

KATARZYNA KRZYŻAGÓRSKA-PISAREK
INDEPENDENT ART HISTORIAN
LONDON

TWO PORTRAITS OF THE PRINCE LADISLAS-SIGISMUND VASA FROM THE COLLECTIONS IN WAWEL CASTLE RE-EXAMINED

INTRODUCTION

This article aims to re-evaluate the existing evidence concerning the attribution and provenance of the two portraits of the Polish Prince Ladislas-Sigismund (1595–1648), later King Ladislas IV, formerly ascribed to the Flemish master Peter Paul Rubens, and now to his workshop and his school or circle respectively. Both pictures are at present in the Wawel Castle in Cracow, and are the two most important works associated with Rubens and his studio in Poland. As both paintings originally came from British collection, so they might benefit from being reviewed from this perspective. The first one is a half-length (to the knees) portrait on long-term loan from the Metropolitan Museum, New York¹, described there as workshop of Peter Paul Rubens, *Ladislas-Sigismund IV, King of Poland*, c. 1624, oil on canvas, 49¼ × 39¾ in. or 125.1 × 101 cm, Inv. n. 29.100.13 (fig. 1). The second one is a full-length equestrian portrait by the school or circle of Rubens, *Ladislas-Sigismund, Prince of Poland on horseback*, after 1624, oil on canvas, 259 × 185.5 cm, Wawel Castle, Cracow, State Collection of Art, Inv. n. 6320 (fig. 3).

Later known as King Ladislas IV, the Polish Prince was the son of the King Sigismund III Vasa and his first wife Anne of Austria (1573–1598), also known as Anna Habsburg. King Ladislas IV ruled the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth from 1632 until his death in 1648 (the coronation took place on 6 February 1633).

The question of different versions of the portrait of the Polish Prince Ladislas-Sigismund (and of his father, King Sigismund III) is a complex one and unfortunately still largely hypothetical. Traditionally, there were few connections between Rubens and Poland, and there are only a few works associated with the famous Flemish master in the country². Yet Rubens studies in Poland have had a long tradition going back well before the First World War. It was Jerzy Mycielski, Professor at the Jagiellonian University in Cracow, who wrote an unpublished, comprehensive research paper on the subject of Polish collectors of Rubens' works, as well as on the influence of Flemish art in Poland. Since then, two more art historians, Professor Zygmunt Batowski and after the Second World War, Professor Władysław Tomkiewicz, both

¹ I would like to thank Dr. Walter Liedtke and the staff at The Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York for their assistance with providing me with the file on the picture and the image for publication.

² There was once a large *Descent from the Cross* by Peter Paul Rubens (oil on canvas, 324.5 × 214.5 cm) and/or his studio in the Church of St. Nicholas in Kalisz, perhaps acquired in the Spanish Netherlands between 1616 and 1621 by Piotr Zeroński, the Polish ambassador and envoy of the King Sigismund III. It either perished in the fire of suspicious nature, or was stolen in December 1973, as communicated by Prof. J.A. Chrościcki.

from the University of Warsaw, had studied this subject in great depth. Many other Polish scholars have contributed to Rubens studies over the years, among others Jan Białostocki, Aleksander Hajdecki, Józef Aleksander Raczyński, Marian Morelowski, Jan Żarnowski, Anna Dobrzycka, Rajnold Przeździecki, Mieczysław Gębarowicz, Karolina Lanckorońska, Janina Ruszczyk, Zygmunt Ważbiński, Jerzy Szablowski, Małgorzata Szuster-Gawłowska, Juliusz A. Chrościcki, Ryszard Szmydki, and others³.

For the purpose of this study, I will primarily draw on the research of Prof. Juliusz A. Chrościcki, in particular on *Rubensowskie portrety Wazów*⁴, the comprehensive paper *Rubens w Polsce*⁵, and his more recent contribution to the Congress in Padova, *Rubens dall'Italia all'Europa*⁶, as well as in the catalogue of the Antwerp exhibition *De prinselijke pelgrimstocht De 'Grand Tour' van Prins Ladislas van Polen 1624–1625*⁷. I will also draw on the archival research of a number of other scholars such as Ważbiński⁸, Szablowski⁹, Duverger¹⁰, Szmydki¹¹, on the publications of the Corpus Rubenianum¹² and others¹³, as well as my own searches in London, particularly regarding the British provenance of both pictures.

RUBENS AND THE PRINCE LADISLAS-SIGISMUND

The first question we must ask is basic: was there a real connection between Rubens and Poland? Although the artist never visited the country¹⁴, the Polish Prince and future king could have met Rubens on a few occasions between 7 September and 2 October 1624, when visiting Brussels, Antwerp (his studio at Wapperstraat) and the military camp at Breda. There are however no specific records of such meetings, except for when the Prince visited Rubens' studio on 25 September 1624. We know for certain that Rubens had painted Ladislas-Sigismund's portrait, probably in Brussels or possibly in Antwerp, from the two surviving portraits in oils showing him half-length (in Cracow and in Genua) as well as from at least seven engravings. This must have happened during the Prince's Grand Tour of western and southern

³ For a more comprehensive list of scholars discussing the subject with relevant bibliography see: J.A. Chrościcki, *Rubensowskie portrety Wazów*, [in:] *Rubens, Niderlandy i Polska*, J.A. Ojrzyski (ed.), Łódź, 1978, p. 42.

⁴ *Ibidem*, pp. 42–61.

⁵ J.A. Chrościcki, *Rubens w Polsce*, „Rocznik Historii Sztuki”, XII, 1981, pp.133–219.

⁶ J.A. Chrościcki, *Diplomazia e credito bancario. Rubens, Breughel dei Velluti e il re di Polonia*, [in:] *Rubens dall'Italia all'Europa: Atti del convegno internazionale di studi*, a cura di C. Limantani-Viridis, F. Bottacin, Padova, 24–27 maggio 1990, Vicenza, 1992, pp. 95–111.

⁷ J.A. Chrościcki, *De 'kunstkamer' van de Poolse kroonprins van 1626*, [in:] *De prinselijke pelgrimstocht De 'Grand Tour' van Prins Ladislas van Polen 1624–1625*, exh. cat., Koninklijk Museum voor Schone Kunsten Antwerpen, 12 oktober–14 december 1997, Antwerp, 1997, pp. 47–59.

⁸ Z. Ważbiński, *Władysław IV jako „artis pictoriae amator”*. *Przyczynek do polityki artystycznej Wazów*, [in:] *Rubens, Niderlandy i Polska...*, pp. 62–79; *idem*, *Uno schizzo di P. P. Rubens per il ritratto di un cardinale: Montalto o Del Monte?; L'ipotesi su un committente romano del pittore fiammingo*, [in:] *Rubens dall'Italia all'Europa...*, pp. 61–74; *idem*, *Il Cardinale Francesco Maria Del Monte: un committente sconosciuto di P. P. Rubens?; osservazioni in occasione di una copia del ritratto di Ladislao Vasa*, [in:] *Begegnungen: Festschrift für Peter Anselm Riedl zum 60. Geburtstag*, K. Güthlein (ed.), Worms, 1993, pp. 124–131.

⁹ J. Szablowski, *Portret konny królewicza Władysława Zygmunta Wazy na Wawelu jako przejaw aktualnych wydarzeń europejskich oraz jego wzory flamandzkie i włoskie*, „Folia Historiae Artium”, XV, 1979, pp. 89–121.

¹⁰ E. Duverger, *Le commerce d'art entre la Flandre et l'Europe centrale au XVIIe siècle. Notes et remarques*, [in:] *Évolution générale et développements régionaux en histoire de l'art. Actes du XXIIe Congrès Internationale d'Histoire de l'Art*, Budapest, 1969, vol. II, Budapest 1972, pp. 157–181; *idem*, *Annotations concernant 'Sieur Jehan Bierens, Agent et Domesticque de son Alteze le Sérénissime Prince Wladislaus Sigismundus, Prince de Pologne et de Suède*, „Gentse Bijdragen to de Kunstgeschiedenis en Oudheidkunde”, XXX, 1995, pp. 119–157.

¹¹ R. Szmydki, *Kontakty artystyczne królewicza Władysława Zygmunta Wazy z Antwerpią: misja Mathieu Rouaulta do Polski w 1626 r.*, Warszawa 2002; *idem*, *Agents artistiques du Prince de Pologne Ladislas-Sigismond Vasa (1595–1648) aux Pays-Bas Méridionaux*, [in:] *Liber Memorialis Erik Duverger*, by H. Pauwels, A. Van den Kerckhove and L. Wuyts, Wetteren 2006, pp. 357–373; *idem*, *Artystyczno-dyplomatyczne kontakty Zygmunta III Wazy z Niderlandami Południowymi*, Lublin 2008.

¹² H. Vlieghe, *Rubens Portraits of Identified Sitters Painted in Antwerp*, Corpus Rubenianum Ludwig Burchard, part XIX, (vol. II), New York 1987, cat. n. 113 and n. 114 (Fig. 133, 134), pp. 123–125.

