I cannot please all men therein, I am contented so that I onelie please the vertuous sorte." See also Nishi, *Representations of Hercules and Hydra*, pp. 80-83.

Hercules, another *Hippolytus*, and a St. *George*, whose Horse, most religiously set out, with Trappings, and Bosses, there wants little, but they worship."[702] In the late 1540s English historian John Bale (1495-1563) conflated the hydra with the dragon slain by St. George, a fusion also found in Shakespeare's *Coriolanus* (1605-8).[703] Finally, in Edmund Spenser's (1552-1599) *The Faerie Queene* (1590), the "monstrous beast" of Book I's antagonist Duessa is equated both with the monster of the Whore of Babylon in Revelations and,

> that renowned Snake
> Which great Alcides[704] in Stremona slew,
> Long fostred in the filth of Lerna lake,
> Whose many heads out budding ever new
> Did breed him endlesse labour to subdew[705]

It is not surprising, then, that Vertue's account of Honthorst's *Adversities* includes the description, "the hydra a dragon & other evil & hideous spirits." Was Vertue participating in this combinatory habit that had been practiced for centuries in England? Or, did Honthorst's portrait truly include both a hydra and a dragon?

---

[702] Erasmus 1668, p. 67. See also Nishi, *Representations of Hercules and Hydra*, p. 104.

[703] Nishi, *Representations of Hercules and Hydra*, pp. 98-99.

[704] Alcides is one of the Greek forms of Hercules' birth name and was a popular among early modern poets.

[705] Spenser 1903, p. 121, Book I, Canto VII, stanza XVII, l. 140-144. See also Nishi, *Representations of Hercules and Hydra*, p. 110.

There are only two other instances that I have found of a hydra appearing in a grand, allegorical portrait of a monarch. One is Gerard Hoet's (1648-1733) *Allegory of the Reign of Emperor Leopold I* (Fig. 4.50; c. 1672; Innsbruck, Ambras Castle), where the monarch appears as Hercules stomping the hydra—a winged, dragon-like creature—surrounded by personifications of the seven virtues in front of the Temple of Virtue and Fame. Possibly made after Leopold I's victory over the Turks in 1664, Hoet's allegory clearly intends to show the emperor as *exemplum virtutis*, subduing not only rebellious citizens but also manifold threats from outside the empire.[706]

The other example is from Rubens's cycle of paintings for Marie de' Medici: *The Perfect Reconciliation of the Queen and her Son after the Death of Constable Luynes* (Fig. 4.51; c. 1622; Paris, Musée du Louvre). Here, the traitorous Duke of Luynes (1578-1621) is incarnated as the screeching, lion-like hydra at lower left, which is also broadly symbolic of dissent and rebellion. Rubens's monster is being slain by a figure of Courage or Divine Justice, seen at upper right about to strike the beast with lightning while Marie and Louis gaze peacefully at each other. As part of the cycle's larger campaign to craft Marie's image as one of non-threatening yet unquestionable power, she is shown with one breast bared, gazing to the heavens in the embodiment of a nurturing (and submissive) wife and mother.[707] Rather than

---

[706] Polleross, "Hercules as an Identification Figure," p. 50.

[707] Geraldine A. Johnson, "Pictures Fit for a Queen: Peter Paul Rubens and the Marie de' Medici Cycle," *Art History* 16, no. 3 (September 1993): p. 453. Johnson's study details the difficult task that Rubens's cycle undertook in using the traditional

Marie self-identifying with Hercules, she stretches a plaintive hand towards the warrior that is mercilessly vanquishing her enemies.

Elizabeth I was one of the earliest female monarchs to be explicitly identified with the Hercules tradition, in John Lyly's (c. 1553/4-1606) poem "The Trivmphs of Trophes" (1586).[708] Celebrating Elizabeth's victory over the Babington Plot, which resulted in the execution of Mary, Queen of Scots, among others, Lyly writes:

> These sucking serpents, these monstrous snakish crewe,
> these blooddie Dragons like spiteful Asps are set,
> With *Hidras* heads which erst *Alcides* slue
> are now of late with our *Bellona* mette.
> …
> To wrest from Hercules hand his Club, who can ?
> who may from *Ioue* [Jove], his lightning take by force ?
> *Homers* verse, who can disgrace ? I say no man,
> who then can touch a sacred Princes coarse.[709]

Elizabeth I seems to be here unproblematically identified with Hercules, whose victory over the Hydra is given equivalence with that of the Queen over those "spiteful Asps" that sought to overthrow her. Lyly's poem also equates "blooddie Dragons" and hydras as well as the description of Elizabeth as "our Bellona." Bellona, a Roman Goddess of War, is Elizabeth's persona as the warrior-queen, and as we have seen also appears in *Adversities*.

---

language of allegorical female nudity in these images lauding Marie de' Medici's power, for a (mostly male) early modern audience that had been conditioned to see in images of women's nudity a warning of sinister and dangerous power.

[708] Nishi, *Representations of Hercules and Hydra*, pp. 84, 96.

[709] Lyly 1902, p. 429, v. 37-40, 53-56.

Like Rubens's Marie de' Medici, Honthorst's Elizabeth Stuart looks to the heavens with a plaintive gesture while her sons (and Bellona) battle a hydra on her behalf. That Elizabeth was so militaristic in her pursuit of restitution as to be considered unfeminine is evidenced by an exchange from 1636 with the Archbishop of Canterbury William Laud (1573-1645) when she writes, "by my experiance in this our great business, all I feare is, that you will think I haue too warring a minde for my sexe but [the] necessitie of my fortune has made it."[710] It is therefore unsurprising that in the paintings she commissioned from Honthorst that same year on the very subject of her fortunes, that she would wish to appear more demure, yet victorious.

Another expansion of the Hercules/Hydra mythology in the early modern period adds dimension to female monarchs' identification with the Greek hero. In the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries some French medals appended Astraea to the myth of the Gallic Hercules, thus crediting the *Herculean* monarch with the renewal of a prophesied Golden Age.[711] In the 1615 anonymous political pamphlet *Cassandre Francoise* these two traditions again find purchase. The pamphlet warns against the impending marriage between Louis XIII and the Spanish princess Anne of Austria, and then turns to Marie de' Medici, who was serving as regent at the time. The author laments that "this beautiful French Astraea has completely changed," and

---

[710] Akkerman 2011, p. 492, letter no. 270, dated 6 August 1636; see also Lewalski, *Writing Women,* p. 65.

[711] Vivanti, "Henry IV, The Gallic Hercules," p. 192.

that her outer garment is "multi-colored and chameleon-like, in order to allow her to take on whatever colors that her passion demands."[712] In this environment of deceitfulness, the author cautions, a hydra has emerged. Louis, called "vostre ieune Hercules Gaulois [our young Gallic Hercules]," is warned of this poisonous "Hydre en France", the Spanish influence that deceives the king through false alliances and could at any moment "shed his lion skin to put on that of the fox."[713] For the author of this pamphlet, Astraea's potential redemption of the current age is jeopardized by the evil omnipresence of the hydra, and only Louis/Hercules can put things to rights.

Honthorst's portrayal of Elizabeth Stuart's battle against her "hydras of adversity," then, is undoubtedly informed by this larger contextual framework of the hydra as symbolic of religious struggle, of virtuous rulership, of control of one's subjects, of unending oppression from outside forces, and of the unique, twinned association with Astraea, whom he had painted Elizabeth in the guise of just seven years earlier. Astraea was, furthermore, considered synonymous with Justice itself.[714]

---

[712] *Cassandre Francoise*, p. 11. [Ceste belle Astree Françoise est toute change…sa robbe est bigarree & de Cameleon, pour pounoir receuoir les couleurs que sa passion luy demande]. See also Johnson, "Pictures Fit for a Queen," p. 462.

[713] *Cassandre Francoise*, pp. 13, 15. [il quitte sa peau de Lyó pour prendre celle d'un Renard.]

[714] In Honoré d'Urfé's dedication to King Louis XIII of France (r. 1610-1643) at the beginning of the third volume of *L'Astrée* (published 1619), the shepherdess Astrée is specifically connected with the ancient goddess, who according to D'Urfé was well-loved by Louis's father Henry IV (r. 1589-1610) for being synonymous with Justice, and so too should Louis embrace Astraea as the embodiment of his moniker "Louis le Juste." Laurence Giavarini, "L'Astrée, 1619: La 'justice' de Louis XIII et les 'lois' de

In Elizabethan and Jacobean poetry on the subject, the imagery of Astraea, which had been so useful for Elizabeth I, found application for the male James in his daughter as the *altera Astraea*.[715] The emphasis on Elizabeth's children as the warriors on her behalf in both of Honthorst's grand allegories therefore takes on the added significance of continuing this tradition.

The imagery of the battle against the hydra in *Adversities* demonstrates the fortitude required to overcome the obstacles before the Bohemian family, the successful outcome of which is depicted in *Triumph* (Fig. 4.41). In the center, three Palatine lions pull Elizabeth's gold chariot toward the gates of Heaven, whose clouds

---

la pastorale," *Dix-septième siècle* 276, no. 3 (2017): pp. 541-542. On Astraea as Justice in the Spanish Imperial tradition, see Frederick A. de Armas, *The Return of Astraea: An Astral-Imperial Myth in Calderón* (Studies in Romance Languages. Lexington: University Press of Kentucky, 1986): especially Chapter 3. On the invocation of Astraea in Jacobean masques, see Martin Butler and David Lindley, "Restoring Astraea: Jonson's Masque for the Fall of Somerset," *ELH* 61, no. 4 (Winter 1994): pp. 807-827. Already in Virgil's *Ecolgues* (about 43 BCE) Astraea is portrayed as divine justice in her ending of the dark Iron Age and the ushering in of a Golden Age borne by new generations. Virgil, Len Krisak, trans., and Gregson Davis, *Virgil's Eclogues* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2010): Eclogue IV, p. 31, ll. 4-10: "The final age of Cumae's prophecies has come / Now the great long line of the ages is begun. / The Virgin [Astraea] now returns, and Saturn's golden regnum. / Now come new generations down on high from heaven. / O chaste Lucina, you need only bless this boy / Just born and then the Iron Age will end. A *gens* / Of gold will gill the globe. / Now, your Apollo reigns." Lucina is the Roman goddess of childbirth (p. 85 nIV.8) and *gens* means line or family (nIV.9), further emphasizing the importance of children in ushering in the Golden Age.

[715] Christof Ginzel, *Poetry, Politics and Promises of Empire: Prophetic Rhetoric in the English and Neo-Latin Epithalamia on the Occasion of the Palatine Marriage in 1613* (Göttingen: V&R Unipress, 2009): pp. 314-315.

reach out to envelop the arriving retinue and where Frederick and Frederick Henry await to reunite the Bohemian family once more. They both wear wreaths symbolic of their victory and hold martyr's palms signifying their sacrifice to the cause of reclaiming the Palatinate. Frederick looks at the viewer and points to Elizabeth while Frederick Henry gestures upward toward Louis and Charlotte, who both died before the age of three. Philip and Edward, who occupied *Adversities*' lower right corner with bows and arrows in hand, here stand in the lower left. Their lack of arrows and relaxed stances make the meaning clear: the battle is over. The fearsome lions are escorted by Gustavus Adolphus, Elizabeth's youngest of thirteen children, shown striding forward as a laurel-crowned cupid. Honthorst emphatically signed the painting in dark gray on the step just above Gustavus's right foot: "GHonthorst. fe. 1636" (Fig. 4.52). Elizabeth's three eldest daughters, Elizabeth, Louise Hollandine, and Henriette Marie, stand on either side of the lion group. Princess Elizabeth, looking out at the viewer, is crowned with laurel and holds another two crowns in her hands, ready to further distribute honor among her siblings. Louise Hollandine, the rearmost but center of this trio, looks back toward her mother and in her left hand—almost exactly in the center of the painting—holds an orange blossom branch, an allusion to the family's adoptive country and to their protectors, the House of Orange. Henriette Marie looks toward her father and brother, holding the lions' rope with her right hand and a large open volume with her left.

Behind Elizabeth's chariot ride her sons Charles Louis, Rupert, and Maurice. Rupert, at the back, was already gaining notoriety for his military prowess, and holds a

commander's baton. Maurice, in the front, holds aloft a lance or spear, perhaps the very same that he wielded to battle the hydra in *Adversities*. In the center is Charles Louis, who wears the ermine-trimmed crown and robe of the Elector Palatine and the Great George of the Order of the Garter.[716] Charles Louis's appearance as Elector Palatine here reveals the intensity of his mother's hopes for restoration: he would not be given the title for thirteen more years, in 1649.[717] Sophia, the youngest daughter, again flutters above her mother with what Vertue would call "Zephyrs wings." Where in *Adversities* she pulled back the curtain to reveal her family's sufferings, here she is crowning her mother in triumph.

Elizabeth sits resplendent in white atop the chariot, whose spiked wheels have trampled Envy and Death and are in the midst of piercing Neptune, the cruel sea-god responsible for Frederick Henry's drowning in 1629 (Fig. 4.53). She casts her eyes and the scepter in her right hand toward her husband, her left hand moving toward her heart in a gesture of avowal and sincerity. Subtle changes in Elizabeth's costume between *Adversities* and *Triumph* serve to highlight her imagined change of status. In *Adversities*, her black mourning veil and band contrast with the white of her gown, a long string of pearls tied around her waist. In *Triumph*, her gown has become more ornate, including pearl and gold trim along the hem—this elaboration also appears on

---

[716] Hoogsteder 1984-86, I, p. 107.

[717] Royalton-Kisch (*Adriaen van de Venne's Album*, p. 32) notes that from mid-1626 on the prospects for Electoral restoration "rapidly deteriorated."

Princess Elizabeth's hem—and an extended, pearl-lined stomacher. The string of pearls that adorned her waist now frames her bust and attaches her red, ermine-lined robe to the shoulders of her gown. Though she still wears a black mourning band, her veil can now barely be seen billowing behind her, held in place by the small diadem balancing on the crown of her head. These symbols come together with the scepter to show Elizabeth as the Queen of Bohemia triumphant.[718]

The importance of these commissions, no doubt intended to hang together in order to have maximum impact and to make clear the two branches of the allegory, is demonstrated by *Triumph*'s high quality and large scale.[719] Lydia Vagts, Cunningham Associate Conservator of Paintings at the Museum of Fine Arts Boston, who worked on the painting's conservation treatment, found no clear evidence of multiple hands at

---

[718] A 1635 portrait of Elizabeth occupies a middle ground between *Adversities* and *Triumph* (Fig. 4.54; Private Collection). Elizabeth's body angle and positioning, the tilt of her head and direction of her eyes, the way her veil falls across her brow, and even her necklace and the neckline of her gown match *Adversities* exactly. However, her diadem and scepter as well as the gesture of the left hand brought to her chest match *Triumph* more closely. This portrait could have been intended as a combination in preparation for both larger canvases or made afterwards and simply utilized elements from both *Triumph* and *Adversities*. If the date of 1635 is correct, then this work would have at least preceded *Triumph*, and could have easily been used as a model. Hoogsteder (1984-86, I, p. 102) states that this painting, then in the collection of the Duke of Buccleugh and subsequently held by Hoogsteder's dealership in The Hague, is a unique type, and that the pose "clearly comes from the *Allegory of Injustice*."

[719] *Adversities*' poor state of preservation makes such evaluations of quality virtually impossible.

work, a staggering conclusion for a canvas measuring more than 10 x 15 feet.[720] This uniformity of execution is found in many of Honthorst's paintings, and is aided by his smooth, clean style of painting and the meticulous efficiency with which he approached his pictures. Large changes to a composition, for example, are rarely seen in Honthorst's paintings. This is also the case with *Triumph*, where the only *pentimenti* are a small alteration made to Henriette Marie's right arm and an adjustment to the bridle of Maurice's horse in the right foreground. The only underpainting that was visible in IR was beneath Maurice's mouth, giving just the barest hint of Honthorst's technique for planning his canvas. Furthermore, the double ground—a thicker, reddish brown earth tone beneath a thin layer of gray—gives the painting a bright but warm overall tone which is characteristic of his palette starting in the 1620s.[721]

Despite the work's uniformity, it is unlikely that Honthorst would have actually executed the entire painting alone. His ownership of the picture is evident in the prominent signature, which contains the Latin *fecit*, denoting that it is of the highest quality and importance. More than simply having his name attached to it in the form of a signature, the inclusion of the *fecit* makes clear that Honthorst intended the

---

[720] Vagts was kind enough to share some of her findings with me during a discussion of the painting on 17 October 2016.

[721] There is also smalt in Princess Elizabeth's dress, beneath a thin layer of ultramarine.

work to be viewed as *made by him*, not just as a product of his studio. This is likely to do with the prestige of the commission and its patron, and the scale and visibility of the works where they were to hang in Rhenen Palace. Nevertheless, it is almost impossible to believe that Honthorst's hand was the only one to touch *Triumph*.

Though the faces and possibly the majority of the figures were likely done by Honthorst, he probably would have utilized specialists within his studio to complete details such as the architecture, background, and even the costumes (look, for example, at the awkwardness of the head and upper body of Charles Louis's horse). Already in 1627, Sandrart reports that Honthorst had a large workshop in his home in Utrecht, in which he had approximately 25 students.[722] When he began taking on royal commissions after his trip to London in 1628, the demand was so great that in 1637 he registered as a member of The Hague guild and established a second studio in a mansion in the Westeinde, close to Elizabeth's residence on Kneuterdijk.[723] That Honthorst's two large studios were necessary to keep up with the demand of his royal patrons, and further arguing for the unlikelihood that he alone completed all of *Triumph* and *Adversities*, is that in October 1635 he had just completed eight large

---

[722] TA 1675, II, Book 3, p. 303. See also Judson/Ekkart 1999, p. XXXIII.

[723] Judson/Ekkart 1999, p. XXXIV.

pictures for Danish King Christian IV's palace at Elsinore, Kronborg Castle.[724] In 1640, Honthorst would receive a commission for an additional 45 paintings for Kronborg, the majority of which were completed by 1641.[725]

Now comes the more difficult question of where these two paintings were hung in the seventeenth century. Though Hermann Braun was the first to link these works together as allegorical pendants—he suggests they were specifically made for Rhenen Palace—it was Hoogsteder who first made the now-accepted argument for the works as allegories of trial and triumph.[726] Judson, following Braun, supposes that both paintings were made to hang in Rhenen Palace, a location supported by the works' importance, provenance, and sizes, as discussed below.[727]

Hoogsteder supposes that De Beer added the entry in question, the last one in the list of pictures, after the fact, to reflect an addition to the display: "a large painted

---

[724] Judson 1959, p. 117. A letter from Christian IV to one of his governors, dated 11 October 1635 details that the paintings had been delivered for the decoration of the King's room.

[725] Judson/Ekkart 1999, p. XXXIV. For these pictures Honthorst was paid 37,500 guilders.

[726] Braun 1966, pp. 288-290, cat. nos. W 13 and W 14. *Triumph* appears in Judson's 1959 book on Honthorst, as cat. no. 121, p. 208, but *Adversities* is not included or was not known to Judson at the time of that first publication. See Hoogsteder 1984-86, I, pp. 105-108 for his interpretation of the paintings.

[727] Judson/Ekkart 1999, cat. nos. 170-171.

piece with Her Majesty the Queen and all of her children."[728] Because De Beer's entry clearly refers to only one painting, Hoogsteder argues that one of the pair was displayed in Rhenen and the other in The Hague, though he argues that the meaning of the allegory was more complete and powerful only when the paintings are considered together.

The marginal notation "(Heid.)" in De Beer's entry indicates that the painting was sent to Heidelberg as part of the possessions that Charles Louis removed in 1649. Indeed, two pieces of evidence confirm that *Triumph* was in Heidelberg already in the seventeenth century. The first is Sandrart's *Teutsche Academie*, which records the work there in 1679, addressing Elizabeth's son Charles Louis who was by then Elector Palatine and referring to the presence of Frederick V in the painting when describing it as the "Triumph-Wagon of Your Highness the Elector's father of Glorious Memory / and all his family."[729] The second is a 1685 inventory of the paintings in the Elector's Palace at Heidelberg, where it is listed as "Elizabeth, Queen of Bohemia, with all her sons and daughters, the princes and princesses of the Palatine; a large painting, by

---

[728] For the inventory entry see Hoogsteder 1984-86, II, p. 9; for his interpretation of the entry see I, p. 106; See also Hoogsteder 2003, p. 191, no. R 118.

[729] TA 1679, II, p. 74. [Triumf-Wagen von Ihro Churfürstlichen Durchl. Herrn Vattern glorwürdigsten Angedenkens/ samt Dero Familie]

Honthorst, dated 1636."[730] As both of these descriptions clearly refer to *Triumph* and *Triumph* alone—Sandrart obviously understood the message of the allegory since he called the work a "Triumph-Wagon"—Hoogsteder suggests that Charles Louis was not able (or allowed) to take both paintings to Heidelberg, and eventually convinced Elizabeth to reunite the set, as she writes to Charles Louis in 1651: "Sonne, I ame glade you are so well satisfied uith my sending you the great picture."[731] This could of course refer to any number of large paintings in her possession, but Hoogsteder supposes it is the *Adversities*.[732]

However, there is no evidence that *Adversities* ever came to Heidelberg, as the closest matching entry in the 1685 inventory is too vague to make a conclusive argument.[733] Indeed, if both paintings were in Heidelberg in 1679, why would Sandrart mention only one? Particularly two works so obviously complementary and of such large scale, in an important collection such as the that of the Elector Palatine.

---

[730] Hoogsteder 1984-86, II, p. 11, no. HB VI, 13. [Elizabeth, Koningin van Bohemen, met al haar zoons en dochters, de prinsen en prinsessen van de Palts; een groot schilderij, door Honthorst, gedateerd 1636.]

[731] Lily Melissa Baker, *Letters of Elizabeth, Queen consort of Frederick I King of Bohemia* (London: Bodley Head, 1953): p. 185. Letter dated 11 September 1651. Elizabeth may have had some limited control over what her son chose to take to Heidelberg with him. For example, he left most of the objects in her bedchamber at Rhenen undisturbed.

[732] Hoogsteder 1984-86, I, p. 106.

[733] Hoogsteder 1984-86, II, p. 15, no. XXII, 1-12. "Frederik en Elizabeth, Konig en Koningin van Bohemen, en tien van hun kinderen; schilderij."

In any case, the earliest secure provenance for *Adversities* is Vertue's 1731 description, meaning the work was in England at that point.[734] It is therefore possible that it was part of the possessions that Elizabeth took with her to England in 1661, and that it entered an English collection after her death. De Beer's reference to only one of the pair in his expansion of the 1633 inventory can be explained by only one of the works being transported to Heidelberg, and that the departure of the work is what De Beer wished to record, rather than its presence in Rhenen.

Elizabeth may well have commissioned these works specifically for Rhenen, where, as Hoogsteder argues, she displayed her best paintings.[735] It follows that they would have been hung in the most public of its rooms: the vestibule. As we have seen, the vestibule was a space specifically curated to convey the couple's courtly, international taste, and to house some of their most impressive paintings by famous artists. The space was also arranged to communicate certain aspects of her life story and ambitions: the Cornelis and Van Bijlert refer to Elizabeth and Frederick's love for each other and for court entertainment; the Savery a reference to—or even a relic of—their time at Prague; the Vroom and Willaerts commemorate not only the blissful beginning of their married life, but also the two navies (British and Dutch) that facilitated their glorious entry in 1613; the Poelenburgh extols the pastoral and idyllic

---

[734] Braun 1966, p. 290.

[735] Hoogsteder 2003, p. 203.

virtues of Elizabeth's children; and the Honthorsts express her most fervent hopes for a triumph over her current state of despair and the restoration of her former status.[736] Honthorst's portrayal of Elizabeth with the trappings of the Queen of Bohemia codifies the curatorial aims of the vestibule: to prophesize a return to her former magnificence.

This begs the question of where exactly these works would have been placed in the vestibule. This can be partially reconstructed using the above-mentioned 1748 floorplan, part of a survey of the property that also included partial dimensions: of the façade, wings, and the dining hall above the vestibule.[737] Using AutoCAD, a design and drafting software commonly used by architects to produce construction drawings, I had the 1748 floorplan scaled to correspond with the dimensions of the façade (Fig. 4.55). This revealed that the vestibule matched the dimensions for the dining hall (12.8l x 8.2w x 4.4h), making them the two largest rooms in the palace. These AutoCAD results also enabled me to determine the dimensions for every wall in the vestibule (Fig. 4.56), thus aiding in speculation on where paintings could have hung.

The most conspicuous place for a pair of works as large and important as *Triumph* and *Adversities* would be the two walls directly opposite the main entrance,

---

[736] Hoogsteder 2003, pp. 203-204. Incidentally, Adam Willaerts served as the dean of the Utrecht Guild of St. Luke with Honthorst in 1625, 1626, 1628, and 1629. Willaerts was dean in 1620-22, 1624-31, and 1636-37. See Muller, *De Utrechtsche Archieven I,* p. 128.

[737] Kretzschmar 1903, p. 98; and Overvoorde 1902-03, pp. 74-75.

which frame the exit to the large rear staircase. Each of these walls measures 5.5 meters wide, or 550 cm. *Triumph* measures 4.8 m (478 cm), and *Adversities* would have been approximately 4.6 m (457 cm). These twin walls could have easily accommodated Honthorst's grand allegories, giving them a dramatic impact when paired with the polished black tiles of the vestibule's floor that reflected light from the large wood and glass chandelier hanging in the center.[738]

Indeed, this is the only place in the room that could accommodate both of Honthorst's paintings. Together they measure 9.35 m in length (935 cm), much longer than either of the vestibule's side walls, which measure only 7.1 m and one of which was punctuated by a fireplace. Furthermore, as the floor plan reveals, the prevalence of windows throughout the palace resulted in a lack of continuous wall space in most rooms. This would limit the places that could accommodate such large paintings to the banquet hall and vestibule below it. Given the large number of hangings and portraits already placed in the banqueting hall, to which I will turn shortly, this room could hardly have held space for these two grand paintings as well. They could have hung in the far corner of the room on adjacent walls, forming a kind of procession turning 90 degrees rather than one moving continuously parallel to the entrance. However, this would have thrown off the balance of the rest of the pictures in the room, placing all the weight in one corner. Therefore, though this idea of the compositions turning

---

[738] Kretzschmar 1903, p. 98.

toward *Triumph* is poetic, I think it unlikely. Furthermore, unlike a space such as the Oranjezaal at Huis ten Bosch, whose faceted walls facilitated a juxtaposition of pictures at angles to one another, Rhenen palace was more rectilinear in its provision of display spaces.

Vroom's *Arrival* (Fig. 4.33), which measures 4.1 m long, could have fit easily on the long wall to the right, perhaps even alongside the smaller Willaerts *Departure*, the largest surviving example of which would put the total at 6.5 m for both pictures. Because Willaerts's painting would have been so much smaller than Vroom's, it was likely stacked beside it, probably paired with the Van Bijlert that comes between the two in De Beer's inventory. The long wall at the left side of the room was interrupted by a fireplace, so was probably hung with the remaining three, smaller paintings: Cornelis's *Venus, Ceres, and Bacchus*, Savery's animal picture, and the portrait of several of Elizabeth's children, possibly by Poelenburgh. Based on average dimensions of similar works by these artists, they could have hung in any order on this wall.[739] This leaves only the wall opposite the two Honthorst paintings, the small sections of wall between the windows on either side of the front door. These could

---

[739] The closest equivalent painting by Cornelis, in Dresden (Fig. 4.32), measures 184 cm long; Van Bijlert's *Pulling of the Pretzel* (ca. 1630; Utrecht, Centraal Museum), which could easily be described as a banquet scene, measures 137.4 cm with its frame, and is among the largest of the artist's paintings; the two best-known variations of Poelenburgh's *Children of the King and Queen of Bohemia* in Budapest (Fig. 4.39) and London (Fig. 4.38), measure 65.3 and 66 cm, respectively. At 3.1, 2, and 2 m, the three sections of the left vestibule wall contained more than enough room to accommodate any of these paintings.

have held mirrors, sconces with candles, small paintings, or a combination thereof. Indeed, several of the paintings following the first five in the 1633 inventory are attributed to artists that almost exclusively worked in small scale: they include a kitchen still-life by Cornelis Jacobsz. Delff (1571-1643), a nighttime perspective by Hendrick van Steenwyck the Younger (ca. 1580-1649), a landscape by Herri met de Bles (ca. 1510-after 1550), and a perspective by Bartholomeus van Bassen, the architect of Rhenen Palace.[740]

Elizabeth's Privy Chambers

According to De Beer's marginal notations about the locations of some items throughout the palace, Elizabeth seems to have had a series of three rooms making up her privy chambers: a small cabinet, a large cabinet, and a bedchamber. The haphazard way in which the locations are given in the inventory makes a complete reconstruction impossible, as there are several items which appear unassigned between objects listed as being in the same room, and still more paintings that are completely unaccounted for. We also do not know which of the rooms on the 1748 floorplan were Elizabeth's, though as discussed above she and Frederick likely occupied separate wings of the palace. If Elizabeth's rooms were in the east wing, then her large cabinet, small

[740] Hoogsteder 1984-86, II, p. 2.

cabinet, and bedchamber could correspond to the rooms labeled D, F, and G on the floorplan, respectively (Fig. 4.31).[741]

The only painting definitively listed as being in "J. Mt. gross Cabinett" is a piece depicting Jacob and Esau, the artist identified only through the inscription on the painting: "DF 1611."[742] Hoogsteder believes that this painting hung together with the work immediately preceding it, Rubens's *Hagar Leaves the House of Abraham* (similar to Fig. 4.57; 1615-17; St. Petersburg, The Hermitage State Museum), perhaps in addition to the preceding thirteen portraits of German nobility.[743] This Rubens—one of only two in Elizabeth's collection at Rhenen—was a gift from Dudley Carleton. The picture was part of the well-known exchange of paintings for antique sculptures between Carleton and Rubens in 1618, and is described by Rubens as,

> painted on panel, about three feet and a-half in length, by two feet and a-half in height, altogether original. It is a subject as it were neither sacred nor profane, although taken from Holy Writ; namely, Sarah in the act of scolding Hagar, who, pregnant, is leaving the house in a

---

[741] This is of course assuming that the first floor corresponds exactly to the ground floor as preserved in the drawing. We know that the vestibule and dining hall are the same size, but the rest is speculation.

[742] Hoogsteder 1984-86, II, p. 9.

[743] The Rubens *Hagar* in the Hermitage, at 62.8 x 76 cm (2.1 x 2.5 ft), is smaller than the work that Rubens describes in his letter, and in the Hermitage painting Abraham is not assisting Hagar in her exit from the home. Hoogsteder 1984-86, II, pp. 8-9. For the argument that numbers R 101-118 in the Rhenen inventory might have hung together in Elizabeth's large cabinet, see Hoogsteder 2003, pp. 199-200. See also Kretzschmar 1903, p. 118.

> feminine and graceful manner, with the assistance of the Patriarch Abraham.[744]

Described by Hoogsteder as the cheapest painting that Carleton bought from Rubens, this work was given to Elizabeth in Heidelberg in 1619 for her twenty-third birthday, and no doubt became a centerpiece of what was left of her possessions at Rhenen.[745]

If the Rubens and "DF" paintings both hung in Elizabeth's large cabinet, that would mean that two of only eight religious paintings in the entire collection were hung together.[746] This also makes thematic sense: Sarah, Abraham's wife shown in the act of casting out Hagar, the slave whom he impregnated, would later give birth to Isaac, the father of Jacob and Esau. The paintings' subjects are therefore part of the same biblical lineage. Both subjects, furthermore, were associated with several themes relevant to the image that Elizabeth sought to craft for herself and her family. Abraham's sons by his two wives Sarah and Hagar, Isaac and Ishmael, became

---

[744] Sainsbury 1859, p. 39. Letter dated 16/26 May, 1618. See also Hoogsteder 1984-86, I, p. 198.

[745] Hoogsteder 2003, p. 203; Akkerman 2015, p. 203, 204n8: in a letter to Carleton of 31 August 1619, Elizabeth includes the marginal postscript: "I pray commend me to the Prince of Orenge I thanke you for the picture you sent me by M^{r} Jacob." This refers to the merchant and art broker Philip Jacobson, through whom Carleton sent Rubens's picture to Elizabeth. See also Hill, "Ambassadors," p. 219. Hill ("Ambassadors," p. 228n92) adds that Philip Jacobson had contributed to the stocking of Prince Henry's gallery in London between 1610-12.

[746] The other six (R 25-30), also appear to have hung together, as they are listed by De Beer in succession. Hoogsteder 2003, p. 199; Hoogsteder 1984-86, II, p. 3.

associated with the founding of separate dynasties through their descendants.[747] Likewise, Jacob and Esau's discord led to them being considered as opposing patriarchs: Jacob of the Israelites and Esau of the Edomites (occupants of the ancient Kingdom of Edom). Jacob and Esau's driving narrative is loss of a birthright, which Jacob was thought to have taken deceitfully and unjustly from his older brother Esau. Similarly, Ishmael is regarded by many in the Islamic faith as the rightful heir of Abraham, having been born before his half-brother Isaac. Many of these figures also endured periods of exile: Jacob, under threat of death after stealing Esau's birthright; Ishmael, first *in utero* and then again at the age of fourteen under the wrath of Abraham's first wife Sarah. These two biblical scenes therefore allude to the unjust loss of Frederick's birthright, the Palatinate. Indeed, as Elizabeth's letter to Charles I after her husband's death quoted above makes clear, the security of her children was her chief concern. The two paintings must also be seen in the context of the family's state of exile and the difficult circumstances under which the current Bohemian dynasty was founded. That Rubens's painting shows Hagar being expelled by a vengeful Sarah while pregnant no doubt conjured doleful memories of Elizabeth's expulsion from Prague in 1620, six months pregnant with her fifth child, Maurice.

Hoogsteder's supposition that these two paintings hung in proximity to thirteen sixteenth-century German portraits is supported by De Beer's identification of the

---

[747] Ishmael's twelve sons became known as the founders of the twelve tribes of Islam.

portrait sitters. Except for two portraits of women that are described too vaguely to be identified, all of these portraits depict members of the Palatine branch of the Wittelsbach family, including several of the sons of Philip, Elector Palatine (1448-1508).[748] The portraits therefore present Frederick's direct ancestors, both in his family line in general and to the title of Elector Palatine specifically. That the portraits contain members of the family several generations removed is likely a combination of intent and circumstance. Frederick and Elizabeth no doubt wished to emphasize the deep roots of their current dynasty as well as to disavow certain current members of their family, such as Maximilian I, the Catholic Elector of Bavaria and Frederick's cousin. Maximilian was one of the four Catholic powers who raised an army against Frederick in 1620 and—adding insult to injury—he assumed Frederick's title of Elector Palatine in 1623. The majority of these portraits likely came directly from Heidelberg palace, and would have been among those possessions that Elizabeth and Frederick took first to Prague and then with them in exile, and thus the incomplete nature of this presentation of the family is the result of what was able to be taken or merely what survived. That all but two of these portraits were taken back to Heidelberg by Charles Louis in 1649 indicates that they were not newly installed, but rather were returned to their original places in the Elector's ancestral seat.

---

[748] Hoogsteder 1984-86, II, pp. 7-8, R 100-113.

As with the Queen's large cabinet, only one work can be definitively placed in her small cabinet: "Ein stuck von Rubens von Antwerpen, Venus und Adonis. (in kamin [fireplace] von konigin klein cabinet)."[749] Rubens's painting is, I argue, that in the Museum Kunstpalast in Düsseldorf (Fig. 4.58; circa 1610). Though De Beer's inventory does not indicate that the painting was taken to Heidelberg in 1649, it apparently entered the Electoral collection soon after that (perhaps following Elizabeth's death in 1662) as already around 1679 it was in the collection of Elector Palatine Johann Wilhelm (r. 1690-1716) in Düsseldorf City Castle.[750] The painting's vertical format and large size (276 x 183 cm, or 9 x 6 ft) make it ideally suited for a dramatic mantel piece. The subject of the painting itself must have been poignant for Elizabeth and her children: Venus clinging to Adonis in a vain attempt to dissuade him from leaving for the hunt that will end his life, while her son Cupid looks on helplessly. Though Elizabeth was just as invested as Frederick was in his fight to reclaim the Palatinate, their prolonged separations during his campaigns were a source of constant distress. A letter of 17 July 1622 captures some of Frederick's anguish when he writes,

---

[749] Hoogsteder 1984-86, II, p. 4, no. R 40; and Kretzschmar 1903, p. 116.

[750] Provenance from <https://artsandculture.google.com/asset/venus-and-adonis/HgG6SJR8DpmHZw> (Accessed 24 April 2018). Johann Wilhelm is a direct successor of Charles Louis. When his son Charles II died without issue in 1685, this marked the end of the Simmern Line of the Wittelsbach family. The title of Elector Palatine then passed to Philipp Wilhelm (r. 1685-1690), whose son Johann Wilhelm assumed the title after him (See Appendix A).

> Believe me my dear heart that my thoughts are truly with you; your portrait always hangs from my collar and will not cease to be there until I see the original, for which I am most impatient. Love me always and believe me to be until death, Madam, Your most faithful friend and most affectionate servant.[751]

While there are no further paintings listed as being in Elizabeth's small cabinet, De Beer does record a set of tapestries there, depicting tournament scenes woven with gold and silver thread.[752] He also gives the dimensions of these weavings in Flemish *ells*: 4 x 15. If, as according to Katie Heyning, one *ell* is approximately 68.58 cm, the tournament tapestries in Elizabeth's small cabinet would measure about 274 x 1029 cm (9 x 34 ft) each.[753] These are among the largest of Elizabeth's tapestries—for example a set of six weavings of the history of Moses and the Israelites together only measure 35.5 *ells* wide—and therefore one must wonder exactly how large Elizabeth's small cabinet was, to accommodate such hangings. These tournament scenes would have no doubt complemented the diagonal lines and outdoor setting of Rubens's painting, as well as alluding to Elizabeth and Frederick's persistent love of courtly entertainment and the hunt.[754]

---

[751] Akkerman 2015, pp. 380-381, letter no. 272.

[752] Kretzschmar 1903, p. 108.

[753] Katie Heyning in Thomas P. Campbell, ed., *Tapestry in the Baroque,* p. 53, cat. no. 5. This measurement is quite close to the conversion figures that Judson/Ekkart give in their introduction to the 1999 catalogue raisonné (p. 49): .688 m.

[754] Not a single tapestry from Elizabeth and Frederick's collection has yet been identified. See Hubach, "Tales from the Tapestry Collection," p. 121.

A further set of fourteen paintings, thirteen of which represented Elizabeth's children, are more ambiguously marked, simply as being in the "Queen's Cabinet."[755] Whether this was meant to indicate the large or small cabinet is a matter of speculation, though as mentioned above there may not have been room in the small cabinet for more paintings given the size of the tapestries hanging there. Thematically, though, these portraits of her children were well suited to either of her more private rooms, functioning to make the absent present in the comforting image of her family made whole again.[756] If they were hung in the large cabinet, the series of portraits

---

[755] Hoogsteder 1984-86, II, p. 14. The location of these works is given through a bracket and marginal notation.

[756] The odd woman out, as it were, is a portrait of Marie de Barbançon, wife of Albert de Ligne (1600-1674), a commander of the Spanish forces in the Netherlands: Hoogsteder 1984-86, II, pp. 6-7; Kretzschmar 1903, p. 117. De Ligne first entered royal service in 1618 in the campaign *against* the Bohemian Revolt and was awarded the Golden Fleece by Philip IV (r. 1621-65) in 1627 but was arrested in 1634 for his role in the Conspiracy of Nobles, a plot to undermine the Spanish cause in the Netherlands by dividing the territory between the Dutch and the French. This and other arrests were made based on revelations given to the Spanish crown by Balthazar Gerbier, who was serving as Charles I's agent in Brussels at the time and was a correspondent of Elizabeth's. Gerbier was one a few men who designed cipher keys for Elizabeth to keep her correspondence secret: Akkerman 2015, p. 868. Why Elizabeth would include a portrait of Barbançon's wife, whose family was no great friend to the Bohemian cause, is unclear. It is possible that the painting was included by mistake, as the listing of locations on this page seems somewhat haphazard. The marginal bracket that groups the objects together has been extended up to include a portrait of Sophia and Marie de Barbançon but to bypass a portrait of William the Silent's (1533-1584) wife. This would presumably be either Charlotte de Bourbon-Montpensier (1546/47-1582), Frederick's maternal grandmother, or Louise de Coligny (1555-1620), the stepmother who raised Frederick's mother after William the Silent's murder in 1584. The bracket also fails to include a portrait of Elizabeth's youngest child, Gustavus Adolphus, which appears at the top of the next column, its location clarified with an additional marginal notation. The list of the children's portraits is

would read as a continuation of the powerful Wittelsbach family, which had ruled Duchies, Electorates, and Kingdoms throughout Europe for centuries. In addition, the presence of Elizabeth's children would underscore the themes introduced by the paintings of *Jacob and Esau* and *Hagar Leaves the House of Abraham*: exile, loss of birthright, and the founding of dynasties. If they were displayed in the small cabinet, by contrast, the emphasis would be placed on Elizabeth's immediate family: in such a display *Venus and Adonis* can be read as analogs for Elizabeth and Frederick, a reunification of the Bohemian family unit that had long been separated by death, war, and strife.[757]

The inclusion of portraits of all of Elizabeth's children allowed her to see them whether alive or dead, pictured her legacy in the form of the dynasty she and her husband established, and emblematized her yearning for a restoration of status, giving physical form to the family so disaffected by the cruel treatment of Spain. Presented in the chronological order of their birth with the exception of Sophia, who (at least in the inventory) is first, Elizabeth's children demonstrate a depth and range of successors of which even the most fecund monarch would be envious. This was, of course, an

---

also interrupted, nonsensically, by the entry describing the large portrait of Elizabeth's children hanging in the Great Hall.

[757] Hoogsteder eagerly reads the presence of a *Venus and Adonis* as a kind of doubling of Frederick and Elizabeth. Indeed, as he closes his 2003 article on the Bohemian picture gallery at Rhenen rather poetically (p. 205): "This was the hunting lodge of a Venus that tried to keep up with her warring Adonis. In Vain. They enjoyed their Konigshuis for only one summer, our Summer King and Summer Queen."

idealized view of the state of Elizabeth's family, as three of her thirteen children had already died. Given this emphasis on the children's portraits as a set, I find Hoogsteder's supposition that the works were executed by a combination of artists unconvincing.[758] As Elizabeth's and her children's main portraitist for more than two decades, it seems entirely logical that Honthorst would be the one to complete the paintings, which were likely perceived from the beginning as a complete set. Indeed, based on the later Coombe Abbey inventories, it seems that Elizabeth owned multiple portraits by Honthorst of many of her children, and the uniformity of the majority of his portraits of them—bust-length on panel within a fictive oval and measuring about 75 x 60 cm—certainly indicates that these portraits were conceived in terms of coordinating sets or subsets.[759]

Finally, we come to Elizabeth's bedchamber, which, judging by De Beer's inventory, contained no paintings.[760] The only decorative objects listed in the Queen's bedchamber is a set of six tapestries depicting the history of Joseph, measuring 5 x 6

---

[758] Hoogsteder 2003, p. 197. Hoogsteder states that the children's portraits were probably done by Van Miereveld and Honthorst, as well as others like Jacob Fransz. van der Merck (1610-1664).