¹³ In the Polish language for instance see: M. Morka, *Polski nowożytny portret konny i jego europejska geneza*, Wrocław–Warszawa–Kraków 1986, pp. 96–98 and pp. 99–100.

¹⁴ According to Chrościcki, the traditional hypothesis that Rubens came to Poland on a diplomatic mission in September/October 1625, repeated among others by E. Rastawiecki, is unfounded, and based on an erroneous association of dates and personalities: Chrościcki, *Rubens w Polsce...*, p. 134.



1. Workshop of Peter Paul Rubens, *Ladislas-Sigismund IV, King of Poland*, oil on canvas, c. 1624, H.O. Havemeyer Collection, Bequest of Mrs. H.O. Havemeyer, [deaccessioned] 1929. Photograph courtesy of the Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York

Europe during the years 1624–1625, prompted by a pilgrimage to Loreto and Rome¹⁵. The Polish Prince travelled *incognito* as nobleman Snopkowski (name which was connected with the Vasa coat of arms Snopiek), with a large entourage of court officials. The Prince who was also related to the Habsburgs by his later marriage to the Archduchess Renate of Austria (whom he married in 1637), travelled with about forty important personalities such as the Lithuanian Chancellor Prince Albrycht Stanisław Radziwiłł, Łukasz Żółkiewski, Adam Kazanowski, Gerard Denhoff and many others. Stefan Pac, the Grand Clerk of Lithuania, as well as Jan Hagenaw, a courtier from the Radziwiłł's entourage, both recorded the journey in their travel diaries. They left Poland on 17 May 1624, and returned home on 22 May 1625. During his travels, the Prince had acquired a number of paintings and works of art in Vienna, Brussels, Milan and Rome¹⁶.

Between 6 and 21 September¹⁷, and then between 2 and 14 October 1624, the Prince stayed with his aunt Infanta Isabella at the Coudenberg Palace in Brussels. He also visited Antwerp between 22 and 26 September¹⁸, and then between 30 September and 2 October 1624¹⁹. He was at the military camp at Breda between 26 and 29 October. For the young prince interested in war matters it was a very instructive visit. Later Velazques painted the crucial moment of the campaign – the Dutch surrender to victorious

¹⁵ S. Pac, *Obraz dworów europejskich na początku XVII wieku przedstawiony w dzienniku podróży królewicza Władysława syna Zygmunta III, do Niemiec, Austrii, Belgii, Szwajcarii i Włoch w roku 1624 do 1625*, Wrocław 1854, p. 1, and pp. 54–55: „...wybrawszy się na peregrynacje dla odprawienia wot, na miejsca Święte, mianowicie do Loretu i do Rzymu uczynionych.”

¹⁶ Chrościcki, *Diplomazia...*, p. 96.

¹⁷ Pac, *op. cit.*, p. 62: on the 6th of September diary entry: „Już było godzin ze dwie w noc kiedyśmy do Bruxel wjechali [...]”; also A. Przybóś (ed.), *Podróż królewicza Władysława Wazy do krajów Europy Zachodniej w latach 1624–1625 w świetle ówczesnych relacji*, Kraków 1977, p. 161.

¹⁸ The Prince and his companions left Antwerp for the camp at Breda on 26th September 1624, where they stayed for a few days; they went back to Antwerp on 30 September.

¹⁹ They left Antwerp for Brussels on 2 September 1624.

Spaniards. On 25 September, Prince Ladislas visited Rubens', and presumably Jan Breughel the Elder's, studios in Antwerp; the following day, he was at the camp in Breda, where he stayed until 30 September, and then returned to Antwerp; from Antwerp he went back to Brussels on 2 October, where he stayed until 14 October 1624. The reason for meetings between Rubens, a painter-diplomat and the trusted ally of the Infanta Isabella Clara, and the Prince Ladislas were above all diplomatic, and concerned the prolongation of the truce between the Spanish Netherlands and the Dutch Republic in the North. The central issue in the Spanish-Polish political relations in the years 1621–1632 was the realisation of plans concerning the Baltic Sea, which aimed to eliminate the Dutch from the commerce, as well as to return Sigismund III Vasa to the Swedish throne²⁰. There were plans for making the Polish Prince the admiral of the Spanish fleet on the Baltic, and he had to return to Poland at the beginning of 1625, as the attack of the Swedes was predicted to happen in the spring that year; instead, the attack came one year later. The negotiations with Brussels produced no results²¹.

We know that Rubens visited the camp at Breda on several occasions, as reported from Brussels by the French ambassador Nicolas de Baugy, to the Secretary of State d'Ocquerre on 30 August 1624: "Rubens, peintre célèbre d'Anvers, qui est connu à Paris par ses ouvrages qui sont dans l'hostel de la royne mère, lequel faict plusieurs allées et venues d'icy au camp du marquis Spinola [...]"²² ("Rubens, famous painter from Antwerp, known in Paris by his works which are in the hotel of the Queen Mother, who makes many comings and goings from here to the camp of the Marquis Spinola..."). It is probable, that Rubens was at Breda at the time of the Prince's visits to the camp. As to Rubens' whereabouts at the time of the Prince's visit in the Netherlands, we also have a letter from Moretus to Jean Woverius, dated 2 October 1624, which mentions that Rubens was absent and unable to meet the Prince in person: "Il est absent en ce moment, mais a exprimé le désir que le livre soit communiqué au prince de Pologne at aux hommes nobles et savants qui l'accompagnent en assez grand nombre"²³ ("He is absent at the moment, but expressed his wish that the book be sent to the Prince of Poland and to the noble and learned men who accompany him in considerable numbers"). This passage, however, could simply refer to Rubens' absence in the Plantin Moretus' printroom at that time.

Pac's diary on the meeting between Rubens and the Prince Ladislas-Sigismund in Antwerp is unfortunately very brief, and surprisingly does not mention the portrait. On 25 September 1624, during their stay in Antwerp, he wrote the following: "Widzieliśmy officyny różnych malarzów, a mianowicie w domu Rubensa, malarza przedniego, nad to w tem rzemieśle nic się foremniejszego widzieć nie mogło"²⁴ ("We visited studios of many artists, among others of Rubens too, whose craft being so perfect was incomparable"). They had visited at least two artists' studios: Rubens' at Wapperstraat, and most probably Jan Breughel I's at Arenbergstraat²⁵. At some point the Polish Prince might have also visited the house of Cornelis van der Geest at the Mattenstraat, a wealthy Antwerp merchant and art collector. This was documented by the well-known *Kunstammer, Cabinet d'art of Cornelis van der Geest*, painted by Willem van Haecht, and dated 1628, which is now in the Rubenshuis. Prince Ladislas was depicted in the great drawing room surrounded by paintings and works of art, in the company of many important personalities, who had visited the house over the years. It is remarkable that next to the Polish Prince are such important figures as Rubens, Infanta Isabella with Prince Albert, the mayor of Antwerp Nicolaas Rockox, and Ambrogio Spinola. This fact seems to point to the high rank of the Polish Prince and perhaps to his true love of Flemish art.

We know that Rubens executed a portrait of the Prince Ladislas, commissioned by Infanta Isabella, from the correspondence of the previously mentioned French ambassador Nicolas de Baugy, who reported from Brussels to the Secretary of State d'Ocquerre on 13 September 1624: "Le peintre Rubens est en ces[t]e ville. L'infante luy a commandé de tirer le pourtraict du Prince de Pologne; en quoi j'estime

²⁰ R. Skowron, *Olivares, Wazowie i Bałtyk: Polska w polityce zagranicznej Hiszpanii w latach 1621–1632*, Kraków 2002, p. 263.

²¹ Chrościcki, *Diplomazia...*, p. 103.

²² L.P. Gachard, *Histoire politique et diplomatique de Pierre-Paul Rubens*, Bruxelles 1877, p. 26.

²³ M. Rooses, Ch. Ruelens, *Correspondance de Rubens et documents épistolaires concernant sa vie et ses oeuvres*, vol. III, Antwerp 1887–1909, pp. 305–306. The book in question was the *Franckfort catalogue*, a list of new publications by the Plantin-Moretus Press.

²⁴ Pac, *op. cit.*, p. 67, diary entry dated 25 September, original spelling; also Przyboś, *op. cit.*, p. 181.

²⁵ Chrościcki, *Diplomazia...*, p. 100.

qu'il revenchera mieux qu'en la négociation de la tresve à quoy il ne peut donner que quelles couleurs et ombrages superficiels, sans corps n'y fondement solide"²⁶ ("The painter Rubens is in this town. The Infanta ordered him to draw a portrait of the Prince of Poland; by this, I estimate he will achieve more than in the negotiations of the truce, to which he can only give but a few colours and superficial shadows, without substance or solid foundation"). As both the Prince and Rubens were at that time in Brussels, the portrait of the Prince might have been executed (drawn/sketched) in the Infanta's Brussels Palace around the 10th September 1624. It is to be noted that the French expression "se faire tirer un portrait" could also mean to have one's portrait made, without any specific allusion to drawing. However, it often referred to drawing, and in this case perhaps another expression would be used, such as "peindre son portrait", if the picture were painted rather than drawn. Other sources have also mentioned this commission. Giovanni Pietro Bellori in *Le Vite dei Pittori, sculttori e architetti moderni*, Rome, 1672, stated that "Con la quale occasione (Rubens) feci i ritratti di molti Principi e personagii: Visitato da Sigismondo Principe di Polonia, che andò a vedere l'assedio di Breda, lo ritrasse al naturale"²⁷ ("With this occasion (Rubens) did portraits of many Princes and personages: Visited by the Prince Sigismund of Poland, who went to see the siege of Breda, he made his portrait from nature"). The latter part of the sentence "al naturale" is also at times translated as "full-length" or "life-size", to which problem we will come back further on. Roger de Piles, in his *Dissertation des ouvrages des plus fameux Peintres dédiée à Monseigneur le Duc de Richelieu*, Paris, 1681, also mentioned the illustrious visitors to Rubens' studio in Antwerp: "Le Prince Sigismond de Pologne entr'autres, & l'Infante Isabelle, luy firent cet honneur en revenant du siège de Breda"²⁸ ("Prince Sigismund of Poland, among others, and Infanta Isabella, did him this honour when coming back from the siege of Breda"). De Piles also mentioned that important matters were discussed between Rubens and the Prince on behalf of Infanta Isabella: "Il traita plusieurs autres affaires d'importance au nom de cette Princesse [...] avec Vladislas Prince de Pologne [...]"²⁹ ("He treated several other important matters on behalf of this Princess [...] with Prince Ladislas of Poland").

It was Bellori, who reported that Rubens portrayed the Prince at the time of his visit in his Antwerp studio. Rooses also thought that the portrait was executed in Antwerp and wrote: "A cette occasion, il passa par Anvers, où Rubens fit son portrait"³⁰ ("On this occasion he (the Prince) passed through Antwerp, where Rubens painted his portrait"). Yet according to Chrościcki, Prince Ladislas' portrait was almost certainly sketched (drawn) by Rubens in Brussels, and finished in his Antwerp studio by his pupils and collaborators³¹. It would be made in three versions: full-length (if Bellori's "al naturale" is understood as "full-length"), knee-length and in bust. The first version, so far unknown to us, has perhaps only survived in a poor quality copy found in the Casa Gunduli in Ancona³², where the Polish Prince stayed between the 13 and 14 December 1624.

The meaning of "al naturale" needs re-examining, albeit briefly, in its historical context. In another letter to Pierre Dupuy, dated 2 September 1627, Rubens mentions in the postscript: "Ho ben depinto il ritratto del marchese Spinola dal naturale [...]"³³ ("I well painted the portrait of the Marquis Spinola from life..."). All the known versions of the Spinola's portrait by Rubens are three-quarter length or half-length, but "dal" does not necessarily mean "al". It seems that Bellori used in *Le Vite dei Pittori...* alternatively such expressions as "in piedi" (standing), "al naturale", "dal naturale" and "al vivo" (meaning: "from life"). For instance, he mentions Van Dyck portraying the Infanta in full-length format (standing) as: "Ritrasse l'Infanta in piedi"³⁴; then quotes a series of portraits of magistrates in the Palace of Justice (now

²⁶ Chrościcki, *Rubens w Polsce...*, p. 161, note 199, quoting the original letter in the Bibliothèque Nationale, Paris, MS. fr. n. 17941 (letter dated about 13.09.1624); also Gachard, *op. cit.*, pp. 26–27.

²⁷ G. P. Bellori, *Le Vite de pittori, scultori et architetti moderni...*, Parte Prima, Roma, 1672, p. 245.

²⁸ R. de Piles, *Dissertation des ouvrages des plus fameux Peintres dédiée à Monseigneur le Duc de Richelieu*, Paris, 1681, pp. 33–34.

²⁹ *Ibidem*, p. 26.

³⁰ M. Rooses, *L'oeuvre de P. P. Rubens: Histoire et description de ses tableaux et dessins*, vol. IV, Antwerp, 1886–1892, p. 282.

³¹ Chrościcki, *Diplomazia...*, p. 101.

³² Acquired in 1867 for the collection at Kórnik, near Poznań; Chrościcki, *Rubens w Polsce...*, p. 169; and *idem*, *Diplomazia...* p. 101.

³³ Rooses, *Ruelens, op. cit.*, vol. IV (1904), p. 299 (letter DXIV). It is to be noted that it is 'dal' not 'al' *naturale*, so the meaning could be different.

³⁴ Bellori, *op. cit.*, p. 258.



2. Paul Pontius, *Portrait of Ladislas-Sigismund, Prince of Poland and Sweden*, second state with artist's name; after Peter Paul Rubens, 1624. Engraving. Courtesy of British Museum

destroyed): “Nella sala del Palazzo della Giustitia della medesima Città dipinse al naturale quei Signori del Magistrato Assisi nel lor Collegio”³⁵ (“In the hall of the Palace of Justice of the same city he painted from nature (or full-length?) the gentlemen of the Magistrate of Assisi in their College”); and somewhere else he says: “lo ritrasse al vivo”³⁶ (“he portrayed him from life”). When mentioning Caravaggio, “Dipinse per questo Signore una musica di giovini ritratti dal naturale in mezza figure”³⁷ (“He painted for this Lord ... young men portrayed from nature in half-figure”). In this case “dal naturale” definitely does not mean “full-length”, but “from life”, as we have the additional description “in half-figure”. In fact, according to Woods-Marsden, since the Renaissance “ritratto al naturale” meant “portrayed as if from nature or life”³⁸. Additionally, the 17th c. Northern Italian art critic, Francesco Scanelli, described in *Il Microcosmo della Pittura*, 1657, a number of portraits as “di meza figura al naturale”³⁹ (“in half-figure from nature”), which otherwise would be a contradiction in terms.

The original version of the Rubens portrait of the Polish Prince was thus probably knee-length (in other words, half-figure) rather than full-length, fact which is also reflected in the extant engravings, among others by Paul Pontius (fig. 2), and dated 1624 (with an inscription correctly listing all the titles of the Prince)⁴⁰, as well as in the workshop copy of the Rubens portrait from the Metropolitan Museum, New York. The original painting of Ladislas-Sigismund by Rubens is now considered of whereabouts

³⁵ *Ibidem*, p. 259.

³⁶ *Ibidem*, p. 260.

³⁷ *Ibidem*, p. 204.

³⁸ J. Woods-Marsden, ‘Ritratto al Naturale’: *Questions of Realism and Idealism in Early Renaissance Portraits*, “Art Journal”, 46, 1987, p. 209.

³⁹ For instance: F. Scanelli, *Il Microcosmo della pittura*, Cesena 1657, p. 259.

⁴⁰ Chrościcki, *Diplomazia...*, p. 101; these inscriptions were incorrect in the other engravings by J. van der Heyden and G. Orlandi in 1635.

unknown, presumably lost. Another version of the portrait of the Polish Prince, in oval shape (cut down) and smaller, but arguably superior in quality (oil on canvas, 75 × 65 cm), shows the sitter in bust only, and is at present in the Palazzo Durazzo-Pallavicini in Genoa. It was formerly in the palace built for Agostino Balbi in the years 1618–1622, owned by Marcello Durazzo from 1709 onwards. The painting was presumably at some point in time cut down and put into an oval frame, fact which might explain the smaller in-bust composition. It was described by old inventories and city guides as by Peter Paul Rubens, sometimes as his self-portrait or even as Van Dyck's self-portrait⁴¹. There was another admittedly less convincing version of the bust-size portrait of the Prince Ladislas in Poland, which was destroyed in the fire of the Warsaw's Uprising of 1944. It came from the Polish museum at Rapperswil in Switzerland, and was formerly in the possession of Henryk Bukowski from Stockholm (the founder of the Nordiska Museum), who donated it to the Polish museum in 1886. The picture was once in the collection of the Swedish King Oscar I (1799–1859). Another, somewhat later version of the portrait currently ascribed to Rubens' school or circle, and possibly dated c. 1625 or even as late as 1630, shows the Prince Ladislas-Sigimund in full-length and on horseback (oil on canvas, 259 × 185.5 cm, Wawel Castle, Cracow), and is partly based on the previously mentioned half-length portrait by Rubens.