[759] See Appendix E.

[760] It is possible that De Beer used the words cabinet and bedchamber interchangeably, but I find it unlikely that bedchamber and cabinet would be distinctive terms in the tapestry section, but not the paintings section.

ells each.[761] While De Beer notes that these tapestries were brought from Leiden—perhaps as a gift—they do not seem to be particularly elaborate, containing no gold or silver thread. While only 6% of Elizabeth's paintings were of religious subjects, more than 52% of her tapestries depicted biblical themes.[762] However, it is unclear whether these tapestries depicted the Joseph of the Old or New Testament. Joseph of the Book of Genesis was sold into slavery in Egypt by his jealous brothers and later rose to become the Vizier, or the Pharaoh's highest-ranked advisor. Saint Joseph in the New Testament was, of course, revered as the earthly father of Jesus and both Matthew and John include genealogies in their gospels showing Joseph's descent from King David. This is in a sense more appropriate, not only given the context of the Holy Family's flight into Egypt and Jesus's subsequent birth in exile, but also because of the associations of Frederick with King David. It is furthermore probable that Honthorst's *David Playing the Harp* (Fig. 2.47) was in Elizabeth and Frederick's collection, if not specifically commissioned by them, as discussed in Chapter 2. Several of Elizabeth's Rhenen tapestries, furthermore, represented well-known biblical kings including Saul

---

[761] Kretzschmar 1903, p. 107.

[762] De Beer's inventory records 127 paintings (Hoogsteder 2003, p. 188), of which just 8 had biblical content. Based on Kretzschmar's transcription of the inventory, I have totaled Elizabeth's tapestry collection at 149 pieces (21 sets). Of these 52.3% are biblical (78 pieces), 26.8% are landscapes/hunt scenes (40 pieces), 12.8% are 'other' (feast scenes, coats of arms, military subjects; 19 pieces), 4.7% are mythological (7 pieces), and 3.4 % are of unknown subject (5 pieces).

and two sets of the history of Solomon, as well as elders such as Tobias, Abraham, Jacob, and Moses.

Much less is known about the functioning of space in Elizabeth's palace than those of Charles, but the sovereign's privy chambers in this period were usually so named to indicate their function as private, less ceremonial rooms and accessible by only the most privileged courtiers or intimate acquaintances, as discussed in Chapter 3. That her cabinets and bedchamber would have been among the most private areas of the palace gives some indication of her personal values related to the display of her art: it is here that we find an emphasis on kingship, family, dynasty, legacy, courtly entertainment, and of course, her only two paintings by Rubens. That these works were personally significant to Elizabeth is also indicated by the fact that of all the paintings and tapestries associated with her privy chambers, only the Wittelsbach portraits were removed to Heidelberg in 1649.

The Coombe Abbey and Rhenen Inventories indicate that Elizabeth owned as many as 89 portraits by Honthorst of herself, Frederick, her children, and her immediate circle. These include six portraits of Frederick, seven portraits of Elizabeth, and multiple portraits of her children. According to Judson and Ekkart's 1999 catalogue of Honthorst's work, these portraits could exist in more than a dozen variations, and several of those that have a probable origin in Elizabeth's collection

were studio copies of an original by the master.[763] That these are just the paintings that stayed in Elizabeth's collection testifies to the extent of her enterprise in using Honthorst and other Hague portraitists (such as Michiel van Miereveld, who as we will see was well-represented in Frederick's cabinet and the dining hall) to image her circle in an almost assembly-line fashion, a factory designed to disseminate as many paintings as her supporters would accept. Because of the nature of this portrait production, there is a great range of quality found in Honthorst's images of Elizabeth's circle and family. Particularly in the late 1640s and early 1650s, when demand for his paintings increased and his studio's portrait production had been in practice for more than two decades, the quality tends toward the underwhelming.[764]

Three portraits of Elizabeth, all based on a painting completed in 1642 and now in the National Gallery London (Fig. 4.59), demonstrate this diffusion of a prototype. The London portrait is undoubtedly the primary version, as it is the largest and most elaborate of the group.[765] The depiction of Elizabeth is also of the highest quality, with the details of her hair, jewelry, costume, and above all her flesh the most skillfully and realistically rendered of the set, even though the painting has been

---

[763] See, for example, Judson/Ekkart 1999, nos. 295 (4), 301 (29), 303, 306 (1), 308, 310, 326, 330 (4), 330 (12), 331 (1), 331 (5), 336 (5), 337 (1), 340 (4), and 340 (11).

[764] It was in the late 1640s, for example, that Honthorst and his studio produced several complex, large-scale paintings for the Oranjezaal at Huis ten Bosch.

[765] It is inscribed "GHonthorst 1642" on the balustrade to Elizabeth's proper right.

relined and now appears flatter than it would have originally. This picture was completed ten years into Elizabeth's widowhood, and that is indeed how she is portrayed here: dressed regally but sorrowfully in black with an enormous set of pearls adorning her neck, ears, and hair, a pair of roses (half-withered) in her hand, and a dog (fidelity) insistently jumping at her feet.

This motif of Elizabeth as the widowed queen is quite common in Honthorst's images of her, for example the portrait now in the Historisches Museum, Hannover (Fig. 4.60). Wearing the same brooch, necklace, and distinctive double-pearl earrings, Elizabeth is portrayed in half-length as the Queen of Bohemia. The setting and format of this picture have been greatly simplified when compared to that in the National Gallery, but her costume has become more regal with a jeweled crown, large double string of pearls crossing her bodice, and ermine-lined black robe sitting delicately on her shoulders. The lace in both portraits, though of different types, seems to have been painted using the same technique, typical of Honthorst's portraits: pure strokes of white paint on top of a black or gray underlayer (the purity of the white varies depending upon how direct the lighting is), with additional black used to fill in the larger gaps of the openwork lace in the Hannover portrait.[766] Two further portraits

---

[766] The National Gallery painting also exhibits several scratch marks in the lace, particularly in the center near Elizabeth's brooch. These were probably marks made with the handle of a paintbrush to remove the layer of white paint and aid in the imitation of the delicate lace by exposing the dark layer below. Additionally, the National Gallery and National Trust paintings were both in the Craven Collection at

based on the 1642 National Gallery picture demonstrate the variability of this type, even within the bounds of the half-length format. Now in the collections of the Paleis Het Loo (Fig. 4.61) and the UK National Trust (Fig. 4.62), these portraits both portray Elizabeth as a widow wearing the distinctive pearl necklace and earrings, though with great variations in costume.[767] In the National Trust portrait, the large pearls at the ends of Elizabeth's sleeves provide another reference to the 1642 portrait on which it is based. Furthermore, one of the rectangular diamond brooches that Elizabeth wears in this picture appeared in at least one earlier portrait of her daughter Elizabeth, also from 1642, now in a private collection (Fig. 4.63).[768]

This copying practice was not limited to Honthorst's works for Elizabeth. For example, portraits of three of her daughters, preserved in the Dutch Royal Collections, are part of a series of twenty-three commissioned in 1636 by Amalia van Solms (Figs. 4.64, 4.65, 4.66). One, of Princess Elizabeth (Fig. 4.64) exists in at least two

---

Coombe Abbey in the nineteenth century, meaning that they may well have both belonged to Elizabeth.

[767] A further variant is found in the collection of Schloss Charlottenburg, Berlin, in which Elizabeth wears a dress that is strikingly similar to those in the Honthorst portraits of Mary Stuart, discussed below (See Judson/Ekkart 1999, pp. 264-266, cat. no. 340 [8]).

[768] I would like to thank the owner of this painting for drawing my attention to the brooch during a discussion of it on 8 November 2017.

variations, one currently at Heidelberg Castle (Fig. 4.67).[769] The Dutch Royal Collection picture seems to be the primary version, and at least is of higher quality.[770] Her lace collar is executed in minute detail, with opaque strokes of white over the peach underlayer of her dress (Fig. 4.68). The trim on her bodice and left sleeve is rendered with precise dots of white over yellow-green lines, mimicking the shimmering of metallic thread, the white becoming stronger where the decoration is positioned under direct light. On her sleeve Elizabeth wears a distinctive diamond and pearl brooch, which was likely one of the few jewels that her family still possessed at this point, as it appears in several portraits of the Bohemian princesses.[771] Though Elizabeth's posture and expression are virtually identical in the Heidelberg picture, the latter is slightly less well-executed, with her anatomy rendered more awkwardly and the soft, luminous quality of her skin and hair is missing. Her costume is less elaborate but is the same distinctive peach hue as that in the Dutch Royal Collection painting, and the brooch has moved to her bodice from her sleeve.

---

[769] The other comes from the Craven collection, but its current whereabouts are unknown. It was sold at Christie's London on April 28, 2016, lot no. 34. See also Judson/Ekkart 1999, p. 270, cat. no. 351 (1).

[770] It is signed and dated "GHonthorst f. 1636" and there are at least two pentimenti, correcting the curve of the shoulders.

[771] In addition to these two portraits of Elizabeth, it appears on one of Sophia in the Royal Collection Trust (RCIN 404423). Elizabeth also wears it on her bodice in *Triumph*.

The same is true of several of Honthorst's portraits of Mary Stuart (1631-60), all based on the double portrait of her and her husband Willem II of Orange that he completed in 1647 (Fig. 4.69; Amsterdam, Rijksmuseum). Moving in decreasing order of quality, they are now in the collection of the Landesmuseum, Hannover (Fig. 4.70), the UK National Trust (Fig. 4.71), and the Dutch Royal Collection (Fig. 4.72). In all three of these variations Mary's dress, expression, jewelry, and hairstyle are copied almost exactly, with the only major deviation in the color of her dress: yellow, pink, blue, and white, respectively. As the original portrait was copied and rescaled Mary's anatomy becomes more awkward, and her features are rendered more stiffly and precisely.

In at least one case we know that Honthorst's portraits of noble children were specifically commissioned to fortify relationships between Elizabeth and her supporters. In 1649 Marie Elizabeth, Princess of Hohenzollern and Marchioness of Bergen op Zoom, commissioned a painting of her daughter Henrietta Francisca from Honthorst, which she then presented to Elizabeth (Fig. 4.73; Bergen op Zoom, Het Markiezenhof Museum). Elizabeth responded by commissioning a portrait of her daughter Louise Hollandine from Honthorst as a reciprocal gift.[772] Henrietta Francisca is depicted standing on the same black and white checkered floor and before the same gold and purple brocaded curtain that appears in Honthorst's group of three large

---

[772] Keblusek, "The Bohemian Court at The Hague," p. 53.

portraits of members of the House of Orange completed just two years before (Figs. 4.69, 4.74, 4.75; all Amsterdam, Rijksmuseum). This curtain, which was probably a studio prop as it appears in a number of Honthorst's portraits, was also a common type as it (or something extremely similar) is featured in Van Dyck's *Portrait of Willem II and Mary Stuart*, done on the occasion of their marriage in 1641 (Fig. 4.76; Amsterdam, Rijksmuseum), as well as his *Portrait of Amalia van Solms,* completed during his visit to The Hague in 1631/32 (Fig. 4.77; Madrid, Museo del Prado).[773]

Frederick's Cabinet

In reconstructing Frederick's cabinet, we encounter a situation similar to that of the portraits of Elizabeth's children: there is a group of paintings in the inventory labeled in the margin as being in "Chff: Cabinet."[774] This set of eight female portraits are the only works in the inventory specifically associated with Frederick's chambers

---

[773] For Van Dyck's visit to The Hague see Amy L. Walsh, "Van Dyck at the Court of Frederik Hendrik," *Studies in the History of Art* 46, Symposium Papers XXVI: Van Dyck 350 (1994): pp. 221-244. Honthorst had also been involved in the exchange of pictures for the marriage negotiations between Willem II and Mary Stuart. Honthorst's *Portrait of Willem II*, completed around 1640 (Fig. 4.78; London, Royal Collection Trust), was probably sent to London as part of these marriage discussions, mostly likely in exchange with a portrait of Mary by Van Dyck similar to that done in 1637, which exists in at least three variations and in two of which the distinctive purple and gold curtain also appears (Figs. 4.79, 4.80, 4.81; London, Hampton Court Palace; Boston, Museum of Fine Arts; Budapest, Museum of Fine Arts).

[774] Hoogsteder 1984-86, II, pp. 5-6. This abbreviation is short for *Churfürst* or *Churffürst*, an archaic spelling of *Kurfürst* [elector].

and, like the portraits of his children in Elizabeth's cabinet, were left intact as a set and not taken to Heidelberg in 1649. Though the portraits are not referred to as a "gallery of beauties," the association with the type would have been unavoidable to a contemporary viewer and likely was purposeful, as by the 1630s the assemblage of such series had long been a courtly activity on the European continent.[775]

One of the most well-known sets of this type was commissioned from the Flemish painter Frans Pourbus the Younger (1569-1622) in 1604 by Vincenzo I Gonzaga, Duke of Mantua (1562-1612). As Vincenzo wrote in a letter from February that year: "I am having a room built in which I am thinking of gathering portraits of the beautiful women in the world."[776] Judging by the 1627-28 inventories of the Mantuan collection— compiled for its sale to Charles I—this gallery was densely

---

[775] Catharine MacLeod and Julia Marciari Alexander, "The 'Windsor Beauties' and the Beauties Series in Restoration England," in Julia Marciari Alexander and Catharine MacLeod, eds., *Politics, Transgression, and Representation at the Court of Charles II*, Studies in British Art 18 (New Haven, CT: Yale Center for British Art; London: Paul Mellon Centre for Studies in British Art, 2007): p. 95.

[776] Sally Hickson, "'Pretty Maids All in a Row': Some Thoughts on Collections of Female 'Beauties' in the Renaissance," in Leslie Boldt-Irons, Corrado Federici, and Ernesto Virgulti, eds., *Beauty and the Abject: Interdisciplinary Perspectives* (New York: Peter Lang, 2007): pp. 122-123 (p. 129n32 for the original Italian and citation of the letter, dated 11 Feb. 16-4). See also Rafaella Morselli in The Weiss Gallery, *From Merchants to Monarchs: Frans Pourbus the Younger* (London: The Weiss Gallery, 2015): p. 38, based on Lorne Campbell, *Renaissance Portraits: European Portrait Painting in the 14th, 15th, and 16th Centuries* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1990): pp. 220, 272n132.

populated: item 100 refers to a series of 78 portraits of "beauties."[777] In 1660s England, a series of portraits of female courtiers was commissioned by Anne Hyde, Duchess of York (1637-1671) from the popular court painter Peter Lely (1618-80). Originally comprising eleven portraits hung together in the White Room at St. James's Palace in London, today all but one have remained together, displayed as a set at Hampton Court Palace and known as the "Windsor Beauties."[778] Like many of the beauties series that preceded them, Lely's portraits only form a superficially coherent group, and have little visual connection beyond the artist's style and their matching frames.[779] Lely's portraits, in fact, like others of the 1660s and 70s assembled by the French Count Roger de Bussy-Rabutin (1618-1693) and Cardinal Flavio Chigi (1631-1693) were not intended to necessarily represent the most beautiful women but the most prominent (and the most available for portrait sittings) as well as those most closely associated with the commissioning family.[780]

---

[777] Hickson, "'Pretty Maids all in a Row," pp. 122-123.

[778] MacLeod and Alexander, "The 'Windsor Beauties'," pp. 81-82. The names of the eleven sitters are given in a 1674 inventory of the possessions of James, Duke of York. In the eighteenth century the ten portraits—along with other portraits of women added later—were moved to the State Bedchamber at Windsor Castle, hence the name "Windsor Beauties." The portraits remained there possibly until 1835, when they were placed at Hampton.

[779] MacLeod and Alexander, "The 'Windsor Beauties'," pp. 103, 114.

[780] MacLeod and Alexander, "The 'Windsor Beauties'," pp. 97-99. MacLeod and Alexander conclude (p. 104) that, "The beauty, notoriety, or personal connections (or some combination thereof) that justified the inclusion of sitters in the Bussy and Chigi

Likewise, Frederick's collection of female portraits preferences young women associated with the Bohemian cause or the court itself. It included Sophia Hedwig, Duchess of Brunswick-Wolfenbüttel (1592-1642), the wife of Ernst Casimir of Nassau-Dietz (1573-1632), a military commander and relative of Dutch stadtholders Maurits and Frederik Hendrik.[781] Sophia would have been the oldest of the identifiable sitters, at 39 in 1631, when we know Van Miereveld painted her portrait from life and thus probably in The Hague, according to a reproductive print by Willem Jacobsz. Delff (1580-1638) (Fig. 4.82; Amsterdam, Rijksmuseum). The series also included portraits of Lady Diana Cecil, Countess of Oxford (1596-1654); Felicitas van Bronckhorst-Gronsveld (1600-1660); and Anna van der Noot (1605-1642), who were all related by marriage to supporters of the Bohemian cause, a fact to which I will return shortly.[782]

Only one of the portraits depicted a famous beauty: Frances Coke, Viscountess Purbeck (1601-1645).[783] Frances spent the summer and autumn of 1623 with her mother at Elizabeth's court in The Hague, where Van Miereveld painted her portrait

---

groups must surely also have been the stimulus for the selection of the Windsor sitters."

[781] Hoogsteder 1984-86, II, p. 5, no. R 58: "Ein stuck Graff Ernsten Gemahlin."

[782] Hoogsteder 1984-86, II, p. 5-6, no. R 60: "Ein contrefaict Diana Cecil Contesse d'Oxfort.", R61: "Ein Contrefaict Felicitas de Gronsfelt.", and R 62 "Ein contrefaict Anna van der Noot."

[783] Hoogsteder 1984-86, II, p. 6, no. R 63: "Ein contrefaict Francoise de Coocke."

(Fig. 4.83; Ashdown House, National Trust Collections).[784] Described by the Stuart historian and author Arthur Wilson (1595-1652) as "a Lady of transcending *beauty*," Frances was the sister-in-law of George Villiers, Duke of Buckingham.[785] Forcibly married to the mentally unstable John Villiers, 1st Viscount Purbeck (c. 1591-1658) in 1617, Frances became infamous a year after her visit to The Hague, when she gave birth to a child that was widely thought to have been fathered by Sir Robert Howard (1585-1653).[786] Apparently at Buckingham's urging, the two were put on trial for adultery and were both convicted; Frances fled abroad and lived in exile for many years, while Robert was excommunicated.[787] The scandal was much talked about among members of court, as Sir John Chamberlain's letters to Dudley Carleton demonstrate several times throughout 1624-25.[788]

---

[784] Johanna Luthman, *Love, Madness, and Scandal: The Life of Frances Coke Villiers, Viscountess Purbeck* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2017): p. 58.

[785] Wilson, *The history of Great Britain*, p. 147.

[786] Johanna Rickman, *Love, Lust, and License in Early Modern England: Illicit Sex and the Nobility*. Women and Gender in the Early Modern World (Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2008): p. 179.

[787] Rickman, *Love, Lust, and License*, pp. 180-188.

[788] Thomas Birch and Robert Folkestone Williams, *The Court and Times of James the First*, vol. II (London: Henry Colburn, 1848): p. 499. Letter dated February 26, 1624-25: Chamberlain wrote to Carleton detailing the witchcraft-like charges being laid against Frances: "There is an imputation laid on her, that with powder and potions she did intoxicate her husband's brains, and practiced somewhat, in that kind, upon the Duke of Buckingham." In March Chamberlain wrote again that, "The Lady Purbeck's business possesseth the high commission very much every week, wherein she acquits herself reasonably well hitherto…Sir Robert Howard was excommunicated openly at

This exceptional case aside, this gallery of female portraits did not depict sensational sitters. Even Frances Coke did not obtain her infamous status until after she sat for Van Miereveld's portrait, and hers and Sophia Hedwig's portraits demonstrate a link between the series of female portraits and the physical presence of these important sitters at the court at The Hague. The portraits therefore preserve an assemblage of Elizabeth and Frederick's supporters in absentia, constituting a kind of document that testifies to the eyewitness (*naer het leven*) quality of Van Miereveld's portraits and forms a record of Elizabeth's immediate circle, of her courtly network in exile.

The only painting in Frederick's cabinet whose sitter was not identified by De Beer was probably done by Honthorst and is described as "A shepherdess with white turtledoves in her hands."[789] Though Judson suggests that this entry refers to the *Shepherdess* now in the Centraal Museum, Utrecht (Fig. 2.83; ca. 1625), it could easily have been a pastoral portrait of the type that Honthorst pioneered in 1628 in his images of Charles I and Henrietta Maria as a Shepherd and Shepherdess, brought back from London as gifts for Elizabeth. Honthorst's *Two Shepherdesses* (Fig. 4.84), for example, was likely a double portrait, with the woman on the right holding a nest with

---

Paul's Cross, on Sunday last, for contempt in refusing to answer." (Birch and Williams, *The Court and Times of James the First*, vol. II, p. 508. Letter dated March 23, 1624-25.)

[789] Hoogsteder 1984-86, II, p. 6, no. R 65: "Ein Bergere mit einer weissen Turteltauben in der handt."

two doves in her right hand.[790] Honthorst's pastoral and mythological portraits were exceedingly popular among ladies of the court, and several noblewomen in and around The Hague chose to be portrayed as such, including Catherina Elizabeth von Hanau (1607-47; Fig. 2.84; Baltimore, The Walters Art Museum), Amalia van Solms and her sisters Charlotte de la Trémouille (1599-1664; Fig. 4.85; Apeldoorn, Paleis Het Loo), Elizabeth van Solms, and Louise Christina van Solms (1606-1669), and Elizabeth and Frederick together with several of the Bohemian princes and princesses.[791]

If Frederick's chambers were indeed in the west wing, as indicated by the location of the "King's Room" given in the 1802 survey of Rhenen mentioned above, then one additional work can be placed in his chambers: "A piece with 3 of her

---

[790] Judson/Ekkart 1999, p. 167, cat. no. 201. An eighteenth-century variation of the figure on the right recently was sold at Sotheby's London: *Two Great Scottish Collections: Property from the Forbeses of Pitsligo and the Marquesses of Lothian*, 28 March 2017, lot no. 477.

[791] See Judson/Ekkart 1999, cat. nos. 454 and 456. Though there is no item in the Rhenen inventory that matches these paintings, Hoogsteder argues for the inclusion in Elizabeth's collection of a work that he dates to c. 1629-30, described by Vertue, of *Frederick V and Elizabeth Stuart as a Shepherd and Flora*, which therefore could have hung in her home on the Kneuterdijk in The Hague (Hoogsteder 1984-86, I, p. 104, cat. no. 44; see also Judson/Ekkart 1999, cat. no. 326). Vertue (1937-38, p. 39) describes the work, for sale at Leipzig in 1745, as "the Bohemian Family (in Solitude) Cupids attending. representing the King & Queen of Bohemia. he as a sheppard with a Crook in his hand she as a Flora. 2 the children carry as basket of Fruits and Flowers painted by…honthorst. 8 x 16." Vertue's diagram clarifies that the painting has a horizontal format.

majesty's children, on the mantlepiece in the room opposite the garden."[792] Hoogsteder supposes that this work refers to a painting by Honthorst, and was probably similar to *The Four Eldest Children of the King and Queen of Bohemia*, which is signed and dated 1631 and is now in the Royal Collection, London (Fig. 4.86).[793] Judson finds it likely that this painting was originally in Elizabeth's collection, and though it clearly depicts four and not three of her children, its dignified portrayal of the sitters and hunting theme would have been wholly appropriate for a room overlooking the garden.[794]

---

[792] The large kitchen garden was located beyond the west wing of the palace. Hoogsteder 1984-86, II, p. 4, no. R 41; Kretzschmar 1903, p. 116: [Ein stuck, mitt 3. Jher Maijet. Kindern, stehen am Camin in der Cammer gegen dem garten Zue.]

[793] There is also the pastoral portrait of Henrietta Maria and Edward (Fitzwilliam Collection, England), which has a 1782 English provenance. David Ekserdjian, *Wentworth-Fitzwilliam: An English Collection* (Lisbon: Calouste Gulbenkian Foundation, 2015. Exh. cat.): p. 64, cat. no. 15, "page 11 of the 1782 Rockingham Inventory in the Little Red Bed Chamber at Wentworth Woodhouse as 'a Picture of 2 Princesses of Palatine with a Basket of Fruit 2^{F} 9^{I} by 3^{F} 3^{I}' (it actually measures 2 foot 6 inches by 3 foot 1 inch)." The painting is signed and dated 1632 on the middle of the left side and is not listed in Judson/Ekkart 1999. The painting described by Van der Doort was not sent to Heidelberg, so it would have been taken to England with Elizabeth in 1661.

[794] Judson/Ekkart 1999, cat. no. 327. The work did not enter the Royal Collection until 1958, when it was acquired by Queen Elizabeth II. Its provenance prior to this is unknown.

Dining Hall

That the female portraits in Frederick's cabinet record actual visitors to the court is supported by the set of fourteen male portraits that De Beer locates in the "k. esssaal," or the royal dining hall, located on the second floor directly above the vestibule.[795] While Hoogsteder suggests an attribution to Van Miereveld for only three of the eight portraits in Frederick's cabinet (those of Sophia Hedwig, Diana Cecil, and Frances Coke), as many as nine of the dining hall portraits depict sitters that he is known to have painted.

As discussed in Chapter 3, Van Miereveld declined multiple invitations to the English court from Henry Frederick and Charles, preferring to stay at the court of the stadtholder in The Hague. In this capacity Van Miereveld also served as a kind of *de facto* portrait painter to Frederick and Elizabeth's court, completing portraits of the various diplomats and courtiers that visited them and the many military officials that passed through on Bohemian, Dutch, and English campaigns. In 1625 or 26, for example, he painted a portrait of the Duke of Buckingham, who took the opportunity to visit Elizabeth around the time of his trip to Paris to negotiate the marriage between Charles and Henrietta Maria (Fig. 4.87). Likewise, several of the sitters in the dining hall portraits had their likenesses painted by Van Miereveld while in The Hague. Furthermore, several of the subjects of both the female portraits in Frederick's cabinet

---

[795] Hoogsteder 1984-86, II, p. 7, nos. R 82-95.

and the male portraits in the dining hall are related, suggesting that some of the paintings were conceived of (and probably gifted) as pendant or complementary pairs that were then separated into distinct groups: the women into a "gallery of beauties" and the men into a gallery of martial honor.

That most of the paintings in the dining hall are specified as depicting colonels (and those that aren't labeled as such also portray military commanders) supports the argument for a thematic separation. These portraits included close friends and supporters of Elizabeth and Frederick such as Maurits and Frederik Hendrik as well as relatives of several of the women represented in Frederick's cabinet. A portrait of "Graff Ernst," for example, probably refers to Ernst Casimir I, Count of Nassau-Dietz, a relative of Frederik Hendrik and husband of Sophia Hedwig (Fig. 4.88; Amsterdam, Rijksmuseum).[796] Two further portraits can be connected to Lady Diana Cecil: a portrait of "Colonel Veer" and one of "Col. Cicil."[797] The former is Horace Vere, 1st Baron Vere of Tilbury (1565-1635), who was painted multiple times by Van Miereveld in The Hague in 1629, and was a relative of Diana Cecil's first husband Henry de Vere (1593-1625; Figs. 4.89, 4.90; London, National Portrait Gallery, and National Trust Collections). The latter is Edward Cecil, 1st Viscount Wimbledon (1572-1638), a strong supporter of English intervention in the Palatinate campaign,

---

[796] Hoogsteder 1984-86, II, p. 7, no. R 83.

[797] Hoogsteder 1984-86, II, p. 7, nos. R 85, 87.

Diana Cecil's uncle, and sitter for Van Miereveld in 1631 (Fig. 4.91; London, National Portrait Gallery). Further evidence that these images functioned as records of the sitters' presence in The Hague is given by additional surviving portraits by Van Miereveld of individuals listed in the inventory: Gaspard de Coligny, Duke of Châtillon (1584-1646; Fig. 4.92; 1631 Amsterdam, Rijksmuseum); Sir Charles Morgan (1575-1642; Fig 4.93; 1630); and Willem Pijnssen van der Aa (1567-1641; Fig. 4.94; c. 1630; Delft, Museum het Prinsenhof).[798]

De Beer also records a set of tapestries in the dining hall: "a room of twelve pieces, mixed with silk, with large imagery, of the creation of the world and the fall of man."[799] Though the marginal notation places these tapestries in the dining hall, the specification at the beginning of the description that it is "a room" of tapestries could mean that they were the sole decoration of an adjacent space. Either way, the close juxtaposition of such religious imagery with the military portraits of the dining hall frames the efforts to reclaim the Palatinate as one of religious conflict, placing those commanders working on Elizabeth and Frederick's behalf in the immediate context of the couple's piety. Tapestries hanging elsewhere in the palace reinforce the martial and religious themes of the dining hall. One room featured, for example, a set of six hangings depicting the Exodus of Moses and the Children of Israel from Egypt that

---

[798] Hoogsteder 1984-86, II, p. 7, nos. R 86, 90, 91.

[799] Kretzschmar 1903, p. 107, no. 8: [Eine Kammer von zwölf Stücken, vermischt mit Seiden, von großem Bildwerk, die Erschaffung der Welt und des Menschen fall].

allude to the religious persecution and exile currently faced by the Bohemian royal family.[800] Nearby, a set of eight tapestries portrayed the Siege of Nanstuhl, a little-known battle that was part of a revolt of Protestant knights against the Catholic Church and the Holy Roman Emperor in 1522, led by Franz von Sickingen (1481-1523).[801] Again reinforcing the theme of a religious struggle against a more powerful enemy, these images of the Seige of Nanstuhl were no doubt meant to commemorate the participants as heroes, martyrs to the Protestant cause.

That the majority of the paintings displayed in Rhenen Palace were gifts says more about the strength and breadth of Elizabeth's circle than it does about hers and Frederick's artistic tastes. The collection included about seven paintings, for example, by Bartholomeus van Bassen, Rhenen's architect. Many of these were probably given by Van Bassen to celebrate the commission, and therefore do not necessarily indicate a deep interest in the artist's work.[802] Likewise, the fact that their collection contained no works by Rembrandt or Van Dyck should not be taken as a lack of interest in these

---

[800] Kretzschmar 1903, p. 108, no. 15. De Beer specifies that these tapestries are almost new and are just a bit damaged [seind fast neu, doch etwas schadhaft von führen, indeme Löcher darein kommen.]

[801] Sickingen was cornered by Catholic forces at Nanstuhl, one of his minor palaces, which was not properly fortified and was in ruins after eight days of artillery attacks. During this siege, Sickingen was grievously injured on the ramparts and later died. See Miriam Usher Chrisman, *Conflicting Visions of Reform: German Lay Propaganda Pamphlets, 1519-1530*, Studies in German Histories (Atlantic Highlands, NJ: Humanities Press, 1996): pp. 82-83.

[802] Hoogsteder 2003, p. 203.

painters, but rather that they could not afford to commission works from them. She could also likely not have afforded paintings by Rubens, Cornelis, Vroom, or Goltzius, leading to the assumption that these paintings—among the most prestigious in her collection—were given as gifts. We know, furthermore, that at least one of the paintings by Rubens was a gift from Dudley Carleton in 1619, as discussed above. She might not have been able to afford many of Honthorst's paintings either. That Elizabeth was Honthorst's most important patron, possibly even his favorite, is testified to not only by the quality of his works for her, but also by the fact that he personally lent her 35,000 *f* in 1651, when her financial circumstances were dire following Charles's execution two years prior.[803]

Hoogsteder concludes that Elizabeth and Frederick did not rise to the level of true passionate art collectors because of the piecemeal nature of the collection. He hints at the cleverness of the hanging in his discussion of the thematic significance of the pictures likely in the vestibule, but does not incorporate a study of the other rooms or of the tapestries, which made up a larger portion of the collection than the paintings.[804] However, though Elizabeth couldn't necessarily express her personal tastes, the arrangement of the paintings *was* her choice and was certainly deliberate, as

---

[803] Hoogsteder 1984-86, I, p. 99. Hoogsteder does not give a reason for the loan, nor does he cite the documentary source. Akkerman (*Courtly Rivals*, pp. 101-102), notes that Elizabeth was still in debt to Honthorst in 1659 for the sum of 11,848 *f*. Akkerman assumes that this debt was unpaid fees for paintings and possibly painting lessons.

[804] Hoogsteder 2003, pp. 203-204.

the above analysis demonstrates. Furthermore, as discussed in Chapter 2, already in 1622 Carleton encouraged the Flemish merchant Daniel Nijs to help stock Elizabeth's collection, which helped to preserve Nijs's burgeoning picture-dealing.[805] These machinations demonstrate that, at least early in her exile, Elizabeth's taste for and delight in pictures was a well-known way to gain her favor.

Conclusion: The Queen of Hearts Returns to England

After Frederick's death, Elizabeth ordered that the Wassenaer Hof's walls be draped with black velvet, and she also dressed in black. She continued to be portrayed as the widowed Queen of Bohemia throughout her life, as we have seen.[806] After the deaths of her eldest son in 1629, her husband in 1632, Frederik Hendrik in 1647, and her brother Charles in 1649, Elizabeth was left without her chief supporters and to make matters worse, she received no allowance from England after the start of the Civil War.[807]

---

[805] Hill, "Ambassadors," p. 219, 228n93.

[806] Keblusek, "The Bohemian Court at The Hague," p. 54. See also Akkerman 2015, p. 27, image caption for the pair of state portraits of Frederick and Elizabeth, by Honthorst in 1634 and 1631 in the Kurpfälzisches Museum, Heidelberg. Frederick portrait was posthumous, and both are unequivocal in their presentation of Frederick and Elizabeth as the rightful monarchs of Bohemia (Figs. 3.36, 4.95).

[807] Green, *Elizabeth: Electress Palatine*, p. 369: Parliament suspended Elizabeth's annual pension on 8 May 1649, though it was never consistently paid to begin with. See also Keblusek, "The Bohemian Court at The Hague," p. 56.

Her son's restoration to the Palatinate the year of her brother's death did little to improve her situation, or her sorrow. Her grief and anger at the death of her brother was so profound that she immediately cancelled all of the celebrations of her son's restitution. A supporter brought Elizabeth a lock of Charles's hair from England, which she wore until her death set in a mourning ring adorned with a crown above a skull and cross-bones and the letters C.R—an eerie reminiscence of his picture brand (Fig. 3.14).[808] Starting in the early 1650s Elizabeth tried to return first to Heidelberg, then to England, but her numerous creditors blocked her from leaving with her debts unpaid.[809] In the matter of her finances the States-General of Holland also ignored her pleas for assistance, as a contemporary remarked in 1652:

> The States [of Holland] sit very close still, some desires have been made by the Lady *Elizabeth*; But she is a trouble both to them and the people do mutter much at her, many wish she was gone, but then some would lose considerable summes which she owes, and is not like to receive for any thing I see, if she stayes.[810]

---

[808] Green, *Elizabeth: Electress Palatine*, p. 368. There are few portraits of Elizabeth completed after her brother's death, and I have found none that show enough of her figure or hands to discern whether this mourning ring is also depicted.

[809] Akkerman, *Courtly Rivals*, p. 101: the Dutch debts left unpaid when Elizabeth left the country totaled 627, 754 *f*. She did, however, reclaim most of her jewelry from pawnbrokers in Amsterdam when Charles II was restored, including her wedding ring.

[810] Letter from an unknown author in The Hague, 20 January (new style) 1652. As transcribed in Scobell 1653, p. 2726. Also cited in Green, *Elizabeth: Electress Palatine*, p. 381.

Faced with mounting debts and the parsimony of her son Charles Louis, Elizabeth wrote to him in 1653:

> It may be my next [letter] will tell you I have no more to eat: this is no parable but the certain truth, for there is no money nor credit for any…I know my son would have me to be rid of all my jewels…I believe he means to starve me out of this place, as they do blocked towns.[811]

She was only able to leave in 1660 when her nephew, the newly-restored Charles II, agreed reluctantly to settle £12,000 worth of her debts.[812]

Elizabeth finally returned to England in May of 1661, some 47 years after her wedding trip. She initially stayed in a house owned by William Craven, who had begun plans to build Elizabeth a grand palace and hunting lodge in the English countryside. On 29 January 1662 she moved into a rented house, where she contracted an illness almost immediately.[813] She died on 13 February, one day before what would have been her forty-ninth wedding anniversary.[814] She was buried in Westminster Abbey, in the same vault into which her brother Henry and eventually her niece Mary and her son Rupert were interred. Her coffin plate identifies her much the same way she did throughout her life:

---

[811] Keblusek, "The Bohemian Court at The Hague," p. 56, based on Green, *Elizabeth: Electress Palatine*, p. 379; letter dated 7/17 November 1653.

[812] Keblusek, "The Bohemian Court at The Hague," p. 57.

[813] Green, *Elizabeth: Electress Palatine*, p. 409.

[814] Green, *Elizabeth: Electress Palatine*, p. 410. See also Keblusek, "The Bohemian Court at The Hague," p. 57.

> the Most Serene and Puissant Princess Elizabeth, Queen of Bohemia, relict of Frederick, by the grace of God King of Bohemia, Chief Steward and Elector Palatine of the Holy Roman Empire, only daughter of James, sister of Charles I and aunt of Charles, the second of that name, kings of Great Britain, France and Ireland. She fell asleep most piously in the Lord at Leicester House, on Thursday 13 Feb.[815]

Perhaps Elizabeth's most enduring legacy is, as she always believed it would be, that of her family line: her grandson George was the first of the Hanover Kings of England and a direct ancestor of the current British monarch, Elizabeth II (r. 1952-present), who shares a namesake with the Winter Queen. Long before this, though, she cemented her place in the history of the Stuart court through her thousands of letters to the rulers, nobility, military commanders, and artists of Europe, disseminating and strengthening the awareness of her cause and improving her reputation as a charming and canny political operator. The hundreds of portraits that she commissioned for her personal displays and to be distributed to her supporters reinforced the diplomatic machinations of her letters.

To her last days Elizabeth enchanted all who met her. One final account, found in a report from the Genoese Ambassador to London Marquis G. A. Durazzo, reads as if the ambitions Elizabeth expressed in Honthorst's *Triumph* had finally come to pass. Just a few weeks before her death, Durazzo recounts,

---

[815] Transcription given by Westminster Abbey: <https://www.westminster-abbey.org/abbey-commemorations/royals/elizabeth-stuart-queen-of-bohemia/> (Accessed 20 June 2018). The year is given on the plate as 1661, but is in the Old Style, and the Abbey confirms the death year as 1662.

> This princess has learned from nature, and continued through the changes of her fortune, an incomparable goodness ; and as people ever turn away from her with profit and applause, she has thus often, by this capital alone, sustained in a most depressed estate the respect due to the dignity of her rank. Now, restored to the possession of her appanages, whilst her son enjoys that of his states, she is restored to some authority, and thus is heightened the lustre of that affable manner with which she wonderfully conciliates the esteem and love of the court.[816]

Durazzo's description of Elizabeth's manner as lustrous is poetic, echoing accounts of the young Princess on her wedding day as "being all over beset with precious *gems*, shining like a *Constellation*" and demonstrating that the Queen of Hearts had indeed withstood her hardships.[817] An enduring romantic, Elizabeth did as Frederick had requested in his letters to her in 1622: she remembered her poor Celadon. She gave the name to her favorite pet, "the pretiest beagle that euer was seene," almost three decades after Frederick's death.[818]

---

[816] As transcribed in Green, *Elizabeth: Electress Palatine*, pp. 408-409.

[817] Op. cit. n518.

[818] Elizabeth sent a portrait of the dog to her son Charles Louis: Wendland 1902, p. 138, no. 95, letter dated 2/12 April 1660, and p. 143, no. 99, letter dated 7/17 May 1660. As Akkerman (*Courtly Rivals*, p. 45) puts it, "the prose romance never left her."

FIGURES

ALL IMAGES REMOVED DUE TO COPYRIGHT

Chapter 5

CODA: HONTHORST, RUBENS, AND VAN DYCK

Introduction: Trimming the Shadow

Rubens and Honthorst met only once, in Utrecht in 1627. The documentation of this encounter comes from Joachim von Sandrart, who reports Rubens's visit to Honthorst's studio in that year. According to Sandrart, Rubens

> came to Utrecht, too, to Honthorst's studio, who received him and showed him all that he had on hand, and among which was a Diogenes with a lantern in his hand,[819] seeking man on a bright day in the people-filled square of Athens. Rubens liked the invention well, but he immediately saw that it was done only by a young painter who had spent a lot of time in the studio; therefore he wanted to know who had begun this Diogenes. Honthorst answered: this young German and pointed to me whereupon, approving this beginning, [Rubens] gave me further diligent thoughts and work, and so looked through the rest [of the paintings] with good satisfaction.[820]

---

[819] The whereabouts of this painting is unknown.

[820] TA 1675, II, Book 3, p. 291: [Also kame er auch nach Utrecht zu dem von Hundhorst/ welcher ihn wol empfangen/ und alles unterhanden habende gezeigt/ unter andern auch einen Diogenes mit einer Laternen in der Hand/ so bey hellem Tag auf dem von Volk-erfülten Platz zu Athen Menschen suchte. Dem Rubens beliebte zwar die Invention wol/ sahe aber doch alsobald/ daß selbiges nur ein junger Mahler/ deren in dem Zimmer viel beysammen stunden/ gemacht; daher er zu wißen begehrte/ wer diesen Diogenes angefangen/ Hundhorst antwortet: Dieser junge Teutsche/ und zeigte auf mich/ worauf er mit Gutheißung dieses Anfangs mir zu fernerm fleißigen nachsinnen und arbeiten Anlaß gegeben/ und also das übrige mit guter Satisfaction durchsehen.]

The discussion of Honthorst's stock that Sandrart mentions provides a tantalizing glimpse into what must have been a lively debate between two painters with dramatically different styles and references Rubens's appreciation for the bright or daylit modality that dominated Honthorst's production by 1627.

Our knowledge of Van Dyck and Honthorst's contact is more limited: they met in The Hague around 1631 or 32 when Van Dyck visited the court of Frederik Hendrik.[821] During this visit—from which he went directly on to London—Van Dyck probably made a drawing or painting of Honthorst for inclusion in his *Iconography*, of which only the final print survives (Fig. 5.1; Fine Arts Museums of San Francisco).[822] Thus while Van Dyck and Honthorst may have only cursorily known each other, they undoubtedly knew *of* each other.

Nevertheless, the personal contact between all three artists was limited: Honthorst overlapped with them neither in Italy nor London, but rather met both in the Netherlands at different times. When Honthorst was in Rome from about 1613-20,

---

[821] On this visit see Amy L. Walsh, "Van Dyck at the Court of Frederik Hendrik," *Studies in the History of Art* 46, Symposium Papers XXVI: Van Dyck 350 (1994): pp. 221-244. See also Slive and Rosenberg, *Dutch Painting,* p. 249.

[822] Wheelock ("Jan Lievens: Bringing New Light to an Old Master," in Wheelock, et al., *Jan Lievens: a Dutch Master Rediscovered* [Washington: National Gallery of Art, 2008. Exh. cat.]: p. 10), mentions that during this 1631/32 visit Van Dyck had painted a now-lost portrait of Lievens for inclusion in the *Iconography*. He could have presumably also painted/drawn other artists present at court, or at least been reminded on his visit of which artists whose portraits he would like to commission for the volume.