There are other records of 17th c. portraits of the Polish Prince. We should mention a painting in the collection of the Cardinal Francesco Maria del Monte in Rome, described in 1627 as “un ritratto del Principe figliolo del Re di Polonia (Sigismondo III) con cornice nere”⁴² (“a portrait of the Prince, son of the King of Poland (Sigismund III), in a black frame). Unfortunately, the name of Rubens is not mentioned. According to Waźbiński, it could be the copy of another portrait, recorded in the Cardinal Francesco Peretti's inventory of 1655 as “quadro uno con ritratto del Principe di Bologna (=Polonia) in habito Pollacco, che tiene in mano un gioiello (=una spada?)”⁴³ (“a painting with the portrait of the Prince of Bologna (=Polonia) in Polish clothes, holding in his hand a jewel [=a sword?]”). Yet Polish clothes and a jewel (a sceptre?) point to another portrait, namely *Royal Prince as the Conquering Ruler at the Battle of Chocim*, dated 1621, perhaps by Pieter Claesz. Soutman, one version now at the National Museum of Warsaw, Wilanów Palace (oil on canvas, 206 × 127.5 cm, Inv. n. 1134 Wil). Another copy of the portrait of Ladislas-Sigismund by Rubens was also at some point in the collection of Jan Bierens, his artistic agent, known as “Agente et Domesticque de son Alteze le Sérénissime Prince Wladislaus Sigismundus, Prince de Poloigne et de Suède”⁴⁴. According to Szmydki, Bierens' Polish memorabilia included a copy of the famous portrait of Ladislas-Sigismund commissioned from Rubens by the Infanta Isabella for the gallery in the Coudenberg Palace in Brussels⁴⁵. According to Duverger, this painting was described as a large portrait of Ladislas IV Sigismund, King of Poland from 1632 until 1648, probably a copy of Rubens's portrait executed in 1624⁴⁶. But could the rather small half-length picture of the Prince be described as a large portrait? Moreover, Rubens' portrait of 1624 did not show the King of Poland, Ladislas IV, but the Prince of Poland Ladislas-Sigismund. There is also another, later and inferior copy (18th or beginning of 19th century; oil on canvas, 76 × 58 cm) of the *Portrait of the Prince Ladislas Vasa in Spanish Clothes*, at the Nieborów Museum in Poland, where the Prince is shown in bust on the background of a red curtain⁴⁷.

There have been some uncertainties as to the significance of certain documents recording consignments of works of art sent to Poland or the debts of the Polish court to Rubens, rediscovered in Belgian archives. They seemed to suggest that Rubens' portrait of the Prince Ladislas-Sigismund was commissioned by the Polish court, and at some time shipped to Poland. Yet according to researchers such as Chrościcki or

⁴¹ As reported by Chrościcki, *Rubensowskie portrety...*, p. 45; also *idem*, *Rubens w Polsce...*, p. 164.

⁴² C.L. Frommel, *Caravaggios Frühwerk und der Kardinal Francesco Maria del Monte*, “Storia dell'arte”, 9/10, 1971, p. 63. Inventory of the Cardinal Francesco Maria del Monte, Roma, Archivio di Stato, vol. 138, fol. 574–588v.

⁴³ Waźbiński, *Il Cardinale...*, p. 125.

⁴⁴ Szmydki, *Kontakty...*, p. 75.

⁴⁵ *Ibidem*, pp. 101–102.

⁴⁶ Duverger, *Annotations...*, p. 123.

⁴⁷ *Peter Paul Rubens: Paintings – Oil sketches – Drawings*, exh. cat., Royal Museum of Fine Arts, Antwerp 1977, p. 77 (ill.) nr. kat. I. 22, catalogue entry by Hanna Benesz; painting formerly in the Warsaw's National Museum.

Szmydki, the existing documents refer to other paintings bought during the Prince's 1624–1625 travels in Europe, or commissioned before by his father, King Sigismund III.

According to Szmydki, and judging from the contents of a letter dated 26 October 1632, sent by the Prince Ladislas to Infanta Isabella, an important consignment of works of art was shipped to Poland in the early autumn of that year⁴⁸. The letter requested a discharge of export taxes on four chests of tapestries and paintings (unfortunately they were not specified), commissioned in 1624 during the Prince's travels in Europe, and now being sent to Warsaw, as well as an exoneration of dues chargeable to Jan Bierens, who was the Prince's personal agent in Antwerp. The chests finally arrived by sea through the port of Gdańsk, just in time for the Prince's coronation as Ladislas IV, held in February 1633. They contained tapestries illustrating *The Stories of Ulysses*, which were commissioned from Jacques Geubels le Jeune in 1624, and executed in 1624–1627 in Brussels⁴⁹.

Another piece of evidence was a note found among the family papers after the death of Isabella Brandt, Rubens's first wife, on 20 June 1626. It was dated 11 July 1626, and stated that a payment of 1,000 florins had been made by Joris Descamps on behalf of the Polish monarch, in respect to the total sum of 1,800 florins for some Royal portraits: "received from Joris Descamps, on behalf of the Polish Royal Majesty, the sum of 1000 florins from the total due sum of 1800 florins, for the (portraits) of His Royal Majesty"⁵⁰. But Joris Descamps worked as an agent for King Sigismund III, not Prince Ladislas-Sigismund. Furthermore, the Prince was not called His Royal Majesty at that time, as he only became king in 1633. Chrościcki rightly interpreted it as a payment for earlier portraits of King Sigismund III⁵¹.

It is therefore important to stress after Chrościcki, that Rubens' portrait of the Prince Ladislas-Sigismund was not commissioned by the Polish court or the Polish nobility⁵², but by Infanta Isabella. It would have been kept in the Coudenberg Palace in Brussels, while copies were probably sent to Vienna, Rome or Madrid, in order to sustain political alliances. Moreover, the depiction of the Polish Prince standing under a canopy, as well as his identification in the inscription on the engraving as Prince of Poland and Grand Duke of Moscow, were, according to Chrościcki, against Polish ceremonial customs. The eldest son of the Polish King was not an official successor to the throne, and such a title would not be recognized in Poland. His clothes and his sword indicated a Prince well accustomed with European ways, unlike for instance his Polish clothes in the full-length portrait *Ladislas Sigismund Vasa as the Conquering Ruler at the Battle of Chocim* (after 1621), ascribed to Pieter Claesz. Soutman. Furthermore, in the Royal Castle of Warsaw there is a picture gallery (Kunstkammer) painted in Warsaw in 1626 (and inscribed "EHere fecit" "Warsawij 1626"), formerly attributed to Jan Breughel II, even though the artist never visited the city, but later identified by Chrościcki as by the French painter Etienne de la Hyre (1583–1643), and depicting the Prince Ladislas' Kunstkammer⁵³. It shows his collection of pictures, sculptures and works of art purchased or obtained as gifts during his travels in Europe in 1624–1625. Among them, we can identify *The Drunken Silenus* and two ovals of *St. Peter* and *St. Paul* by Rubens and/or his studio, and a partially concealed *Madonna with a Flowery Garland surrounded by Angels*, a large piece executed by Rubens in collaboration with his friend, Jan Breughel I. Rubens's portrait of Prince Ladislas was not included, so it was not present in the Princely collection in 1626.

The question we need to ask is: what had happened to the original portrait by Rubens? According to Szmydki, it might have hung in the Coudenberg Palace in Brussels with other portraits of the Polish Royal family, of the King Sigismund III, his wife Queen Constance, and their son the *Royal Prince as the Conquering Ruler at the Battle of Chocim, 1621*, all by Pieter Claesz. Soutman (1580–1657). They were brought from Poland by Soutman in 1628, who was the official "*pittore di sue maestà de Polonia*". The Dutch portraitist worked for King Sigismund III, and probably later supplied paintings to Prince Ladislas-Sigismund. Soutman stayed at the Polish court during the years 1624–1628, and left Poland in

⁴⁸ Szmydki, *Kontakty...*, p. 76.

⁴⁹ E. Duverger, *Une tenture de l'histoire d'Ulisse livrée par Jacques Geubels le Jeune au Prince de Pologne*, "Artes Textiles", VII, 1971, pp. 74–98.

⁵⁰ Chrościcki, *Rubens w Polsce...*, p. 162.

⁵¹ Chrościcki, *Diplomazia...*, p. 107.

⁵² *Ibidem*, p. 102.

⁵³ Chrościcki, *De 'kunstkamer'...*, pp. 47–59.



3. Circle of Peter Paul Rubens, *Ladislas-Sigismund, Prince of Poland on Horseback*, oil on canvas, after 1624, Cracow, Wawel Castle, State Collection of Art

1628, with the above-mentioned portraits he painted of the Vasas for Infanta Isabella⁵⁴. We do not know if these works were commissioned by the Infanta, or were gifts from the Polish court. Soutman's stay in Poland might have been prompted by a meeting with Prince Ladislas during his Grand Tour in Europe.

In fact, as many as seven portraits of the Polish Vasas hung on the walls of the Coudenberg Palace in Brussels⁵⁵. In the inventory of the Palace collection drawn up on 14 March 1643 by Juan de Benero⁵⁶, there were seven portraits connected with the Polish Royal family: two life-size portraits of Sigismund III and his wife Constance of Austria, in pontifical clothes (two such portraits are now at the Alte Pinakothek in Munich; 220.5 × 131.8 cm and 219 × 132.7 cm, considered as copies taken out of Poland in 1642 by the daughter of the King Sigismund III Anna Catherine as her dowry), probably painted by Soutman (although no name of the artist was specified); a portrait of the Prince of Poland in Polish clothes, identified by Szmydki as the *Royal Prince as the Conquering Ruler at the Battle of Chocim* by Soutman (a copy/replica or perhaps a much over cleaned original is currently in Wilanów); a portrait of the Prince Ladislas knee-length wearing a hat, as n. 46, from the collection of Infanta Isabella Clara, with no name of the artist specified, but in the later 1659 inventory it was described as by Rubens; two more portraits of the King and Queen of Poland, dressed in Spanish clothes, according to Szmydki, probably by Frans Luyx from Vienna; and an anonymous portrait of the Polish King dressed in red.

Let us quote the complete Coudenberg Palace inventory 1643 entry for the knee-length portrait which interests us here: "Galeria: 18. Una retrato del Principe de Polonia Wladislaus, de algo mao de media cuerpo, vestido de negro mangas con ora, valona sombrero, la falda levantada, y en ella un maco de martinets con una joya de diamantes, y una perla pendiente, espada dorada, de seys palmos de alto,

⁵⁴ Szmydki, *Artystyczno-dyplomatyczne kontakty...*, pp. 118–120.

⁵⁵ Szmydki, *Kontakty...*, p. 131; also Chrościcki, *Rubens w Polsce...*, Aneks 3, pp. 214–215.

⁵⁶ Szmydki, *Artystyczno-dyplomatyczne kontakty...*, pp. 121–139.

y auatro y medio de anche, sobra lienço al olio, n. 46”⁵⁷ (Gallery 18. “A portrait of the Prince of Poland Wladislaus, ... half-length, dressed in black with sleeves with gold, a Walloon hat, the brim lifted,... a diamond jewelry, and a pearl hanging, gilded sword, six palmos high and four and half in width, oil on canvas, n. 46”).

In the next Coudenberg Palace inventory of 12 January 1659, the portrait is listed as “[nr. 122] 84. Otro mas pequeno, representando el rey de Polonia con el sombrero en la caveza, pintado de Rubens”⁵⁸ (“a smaller (portrait) showing the king of Poland, in a hat on his head, painted by Rubens”). In the inventory of 1692 it was described as “[nr. 72] 45. Een kniestuck, representerende den koninck vn Polen met eenen hoet op sijn hoofd”⁵⁹ (“one item showing the king of Poland to the knees with a hat on his head”).

Firstly, we notice that Rubens’ half-length portrait in the Infanta Isabella’s collection was on canvas, not on panel, as is the New York version (although now transferred from panel to canvas). It is also to be noted that the Genoa oval version of the painting is on canvas. Moreover, the measurements of the original picture were 120 cm high and 90 cm wide (if we consider 1 Spanish palmo = 20 cm). The New York-Cracow picture is wider by as much as 10 cm (125 × 101 cm), so it is most probably not the same painting.

We also know that another portrait of the Polish King, hanging above a fireplace in the Coudenberg Palace in Brussels, disappeared in the fire of the 3–4 February 1731, which ravaged the Royal residence, as reported by Jean Baptiste Aimé, the princely controller. But according to Szmydki, this portrait was later found in the garden conservatory⁶⁰. Thus we still do not know what had happened to the Rubens’ original portrait of the Polish Prince.

I would like to briefly comment on the two portraits of the Polish royals from the Alte Pinakothek in Munich. Possibly, these are not mere copies of Soutman’s originals, as usually stated⁶¹. Even judging from photographs their high quality of execution could perhaps establish them as originals. The remarkable treatment of the King’s and Queen’s robes, and the fine depiction of the King’s features are arguably of better quality than the full-length portrait of Ladislas-Sigismund in Polish clothes from Wilanów, sometimes ascribed to Soutman. It seems that other scholars, such as Tomkiewicz, also thought the Munich canvases of high enough quality to be originals, even by Rubens: “bardzo dobrego pędzla, uchodziły niegdyś za dzieła Rubensa”⁶² (“very well painted, they were once considered works by Rubens”). Smith also listed both portraits as by Rubens⁶³. Mycielski suggested the attribution to Pieter Claesz. Soutman⁶⁴. There are in fact a number of parallels between the two portraits of King Sigismund III in Munich and in Wilanów, which seem to point to the same artist, possibly Soutman. These are in my view: the choice of colours with an attractive burgundy red playing an important role; the general composition, with the column on the right and the cloudy sky beyond; the execution of the jewels; the comparable awkward position of the body, even though one figure is standing, and the other sitting down – particularly the angle of the right arm on which the figures are leaning, or the left foot advanced forward; the faces seen in three-quarter and turned the same way, as well as showing a similarly vacant expression.

We also have the evidence of an engraving by Jonas Suyderhoef⁶⁵ (c. 1613–1686) after Pieter Claesz. Soutman, 1644–1650, inscribed “P. Soutman Pinxit”, where the oval portrait of Sigismund III in bust closely follows in reverse the Munich canvas. We have another print by the same engraver, also after Soutman, which shows a portrait of King Ladislas IV⁶⁶. The likeness of the King is based on yet another portrait of Ladislas IV, of which one version is in the National Museum in Warsaw, *Portrait*

⁵⁷ *Ibidem*, p. 123.

⁵⁸ M. De Maeyer, *Albrecht en Isabella en de Schilderkunst*, Brussels 1955, p. 442.

⁵⁹ *Ibidem*, p. 458.

⁶⁰ Szmydki, *Artystyczno-dyplomatyczne kontakty...*, p. 129.

⁶¹ *Ibidem*, pp. 129–130, quoting J. Lilejko, *Portrety tzw. koronacyjne Zygmunta III i Konstancji jako wyraz polityki dynastycznej Wazów*, [in:] *Portret. Funkcja – forma – symbol*. Materiały Sesji Stowarzyszenia Historyków Sztuki, Toruń, grudzień 1986, Warszawa 1990, pp. 377–391.

⁶² W. Tomkiewicz, *Pędzlem rozmaitym: malarstwo okresu Wazów w Polsce*, Warszawa 1970, p. 157.

⁶³ J. Smith, *A catalogue raisonné of the most eminent Dutch, Flemish and French painters*, part II, *P. P. Rubens*, London, 1829–1842, p. 76, no. 231 and no. 232.

⁶⁴ J. Mycielski, *Portrety polskie w XVI–XIX w.*, Lwów 1911 (no page numbers).

⁶⁵ Engraving, 408 × 276 cm, Warsaw, National Museum, Inv. N. Gr.Pol. 15385.

⁶⁶ Engraving by Jonas Suyderhoef, 413 × 278 cm, Warsaw, National Museum, Inv. N. 79212.

of *Ladislas IV as a King*, c. 1637, oil on canvas, 152 × 116 cm (Inv. N. MN 311 833). The King in the engraving is depicted without a crown, contrarily to the picture in Warsaw. It is to be noted that there are parallels between the portrait of Ladislas IV from Warsaw and the portrait of Sigismund III from Munich. The pose of the figures is almost identical (and even more awkward in the Warsaw picture) and the coronation robes, the crown, the sceptre and the orb are very similarly rendered.

PORTRAIT OF LADISLAS-SIGISMUND, PRINCE OF POLAND, HALF-LENGTH

This is a painting in oil on canvas, transferred from panel (125 × 101 cm), from the Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York, now on loan to Wawel Castle in Cracow (Inv. N. 29.100.12). It was previously exhibited in: New York (1915), New York (1930); Detroit (1936), Honolulu (1950), Paris (1952–1953), Milwaukee (1953), Austin (1953), New York (1955), Bruges (1962), Cracow (1976), Stockholm (1977); Warsaw (1993), Baltimore (1999), Chicago (1999), Huntsville (1999), San Diego (2000), Tulsa (2000), and Warsaw (2000)⁶⁷. Provenance: John Campbell, Lord Glenorchy, 3rd Earl of Breadalbane and Holland (1696–1782), London since 1737; Sir Henry William Dashwood, 5th Bt., Kirtlington Hall, Oxfordshire (sale, Christie's, London, April 23, 1887, as Rubens, n. 138. *Ladislaus IV, King of Poland*, 49 × 40 in, price 131 pounds, no buyer's name stated⁶⁸, bought in; the same picture in the 1887 sale listed by Redford as "Coll. Sir H. W. Dashwood, *Portrait of Ladislaus of Poland, with Order of the Golden Fleece*, 49 in by 40 in, from Lord Glenorchy's coll. in 1737. This was said by some to be by Gaspar de Crayer, £131"⁶⁹; his son, Sir George John Egerton Dashwood, 6th Bt. (1889–1909; sale, Knight, Frank and Rutley, London, October 22, 1909); Mrs. H. O. (Louisine W.) Havemeyer, New York (bought through an art dealer Trotti, May 1914; until d. 1929; as by Rubens); Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York; from 1977 on loan to Wawel Castle in Cracow, Poland.