Rubens was back in Antwerp by 1609, and Van Dyck did not go to Italy until late 1621. Likewise, Honthorst was in London in 1628, Rubens in 1629-30, and Van Dyck in 1620-21 and again in 1632-41.[823]

Rubens and Van Dyck appear ever-present but only cursorily investigated in the later critical reception of Honthorst's court paintings, and we cannot help but wonder how large they loomed over his presence and production at court. The aim of this Coda is to reconstruct the ways in which these artists interacted with and impacted Honthorst, to better understand how Honthorst responded to and set himself apart from Van Dyck and especially Rubens. Building upon the role of patronage in Honthorst's self-fashioning and production as recounted in the previous three chapters, this Coda investigates, by way of a conclusion, the extent to which Honthorst's knowledge of Rubens and (surprisingly less so) Van Dyck encouraged him to find and define his courtly niche. Apparently not seeking to be derivative of Van Dyck or Rubens—for if so, he surely would have copied their painting styles or compositions more directly—Honthorst instead assimilated aspects of both in order to make his courtly productions more successful. In much the same way that he mixed elements of his own pictures as he sought to develop his court style in the 1620s, so too does he combine and experiment with those by Rubens and Van Dyck, seeking the ideal formula through which to achieve everlasting fame.

---

[823] Hearn, "Van Dyck in Britain," p. 11.

Fifteen years Honthorst's senior, Rubens had already earned a lofty reputation by 1612, when Dominicus Baudius honored him with a Latin encomium on his painting *Prometheus Bound* (Fig. 5.2; Philadelphia Museum of Art), calling Rubens "the most famous and distinguished…Prince of Painters of this Century."[824] When Honthorst returned to the Netherlands from Italy in 1620 and began his dealings with Dudley Carleton in The Hague, the Ambassador had just concluded—two years prior—extensive dealings with Rubens about the exchange of paintings for ancient marbles.[825] The paintings sent to The Hague included Rubens's *Prometheus*, which Baudius had praised; *Daniel in the Lion's Den* (Fig. 3.23), which was eventually sent to Charles; and *Hagar Leaves the House of Abraham* (Fig. 4.57), which had been sent to Elizabeth Stuart as a birthday gift in 1619 and which she would bring back to The Hague when beginning her exile in 1621. In addition to the works owned by Carleton,

---

[824] [AD CLARISSIMUM ET ORNATISSIMUM VIRUM D. PETRUM RUBENIUM PRINCIPEM PICTORUM HUJUS ÆVI]: as transcribed in Max Rooses, *Correspondance de Rubens et documents épistolaires concernant sa vie et ses œuvres*, 6 vols. (Anvers: Veuve de Backer, 1887-1909): II (1898), p. 55, no. CXXXIII. The Latin text of the poem is transcribed in full in Rooses (pp. 55-57). The most commonly translated part of Baudius's poem is the first section, which described the *Prometheus Bound*. It was first translated into English by Fiske Kimball, "Rubens' *Prometheus*," *The Burlington Magazine* 94, no. 588 (March 1952): p. 67, and more precisely by Charles Dempsey ("Euanthes Redivivus: Rubens's Prometheus Bound," *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes* 30 [1967]: p. 241), on which most subsequent analyses are based, though Dempsey does not address the dedication. On *Prometheus Bound* see most recently Atkins, *The Wrath of the Gods*.

[825] For this exchange see op. cit., Ch. 2, p.35n57.

there were several others by Rubens that date before 1620 in the collections of the Orange and Bohemian courts in The Hague.

These works, if present in the collections already at that moment of Honthorst's first contact, would have been prominently displayed, testaments to Rubens's place already at court. In several instances these paintings, such as *The Devotion of Artemisia* (Fig. 5.3) and *Venus and Adonis* (Fig. 4.58), prompted a painted emulation from Honthorst, often several years if not decades after the fact. In the case of Honthorst's *Artemisia* (Fig. 5.17), done more than fifteen years after Rubens's version of the subject, Honthorst rejects Rubens's crowded, horizontal composition and the almost triumphal, upward gaze of the Flemish master's heroine. Instead, Honthorst's vertical painting is infused with a greater sense of stillness and mournful self-reflection on the part of the titular figure, while the pivotal moment of her outstretched hand holding a wide, shallow cup into which ashes are poured is drawn directly from Rubens's painting.

Rubens already wielded great influence in London by the time of Honthorst's arrival there in 1628. The most potent manifestation of Charles's appreciation for Rubens was probably found in a small room in the Privy Lodgings that connected the Breakfast Chamber with the Long Gallery at Whitehall.[826] If Honthorst was granted

---

[826] Millar 1960, p. 37. For a reconstruction of the floorplan of Whitehall Palace under Charles I see Per Rumberg and Desmond Shawe-Taylor, "'The Greatest Amateur of Paintings Among the Princes of the World,'" p. 19 fig. 21.

access to this part of Whitehall palace—likely given his presumed interest in Charles's masterpieces and the fact that two of the artist's paintings would be hung in the adjacent bedchamber—he would have seen two self-portraits.[827] These images, of Rubens (Fig. 3.57) and Daniel Mytens (Fig. 3.58), would eventually be joined by a third of Van Dyck, added sometime after his second arrival in England in 1632 (Fig. 3.59).[828] Two of the major works by Rubens in Charles's collection, *Peace and War* (Fig. 3.22) and *Landscape with St. George and the Dragon* (Fig. 3.49), were created after Honthorst's time there.

A large number of paintings by Rubens could be found, however, in the collection of the Duke of Buckingham, who sponsored Honthorst's invitation to London and with whom the artist probably stayed during his time there, as argued in Chapter 3. In Buckingham's collection at York House, Honthorst could have encountered as many as thirty paintings by Rubens, including the impressive *Equestrian Portrait* and *Apotheosis* of the Duke of Buckingham (Figs. 5.4, 5.5). The latter work, installed on the ceiling of one of the rooms at York House, introduced Honthorst to Rubens's striking approach to allegory within illusionistic space, and undeniably had an impact on Honthorst's *Apollo and Diana*, made for Charles at the behest of Buckingham in 1628 (Fig. 3.4).

---

[827] Millar 1960, pp. 37-38, nos. 2, 4, 5.

[828] On the significance of Charles's collection of self-portraits, see Ch. 3, pp. 206-208.

Van Dyck was seven years Honthorst's junior, but already by 1620-21 he had served for a time in the courtly circles of London and his *Continence of Scipio* (Fig. 5.6; 1621; Oxford, Christ Church Picture Gallery) would be of vital importance to Honthorst's conception of the *Apollo and Diana*. Within a few years Van Dyck's work had already had an impact there: around 1625 Mytens painted a portrait of the Earl of Pembroke (Fig. 5.7; Coll. Marquess of Salisbury) that is executed in a smooth style but clearly based on Van Dyck's c. 1621 image of the Earl of Arundel (Fig. 5.8).[829] Even though Honthorst worked at Charles's court before Van Dyck did (he would not paint a member of the royal family until he returned in 1632), Honthorst had left London several years before Van Dyck's arrival, and was quickly superseded by the Flemish master. Though in Abraham van Doort's c. 1637 inventory of Charles's collection Honthorst's *Duke of Buckingham and his Family* (Fig. 3.6) still maintained pride of place in the king's bedchamber at Whitehall Palace, Van Dyck's elegant style soon dominated the interests of Charles and his courtiers. Even Mytens, who was the only painter other than Van Dyck to earn an official designation from Charles, and whose self-portrait hung alongside Rubens's in Charles's Privy Chambers, left London soon after Van Dyck's arrival.[830]

---

[829] See Hearn, *Van Dyck & Britain*, pp. 38-63, "Painting in England before Van Dyck: His first visit in 1620-1 and its aftermath," esp. pp. 50-51, cat. nos. 7 and 8.

[830] This was following what must have been an aggravating commission for Van Dyck to complete a version of Mytens's *Charles I and Henrietta Maria* (London, Royal Collection Trust; RCIN 405789). Van Dyck's painting, *Charles I and Henrietta Maria Holding a Laurel Wreath*, is now in Kroměříž, Archbishop's Castle and Gardens. As

Elizabeth Stuart, in The Hague, could not afford to commission portraits from Van Dyck upon his visit there in 1631/2. Indeed, the only painting he seems to have made of her children was done in London, for Charles, and Elizabeth owned no identifiable paintings by him.[831] However, both he and Honthorst were active in producing images of Amalia van Solms and her children. Though Van Dyck's portraits were popular among the stadtholder and his circle, by this point his and Honthorst's respective portraits apparently filled separate niches at court. They each completed paintings, for example, of Willem II and Mary Stuart around the time of their marriage negotiations, Honthorst of the groom (Fig. 4.78) and Van Dyck of the bride (Fig. 4.80), and again after their betrothal (Figs. 4.69, 4.76). Honthorst's double

---

contemporary Dutch practitioners of a smooth style of painting and now in London completing court portraits, comparisons between Honthorst and Mytens must have been common for Charles and his courtiers. Though the two would not have met in the Netherlands (Mytens was in London by 1618; Wood, "Orazio Gentileschi," p. 109), Mytens's status as the only artist up to that point to receive an official title and position from Charles would have certainly set him up as one of the standards for Honthorst to measure himself against. Like Van Dyck and Rubens, Mytens had also earned the patronage of the Earl and Countess of Arundel (see, for example, his portraits of them from c. 1618; London, National Portrait Gallery NPG 5292 and 5293), a feat that had eluded Honthorst since his return to the North. It's possible that in London Honthorst's paintings operated between the styles of Mytens and Rubens/Van Dyck: combining the smooth likenesses of Van Miereveld's student with a grander and livelier manner (albeit of a different sort than the Flemish *bravura* brushwork and coloring). On Van Miereveld's students see Anita Jansen, "Atelier en atelierpraktijken aan de Oude Delft," in Anita Jansen, ed., *De Portretfabriek van Michiel van Mierevelt (1566-1641)* (Delft: Museum Het Prinsenhof; W Books, 2011. Exh. cat.): p. 58.

[831] *Prince Charles Louis, Elector Palatine, and his Brother, Prince Rupert of the Palatinate*, 1637. Paris, Musée du Louvre.

portrait (Fig. 4.69), done six years after Van Dyck's (Fig. 4.76), was completed in The Hague as part of a decorative triptych of Orange family portraits (Figs. 4.69, 4.74, 4.75). Van Dyck's, on the other hand, was done in London on the occasion of their wedding. It appears that, though Van Dyck's paintings had an indelible impact upon Honthorst's production in London, apart from Van Dyck's portrait of Honthorst for the *Iconography*, it was Rubens who loomed the largest for him in The Hague.

One bibliographic detail serves to define an aspect of Honthorst's courtly activity and comportment as separate from that of Rubens and Van Dyck: his role as instructor to royal children in The Hague, particularly Elizabeth's. While in their lifetimes Rubens was the painter to Spain and Van Dyck the painter to England, Honthorst fashioned himself as the painter to Bohemia, albeit the more provincial Bohemia-in-exile. Nevertheless, he became arguably more deeply entrenched with Elizabeth and her family than even Van Dyck did with Charles's; we should recall in relation to this the remarkable fact that Honthorst gave Elizabeth a large loan in 1651.[832]

Arnold Houbraken recounts that Honthorst taught as many as five of the Bohemian children in the rules of art, including Rupert, Louise Hollandine, and Sophia.[833] Of these pupils, the best-known is Louise Hollandine, who secretly

---

[832] Op. cit., Ch. 4, p323n798.

[833] Houbraken 1718-21, p. 150. See also Appendix B, no. 5.

converted to Catholicism and died the Abbess of Maubuisson, as she is referred to by Houbraken.[834] Honthorst's prominent instruction of Elizabeth's children helped to mythologize the artist as the teacher of royalty: not only was he fit to serve them; he was fit to instruct them. Honthorst allegorized the art of painting not just in the production of portraiture but also as a female artist at work in an image of 1648 (Fig. 5.9; Sacramento, Crocker Art Museum). However, the painter in this picture does not resemble Louise Hollandine, nor does the male portrait she is finishing resemble either of the known images of him (Figs. 5.1, 5.10).[835] The fascination with Honthorst as Louise's teacher persisted well into the nineteenth century. In 1854, Hendrik Jacobus Scholten (1824-1907) produced a painting documenting an imagined interaction between Honthorst, Louise Hollandine, and Amalia van Solms (Fig. 5.11; Amsterdam, Rijksmuseum).[836] Honthorst's visions of The Hague's elite, bedecked in satin and

---

[834] Louise reportedly snuck away from The Hague in the middle of the night in 1657, traveling to Paris to join her brother Edward, who had already defied their mother by converting to Catholicism to marry Anna Gonzaga in 1645. See Keblusek, "The Bohemian Court at The Hague," pp. 52-53. Keblusek describes that Louise Hollandine "was possibly a pupil" of Honthorst, though other commentators on the subject are less cautious. See for example, Akkerman, *Courtly Rivals*, p. 102, and Judson/Ekkart 1999, p. XXXIV.

[835] Though this image is sometimes thought to be a clever method of self-portrayal in an allegory of painting on the part of a male artist, as Judson/Ekkart (p. 313, cat. no. 467) point out, "there is no resemblance between the man and the engraved portrait of the artist by Pieter de Jode."

[836] The work seems to have been commissioned in The Hague by Robert Melvil, Baron van Lynden (1843-1910), from whose collection it entered that of the Rijksmuseum.

active in their discussion and consumption of art, lives on in Scholten's image, despite the fact that none of the three figures particularly resemble their namesakes.

In part due to the lack of many names to connect with Honthorst's studio, several paintings in his style have been attributed to Louise Hollandine over the years. The most convincing of these recent assignments, to my mind, is one sold at Sotheby's in 2010 from the collection of the Earls of Craven, meaning that it might have once been in Elizabeth's possession (Fig. 5.12; c. 1650).[837] The painting was listed as a *Self-Portrait Holding a Paint Brush*, when in fact she is holding a mahlstick.

Though it is undoubtedly a portrait of Louise Hollandine, whether it is a self-portrait will remain a matter of some debate since there are no securely attributed works that have been identified. The painting is, however, undoubtedly the product of Honthorst's studio or circle, and contains an admixture of pastoral elements. The distinctive, fabric-wrapped, broad-brimmed hat that Louise wears makes her appear more exotic and her voluminous striped sleeves are reminiscent of Honthorst's musicians and shepherdesses starting in the 1620s, as discussed in Chapter 2 (see, for example, Fig. 2.83). There is only one surviving example by Honthorst in which this type of hat appears: the figure of Astronomy in *Apollo and Diana* wears a blue and white version (Fig. 3.4).[838]

---

[837] Sotheby's (London), *Ashdown House: The Winter Queen & The Earl of Craven*, Wednesday, 27 October 2010, lot no. 33.

[838] That the exoticizing garment was still current in The Hague around mid-century is evidenced by a painting by Cesar van Everdingen (1617-1678; Fig. 5.13). Everdingen

The Utrecht Humanist Aernout van Buchell, who recorded Honthorst's homecoming party at Het Poortgen in 1620, also notes that the guests discussed Honthorst's and Rubens's paintings in close juxtaposition. Sheila D. Muller has recently argued that all present at this event were hopeful that Honthorst would soon be recognized as Rubens's Dutch counterpart.[839] This is perhaps what Honthorst aspired to, as indicated by his self-portrait (Fig. 5.10): not to be a new Rubens or Van Dyck, but rather a counterpart, occupying many of the same spaces in adjacent and often divergent niches. The shadows of Rubens and Van Dyck presented Honthorst with the problem of differentiation. He would not be considered a new Titian as Rubens was, nor did he work in a similar style to Van Dyck. This offered room for experimentation within the modes that they had established: Rubens's living allegory, and Van Dyck's graceful portraiture. In not seeking to directly imitate Rubens and Van Dyck, Honthorst was able to creatively emulate them.

---

was in The Hague frequently in the years before 1650, when he was completing his five contributions to the Oranjezaal.

[839] Sheila D. Muller, "For the Pleasure and Contentment of the Audience: Gerrit van Honthorst's *The Merry Fiddler*: Promoting Civil Behavior in Early Seventeenth-Century Utrecht," in Arthur J. DiFuria, ed., *Genre Imagery in Early Modern Northern Europe: New Perspectives* (New York: Routledge, 2018): pp. 112-13.

London

In London, Honthorst would have seen several paintings by both Flemish artists in Charles I's, the Duke of Buckingham's, and the Earl of Arundel's collections, among others. These included portraits such as Van Dyck's of the Earl of Arundel (Fig. 5.8) and the Duke of Buckingham (Fig. 5.14; Private collection), as well as Rubens's self-portrait in Charles's collection (Fig. 3.57). In addition to the growing importance of their portraits among courtiers, Van Dyck's *Continence of Scipio* (Fig. 5.6) and Rubens's *Apotheosis* (Fig. 5.5), both owned by Buckingham, provided inspiration on a large scale when Honthorst arrived in London and began work on *Apollo and Diana* (Fig. 3.4).

Van Dyck's *Continence of Scipio* was probably commissioned by Buckingham and hung in the hall of York House next to a copy after Titian's *Emperor Charles V*, together emphasizing the Duke's interest in images of virtuous kingship as well as his attention to displaying works by artists of great reputation.[840] Its prominent display undoubtedly drew Honthorst's attention when he entered the Duke's service, and presented a vital example in approaching the large-scale arrangement of figures in an antique idiom, including a probable *portrait historié* of Buckingham in the painting's central figure.

---

[840] John Davies, "An Inventory of the Duke of Buckingham's Pictures, etc., at York House in 1635," *The Burlington Magazine for Connoisseurs* 10, no. 48 (March 1907): p. 379: "*In the Hall*. Vandyke.—One great Piece being Scipio." Van Dyck's painting is listed first in the Inventory.

The story of Scipio relates how a woman was captured by the titular Roman commander during a sack of New Carthage and was discovered to be the fiancée of an opposing chief named Allucius. Upon learning this, Scipio generously returned her and gave the ransom paid by her parents to Allucius as a wedding present.[841] Scipio's refusal to keep the maiden as spoils of war and his demand of nothing in return made him a popular example of benevolence for early modern viewers.

Scipio must have made an indelible impact upon Honthorst when he first arrived in England. He seems to have studied Van Dyck's painting in detail, pulling crucial yet subtle elements and ideas from it in his efforts to idealize Charles's image. For his smoothly painted and Caravaggesquely dramatic *Apollo and Diana* (Fig. 3.4), Honthorst neither lifted figures nor compositions directly from Van Dyck's work. Rather, he found inspiration in the harmoniously arranged procession of figures from the right, culminating in Scipio leaning forward at left, a pinnacle of kingship. His posture, higher positioning, reaching gesture, and especially his brilliant, billowing red robe have strong associations with Honthorst's portrait of Charles in *Apollo and Diana*.

Furthermore, the figure of the betrothed Allucius at center is thought to be a portrait of Buckingham, with the picture commissioned on the occasion of his marriage to Katharine Manners in May 1620, just a few months before Van Dyck's

---

[841] Tim Batchelor, "*The Continence of Scipio*," cat. no. 6 in *Van Dyck & Britain*, p. 48.

first arrival in London.[842] The identification of the central figure with Buckingham is tentative, but the marital emphasis in the story of Scipio nevertheless presents a strong argument for this figure as an analogue for Buckingham and his new wife, whose portrait is certainly not to be found in Van Dyck's female figure.[843] In any case, the central figure's short, antique-inspired tunic and presentation of a woman wearing a golden dress with a blue sash may have had additional influence on Honthorst's depictions of the Duke and Duchess of Buckingham in *Apollo and Diana*. Finally, the group of attendant figures in Van Dyck's painting, including a black man, may have been a source of inspiration for Honthorst. In *Apollo and Diana*, this figure is translated into the form of a young black boy attending Astronomy, the only inclusion of a person of color in Honthorst's entire *oeuvre*.[844]

The question of patronage for the *Continence of Scipio* demonstrates the intricacies of the networks in London, which also inflected Honthorst's paintings. The work was completed on Van Dyck's first visit in 1620 at the exact moment that

---

[842] Batchelor, "*The Continence of Scipio*," cat. no. 6 in *Van Dyck & Britain*, p. 48. See also Pamela Gordon, "The Duke of Buckingham and van Dyck's 'Continence of Scipio'," in National Gallery of Canada, *Essays on Van Dyck* (Ottowa: National Gallery of Canada, 1983. Conference proceedngs.): p. 55.

[843] Batchelor, "*The Continence of Scipio*," cat. no. 6 in *Van Dyck & Britain*, p. 48. Parry (*Golden Age Restor'd*, p. 139) underscores the Allucius-Buckingham portrait identification by pointing out that figure's more contemporary costume (to my mind this is only true of the sleeves), and arguing that *Scipio* represents "a significant gesture of friendship and conciliation" from Arundel to the Duke.

[844] An analysis of this figure will be the subject of an upcoming article.

Buckingham was feverishly commissioning and acquiring objects for his collection. *Continence of Scipio*'s status as a large-scale history painting by the increasingly in-demand Van Dyck must have appealed to the Duke, as did its role as an *exemplum* of neo-stoic self-regulation.[845] Pamela Gordon argues for Buckingham as the work's patron, occasioned by both his marriage and promotion to Lord High Admiral.[846] David Howarth provided an additional argument for Buckingham's patronage by establishing that John Villiers, 1st Viscount Purbeck and Buckingham's elder brother, brought Van Dyck to London in 1620.[847]

Though Howarth's research corrects the longstanding assumption that the Earl and Countess of Arundel were solely responsible for bringing Van Dyck to England, it

---

[845] Karen Hearn, "Van Dyck in Britain,", p. 11; and Kevin Sharpe, "Van Dyck, the Royal Image and the Caroline Court," p. 17. Philip McEvansoneya ("Some Documents," p. 27) has demonstrated how Buckingham's collections were established starting in 1618 from nothing, with the bulk of the objects entering the collection before 1626.

[846] Gordon, "The Duke of Buckingham and van Dyck's 'Continence of Scipio'," pp. 53-55. Oliver Millar published a payment recorded from Buckingham to Van Dyck via the Duke's agent Endymion Porter ("Van Dyck's 'Continence of Scipio' at Christ Church," *The Burlington Magazine* 93, no. 577 [April 1951]: p. 125). Though no date or amount is specified for this payment, the fact that *Continence of Scipio* is the only work by Van Dyck listed in the York House inventory of 1635 lends weight to the argument that this is the item for which Porter paid the artist. For the inventory see Davies, "An Inventory of the Duke of Buckingham's Pictures." Millar notes ("'Continence of Scipio'," p. 125 and n4) that the payment must have been given before Porter left Buckingham's service for the king's, in 1620-21.

[847] Howarth, "The Arrival of Van Dyck in England," *The Burlington Magazine* 132, no. 1051 (October 1990): p. 709. See also Sharpe, "Van Dyck, the Royal Image and the Caroline Court," p. 15.

also maintains the Arundel influence by arguing that it was Lady Arundel who introduced John Villiers to Van Dyck in the first place.[848] This supports the argument that Arundel is *Scipio*'s original patron, and that it was intended as a gift to Buckingham. In 1973, John Harris identified the frieze fragment in the lower left corner as one found at the excavation of Arundel House the year before.[849] Indeed, the commissioning of this picture does come at the moment when Arundel was most in need of Buckingham's favor: the end of a multi-year struggle for the position of royal favorite. Around 1620/21, Buckingham emerged victorious and, as Howarth puts it, "public humiliation followed" for Arundel.[850]

Rubens's *Apotheosis* (Fig. 5.5), also in Buckingham's collection and on display at York House, provided an important example of large-scale, complex

---

[848] Howarth, "The Arrival of Van Dyck in England," p. 709.

[849] Harris, "The Link between a Roman Second Century Sculptor, Van Dyck, Inigo Jones and Queen Henrietta Maria," *The Burlington Magazine* 115, no. 845 (August 1973): pp. 526-530. See also Denys Eyre Lankester Hayes, *The Arundel Marbles* (Oxford: University of Oxford, Ashmolean Museum, 1975): p. 31, pl. 9. Though some have argued that the marble could have been in Buckingham's collection before going to Arundel's, Howarth and historian Graham Parry see the presence of the Arundel marble as the key to the work's patronage, as a gift from Arundel to Buckingham: Gordon, "The Duke of Buckingham and Van Dyck," p. 54; For Arundel as the patron see Howarth, *Lord Arundel and His Circle* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1985): pp. 156-157; Parry, *Golden Age Restor'd*, pp. 139-140.

[850] Howarth, "The Arundel Collection: Collecting and Patronage in England in the Reigns of Philip III and Philip IV," in *The Sale of the Century,* p. 79. Howarth notes that this competition began in 1617 and lasted "some four years," putting its end date in late 1620 or 21.

allegory of the type that Honthorst had never attempted before. Though the original of both the *Apotheosis* and Rubens's *Equestrian Portrait* (Fig. 5.4) were destroyed by fire in 1949, they are preserved in painted sketches (Fig. 5.15; before 1625; London, National Gallery; and Fig. 5.16; c. 1625; Fort Worth: Kimbell Art Museum). The impact of the *Equestrian Portrait* on Honthorst is unclear, as he almost never painted a work of that type.[851] From Rubens's *Apotheosis*, Honthorst drew inspiration for both the ennobling of certain figures within a crowded composition and appealing to the classical interests and erudition of Buckingham and other members of court. Furthermore, the overwhelming presence of Rubens in Buckingham's collection—the 1635 inventory reveals a stunning thirty paintings—would have motivated Honthorst's ambitious portrayal of Charles and his courtiers in *Apollo and Diana* (Fig. 3.4).[852]

Apotheosis of the Duke of Buckingham, according to the 1635 inventory installed on the ceiling of the Duke's Closet in the Great Chamber, also finds several similarities with *Apollo and Diana*, completed just a few years later.[853] Buckingham is borne aloft at center by Minerva and Mercury, while Envy tries to drag him down by his right foot. Envy's positioning and thematic purpose are furthermore closely

---

[851] The rare exceptions to this are the three portraits of Elizabeth Stuart's eldest sons behind her on horseback in *Triumph* (Fig. 4.41), where the riders are portrayed in a more subdued manner.

[852] Davies, "An Inventory of the Duke of Buckingham's Pictures," pp. 379-382.

[853] Davies, "An Inventory of the Duke of Buckingham's Pictures," p. 379.

aligned with the bearded figure in the lower left corner of *Apollo and Diana*: they are both embodiments of vices in the act of being banished.[854] The gods lift Buckingham toward a temple before which appear two figures: Honor and Virtue.[855] The leftmost, Honor, is seated in the sketch but standing in the painting and is particularly important in relation to *Apollo and Diana*. While the temple figure is unequivocally a personification of Honor, his attributes have much in common with those of Apollo. Rubens's sketch of the subject gives the only sense of the final painting's color, and in it Honor is draped in a red robe with a conspicuous golden burst of light around his head, two devices typical in depictions of Apollo and similarly utilized by Honthorst. It is unclear whether Honthorst could have seen Rubens's sketch, but he certainly saw the painting, in which Honor's golden halo appears to have been replaced by a laurel wreath, another common identifier of Apollo. Honthorst's time in London provided transformative experiences for both his artistic reputation and practice. Not only did his work for Charles I confer a higher status on Honthorst that encouraged a stream of other court patronage, but also it was another valuable opportunity to study

---

[854] This figure also resembles the Titan in Rubens's *Prometheus* (Fig. 5.2), which Honthorst would have seen in Carleton's collection in The Hague.

[855] The identification of these figures was made by Gregory Martin in 1966, based on a drawing by Rubens where figures with the identical attributes to those in the *Apotheosis* are identified in the master's hand as representing Virtue and Honor. The drawing is now in the collection of the Museum Plantin-Moretus, Antwerp. See Martin, "Rubens and Buckingham's 'fayrie ile'," *The Burlington Magazine* 108, no. 765 (Dec. 1966): p. 617 and n24. See also Julius S. Held, *Rubens: Selected Drawings* (Oxford: Phaidon, 1986): cat. no. 133, pl. 104.

monumental compositions by Rubens and Van Dyck, which undoubtedly spurred on the ambitiousness of his courtly productions.

The Hague

Once he returned to The Hague from the court of Charles I, Honthorst was immediately occupied with portrait commissions from both Charles and Elizabeth. Increased patronage from the stadtholder followed soon thereafter. Rubens and Van Dyck were well-represented in the stadtholder's art collection, where works by both artists, as well as by Honthorst, were consistently listed as mantlepieces in inventories documenting the Orange palaces. As a depiction of widowhood done first for Elizabeth and then for Amalia, Honthorst's *Artemisia* (Fig. 5.17; c. 1632; Princeton University Art Museum) meditates upon the same moment in the narrative as a work by Rubens already in Amalia's collection (Fig. 5.3). When Honthorst produced a *Meleager and Atalanta* in 1632 for the stadtholder (Fig. 5.18; Potsdam, Schloss Sanssouci), he may have been looking back toward a version of the scene by Rubens (Fig. 5.19; New York, Metropolitan Museum of Art). While Rubens's painting is animated by the relationship between its titular figures in a compressed pictorial space, Honthorst's provides a grander, more triumphal view of the party's procession after the hunt, more in keeping with the celebratory nature of the hunt in courtly circles. Around mid-century Honthorst again turned to Rubens for inspiration, for three of his paintings for the Oranjezaal. Particularly in the case of *Disembarkation of Mary Stuart*

(Fig. 5.20; 1649), Honthorst's composition is unthinkable without the precedent of Rubens's, and constitutes one his most direct homages to the Flemish master.

As discussed in Chapter 4, Elizabeth Stuart and Frederick V had persistently limited resources and were probably unable to afford paintings by high-priced artists like Rubens and Van Dyck. Indeed, Anthoni de Beer's 1633 inventory of the Bohemian picture collections at Rhenen Palace reveals no works by Van Dyck and only two by Rubens, one of which, *Hagar Leaves the House of Abraham* (Fig. 4.57), exerted an unknown influence on Honthorst as Elizabeth's copy of the subject cannot be traced with certainty and Honthorst's only known version is lost. The other, *Venus and Adonis* (Fig. 4.58), proved to be fruitful source material for Honthorst some years later, when he produced a work of that subject, probably for Elizabeth, in 1641 (Fig. 5.21).[856]

Though Honthorst's portrait subjects overlapped with Van Dyck's occasionally during this period, Van Dyck's paintings for the stadtholder appear to have had minimal impact on Honthorst's practice when compared with those by Rubens. Van Dyck's portrait of Honthorst, made during his visit to The Hague in 1631/2, would, however, have an influence on Honthorst's sole surviving self-portrait, preserved in a print for Jan Meyssens' *Image de Divers Hommes* (Antwerp, 1649). The portraits in

---

[856] Honthorst completed a painting of an earlier moment in the biblical narrative, *Hagar Given to Abraham by Sarah* in 1647 that was in hung in the audience room of Honselaarsdijk. The work is now lost and there are no known photographs of it. Judson/Ekkart 1999, p. 50, cat. no. 2.

Van Dyck's *Iconography*, in circulation throughout the Netherlands already in the 1630s, apparently did not inspire Honthorst's portraiture so much as his self-conception.[857] Van Dyck's image of the artist, like so many throughout the *Iconography*, includes Honthorst's elbow prominently angled toward the viewer as his hand rests on his chest in a graceful gesture of self-presentation echoed by the prominent swath of fabric crossing his torso (Fig. 5.1). Honthorst repeats this pose along with the large bundle of fabric, although more contained, in his self-portrait of 1649 (Fig. 5.10).[858]

Though the dearth of surviving self-portraits by Honthorst indicates a divergence from Van Dyck and Rubens in the relative lack of interest in disseminating his image, in the portrait print of 1649 he seems to have taken up their model with some enthusiasm. Positioned almost identically to the self-portraits by Rubens (Fig. 3.57) and Van Dyck (Fig. 3.59) in Charles's collection, Honthorst again invokes Van Dyck with his hand only just rising above the edges of the print in the lower left

---

[857] This was certainly the case with Rembrandt, whose etched self-portrait of 1631 (Rijksmuseum, RP-P-OB-13) drew direct inspiration from Van Dyck's presentations of artists in the *Iconography*, such as that of Daniel Mytens (Fine Arts Museums of San Francisco, 1963.30.10156). See Stephanie Dickey, *Rembrandt: Portraits in Print*. Philadelphia: John Benjamins Pub. Co., 2004.

[858] Indeed, though few of Honthorst's individual portraits feature such a self-referential gesture, those that do all date after Van Dyck's visit in 1631/2. See, for example, *Sophia, Princess Palatine and Consort of Ernest Augustus, Elector of Hanover*, signed and dated 1650 and now part of the collections of the UK National Trust, on display at Ashdown House (NT 493063).

corner. Though he is posed and dressed less dramatically than Van Dyck's own image in the *Iconography* (Fig. 5.22; Fine Arts Museums of San Francisco), Honthorst takes one important detail from the former's self-portrait: a chain of honor. Though not possessed of one in reality, in his lone self-image Honthorst declares his equality with both Rubens and Van Dyck, who feature chains again and again in their self-portraits.

Turning to Rubens's particular influence on Honthorst in this period, we find several instances of direct pictorial emulation in works for both the Bohemian and Orange courts. Honthorst's *Artemisia* (Fig. 5.17; ca. 1632), for example, was meant to serve as a monument to widowhood for Elizabeth and was eventually given to Amalia. For this subject, Honthorst found a ready example by Rubens already in the stadtholder's collection and chose to depict precisely the same moment in the narrative (Fig. 5.3; ca. 1615-16).

Honthorst's *Artemisia* was completed around 1632, possibly for the recently widowed Elizabeth Stuart. It shows the forth-century BCE queen in the act of becoming a living mausoleum for her deceased husband: his ashes are being mixed with wine for her imminent consumption.[859] In Honthorst's image, Artemisia's crisp,

---

[859] Fittingly, Artemisia was also the commissioner of the Mausoleum at Halicarnassus, the wonder of the ancient world built in tribute to her husband Mausolus. For Renaissance images of Artemisia as a powerful queen and patron of the mausoleum, see Sheila ffolliott, "Artemisia Conquers Rhodes: Problems in the Representation of Female Heroics in the Age of Catherine de' Medici," in Katherine A. McIver and Cynthia Stollhans, eds., *Patronage, Gender and the Arts in Early Modern Italy: Essays in Honor of Carolyn Valone* (New York: Italica Press, 2015): pp. 85-102.

meticulously painted satin gown virtually crinkles as she leans forward to hold her cup under the fall of ashes near the center of the painting. Artemisia's attendants and trio of viewers form a sweeping diagonal across the canvas as they crowd around the queen, many of their leaning postures and reaching gestures echoing those of Artemisia.

Honthorst's painting cultivates quite a different mood from Rubens's, done almost twenty years prior (Fig. 5.3). The sense of compression and focus on the figure of Artemisia in Rubens's image is a result of the painting having been cut down by almost half. Nevertheless, in his version Honthorst has translated Rubens's horizontal format into a more monumental vertical one. Both paintings present the central event of the ashes being poured into Artemisia's cup, as well as a crowd of interested observers, while the dispositions of the two protagonists differ. In Rubens's painting Artemisia moves her arm emphatically forward to accept the scoop of her husband's ashes, her crown glittering as she tilts her head and eyes upward, holding her hand to her heart in a gesture of earnestness. Honthorst's queen, by contrast, appears more stoic, in keeping with the tranquility found so often in his portraits of royal sitters. In Honthorst's painting Artemisia's downcast eyes and gentle lowering of her cup below the ashes is more doleful than insistent. Rather than Rubens's triumphant queen, in Honthorst's image Artemisia's face is shadowed and overlapped by her mourning veil.

In her capacity as the widowed Queen of Bohemia, an image that she cultivated throughout her life, Elizabeth may have been the one to commission Honthorst's striking portrayal of enduring loyalty. The work was completed around

the time of Frederick V's death in 1632, and Elizabeth seems to have given the work to Amalia sometime after Frederik Hendrik's death in 1647; a painting by Honthorst was placed over a fireplace in her chambers in Huis ten Bosch in a 1654 inventory.[860] Rubens's work is listed already in 1632 in the inventory of Noordeinde, a mantlepiece in what was called the 'cabinet' of Louise de Coligny (1555-1620), the widow of William the Silent (d. 1584).[861] That Honthorst's painting has been identified with that listed in Huis ten Bosch in 1654 and several subsequent inventories is significant. There, it would have been a likely source of inspiration for other artists, including Govaert Flinck (1615-60) as he completed his *Allegory of the Memory of Frederik Hendrik* (Fig. 5.23; 1654; Amsterdam, Rijksmuseum) for Amalia's large cabinet adjacent to the Oranjezaal.[862]

---

[860] <https://artmuseum.princeton.edu/collections/objects/30620> (Accessed 11 February 2019); Judson/Ekkart 1999, pp. 134-135, cat. no. 153; and Van der Ploeg and Vermeeren, *Princely Patrons,* pp. 150-151, cat. no. 12.

[861] Magreta 2008, p. 292, no. 596: "A painting stands in front of the chimney, the story of Artemisia, done by Rubens of Antwerp." [Een schilderije staende voor de schoorsteen, d'historij van Artemise, door Rubbens van Antwerpern gedaen.]

[862] Van der Ploeg and Vermeeren, "The Stadholder's Art Collection," p. 48. In the rebirth of the phoenix in the background and the statue of Frederik Hendrik, Flinck emphasizes that this image, like Honthorst's, communicates the hope of everlasting presence in the memory of one's survivors. Underscoring this message is the figure standing in front of Amalia: this is an allegory of Hope itself, her eyes turned upwards and holding a flowering orange branch in one hand and an anchor in the other (Fig. 5.24; London, The Courtauld Gallery).

Honthorst may have seen Rubens's *Meleager and Atalanta* of about two decades prior (Fig. 5.19; ca. 1616; New York, Metropolitan Museum of Art) before he painted a work of the same subject that was on display at Huis Honselaarsdijk by 1694 (Fig. 5.18; 1632; Potsdam, Schloss Sanssouci). Probably containing court portraits as opposed to Rubens's history painting, Honthorst's composition is more open than Rubens's as well, showing more of the figures as they process to the beat of the tambourine held by the woman at left. In this way, Honthorst's painting preserves the ceremonial, courtly nature of the hunt, where Rubens's emphasizes the joint effort between the two main figures—Atalanta in wounding the boar and Meleager in killing it—as well as the visceral nature of the presentation of the head. Sharing the relative scale of the boar's head and the bared breast of the female protagonist with Rubens's painting, Honthorst's also shows Atalanta as a huntress: she wears a quiver and bow and carries the boar head herself, while the only clue to Meleager's contribution is his spear that projects toward the center of the painting. However, Honthorst's removal of the figures farther to the background and their depiction at full-length emphasizes his adaptation of Rubens's scene into one more idealized, and idyllic.[863]

---

[863] Judson/Ekkart pp. 119-120, cat. no. 120.

The other work by Rubens owned by Elizabeth, *Venus and Adonis*, provides a further example of the older master's influence on Honthorst (Fig. 4.58).[864] Honthorst's painting, certainly a double portrait, was probably also in Elizabeth's collection and was completed about thirty years after Rubens's, in 1641.[865] It is executed in Honthorst's brighter and smoother courtly mode, while the similarities between it and Rubens's image of the subject, including a smaller version now in the Hermitage (Fig. 5.25), are striking.[866] In all three paintings, the core figural group follows the same left-right diagonal, Adonis leaning on his spear as he stands and attempts to disengage from Venus's arms and twisting body. The crying cupid that clutches Adonis's left leg and spear in Rubens's Hermitage painting finds an analogue and has been tripled in Honthorst's, where three red-faced cherubs beg the hunter to reconsider. In Honthorst's painting we find a cluster of trees and limited view of the landscape that are typical of his pastoral compositions, and which also closely correspond to those found in Rubens's Hermitage panel.

---

[864] As argued in Chapter 4, the Palatine provenance of the Düsseldorf *Venus and Adonis* by Rubens, as well as its large size, points to that work being the one listed as a mantlepiece in Elizabeth's chamber at Rhenen.

[865] Judson/Ekkart 1999, p. 133, cat. no. 148: it matches the dimensions of a work of the same subject sold from the Craven collection on 13 April 1923 almost exactly.

[866] The other Rubens *Venus and Adonis* that is quite similar to the Düsseldorf example is now in the Met. Both the Hermitage and Met pictures, incidentally, have Bavarian provenances.

Though quite dissimilar compositionally, Honthorst's painting may have also been thinking back to Van Dyck's *Venus and Adonis*, which features portraits of the Duke and Duchess of Buckingham as the titular mythological figures and was completed in the Flemish painter's first London sojourn in 1620-21 (Fig. 5.14).[867] While the ostentatious display of sculpted flesh in Van Dyck's painting is quite different from that found in Honthorst's, he does adopt a similar approach to Van Dyck in his insertion of courtly portrait figures into this mythological narrative.[868] Indeed, in Honthorst's and Van Dyck's paintings both figures have their torsos and one shoulder bared, with the wrapping of red drapery around the Venuses in both pictures bearing a close similarity. Rubens also employed this system of costuming in some of his mythological and allegorical portraits, including several in the Marie de' Medici cycle and his *Diana and Her Nymphs Departing for the Hunt* of c. 1615 (Fig. 5.26; Cleveland Museum of Art).

The Oranjezaal at Huis ten Bosch is arguably the best-known commemorative project produced in the seventeenth-century Netherlands and was commissioned by

---

[867] Christiane Hille, *Visions of the Courtly Body: The Patronage of George Villiers, First Duke of Buckingham, and the Triumph of Painting at the Stuart Court* (Berlin: Akademie, 2012): pp. 145-146. On the rediscovery and dating of the painting see Michael Jaffé, "Van Dyck's 'Venus and Adonis'," *The Burlington Magazine* 132, no. 1051 (October 1990): pp. 696-703.

[868] Hille (*Visions of the Courtly Body*, pp. 146-174) convincingly reads this the portrait as part of the emerging idealization of the body and its comportment in the age of Stuart theater and masques.

Amalia as a tribute to the memory of Frederik Hendrik.[869] Honthorst contributed six works to the Oranjezaal's remarkable decorative program, several of which constitute his most direct engagement with Rubens's court paintings and testify to the Flemish master's continuing dominance at foreign courts a decade after his death. Rubens's student Jacob Jordaens who, after Rubens's and Van Dyck's deaths became the preeminent Flemish painter, contributed two pictures to the Oranjezaal. These included the largest work, *The Triumph of Frederik Hendrik*, which occupies the entirety of the eastern wall (Fig. 5.27; 1652). Jordaens's monumental canvas—to which Honthorst might have contributed the portrait of Willem II in the lower right corner—demonstrates that the mediation of Rubens in the Northern Netherlands was ongoing.[870]

Honthorst's *Disembarkation of Mary Stuart* (Fig. 5.20), *Marriage of Frederik Hendrik and Amalia van Solms* (Fig. 5.28; 1651), and *The Steadfastness of Frederik Hendrik* (Fig. 5.29; 1649-51) are him at his most Rubenesque. All three demonstrate a reliance on and creative reinterpretation of figures in Rubens's Medici Cycle, particularly the writhing naiads and sea gods in the bottom register of *The Arrival of*

---

[869] On the Oranjezaal's conception and program see, for example, Rudi Ekkart, ed., et al., *De Oranjezaal: catalogue en documentatie* (The Hague: RKD Monographs, 2015): <http://oranjezaal.rkdmonographs.nl/verantwoording-1> (Accessed 2 March 2019); or, more briefly, "Van der Ploeg and Vermeeren, "The Stadholder's Art Collection," pp. 49-55.