This portrait of the Polish Prince Ladislas-Sigismund shows him dressed in Spanish clothes, knee-length, in front of a billowing curtain, with a golden chain and the insignia of the Golden Fleece on his breast, an order bestowed on him in 1615 by Philip III of Spain. His right hand rests on a commander's baton. He is wearing a black costume embroidered in gold on the sleeves, with white lace cuffs and collar, a coat flung across his left shoulder, a gilt handle of his sword visible by his left side, and a large brimmed hat with a tassel decorated with jewels and feathers.

His pose is reminiscent of Titian's portraits of rulers, such as *Charles V with Drawn Sword*, which Rubens at some time copied. We can also mention similarities with another contemporary or slightly earlier work by Rubens, executed for the Maria de' Medici Gallery, namely the full-length *Portrait of Francesco I de Medici, Grand Duke of Tuscany*, 1622–25, oil on canvas, 247 × 116 cm, Musée National du Château de Versailles (or the Louvre?). The pose is notably similar, in three-quarters, and turned to the left, with one hand resting on a baton/cane, and the other on the hip (although in this case hidden from view), with a similarly positioned belt and sword (but the latter again out of view), and on a backdrop of a cloudy sky and a draped red curtain, with the same hanging tassel, also set against a stone balustrade balcony.

American art historians favour the New York portrait over the smaller version of the composition from the Palazzo Durazzo-Palavicini in Genoa (oil on canvas, in oval, 75 × 65 cm – according to M. Jaffé, 100 × 80 cm⁷⁰ also Rooses⁷¹), rediscovered by Rooses and described as "by the master's hand". Surprisingly, Rooses did not list the portrait from the Glenorchy/Dashwood collection⁷². Most scholars rightly found the Genoese version superior to the New York picture. Unfortunately, the former was not linked in

⁶⁷ Detailed exhibition history together with the provenance kindly provided with the picture's file, courtesy of the Metropolitan Museum, New York.

⁶⁸ A. Graves, *Art sales from early in the eighteenth century to early in the twentieth century (mostly old master and early English pictures)*, London 1918–1921, vol. III, p. 121.

⁶⁹ G. Redford, *Art Sales: a history of sales of pictures and other works of art etc*, 2 vols., London 1888, vol. I, p. 446.

⁷⁰ M. Jaffé, *Rubens, Catalogo completo*, Milano 1989, pp. 282–283, n. 775.

⁷¹ Rooses, *op. cit.*, vol. IV, p. 282.

⁷² *Ibidem*.

any way with Polish collections, and was most probably sent directly from Antwerp to Genoa. According to Chrościcki, there is also no proof that the American painting had ever been to Poland.

As more or less reliable witnesses to the original portrait of the Prince Ladislas-Sigismund by Rubens, dated 1624, we have three engravings: the first one by the well known – Flemish engraver Paul Pontius (b. 1603 in Antwerp – d. 1658 in Antwerp), dated 1624; the second one by Jacob van der Heyden (after 1624), a Flemish engraver, print publisher, sculptor and painter (b. in Strasbourg 1573 – d. in Brussels 1645); and the third one by the less well known N. Perrey and/or Giovanni Orlandi DD (dated 1635). The sitter can be identified by inscriptions which show some variations. The inscription on the Pontius' engraving correctly states: WLADISLAVS SIGISMVNDVS D.G. POLONIAE ET SVECIAE PRINCEPS ELECT. MAGN. DVX MOSCOVIAE SMOL. SEVER. CFRD. DVX. Hanna Widacka attracted our attention to a number of engravings after the portrait: the three mentioned above showing the prince to the knees, but also five more showing him in oval⁷³. The Perrey/Orlandi engraving is the least successfully executed of the half-length ones, and also the most puzzling. Its inscription states WLADISLAVS SIGISMVNDVS D.G. POLONIAE ET SVETIAE REX ELECT. MAGN. DVX MOSCOVIAE SMOL. SEVER CFRD. DVX. Widacka pointed out that the letters forming the word "Rex" are higher than others; in its place there once were letters CEPS, now partially erased. Thus the original inscription contained the title PRINCEPS, not REX, hence the conclusion that the copperplate was created in the years 1624–1632, before the death of King Sigismund III Vasa. Upon the accession to the throne of Ladislas IV, the inscription was updated to "Rex". This confirms that the date 1635 was engraved later; it does not fit in with the composition, the inscription, or the dedication. The dedication says "All' Illustriss et Eccellentiss sig sig Il Prencipe Grimaldo Girolamo di Gerace [...]" Girolamo Grimaldi, Prince di Gerace (1609–1653) was a member of Genoese, Calabrian and Neapolitan nobility. The print was also signed by Giovanni Orlandi DD. Giovanni Orlandi Romano DD was an engraver, printer and publisher from Bologna, active in Rome from c. 1590 until 1613, and then in Naples until 1640. In all probability he published this portrait of Prince Ladislas, but his participation was limited to the dedication, while he might have purchased the original copperplate by N. Perrey. Widacka found the signature N. Perrey doubtful, perhaps because of the general lack of information on this engraver. Although Nicolas Perrey (French, 17th c.), is barely mentioned in bibliographical dictionaries and directories, he was considered one of the greatest image maker active in Naples in the 17th century. In fact, Perrey dominated the scene for half a century, producing numerous frontispieces, devotional and scientific images and allegorical cycles. As indicated by Widacka, in other known 17th-century engravings, the figure of Prince Ladislas (then King) was reduced to bust-size, placing him sometimes in a mirror oval image and a more or less decorative frame. One such print was made by Balthasar Moncornet (c. 1600–1668), French engraver, publisher and dealer in engravings. The reversed bust of King Ladislas is separated from the viewer by a small parapet, and placed in an elaborate oval frame, with an inscription running around it, under an oblong cartouche with another long inscription and artist's signature "B. Moncornet excū".

The first three copperplate engravings were either contemporary or nearly contemporary with Rubens' portrait, and did not vary in detail or composition. But when we compare the three prints to the painting from New York/Cracow, some differences are immediately apparent. In the Cracow picture the large curtain tassel on the right is conspicuously missing; the folds of the curtain are fewer and differently orientated; the dark billowing curtain at the back extends well beyond the Prince's head, unlike in the three engravings where it stops at the level of the brim of his hat; the balustrade in the lower left corner is missing (which could perhaps indicate that the portrait was cut down at the bottom); the clothes are different, with the sleeves being lighter and plain in the engraving, and darker and embroidered with gold in the Cracow picture; the handle of the sword is considerably larger; and above all the proportions of the entire picture are different. The Cracow painting is quite a lot wider than the engraved versions of the Rubens' original, so the Prince's left arm and coat had to be inflated in order to fill the extra space.

Some scholars suggested that certain background details were perhaps added by the engraver (tassel, rope, and balustrade) such as Paul Pontius, rather than invented by Rubens. However, another similar and nearly contemporary composition by Rubens, *Portrait of Francesco I de Medici, Grand Duke of Tuscany*, previously mentioned, shows a comparable composition in full-length format, and also displays the same type of background with a tassel. Again, a similar pose of the sitter and a background with a tasselled curtain, but

⁷³ H. W i d a c k a, *Rubensowski portret królewicza Władysława i jego graficzne redakcje*, „Gazeta Antykwaryczna”, 57, 2000, no. 12.

placed on the left of the picture, can be seen in Rubens' *Portrait of Ambrogio Spinola*, c. 1627–28 (oil on panel, 117.5 × 85 cm), Brunswick, Herzog-Anton-Ulrich-Museum (another version is in Prague). It seems to me that Rubens re-used this type of composition and background in a number of portraits around that time.

Although many scholars in the past such as Valentiner, Held and Goris, Van Puyvelde and Larsen⁷⁴ all agreed that the picture from New York was a typical court portrait painted by Rubens and engraved by Pontius, I cannot concur, together with Chrościcki and Vlieghe from the *Corpus Rubenianum*. The obvious and striking differences with the three contemporary engravings are only some of the reasons for not ascribing this work to the hand of Rubens. Already Rooses rightly noted that it is a relatively flat workshop piece⁷⁵. According to Oldenbourg this portrait was painted very thinly and perhaps only retouched by the master, as well as over-cleaned on many occasions, with parts of the jaw and hands practically destroyed⁷⁶. As the overall quality of execution is insufficient for a Rubens original, we thus ought to consider this portrait an example of Rubens' workshop production. The argument of it being retouched by Rubens is more difficult to justify or verify. Vlieghe took the matter further, and listed the picture as a copy after a lost original by Rubens⁷⁷.