[870] This was suggested by Michiel Francken of the RKD, one of the technical researchers on the Oranjezaal, during a visit to Huis ten Bosch in August 2015.

Marie de' Medici in Marseilles (Fig. 5.30; 1622-25; Paris, Musée du Louvre). Rubens's influence on Honthorst is most visible in the *Disembarkation of Mary Stuart* with its obvious thematic parallels, where Honthorst's naiads are without half-tentacled legs and bear flower crowns rather than the hard labor of helping to bring the ship ashore.

As was true of the comparisons between both artists' *Artemisia, Meleager and Atalanta*, and *Venus and Adonis* discussed above, here Honthorst's smoother application of paint and more idyllic approach to the subject are readily apparent. This case differs from those examples, though, in that Honthorst's pictorial source is not in the least concealed. Rather, he seems to be paying direct homage to Rubens by borrowing from his innovations in allegorical, memorializing, and ennobling royal pictorial cycles some thirty years later. Though it is unclear when he would have seen Rubens's cycle—there is no evidence that Honthorst visited France and the earliest reproductive print that I have been able to find of the *Arrival* dates to 1710—it evidently served as his touchstone for large-scale courtly programs several decades after the fact.[871] It may well have been one of the points of discussion in Honthorst's studio upon Rubens's visit in 1627, just a couple of years after the cycle's completion.

---

[871] Engraving by Gaspard Duchange, design by Jean Baptiste Nattier after Rubens, part of series *La Gallerie du Palais du Luxembourg*, London, British Museum (1891,0414.1220).

Conclusion

By the time of Rubens's and Van Dyck's deaths in 1640 and 1641, respectively, Honthorst was firmly established in and inundated with commissions from the courts of Elizabeth Stuart, Amalia van Solms, and Christian IV of Denmark. Though Christian IV had given Rubens a chain of honor in 1620, it was from Honthorst that he commissioned 53 paintings between 1635 and 1641.[872] His style had by then moved strongly in the direction of the polished and idealized. Not only was Honthorst occupied by his courtly success, but also Jordaens easily stepped into Rubens's place and, in the case of Van Dyck, artists like Peter Lely worked to perpetuate a portrait style that was by then deeply entrenched in England.

Given the consistent juxtaposition of Honthorst's court commissions with those by Rubens and Van Dyck, though, he undoubtedly sought to emulate certain aspects of their persons and productions. This Coda has examined some of the ways in which he operated apart from but very much in conversation with both Flemish masters, in order to investigate the nature of the relationship between these artists and their pictures. To recall the discussion of Honthorst's critical fortunes with which this study began, we saw that he has been relegated in the opinions of many later scholars to an inferior, even unfortunate, example of a court painter in large part due to the particularities of his court style. This is unsurprisingly one of the chief aspects of his

---

[872] Brown and Elliott, eds., *The Sale of the Century*, cat. no. 24, p. 194.

practice that separates him from Rubens and Van Dyck, and it has been the goal of this project to begin breaking down the barriers to studying all three in concert.

This chapter has revealed, by way of a conclusion to this dissertation, an additional aspect of the complexity of court culture in this period, and Honthorst's place within it. He fashioned his paintings to be enough in dialogue with those of his contemporaries that they might borrow or build upon the same pictorial language but not rely on them stylistically. In not imitating their styles or compositions directly, Honthorst chose specific subjects, motifs, or devices that fit with and helped to expand his own brand of courtly elegance and narrative. This brand, fashioned after his first courtly contact in 1621 and refined in the more than three decades of elite commissions that followed, facilitated Honthorst's rise to the heights of fame and success.

FIGURES

ALL IMAGES REMOVED DUE TO COPYRIGHT

REFERENCES

Abbreviations

ASR: Archivio di Stato, Rome
Curia di Borgo

The National Archives, Kew, United Kingdom
AO: Records of the Auditors of the Imprest and Successors
SP: State Papers
E: Records of the Exchequer

NL-HaNA: National Archives, The Hague, Netherlands
Nassause Domeinraad [Nassau Domain Council]

TA 1675 | TA 1679
Joachim von Sandrart's *Teutsche Academie der Bau-, Bild- und Mahlerey-Künste*, as transcribed and annotated in the scholarly annotated online edition, <http://ta.sandrart.net/en/>

Primary Sources

Akkerman, Nadine. *The Correspondence of Elizabeth Stuart, Queen of Bohemia*. Vol 1: 1603-1631. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2015.

————. *The Correspondence of Elizabeth Stuart, Queen of Bohemia*. Vol 2: 1632-1642. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011.

Angel, Philips, Michael Hoyle, and Hessel Midema. "Praise of Painting." *Simiolus: Netherlands Quarterly for the History of Art* 24, no. 2/3, Ten Essays for a Friend: E. de Jongh 65 (1996): pp. 227-258.

Aubrey, John. *Miscellanies Upon Various Subjects*. 4th ed. London: John Russell Smith, 1857.

Baker, Lily Melissa. *Letters of Elizabeth, Queen consort of Frederick I King of Bohemia*. London: Bodley Head, 1953.

Baldinucci, Filippo and Catherine Enggass, trans. *The Life of Bernini*. University Park and London: The Pennsylvania State University Press, 1966.

Baldinucci, Filippo. *Notizie de' Professori del Disegno, Da Cimabue in qua, Secolo V. dal 1610. al 1670. Distinto in Decennali*. Florence, 1681.

————. *Opere di Filippo Baldinucci*. Vol. 12. Milan: Società tipografica de' Classici italiani, 1808.

Bellori, Giovanni Pietro. *The Lives of the Modern Painters, Sculptors and Architects*. Translated by Alice Sedgwick Wohl; notes by Hellmut Wohl. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2005.

Benger, Elizabeth. *Memoirs of Elizabeth Stuart, Queen of Bohemia, Daughter of King James the First. Including Sketches of the State of Society in Holland and Germany, in the 17th Century*. 2 vols. London: Printed for Longman, Hurst, Rees, Orme, Brown, and Green, 1825.

Bidwell, William B., and Maija Jansson, eds. *Proceedings in Parliament, 1626*. 4 Vols. Yale Center for Parliamentary History. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1991-1996.

De Bie, Cornelis. *Het gulden cabinet vande edele vry schilder-const*. Antwerp, 1662.

Birch, Thomas and Robert Folkestone Williams. *The Court and Times of James the First*. 2 vols. London: Henry Colburn, 1848.

Blaze de Bury, Marie, Baroness. *Memoirs of the Princess Palatine, princess of Bohemia, including her correspondence with the great men of her day, and memoirs of the court of Holland under the princes of Orange*. London: R. Bentley, 1853.

Bromley, Sir George. *A Collection of Original Royal Letters*. London: J. Stockdale, 1787.

CSP Venetian XII

Brown, Horatio F., ed. Calendar of state papers and manuscripts relating to English affairs existing in the archives and collections of Venice and in other libraries of Northern Italy. Vol. XII, 1610-1613. London: Printed for his Majesty's Stationery Office by Mackie and Co Ld., 1905.

Van Buchell, Aernout and J. W. C. van Campen, ed. *Notae quotidianae van Aernout van Buchell*. Utrecht: Kemink, 1940.

Camden, William. *Annales: the true and royall history of the famous empresse Elizabeth Queene of England France and Ireland &c. True faith's defendresse of diuine renowne and happy memory*. London: Printed [by George Purslowe, Humphrey Lownes, and Miles Flesher] for Beniamin Fisher and are to be sould at the Talbott in Pater Noster Rowe, 1625. <http://gateway.proquest.com/openurl?ctx_ver=Z39.88-2003&res_id=xri:eebo&rft_id=xri:eebo:citation:99843074> (Accessed 7 November 2017).

Camden, William and R.N. Gent, trans. *Annals, or, The historie of the most renovvned and victorious princesse Elizabeth, late Queen of England Containing all the important and remarkable passages of state both at home and abroad, during her long and prosperous reigne*. London: Printed by Thomas Harper for Benjamin Fisher, 1635. <http://gateway.proquest.com.udel.idm.oclc.org/openurl?ctx_ver=Z39.88-2003&res_id=xri:eebo&rft_id=xri:eebo:image:7568:12> (Accessed 3 July 2018).

Camden, William, and Thomas Smith. *V. cl. Gulielmi Camdeni et illustrium vivorum ad G. Camdenum Epistolae cum appendice varii argumenti : accesserunt annalium regni Regis Jacobi I apparatus et commentarius de antiquitate, dignitate, & officio comitis marescalli Angliae*. London: Impensis Richardi Chiswelli, 1691. < http://gateway.proquest.com/openurl?ctx_ver=Z39.88-2003&res_id=xri:eebo&rft_id=xri:eebo:citation:13226519 > (Accessed 7 November 2017).

Carpenter, William Hookham. *Pictorial Notices, consisting of a memoir of Sir Anthony Van Dyck, with a descriptive catalogue of the etchings executed by him, and a variety of interesting particulars relating to other artists patronized by Charles I*. London: J. Carpenter, 1844.

De Caus, Salomon. *Hortvs Palatinvs: A Friderico Rege Boemiae Electore Palatino*. Frankfurt am Main, 1620. <http://digi.ub.uni-heidelberg.de/diglit/caus1620> (Accessed 20 April 2018).

Caxton, William, and Henry Bradley. *Dialogues in French and English*. London: Published for the Early English Text Society by Kegan Paul, Trench, Trübner & Co., Ltd., 1900.

Chamberlain, John, and Norman Egbert McClure, ed. *The Letters of John Chamberlain*. 2 vols. Philadelphia: American Philosophical Society, 1939.

De Chantelou, Paul Fréart. Journal du Voyage du Cavalier Bernin en France. Gazette de Beaux-Arts, 1885.

Chapman, George and Inigo Jones. The memorable maske of the two honorable houses or Innes of Court; the Middle Temple, and Lyncolns Inne : As it was performd before the King, at White-Hall on Shroue Munday at night; being the 15. of February. 1613. At the princely celebration of the most royall nuptialls of the Palsgraue, and his thrice gratious Princesse Elizabeth. &c. London: G. Eld for George Norton, 1613. EEBO. <http://gateway.proquest.com/openurl?ctx_ver=Z39.88-2003&res_id=xri:eebo&rft_id=xri:eebo:citation:99838396> (Accessed 11 August 2017).

Chaucer, Geoffrey. *The works of Geoffrey Chaucer, compared with the former editions, and many valuable Mss. Out of which, Three Tales are added which were never before*. London: Printed for Bernard Lintot, 1721. <http://find.galegroup.com.udel.idm.oclc.org/ecco/infomark.do?&source=gale&prodId=ECCO&userGroupName=udel_main&tabID=T001&docId=CW116344487&type=multipage&contentSet=ECCOArticles&version=1.0&docLevel=FASCIMILE> (Accessed 25 October 2017).

Chroust, Anton. "Die Bibliothek des Prinzen Moritz von Oranien." *Oud Holland* 15, no. 1 (1897): pp. 11-23.

Coryate, Thomas. *Coryat's crudities; reprinted from the edition of 1611. To which are now added, his letters from India, &c. and extracts relating to him, from various authors: being a more particular account of his travels (mostly on foot) in different parts of the globe, than any hitherto published. Together with his orations, character, death, &c. with copper-plates. In three volumes.* London: printed for W. Cater, 1776. <http://find.galegroup.com.udel.idm.oclc.org/ecco/infomark.do?&source=gale&prodId=ECCO&userGroupName=udel_main&tabID=T001&docId=CW104292648&type=multipage&contentSet=ECCOArticles&version=1.0&docLevel=FASCIMILE> (Accessed 25 October 2017).

Coryate, Thomas, George Coryate, Hermann Kirchner, and William Hole. *Coryats crudities: hastily gobled vp in five moneths trauells in France, Sauoy, Italy, Rhetia, co[m]monly called the Grisons country, Heluetia alias Switzerland, some parts of high Germany, and the Netherlands; newly digested in the hungry aire of Odcombe in the county of Somerset, & now dispersed to the nourishment of the trauelling members of this kingdome.* London: Printed by William Stansby for the author, 1611. <

http://gateway.proquest.com/openurl?ctx_ver=Z39.88-2003&res_id=xri:eebo&rft_id=xri:eebo:citation:99844372> (Accessed 25 October 2017).

Courtin, Antoine de. *Nouveau traité de la civilité qui se pratique en France parmi les honnêtes gens*. Paris: L. Josee et C. Robustel, 1712 (original 1671). <http://gallica.bnf.fr/ark:/12148/bpt6k9667552j> (Accessed 3 December 2016).

Crinò, Anna Maria and Benedict Nicolson. "Further Documents Relating to Orazio Gentileschi." *The Burlington Magazine* 103, no. 697 (Apr. 1961): pp. 144-145.

Davies, John, and Rev. Alexander B. Grosart, ed. *The Complete Poems of Dir John Davies*. 2 vols. London: Chatto and Windus, Piccadilly, 1876.

Davies, Randall. "An Inventory of the Duke of Buckingham's Pictures, etc., at York House in 1635." *The Burlington Magazine for Connoisseurs* 10, no. 48 (March 1907): pp. 376, 379-382.

D'Ewes, Sir Simonds, and Elisabeth Bourcier, ed. *The Diary of Sir Simonds d'Ewes (1622-1624): Journal d'un étudiant londonien sous le règne de Jacques 1er*. Publications de la Sorbonne. Paris: Didier, 1974.

Dolce, Lodvico. L'Aretino ovvero Dialogo della pittura di Lodovico Dolce con l'aggiunta delle lettere del Tiziano a vari e dell' Aretino a lui. Milano: G. Daelli e comp. editori, 1863 (original 1557).

Donne, John, and Gary A. Stringer, ed. The Variorum Edition of the Poetry of John Donne, vol. 8: The epigrams, epithalamions, epitaphs, inscriptions, and miscellaneous poems. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press, 1996.

Van der Doort, Abraham. A catalogue and description of King Charles the First's capital collection of pictures, limnings, statues, bronzes, medals, and other curiosities. Original 1637-40, printed from the manuscript in the Ashmolean Museum at Oxford. London: Printed for W. Bathoe, 1757.

Digby, John, Earl of Bristol, and George Villiers, Duke of Buckingham. A true relation and iournall, of the manner of the arrivall, and magnificent entertainment, giuen to the high and mighty Prince Charles, Prince of Great Britaine, by the King of Spaine and his court at Madrid. London: Printed by John Hauiland for William Barret, 1623.

Drossaers, S. W. A. and Th. H. Lunsingh Scheurleer, eds. *Inventarissen van de*

inboedels in de verblijven van de Oranjes en daarmede gelijk te stellen stukken. 3 vols, Rijks Geschiedkundige Publicatiën, grote serie, 147. The Hague: Nijhof, 1974-1976.

Duverger, Erik. *Antwerpse kunstinventarissen uit de zeventiende eeuw*. 14 vols. Brussels: Koninklijke Academie voor Wetenschappen, Letteren, en Schone Kunsten van België, 1984-2009.

Edmond, Mary. "Limners and Picturemakers." *The Volume of the Walpole Society* 47 (1978-1980): pp. 60-242.

Erasmus, Desiderius and John Wilson, trans. *Moriæ encomium, or, The praise of folly*. London: Printed for William Leak, and are to be sold at the Crown in Fleetstreet, 1668. <http://eebo.chadwyck.com/search/full_rec?SOURCE=pgimages.cfg&ACTION=ByID&ID=V49854> (Accessed 9 April 2018).

Erasmus, Desiderius. *The Praise of Folly*. London: Hamilton, Adams and Co., 1887.

Fairfax, Brian, and Horace Walpole, ed. A catalogue of the curious collection of pictures of George Villiers, Duke of Buckingham. In which is included the valuable collection of Sir Peter Paul Rubens. London: W. Bathoe, 1758.

Félibien, André. *Entretiens sur les vies et sur les ouvrages des plus excellens peintres anciens et modernes.* Tome troisieme. Londres: chez David Mortier, Libraire dans le Strand à L'Enseigne D'Erasme, 1705 (orig. ed. 1684). <http://find.galegroup.com.udel.idm.oclc.org/ecco/infomark.do?&source=gale&prodId=ECCO&userGroupName=udel_main&tabID=T001&docId=CW106115407&type=multipage&contentSet=ECCOArticles&version=1.0&docLevel=FASCIMILE> (Accessed 16 November 2018).

Finet, John. Ceremonies of Charles I: The Note Books of John Finet, 1628-1641. New York: Fordham University Press, 1987.

Fox-Strangways, Maurice, Earl of Ilchester, and H.M. Hake. "Vertue's Note Book A.q. [British Museum, Add. MS. 23,071]." *The Volume of the Walpole Society* 24, Vertue Note Books: Volume IV (1935-1936): pp. 1-100.

Fox-Strangways, Maurice, Earl of Ilchester, and H.M. Hake. "Vertue's Note Book A.y.y. [British Museum, Add. MS. 23,073]." *The Volume of the Walpole Society* 26, Vertue Note Books: Volume V (1937-38): pp. 1-92.

Gascoigne, George. *The noble arte of venerie or hunting*. London: Printed by Thomas

Purfoot, 1611 (orig. 1575).

Van Gelder, Hendrik Enno. “Haagsche cohieren. I (1627).” *Jaarboek Die Haghe* (1913): pp. 9-67.

————. “Haagsche cohieren. II (1674).” *Jaarboek Die Haghe* (1914-1915): pp. 1-117.

Gerbier, Balthazar, Sir. *Subsidium peregrinantibus, or, An assistance to a traveler in his convers with 1. Hollanders, 2. Germans, 3. Venetians, 4. Italians, 5. Spaniards, 6. French: directing him after the latest mode, to the greatest honour, pleasure, security, and advantage in his travels: written to a princely traveler for a vade mecum.* Oxford: Printed for Robert Gascoigne, 1665. <http://name.umdl.umich.edu/A42641.0001.001> (Accessed 16 October 2018).

Goren van Prinsterer, Guillaume, ed. Archives ou correspondence inédite de la maison d’Orange-Nassau. Utrecht, 1857.

Grant, Mary, ed. *The Myths of Hyginus*. Lawrence: University of Kansas Press, 1960.

CSP Domestic IX

Green, Mary Ann Everett, ed. *Calendar of State Papers: Domestic Series of the Reign of James I, 1611-1618, preserved in the State Paper Department of Her Majesty’s Public Record Office*. Vol. IX. London: Longman, Brown, Green, Longmans & Roberts, 1858.

————. *Letters of Queen Henrietta Maria, Including her Private Correspondence with Charles the First*. London: Richard Bentley, 1857.

Grey, Zachary. *An Attempt towards the Character of the Royal Martyr King Charles I. From Authentic Vouchers*. London: Printed for J. Roberts at the Oxford Arms near Warwick-Lane, 1738.

Heidelberger Schlossverein. “Aus den Akten des Großherzoglichen General-Landes-Archiv zu Karlsruhe [2].” *Mitteilungen zur Geschichte des Heidelberger Schlosses* vol. 1 (1885-86): pp. 161-221.

Heinsius, Daniël. “Pastorael.” In *Nederduytsche poemata* (Facsimile of 1616 edition; Bern, Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 1983): pp. 26-33.

Herbert, Edward, et al. *A complete history of England: with the lives of all the Kings and Queens thereof*. 3 vols. London: Printed for Brab. Aylmer, et al., 1706.

Héroard, Jean. *Journal de Jean Héroard sur l'enfance et la jeunesse de Louis XIII (1601-1628)*, ed. Eudore de Soulié and Edouard de Barthélemy, 2 vols. (Paris, 1868).

Hervey, Mary F. S. *The Life Correspondence & Collections of Thomas Howard, Earl of Arundel, "Father of Vertu in England"*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 1921.

Heywood, Thomas. *A Marriage Triumph: On the Nuptials of the Prince Palatine, and the Princess Elizabeth, Daughter of James I*. London: Reprinted for the Percy Society by T. Richards, 1842.

Hoet, G. and P. Terwesten. Catalogus of naamlyst van schilderyen, met derzelver pryzen. 3 vols. The Hague, 1752-1770.

Hoftijzer, P. G. et al., eds. John Farrington. An account of a journey through Holland, Frizeland, etc. in severall letters to a friend. Leiden: Academic Press Leiden, 1994.

Hooft, P.C., and F.A. Stoett and Pieter Leendertz, eds. *Gedichten van P.C. Hooft: volledige uitgave*. Vol. 2. Amsterdam: Van Kampen, 1900.

Van Hoogstraten, Samuel. *Inleyding tot de hooge schoole der schilderkunst: anders de zichtbaere werelt*. Davaco, 1969 (facsimile of original, 1678). <https://www.dbnl.org/tekst/hoog006inle01_01/colofon.php> (Accessed 24 October 2018).

Howell, James. Epistolæ ho-elianæ. Familiar letters domestic and forren: divided into six sections, partly historicall, politicall, philosophicall, upon emergent occasions. London: Printed by W.H. for Humphrey Moseley, 1645. <http://gateway.proquest.com/openurl?ctx_ver=Z39.88-2003&res_id=xri:eebo&rft_id=xri:eebo:citation:99860947> (Accessed 24 January 2017).

Houbraken, Arnold, and B.M. Israël. *De groote schouburgh der nederlantsche konstschilders en schilderessen*. Amsterdam, First ed. 1718-1721, facsimile ed. 1976. <http://www.dbnl.org/tekst/houb005groo01_01/> (Accessed 15 May 2017).

Johnston, James. *The History of the Most Noble Order of the Garter*. London: Printed and sold by S. Popping at the Raven in Pater-Noster-Row, 1712. <http://find.galegroup.com/ecco/infomark.do?&source=gale&prodId=ECCO&

userGroupName=udel_main&tabID=T001&docId=CW102217655&type=multipage&contentSet=ECCOArticles&version=1.0&docLevel=FASCIMILE> (Accessed 8 March 2014).

Jonson, Ben. *The fortunate isles and their vnion Celebrated in a masque design'd for the court, on the Twelfth night. 1624*. London: S.n., 1625. <http://gateway.proquest.com.udel.idm.oclc.org/openurl?ctx_ver=Z39.88-2003&res_id=xri:eebo&rft_id=xri:eebo:citation:99844878> (Accessed 2 October 2018).

Junius, Franciscus. *De pictura veterum libri tres*. Amsterdam: Johannes Blaeu, 1637.

————. *De schilder-konst der oude begrepen in drie boecken*. Middelburgh: Printed for Zacharias Roman, Bookseller living on the Burcht, in the Golden Bible, 1641.

————. *The painting of the ancients, in three bookes: declaring by historicall observations and examples, the beginning, pregresse, and consummation of that most noble art, and how those ancient articifers attained to their still so much excellencie*. *Written first in Latine by Franciscus Junius, F.F. And now by Him Englished, with some Additions and Alterations*. London: Printed by Richard Hodgkinsonne; and are to be sold by Faniel Frere, at the signe of the Bull in Little-Britain, 1638.

Kennedy, James. *A New Description of the Pictures, Statues, Bustos, Basso-Relievos, and Other Curiosities at the Earl of Pembroke's House at Wilton*. *In the Antiques of this Collection are contain'd the Whole of Cardinal Richelieu's and Cardinal Mazarine's, and the greatest Part of the Earl of Arundel's; besides several particular Pieces purchas'd at different Times.* Salisbury: printed by Benjamin Collins; London: sold by R. Baldwin, 1758.

Knachel, Philip A., ed. *Eikon basilike; the portraiture of His Sacred Majesty in his solitudes and sufferings*. Folger Documents of Tudor and Stuart Civilization. Ithaca, NY: Published for the Folger Shakespeare Library by Cornell University Press, 1966. Original ed. 1649.

De Lairesse, Gérard. *The Art of Painting, in All Its Branches, Methodically Demonstrated by Discourses and Plates, and Exemplified by Remarks on the Paintings of the Best Masters; and Their Perfections and Oversights Laid Open*. Translated by John Frederick Fritsch. London: Printed for the author, and sold by J. Brotherton, 1738.

Larsen, Erik. *La vie, les ouvrages et les élèves de Van Dyck: manuscript inédit des archives du Louvre, par un auteur anonyme*. Brussels: Palais des Académies, 1975.

Leigh, William. *Queene Elizabeth, paraleld in her princely vertues*. London: Printed by Thomas Creede for Arthur Johnson, 1612. <http://gateway.proquest.com.udel.idm.oclc.org/openurl?ctx_ver=Z39.88-2003&res_id=xri:eebo&rft_id=xri:eebo:citation:99844070> (Accessed 25 October 2017).

Littré, Émile, and Amédée Beaujean. *Dictionnaire de la langue française, avec un supplement d'histoire et de géographie. Abrégé du dictionnaire de É. Littré par A. Beaujean*. 8th ed. Paris: Librarie Hachette, 1886.

Lodge, Thomas. *Phillis: honoured vvith pastorall sonnets, elegies, and amorous delights : VVhere-vnto is annexed, the tragicall complaint of Elstred*. London, 1593. <DEV/openurl?ctx_ver=Z39.88-2003&res_id=xri:eebo&rft_id=xri:eebo:image:10110:12> (Accessed 20 Februrary 2019).

Luzio, Alessandro. *La galleria dei Gonzaga venduta all'Inghilterra nel 1627-28. Documenti degli archivi di Mantova e Londra raccolti ed illustrate da Alessandro Luzio*. Rome: Bardi, 1974. Reproduction of the 1913 Milan edition.

Lyly, John, and R. Warwick Bond. *The complete works of John Lyly: Now for the first time collected and edited from the earliest quartos*. Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1902.

Mancini, Giulio. *Considerazioni sulla pittura*. Rome: Accademia nazionale dei Lincei, 1956.

Van Mander, Karel. *The Lives of the Illustrious Netherlandish and German Painters*, 6 vols. Translated and edited by Hessel Miedema. Davaco: Doornspijk, 1994.

McEvansoneya, Philip. "Some Documents Concerning the Patronage and Collections of the Duke of Buckingham." *Rutgers Art Review* 8 (1987): pp. 27-38.

Messin, Isaac Barré. *Stances sur la mort de son Altesse Frederic Henri, Prince Palatin, du Rhin, Duc de Bauiere, esleu & designé Roy de Boheme &c. Dediées a la Royne de Boheme sa Mere*. The Hague: Arnoult Meuris, 1629.

Middleton, Thomas, and A. H. Bullen, ed. *The Works of Thomas Middleton*, 8 vols. Boston: Houghton, Mifflin, 1885-86.

Millar, Oliver, ed. "Abraham Van Der Doort's Catalogue of the Collections of Charles I." *The Volume of the Walpole Society* 37 (1958-1960).

————. *The Forty-Third Volume of the Walpole Society: The Inventories and Valuations of the King's Goods 1649-1651*. Glasgow: The University Press, 1970-72.

Montague-Smith, Patrick W., ed. *Debrett's Peerage & Baronetage*. 147th ed. London: Debrett's Peerage Limited, 2008.

Müntz, Eugène, and Émilie Molinier. *Le chateau de Fontainebleau au XVIIe siècle d'après des documents inédits*. Paris, Nogent-le-Retrou: Impr. De Daupeley-Gouverneur, 1886.

Nichols, John. *The Progresses, Processions, and Magnificent Festivities of King James the First, His Royal Consort, Family, and Court*. London: Printed by and for J. B. Nichols, Printer to the Society of Antiquaries, 1828.

Norgate, Edward. *Miniatura, or, The art of limning* (1660). Jeffrey M. Muller and Jim Murrell, eds. New Haven: New Critical Edition Published for the Paul Mellon Centre for Studies in British Art by Yale University Press, 1997.

Orbison, Tucker, ed. *The Middle Temple Documents Relating to George Chapman's* The Memorable Masque. Oxford: Published for the Malone Society by Oxford University Press, 1983.

Paleotti, Gabriele and William McCuaig, trans. *Discourse on Sacred and Profane Images*. Los Angeles: Getty Publications, 2012.

De Passe, Crispijn, the younger. *Le Miroir des plus Belles Courtisannes de ce Temps. Spiegel der Alderschoonste Cortisanen dese Tyts. Spieghel der Allerschónsten Courtisannen dieser Zeyt*. Amsterdam[?]: "Ghedruckt voor den Autheur," 1631.

Peacham, Henry. *The compleat gentleman*. Ed. 1634. London: Clarendon Press, 1906. <https://archive.org/details/cu31924093830358> (Accessed 17 January 2017).

Petrie, Sir Charles, ed.. *The Letters, Speeches, and Proclamations of King Charles I*. London: Cassell and Company Ltd., 1935.

Phillips, Sir Claude. *The Picture Gallery of Charles I: Primary Source Edition*. Nabu Press, 2013.

————. *The Picture Gallery of Charles I.* London: Seeley and Company, Ltd., 1896.

De Piles, Roger. *Abregé de la vie des peintres, avec des reflexions sur leurs ouvrages, et un traité du peintre parfait, de la connoissance des desseins, & de l'utilité desa estampes De Piles*. Paris: chez Charles de Sercy, au Palais, au sixiéme Pilier de la Grand'Sale, 1699.

————. *Cours de peinture par principes*. Paris: Chez Jacques Estienne, 1708.

————. *The principles of painting*. London: Printed for J. Osborn, at the Golden Ball, in Pater-Noster Row, 1743. <http://find.galegroup.com.udel.idm.oclc.org/ecco/infomark.do?&source=gale&prodId=ECCO&userGroupName=udel_main&tabID=T001&docId=CW106434694&type=multipage&contentSet=ECCOArticles&version=1.0&docLevel=FASCIMILE> (Accessed 8 August 2018).

Resta, Sebastiano, and Jean Meyssens. *The true effigies of the most eminent painters, and other famous artists that have flourished in Europe. Curiously engraven on copper-plates. Together with an account of the time when they lived, the most remarkable passages of their lives, and most considerable works*. London, 1694.

Ripa, Cesare. *Iconologia del cavaliere Cesare Ripa, Perugino*. 5 vols. Perugia: Nella stamperia di Piergiovanni Constantini, 1764 (orig. illus. ed. 1603).

Ronsard, Pierre de, and Paul Laumonier. *Oeuvres complètes de P. de Ronsard*. Vol. V: Le Premier Livre des Poèmes. Paris: A. Lemerre, 1914.

Rooses, Max. *Correspondance de Rubens et documents épistolaires concernant sa vie et ses œuvres*. 6 vols. Anvers: Veuve de Backer, 1887-1909.

Royal Academy of Arts. *Exhibition of Dutch Art 1450-1900*. London: Royal Academy of Arts, 1929. Exh. cat.

Rubens, Peter Paul and Ruth Saunders Magurn, ed. and trans. *The Letters of Sir Peter Paul Rubens*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1955.

Sainsbury, W. Noël. *Original Unpublished Papers Illustrative of the Life of Sir Peter Paul Rubens as an Artist and a Diplomatist*. London: Bradbury & Evans, 1859.

Von Sandrart, Joachim and Christian Klemm, ed. *Teutsche Academie der Bau-, Bild- und Mahlery-Künste*. Nördlingen: A. Uhl, 1994-95.

De la Serre, M. *Histoire de l'entrée de la reine mère du roi très-chretien dans les villes des Pays-Bas*. Amsterdam, 1848 (first edition London, 1639).

Saunders, William Henry. *Annals of Portsmouth: historical, biographical, statistical, etc.* London: Hamilton, Adams, & Co, Printed in Portsmouth, 1880.

Scobell, Henry. *Severall proceedings in Parliament,* Issue 173 (13th – 20th January 1653). <http://gateway.proquest.com.udel.idm.oclc.org/openurl?ctx_ver=Z39.88-2003&res_id=xri:eebo&rft_id=xri:eebo:image:167838:9> (Accessed 20 June 2018).

Spenser, Edmund, and George Armstrong Wauchope, ed. *Spenser's The faerie queene, Book I*. New York: The Macmillan Company; London: Macmillan & Co., Ltd., 1903.

Smets, Anthonie, with Anne-Dirk Renting and J. T. C. Renting-Kuijpers, eds., and contributions by A. S. Korteweg. *The Seventeenth-Century Orange-Nassau Library: The Catalogue Compiled by Anthonie Smets in 1686, the 1749 Auction Catalogue, and Other Contemporary Sources*. Utrecht: HES, 1993.

Smith, John. A catalogue raisonné of the works of the most eminent Dutch, Flemish and French painters: in which is included a short biographical notice of the artists, with a copious description of their principal pictures; a statement of the prices at which such pictures have been sold at public sales on the continent and in England; a reference to the galleries and private collections, in which a large portion are at present; and the names of the artists by whom they have been engraved; to which is added, a brief notice of the scholars & imitators of the great masters of the above schools. 9 vols. London: Published by Smith and Son, 1829-1842.

Stuart, James I. *Basilikon doron Devided into three bookes*. Edinburgh: Printed by Robert Walde-graue printer to the Kings Maiestie, 1599. British Library, <http://eebo.chadwyck.com.udel.idm.oclc.org/search/full_rec?SOURCE=config.cfg&ACTION=ByID&ID=99836898&ECCO=param(ECCO)&SUBSET=1&ENTRIES=default&HIGHLIGHT_KEYWORD=param(HIGHLIGHT_KEYWORD)> (Accessed 16 January 2017).

Basilikon Doron 1603
Stuart, James I. *Basilikon doron. Or His Maiesties instructions to his dearest sonne,*

Henry the prince. London: Imprinted by E. Allde for E. White and others of the company of the Stationers, 1603. <http://gateway.proquest.com.udel.idm.oclc.org/openurl?ctx_ver=Z39.88-2003&res_id=xri:eebo&rft_id=xri:eebo:citation:99843242> (Accessed 9 April 2018).

Suetonius, and Philemon Holland, trans. *History of the twelve Caesars*. 1606. Edition London: D. Nutt, 1899.

Van Sypesteyn, Cornelis Ascanius. *Het Hof van Boheme en Het Leven in Den Haag in de XVII^{e} Eeuw*. Amsterdam: J.C. Loman, Jr., 1886.

Tierney, Mark Aloysius. The history and antiquities of the castle and town of Arundel; including the biography of its earls, from the conquest to the present time. 2 vols. London: G. and W. Nicol, 1834.

Thode, Henry. Die Gemälde-Sammlung des Heidelberger Schlosses: Verzeichniss vom Jahre 1685. Heidelberg: Groos, 1896.

Bürger, William [Étienne-Joseph-Théophile Thoré, or Thoré-Bürger]. *Musées de la Hollande*. 2 vols. Bruxelles; Ostende: F. Claassen; Paris: Vve J. Renouard, 1858-1860. <https://catalogue.bnf.fr/ark:/12148/cb31464668p> (Accessed 9 November 2018).

Townshed, Aurelian. *Albions triumph Personated in a maske at court. By the Kings Maiestie and his lords. The Sunday after Twelfe Night.* London: Printed by Aug. Matthewes for Robert Allet [Allot] at the Blacke Beare in Pauls Church-yard, 1632. <http://gateway.proquest.com.udel.idm.oclc.org/openurl?ctx_ver=Z39.88-2003&res_id=xri:eebo&rft_id=xri:eebo:citation:99857100> (Accessed 2 October 2018).

United States Department of Commerce and National Bureau of Standards. *Report of the Twenty-Fifth National Conference on Weights and Measures*. Washington: United States Government Printing Office, Miscellaneous Publication M156, 1936.

Unknown. Beschreibung Der Reiß Empfahun[n]g deß Ritterlichen Ordens: Vollbringung des Heyraths: vnd glücklicher Heimführung: Wie auch der ansehnlichen Einführung: gehaltener Ritterspeil vun Frewdenfests: Des…Herrn Friederichen deß Fünften / Pfaltzgraven bey Rhein…Mit der…Princessin / Elizabethen[n] / deß Großmechtigsten Herrn / Herrn Iacobi

deß Ersten Königs in GroßBritannien Einigen Tochter: Mit schönen Kupfferstücken gezieret. Heidelberg: Gerhard Vögelin, 1613.

Unknown. *Cassandre Francoise*. 1615. Boston Public Library edition.

Unknown. Catalogue of the pictures at Combe Abbey, Warwickshire: The Seat of William Earl of Craven. England, 1866.

Unknown. The magnificent, princely, and most royall entertainments giuen to the high and mightie Prince, and Princesse, Frederick, Count Palatine, Palsgraue of the Rhyne: and Elizabeth, sole daughter to the high and mighty King of England, Iames, our Soueraigne Lord. London: Printed by Thomas Snodham for Nathaniel Butter, 1613.

D'Urfé, Honoré. *L'Astrée*. Part II, 2nd ed. Paris: Olivier de Varennes, 1630.

Virgil, Len Krisak, trans., and Gregson Davis. *Virgil's Eclogues*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2010.

Welby, Horace. *Predictions Realized in Modern Times*. London: Kent and Co. Paternoster Row, 1862.

Wendland, Anna, ed. *Briefe der Elisabeth Stuart, Königin von Böhmen, an ihren Sohn, den Kurfürsten Carl Ludwig von der Pfalz, 1650-1662, nach den im Königlichen Staatsarchiv zu Hannover befindlichen Originalen*. Stuttgart: Tübingen, 1902.

Weyerman, Jacob Campo. *De levens-beschryvingen der Nederlandsche konst-schilders en konst-schilderessen, met een uytbreyding over de schilder-konst der ouden*. 4 vols. 's Gravenhage: By de wed. E. Boucquet, H. Scheurleer, F. Boucquet, en J. de Jongh, 1729.

Wolkan, Rudolf. *Deutsche lieder auf den Winterkönig*. Bibliothek deutscher Schriftsteller aus Böhmen, vol. VIII. Prague: J.G. Calve, 1898.

Wilson, Arthur. *The history of Great Britain: being the life and reign of King James the First, relating to what passed from his first access to the crown, till his death*. London: Printed for Richard Lownds, 1653.

Yonge, James, and F. N. L. Poynter, ed. *The Journal of James Yonge [1647-1721]: Plymouth Surgeon*. Hamden, Conn.: Archon Books, 1963.

Secondary Sources

Aaron, Melissa D. *Global Economics: A History of the Theatre Business, the Chamberlain's/King's Men, and Their Plays, 1599-1642*. Newark, DE: University of Delaware Press, 2005.

Adams, Ann Jensen. *Public Faces and Private Identities in Seventeenth-Century Holland: Portraiture and the Production of Community*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2009.

Adams, Ann Jensen, and Sabine Schulze. *Leselust: Niederländische Malerei von Rembrandt bis Vermeer*. Frankfurt am Main: Schirn Kunsthalle Frankfurt; Stuttgart: G. Hatje, 1993. Exh. cat.

Adams, Robyn and Rosanna Cox. *Diplomacy and Early Modern Culture*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011.

Adamson, John. "The Tudor and Stuart Courts 1509-1714." In John Adamson, ed. *The Princely Courts of Europe: Ritual, Politics and Culture Under the* Ancien Régime *1500-1750* (London: Weidenfeld & Nicolson, 1999): pp. 95-118.

Akkerman, Nadine. *Courtly Rivals in The Hague: Elizabeth Stuart (1596-1662) & Amalia von Solms (1602-1675)*. Venlo: VanSpijk/Refaka Publishers, 2014.

————. "*Semper Eadem*: Elizabeth Stuart and the Legacy of Queen Elizabeth I." In Sara Smart and Mara R. Wade, eds. *The Palatine Wedding of 1613: Protestant Alliance and Court Festival* (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz in Kommission, 2013): pp. 145-168.

Albion, Gordon. *Charles I and the Court of Rome: A Study in Seventeenth Century Diplomacy*. Louvain: Bibliothèque de l'Universitaire Place du Peuple, 1935.

Alexander, Julia Marciari. "Portraiture and Royal Family Ties: Kings, Queens, Princes, and Princesses in Caroline England." In Naomi J. Miller and Naomi Yavneh, eds. *Gender and Early Modern Constructions of Childhood* (Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2014): pp. 209-222.

Alpers, Svetlana. *Rembrandt's Enterprise: The Studio and the Market*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1988.

Alsteens, Stijn and Adam Eaker, et al. *Van Dyck: The Anatomy of Portraiture*. New York: The Frick Collection; New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2016. Exh. cat.

Alsteens, Stijn. “A Portraitist’s Progress.” In Stijn Alsteens and Adam Eaker, et al. *Van Dyck: The Anatomy of Portraiture*. (New York: The Frick Collection; New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2016. Exh. cat.): pp. 1-37.

Altes, Everhard Korthals. “Félibien, de Piles and Dutch seventeenth-century paintings in France.” *Simiolus: Netherlands Quarterly for the History of Art* 34, no. 3/4 (2009/2010): pp. 194-211.

Anderson, Christina M. *The Flemish Merchant of Venice: Daniel Nijs and the Sale of the Gonzaga Art Collection*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2015.

Arch, Nigel. *Splendour at Court: Dressing for Royal Occasions Since 1700*. London: Unwin Hyman, 1987.

De Armas, Frederick A. “Mercury as a Messenger of Renaissance Classicisms.” In Larry F. Norman and Anne Leonard, eds., *Classicisms* (Chicago: Smart Museum of Art, The University of Chicago, 2017; Exh. cat.): pp. 71-79.

————. *The Return of Astraea: An Astral-Imperial Myth in Calderón*. Studies in Romance Languages. Lexington: University Press of Kentucky, 1986.

Asch, Ronald G. “The Revival of Monopolies: Court and Patronage during the Personal Rule of Charles I, 1629-1640.” In Ronald G. Asch and Adolf M. Birke, eds. *Princes, Patronage, and the Nobility: The Court at the Beginning of the Modern Age, c. 1450-1650*. London: Studies of the German Historical Institute (Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 1991): pp. 357-392.

Ashelford, Jane. *The Art of Dress: Clothes and Society 1500-1914*. New York: Harry N. Abrams; London: National Trust Enterprises Limited, 1996.

Ashmolean Museum. *Thomas Howard, Earl of Arundel: Patronage and Collecting in the Seventeenth Century*. Oxford: Ashmolean Museum, University of Oxford, 1985. Exh. cat.

Aston, Margaret. “Gods, Saints, and Reformers: Portraiture and Protestant England.” In Lucy Gent, ed. *Albion’s Classicism: The Visual Arts in Britain, 1550-1660*. *Studies in British Art* 2 (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1995): pp. 181-220.

Atherton, Ian and Julie Sanders. *The 1630s: Interdisciplinary Essays on Culture and Politics in the Caroline Era*. Manchester, UK: Manchester University Press,

2006.

Atkins, Christopher D. M. *The Signature Style of Frans Hals: Painting, Subjectivity, and the Market in Early Modernity*. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, 2012.

————. *The Wrath of the Gods: Masterpieces by Rubens, Michelangelo, and Titian*. Philadelphia: Philadelphia Museum of Art in association with Yale University Press, 2015. Exh. cat.

Auclair, Valérie. "L'invention décorative de la galerie François Ier au château de Fontainebleau." *Seizième Siècle*, no. 3 (2007): pp. 9-35.

Auwera, Joost Vander and Irene Schaudies, eds. *Jordaens and the Antique*. New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2012. Exh. cat.

Auwers, Michael. "The Gift of Rubens: Rethinking the Concept of Gift-Giving in Early Modern Diplomacy." *European History Quarterly* 43, no. 3 (2013): pp. 421-441.

————. "Peter Paul Rubens: The Infanta and her Painter-Diplomat." In Cordula van Whye, ed., *Isabel Clara Eugenia: Female Sovereignty in the Courts of Madrid and Brussels* (Madrid: Centro de Estudios Europa Hispánica, 2011): pp. 382-413.

Avery, Charles. "Benvenuto Cellini's Silver Statues of the Twelve Olympian Gods for Fontainebleau." *Studies in the Decorative Arts* 14, no. 1 (Fall-Winter 2006-2007): pp. 2-18.

————. "Hubert le Sueur, the 'Unworthy Praxiteles' of King Charles I," *The Volume of the Walpole Society* 48 (1980-82): pp. 135-209.

Aymonino, Adriano. "'Nature Perfected': The Theory & Practice of Drawing after the Antique." In Adriano Aymonino, et al. *Drawn from the Antique: Artists and the Classical Ideal* (London: Sir John Soane's Museum, 2015. Exh. cat., Teylers Museum, Haarlem, Sir John Soane's Museum, London): pp. 15-67.

Bacariza Domínguez, Javier. *Caravaggism and Classicism in Italian Painting at the Thyssen-Bornemisza Museum: A Technical and Historical Study*. Madrid: Rayxart Investigación, 2008.

Baer, Ronni, et al. *Class Distinctions: Dutch Painting in the Age of Rembrandt and Vermeer*. Boston: MFA Publications, 2015. Exh. cat.

Baer, Ronni. “The Life and Art of Gerrit Dou.” In Ronni Baer ed. *Gerrit Dou 1613-1675: Master Painter in the Age of Rembrandt* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2000. Exh. cat. National Gallery of Art, D.C., Dulwich Picture Gallery, Royal Cabinet of Painting Mauritshuis.): pp. 26-53.

Baderou, Henri. *The School of Fontainebleau: XVI Century*. Paris: A. Skira; New York: French and European Publications, 1940.

Bakker, Boudewijn. “Schilderachtig: Discussions of a Seventeenth-Century Term and Concept.” *Simiolus: Netherlands Quarterly for the History of Art* 23, no. 2/3 (1995): pp. 147-162.

Banach, Jerzy. *Hercules Polonus: Studium z ikonografii sztuki nowożytnej*. Warszawa: Panstwow Wydanictwo Naukowe, 1984.

Barcroft, John H. “Carleton and Buckingham: The Quest for Office.” in Howard S. Reinmuth, ed. *Early Stuart Studies: Essays in Honor of David Harris Wilson* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1970): pp. 122-136.

Barnes, Susan J. and Arthur K. Wheelock, Jr. *Van Dyck 350*. Washington: National Gallery of Art; Hanover: Distributed by the University Press of New England, 1994. Conference proceedings.

Barnes, Susan J., et al,. *Van Dyck: A Complete Catalogue of the Paintings*. New Haven, CT: Published for the Paul Mellon Centre for Studies in British Art by Yale University Press, 2004.

Barnes, Susan J. “The Young Van Dyck and Rubens.” In Arthur K. Wheelock, et al. *Anthony van Dyck* (Washington: National Gallery of Art, 1990): pp. 17-26. Exh. cat., National Gallery of Art, Washington, DC.

Bassegoda, Bonaventura. “Pictorial Decoration of the Escorial During the Reign of Philip IV.” In Jonathan Brown and J.H. Elliott, eds. *The Sale of the Century: Artistic Relations Between Spain and Great Britain, 1604-1655* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2002. Exh. cat., Museo Nacional del Prado, Madrid.): pp. 107-140.

Battifol, Louis. “Marie de Médicis et les Arts.” *Gazette des Beaux-Arts* 3, tome 35 (1906): pp. 221-243.

Baumgärtel, Bettina, and Kathrin Bürger. *Ein Fest der Malerei: die niderländischen und flämischen Gemälde des 16.-18. Jahrhunderts: Bestandskatalog der*

Gemäldesammlung Museum Kunst Palast, Sammlung der Kunstakademie Düsseldorf. Leipzig: Seemann cop., 2005.

Bauer, Linda Freeman. "Moral Choice in Some Paintings by Caravaggio and His Followers." *The Art Bulletin* 73, no. 3 (September 1991): pp. 391-398.

Béguin, Sylvie, Jean Guillaume, and Alain Roy. *La galerie d'Ulysse à Fontainebleau*. Paris: Presses universitaires de France, 1985.

Béguin, Sylvie. *La Galerie François Ier [premier] au château de Fontainebleau*. Paris: Flammarion, 1972.

Belkin, Kristin Lohse, Fiona Healy, and Jeffrey M. Muller. *A House of Art: Rubens as Collector, Rubenshuis & Rubenianum*. Schoten: BAI, 2004.

Belkin, Kristin Lohse. "Titian, Rubens, and Van Dyck: A New Look at Old Evidence." In Görel Cavalli-Björkman (ed.), *Bacchanals by Titian and Rubens* (Stockholm: Nationalmuseum, 1987): pp. 143-152.

Bellany, Alastair James. *The Politics of Court Scandal in Early Modern England: News Culture and the Overbury Affair, 1603-1666*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 2002.

Beller, Elmer Adolph. *Caricatures of the 'Winter King' of Bohemia from the Sutherland Collection in the Bodleian Library, and from the British Museum*. London: Oxford University Press, H. Milford, 1928.

Benger, E. *Memoirs of Elizabeth Stuart. Vol. 1: Queen of Bohemia, daughter of King James the First*. Whitefish, MT: Kessinger Publishing, 1825.

Bennett, Josephine Waters. "Britain among the Fortunate Isles." *Studies in Philology* 53, no. 2 (April 1956): pp. 114-140.

Benoît, Gérard. "Valentin et les carvagesques français." *Esprit,* Nouvelle série, 434, no. 4 (April 1974): pp. 727-728.

Beranek, Saskia. "Strategies of Display in the Galleries of Amalia van Solms." *JHNA: Journal of Historians of Netherlandish Art* 9, no. 2 (Summer 2017). <doi.org/10.5092/jhna.2017.9.2.4> (Accessed 20 June 2018).

Betcherman, Lita-Rose. "The York House Collection and its Keeper." *Apollo* 92 (1970): pp. 250-259.

Bevers, Holm. “Drawing in Rembrandt’s Workshop.” In Holm Bevers et al., eds., *Drawings by Rembrandt and His Pupils: Telling the Difference* (Los Angeles: J. Paul Getty Museum, 2009. Exh. cat.): pp. 1-30.

Bevington, David M. and Peter Holbrook, eds. *The Politics of the Stuart Court Masque*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 1998.

Bialostocki, Jan. “Mededelingen van het Rijksbureau voor Kunsthistorische Documentatie: Kaunitz Honthorst Rediscovered.” *Oud Holland* 73 (1958): pp. 167-168.

Bilhöfer, Peter. “Instrumentalisierung der Antike in der Herrscherpräsentation am Beispiel des ‘Winterkönigs’ Friedrich von der Pfalz.” *Thetis: Mannheimer Beiträge zur Klassischen Archäologie und Geschichte Griechenlands und Zyperns* 7 (2000): pp. 117-130.

Bissell, R. Ward. “Orazio Gentileschi’s ‘Young Woman with a Violin’.” *Bulletin of the Detroit Institute of Arts* 46, no. 4 (1967): pp. 71-79.

————. “Simon Vouet, Raphael, and the Accademia di San Luca in Rome.” *Artibus et Historiae* 32, no. 63 (2011): pp. 55-72.

Blankert, Albert et al. *Dutch Classicism in Seventeenth-Century Painting* (Rotterdam: NAi Publishers, 1999): 12-33. Exh. cat., Museum Boijmans Van Beuningen, and the Städelisches Kunstinstitut, Frankfurt.

————. *Gods, Saints, & Heroes: Dutch Painting in the Age of Rembrandt,* Washington, DC: National Gallery of Art, 1980. Exh. cat.

Blankert, Albert, Leonard J. Slatkes, Marten Jan Bok, et al. *Nieuw licht op de Gouden Eeuw: Hendrick ter Brugghen en tijdgenoten*/*Holländische Malerei in neuem Licht*. Braunschweig: Limbach, 1986. Exh. cat., Centraal Museum, Utrecht, and Herzog Anton Ulrich-Museum Braunschweig.

Bliss, Joseph R. “Benvenuto Cellini’s Satyrs for the ‘Porte Dorée’ at Fontainebleau.” *Studies in the History of Art* 64, Symposium Papers XLI: Large Bronzes in the Renaissance (2003): pp. 72-93.

Boers-Goosens, Marion. “Prices of Northern Netherlandish Paintings in the Seventeenth Century.” In Amy Golahny, Mia M. Mochizuki, and Lisa Vergara, eds. *In His Milieu: Essays on Netherlandish Art in Memory of John Michael Montias* (Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, 2006): pp. 59-72.

Bok, Marten Jan. "'Nulla dies sine linie': De Opleiding van Schilders in Utrecht in de Eerste Helft van de Zeventiende Eeuw." *Zeventiende eeuw: cultuur in de Nederlanden in interdisciplinair perspectief* 6, no. 1 (1990): pp. 58-68.

Bomford, Kate. "Peter Paul Rubens and the Value of Friendship." *Nederlands Kunsthistorisch Jaarboek* 54 (2003): pp. 229-257.

Bonfait, Olivier. "Les Pays-Bas dans Littérature Artistique en France au XVII^{e} Siècle." In Michèle-Caroline Heck, ed. *L'Histoire de l'Histoire de l'Art Septentroinal au XVII^{e} Siècle* (Turnhout: Brepols, 2009): pp. 81-98.

Du Bourg, Alexis Merle. *Antoon van Dyck: Portraits*. Brussels: Fonds Mercator, 2008. Exh. cat., "Van Dyck," Musée Jacquemart-André, Paris.

Brandt, Aurelia. "Goltzius and the Antique." *Print Quarterly* 18, no. 2 (June 2001): pp. 135-149.

Bratton, Jerry. "The Art of Restoration: King Charles II and the Restitution of the English Royal Art Collection." *The Court Historian* 10, no. 2 (2005): pp. 115-135.

Braun, Hermann. *Gerard und Willem van Honthorst*. PhD diss., Universität zu Göttingen, 1966.

Brejon de Lavergnée, Barbara. "Vouet, Simon." Oxford Art Online, 2003. <https://doi.org/10.1093/gao/9781884446054.article.T090199> (Accessed 1 March 2019).

Brenninkmeyer-de Roij, Beatrijs, and Arthur Hartkamp. "Oranje's erfoed in het Mauritshuis: De lotgevallen van de collecties van het Huis van Oranje in de period 1795-1816, en het maecenaat van Koning Willem I." *Oud Holland* 102, no. 3 (1988): pp. 181-235.

Brody, Jules. "What *Was* French Classicism?" In David Lee Rubin, ed. *Rethinking Classicism: Overviews*, Continuum vol. 1 (New York: AMS Press, 1989): pp. 51-75.

Broekman, Inge. *Constantijn Huygens, de kunst en het hof*. PhD diss., University of Amsterdam, 2010.

————. *De Rol van de Schilderkunst in het Leven van Constantijn Huygens (1596-1687)*. Hilversum: Verloren, 2005.

Brooke, Iris. *English Costume of the Seventeenth Century*. London: A. & C. Black, 1934.

Brown, Christopher. *Scenes of Everyday Life: Dutch Genre Paintings from the Mauritshuis*. Oxford: Ashmolean Museum, 1999. Exh. cat.

————. *Scenes of Everyday Life: Dutch Genre Painting of the Seventeenth Century*. London; Boston: Faber and Faber, 1984.

————. *Utrecht Painters of the Dutch Golden Age*. London: National Gallery Publications Limited, 1997. Exh. cat., The Fine Arts Museum of San Francisco, The Walters Art Gallery, Baltimore, and The National Gallery, London.

————. *Van Dyck*. Oxford: Phaidon, 1982.

Brown, Christopher and Nigel Ramsay. "Van Dyck's Collection: Some New Documents." *The Burlington Magazine* 132, no. 1051 (Oct. 1990): pp. 704-709.

Brown, Jonathan, "Artistic Relations between Spain and England 1604-1655." In Jonathan Brown and J.H. Elliott, eds. *The Sale of the Century: Artistic Relations Between Spain and Great Britain, 1604-1655* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2002. Exh. cat., Museo Nacional del Prado, Madrid.): pp. 41-68.

————. *Kings & Connoisseurs: Collecting Art in Seventeenth-Century Europe*. The A.W. Mellon Lectures in the Fine Arts, The National Gallery of Art, Washington. Bollingen Series XXXV: 43. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1994.

Brown, Marshall. "The Classic Is the Baroque: On the Principle of Wölfflin's Art History." *Critical Inquiry* 9, no. 2 (December 1982): pp. 379-404.

Brown University. *Children of Mercury: The education of artists in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries: published in conjunction with an exhibition by the Department of Art, Bell Gallery, List Art Center, Brown University, Providence, Rhode Island, March 2 through March 30, 1984*. Providence, RI: Brown University Department of Art, 1984.

Browne, Clare. "The Cartoons at the Mortlake tapestry manufactory." In Mark Evans, Clare Browne, and Arnold Nesselrath, eds. *Raphael: Cartoons and Tapestries for the Sistine Chapel* (London: V&A Publishing. Exh. cat.): pp. 54-56.

Brusati, Celeste. *Artifice and Illusion: The Art and Writing of Samuel van Hoogstraten*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1995.

Bruyn, Josua, P. van den Brink, et al. "Het gedroomde land. Pastorale schilderkunst in de Gouden Eeuw." *Oud Holland* 108 (1994): pp. 141-148.

Bruyn, Josua and Oliver Millar. "Notes on the Royal Collection – III: The 'Dutch Gift' to Charles I." *The Burlington Magazine* 104, no. 712 (July 1962): pp. 291-294.

Buijsen, Edwin, et al. *Haagse Schilders in de Gouden Eeuw: Het Hoogsteder Lexicon van alle schilders werkzaam in Den Haag, 1600-1700*. The Hague: Kunsthandel Hoogsteder & Hoogsteder; Zwolle: Waanders Uitgevers, 1998.

————. *The Hoogsteder Exhibition of Music & Painting in the Golden Age*. The Hague: Hoogsteder & Hoogsteder; Zwolle: Waanders, 1994. Exh. cat. Hoogsteder & Hoogsteder, The Hague and Hessenhuis Museum, Antwerp.

Van de Bunt, Aleid. "Frederik en Elisabeth van de Palts in Rhenen." *Oud-Utrecht* 32 (1959): pp. 51-52.

Burchard, Wolf. *The Sovereign Artist: Charles Le Brun and the Image of Louis XIV*. London: Paul Holberton Publishing, 2016.

Burke, Jill, Stephen J. Campbell, and Thomas Kren. "Introduction: The Renaissance Nude, 1400-1530." In Thomas Kren, ed. *The Renaissance Nude* (Los Angeles: The J. Paul Getty Museum, 2018. Exh. cat.): pp. 1-16.

Burke, Marcus B. "Luis de Haro as Minister, Patron and Collector of Art." In Jonathan Brown and J.H. Elliott, eds. *The Sale of the Century: Artistic Relations Between Spain and Great Britain, 1604-1655* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2002. Exh. cat., Museo Nacional del Prado, Madrid.): pp. 87-106.

Burke, Peter. *The Fabrication of Louis XIV*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1992.

Butler, Martin. *The Stuart Court Masque and Political Culture*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 2008.

Butler, Martin and David Lindley. "Restoring Astraea: Jonson's Masque for the Fall of Somerset." *ELH* 61, no. 4 (Winter 1994): pp. 807-827.

Butler, Todd Wayne. *Imagination and Politics in Seventeenth-Century England*. Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2008.

Buvelot, Quentin. "Ambassadors for the Netherlands: Seventeenth-century Dutch Paintings in England." In Rupert Goulding and David A.H.B. Taylor, eds., *Prized Possessions: Dutch Paintings from national Trust Houses*. (London: National Trust: In association with Paul Holberton Publishing, 2018. Exh. cat., The Holburne Museum, Bath, the Royal Picture Gallery Mauritshuis, The Hague, and Petworth House, West Sussex.): pp. 28-49.

————. "Frans van Mieris' Reputation." In Quentin Buvelot, ed. *Frans van Mieris 1635-1681* (Zwolle: Waanders Publishers, 2005. Exh. cat., Mauritshuis, The Hague, and National Gallery of Art, Washington D.C.): pp. 12-27.

Camille, Michael. "Before the Gaze: The Internal Senses and Late Medieval Practices of Seeing." In Robert S. Nelson, ed. *Visuality Before and Beyond the Renaissance: Seeing as Others Saw* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000): pp. 197-223.

————. *The Medieval Art of Love: Objects and Subjects of Desire*. New York: Harry N. Abrams, Inc., Publishers, 1998.

Campbell, C. Jean. "'Symone nostro snensi iocundissima': The Court Artist, Heart, Mind, and Hand." In Stephen J. Campbell, ed. *Artists at Court: Image-Making and Identity, 1300-1550* (Chicago: Distributed by University of Chicago Press, 2004): pp. 33-45.

Campbell, Lorne. *Renaissance Portraits: European Portrait Painting in the 14th, 15th, and 16th Centuries*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1990.

Campbell, Stephen J. "Counter Reformation Polemic and Mannerist Counter-Aesthetics: Bronzino's 'Martyrdom of St. Lawrence' in San Lorenzo." *RES: Anthropology and Aesthetics* 46, Polemical Objects (Autumn, 2004): pp. 98-119.

Campbell, Thomas P. "The Development of New Centers of Production and the Recovery of the Netherlandish Tapestry Industry, 1600-1620." In Thomas P. Campbell, ed. *Tapestry in the Baroque: Threads of Splendor* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2007): pp. 61-75. Exh. cat., Metropolitan Museum of Art and Palacio Real, Madrid.

————. "Disruption and Diaspora: Tapestry Weaving in Northern Europe, 1570-1600." In Thomas P. Campbell, ed. *Tapestry in the Baroque: Threads of*

Splendor (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2007): pp. 17-27. Exh. cat., Metropolitan Museum of Art and Palacio Real, Madrid.

————. "Stately Splendor, Woven Frescoes, Luxury Furnishings: Tapestry in Context, 1600-1660." In Thomas P. Campbell, ed. *Tapestry in the Baroque: Threads of Splendor* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2007): pp. 107-122. Exh. cat., Metropolitan Museum of Art and Palacio Real, Madrid.

Campbell, Thomas P., ed. *Tapestry in the Baroque: Threads of Splendor*. New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2007. Exh. cat., Metropolitan Museum of Art and Palacio Real, Madrid.

Cappelletti, Francesca. *La collezione Pallavicini e il palazzo del giardino a Montecavallo*. Roma: Campisano, 2014.

Carey, Sorcha. "The Problem of Totality: Collecting Greek Art, Wonders and Luxury in Pliny the Elder's *Natural History*." *Journal of the History of Collections* 12, no. 1 (2000): pp. 1-13.

Carpino, Alexandra. "Margaret of Austria's Funerary Complex at Brou: Conjugal Love, Political Ambition, or Personal Glory?" In Cynthia Miller Lawrence, ed. *Women and Art in Early Modern Europe: Patrons, Collectors, and Connoisseurs* (University Park, PA: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1997): pp. 37-52.

Caron, Linda. "The Use of Color by Rosso Fiorentino." *The Sixteenth Century Journal* 19, no. 3 (Autumn 1998): pp. 355-378.

Di Castro, Daniela, Anna Maria Pedrocchi, and Patricia Waddy. *Il Palazzo Pallavicini Rospigliosi e la Galleria Pallavicini*. Archivi de arte antica. Torino: Umberto Allemandi, 1999.

Cavazzini, Patrizia. "Artemisia and the Other Women in Agostino Tassi's Life: Attitudes to Women's Improper Sexual Behaviour in Seventeenth-Century Rome." In Judith W. Mann, ed. *Artemisia Gentileschi: Taking Stock* (Turnhout, Belgium: Brepols, 2005): pp. 39-50.

————. "Le milieu de Simon Vouet: les peintres à Rome entre l'Académie de Saint-Luc et les tribunaux romains de la première moitié du Seicento." In Olivier Bonfait et Hélène Rousteau-Chambon, eds. *Simon Vouet en Italie* (Rennes: Presses universitaires de Rennes; Paris: Institut national d'histoire de l'art, 2011): pp. 137-149.

Chaline, Olivier. “The Valois and Bourbon Courts c. 1515-1750.” In John Adamson, ed. *The Princely Courts of Europe: Ritual, Politics and Culture Under the Ancien* Régime *1500-1750* (London: Weidenfeld & Nicolson, 1999): pp. 67-94.

Chambers, David and Jane Martineau, eds. *Splendours of the Gonzaga*. London: The Museum, 1981. Exh. cat., Victoria & Albert Museum.

Chapman, H. Perry. “Rembrandt and Caravaggio: Emulation without Imitation.” In Lorenzo Pericolo and David M. Stone, eds. *Caravaggio: Reflections and Refractions* (Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2014): pp. 273-300.

Chatelain, Jean-Marc, and Delphine Denis. “*L’Astrée* d’Honoré d’Urfé: Fortune et Vicissitudes d’un *Best-Seller* au XVII^{e} Siècle.” *Revue d’Histoire littéraire de la France* 117, no. 4 (Octobre-Décembre 2017): pp. 783-796.

Chmielewski, Filip. “‘The Judgment of Midas’ from the Lublin Province Museum: an early work by Gerrit van Honthorst?” *Rocznik Muzeum Narodowego w Warszawie* 37 (2012): 182-188.

Chorpenning, Joseph F. “The Enigma of St. Joseph in Poussin’s Holy Family on the Steps.” *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes* 60 (1997): pp. 276-281.

Chrisman, Miriam Usher. *Conflicting Visions of Reform: German Lay Propaganda Pamphlets, 1519-1530*. Studies in German Histories. Atlantic Highlands, NJ: Humanities Press, 1996.

Christiansen, Keith, Judith Walker Mann, et al. *Orazio and Artemisia Gentileschi*. New York: Metropolitan Museum of Art; New Haven: Yale University Press, 2001. Exh. cat. Rome, Palazzo di Venezia; Metropolitan Museum of Art; and St. Louis Art Museum.

Ciammitti, Luisa, Steven F. Ostrow, and Salvatore Settis, eds. *Dosso’s Fate: Painting and Court Culture in Renaissance Italy*. Los Angeles: Getty Research Institute for the History of Art and the Humanities, 1998.

Clark, Kenneth. *Rembrandt and the Italian Renaissance*. New York: New York University Press, 1966.

Cody, Steven J. “Rubens and the ‘Smell of Stone’: The Translation of the Antique and the Emulation of Michelangelo.” *Arion* 20, no. 3 (Winter 2013): pp. 39-55.

Cogswell, Thomas. *The Blessed Revolution: English Politics and the Coming of War, 1621-1624*. Cambridge, New York: Cambridge University Press, 1989.

————. "Phaeton's chariot: the parliament-men and the continental crisis in 1621." In J. F. Merritt, ed., *The Political World of Thomas Wentworth, Earl of Strafford, 1621-1641* (Cambridge, New York: Cambridge University Press, 1996): pp. 24-46.

Cole, Alison. *Italian Renaissance Courts: Art, Pleasure and Power*. London: Laurence King Publishing, 2016.

Cook, Ann Jennalie. *Making a Match: Courtship in Shakespeare and His Society*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1991.

Coolidge, Grace E. "Investing in the Lineage: Children in the Early Modern Spanish Nobility, 1350-1750." In Grace E. Coolidge, ed. *The Formation of the Child in Early Modern Spain* (Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2014): pp. 223-248.

Corns, Thomas N., ed. *The Royal Image: Representations of Charles I*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 1999.

Cowan, Brian. "Art and Connoisseurship in the Auction Market of Later Seventeenth-Century London." In Neil De Marchi and Hans J. Van Miegroet, eds. *Mapping Markets for Paintings in Europe, 1450-1750* (Turnhout, Belgium: Brepols, 2006): 263-284.

Crépin-Leblond, and Vincent Droguet. *Le roi et l'artiste: François Ier et Rosso Fiorentino*. Paris: Éditions de la RMN-Grand Palais, 2013. Exh. cat., Château de Fontainebleau.

Crinò, Anna Maria, and Benedict Nicolson. "Further Documents Relating to Orazio Gnetileschi." *The Burlington Magazine* 103, no. 697 (April 1961): pp. 144-145.

Cristóbal, Vicente. "Ovid in medieval Spain." In James G. Clark, et al. *Ovid in the Middle Ages* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011): pp. 231-256.

Cropper, Elizabeth and Charles Dempsey. *Nicolas Poussin: Friendship and the Love of Painting*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1996.

Cruickshanks, Eveline. *The Stuart Courts*. Stroud: Sutton, 2000.

Cumming, Valerie. "'Great vanity and excesse in Apparell'. Some Clothing and Furs of Tudor and Stuart Royalty." In Arthur MacGregor, ed. *The Late King's Goods: Collections, Possessions, and Patronage of Charles I in the Light of the Commonwealth Sale Inventories*. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1989): pp. 322-50.

————. *Royal Dress: The Image and the Reality, 1580 to the Present Day*. New York: Holmes & Meier, 1989.

Cunnington, C. Willett. *Handbook of English Costume in the Seventeenth Century*. Boston: Plays, Inc., 1972.

Curran, Kevin. "James I and fictional authority at the Palatine wedding celebrations." *Renaissance Studies* 20, no. 1 (February 2006): pp. 51-67.

Cust, Lionel. "Notes on Picutres in the Royal Collections-XVIII. On Some Portraits Attributed to Antonio Moro and on a Life of the Painter by Henri Hymans." *The Burlington Magazine for Connoisseurs* 18, no. 91 (October 1910): pp. 2, 5-7, 10-12.

Cust, Lionel and Mary L. Cox. "Notes on the Collections Formed by Thomas Howard, Earl of Arundel and Surrey, K. G." *The Burlington Magazine for Connoisseurs* 19, no. 101 (August 1911): pp. 278-286.

Cust, Richard. *Charles I: A Political Life*. Harlow, U.K.: Pearson Longman, 2005.

Daye, Anne. "Torchbearers in the English Masque." *Early Music* 26, no. 2 (May 1998): pp. 246-250, 253-262.

Dekker, Jeroen, Leendert Groenendijk, and Johan Verberckmoes. "Proudly Raising Vulnerable Youngsters: The Scope for Education in the Netherlands." In Jan Baptist Bedaux & Rudi Ekkart, eds. *Pride and Joy: Children's Portraits in the Netherlands 1500-1700* (Ghent, Amsterdam: Ludion Press, 2000. Exh. cat., Frans Halsmuseum, Haarlem and Koninklijk Museum voor Schone Kunsten, Antwerp.): pp. 43-60.

Delen, Marie-Ange, and Rachel Esner, trans. "The Genesis of the Court at The Hague." In Marika Keblusek and Jori Zijlmans, eds. *Princely Display: The Court of Frederik Hendrik of Orange and Amalia van Solms* (Zwolle: Waanders, 1997. Exh. cat., Historical Museum, The Hague.): pp. 18-29.

Dempsey, Charles. "Euanthes Redivivus: Rubens's Prometheus Bound." *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes* 30 (1967): pp. 420-425.

Desprechins, Anne. “Images de ‘L’Astrée’: Étude de la reception du texte à travers les tapisseries.” *Revue d’Histoire littéraire de la France* 81, no. 3 (May-June 1981): pp. 355-366.

Dickerman, Edmund H., and Anita M. Walker. “The Choice of Hercules: Henry IV as Hero.” *The Historical Journal* 39, no. 2 (June 1996): pp. 315-337.

Dickerson III, C. D., and Esther Bell, eds. *The Brothers Le Nain: Painters of Seventeenth-Century France.* San Francisco: Fine Arts Museums of San Francisco; New Haven: Yale University Press, 2016. Exh. cat. Kimbell Art Museum, Fort Worth and Fine Arts Museums of San Francisco.

Dickey, Stephanie and Herman Roodenburg, eds. *The Passions in the Arts of the Early Modern Netherlands*. *Nederlands kunsthistorisch jaarboek* 60. Zwolle: Waander Uitgeverij, 2010.

Donovan, Fiona. *Rubens and England*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2004.

Downes, Kerry. “Rubens’s Prices.” *The Burlington Magazine* 125, no. 963 (June 1983): p. 362.

Doyle, Daniel R. “The Sinews of Habsburg Governance in the Sixteenth Century: Mary of Hungary and Political Patronage.” *The Sixteenth Century Journal* 31, no. 2 (Summer 2000): pp. 349-360.

Dunn-Hensley, Susan. *Anna of Denmark and Henrietta maria: Virgins, Witches, and Catholic Queens*. Cham, Switzerland: Palgrave Macmillan, 2017.

Duverger, Erik. “Bronnen voor de geschiedenis van de artistieke betrekkingen tussen Antwerpen en de Noordelijke Nederlanden tussen 1632 en 1648.” In *Miscellanea Jozef Duverger. Bijdragen tot de kunstgeschiedenis der Nederlanden*, Vol. 1 (Ghent, 1968): pp. 336-373.

Van Eck, Xander. “Review: Dutch Classicism in Seventeenth-Century Painting by A. Blankert.” *Simiolus: Netherlands Quarterly for the History of Art* 28, no. 1/2 (2000-2001): pp. 75-79.

Edmunds, Martha Mel Stumberg. *Piety and Politics: Imaging Divine Kingship in Louis XIV’s Chapel at Versailles*. Newark, DE: University of Delaware Press; London: Associate University Presses, 2002.

Edmundson, George. *Anglo-Dutch Rivalry During the First Half of the Seventeenth Century*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1911.

Eichberger, Dagmar and Philippe Lorentz. "Sophisticated Courtier or skilled Artisan? Re-assessing modern notions of the artist in the late Middle Ages and the Early Modern Period." In Dagmar Eichberger, Philippe Lorentz, and Andreas Tacke, eds. *The Artist Between Court and City (1300-1600)* (Petersberg: Michael Imhof Verlag, 2017): pp. 14-23.

Van Eikema Hommes, Margriet. "The contours in the paintings of the Oranjezaal, Huis ten Bosch." In Marieke van den Doel and Natasja van Eck, eds., *The learned eye* (2005): pp. 59-84.

Van Eikema Hommes, Margriet, and Ernst van de Wetering. "Light and Colour in Caravaggio and Rembrandt, as seen through the eyes of their contemporaries." In Duncan Bull, et al. *Rembrandt, Caravaggio* (Zwolle: Waanders, 2006. Exh. cat., Rijksmuseum Amsterdam and the Van Gogh Museum.): pp. 164-179.

Ekkart, Rudi, ed., et al. *De Oranjezaal: catalogue en documentatie*. The Hague: RKD Monographs, 2015. <http://oranjezaal.rkdmonographs.nl/verantwoording-1> (Accessed 2 March 2019).

————. *Dutch Portraits: The Age of Rembrandt and Frans Hals*. Zwolle: Waanders, 2007. Exh. cat., National Gallery, London, and "Hollanders in beeld: Portretten uit de Gouden Eeuw," Mauritshuis, The Hague.

Ekserdjian, David. "Charles I and the Italian Renaissance." In Desmond Shawe-Taylor, et al. *Charles I: King and Collector* (London: Royal Academy of Arts, 2018. Exh. cat.): pp. 100-123.

————. "Charles I and the Northern Renaissance." In Desmond Shawe-Taylor, et al. *Charles I: King and Collector* (London: Royal Academy of Arts, 2018. Exh. cat.): pp. 82-97.

————. *Wentworth-Fitzwilliam: An English Collection*. Lisbon: Calouste Gulbenkian Foundation, 2015. Exh. cat., Calouste Gulbenkian Museum.

Elliott, John. "A Troubled Relationship: Spain and Great Britain, 1604-1655." In Jonathan Brown and J.H. Elliott, eds. *The Sale of the Century: Artistic Relations Between Spain and Great Britain, 1604-1655* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2002. Exh. cat., Museo Nacional del Prado, Madrid.): pp. 17-38.

————. *Spain, Europe & the Wider World, 1500-1800*. New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2009.

Emmens, J. A. "A Seventeenth-Century Theory of Art: Nature and Practice." In Wayne E. Franits, ed. *Looking at Seventeenth-Century Dutch Art: Realism Reconsidered* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997): pp. 15-20.

————. "Natuur, onderwijzing en oefening. Bij een drieluik van Gerrit Dou." In Josua Bruyn et al., eds. *Album Discipulorum J. G. van Gelder* (Utrecht: Haentjens Dekker & Gumbert, 1963): pp. 125-136.

Erkelens, Wies. "Der statthalterliche Hof Friedrich Heinrichs und der Amalia von Solms." In Horst Lademacher, ed. *Onder den Oranje Boom: Dynastie in der Republik – das Haus Oranien-Nassau als Vermittler niederländischer Kultur in deutschen Territorien im 17. und 18. Jahrhundert* (Munich: Hirmer, 1999. Exh. cat., Kaiser-Wilhelm-Museum, Krefeld; Schloß Oranienburg, Berlin; and Paleis Het Loo, Apeldoorn): pp. 107-130.

Evans, Mark L. *Princes as Patrons: The Art Collections of the Princes of Wales from the Renaissance to the Present Day*. London: Merrell Holberton Publishers, 1998. Exh. cat., The National Museum & Gallery, Cardiff, Wales.

Fantoni, Marcello. *The Politics of Space: European Courts ca. 1500-1750*. Rome: Bulzoni Editore, 2009.

Farina, Viviana. *Giovan Carlo Doria: promotore delle arti a Genova nel primo Seicento*. Firenze: Edifir, 2002.

Feeley, Inger. "Goltzius and the Netherlandish Interest in Classical Art." In Glenn Harcourt, ed. *Hendrick Goltzius and the Classical Tradition* (Los Angeles, CA: Fisher Gallery, University of Southern California, 1992. Exh. cat.): pp. 32-35.

Feigenbaum, Gail. "Introduction: Art and Display in Principle and in Practice." In Feigenbaum and Francesco Freddolini, eds. *Display of Art in the Roman Palace, 1550-1750* (Los Angeles: The Getty Research Institute, 2014): pp. 1-24.

Feros, Antonio. *Kingship and Favoritism in the Spain of Philip III, 1598-1621*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 2000.

ffolliott, Sheila. "Artemisia Conquers Rhodes: Problems in the Representation of Female Heroics in the Age of Catherine de' Medici." In Katherine A. McIver

and Cynthia Stollhans, eds., *Patronage, Gender and the Arts in Early Modern Italy: Essays in Honor of Carolyn Valone* (New York: Italica Press, 2015): pp. 85-102.

————. "'La Florentine' or 'La bonne Françoise': Some Sixteenth-Century Commentators on Catherine de' Medici and Her Patronage." In Christina Strunck, ed., *Medici Women as Cultural Mediators (1533-1743)* (Milan: Milano Silvana, 2011. Conference proceedings.): pp. 17-37.

Filipczak, Zirka Zaremba. *Picturing Art in Antwerp, 1550-1700*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1987.

————. "Reflections on Motifs in Van Dyck's Portraits." In Arthur K. Wheelock, ed. *Van Dyck: Paintings* (Washington, DC: National Gallery of Art, 1991): 59-68. Exh. cat., the National Gallery of Art, Washington, DC.

Fleischer, Roland E. *Rembrandt, Rubens, and the Art of Their Time: Recent Perspectives*. University Park, PA: The Pennsylvania State University, 1997.

Fock, C. W. "The Princes of Orange as Patrons of Art in the Seventeenth Century." *Apollo* 110 (1979): pp. 466-475.

Foister, Susan. "Foreigners at court: Holbein, Van Dyck and the Painter-Stainers Company." In David Howarth, ed. *Art and Patronage in the Caroline Courts: Essays in Honour of Sir Oliver Millar* (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 1993): pp. 32-50.

Franits, Wayne E. "Laboratorium Utrecht: Baburen, Honthorst und Terbrugghen im künstlerischen Austausch." In Jochen Sander, Bastian Eclercy, and Gabriel Dette, eds., *Caravaggio in Holland* (2009): 37-53.

————. *Looking at Seventeenth-Century Dutch Art: Realism Reconsidered*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1997.

Franklin, David and Sebastian Schütze, eds. *Caravaggio and His Followers in Rome*. New Haven & London: Yale University Press, 2011. Exh. cat., National Gallery of Canada and the Kimbell Art Museum, Fort Worth.

Fraschetti, Stanislao. *Il Bernini, la sua vita, la sua opera, il suo tempo*. Milan: U. Hoepli, 1900.

Fredericksen, Burton B. "E Cosi Desio Me Mena." *The J. Paul Getty Museum Journal* 10 (1982): pp. 21-38.

Fuhring, Peter. “Jacob Matham’s ‘Verscheijden cierage’: An Early Seventeenth-Century Model Book of Etchings after the Antique.” *Simiolus: Netherlands Quarterly for the History of Art* 21, no. 1/2 (1992): pp. 57-84.

Fujikawa, Mayu. “Pope Paul V’s global design: the fresco cycle in the Quirinal Palace.” *Renaissance Studies* 30, no. 2 (April 2016): pp. 192-217.

Fumaroli, Marc, and Paul J. Young, trans. “Classicism and the Baroque: The *Imago primi saeculi* and its Detractors.” In John W. O’Malley and Michael C. J. Putnam, eds. *Art, Controversy, and the Jesuits: The* Imago primi saeculi *(1640)* (Philadelphia: Saint Joseph’s University Press, 2015): pp. 57-88.

Gaethgens, B. “L’*Artemise* de Gérard van Honthorst ou les deux corps de la reine.” *Revue de l’Art* 109, no. 3 (1995): pp. 13-25.

Gage, Frances. *Painting as Medicine in Early Modern Rome: Giulio Mancini and the Efficacy of Art*. University Park, PA: The Pennsylvania State University Press, 2016.

Gajda, Alexandra. *The Earl of Essex and Late Elizabethan Political Culture*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press, 2012.

Gardiner, Samuel Rawson. *History of England from the Accession of James I to the Outbreak of the Civil War, 1603-1642*. 10 vols. London: Longmans, Green, 1904-09.

Gash, John. “Caravaggio and his Followers, Rome, Florence, and London.” *The Burlington Magazine* 152, no. 1290 (September 2010): pp. 632-635.

Gatteaux, Édouard, and Victor Baltard. *Galerie de la Reine, dite de Diane, à Fontainebleau, peinte par Ambroise Dubois en MDC sous le règne de Henri IV*. Paris: E. Gatteaux, V. Baltard, 1858.

Van Gelder, Hendrik Enno. “Constantijn Huygens en de schilders van zijn tijd.” *(Pen en penseel, Bijzonder nummer van) Critisch Bulletin* (1947): pp. 205-211.

————. “Haagsche kunstverzamelingen voor 1900.” *Jaarboek Die Haghe* (1942): pp. 1-36.

————. “Iets over Barthold van Bassen, ook als bouwmeester van het Koningshuis te Rhenen.” *Bulletin van den Nederlandschen Oudheidkundigen Bond* Year 4, series 2, no. 5 (1911): pp. 234-240.

Van Gelder, Jan Gerrit. “Antonie van Dyck in Holland in de zeventiende eeuw.” *Bulletin Musées Royaux des Beaux-Arts de Belgique* no. 1-2 (1959): pp. 43-86.

————. “Pastor Fido-voorstellingen in de Nederlandse kunst van de zeventiende eeuw.” *Oud Holland* 92 (1978): pp. 227-259.

————. “Rubens in Holland in de zeventiende eeuw.” *Nederlandsch Kunsthistorisch Jaarboek* 3 (1950-1951): pp. 103-150.

————. “De schilders van de Oranjezaal.” *Nederlands Kunsthistorisch Jaarboek* (1948/49): pp. 118-164.

————. “De waardering van Rubens, een terugblik.” *Tijdschrift der stad Antwerpen* 23 (1977): pp. 179-197.

Van Gelder, Jan Gerrit and Ingrid Jost, and Keith Andrews, ed. *Jan de Bisschop and his Icones & Paradigmata: Classical Antiquities and Italian Drawings for Artistic Instruction in Seventeenth-Century Holland*. 2 vols. Doornspijk, Netherlands: Davaco, 1985.

Gent, Lucy. “Introduction.” In Lucy Gent, ed. *Albion’s Classicism: The Visual Arts in Britain, 1550-1660*. *Studies in British Art* 2 (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1995): pp. 1-18.

Georgievska-Shine, Aneta. “From Ovid’s Cecrops to Rubens’s City of God in ‘The Finding of Erichthonius.” *The Art Bulletin* 86, no. 1 (March 2004): pp. 58-74.

————. *Rubens and the Archaeology of Myth, 1610-1620: Visual and Poetic Memory*. Burlington, VT: Ashgate Pub. Co., 2009.

Georgievska-Shine, Aneta, and Larry Silver. *Rubens, Velázquez, and the King of Spain*. Burlington, VT: Ashgate Publishing Company, 2014.

Gerson, Horst. “Die Ausstellung Caravaggio und die Niederlande.” *Kunstchronik* 5 (1952): pp. 287-293.

Giavarini, Laurence. “L’Astrée, 1619: La ‘justice’ de Louis XIII et les ‘lois’ de la pastorale.” *Dix-septième siècle* 276, no. 3 (2017): pp. 539-556.

Ginzel, Christof. *Poetry, Politics and Promises of Empire: Prophetic Rhetoric in the English and Neo-Latin Epithalamia on the Occasion of the Palatine Marriage in 1613*. Göttingen: V&R Unipress, 2009.

Goldfarb, Hilliard T. *Rubens and Titian: Power, Politics, and Style*. Boston: Isabella Stewart Gardner Museum, 1998. Exh. cat.

Gordon, Pamela. "The Duke of Buckingham and van Dyck's 'Continence of Scipio'." In National Gallery of Canada, *Essays on Van Dyck* (Ottowa: National Gallery of Canada, 1983. Conference proceedings.): pp. 53-55.

Gosman, Martin. "Princely Culture: Friendship or Patronage?" In Martin Gosman, A. A. MacDonald, and Arie Johan Vanderjagt. *Princes and Princely Culture, 1450-1650* (Leiden: Brill, 2003): pp. 1-29.

Gouk, Penelope. "Horological, Mathematical and Musical Instruments. Science and Music at the Court of Charles I." In Arthur MacGregor, ed. *The Late King's Goods: Collections, Possessions, and Patronage of Charles I in the Light of the Commonwealth Sale Inventories*. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1989): pp. 387-402.

Goulding, Rupert, and David A.H.B. Taylor, eds. *Prized Possessions: Dutch Paintings from national Trust Houses*. London: National Trust: In association with Paul Holberton Publishing, 2018. Exh. cat., The Holburne Museum, Bath, the Royal Picture Gallery Mauritshuis, The Hague, and Petworth House, West Sussex.

Green, Mary Anne Everett. *Elizabeth: Electress Palatine and Queen of Bohemia*. 2nd ed. London: Methuen & Co., 1909.

Gregg, Pauline. *King Charles I*. London: J.M. Dent & Sons Ltd., 1981.

Gregorio, Laurence A. *The Pastoral Masquerade: Disguise and Identity in* L'Astrée. Stanford French and Italian Studies, v. 73. Saratoga, CA: Anma Libri, 1992.

Grell, Ole Peter. "Merchants and Ministers: The Foundations of International Calvinism." In Andrew Petegree, Alastair Duke, and Gillian Lewis, eds. *Calvinism in Europe, 1540-1620* (Cambridge, New York: Cambridge University Press, 1994): pp. 254-273.