The Genoese version, now cut down and unfortunately assessed only from photographs appears however to be of arguably higher quality, but not necessary sufficient to be the Rubens' original. Moreover, we can for instance see that the Prince's right sleeve is dark in the Genoese version, in keeping with the New York picture, but lightly-coloured in the Rubens' picture engraved by Pontius and others. The same applies to the background on the right hand side of the canvas directly behind the Prince's head, dark in the Genoese painting, and light in all the engravings. This could indicate that the Genoese picture is also not the original version of the portrait.

It is to be noted that the portrait of the Prince Ladislas-Sigismund could perhaps indicate depicted in the previously mentioned Van Haecht's picture gallery also shows him dressed as in the engravings: the sleeves are lighter in colour (brown as opposed to black) than the rest of the outfit. It seems that the miniature portrait of the Prince might have been painted after the original portrait by Rubens, which looked slightly different from the New York's and the Genoese versions, and more similar to the Pontius' engraving.

We have another puzzling entry mentioning another such portrait in the Smith's supplement to the *Catalogue raisonné...*: "113. *Portrait of Wladeslaus Sigismund, King of Poland*, when about fifty years of age, represented in nearly a front view, wearing a turned-up hat decked with feathers, a striped silk doublet with light-coloured sleeves, a small lace ruff, and a mantle over the left shoulder. His right hand rests on a cane, and the left is placed on his hip. Seen to the knees. Engraved by Pontius. Description, No. 231, vol. III, improved. In the Public Gallery Munich"⁷⁸. It is to be noted that the description specifically mentions "light-coloured sleeves". It is not entirely clear whether Smith talks about an engraving by Pontius made after Rubens, or another version of the painting.

The earliest known provenance of the Cracow picture goes back to the 18th century, the Scottish aristocratic collection of John Campbell, Lord Glenorchy, 3rd Earl of Breadalbane and Holland (1696–1782). John Campbell was a Scottish nobleman, diplomat and politician educated at Christ Church, Oxford. He was called Lord Glenorchy from 1716 until 1752, when he succeeded to the earldom. He was an envoy to Denmark from 1718, and ambassador to Russia since 1731. Member of Parliament for Saltash in 1727 and 1734, and for Oxford City from 1741, he was a Scottish representative peer from 1752. Lord Glenorchy was also Master of the Jewel Office from 1745–1756; he was awarded a DCL from Oxford University in 1756, served as Justice in Eyre south of the Trent from 1756 to 1765, and was Vice-Admiral of Scotland from 1776 onwards. His ancestral seat was Kilchurn Castle which stands at the northern end of Loch Awe in the Highlands, Scotland. Sir John Campbell, Earl of Breadalbane, completed the last major alterations to the castle in the late 17th century. The castle was struck by lightning in 1769, and subsequently abandoned.

⁷⁴ W.R. Valentiner, *Rubens Paintings in America*, "Art Quarterly", 9, 1946, p. 153; J.A. Goris, J.S. Held, *Rubens in America*, New York 1947, p. 29; E. Larsen, *P. P. Rubens, with a complete catalogue of his works in America*, Antwerp 1952, p. 217.

⁷⁵ Rooses, *op. cit.*, vol. IV, pp. 282–283.

⁷⁶ R. Oldenbourg, *P. P. Rubens: des Meisters Gemälde, Klassiker der Kunst*, Stuttgart 1921, p. 446, ill. p. 273.

⁷⁷ Vlieghe, *op. cit.*, no. 113, pp. 123–124, as copy 1.

⁷⁸ Smith, *op. cit.*, vol. 9, Supplement, pp. 275–276.

There was perhaps a significant connection between the Campbells of Glenorchy and George Jamesone, a Scottish painter who apparently worked in Rubens' studio. Jamesone was born at Aberdeen in 1588, and died in 1644, and had for his fellow pupil Sir Anthony van Dyck. Horace Walpole reported in his *Anecdotes of painting in England*⁷⁹ that Jamesone returned from his studies in Rubens' workshop, and established himself as a painter of portraits at Edinburgh around the year 1628. He painted in a broad, thin and transparent manner. Jamesone appears to have commenced a course of portrait painting, and the many portraits of ancestors still in the possession of families dispersed throughout various parts of Scotland attest to the extent of his production. The Campbells of Glenorchy, then a wealthy and influential family, distinguished themselves by their patronage of Jamesone. It is indeed not without reason that the portraits of Jamesone have frequently been mistaken for those of Van Dyck. However, his pictures generally present hard and typified features, seldom with any physical grace. The background of his portraits was generally kept neutral in dull dark brown or deep grey. The dress, frequently of a sombre hue, often faded away into the background. Jamesone has been named the Van Dyck of Scotland, and it would be interesting to investigate the connection between the Glenorchy collection and Jamesone further.

PORTRAIT OF LADISLAS-SIGISMUND, PRINCE OF POLAND ON HORSEBACK

This painting is an oil on canvas (259 × 185.5 cm)⁸⁰, dated after 1624, at Wawel Castle, Cracow, from the State Collection of Art (Inv. n. 6320). This life-size equestrian portrait, now in Wawel, appears to be directly derived from the previous portrait, as well as from an earlier (c. 1615) Rubens composition for the equestrian portrait of the Archduke Albert⁸¹, now lost, also re-used in the *Equestrian Portrait of King Sigismund III Vasa* by Rubens' workshop (?) in the Gripsholm Castle in Sweden (dated after 1624, oil on canvas, 266 × 184 cm, Inv. N. NM Grh 2012 (fig. 4). *Portrait of King Sigismund III Vasa* was acquired in 1741 in Paris by Carl Gustaf Tessin (1695–1770), son of the architect Nicodemus Tessin the Younger, then the Swedish ambassador in Paris and art collector, who considered it by Rubens. Tessin was in Paris in 1741, when the famous collection of the financier Pierre Crozat was put up for auction, and was to be one of the principal buyers. The previous whereabouts of the large picture from Gripsholm are little known, but it appears that it was earlier in the collection of Count Johan Gabriel Stenbock⁸². Count Stenbock (1640–1705), was born into one of the oldest and most respected families in Sweden and began his career at court of the Queen Christina. He went on a Grand Tour of Europe (where he could have purchased this painting), and later was appointed Treasurer to the Queen Dowager, and then a Privy Councillor in 1668. His family lived in the Stenbock Palace in Stockholm, built in 1640 by his father, Fredrik Stenbock. Originally, it was built in the Renaissance style, but was later rebuilt in 1670 by Johan Gabriel Stenbock in Baroque style, designed by Nicodemus Tessin. Johan Gabriel Stenbock remained one of the most influential men under King Charles XI.

The pose of the Prince Ladislas in the Wawel picture is almost identical as in the half-length New York portrait, except that he is depicted in armour and on horseback, as was his father. The life-size figure of the Polish Prince is shown sitting on a brown (bay) horse, holding a field-marshal's staff in his right hand. He is clad in similar armour, but is wearing a black hat with a feather and round his left arm he has tied an officer's red scarf, just as in the Gripsholm picture (and the lost Archduke Albert portrait). In the background there is a wooded undulating landscape with soldiers besieging a town identified by Szablowski and Chrościcki as the Battle of Chocim, which took place in 1621, painted after an engraving by Giacomo Lauro, 1624⁸³.

⁷⁹ H. Walpole, *Anecdotes of painting in England with some account of the principal artists*, London 1849, vol. II, p. 346, note 2.

⁸⁰ According to Szablowski: 261 × 187 cm.

⁸¹ The portrait of the Archduke Albert must be dated before 1617, as its smaller version was reproduced in miniature in the *Kunstammer* by Jan Breughel the Elder and Peter Paul Rubens, *Sight*, dated 1617 (oil on panel, 64.7 × 109.5 cm) Prado, Madrid. It is to be noted that the Archduke is wearing a red 'dress'.

⁸² *Orzeł i trzy korony. Sąsiedztwo polsko-szwedzkie nad Bałtykiem w epoce nowożytnej (XVI–XVIII w.)*, exh. cat., redakcja naukowa K. Połujan, Zamek Królewski, Warszawa 2002, p. 124, n. II 1.

⁸³ Szablowski, *op. cit.*, pp. 112–118; Chrościcki, *Diplomazia...*, p. 103.

PROVENANCE: METCALFE AND DUNDAS COLLECTIONS

The provenance of this portrait is somewhat confusing as regards the sources. It goes back to the mid-19th century, with its earliest known origins in Britain. The picture is generally described as coming from the Henry Metcalfe sale at Christie's in London on 15 June 1850⁸⁴. The Christie's 1850 sale catalogue listed it as "45. Rubens, *Portrait of Stanislaus Sigismund, King of Poland*, in a red dress with a scarf and a hat and feather, on a bay horse, in a landscape; A noble work of the great master"⁸⁵. Ladislas was evidently mistaken for Stanislaus. It is to be underlined that the Christie's catalogue description contained the words "in a red dress", which do not seem to correspond to the Cracow picture, at least as it looks now, because the Prince is dressed all in black, and the only red is his red officer's scarf attached to his elbow. Possibly quoting Rooses, most scholars repeat that *Portrait of Stanislas (Wladislas) Sigismund on a bay horse* by Rubens (the words "in a red dress" are usually omitted) was sold in the Metcalfe sale in London in 1850 to Bousfield for 231 pounds, and later in an anonymous sale (London, 1860) to Smith for 252 pounds⁸⁶. As to Vlieghe and the Corpus Rubenianum, he only laconically stated that this picture was probably withdrawn from the 1850 sale and sold on 19 May 1860 by Philip Metcalfe at Christie's in London, as lot 198⁸⁷.