Grierson, Herbert J.C. *The poems of John Donne. Edited from the old editions and numerous manuscripts with introductions & commentary*. 2 vols. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1912.

Griffey, Erin. "A brief description: the language of Stuart inventories." *Studi di Memofonte* 12 (2014): pp. 3-21.

————. *Henrietta Maria: Piety, Politics and Patronage*. Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2008.

————. *On Display: Henrietta Maria and the Materials of Magnificence at the Stuart Court*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2015.

Groenveld, Simon and Michael J. Wintle, eds. *State and Trade: Government and the Economy in Britain and the Netherlands Since the Middle Ages*. Zutphen: Walburg Pers, 1992.

Groenveld, Simon. *De winterkoning: balling aan het Haagse hof*. The Hague: Hague Historical Museum, 2003. Exh. cat.

————. "Frederik Hendrik en de Stuarts, 1640-1647. Herziening van de opvattingen van Pieter Geyl." *Oranje-Nassau Museum Jaarboek* (1987): pp. 7-28.

Groeneweg, Irene, Michèle Hendricks, trans., and Ingrid Grunnhill, ed. "Court and City: Dress in the Age of Frederik Hendrik and Amalia." In Marika Keblusek and Jori Zijlmans, eds. *Princely Display: The Court of Frederik Hendrik of Orange and Amalia van Solms* (Zwolle: Waanders, 1997. Exh. cat., Historical Museum, The Hague.): pp. 201-218.

Gudlaugsson, Sturla J. "Representations of Granida in Dutch Seventeenth-Century Painting: I." *The Burlington Magazine* 90 (1948-1949): pp. 226-230.

Guilding, Ruth. *Owning the Past: Why the English Collected Antique Sculpture, 1640-1840*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2014.

Hahn, Cynthia. "Vision." In Conrad Rudolph, ed. *A Companion to Medieval Art: Romanesque and Gothic in Northern Europe* (Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell, 2010): pp. 44-64.

Hammer, Paul E. J. *The Polarisation of Elizabethan Politics: The Political Career of Robert Devereux, 2nd Earl of Essex, 1585-1597*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 1999.

Harris, Carolyn. *Queenship and Revolution in Early Modern Europe: Henrietta Maria and Marie Antoinette*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2015.

Harris, John. "Inigo Jones and the Mystery of Heidelberg Castle: The Architects of the Englischer-Bau." *Apollo* 137, no. 373 (March 1993): pp. 147-152.

————. "The Link between a Roman Second Century Sculptor, Van Dyck, Inigo Jones and Queen Henrietta Maria." *The Burlington Magazine* 115, no. 845 (August 1973): pp. 526-530.

Hart, F. Elizabeth. "'Great is Diana' of Shakespeare's Ephesus." *Studies in English Literature, 1500-1900* 43, no. 2: Tudor and Stuart Drama (Spring 2003): pp. 347-374.

Hart, Vaughan. *Art and Magic in the Court of the Stuarts*. London, New York: Routledge, 1994.

Hart, Vaughan. *Inigo Jones: The Architect of Kings*. New Haven and London: Yale University Press for The Paul Mellon Centre for Studies in British Art, 2011.

Haskell, Francis and Nicholas Penny. *Taste and the Antique: The Lure of Classical Sculpture, 1500-1900*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1981.

Haskell, Francis. "Charles I's Collection of Pictures." In Arthur MacGregor, ed. *The Late King's Goods: Collections, Possessions, and Patronage of Charles I in the Light of the Commonwealth Sale Inventories*. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1989): pp. 203-31.

————. *The King's Pictures: The Formation and Dispersal of the Collections of Charles I and his Courtiers*. New Haven: Published for the Paul Mellon Centre for Studies in British Art by Yale University Press, 2013.

Haverkamp-Begemann, Egbert. *Rembrandt:* The Nightwatch. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1982.

Havran, Martin J. *Caroline Courtier: The Life of Lord Cottington*. Columbia, SC: University of South Carolina Press, 1973.

Hayes, Denys Eyre Lankester. *The Arundel Marbles*. Oxford: University of Oxford, Ashmolean Museum, 1975.

Heal, Felicity. *The Power of Gifts: Gift Exchange in Early Modern England*. Corby: Oxford University Press, 2014.

Hearn, Karen. "Insiders or outsiders? Overseas-born artists at the Jacobean court." In Randolph Vigne and Charles Littleton, eds. *From Strangers to Citizens: The Integration of Immigrant Communities in Britain, Ireland, and Colonial America, 1550-1750* (London: Huguenot Society of Great Britain and Ireland, 2001): pp. 117-126.

————. *Dynasties: Painting in Tudor and Jacobean England 1530-1630*. London: Tate Publishing, 1995. Exh. cat. Tate Britain, London.

————. "Van Dyck in Britain." In Karen Hearn et al. *Van Dyck & Britain* (London: Tate Publications, 2009. Exh. cat., Tate Britain): pp. 11-13.

Hecht, Peter. "Dutch Painters in England: Readings in Houbraken, Weyerman, and Van Gool." In Simon Groenveld and Michael J. Wintle, eds. *The Exchange of Ideas: Religion, Scholarship, and Art in Anglo-Dutch Relations in the Seventeenth Century* (Zutphen: Walburg Instituut, 1994): pp. 150-162.

Held, Julius S. *Rubens: Selected Drawings*. Oxford: Phaidon, 1986.

Hellein, Tanya Mary Claudine. *The Many Faces of the Winter Queen*. MA Thesis, Courtauld Institute of Art, 1998.

Helmus, Liesbeth M., et al. *The Bloemaert Effect: Colour and Composition in the Golden Age*. Petersberg, Germany: Michael Imhof Verlag, 2011. Exh. cat., Centraal Museum, Utrecht and Staatliches Museum Schwerin.

Helmus, Liesbeth M. "The Utrecht Caravaggisti: Imitation and Improvement." In Bernd Ebert and Liesbeth M. Helmus, eds. *Utrecht, Caravaggio and Europe* (München: Hirmer Verlag GmbH, 2018. Exh. cat. Centraal Museum, Alte Pinakothek Munich.): pp. 51-64.

————. "The Dutchness of Utrecht Caravaggism." In Helmus and Volker Manuth, eds. *Utrecht et le Mouvement Caravagesque International* (Paris: Paris Tableau, 2015): pp. 30-33.

Hemmer, Marloes W. "Artistic transmission in the Low Countries: De Grebber's creative imitation of Rubens." *De Zeventiende Eeuw* 31, no. 1 (2015): pp. 191-210.

Hepp, Frieder. "»Deß gewesten Pfaltzgrafen Glück und Unglück« Aufstieg und Fall des »Winterkönigs« im Spiegel der zeitgenössischen Flugblattpublizistik." In Annette Frese, Frieder Hepp, and Renate Ludwig, eds., *Der Winterkönig: Heidelberg zwischen höfischer Pracht und Dreißigjährigem Krieg* (Remshalden: B.A. Greiner, 2004): pp. 39-52.

Hibbard, Howard. "Scipione Borghese's Garden Palace on the Quirinal." *Journal of the Society of Architectural Historians* 23, no. 4 (December 1964): pp. 163-192.

Hickson, Sally. "'Pretty Maids All in a Row': Some Thoughts on Collections of Female 'Beauties' in the Renaissance." In Leslie Boldt-Irons, Corrado Federici, and Ernesto Virgulti, eds. *Beauty and the Abject: Interdisciplinary Perspectives* (New York: Peter Lang, 2007): pp. 117-130.

Hill, Robert. "Ambassadors and art collecting in early Stuart Britain: The parallel careers of William Trumbull and Sir Dudley Carleton, 1609-1625." *Journal of the History of Collections* 15, no. 2 (2003): pp. 211-228.

————. "Sir Dudley Carleton and his Relations with Dutch Artists 1616-1632." *Leids kunsthistorisch jaarboek* 13 (2003): pp. 255-274.

Hille, Christiane. *Visions of the Courtly Body: The Patronage of George Villiers, First Duke of Buckingham, and the Triumph of Painting at the Stuart Court*. Berlin: Akademie, 2012.

Hitchmough, Wendy. "Queenship and the Currency of Arts Patronage as Propagnada at the Early Stuart Court." In Caroline Dunn and Elizabeth Donnelly Carney, eds. *Royal Women and Dynastic Loyalty* (Cham, Switzerland: Palgrave Macmillan, 2018): pp. 139-149.

Hoffman, Martha K. "Childhood and Royalty at the Court of Philip III." In Grace E. Coolidge, ed. *The Formation of the Child in Early Modern Spain* (Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2014): pp. 123-142.

————. *Raised to Rule: Educating Royalty at the Court of the Spanish Habsburgs, 1601-1634*. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 2011.

Hofstede, Justus Müller. "Artificial light in Honthorst and Terbrugghen: form and iconography." In Rüdiger Klessman, *Hendrick ter Brugghen und die Nachfolger Caravaggios in Holland* (1988): 13-44.

Holly, Michael Ann. *Past Looking: Historical Imagination and the Rhetoric of the Image*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1996.

Hoogewerff, G. J. *Gerrit van Honthorst: Twenty-Eight Reproductions with Text and Catalogue*. The Hague: G. Naeff, 1924.

Hoogsteder, Willem Jan. "Die Gemäldesammlung von Friedrich V. und Elizabeth im Köningshaus in Rhenen/Niederlande." In Peter Wolf, et al, eds., *Der Winterkönig Friedrich V: Der Letzte Kurfürst aus der Oberen Pfalz*

(Augsburg: Haus der Bayerischen Geschichte, 2003. Exh. cat., Bayerischen Landesausstellung, Stadtmuseum, Amberg.): pp. 188-206.

————. *De schilderijen van Frederik en Elizabeth, Koning en Koningin van Bohemen*. 3 vols. MA Thesis, Utrecht/London: Kunsthistorisch Instituut der Rijks Universiteit te Utrecht, 1984-1986.

Horowitz, Louise K. "Pastoral Parenting: L'Astrée." *Studies in the History of Art* 36, Symposium Papers XX: The Pastoral Landscape (1992): pp. 128-135.

Howarth, David. "The Arrival of Van Dyck in England." *The Burlington Magazine* 132, no. 1051 (October 1990): pp. 709-710.

————. "The Arundel Collection: Collecting and Patronage in England in the Reigns of Philip III and Philip IV." In Jonathan Brown and J.H. Elliott, eds. *The Sale of the Century: Artistic Relations Between Spain and Great Britain, 1604-1655* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2002. Exh. cat., Museo Nacional del Prado, Madrid.): pp. 69-86.

————. "Charles I, Sculpture, and Sculptors." In Arthur MacGregor, ed. *The Late King's Goods: Collections, Possessions, and Patronage of Charles I in the Light of the Commonwealth Sale Inventories*. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1989): pp. 73-113.

————. *Images of Rule: Art and Politics in the English Renaissance, 1485-1649*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1997.

————. *Lord Arundel and His Circle*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1985.

————. "'Mantua Peeces': Charles I and the Gonzaga Collections." In David Chambers and Jane Martineau, eds. *Splendours of the Gonzaga* (London: Victoria and Albert Museum, 1981. Exh. cat.): pp. 95-100.

Hubach, Hanns. "Tales from the Tapestry Collection of Elector Palatine Frederick V and Elizabeth Stuart, the Winter King and Queen." In Thomas P. Campbell, ed. *Tapestry in the Baroque: New Aspects of Production and Patronage* (New York: Metropolitan Museum of Art, 2010. Conference proceedings.): pp. 104-133.

Huemer, Frances. *Portraits Painted in Foreign Countries*. *Corpus rubenianum Ludwig Burchard* vol. XIX, 1. Brussels: Arcade Press, 1977.

————. *Rubens and the Roman Circle: Studies of the First Decade*. New York: Garland Pub., 1996.

Huerta, Robert D. *Vermeer and Plato: Painting the Ideal*. Lewisburg: Bucknell University Press, 2005.

Huisken, Jacobine E., Koen Ottenheym, and Gary Schwartz, eds. *Jacob van Campen: Het Klassieke Ideaal in de Gouden Eeuw*. Amsterdam: Architectura & Natura Pers,
1995. Exh. cat., Koninklijk Paleis te Amsterdam.

Hume, Martin A. S. *The Court of Philip IV: Spain in Decadence*. London: Eveleigh Nash and Grayson, 1928.

Impey, O. R. *The Origins of Museums: The Cabinet of Curiosities in Sixteenth and Seventeenth-Century Europe*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1985.

Jaffé, Michael. *Rubens and Italy*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1977.

————. "Van Dyck's 'Venus and Adonis'." *The Burlington Magazine* 132, no. 1051 (October 1990): pp. 696-703.

Jansen, Anita. "Atelier en aterlierpraktijken aan de Oude Delft." In Anita Jansen, ed. *De Portretfabriek van Michiel van Mierevelt (1566-1641)* (Delft: Museum Het Prinsenhof; W Books, 2011. Exh. cat.): pp. 41-64.

Janson, H. W. "The Birth of 'Artistic License': The Dissatisfied Patron in the Early Renaissance." In Guy Fitch Lytle and Stephen Orgel, eds. *Patronage in the Renaissance* (Princeton: Princeton University Press. 1981): pp. 344-353.

Janssen, Geert H. *Princely Power in the Dutch Republic: Patronage and William Frederick of Nassau (1613-64)*. Manchester, UK and New York: Manchester University Press, 2008.

Jannsen, Paul Huys. *Jan van Bijlert, 1597/98-1671: Catalogue Raisonné*. OCULI: Studies in the Arts of the Low Countries, Vol. 7. Amsterdam; Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 1998.

Jardine, Lisa. *Going Dutch: How England Plundered Holland's Glory*. New York: Harper, 2008.

————. "Towards Reading Albion's Classicism: An Exchange of Gifts between Northern Classical Scholars." In Lucy Gent, ed. *Albion's Classicism: The*

Visual Arts in Britain, 1550-1660. *Studies in British Art* 2 (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1995): pp. 19-28.

Jenkins, Catherine. "Michelangelo at Fontainebleau." *Print Quarterly* 28, no. 3 (September 2011): pp. 261-265.

Jenkins, Ian, and Adriano Aymonino. "Ideal Beauty and the *Canon* in Classical Antiquity." In Adriano Aymonino, et al. *Drawn from the Antique: Artists and the Classical Ideal* (London: Sir John Soane's Museum, 2015. Exh. cat., Teylers Museum, Haarlem, Sir John Soane's Museum, London): pp. 11-14.

Jervis, Simon. "'Shadows, not substantial things'. Furniture in the Commonwealth Inventories." In Arthur MacGregor, ed. *The Late King's Goods: Collections, Possessions, and Patronage of Charles I in the Light of the Commonwealth Sale Inventories*. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1989): pp. 277-306.

Joby, Christopher. *The Dutch Language in Britain (1550-1702): A Social History of the Use of Dutch in Early Modern Britain*. Boston: Brill, 2015.

Johannesson, Kurt. "The Portrait of the Prince as a Rhetorical Genre." In Allan Ellenius, ed. *Iconography, Propaganda, and Legitimation* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998): pp. 11-36.

Johnson, Geraldine A. "Pictures Fit for a Queen: Peter Paul Rubens and the Marie de' Medici Cycle." *Art History* 16, no. 3 (September 1993): pp. 447-469.

Jones, Susan C., Sheila ffolliott, C. Adelson. *Images of a Queen's Power: the Artemisia Tapestries*. Minneapolis: Minneapolis Institute of Arts, 1993. Exh. cat.

De Jongh, Eddy. "Erotica in Vogelperspectief: De Dubbelzinnigheid van een Reeks 17de eeuwse Genrevoorstellingen." *Simiolus: Netherlands Quarterly for the History of Art* 3, no. 1 (1968-69): pp. 22-74.

Jowell, Frances Suzman. "Thoré-Bürger and the Revival of Frans Hals." *The Art Bulletin* 56, no. 1 (March 1974): pp. 101-117.

————. "Vermeer and Thoré-Bürger: Recoveries of Reputation." *Studies in the History of Art* 55, Symposium Papers XXXIII: Vermeer Studies (1998): pp. 35-57.

Judson, Richard J. "A new Gerrit van Honthorst: Christ crowned with thorns." *Nationalmuseum Bulletin* 17, no. 2 (1993): pp. 42-48.

————. "A new Honthorst Allegory: can this be love?" In Cynthia P. Schneider ed., *Shop Talk: Studies in Honor of Seymour Slive* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Art Museums, 1995): pp. 128-129.

————. *Gerrit van Honthorst: A Discussion of his Position in Dutch Art*. The Hague: Nijhoff, 1959.

————. "Hamburg's 'Solon before Croesus' by Honthorst." *Jahrbuch der Hamburger Kunstsammlungen* 4 (1959): pp. 51-60.

————. "New Light on Honthorst." In Rüdiger Klessman ed., *Hendrick ter Brugghen und die Nachfolger Caravaggios in Holland* (1988): pp. 111-120.

Judson, Richard J. and Rudolf E.O. Ekkart. *Gerrit van Honthorst, 1592-1656*. Doornspijk, The Netherlands: Davaco, 1999.

Kauffmann, Hans. "Der Manierismus in Holland und die Schule von Fontainebleau." *Jahrbuch der Preuszischen Kunstsammlungen* 44 (1923): pp. 184-204.

Kaufmann, Thomas DaCosta. *The Mastery of Nature: Aspects of Art, Science, and Humanism in the Renaissance*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1993.

Keblusek, Marika, and John Rudge, trans. "Books at the Stadholder's Court." In Marika Keblusek and Jori Zijlmans, eds. *Princely Display: The Court of Frederik Hendrik of Orange and Amalia van Solms* (Zwolle: Waanders, 1997. Exh. cat., Historical Museum, The Hague.): pp. 143-160.

Keblusek, Marika, and Michèle Hendricks, trans. "The Bohemian Court at The Hague." In Marika Keblusek and Jori Zijlmans, eds. *Princely Display: The Court of Frederik Hendrik of Orange and Amalia van Solms* (Zwolle: Waanders, 1997. Exh. cat., Historical Museum, The Hague.): pp. 47-57.

Keblusek, Marika. "Celebrating a Union: The Festive Entry of Friedrich, Elector Palatine, and Princess Elizabeth in the Netherlands." In Sara Smart and Mara R. Wade, eds. *The Palatine Wedding of 1613: Protestant Alliance and Court Festival* (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz in Kommission, 2013): pp. 391-410.

————. "Cultural and Political Brokerage in Seventeenth-Century England: the Case of Balthazar Gerbier." *Leids Kunsthistorisch Jaarboek* 13 (2003): pp. 73-84.

————. "The Embassy of Art: Diplomats as Cultural Brokers." In Marika Keblusek and Badelock Vera Noldus, eds. *Double Agents: Cultural and Political Brokerage in Early Modern Europe*. Studies in Medieval and Reformation Traditions, Volume 154 (Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2011): pp. 11-26.

————. "Entertainment in Exile: Theatrical Performances at the Courts of Margaret Cavendish, Mary Stuart and Elizabeth of Bohemia." In Peter Davidson and Jill Bepler, eds., *The Triumphs of the Defeated: Early Modern Festivals and Messages of Legitimacy*, Wolfenbütteler Forschungen, Band 116 (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz in Kommission, 2007): pp. 172-190.

————. "Playing by the rules: The Hague Courts and the *Acteonisation du Grand Veneur d'Hollande* (1643)." *De Zeventiende Eeuw* 32 (2016): pp. 235-250.

————. "The Pretext of Pictures: Artists as Cultural and Political Agents." In Marika Keblusek and Badelock Vera Noldus, eds. *Double Agents: Cultural and Political Brokerage in Early Modern Europe*. Studies in Medieval and Reformation Traditions, Volume 154 (Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2011): pp. 147-160.

Kemmer, Claus. "In Search of Classical Form: Gerard de Lairesse's Groot schilderboek and Seventeenth-Century Dutch Genre Painting." *Simiolus* 26 (1998): pp. 87-115.

Kemp, Martin. "'Wrought by No Artist's Hand': The Natural, the Artificial, the Exotic, and the Scientific in Some Artifacts from the Renaissance." In Claire Farago, ed. *Reframing the Renaissance: Visual Culture in Europe and Latin America, 1450-1650* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1995): pp. 176-196.

Kern, Ulrike. *Light and Shade in Dutch and Flemish Art*. Turnhout, Belgium: Brepols, 2014.

Kettering, Alison McNeil. *The Dutch Arcadia: Pastoral Art and its Audience in the Golden Age*. Totowa, NJ: Allanheld and Schram, 1983.

Keyes, George S. *Mirror of Empire: Dutch Marine Art of the Seventeenth Century*. Cambridge; New York: Cambridge University Press, 1990. Exh. cat., Minneapolis Institute of Arts, The Toledo Museum of Art, Los Angeles County Museum of Art.

Kimball, Fiske. “Rubens’ *Prometheus*.” *The Burlington Magazine* 94, no. 588 (March 1952): pp. 67-70.

Kindleberger, Charles Poor. *A Financial History of Western Europe*. London, Boston: Allen & Unwin, 1984.

King, Donald. “Textile Furnishings.” In Arthur MacGregor, ed. *The Late King’s Goods: Collections, Possessions, and Patronage of Charles I in the Light of the Commonwealth Sale Inventories*. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1989): pp. 307-21.

Kipling, Gordon. “Henry VII and the Origins of Tudor Patronage.” In Guy Fitch Lytle and Stephen Orgel, eds. *Patronage in the Renaissance* (Princeton: Princeton University Press. 1981): pp. 117-164.

Kloek, Wouter Th. *Dageraad der Gouden Eeuw: Noordnederlandse kunst, 1580-1620*. Paris: Nuit et Jour, 1993.

Koenderink, Jan, Andrea van Doorn, and Johan Wagemans. *Painting to Marble*. De Clootcrans Press, 2012.

Koopmans, Joop W. *News and Politics in Early Modern Europe (1500-1800)*. Leuven: Peeters, 2005.

Köhler, Neeltje, Pieter Biesboer, et al. *Painting in Haarlem 1500-1850: The Collection of the Frans Hals Museum*. Ghent: Ludion, 2006.

Knecht, R.J. *The French Civil Wars, 1562-1598*. New York: Longman, 2000.

Knowles, Sir James. *Politics and Political Culture in the Court Masque*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2015.

Kretzschmar, Johann. “Das kurpfälzische Schloß zu Rhenen.” In *Mitteilungen zur Geschichte des Heidelberger Schlosses*, Vol. IV (1903): pp. 96-133.

Kronbergs, Ann. “The Significance of the Court Performance of Shakespeare’s *The Tempest* at the Palatine Wedding Celebrations,” in Sara Smart and Mara R. Wade, eds. *The Palatine Wedding of 1613: Protestant Alliance and Court Festival* (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz in Kommission, 2013): pp. 339-351.

Ter Kuile, O. “Daniel Mijtens: ‘His Majesties Picture-Drawer.” *Nederlands Kunsthistorisch Jaarboek* 20 (1969): pp. 1-106.

Kuyper, W. *Dutch Classicist Architecture: A Survey of Dutch Architecture, Gardens, and Anglo-Dutch Architectural Relations from 1625 to 1700*. Delft: Delft University Press, 1980.

Labordus, Jorunn. "Gerard van Honthorst en zijn prinsessen." In Els Kloek and Catherine Peters Sengers, eds., *Vrouwen en kunst in de republiek* (1998): pp. 79-88.

Lacey, Andrew. *The Cult of King Charles the Martyr*. Rochester, NY: Boydell Press, 2003.

Larsen, Erik. *The Paintings of Anthony van Dyck.* 2 vols. Freren: Luca, 1988.

Laver, James. *Costume of the Western World*. New York, Harper & Brothers, Publishers, 1951.

Lawrence, Cynthia Miller. *Women and Art in Early Modern Europe: Patrons, Collectors, and Connoisseurs*. University Park, PA: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1997.

Lehmann, Doris H. "Status 'Malerfürst' – Konstrukt oder soziales Phänomen?" In Dagmar Eichberger, Philippe Lorentz, and Andreas Tacke, eds. *The Artist Between Court and City (1300-1600)* (Petersberg: Michael Imhof Verlag, 2017): pp. 68-97.

Lemberg, Margret. *Eine Königin ohne Reich: Das Leben der Winterkönigin Elisabeth Stuart und ihre Briefe nach Hessen*. Marburg: N.G. Elwert, 1996.

Levey, Michael. *Painting at Court*. London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1971.

————. *The Later Italian Pictures in the Collection of Her Majesty the Queen*. London: The Phaidon Press, 1964.

Lewalski, Barbara Kiefer. *Writing Women in Jacobean England*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1993.

Liedtke, Walter A. *Dutch Paintings in the Metropolitan Museum of Art*. 2 vols. New York: Metropolitan Museum of Art; New Haven: Yale University Press, 2007.

Lightbown, Ronald. "Charles I and the Art of the Goldsmith." In Arthur MacGregor, ed. *The Late King's Goods: Collections, Possessions, and Patronage of Charles I in the Light of the Commonwealth Sale Inventories*. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1989): pp. 233-255.

————. "Charles I and the Tradition of European Princely Collecting." In Arthur MacGregor, ed. *The Late King's Goods: Collections, Possessions, and Patronage of Charles I in the Light of the Commonwealth Sale Inventories*. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1989): pp. 53-72.

————. "The King's Regalia, Insignia and Jewellery." In Arthur MacGregor, ed. *The Late King's Goods: Collections, Possessions, and Patronage of Charles I in the Light of the Commonwealth Sale Inventories*. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1989): pp. 257-75.

————. "Van Dyck and the Purchase of Paintings for the English Court." *The Burlington Magazine* 111, no. 769 (July 1969): pp. 418-421.

Limon, Jerzy, and Agnieszka Żukowska. "Staging the Royal Blend: Time Structures in George Chapman's *Memorable Masque*." In Sara Smart and Mara R. Wade, eds. *The Palatine Wedding of 1613: Protestant Alliance and Court Festival* (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz in Kommission, 2013): pp. 319-338.

Lincoln, Matthew D. "Sources for Gerrit van Honthorst's Italian Nickname." *Notes in the History of Art* 35, no. 3 (Spring 2016): pp. 244-249.

Lindquist, Sherry C. M. "'The Will of a Princely Patron' and Artists at the Burgundian Court." In Stephen J. Campbell, ed. *Artists at Court: Image-Making and Identity, 1300-1550* (Chicago: Distributed by University of Chicago Press, 2004): pp. 46-56.

Lingo, Estelle Cecile. *François Duquesnoy and the Greek Ideal*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2007.

Lockyer, Roger. "An English Valido? Buckingham and James I." In Richard Ollard and Pamela Tudor-Craig, eds., *For Veronica Wedgwood These: Studies in Seventeenth-Century History* (London: Collins, 1986): pp. 45-58.

————. *Buckingham: The Life and Political Career of George Villiers, first Duke of Buckingham, 1592-1628*. London, New York: Longman, 1981.

Logan, Anne-Marie S. *The 'Cabinet' of the Brothers Gerard and Jan Reynst*. Amsterdam, New York: North-Holland Pub. Co.,1979.

Loonstra, Marten. *The Royal Palace Huis ten Bosch in a historical view*. Zutphen, Netherlands: De Walburg Pers, 1985.

Lootsma, Hilbert. “Tracing a pose: Govert Flinck and the emergence of the van Dyckian mode of portraiture in Amsterdam.” *Simiolus: Netherlands Quarterly for the History of Art* 33, no. 4 (2008): pp. 221-236.

Lowenthal, Anne Walter. “Wtewael’s ‘Moses’ and Dutch Mannerism.” *Studies in the History of Art* 6 (1974): pp. 124-141.

Luijten, Ger, ed., et al. *Dawn of the Golden Age: Northern Netherlandish Art, 1580-1620* [*Dageraad der Gouden Eeuw: Noordnederlandse Kunst, 1580-1620*]. Amsterdam: Rijksmuseum; Zwolle: Waanders; New Haven: Yale University Press, 1993. Exh. cat.

Luthman, Johanna. *Love, Madness, and Scandal: The Life of Frances Coke Villiers, Viscountess Purbeck*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2017.

Van Luttervelt, Remmet. “Het portret van Willem II en Maria Stuart in het Rijksmuseum.” *Oud-Holland* 68 (1953): pp. 159-169.

MacGregor, Arthur. *Curiosity and Enlightenment: Collectors and Collections from the Sixteenth to the Nineteenth Century*. New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2007.

————. “The Household below Stairs. Officers and Equipment of the Stuart Court.” In Arthur MacGregor, ed. *The Late King’s Goods: Collections, Possessions, and Patronage of Charles I in the Light of the Commonwealth Sale Inventories*. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1989): pp. 367-86.

————. “‘The King’s Disport’. Sports, Games and Pastimes of the Early Stuarts.” In Arthur MacGregor, ed. *The Late King’s Goods: Collections, Possessions, and Patronage of Charles I in the Light of the Commonwealth Sale Inventories*. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1989): pp. 403-21.

————. “The King’s Goods and the Commonwealth Sale. Materials and Context.” In Arthur MacGregor, ed. *The Late King’s Goods: Collections, Possessions, and Patronage of Charles I in the Light of the Commonwealth Sale Inventories* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1989): pp. 13-52.

MacLeod, Catharine, and Julia Marciari Alexander. “The ‘Windsor Beauties’ and the Beauties Series in Restoration England.” In Julia Marciari Alexander and Catharine MacLeod, eds. *Politics, Transgression, and Representation at the Court of Charles II*. Studies in British Art 18. (New Haven, CT: Yale Center for British Art; London: Paul Mellon Centre for Studies in British Art, 2007): pp. 81-122.

MacLeod, Catharine. “Facing Europe: The Portraiture of Anne of Denmark (1574-1619).” In Jill Bepler and Svante Norrhem, eds. *Telling Objects: Contextualizing the Role of the Consort in Early Modern Europe* (Wolfenbütteler Forschungen, bd. 153; Wiesbaden, Harrassowitz Verlag, in Kommission, 2018): pp. 63-86.

————. *The Lost Prince: The Life and Death of Henry Stuart*. London: National Portrait Gallery Publications, 2012. Exh. cat.

————. “‘Our Rising Sun is set’: the Death of Prince Henry.” In Catherine MacLeod, *The Lost Prince: The Life and Death of Henry Stuart* (London: National Portrait Gallery Publications, 2012. Exh. cat.): pp. 160-61.

Macinnes, Allan I, and Jane H. Ohlmeyer. *The Stuart Kingdoms in the Seventeenth Century: Awkward Neighbours*. Dublin: Four Courts Press, 2002.

Mączak, Antoni. “From Aristocratic Household to Princely Court: Restructuring Patronage in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries.” In Ronald G. Asch and Adolf M. Birke, eds. *Princes, Patronage, and the Nobility: The Court at the Beginning of the Modern Age, c. 1450-1650*. London: Studies of the German Historical Institute (Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 1991): pp. 315-328.

Magreta, Todd Jerome. *The Development of Orange-Nassau Princely Artistic Activity, 1618-1632*. PhD diss., City University of New York, 2008.

Malhomme, Florence. “Le Madrigal Anglais: Influences et Age d’Or (1593-1622), Problématique générale et approche analytique.” *Musurgia* 4, no. 4 (Dossiers d’analyse, 1997): pp. 7-28.

Mansour, Opher. “Picturing Global Conversion: Art and Diplomacy at the Court of Paul V (1605-1621).” *Journal of Early Modern History* 17 (2013): pp. 525-559.

De Marchi, Neil and Hans J. Van Miegroet, eds. *Mapping Markets for Paintings in Europe 1450-1750*. Turnhout, Belgium: Brepols, 2006.

Markey, Lia. *The New World in Renaissance Italy: A Vicarious Conquest of Art and Nature at the Medici Court*. PhD diss., University of Chicago, 2008.

————. *Imagining the Americas in Medici Florence*. University Park, PA: The Pennsylvania State University Press, 2016.

Markschies, Alexander. *Icons of Renaissance Architecture*. Munich, London: Prestel, 2003.

Marqués, Manuela B. Mena. "Titian, Rubens, and Spain." In *Titian and Rubens: Power, Politics, and Style*, Boston: Isabella Stewart Garner Museum, 1998. Exh. cat.

Marr, Alexander. "Picturing Collections in Early Modern Europe." *Intellectual History Review* 20, no. 1 (2010): pp. 1-4.

Martin, Gregory. *The Ceiling Decoration of the Banqueting Hall*. 2 vols. *Corpus rubenianum Ludwig Burchard* vol. XV, London: Harvey Miller, 2005.

————. "Rubens and Buckingham's 'fayrie ile'." *The Burlington Magazine* 108, no. 765 (Dec. 1966): pp. 613-618.

————. *Rubens in London: Art and Diplomacy*. London: Harvey Miller, 2011.

Marshall, Rosalind K. *The Winter Queen: The Life of Elizabeth of Bohemia, 1596-1662*. Edinburgh: National Galleries of Scotland, 1998. Exh. cat.

Marvick, Elizabeth Wirth. *Louis XIII: The Making of a King*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1986.

Mayer, Jean-Christophe. *The Struggle for Succession in Late Elizabethan England: Politics, Polemics and Representations*. Montpellier, France: Institut de Recherche sur la Renaissance, 2004.

McQueen, Alison. *The Rise of the Cult of Rembrandt: Reinventing an Old Master in 19th-Century France*. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, 2003.

Melion, Walter S. *Shaping the Netherlandish Canon: Karel van Mander's Schilder-boeck*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1991.

Memegalos, Florene S. *George Goring (1608-1657): Caroline Courtier and Royalist General*. Burlington, VT: Ashgate Publications, 2007.

Meding, Twyla. "Pastoral Palimpsest: Writing the Laws of Love in *L'Astrée*." *Renaissance Quarterly* 52, no. 4 (Winter 1999): pp. 1087-1117.

Metzger, Wolfgang. "The Perspective of the Prince: The *Hortus Palatinus* of Friedrich

V and Elizabeth Stuart at Heidelberg." In Sara Smart and Mara R. Wade, eds. *The Palatine Wedding of 1613: Protestant Alliance and Court Festival* (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz in Kommission, 2013): pp. 567-596.

Metzler, Sally. *Bartholomeus Spranger, Splendor and Eroticism in Imperial Prague*. New York: The Metropolitan Museum of Art; New Haven: Yale University Press, 2014. Exh. cat.

Van der Meulen, M. "Rubens in Holland in de zeventiende eeuw: enige aanvullingen." In Arnout Balis, Nora de Porter, and Antoon De Schreyver, *Rubens and His World* (Antwerp, 1985): pp. 307-317.

Meurer, Peter. "Europa Regina: 16th Century Maps of Europe in the Form of a Queen." *Belgeo: Revue Belge de Géographie* 3-4 (2008): pp. 355-370.

De Meyere, Jos A. L. *"Granida en Daifilo": (1625) van Gerard van Honthorst: onderzeok en restauratie*. Utrecht: Centraal Museum, 1988.

————. *Nieuwe gegevens over Gerard van Honthorst's beschilderd plafond uit 1622*. Utrecht, 1976.

Miedema, Hessel. "Kunstschilders, gilde en academie Over het problem van de emancipatie van de kunstschilders in de Noordelijke Nederlanden van de 16de en 17de eeuw." *Oud Holland* 101, no. 1 (1987): pp. 1-34.

Millard, Charles W. "Toward the Liberation of Color." *The Hudson Review* 29, no. 2 (Summer 1976): pp. 265-269.

Millar, Oliver. *The Age of Charles I: Painting in England, 1620-1648*. London: Tate Gallery Publications, 1972. Exh. cat.

————. "Charles I, Honthorst, and Van Dyck." *The Burlington Magazine* 96, no. 611 (February 1954): pp. 36-42.

————. "Some Painters and Charles I." *The Burlington Magazine* 104, no. 713 (August 1962): pp. 323-330.

————. *The Tudor, Stuart, and Early Georgian Pictures in the Collection of Her Majesty the Queen*. 2 vols. London: Phaidon Press, 1963.

————. *Van Dyck in England*. London: National Portrait Gallery, 1982-1983. Exh. cat.

————. "Van Dyck in London." In Arthur K. Wheelock, et al. *Anthony van Dyck* (Washington: National Gallery of Art, 1990. Exh. cat.): pp. 53-58.

————. "Van Dyck's 'Continence of Scipio,' at Christ Church." *The Burlington Magazine* 93, no. 577 (April 1951): pp. 125-127.

Miller, Anthony. *Roman Triumphs and Early Modern English Culture*. Houndmills, Basingstoke, Hampshire; New York: Palgrave, 2001.

De Mirimonde, Albert Pomme. "A propos du Concert de Gerrit van Honthorst." *La Revue des Arts* 10, no. 3 (1960): p. 260.

————. "'L'accord retrouvé' de Gerrit van Honthorst." *La Revue des Arts* 10, no. 3 (1960): pp. 109-116.

Mirollo, James V. "The Aesthetics of the Marvelous: The Wondrous Work of art in a Wondrous World." In Peter G. Platt, ed. *Wonders, Marvels, and Monsters in Early Modern Culture* (Newark, London: University of Delaware Press, 1999): 24-44.

Mitchell, Silvia Z. "Growing up Carlos II: Political Childhood in the Court of the Spanish Habsburgs." In Grace E. Coolidge, ed. *The Formation of the Child in Early Modern Spain* (Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2014): pp. 189-208.

Mörke, Olaf, and Rachel Esner, trans. "The Orange Court as Centre of Political and Social Life during the Republic." In Marika Keblusek and Jori Zijlmans, eds. *Princely Display: The Court of Frederik Hendrik of Orange and Amalia van Solms* (Zwolle: Waanders, 1997. Exh. cat., Historical Museum, The Hague.): pp. 58-104.

Moir, Alfred. *Anthony van Dyck*. New York: H.N. Abrams, 1994.

————. *Caravaggio and his Copyists*. New York: New York University Press for the College Art Association of America, 1976.

————. *A Profile of the Seventeenth Century: Prints from Van Dyck's Iconography*. California: Regents of the University of California, 1991. Exh. cat., University Art Museum and Pacific Film Archive, University of California at Berkeley.

Monod, Paul Kléber. *The Power of Kings: Monarchy and Religion in Europe, 1589-1715*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1999.

Montagu, Jennifer. *The Expression of the Passions: the Origin and Influence of Charles Le Brun's* Conférence sur l'expression générale et particulière. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1994.

Monter, William. *The Rise of Female Kings in Europe, 1300-1800*. New Haven, London: Yale University Press, 2012.

Moote, A. Lloyd. *Louis XIII, the Just*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1989.

Morris, Anita Boyd. *Diplomacy and Art: The Three "Dutch Gifts" to the British*. MA Thesis, UCLA, 2000.

Muller, Jeffrey M. "Rubens's Theory and Practice of the Imitation of Art." *The Art Bulletin* 64, no. 2 (1982): pp. 229-247.

————. *Rubens: The Artist as Collector*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1989.

Muller, Samuel. *De Utrechtsche Archieven I: Schilders-Vereenigingen te Utrecht*. Utrecht: Rijksarchief in de Provincie Utrecht, 1880.

————. "Het Koningshuis te Renen." *Bulletin van den Nederlandschen Oudheidkundigen Bond* Year 4, series 2, no. 2 (1911): pp. 66-73.

————. "Twee Utrechtsche klaustrale huizen." *Oud Holland* 35 (1917): pp. 196-213.

Muller, Sheila D. "For the Pleasure and Contentment of the Audience: Gerrit van Honthorst's *The Merry Fiddler*: Promoting Civil Behavior in Early Seventeenth-Century Utrecht." In Arthur J. DiFuria, ed., *Genre Imagery in Early Modern Northern Europe: New Perspectives* (New York: Routledge, 2018): pp. 97-130.

Müllenmeister, Kurt J. *Roelant Savery, Kortrijk 1576-1639 Utrecht, Hofmaler Kaiser Rudolf II. in Prag: Die Gemälde mit Kritischem Oeuvrekatalog*. Freren: Luca Verlag, 1988.

————. "Roelant Savery, Kortrijk 1576-1639 Utrecht." In Ekkehard Mai, ed. *Roelant Savery in Seiner Zeit (1576-1639)* (Cologne: Das Museum, 1985. Exh. cat. Wallraf-Richartz-Museum, Cologne and Centraal Museum, Utrecht.): pp. 30-37.

Müller, Jürgen. *Der Sokratische Kunstler: Studien zu Rembrandts Nachtwache*. Brill's Studies in Intellectual History vol. 235. Leiden, Boston: Brill, 2015.

Murdoch, Steve. *Britain, Denmark-Norway, and the House of Stuart, 1603-1660: A Diplomatic and Military Analysis*. East Linton, East Lothian, Scotland: Tuckwell Press, 2003.

Musée Bousset. *De Nicolò dell'Abate à Nicolas Poussin: aux sources du classicism, 1550-1650*. Meaux: Le Musée, 1988. Exh. cat.

Myhill, Nova. "'Wanton Females of All Sorts': Spectatorship in 'The Antipodes'." *Early Theatre* 16, no. 2 (2013): pp. 121-142.

Neer, Richard T. "Bourdon, Bosse, and the Rules of Classicism." In Larry F. Norman and Anne Leonard, eds., *Classicisms* (Chicago: Smart Museum of Art, The University of Chicago, 2017; Exh. cat.): pp. 31-42.

————. "Poussin and the Ethics of Imitation." *Memoirs of the American Academy in Rome*, vol. 51/52 (2006/2007): pp. 297-344.

Negro, Angela. "Paul Bril and Guido Reni in the Loggia della Pergola in Palazzo Pallavicini Rospigliosi." In Carla Hendricks, *Northern Landscapes on Roman Walls: The Frescoes of Matthijs and Paul Bril* (Florence: Centro Di, 2003): pp. 87-100.

Nicolson, Benedict. *Caravaggism in Europe*. 2nd ed. Archivi di storia dell'arte. Torino: U. Allemandi, 1990.

————. "The 'Candlelight Master' A Follower of Honthorst in Rome." *Nederlands Kunsthistorisch Jaarboek* 11 (1960): pp. 121-164.

————. *The International Caravaggesque Movement: Lists of Pictures by Caravaggio and his Followers throughout Europe from 1590 to 1650*. Oxford: Phaidon, 1979.

Nishi, Takashi. *The Representations of Hercules and Hydra in Shakespeare's* Coriolanus. PhD diss., Birkbeck, University of London, 2014.

Nodes, Daniel J. "A Hydra in the Gardens of Adonis: Literary Allusion and the Language of Humanism in Egidio of Viterbo (1469-1532)." *Renaissance Quarterly* 57, no. 2 (Summer 2004): pp. 494-517.

Nogrady, Elizabeth Ann. *Abraham Bloemaert (1566-1651), the "Netherlandish Academy" and Artistic Collaboration in Seventeenth-Century Utrecht*. PhD diss., New York University, 2009.

Noldus, Badeloch Vera. "Loyalty and Betrayal: Artist-Agents Michel le Blon and Pieter Isaacsz., and Chancellor Axel Oxenstierna." In Hans Cools, Marika Keblusek, and Badeloch Noldus, eds. *Your Humble Servant: Agents in Early Modern Europe* (Hilversum: Verloren, 2006): pp. 51-64.

————. "A Spider in Its Web: Agent and Artist Michel le Blon and His Northern European Network." In Marika Keblusek and Badelock Vera Noldus, eds. *Double Agents: Cultural and Political Brokerage in Early Modern Europe*. Studies in Medieval and Reformation Traditions, Volume 154 (Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2011): pp. 161-192.

————. "An 'Unvergleichbarer Liebhaber': Peter Spierinck, the Art-Dealing Diplomat." *Scandinavian Journal of History* 31, no. 2 (2006): pp. 173-185.

Nonaka, Natsumi. *Renaissance Porticoes and Painted Pergolas: Nature and Culture in Early Modern Italy*. London: Routledge, Taylor & Francis Group, 2017.

Noorman, Judith. "On Truth and Beauty. Drawing Nude Models in Rembrandt's Time." In Judith Noorman and David de Witt, eds. *Rembrandt's Naked Truth: Drawing Nude Models in the Golden Age* (Zwolle: WBooks, 2016. Exh. cat., Museum Het Rembrandthuis.): pp. 11-44.

Norman, A.V.B. "Arms, Armour and Militaria." In Arthur MacGregor, ed. *The Late King's Goods: Collections, Possessions, and Patronage of Charles I in the Light of the Commonwealth Sale Inventories*. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1989): pp. 351-66.

Ollard, Richard Lawrence. *The Image of the King: Charles I and Charles II*. New York: Atheneum, 1979.

Oman, Carola. *The Winter Queen: Elizabeth of Bohemia*. London: Phoenix, 2000.

Orgel, Stephen and Roy C. Strong. *Inigo Jones. The Theatre of the Stuart Court*. 2 vols. London: Sotheby Parke Bernet, 1973.

Orso, Steven N. *Velázquez, Los Borrachos, and Painting at the Court of Philip IV*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1993.

Oruch, Jack B. “St. Valentine, Chaucer, and Spring in February.” *Speculum* 56, no. 3 (July 1981): pp. 534-565.

Osborne, Toby. “Van Dyck, Alessandro Scaglia and the Caroline Court: Friendship, Collecting and Diplomacy in the Early Seventeenth Century.” *The Seventeenth Century* 22, no. 1 (2007): 24-41.

Overvoorde, J. C. “Het slot van den Winterkoning te Rhenen.” *Bulletin van den Nederlandschen Oudheidkundige Bond* 4, no. 2 (1902-1903): pp. 74-78.

Palme, Per. *Triumph of Peace: A Study of the Whitehall Banqueting House*. London: Thames and Hudson, 1957.

Papi, Gianni. *Gherardo delle Notti: Gerrit Honthorst in Italia*. Soncino (CR): Edizioni dei Soncino, 1999.

————. “Gerrit van Honthorst fra Italia e Olanda.” In Gianni Papi, ed. *Gherardo delle Notti: quadri bizzarissimi e cene allegre* (Florence: Giunti, 2015. Exh cat., Galleria degli Uffizi): pp. 32-89.

Parry, Graham. *The Golden Age Restor’d: The Culture of the Stuart Court 1603-42*. New York: St. Martin’s Press, 1981.

Parsons, Ben. “Dutch Influences on English Literary Culture in the Early Renaissance, 1470-1650.” *Literature Compass* 4, no. 6 (November 2007): pp. 1577-1596.

Peacock, John. “The Politics of Portraiture.” In Kevin Sharpe and Peter Lake, eds., *Culture and Politics in Stuart England* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1993): pp. 199-228.

————. “The Visual Image of Charles I.” In Thomas N. Corns, ed. *The Royal Image: Representations of Charles I* (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 1999): pp. 176-239.

Pearson, Andrea G., ed. *Women and Portraits in Early Modern Europe: Gender, Agency, Identity*. Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2008.

Pebworth, Ted-Larry. “George Herbert’s Poems to the Queen of Bohemia: A Rediscovered Text and a New Edition.” *English Literary Renaissance* 9, no. 1 (Winter 1979): pp. 108-120.

Peck, Linda Levy. “Court Patronage and Government Policy: The Jacobean Dilemma.” In Guy Fitch Lytle and Stephen Orgel, eds. *Patronage in the Renaissance* (Princeton: Princeton University Press. 1981): pp. 27-46.

Della Pergola, Paola. *Galleria Borghese in Roma: i dipinti*. 2 vols. Rome: Libreria della Stato, 1955.

Pericolo, Lorenzo. “Statuino: An Undercurrent of Anticlassicism in Italian Baroque Art Theory.” *Art History* 38, no. 5 (November 2015): pp. 862-889.

Del Pesco, Daniela. “Au château de Fontainebleau avec Cassiano dal Pozzo en 1625.” In Vincent Droguet et al, *Fontainebleau: « La vraie demeure des rois, la maison des siècles »* (Paris: Swan éditeur; Fontainebleau: Château de Fontainebleau, (2015): pp. 21-78.

Van der Ploeg, Peter, and Carola Vermeeren. “Art and the Princes of Orange to 1625.” In Van der Ploeg and Vermeeren, eds. *Princely Patrons: The Collection of Frederick Henry of Orange and Amalia of Solms in The Hague* (Zwolle: Waanders, 1997. Exh. cat., Royal Picture Gallery Mauritshuis, The Hague): pp. 12-17.

————. “‘From the ‘Sea Princes’ Monies’: The Stadholder’s Art Collection.” In Van der Ploeg and Vermeeren, eds. *Princely Patrons: The Collection of Frederick Henry of Orange and Amalia of Solms in The Hague* (Zwolle: Waanders, 1997. Exh. cat., Royal Picture Gallery Mauritshuis, The Hague): pp. 34-60.

Van de Pol, Lotte, and Liz Waters, trans. *The Burgher and the Whore: Prostitution in Early Modern Amsterdam*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011.

Polleross, Friedrich. “From the *exemplum virtutis* to the Apotheosis: Hercules as an Identification Figure in Portraiture. An Example of the Adoption of Classical Forms of Representation.” In Allan Ellenius, ed. *Iconography, Propaganda, and Legitimation* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998): pp. 37-62.

Pollnitz, Aysha. Princely Education in Early Modern Britain. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 2015.

Portús, Javier. Velázquez’s Fables: Mythology and Sacred History in the Golden Age. Madrid: Museo Nacional del Prado, 2007. Exh. cat.

Posner, Donald. “Concerning the ‘Mechanical Parts of Painting and the Artistic

Culture of Seventeenth-Century France." *The Art Bulletin* 75, no. 4 (December 1993): pp. 583-598.

Van Puyvelde, Leo. *Van Dyck*. Brussels: Elsevier, 1950.

Rasterhoff, Claartje. *Painting and Publishing as Cultural Industries: The Fabric of Creativity in the Dutch Republic, 1580-1800*. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, 2017.

Redworth, Glyn, and Fernando Checa. "The Courts of the Spanish Habsburgs 1500-1700." In John Adamson, ed. *The Princely Courts of Europe: Ritual, Politics and Culture Under the* Ancien Régime *1500-1750* (London: Weidenfeld & Nicolson, 1999): pp. 43-66.

Remington, Vanessa, and Lucy Whitaker. "A 'More Solitary Place' : Charles I and His Cabinet." In Desmond Shawe-Taylor, et al. *Charles I: King and Collector* (London: Royal Academy of Arts, 2018. Exh. cat.): pp. 206-230.

Rensselaer, Lee. *Ut Pictura Poesis: The Humanistic Theory of Painting*. New York: W.W. Norton, 1967.

Reynolds, Anna. *In Fine Style: The Art of Tudor and Stuart Fashion*. London: Royal Collection Trust, 2013. Exh. cat., The Queen's Gallery, Palace of Holyroodhouse, Edinburgh.

Reznicek, E.K.J. "The Significance of a Table Leg: Some Remarks on Gerard van Honthorst's 'Steadfast Philosopher'." *The Hoogsteder Mercury* 11 (1990): pp. 22-27.

Richards, Judith. "'His Nowe Majestie' and the English Monarchy: The Kingship of Charles I before 1640." *Past & Present* 113 (November 1986): pp. 70-96.

Rickman, Johanna. *Love, Lust, and License in Early Modern England: Illicit Sex and the Nobility*. Women and Gender in the Early Modern World. Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2008.

Roberts, Benjamin B. *Sex and Drugs before Rock 'n' Roll: Youth Culture and Masculinity during Holland's Golden Age*. Amsterdam Studies in the Dutch Golden Age. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, 2012.

Roberts, Jane. "The Limnings, Drawings and Prints in Charles I's Collection." In Arthur MacGregor, ed. *The Late King's Goods: Collections, Possessions, and*

Patronage of Charles I in the Light of the Commonwealth Sale Inventories. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1989): pp. 115-129.

Roodenburg, Herman. *The Eloquence of the Body: Perspectives on Gesture in the Dutch Republic*. Zwolle: Waanders Publishers, 2004.

————. "How to Sit, Stand, and Walk: Toward a Historical Anthropology of Dutch Paintings and Prints." In Wayne E. Franits, ed. *Looking at Seventeenth-Century Dutch Art: Realism Reconsidered* (Cambridge, New York: Cambridge University Press, 1997): pp. 175-186.

Rosenberg, Jakob, Seymour Slive, and E.H. ter Kuile. *Dutch Art and Architecture 1600-1800*. Baltimore: Penguin Books, 1966.

Rosenblatt, Ivana May. *Libeling Painting: Exploring the Gap between Text and Image in the Critical Discourse on George Villiers, the First Duke of Buckingham*. MA thesis, The Ohio State University, 2009.

Rosenthal, Earl E. "The Invention of the Columnar Device of Emperor Charles V at the Court of Burgundy in Flanders in 1516." *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes* 36 (1973): pp. 198-230.

Roskill, Mark W. *Dolce's Aretino and Venetian Art Theory of the Cinquecento*. Monographs on archeology and fine arts, 15. New York: Published for the College Art Association of America by New York University Press, 1968.

Royalton-Kisch, Martin. Adriaen van de Venne's Album in the Department of Prints and *Drawings in the British Museum*. London: Published for the Trustees of the British Museum by British Museum Publications, 1988.

————. "Prince Frederick Henry and his court in an album drawn by Van de Venne." *Oranje-Nassau Museum Jaarboek* (1985-1986): pp. 6-29.

Rumberg, Per, and Desmond Shawe-Taylor. "'The Greatest Amateur of Paintings Among the Princes of the World.'" In Desmond Shawe-Taylor, et al. *Charles I: King and Collector* (London: Royal Academy of Arts, 2018. Exh. cat.): pp. 17-25.

Russell, Conrad. *The Causes of the English Civil War*. The Ford Lectures Delivered in the University of Oxford. Oxford, U.K.: Clarendon Press, 1990.

Salerno, Luigi. "The Picture Gallery of Vincenzo Giustiniani: III." *The Burlington Magazine* 102 (1960): pp. 135-148.

Salzman, L. F. “Some Notes on Shepherds’ Staves.” *The Agricultural History Review* 5, no. 2 (1957): pp. 91-94.

Santaliestra, Laura Oliván. “‘My sister is growing up very healthy and beautiful, she loves me’: The Childhood of the *Infantas* María Teresa and Margarita María at Court.” In Grace E. Coolidge, ed. *The Formation of the Child in Early Modern Spain* (Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2014): pp. 165-188.

Schaudies, Irene. “Trimming Rubens’ Shadow: New Light on the Mediation of Caravaggio in the Southern Netherlands.” *Nederlands Kunsthistorisch Jaarboek* 55 (2004): pp. 335-367.

Scheurleer, Theodoor Herman Lunsingh. “De woonvertrekken in Amalia’s Huis in het Bosch.” *Oud-Holland* 84 (1969): pp. 29-65.

Schlugleit, D. “L’Abbe de Scaglia, Jordaens et l’‘Histoire de Psyche’ de Greenwich-House (1639-1642).” *Revue belge d’archéologie et d’histoire de l’art* (1937): pp. 139-166.

Schmachtenberg, Barbara. *Das Ornamentum der Galerie d’Ulysse von Fontainebleau im gesellschaftlichen Kontext*. Frankfurt am Main: PL Academic Research, 2015.

Schoemaker, Laurens M. *Tegen de Helling van de Heuvelrug: Rhenen in Oude Tekeningen, 1600-1900*. Historische Heuvelrug Reeks, 13. Utrecht: Matrijs, 2007.

Scholten, Frits, and Joanna Woodall. “Netherlandish Artists on the Move.” *Nederlands Kunsthistorisch Jaarboek* 63 (2013): pp. 6-39.

Scholten, Frits. “François Dieussart, Constantijn Huygens, and the Classical Ideal in Funerary Sculpture.” *Simiolus: Netherlands Quarterly for the History of Art* 25, no. 4 (1997): pp. 303-328.

Schwartz, Gary. “The Barberini and Orange Inventories: A Comparison of the Collections and their Publication.” In David A. Levine and Jack Freiberg, eds., *Medieval Renaissance Baroque: A Cat’s Cradle for Marilyn Aronberg Lavin* (New York: Italica Press, 2010): pp. 167-178.

————. *The Night Watch*. Amsterdam: Rijksmuseum, 2008.

Seaman, Natasha T. *The Religious Paintings of Hendrick ter Brugghen: Reinventing Christian Painting after the Reformation in Utrecht*. Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2012.

Seitz, Fritz. "Zur Baugeschichte des Heidelberger Schlosses." *Mitteilungen zur Geschichte des Heidelberger Schlosses* vol. 1 (1885-86): pp. 222-253.

Serres, Karen. "Henrietta Maria, Charles I and the Italian Baroque." In Desmond Shawe-Taylor, et al. *Charles I: King and Collector* (London: Royal Academy of Arts, 2018. Exh. cat.): pp. 171-187.

Sevcik, Anja K., et al. *Wundervoll: Honthorsts Anbetung der Hirten*. "Wallraf im Fokus." Köln: Wallraf-Richartz-Museum & Fondation Courboud, 2017. Exh. cat.

Sharnova, Elena. "A Newly Discovered 'Justice of Trajan' from the Second School of Fontainebleau." *The Burlington Magazine* 142, no. 1166 (May 2000): pp. 288-291.

Sharpe, Kevin. "The Image of Virtue: The Court and Household of Charles I, 1625-1642." In David Starkey et al., *The English Court: From the Wars of the Roses to the Civil War* (London: Longman Group UK, 1987): pp. 226-260.

————. *Image Wars: Promoting Kings and Commonwealths in England, 1603-1660*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2010.

————. "Van Dyck, the Royal Image and the Caroline Court." In Karen Hearn et al., *Van Dyck & Britain* (London: Tate Publications, 2009): pp. 14-23. Exh. cat., Tate Britain.

Shipp, Horace. *The Dutch Masters*. New York: Philosophical Library, Inc., 1953.

Sillitoe, Peter. "'And afterward to his pallace of Westminster, there to solace himself': Rediscovering the Progresses of Charles I." *The Yearbook of English Studies* 44, Caroline Literature (2014): pp. 87-102.

Silver, Larry. *Marketing Maximilian: The Visual Ideology of a Holy Roman Emperor*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2008.

————. *Peasant Scenes and Landscapes: The Rise of Pictorial Genres in the Antwerp Art Market*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2006.

Skerpan-Wheeler, Elizabeth. “The First ‘Royal’: Charles I as Celebrity.” *PMLA* 126, no. 4, Special Topic: Celebrity, Fame, Notoriety (October 2011): pp. 912-934.

Slatkes, Leonard J. *Dirck van Baburen (c. 1595-1624): A Dutch Painter in Utrecht and Rome*. Utrecht: Haentjens Dekker & Gumbert, 1965.

————. “Honthorst, Gerrit [Gérard] (Hermansz.) van.” Oxford Art Online, 2003. <https://doi.org/10.1093/gao/9781884446054.article.T038821> (Accessed 24 October 2018).

Slive, Seymour and Jakob Rosenberg. *Dutch Painting: 1600-1800*. New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1995.

Sluijter, Eric Jan. “The English Venture: Dutch and Flemish Artists in Britain 1550-1800.” *Leids Kunsthistorisch Jaarboek* 13 (2003): 11-30.

————. “How Rembrandt Surpassed the Ancients, Italians and Rubens as the Master of ‘the Passions of the Soul.” *Low Countries Historical Review* 129, no. 2 (2014): 63-89.

————. *Rembrandt and the Female Nude*. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, 2006.

————. *Rembrandt’s Rivals: History Painting in Amsterdam, 1630-1650*. Oculi, Studies in the Arts of the Low Countries, Volume 14. Amsterdam; Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 2015.

Sluijter-Seijffert, Nicolette, and Jennifer M. Milian and Katy Kist, trans. *Cornelis van Poelenburch, 1594/5-1667: The Paintings*. OCULI: Studies in the Arts of the Low Countries, vol. 15. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 2016.

Sohm, Philip. *Pittoresco: Marco Boschini, his critics, and their critiques of painterly brushwork in seventeenth- and eighteenth-century Italy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991.

————. *Style in the Art Theory of Early Modern Italy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001.

Spear, Richard E. and Philip L. Sohm. *Painting for Profit: The Economic Lives of Seventeenth-Century Italian Painters*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2010.

Speelers, Lidwien, and Margriet van Eikema Hommes. “Jordaens and the Oranjezaal in Huis ten Bosch Palace, the Paintings and the Letters.” In Birgit Ulrike Münch and Zita Ágota Pataki, eds. *Jordaens: Genius of Grand Scale [Genie großen Formats]*. CISA (Cultural and Interdisciplinary Studies in Art) vol. X. (Stuttgart: Ibidem, 2012): pp. 131-163.

Spicer, Joaneath A., et al. *Masters of Light: Dutch Painters in Utrecht during the Golden Age*. New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1997. Exh. cat., Fine Arts Museum of San Francisco, Walters Art Gallery, Baltimore, and National Gallery, London.

Spliethoff, Marieke E. “Amor Omnia Vincit: de drie oudste kinderen van stadhouder Frederik Hendrik en Amalia van Solms op een groepsportret door Gerard van Honthorst, 1629.” In *Face book: Studies on Dutch and Flemish Portraiture of the 16th-18th Centuries: liber amicorum presented to Rudolf E.O. Ekkart on the occasion of his 65th birthday* (Leiden: Primavera Pers, 2012): pp. 167-174.

Smart, Sara. “From Garter Knight to Second David: The Palatine Portrayal of Friedrich V.” In Sara Smart and Mara R. Wade, eds. *The Palatine Wedding of 1613: Protestant Alliance and Court Festival* (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz in Kommission, 2013): pp. 167-203.

Smith, David R. “Rembrandt’s Early Double Portraits and the Dutch Conversation Piece.” *The Art Bulletin* 64, no. 2 (June 1982): pp. 259-288.

Smuts, R. Malcolm. *Court Culture and the Origins of a Royalist Tradition in Early Stuart England*. Philadelphia, University of Pennsylvania Press, 1987.

————. “Prince Henry and His World.” In Catherine MacLeod, *The Lost Prince: The Life and Death of Henry Stuart* (London: National Portrait Gallery Publications, 2012. Exh. cat.): pp. 19-31.

————. “The Political Failure of Stuart Cultural Patronage.” In Guy Fitch Lytle and Stephen Orgel, eds. *Patronage in the Renaissance* (Princeton: Princeton University Press. 1981): pp. 165-190.

Snoep, D.P. Praal en propaganda. Triumfalia in de Noordelijke Nederlanden in de 16de en 17de eeuw. Alphen aan den Rijn: Canaletto, 1975.

Staring, Adolph. “Portretten van den Koning-Stadhouder.” *Nederlands Kunsthistorisch Jaarboek* (1950/51): pp. 151-196.

Stechow, Wolfgang. *Rubens and the Classical Tradition*. Cambridge, MA: Published for Oberlin College by Harvard University Press, 1968.

Stevens, Andrea Ria. *Inventions of the Skin: The Painted Body in Early English Drama, 1400-1642*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2013.

Van der Stighelen, Katlijne. "Young Anthony: Archival Discoveries Relating to Van Dyck's Early Career." *Studies in the History of Art* 46, Symposium Papers XXVI: Van Dyck 350 (1994): pp. 16-46.

Stopes, Charlotte Carmichael. *The life of Henry, third earl of Southampton. Shakespeare's Patron*. Cambridge, UK: The University Press, 1922.

Stone, David M. *Theory and practice in Seicento art: The example of Guercino*. PhD diss., Harvard University, 1989.

Strong, Roy C. "Elizabethan Painting: An Approach Through Inscriptions – 1: Robert Peake the Elder." *The Burlington Magazine* 105, no. 719 (February 1963): pp. 53-57.

————. *The Cult of Elizabeth: Elizabethan Portraiture and Pageantry*. London: Thames and Hudson, 1977.

————. *The Tudor and Stuart Monarchy: Pageantry, Painting, Iconography*. 3 vols. Rochester: Boydell Press, 1995-1998.

————. *The Winter Queen*. London: National Portrait Gallery, 1963.

————. *Van Dyck: Charles I on Horseback*. London: Allen Lane, 1972.

Strong, Roy C., and V.J. Murell. *Artists of the Tudor Court: The Portrait Miniature Rediscovered, 1520-1620*. London: Victoria & Albert Museum, 1983. Exh. cat.

Sutton, Peter C. *The Age of Rubens*. Boston: Museum of Fine Arts, 1993. Exh. cat., Museum of Fine Arts, Boston and Toledo Museum of Art, Ohio.

————. "'Tutti finite con amore': Rubens' 'Prometheus Bound'." In Anne-Marie Logan, ed. *Essays in Northern European Art: Presented to Egbert Haverkamp-Begemann on His Sixtieth Birthday* (Doornspijk, Netherlands: Davaco, 1983): pp. 270-275.

Sutton, Peter C., and Johann Kräftner, ed. *The Hohenbuchau Collection: Holländische und Flämische Gemälde aus dem Goldenen Zeitalter*. Wien: Liechtenstein Museum: C. Brandstätter, 2011.

Tacke, Andreas. "'worzu die Academien dienen': Sandrart lernt von Honthorst." In Anna von Schreurs, *Unter Minervas Schutz* (2012): 101-111.

Taylor, David A.H.B. "A Taste for the Golden Age: Dutch Pictures in the National Trust's Collection." In Rupert Goulding and David A.H.B. Taylor, eds., *Prized Possessions: Dutch Paintings from national Trust Houses*. (London: National Trust: In association with Paul Holberton Publishing, 2018. Exh. cat., The Holburne Museum, Bath, the Royal Picture Gallery Mauritshuis, The Hague, and Petworth House, West Sussex.): pp. 12-27.

Taylor, Paul. "The Concept of *Houding* in Dutch Art Theory." *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes* 55 (1992): pp. 210-232.

Taylor-Poleskey, Molly. "Mapping the Journey up the Rhine: Digital Representations of the Palatinate Wedding Route." In Sara Smart and Mara R. Wade, eds. *The Palatine Wedding of 1613: Protestant Alliance and Court Festival* (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz in Kommission, 2013): pp. 371-390.

Tervaert, Rense Cohen, et al. *Dynasty: Portraits of the House of Orange-Nassau*. Eindhoven, Netherlands: Lecturis: Stichting Koninklijk Paleis Amsterdam, 2016. Exh. cat.

Thielemann, Andreas. "Rubens' Traktat *De imitatione statuarum*." In Ursula Rombach and Peter Seiler, eds., *Imitatio als Transformation: Theorie und Praxis der Antikennachahmung in der Frühen Neuzeit* (Petersberg: Michael Imhof Verlag, 2012. Conference proceedings.): pp. 95-150.

Thoen, Irma. *Strategic Affection?: Gift Exchange in Seventeenth-Century Holland*. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, 2006.

Thomas, Andrew L. *House Divided: Wittelsbach Confessional Court Cultures in the Holy Roman Empire, c. 1550-1650*. Leiden, Boston: Brill, 2010.

Thornton, Peter K. *Seventeenth-Century Interior Decoration in England, France, and Holland*. New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1978.

Thuillier, Jacques, and Anthony Blunt. *Fontainebleau et la peinture française du XVIIe siècle*. Paris: Centre national de la recherche scientifique, 1975.

Thurley, Simon. Whitehall Palace: An Architectural History of the Royal Apartments, 1240-1698. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1999.

————. *Whitehall Palace: The Official Illustrated History*. London: Historic Royal Palaces in association with Merrell, 2008.

Tiethoff-Spliethoff, Marieke, and Wendie Shaffer, trans. "Role-play and Representation. Portrait Painting at the Court of Frederik Hendrik and Amalia." In Marika Keblusek and Jori Zijlmans, eds. *Princely Display: The Court of Frederik Hendrik of Orange and Amalia van Solms* (Zwolle: Waanders, 1997. Exh. cat., Historical Museum, The Hague.): pp. 161-200.

Tiethoff-Spliethoff, Marieke. *Oranje en de kunst*. Breda: Lekturama, 1992.

Tietze-Conrat, Erica. "L'allegorie dans la peinture classique hollandaise." *Gazette des Beaux-Arts* 70, 5e per., vol. XVII (1928): pp. 1-12.

Trautz, Fritz. *England und Kurpfalz: Bilder und Dokumente aus der Zeit der Winterköningin Elisabeth Stuart*. Heidelberg, 1963. Exh. cat., Ottheinrichsbau des Heidelberger Schlosses.

Trevor-Roper, H. R. *Princes and Artists: Patronage and Ideology at Four Habsburg Courts, 1517-1633*. London: Thames and Hudson, 1976.

Tucker, Rebecca. "'His excellency at home': Frederik Hendrik and the noble life at Huis Honselaarsdijk." *Nederlands Kunsthistorisch Jaarboek* 51 (2000): pp. 82-101.

————. "The politics of display at Honselaarsdijk." *Nederlands Kunsthistorisch Jaarboek* 65 (2015): pp. 115-142.

Tummers, Anna, et al. *The Art of Laughter: Humour in Dutch Paintings of the Golden Age*. Zwolle: Waanders Uitgevers, 2017. Exh. cat., Frans Hals Museum.

Tummers, Anna. *The Eye of the Connoisseur: Authenticating Paintings by Rembrandt and His Contemporaries*. Los Angeles: J. Paul Getty Museum, 2011.

Ubeda de los Cobos, Andrés, ed. *Paintings for the Planet King: Philip IV and the Buen Retiro Palace*. Madrid: Museo Nacional del Prado in association with Paul Holberton Pub., 2005.

Ufer, Ulrich. *Welthandelzentrum Amsterdam: globale Dynamik und modernes Leben im 17. Jahrhundert*. Cologne: Böhlau Verlag, 2008.

Vergara, Alexander. *Rubens and his Spanish Patrons*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999.

Vermeylen, Filip. *Painting for the Market: Commercialization of Art in Antwerp's Golden Age*. Turnhout, Belgium: Brepols, 2003.

Véron-Denise, Danièle, and Vincent Droguet. *Peintures pour un château: cinquante tableaux (XVIe-XIXe siècle) des collections du Château de Fontainebleau*. Paris: Réunion des musées nationaux, 1998. Exh. cat.

Victoria and Albert Museum and Netherlands Ministerie van Onderwijs, Kunsten en Wetenschappen. *The Orange and the Rose: Holland and Britain in the Age of Observation, 1600-1750.* London: 1964.

Vivanti, Corrado. "Henry IV, the Gallic Hercules." *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes* 30 (1967): pp. 176-197.

Vlieghe, Hans. *Portraits of Identified Sitters Painted in Antwerp*. *Corpus rubenianum Ludwig Burchard* vol. XIX, 2. London: Harvey Miller, 1987.

De Vries, Lyckle. *Gerard de Lairesse: An Artist Between Stage and Studio*. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, 1998.

De Vries, Sandra. "A 'Holy Family' by Gerrit van Honthorst from the 'Provenhuis van Nordingen' at Alkmaar." *The Hoogsteder Mercury* 12 (1991): pp. 17-28.

Waagen, Gustav. "The Great Trio: Charles I, Arundel, and Buckingham." In Frank Herrmann, *The English as Collectors: A Documentary Sourcebook*. London: John Murray, 1999.

Walsh, Amy L. "Van Dyck at the Court of Frederik Hendrik." *Studies in the History of Art* 46, Symposium Papers XXVI: Van Dyck 350 (1994): pp. 221-244.

Warnke, Martin. *The Court Artist: On the Ancestry of the Modern Artist*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1993.

Watson, Katharine and Charles Avery. "Medici and Stuart: A Grand Ducal Gift of 'Giovanni Bologna' Bronzes for Henry Prince of Wales (1612)." *The Burlington Magazine* 115, no. 845 (August 1973): pp. 493-507.

Weigl, Gail Capitol. "'And when slow Time hath made you fit for warre': The

Equestrian Portrait of Prince Henry." In Timothy Wilks, ed. *Prince Henry Revived: Image and Exemplarity in Early Modern England* (Southampton, UK: Southampton Solent University; London: in association with Paul Holberton Pub., 2007): pp. 146-172.

Weller, Dennis P., Leonard J. Slatkes, and Roger B. Ward. *Sinners & Saints, Darkness and Light: Caravaggio and his Dutch and Flemish Followers*. Raleigh, NC: North Carolina Museum of Art, 1998. Exh. cat., North Carolina Museum of Art, Raleigh, NC, Milwaukee Art Museum, Milwaukee, WI, and Dayton Art Institute, Dayton, Ohio.

Wenzel, Michael. "The *Windsor Beauties* by Sir Peter Lely and the Collection of Paintings at St James's Palace, 1674." *Journal of the History of Collections* 14, no. 2 (November 2002): pp. 205-213.

Wenzel, Siegfried. "Ovid from the pulpit." In James G. Clark, et al. *Ovid in the Middle Ages* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011): pp. 160-176.

Westermann, Mariët. "Dutch Classicism. Rotterdam and Frankfurt." *The Burlington Magazine* 142, no. 1164 (March 2000): pp. 186-189.

Weston-Lewis, Aidan. "Annibale Carracci and the Antique." *Master Drawings* 30, no. 3 (Autumn 1992): pp. 287-313.

Weststeijn, Thijs. *Art and Antiquity in the Netherlands and Britain: The Vernacular Arcadia of Franciscus Junius (1591-1677)*. Studies in Netherlandish Art and Cultural History, Leiden: Brill, 2015.

————. *The Visible World: Samuel van Hoogstraten's Art Theory and the Legitimation of Painting in the Dutch Golden Age*. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, 2008.

De Wet, Chris L. *Preaching Bondage: John Chrysostom and the Discourse of Slavery in Early Christianity*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2015.

Wheelock, Arthur K., et al. *Anthony van Dyck*. Washington: National Gallery of Art, 1990. Exh. cat., National Gallery of Art, Washington, DC.

Wheelock, Arthur K., Alexandra Libby, and Henriette Rahusen. *Dutch Paintings of the Seventeenth Century*. National Gallery of Art Online Editions, 2014. <https://purl.org/nga/collection/catalogue/17th-century-dutch-paintings> (Accessed July 18, 2017).

Wheelock, Arthur K. "Jan Lievens: Bringing New Light to an Old Master." In Arthur K. Wheelock, et al. *Jan Lievens: a Dutch Master Rediscovered* (Washington: National Gallery of Art, 2008. Exh. cat., National Gallery of Art, Washington, DC, Milwaukee Art Museum, and Rembrandthuis, Amsterdam): pp. 1-27.

————. *Jan Lievens: a Dutch Master Rediscovered*. Washington: National Gallery of Art, 2008. Exh. cat., National Gallery of Art, Washington, DC, Milwaukee Art Museum, and Rembrandthuis, Amsterdam.

Whinney, Margaret Dickens and Oliver Millar. *English Art, 1625-1714*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1957.

Whitaker, Katie. *A Royal Passion: The Turbulent Marriage of King Charles I of England and Henrietta Maria of France*. New York: W.W. Norton & Co., 2010.

White, Christopher. *Anthony van Dyck: Thomas Howard, the Earl of Arundel*. Malibu, CA: J. Paul Getty Museum, 1995.

————. *The Dutch Pictures in the Collection of Her Majesty the Queen*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 1982.

White, Christopher and Rosanna de Sancha. *Dutch Pictures in the Collection of Her Majesty the Queen*. London: Royal Collection Trust, 2015.

Whitelock, Anna. "Reconsidering the Political Role of Anna of Denmark." In Helen Matheson-Pollock, Joanne Paul, and Catherine Fletcher, eds. *Queenship and Counsel in Early Modern Europe* (Cham, Switzerland: Palgrave Macmillan, 2018): pp. 259-275.

Wieseman, Marjorie. "A Courtly Art Come to The Hague: Portrait Miniatures at the Court of Elizabeth of Bohemia." In Ann Jensen Adams, et al. *Face Book: Studies on Dutch and Flemish Portraiture of the 16th-18th Centuries: Liber Amicorum Presented to Rudolf E. O. Ekkart on the Occasion of his 65th Birthday* (Leiden: Primavera Pers, 2012): pp. 127-132.

Wilcher, Robert. "What Was the King's Book for?: The Evolution of 'Eikon Basilike'." *The Yearbook of English Studies* 21, Politics, Patronage and Literature in England 1558-1658 (1991): pp. 218-228.

Wilk, Molly E. *From Rome to Utrecht: The Nativities of Gerrit van Honthorst*. MA Thesis, Hunter College, 2007.

Wilks, Timothy. “Art Collecting at the English Court from the Death of Henry, Prince of Wales to the Death of Anne of Denmark (November 1612-March 1619).” *Journal of the History of Collections* 9, no. 1 (1997): pp. 31-48.

————. *The Court Culture of Prince Henry and his Circle*. PhD diss., Oxford, 1987.

————. “‘Forbear the heat and haste of building’ : rivalries among the designers at Prince Henry’s court, 1610-12.” *Court Historian* 6, no. 1 (May 2001): pp. 49-65.

————. “Introduction.” In Catherine MacLeod, *The Lost Prince: The Life and Death of Henry Stuart* (London: National Portrait Gallery Publications, 2012. Exh. cat.): pp. 11-17.

————. “‘Paying special attention to the adorning of a most beautiful gallery’ : The Pictures in St. James’s Palace, 1609-49.” *Court Historian* 10, no. 2 (December 2005): pp. 149-172.

————. “The Pike Charged: Henry as Militant Prince.” In Timothy Wilks, ed. *Prince Henry Revived: Image and Exemplarity in Early Modern England* (Southampton, UK: Southampton Solent University; London: in association with Paul Holberton Pub., 2007): pp. 180-211.

————. “Princely Collecting.” In Catherine MacLeod, *The Lost Prince: The Life and Death of Henry Stuart* (London: National Portrait Gallery Publications, 2012. Exh. cat.): pp. 118-119.

Williamson, J. W. *The Myth of the Conqueror: Prince Henry Stuart, a Study of Seventeenth-Century Personation*. New York: AMS Press, 1978.

Wilson, Edward M. and Olga Turner. “The Spanish Protest against ‘A Game at Chesse’.” *The Modern Language Review* 44, no. 4 (Oct. 1949): pp. 476-482.

Wilson-Chevalier, Kathleen. “Art patronage and women (including Habsburg) in the orbit of King Francis I.” *Renaissance Studies* 16, no. 4 (December 2002): pp. 474-524.

Wine, Kathleen. “*L’Astrée*: Tomb or Fountain?” *L’Esprit Créateur* 25, no. 1 (Spring 1985: Art, Architecture, Text: The Late Renaissance): pp. 32-42.

Winkler, Klaus. “Musik und Tanz am Heidelberger Hof von Friedrich V. und Elizabeth Stuart.” In Annette Frese, Frieder Hepp, and Renate Ludwig, eds.,

Der Winterkönig: Heidelberg zwischen höfischer Pracht und Dreißigjährigem Krieg (Remshalden: B.A. Greiner, 2004): pp. 29-38.

Wölfflin, Heinrich and Mary Hottinger, trans. *Principles of Art History, the Problem of the Development of Style in Later Art*. New York: Dover, 1932.

Wood, Jeremy. "Connoisseurship at the Caroline Court." In Desmond Shawe-Taylor, et al. *Charles I: King and Collector* (London: Royal Academy of Arts, 2018. Exh. cat.): pp. 29-48.

————. "Inigo Jones, Italian Art, and the Practice of Drawing." *The Art Bulletin* 74, no. 2 (June 1992): pp. 247-270.

————. "Orazio Gentileschi and Some Netherlandish Artists in London: The Patronage of the Duke of Buckingham, Charles I and Henrietta Maria." *Simiolus: Netherlands Quarterly for the History of Art* 28, no. 3 (2000-2001): pp. 103-128.

————. "Van Dyck and the Earl of Northumberland: Taste and Collecting in Stuart England." *Studies in the History of Art* 46 (1994): pp. 280-284.

————. "Van Dyck's 'Cabinet de Titien': The Contents and Dispersal of his Collection." *The Burlington Magazine* 132, no. 1051 (Oct. 1990): pp. 680-695.

Woodall, Joanna. "Sovereign Bodies: The Reality of Status in Seventeenth-Century Dutch Portraiture." In Joanna Woodall, ed., *Portraiture: Facing the Subject* (Manchester, UK: Manchester University Press, 1997): pp. 75-100.

Woollett, Anne T. and Ariane van Suchtelen. *Rubens & Brueghel: A Working Friendship*. Los Angeles: J. Paul Getty Museum, 2006. Exh. cat., J. Paul Getty Museum, Los Angeles and The Mauritshuis

Wright, Joseph. *Historical German Grammar: Vol. I, Phonology Word-Formation and Accidence*. London, New York, Toronto: Oxford University Press, 1907.

Wroughton, John. *The Routledge Companion to the Stuart Age, 1603-1714*. London: Routledge, Taylor & Francis Group, 2006.

Wyld, Helen. *Gerrit van Honthorst's 'Apollo and Diana' (1628): Portrait and Allegory at the Court of Charles I*. BA Thesis, Courtauld Institute of Art, 2003.

Yates, Frances A. *Astraea: The Imperial Theme in the Sixteenth Century*. London, Boston: Routledge & K. Paul, 1975.

————. "Queen Elizabeth as Astraea." *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes* 10 (1947): pp. 27-82.

Zeri, Federico. *La Galleria Pallavicini in Roma: catalogo dei dipinti*. Firenze: Sansoni, 1959.

Ziegler, Georgianna. "A second phoenix: the rebirth of Elizabeth I in Elizabeth Stuart." In Elizabeth H. Hageman and Katherine Conway, eds. *Resurrecting Elizabeth I in Seventeenth-Century England* (Madison, NJ: Fairleigh Dickinson University Press, 2007): pp. 111-131.

————. "Devising a Queen: Elizabeth Stuart's Representation in the Emblematic Tradition." *Emblematica* 14 (2005): pp. 115-179.

Zijlmans, Jori, and Michèle Hendricks, trans. "Life at the Hague Court." In Marika Keblusek and Jori Zijlmans, eds. *Princely Display: The Court of Frederik Hendrik of Orange and Amalia van Solms* (Zwolle: Waanders, 1997. Exh. cat., Historical Museum, The Hague.): pp. 30-46.

Zwicker, Steven N. *Lines of Authority: Politics and English Literary Culture, 1649-1689*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1993.

Auction/Sale Catalogues

Brown, Beverly Louise and Patrick Matthiesen. *2001: An Art Odyssey 1500-1720: Classicism, Mannerism, Caravaggism and Baroque*. London: Matthiesen Fine Art, 2001.

Christie's (London). *Important Old Master Paintings from the Eric Albada Jeldersma Collection*, 6 December 2018.

Salomon Lilian. *Old Masters*. 2017.

Sotheby's (London). *Ashdown House: The Winter Queen & The Earl of Craven*. Wednesday, 27 October 2010.

Sotheby's (New York). *Master Paintings and Sculpture Day Sale*. Friday, 02 February 2018.

Weiss Gallery, The. *From Merchants to Monarchs: Frans Pourbus the Younger*. London: The Weiss Gallery, 2015.

Appendix A

HOUSE OF STUART FAMILY TREE

Reproduced on next page, horizontally.

♔ = Monarch

♕ = Elector

House of Stuart

♔ Mary, Queen of Scots 1542-1587 = Henry Stuart (Stewart), Lord Darnley 1545-1567

♔ James VI of Scotland and I of England 1566-1625 r. 1603-1625 = Anne of Denmark 1574-1619 m. 1589

Henry Frederick, Prince of Wales 1594-1612

Elizabeth Stuart, Electress Palatine, Queen of Bohemia 1596-1662 r. 1619-1620 = ♔ ♕ Frederick V, Elector Palatine, King of Bohemia 1596-1632 r. 1619-1620; m. 1613

- Frederick Henry, Prince of the Palatinate, 1614-1629
- ♕ Charles I Louis, Elector Palatine 1617-1680; r. 1648-1680 = Charlotte of Hesse-Kassel 1627-1686; m. 1650
  - ♕ Charles II, Elector Palatine, 1651-1685; final Protestant Elector, r. 1680-85
  - Elizabeth Charlotte, Princess Palatine, 1652,1722
  - Frederick of the Palatinate, 1653
- Elizabeth, 1618-1680; d. Herford Abbey
- Rupert of the Rhine, 1619-1682; Head of Royal Navy and Colonial Governor
- Maurice of the Palatinate, 1620-1652
- Louise Hollandine, 1622-1709; d. a nun in convent at Maubuisson
- Louis, 1623-1624
- Edward, Count Palatine of Simmern, 1625-1663 = Anna Gonzaga, 1616-1684; m. 1645
- Henrietta Maria, 1626-1651 = Sigismund Rákóczi, Prince of Transylvania (Siebenbürgen); m. 1651
- Philip Frederick, 1627-1650
- Charlotte, 1628-1631
- Sophia, Electress of Hanover 1630-1714 = ♕ Ernst Augustus of Brunswick-Lüneburg, Elector of Hanover 1629-1698; m. 1658
  - (of 7 children)
  - ♔ ♕ King George I, Elector of Hanover 1660-1727, r. 1714-1727
- Gustavus Adolphus, 1632-1641

♔ Charles I of England 1600-1649 r. 1625-1649 = Henrietta Maria of France 1609-1669 m. 1625

- Charles James, 1629
- ♔ Charles II, 1630-1685 r. 1660 - 1685 = Catherine of Braganza m. 1662
- Mary, Princess Royal 1631-1660 = William II, Prince of Orange 1626-1650; m. 1641; r. 1647-1650
  - ♔ King William III of England, 1650-1702; r. 1689-1702 = ♔ Queen Mary II, 1662-1694; r. 1689-1694, m. 1677
- Anne Hyde, 1637-71; m. 1659 = ♔ James II and VII 1633-1701 r. 1685-1688 = Mary of Modena, 1658-1718; m. 1673
  - (of 8 children)
  - ♔ Queen Mary II
  - ♔ Queen Anne 1665-1714; r. 1702-1707
  - (of 10 children)
  - James Francis Edward Stuart, 1688-1766
- Princess Elizabeth, 1635-1650
- Henry, Duke of Gloucester, 1640-1660
- Princess Anne, 1637-1640
- Princess Catherine, 1639
- Princess Henrietta, 1644-1670 = Philippe, Duke of Orléans, 1640-1701; m. 1661

Appendix B

SEVENTEENTH- AND EIGHTEENTH-CENTURY BIOGRAPHIES OF HONTHORST

1. Guilio Mancini, *Considerazioni sulla pittura*, Rome 1617-1620

> Gerard…was born in…, a city of Flanders, and after having studied for several years under…, quite a famous Flemish painter, came to Rome at that period when the manner of Caravaggio was frequently adopted. Studies which he made in the life classes bore witness to his excellence in drawing. After that, some examples of his work in colors were to be seen, such as those of Saint John the Baptist in the Church of Santa Maria della Scala and various privately owned paintings, and recently a merry company at a table, lit from two artificial sources for the Grand Duke of Tuscany- a work which, with certain reflected and broken lights due to the double illumination, shows much skill. And now he is at work on a Nativity of Our Lord in which the figures get their light from the newborn Christ; this holds a worthy place of its own, despite the fact that the concept was introduced by Correggio and afterwards carried out by Annibale Carracci with great artistry. He left Rome this year,[873] aged between 30 and 35. He is very reserved and melancholic, but none the less is well-mannered and courteous in showing his paintings to studio visitors, and does not even object to working in their presence. He obtains high prices, but notwithstanding this he allows some scope for those who buy for resale to make a profit, since his style is very spirited and pleasing in those scenes of merrymaking by night which at the very first encounter make a striking effect; it is for this reason that such dealers are very glad to do business with him, since he is a man of his word who can be trusted to deliver a painting on the date promised- a quality not so common among painters.[874]

2. Joachim von Sandrart, *Teutsche Academie der Bau-, Bild- und Mahlerey-Künste*, 1675, II, Book 3 (Dutch and German Artists), pp. 303-304:

---

[873] This is an autograph change in the original manuscript from "He is living in Rome at present."

[874] Translation as it appears in Judson/Ekkart 1999, p. 47.

Gerard van Honthorst / Painter of Utrecht. Gerard was born in the world-famous city of Utrecht, among the most important of art. He was educated by honest good parents and had been taught by Abraham Blomart and with much experience in the noble art of painting went then to Rome. As Adam Elzheimer did in small so he in lifesize produced night pieces, which rose high and encountered great prestige, being displayed in many palaces, especially those of the Marchese Justinian, where he lived for a long time, and many highly praiseworthy works including a great night piece in which our Savior is bound, with a white shirt, before Pilato; The candle and the glow of the candle illuminate all things in true naturalness to life, so that art never rose higher: also in Madonna della Scala an altarpiece of the beheading of St. John the Baptist in prison by a lantern, a priceless nightpiece that was highly praised: as well as in S. Maria de Victoria a big piece of St. Paul going into the third heaven.

After leaving many praiseworthy pieces, he returned to his native city of Utrecht, his friends had the highest pleasure to see him return to Utrecht, and he has many apprentices there. He would soon perfect his art for which he also made a good marriage between great works done after life of biblical history and poetic works so he very quickly made his house famous, that it became full of the children of good men whom he taught. In my time there were four or five and twenty, each paid him one hundred guilders a year for the education; his fame grew and grew, so great that King Carl Stuart in Engeland called him to him to paint a very large work, in which Apollo and Diana (in which the king and queen's pictures are given) sit on high in the clouds together and watch as Mercurius in the image of the Duke of Buckingam leads the seven liberal arts with him from the earth and introduces them to the King. It is very splendidly and reasonably drawn, and colorfully painted in the formation of every special property. By contrast, the harmful vices Envy and Hatred are overthrown by virtuous Love, it is with many others in the royal hall of the Banqueting House, to be regarded as his eternal fame, and some pictures of the royal couple, which he completed in six months. He was paid 3000 guilders, and a service for 12 of pure silver, included bowls, plates, edges[?], saltcellars, and other vessels. He next received a valuable horse, and was dismissed with graces.

After returning to Utrecht at the desire of the art lovers, he made a great deal of work for the king, and still more for the King of Denmark, in which he honors the ancient kings of land and water and that all of them [the series of paintings] describe themselves as a whole book, and to be alone enough to show that Honthorst, in all parts of art, proved his great and perfect intellect and diligence quite masterfully, and how he then also became in his life a man of good manners, so far as man is permitted to speak, and he was

virtuous, unquestioning, polite, and very happy, and very beloved, whereby he collected a very great treasure, by continuing very rapidly and diligently, and his happiness may have come to its own advantage.

After such a number of other laudably-formed pieces of delicate poetry for the pleasure-houses of the Prince of Orange in The Hague, Rijswijk, Honselaarsdijk, and thereabouts, he was appointed by the Prince to paint a rotunda at Rijswijk, which he praised in a short time/ and that he first made the round vault like a merry heaven full of angels and flying gods of love and all kinds of birds flying in the air, birds of paradise, pheasants, and others, quite astounding, graceful, and sophisticated. Below he made a walking Gallery with many Nations, joyful conversations between many musicians on different instruments, as well as a petite building; tapestries, and on the moors all manner of Indian birds, ravens, parrots, playing monkeys and cats, which give the art lover, besides pleasure, great amazement. For this he received 8000 guilders (regardless of which it was finished very soon).

Finally, all of the high-standing persons go to him to have their portraits painted. And lastly, this study is his profession, not merely artificial, but also graceful, and so demonstrated that he was not a mere painter, but also a reasonable steward, so that he deserved to be crowned with the laurel of the highest honor. In Utrecht in 1592 he moved from the dark dwelling of the maternal body to the bright day, to The Hague, in the year 1660, he was shut up in the tired night of the grave, and left behind two sons of his profession, who strived to follow their father's virtue.

The art-lover can find his likeness in copperplate LL.

[Gerhard von Hundhorst/ Mahler von Utrecht. Gerhard von Hundhorst wurde in dem Welt-berühmten Utrecht/ als seiner Geburts-Stad/ unter die Fürtreflichste seiner Kunst halben gezehlet/ war von ehrlichen guten Eltern und wol erzogen/ hatte bey Abraham Blomart gelernet/ und mit gründlicher wolgefaßten Erfahrenheit in der edlen Mahl-Kunst sich nach Rom begeben/ allda er wie Adam Elzheimer in kleinen/ also er in Lebensgroßen Begibt sich auf die NachtstuckNachtstucken hoch gestiegen und in großes Ansehen kommen/ wie dann in vielen Palästen/ sonderlich bey dem Marchese Justinian zuersehen/ bey dem er lang gewohnt/ und viele hoch-rühmliche Werke gemacht/ Seine Werke zu Rom.darunter ein großes Blat in die Nacht/ wie unser Erlöser gebunden/ mit einem weißen Hemd angethan/
vor Pilato stehet; der ihn examinirt/ da der Kerzen und Lichter Schein alles in wahrer Natürlichkeit/ dem Leben dermaßen ähnlich/ beleuchtet/ daß niemal

die Kunst höher gestiegen: Also ist allda auch eine madonna della scala, der Altar von S. Johannis des Täuffers Enthauptung/ in der Gefängnis bey einem Windlicht/ ein fürtrefliches Nachtstuck/ so hoch zu preisen; wie auch zu S. Maria de Victoria ein großes Blat/ da der heilige Paulus in dritten Himmel verzucket wird.

Nach mehr hinterlassenen vielen löblichen Gedächtnißen/ begabe er sich wieder in seine Geburts-Stadt Utrecht/ zu seiner Freunde höchster Vergnügung/ Komt wieder nach Utrecht/ und hat allda viele Lehrlinge.und thäte sich bald mit seiner Kunst herfür/ deßwegen er auch eine gute Heuraht getroffen/ und mit der Mänge großer nach dem Leben gemahlter Werke/ biblischer Historien/ und Poetischer Gedichte/ so er sehr geschwind/ seinem Gebrauch nach/ verfärtiget/ sein Haus sehr berühmt gemacht/ daß es voll wurde von fürnehmer Leute Kindern/ die bey ihm zu lernen aufgedingt worden/ wie dann bey meiner Zeit unser vier auch fünf und zwanzig gewesen/ dern jeder ihm wegen der Lehr hundert Gulden jährlich bezahlt; sein Ruhm wurde je länger Wird in Engelland erfordert/ und mahlt darinnen herrliche Werke.je größer/ deßwegen der König Carl Stuart in Engeland ihn zu sich beruffen/ um ein sehr großes Werk zu mahlen/ wie nämlich Apollo und Diana, (denen er des Königs und der Königin Bildniße gegeben) beysammen hoch auf den Wolken sitzen/ und zusehen/ wie Mercurius von der Erden/ in Gestalt des Herzogs von Buckingam/ die sieben freye Künste mit sich führet/ und dem König vorstellet/sehr herrlich und vernünftig gezeichnet/ und treflich in Ausbildung eines jeden besonderer Eigenschaft coloriret. Hingegen wie die schädliche Untugenden/ Neid und Haß/ durch die tugendliche Liebe midergestürtzt warden/ mit noch vielen anderen/ so allda in des Banchetin Hauses Königlichen Saal zu seinen ewigen Ruhm zu sehen/ worfür/ und etliche wenige Contrafäte des Königlichen Hauses/ die er all inner 6. Monaten geendet/ er eine Recompens von 3000. Gulden/ samt einen von ganz Silber gemachten Servis auf 12. Personen an Schüsseln/ Tellern/ Kanten/ Saltzfäßern und anderm Zugehör/ neben einem kostbaren Pferd/ empfangen/ und mit Gnaden entlaßen worden.

Nachdem er wieder zu Utrecht/ nach sehnlichem Verlangen der Kunstliebenden/ ankommen/ hat er noch eine große Mänge Werke vor hochgemeldten König/ noch vielmehr aber für den König in Dennemark verfärtiget/ darinnen er der alten Könige rühmliche Thaten zu Land und Waßer/ der Ordnung nach/ abgebildet/ die alle zu beschreiben für sich selbst ein ganzes Buch bedörften/ und allein genug seyn/ zu erweisen/ daß Hundhorst in allen Theilen der Kunst seinen großen vollkommenen Verstand und Fleiß ganz meisterhaft erwiesen/ wie er dann auch in seinem Lebens-Wandel ein vollkommener Mann gewesen/ sofern von Menschen also zu reden/ erlaubet ist/ dann er war Tugend-reich/ unsträflich/ höflich/ darzu

glückselig und sehr beliebet/ wordurch er einen überaus großen Schatz gesamlet/ indeme er sehr geschwind und fleißig immer fortgesetzt/ und sich sein Glück wol zu Nutzen gemachet.

Nach dergleichen vielen andern löblich-gebildten Stucken/ zierlichen Poesien zu den Lust-Häusern des Prinzen von Oranien ins Grafenhaag/ Reßwick/ Honslardick und dortherum an. andere Ort mehr/ wurde er zu dem erstgedachten Prinzen beruffen/ der ihme zu Reßwick eine Rutonda zu mahlen angedinget/ welche er in kurzer Zeit löblich verfärtiget/ also daß er erstlich das runde Gewölb wie einen frölichem Himmel voller Engel und fliegender Liebes-Göttern/ mit allerley in der Luft schwebenden Geflügel/ die dem Paradeiß-Vogel/ Fasanen und andern nachjagen/ ganz verwunderlich/ fremd und anmuhtig gebildet/ herunterwarts mahlte er eine herum gehende Galleria mit vielerley Nationen/ freudigen Conversationen etlicher musicirenden Personen auf unterschiedlichen Instrumenten/ als auch ein zierliches Gebäu/ Tapetzerey/ und auf die Mauren allerley Indianische Vögel/ Raben/ Papagey/ spielende Affen und Katzen/ die dem Kunst-liebenden/ neben der Lust/ zu großer Verwunderung Ursach geben/ worfür er (unangesehen/ daß ers sehr bald geendet) 8000. Gulden empfangen.

Mehr hat er alle hohe Stands-Personen in Begibt sich zuletzt auf das Contrafäten. Holland gecontrafätet/ und zuletzt dieses Studium seine Profession seyn laßen/ auch alle nicht allein künstlich/ sondern zugleich anmutig/ und also vorgestellet/ daß er männiglich ohne seinen Schaden contentiret/ darbey zu erkennen gebend/ daß er nicht allein ein fürtreflicher Mahler; sondern auch ein vernünftiger Hoffmann seye/ demnach wol verdiene/ daß er mit dem Lorbeerkranz höchster Ehren gekrönt werde. Er ist zu Utrecht/Anno 1592.aus der finstern Wohnung des mütterlichen Leibes an das helle Tagesliecht gesetzet/ zu Grafenhag aber wieder Anno 1660. in die tunkele Nacht des Grabes verschloßen worden/ und solte zween Söhne seiner Profession hinterlaßen haben/ die des Vatters Tugend nachzufolgen sich rühmlich bemühen.

Sein Contrafät wird der Kunst-liebende in der Kupferblatte LL. Finden][875]

3. Filippo Baldinucci, *Notizie de' professori del disegno da Cimabue in qua*, 1681-1728:

---

[875] As transcribed and annotated in the scholarly annotated online edition, <http://ta.sandrart.net/en/>.

Gerard Honthorst, born in Utrecht in the year 1592, learned the art of painting from Abraham Bloemaert, he was a good inventor and portraitist, he worked for a long time in Italy for Cardinals and other Princes. He spent time in England, where he made some beautiful things for the King, as well as for the King of Denmark. He finally retired to The Hague, where he worked in the service of the Prince of Orange until the year 1661. at which time he was still living. His own self-portrait was made into a print by Pieter de Jode.

[Gheraldo Honthorst, nacque in Utrecht l'anno 1592. apprese l'arte del dipignere da Adamo Blomaert, fu buon inventore e ritrattista, operò gran tempo in Italia per più Cardinali ed altri Principi. Passatosene in Inghilterra, fece cose belle per quell Re, siccome per lo Re di Danimarca Ritiratosi finalmente all'Haya, operò in servizio del Principe d'Orange fino all'anno 1661. nel qual tempo ancora viveva. Fece il ritratto di se stesso, che poi fu dato alle stampe, con intaglio di Pietro de Jode.][876]

4. Sebastiano Resta and Jean Meyssens, *The true effigies of the most eminent painters, and other famous artists that have flourished in Europe. Curiously engraven on copper-plates. Together with an account of the time when they lived, the most remarkable passages of their lives, and most considerable works*. London, 1694 (First published in French in 1649), no. 51, p. 5:

   Born at *Utrecht anno*Do.1592. Brought up by *Abraham Blomaert*, was very good in Designs and in Faces. His sufficiency being known to several Cardinals, he was employed by them in painting the Rarities that Italy at that time afforded, He came afterwards into *England*, where King *James* the first, made use of him in several Designs to his satisfaction; In *Denmark* are many fine Pieces of his to be seen, His last employment was in the service of the Prince of *Orange* at the *Hague.*

5. Arnold Houbraken, *De groote schouburgh der nederlantsche konstschilders en schilderessen*, Amsterdam 1718-1721, no. 65, pp. 149-150:

   GERARD HONTHORST, Born in Utrecht in the year 1592. He learned the rules of art from Abraham Bloemaert, then went on to Rome. There he had grown such, in some years, that the choicest connoisseurs and lovers of art

[876] Italian as transcribed in Filippo Baldinucci, *Opere di Filippo Baldinucci*, Vol. 12 (Milan: Società tipografica de' Classici italiani, 1808): p. 96.

praised his work, especially his night paintings. Afterwards he also worked for various Cardinals, the King of England Charles I, the King of Denmark, and finally the Prince of Orange at that time, for his excellent art, such as portraits, if ordinance has been told[?]. He was particularly affable, experienced, and lived an organized life, whereby he taught many children the primary contents of art, especially those of the Queen of Bohemia, sister of King Charles I of England: the Prince Palatine, Prince Rupert, and four daughters, of which one was Sophia also the Abbess of Maubuisson, to which the spring of art had come. He painted many pictures of significant people, including Marie de' Medici, the Queen of France, as Jan Vos puts it:

Thus, shown here is Medicis, mother of three kingdoms,

The tower of envy stifles her lily:

Whatever Fortune much Great did appear,

has felt so alone, uncertain is fame.

Her climb was ruined by heavy exile.

The throne is made of gold, but the stairs are treacherous [slippery].

He was still alive in the year 1662, and painted at the Princely Pleasure-House in den Bosch outside of The Hague.

[GERARD HONTHORST, geboren binnen Utrecht, in het jaar 1592. Heeft de gronden van de Konst geleerd by ABRAM. BLOEMAERT, daar naar voort te Romen; daar hy in eenige jaren zoodanig was toegenomen, dat de keurigste kenners en beminnaars van de Schilderkonst groot bevallen in zyn werk, inzonderheid zyn nagtlichten, kregen; gelyk hy ook naderhand van verscheiden Kardinalen, den Koning van Engeland Karel den I., den Koning van Denemarken, en eindelyk van den Prins van Oranje in dien tyd, om zyne uitstekende Konst, zoo in Pourtretten als Ordinantien is aangezogt geweest.

Hy was byzonder minzaam, beleeft en van een geregelt leven; waarom hy ook vele Kinderen van de voornaamste luiden in de Konst heeft onderwezen, inzonderheid die van de Koningen van Bohemen, zuster van Koning Karel van Engeland, den Prins Palatin, Prins Robbert, en vier Dochters, waar van d'eene was Sophia, ook de *Abdisse* van *Maubuisson*, die veer in de Konst gekomen waren.

Hy heeft vele Beeltenissen van aanzienlyke luiden geschildert, en onder deze ook Maria de Medicis, Koningin van Vrankryk enz. daar Jan Vos dit op zeit:

Dus toont zig Medicis, een Moeder van drie Ryken,

De doren van de nydt verstikt haar leelybloem:

Al wat Fortuin aan veel der Grooten ooit deed blyken,

Heeft zy alleen gevoelt. Onzeeker is de roem.

Haar klimmen word verpoost door zwaare ballingschappen.

De troonen zyn van goud; maar glibberig van trappen.

Hy was in den jare 1662 nog in leven, en schilderde op het Prinselyke Lusthuis in 't Bosch buiten den Haag.][877]

[877] Arnold Houbraken and B.M. Israël, *De groote schouburgh der nederlantsche konstschilders en schilderessen* (Amsterdam, First ed. 1718-1721, facsimile ed. 1976): no. 65, pp. 149-150, <http://www.dbnl.org/tekst/houb005groo01_01/> (Accessed 15 May 2017).

Appendix C

LETTER FROM HONTHORST TO DUDLEY CARLETON

Letter dated 26 February / 8 March 1629
SP 84/139/30

Excellent Sir,

I have most gratefully received Your Excellency's letter, which I immediately answered through the honorable Monsignore Calandrini of Amsterdam.[878] I did not receive a reply until today, which also makes me doubt that my letter has arrived well or that it has probably been lost on the way. The content mainly concerned the measure of size, that is, the length and breadth of the picture I should carry out for Your Excellency.[879] This measurement of the panel was what I had lost before I started with the frame, which I will catch up on immediately. If Your Excellency would be so gracious as to send it [the measurements] to me immediately, I will begin right away. I have spent some days in The Hague, where I made half-length portraits of Their Majesties the King and Queen of Bohemia, at the request of signore Carr on behalf on His Majesty of England.[880] I hope that if His Majesty, with Your Excellency, sees it, he will greatly enjoy it. In addition, I have made a *modello* of the portrait of Their Majesties of Bohemia with all of the princes and princesses, their children, about which Their Majesties were very pleased.[881] I wish nothing more than to receive orders from His Majesty of England as I also hope to serve Your Excellency to the best of my ability, how you humble me and will always find me ready to serve. I ask Our Lord to continue to give you greatness and happiness. In Utrecht.

---

[878] For Calandrini see Chapter 4, Ch. 4, p. 248n601.

[879] On the continuing negotiations between Honthorst and Carleton regarding pictures and measurements, see Robert Hill, "Sir Dudley Carleton and his Relations with Dutch Artists 1616-1632," *Leids kunsthistorisch jaarboek* 13 (2003): pp. 263-64.

[880] This is probably Sir Robert Kerr [pronounced Carr] (c. 1578-1654), 1st Earl of Ancram and Gentleman of the Bedchamber to Charles I.

[881] On the modello see Chapter 4, p.246n595.

On the 8th of March 1629

Humbly your Excellency's,
Gerrit van Honthorst

[Exmo Sig.re
Ho bon recevuto la gratissima di Vro:Exa. Alla quale subito feci la risposta inmandola sotto coverto elli mR Calandrini d'Amsterdam. Et insino quo giorno non mi e capita la risposta di essa / che mi fa dubitare non essere ben incaminata, o vero chè visia smarito p la strada la substanza di essa fu principalmente p la misura della grandessa cioe la lungezza e largessa del quadro che vra Exa mi habbio comesso A fare / essendo la misura che io haveva smarito p il legnarolo avanti che havevo messo mano a fare il Cornice di esse / che io subito havendo detta misura che vra Ex.a compiacera di farmelo mandare quanto pma mettero mano Subbito – Io sono stato alcuni giorni nella Haija dove ho ritratto insino a meso corpo la Ma:ta del Re e la Regina di Bohemia A requisitione del sig.re Caar p commissione di Sua Ma.ta d'Angelterra. Sperando che quando d.a Sua Ma:ta insieme con vra Ex.a lo vederanno che ne haveranno gran gusto / Et più ancora ho fatto un Modello del Ritratto di d.a Sua Ma.ta di Bohemia con tutti li principi et principesse Suoi fig.li in che la sua ma:ta haveva gran contento / Io non desidero altro che d'essere comandato dalla sua Ma:ta d'Angelterra come ancora di vra Ex.a in poterli servire con la mia virtu che mi trovanno Humiliss. le suo et Prontissimo nelle detti serviti. Pregando N. S. Iddio p la loro maggiore grandezza è felicita. In Utrecht.
Adi 8 di Marzo 1629

Humiliss. di vra Ex.a
Gerrit van Honthorst][882]

[882] Transcribed in Italian and translated into German in Braun 1966, no. 45, pp. 354-356.

Appendix D

USE OF GROUNDS IN PAINTINGS BY HONTHORST AS EXAMINED BY AUTHOR, DIVIDED BY TYPE

1. Double Grounds (red base, gray upper unless otherwise specified):

    1.1. *Christ Crowned with Thorns*, about 1620, Los Angeles, The J. Paul Getty Museum (90.PA.26).
        1.1.1. Red lower, yellowish brown upper

    1.2. *The Adoration of the Shepherds*, 1622, Cologne, Wallraf-Richartz Museum (WRM 2122).

    1.3. *King David Playing the Harp,* 1622, Utrecht, Centraal Museum (8670).
        1.3.1. Reddish lower with light, buff-colored upper

    1.4. *Saint Sebastian*, about 1623, London, National Gallery (NG4503).
        1.4.1. Upper layer appears tan in cross-section

    1.5. *Satyr and Nymph*, c. 1623, Kassel, Schloss Whilhelshöhe, Gemäldegalerie Alte Meister (damaged WWII and subsequently rolled, ground visible through large areas of loss).

    1.6. *The Violin Player,* 1626, The Hague, Royal Picture Gallery Mauritshuis (Inv. 1107).[883]

    1.7. *Allegory of Justice: The History of the Winter King's Family,* 1636, Brookfield Arts Foundation (20090825.4), on long-term loan to the Museum of Fine Arts, Boston (Photo courtesy of the MFA Boston).

    1.8. *Portrait of Frederik Hendrik*, 1631, The Hague, Koninklijke Verzamelingen (SC/0010).[884]

---

[883] Confirmed by cross-section taken in 2015, examined 3/17/17.

[884] Referenced in file for number 1.2, which notes that the ground structure matches as seen in sample taken 11/16/15.

1.9. *The Four Eldest Children of the King and Queen of Bohemia,* 1631, London, Royal Collection Trust (RCIN 404971).

2. Grey Ground:[885]

2.1. *King Charles I*, 1628, London, National Portrait Gallery (NPG 4444).

2.2. *George Villiers, 1st Duke of Buckingham with his Family*, 1628, London, Royal Collection Trust (RCIN 406553).

3. Tan/Cream/Buff Ground:

3.1. *Musical Group on a Balcony,* 1622, Los Angeles, J. Paul Getty Museum (70.PB.34).

3.2. *The Concert*, 1623, Washington, D.C., National Gallery of Art (2013.38.1).

3.3. *Frederick Henry, Prince of Orange*, 1631, London, Royal Collection Trust (RCIN 404407).

3.4. *Portrait of Mademoiselle de Valkenburg and d'Osemal*, 1641, Hannover, Landesmuseum (PAM 800).

3.5. *Prince Rupert, Count Palatine*, 1641-42, London, National Portrait Gallery (NPG 4519).

3.6. *Portrait of Elizabeth Stuart,* c. 1642, Hannover, Historisches Museum (VM 030095).

3.7. *Portrait of Prince Rupert of the Palatine*, 1642, Hannover, Landesmuseum (KM 253).

3.8. *Portrait of Mary Stuart*, c. 1647, Hannover, Landesmuseum (KM 254).

---

[885] Grouping in single ground categories does not necessarily indicate the absence of a double ground, but a double ground could not be confirmed in examination or was not noted in an object's file.

3.9. *Princess Sophia*, 1648, London, Royal Collection Trust (RCIN 404423).

3.10. *Allegory of Fruitfulness in Marriage*, 1649, Schloß Rheydt.

3.11. *Allegory of Charity*, 1649, Schloß Rheydt.

3.12. (studio of Honthorst), *Elizabeth, Princess of the Palatinate*, 17th century, London, National Portrait Gallery (NPG 340).

4. Warm Pink/Red Ground:

4.1. *The Mocking of Christ*, circa 1617, Los Angeles County Museum of Art (AC1999.92.1).

4.2. *Apollo and Diana*, 1628, London, Royal Collection Trust (Hampton Court Palace, RCIN 405746).

4.3. *Willem II, Prince of Orange,* c. 1640, London, Royal Collection Trust (RCIN 404406).

5. Unusual Canvas:

5.1. *The Adoration of the Shepherds*, 1622, Cologne, Wallraf-Richartz Museum (WRM 2122).
5.1.1. Mattress ticking

5.2. *Artemisia,* ca. 1635, Princeton University Art Museum (y1968-117).
5.2.1. Herringbone

Appendix E

PAINTINGS BY HONTHORST IN THE BOHEMIAN COLLECTIONS, THE HAGUE

Table 1

Paintings by Honthorst in the Bohemian Collections, The Hague (divided by genre)					
	Title	*Date and Signature*	*Judson cat. no.*	*Current Location*	*Earliest Provenance*
Genre, History, Pastoral					
1.	*David Playing the Harp*	1622; Signed G. van Honthorst fe: 1622	11	Centraal Museum, Utrecht	Combe Abbey 1866, no. 365.
2.	*Flora*		113	Unknown	Combe Abbey 1769, no. 23
3.	*A Woody Landscape with Nymphs and a Satyr*		125	Unknown	Combe Abbey 1866, no. 361
4.	*Venus and Adonis*	1641; Signed G.Honthorst 1641	148	Christie's London, 16 December, 1998, no. 37.	Sold from the Craven Coll., Combe Abbey, 13 April 1923, no. 93.
5.	*Shepherdess*	16[2]2; Signed GvHonthorst. fe 16[?]2	193	Centraal Museum, Utrecht; inv. no. 6499	1633 Rhenen Inventory, no. 65
6.	*Smiling Girl, a Courtesan, Holding an Obscene Image*	1625?	215 (6)	Unknown	Coombe Abbey, Craven Collection (possibly)

7.	*Boy Blowing on a Firebrand*	ca. 1621	231	Art Institute of Chicago	Combe Abbey 1866, no. 246.
Historiated, Allegorical, Pastoral Portraits					
8.	*Allegory of Injustice, The History of the Winter King's Family*	ca. 1635	170	Heidelberg, Kurpfälzisches Museum	Rhenen Palace
9.	*Allegory of Justice, The History of the Winter King's Family*	1636; Signed Ghonthorst fe 1636	171	Long-term loan, Museum of Fine Arts, Boston	Rhenen Palace
10.	*Amalia van Solms, Half-Length, as Diana*	1632	310	The Hague, Koninklijke Verzamelingen	Sold Sotheby's, London, Auction Cornelia, Countess of Craven, 27 November 1968, no. 41.
11.	*King Charles I as a Shepherd*	1628	416	Unknown	Commissioned by Charles from Honthorst as a gift for Elizabeth and Frederick
12.	*Henrietta Maria as a Shepherdess*	1628	418	Unknown	Commissioned by Charles from Honthorst as a gift for Elizabeth and Frederick
13.	*Frederick V and Elizabeth Stuart as a Shepherd and Flora*	c. 1629-30	326	Unknown	Probably Coll. Of Elizabeth of Bohemia (Hoogsteder 1984-86, cat. no. 44)

14.	*The Four Eldest Children of the King and Queen of Bohemia*	1631; Signed: Honthorst.1631	327	Royal Collection, London	Probably Coll. Of Elizabeth of Bohemia and Prince Rupert
15.	*Elizabeth Stuart, Queen of Bohemia, As Venus*	1646; Signed and dated	341	Unknown	Combe Abbey 1866, no. 359.
16.	*Sophia, Princess Palatine, as an Angel*	ca. 1636	379	Unknown	Sold London, Phillips, Auction Earl of Craven, 18 December 1984, no. 7.
17.	*Elisabeth van Solms as Minerva*	1632; Signed and dated	454	Unknown	Sold London, Sotheby's, Auction Cornelia, Countess of Craven, 27 November 1968, no. 52.
18.	*Louise Christina van Solms as Diana*		456	Unknown	Combe Abbey 1866, no. 389.
19.	*Unknown Lady as a Shepherdess*	c. 1630	492	Walters Art Gallery, Baltimore	Combe Abbey 1866, no. 341.
20.	*Unknown Lady as a Shepherdess*	c. 1630	493	Collection Fürst von Isenburg	Combe Abbey 1866, no. 287.

Portraits					
21.	*Henrietta Maria Princess Palatine*		377	Private collection	Sold Sotheby's, *Ashdown House,* lot 31.
22.	*Prince Edward, Count Palatine of Simmern*	1638; Signed: Ghonthorst. 1638	369	Private Collection	Sold Sotheby's, *Ashdown House*, lot 96.
23.	*Elizabeth of Bohemia*	G. Honthorst	336 (5)	Private Collection	Sold Sotheby's, *Ashdown House*, lot 107.
24.	*Princess Louise Hollandine*	1642; Signed: Ghonthorst / 1642	364	Private collection	Sold Sotheby's, *Ashdown House*, lot 108.
25.	*Portrait of Frederik Hendrik*		295 (4)	Stichting Historische Verzamelingen van het Huis Oranje-Nassau	Combe Abbey 1866, no. 154.
26.	*Portrait of Mary Stuart*		301 (29)	Ashdown House, National Trust, no. 4	Combe Abbey 1866, no. 188.
27.	*Portrait of Louise Henriette*	1647	303	Unknown	Delivered 4 October 1647

28.	*Three-Quarter Length Portrait of Frederik Hendrik*		306 (1)	Unknown	Combe Abbey 1866, no. 320.
29.	*Amalia van Solms, in Profile*	ca. 1631-33	308	Unknown	Sold Sotheby's, London, Auction Cornelia, Countess of Craven, 27 November 1968, no. 90.
30.	*Amalia van Solms, Half-Length*	1632; Signed: GHonthorst fe 1632	309	Centraal Museum, Utrecht	Sold Sotheby's, London, Auction Cornelia, Countess of Craven, 27 November 1968, no. 50.
31.	*King Friedrich V, Full-Length in Robes of State*	1634; Signed: GHonthorst 1634	330	Heidelberg, Kurpfälzisches Museum	Sold Sotheby's, London, Auction Cornelia, Countess of Craven, 27 November 1968, no. 35.
32.	*King Friedrich V, Half-Length, in Armour (lace collar)*		330 (4)	Ashdown House, National Trust	Combe Abbey 1866, no. 185.
33.	*King Friedrich V, Half-Length, in Armour (small collar)*		330 (12)	Unknown	Combe Abbey 1866, no. 377.
34.	*King Friedrich V of Bohemia in Profile (Armor type)*		331 (1)	Schloß Fasanerie	Combe Abbey 1866, no. 169.

35.	*King Friedrich V of Bohemia in Profile (Armor type)*		331 (5)	Unknown	Combe Abbey 1866, no. 404.
36.	*King Friedrich V of Bohemia in Profile á la Romaine*	1633; Signed: GHonthorst fe 1633	332	Unknown (Variation preserved in Hannover)	Combe Abbey 1866, no. 70.
37.	*Elizabeth Stuart, Full-Length with Crown, Sceptre, and Orb*	1631; Signed: GHonthorst 1631	336	Heidelberg, Kurpfälzisches Museum	Combe Abbey 1866, no. 3.
38.	*Elizabeth Stuart, Queen of Bohemia, in Profile*	1632; Signed: G.Honthorst F. 1632	337	Stichting Historische Verzamelingen van het Huis Oranje-Nassau	Combe Abbey 1866, no. 83.
39.	*Elizabeth Stuart, Queen of Bohemia, in Profile*		337 (1)	Schloß Fasanerie	Sold Sotheby's, London, Auction Cornelia, Countess of Craven, 27 November 1968, no. 38.
40.	*Elizabeth Stuart, Queen of Bohemia, Full-Length*	1642; Signed: GHonthorst. 1642.	340	National Gallery of Art, London	Combe Abbey 1866, no. 189.
41.	*Elizabeth Stuart, Half-Length*	1650; Signed: GHonthorst 1650	340 (4)	Ashdown House, National Trust	Coombe Abbey, Craven Collection

42.	*Elizabeth Stuart, Bust-Length, with Crown*		340 (11)	Unknown	Combe Abbey 1866, no. 379.
43.	*Frederick Henry, Prince Palatine*	ca. 1630	342	Ashdown House, National Trust, no. 10	Combe Abbey 1866, no. 195.
44.	*Charles I Louis, Prince Palatine, Half-Length*	ca. 1635-40	344 (1)	Ashdown House, National Trust	Coombe Abbey, Craven Collection
45.	*Charles I Louis, Prince Palatine, Half-Length*	Ca. 1639	346 (1)	Schloß Fasanerie	Combe Abbey 1866, no. 197.
46.	*Charles I Louis, Prince Palatine, Half-Length*	Ca. 1640	347 (1)	Ashdown House, National Trust	Combe Abbey 1866, no. 193.
47.	*Elizabeth, Princess Palatine, Half-Length*		351 (1)	Unknown	Combe Abbey 1866, no. 173.
48.	*Elizabeth, Princess Palatine, Half-Length*	ca. 1637	352 (1)	Schloß Fasanerie	Combe Abbey 1866, no. 192.

49.	*Elizabeth, Princess Palatine, Half-Length (in Theatrical Costume)*	ca. 1639-40	353 (1)	Ashdown House, National Trust, no. 16	Combe Abbey 1866, no. 54.
50.	*Rupert, Prince Palatine, Half-Length*	ca. 1637-38	355	Unknown	Combe Abbey 1866, no. 196.
51.	*Rupert, Prince Palatine, Half-Length, Roman Dress*	ca. 1640	356	London, National Portrait Gallery	Combe Abbey 1866, no. 79.
52.	*Maurice, Prince Palatine, Half-Length*	1639; Signed and dated middle right	359 (1)	Unknown	Sold London, Christie's, Auction Cornelia, Countess of Craven, 13 April 1923, no. 95.
53.	*Maurice, Prince Palatine, Half-Length*	1642; Signed: GHonthorst 1642	360 (2)	Unknown	Combe Abbey 1866, no. 194.
54.	*Louise Hollandine, Princess Palatine, Half-Length*	1639	363	Unknown	Combe Abbey 1866, no. 186.
55.	*Louise Hollandine, Princess Palatine, Half-Length*	1642; Signed and dated	364	Ashdown House, National Trust	Sold London, Phillips, Auction Earl of Craven, 18 December 1984, no. 90.

56.	*Louise Hollandine, Princess Palatine, Half-Length*	1650; Signed: GHonthorst 1650	367	Ashdown House, National Trust	Coombe Abbey, Craven Collection
57.	*Louise Hollandine, Princess Palatine, Half-Length*		367 (1)	Unknown	Combe Abbey 1866, no. 179.
58.	*Edward, Prince Palatine, Half-Length*	1638; Signed and dated	369	Ashdown House, National Trust	Sold London, Phillips, Auction Earl of Craven, 18 December 1984, no. 87.
59.	*Edward, Prince Palatine, Three-Quarter Length*	1645; Signed and dated	371	Unknown	Combe Abbey 1866, no. 178.
60.	*Henrietta Maria, Princess Palatine, Half-Length*	ca. 1640	374	Ashdown House, National Trust	Combe Abbey 1866, no. 187[?]
61.	*Henrietta Maria, Princess Palatine, Three-Quarter Length*	ca. 1648-50	377 (1)	Ashdown House, National Trust	Combe Abbey 1866, no. 300.
62.	*Sophia, Princess Palatine, Half-Length, with Lemons in her Hand*	ca. 1645-47	382 (2)	Heidelberg, Kurpfälzisches Museum	Sold London, Sotheby's, Auction Cornelia, Countess of Craven, 27 November 1968, no. 49.

63.	*Sophia, Princess Palatine, Half-Length, with Lemons in her Hand*	ca. 1645-47	382 (5)	Unknown	Sold London, Phillips, Auction Earl of Craven, 18 December 1984, no. 89 (attr. to Louise Hollandine).
64.	*Sophia, Princess Palatine, Half-Length, with Flowers in her Hand*	1648; Signed: GHonthorst 1648	383	Royal Collection, London (RCIN 404423)	Combe Abbey 1866, no. 183.
65.	*Sophia, Princess Palatine, Half-Length*	1650; Signed: GHonthorst 1650	384 (2)	Ashdown House, National Trust	Combe Abbey 1866, no. 190.
66.	*Sophia, Princess Palatine, Bust-Length*	c. 1650	384 (4)	Unknown	Sold London, Phillips, Auction Earl of Craven, 18 December 1984, no. 28.
67.	*Sophia, Princess Palatine, Bust-Length*	c. 1650	384 (6)	Unknown	Sold London, Sotheby's, Auction Cornelia, Countess of Craven, 27 November 1968, no. 27d.
68.	*Sophia Dorothea van Brederode, Wife of Christian Albrecht zu Dohna*		399	Collection Alexander Fürst Dohna, Basel	Sold London, Sotheby's, Auction Cornelia, Countess of Craven, 27 November 1968, no. 55.
69.	*William, Earl of Craven, Full-Length*	1642; Signed and dated	403	Fitzwilliam Museum, Cambridge, UK	Combe Abbey 1866, no. 27.

70.	*William, Earl of Craven, Full-Length*	1650; Dated	403 (1)	Unknown (Judson Pl. 300)	Combe Abbey 1866, no. 308[?].
71.	*William, Earl of Craven, Half-Length*		403 (4)	Ashdown House, National Trust	Craven Collection
72.	*William, Earl of Craven, Half-Length, to the Right*		404	Unknown	Sold London, Phillips, Auction Earl of Craven, 18 December 1984, no. 88.
73.	*James Graham, 1st Marquess of Montrose*	1649; Signed: GHonthorst 1649	419	Unknown	Given to Elizabeth of Bohemia by the Marquess, as mentioned in a letter of 21 June 1649.
74.	*Amalia Elisabeth von Hanau-Münzenberg, Wife of Landgraf Wilhelm V von Hessen-Kassel*	1645; Signed: GHonthorst 1645	421	Ashdown House, National Trust	Combe Abbey 1866, no. 92.
75.	*Amalia Elisabeth von Hanau-Münzenberg, Wife of Landgraf Wilhelm V von Hessen-Kassel*	ca. 1645	421 (3)	Unknown	Combe Abbey 1866, no. 395.
76.	*Wihelm V, Landgraf von Hessen-Kassel*	Signed: GHonthorst	425	Collection Prince de Mérode	Combe Abbey 1866, no. 291.

77.	*Henriette Francesca von Hohenzollern*	1649; Signed: GHonthorst 1649	427	Museum Markiezenhof, Bergen op Zoom	Combe Abbey 1866, no. 167.
78.	*Isabella van Hornes, Wife of Lodewijk van Nassau-Beverweerd, to the Left*	1636; Signed: GHonthorst 1636	428	Coll. Duke of Grafton, Euston Hall	Combe Abbey 1866, no. 339.
79.	*Johan Graaf van Hornes*		430	Collection Van Tuyll van Serooskerken, Castle Heeze	Combe Abbey 1866, no. 285.
80.	*(Possibly) Johan de Merode*		434	Ashdown House, National Trust, no. 23	Combe Abbey 1866, no. 289.
81.	*Elisabeth Charlotte van Nassau-Siegen, Wife of Georg Friedrich von Waldeck*	Signed: Ghonthorst	436	Art Dealer Dr. Van Delden & Cie, Osnabrück (1993)	Possibly Coll. Sophia, Princess Palatine, Electress of Hannover
82.	*Hendrik Casimir I, Graaf van Nassau-Dietz*		438	Rijksmuseum Paleis Het Loo, Apeldoorn (on loan from Oranje-Nassau-Museum)	Sold London, Sotheby's, Auction Cornelia, Countess of Craven, 27 November 1968, no. 67.
83.	*Wilhelmina Christina van Nassau-Siegen, Wife of Josias von Waldeck*	1641; Signed: GHonthorst 1641	443 (1)	Art Dealer Dr. Van Delden & Cie, Osnabrück (1993)	Possibly Coll. Sophia, Princess Palatine, Electress of Hannover

84.	*Margaretha von Plessen*	1647; Signed and dated	446	Unknown	Combe Abbey 1866, no. 180.
85.	*Charles de la Porte, Duc de la Meilleraye*		447	Unknown	Sold London, Sotheby's, Auction Cornelia, Countess of Craven, 27 November 1968, no. 65.
86.	*Valdemar Christian, Graf von Schleswig-Holstein*	1647; Signed: GHonthorst / 1647	453	Museum Frederiksborg, Hillerod	Sold London, Sotheby's, Auction Cornelia, Countess of Craven, 27 November 1968, no. 68.
87.	*Ursula van Solms*	c. 1636	458 (1)	Unknown (Judson Pl. 347)	Sold London, Sotheby's, Auction Cornelia, Countess of Craven, 27 November 1968, no. 54
88.	*Ursula van Solms*	c. 1636	458 (2)	Unknown	Sold London, Sotheby's, Auction Cornelia, Countess of Craven, 27 November 1968, no. 61.
89.	*Unknown Officer, Perhaps a Member of the Nassau Family*	Signed: Ghonthorst	491	Art Dealer Dr. Van Delden & Cie, Osnabrück (1993)	Possibly Coll. Sophia, Princess Palatine, Electress of Hannover
90.	*Unknown Lady*	1641; Dated	504	Unknown	Coombe Abbey, Craven Collection

91.	*Portrait of a Lady in a Yellow Dress and a Red Cloak*	1647; Signed: GHonthorst ./ 1647	509	Unknown	Sold London, Sotheby's, Auction Cornelia, Countess of Craven, 27 November 1968, no. 71.
92.	*Unknown Lady*	1648; Signed: GHonthorst 1648	510	Heidelberg, Kurpfälzisches Museum	Combe Abbey 1866, no. 172.
93.	*Unknown Lady*	1648; Signed and dated	512	Unknown	Combe Abbey 1866, no. 191.
94.	*Unknown Lady*	GHonthorst […]	518	Historisches Museum, Hannover	Sold London, Sotheby's, Auction Cornelia, Countess of Craven, 27 November 1968, no. 48.
95.	*Unknown Lady*		519	Unknown	Sold London, Sotheby's, Auction Cornelia, Countess of Craven, 27 November 1968, no. 47.
96.	*Double Portrait of Two Children, possibly Henrietta Maria and Edward of the Palatine*	1632; Signed and dated	N/A	Collection Wentworth-Fitzwilliam, England	Unknown