The 1850 and 1860 sales were listed in another important publication by George Redford, *Art Sales: a history of sales of pictures and other works of art*, London, 1888, 2 vols. It described the painting as *Stanislaus Sigismund, K(ing) of Poland, on bay horse*, by Rubens, sold in 1850 for £231 by H. Metcalfe to Bousfield⁸⁸. Again the original Christie's description "in a red dress" was omitted. Another, later entry in Redford, presumably of the same picture, stated that in 1860, *Stanislaus Sigismund, K(ing) of Poland, on bay horse, in red* (this time specified as dressed in red), from the Coll. of Philip Metcalfe, Exor. (Abbreviation for 'executor') of Sir Joshua Reynolds, was sold for £63 by N.N. to Smith⁸⁹. The second picture slightly differed from the first one by the description of the red dress, but also by its price; it was a lot less expensive (nearly four times less) than when sold in 1850.

Incidentally, we should note that there is a portrait of the Polish King (or Prince) Ladislas in what one could describe "a red dress", but he is not on horseback. It is the previously mentioned picture called *Royal Prince as the Conquering Ruler at the Battle of Chocim, 1621*, perhaps painted by Pieter Claesz. Soutman, but before ascribed to Rubens, now in the Wilanów Palace (from the Potockis and Branickis collections).

There is yet another important source of information on these sales, which needs to be mentioned here. *Art sales from early in the 18th century to early in the 20th century*, by Algernon Graves, was published in London in 1918–1921. It is an extensively researched publication documenting major British sales, which expanded on the work of Redford, supposedly correcting errors and omissions which appear in his *Art Sales*. Graves described the portrait sold at Christie's in London on 15 June 1850 by Henry Metcalfe as Rubens "45, *Stanislaus, King of Poland, in Red*", to Bousfield for 431 pounds"⁹⁰. (notice almost double the price reported by Redford) The description "in red", and no mention of a horse again would not seem to correspond to the Cracow picture. Apparently the same portrait of the King of Poland was again sold at Christie's in London on 19 May 1860, by a certain "M. Bijstiom", as Rubens "198, *Stanislaus, King of Poland, in Red Dress*", from the Metcalfe collection, but no price or buyer were indicated this time. The description is similar (no mention of a horse either) and could match (in theory) the Wilanów composition, as the Prince's Polish costume could be described as a 'dress'.

⁸⁴ Vlieghe, *op. cit.*, no. 114, pp. 124–125.

⁸⁵ *Catalogue of the Very Important Collection of Pictures, of the Highest Class, of Henry Metcalfe, Esq., Deceased, and Removed from Hill Street*, Christie's, London, 15 June 1850, p. 9. n. 45, quoted by Szablowski, *op. cit.*, p. 92, note 4. There was just one more picture by Rubens in the Metcalfe sale: no. 21. Rubens and G. Seghers, *Virgin Mourning over the Dead Christ*.

⁸⁶ Rooses, *op. cit.*, vol. IV, p. 282.

⁸⁷ Vlieghe, *op. cit.*, p. 124.

⁸⁸ Redford, *op. cit.*, vol. II, p. 321.

⁸⁹ *Ibidem*, p. 322.

⁹⁰ Graves, *op. cit.*, pp. 119–120.

Was the description “in red” or “in a red dress” a mistake on the part of Christie’s and then Redford and Graves? Was the Cracow picture overpainted or restored? Or was the Metcalfe portrait a different picture altogether?

It is to be noted that the study/modello for the lost portrait (small in size) of the Archduke Albert on horseback by Rubens on which the portrait of Ladislas was based depicted in miniature in the *Kunst-kammer Sight* by Rubens and Breughel, shows him dressed in a kind of red ‘dress’ or ‘skirt’ worn over his armour. This detail (to my knowledge) went so far unnoticed by scholars. On the other hand, the Gripsholm portrait, also apparently based on the same lost portrait by Rubens, shows the King Sigismund III as dressed entirely in black.

The present portrait later found its way into Sir Frederick Cook’s collection in Richmond (perhaps by 1903), where it was listed as a copy: “no. 344, After Peter Paul Rubens, *Equestrian Portrait of Ladislas-Sigismund, Prince of Poland*, 262.3 × 186.3, Metcalf? (in the collection) by 1903, (sold in) 1958, (to) Cracow, Poland, Wawel Castle, State Collection of Art”⁹¹. In the first catalogue of the Cook collection it was, however, described as an original by the master: “Petrus Paulus Rubens, *Equestrian Portrait of Wladislas-Sigismund, Prince of Poland*”, but cautiously “*probably* from the Metcalfe sale, 1850”, as if the provenance were uncertain⁹². The description “in red” was omitted. In the next abridged catalogue of the Cook collection, compiled by M. W. Brockwell in 1932, the painting was listed in the Room XV, the Sculpture Gallery, and described as attributed to Rubens: “344 (179). PP Rubens (att. to), *Equestrian Portrait of Wladislas-Sigismund, Prince of Poland*. This is clearly the picture: *Portrait of Stanislaus Sigismund, King of Poland* included in the Henry Metcalfe sale, June 15 1850, No. 45”⁹³. The Metcalfe provenance was at that point cited as fully trustworthy, but the description “in red” was again omitted.

The picture was later sold in Sir Francis Cook sale, London (Sotheby’s) on 25 June 1958, as lot. 118 by “Rubens”, with no first name or initials mentioned, so the attribution to the master was clearly doubted – curiously no Metcalfe provenance was mentioned at that point; it was sold to Jenkins for 240 pounds; then to L. Koetser, London; Andrzej Ciechanowiecki, Heim Gallery, London. It was finally purchased by Dr. Julian Godlewski from Zurich, and in 1977 donated to the Wawel Castle in Cracow.

So who was Philip Metcalfe, so far the earliest known owner of the portrait?

Philip Metcalfe (1733–1818), was a rich British merchant and industrialist (of “Bisson and Metcalfe”, malt distillers) in the city of London, and from 1784, among other things, MP for Horsham, West Sussex. He was patron of the arts as well as friend of the famous artist Sir Joshua Reynolds, on whose advice he bought many pictures for his own art collection⁹⁴. From the year 1780 onwards Philip Metcalfe lived at 17 Savile Row, Westminster, London and from 1794 (or 1795), at 30 Hill Street, Berkeley Square, London when he joined the financial and cultural elite. He was member of select London clubs and societies such as since 1760, the Society for the Encouragement of Arts, Manufactures and Commerce (now the Royal Society of Arts). He was also a friend of Samuel Johnson, and one of the founder members of the British Institution in 1805, organizing art exhibitions in London. Metcalfe had another house in the fashionable Brighton, and in 1809 purchased a country residence Hawstead House near Bury-St-Edmunds in Suffolk from a member of his family. He retired there, but by then he was blind. Metcalfe went on a Grand Tour to Italy in 1766–1767, at which occasion he was portrayed by Pompeo Batoni, and where he is known to have purchased a painting by Zocchi and two views of Venice by Canaletto. In the summer of 1781,

⁹¹ E. Danziger, *The Cook collection, its founder and its inheritors*, “The Burlington Magazine”, CXLVI, 2004 (July), no. 1216, pp. 444–458 (includes the *Concordance of Cook collection paintings* with the listing).

⁹² H. Cook (ed.), *A Catalogue of the Paintings at Doughty House, Richmond and elsewhere in the collection of Sir Frederick Cook B.T.*, vol. 2, *Dutch and Flemish schools*, by J.O. Kronig, London 1914, p. 91.

⁹³ H. Cook (ed.), *Abridged Catalogue of the Pictures at Doughty House, Richmond, Surrey, in the Collection of Sir Herbert Cook, Bart.*, compiled by Maurice Walter Brockwell, London 1932, p. 81.

⁹⁴ For Metcalfe see: W.P. Courtney, *Eight Friends of the Great*, London 1910, pp. 14–34, also K. Fairclough, *Philip Metcalfe (1733–1818). The MP and Industrialist who built the Clock Mill, Three Mills*, London 2003.

he went with his friend Sir Joshua Reynolds on another tour on the Continent. Incidentally, Reynolds had plans to examine several pictures by Rubens in Antwerp. They also visited many more towns such as Brussels, Ghent, Bruges, Mechlin, Dodrecht, Rotterdam, The Hague, Leyden, Amsterdam, Düsseldorf, Cologne, Aix-la Chapelle and Liège. Reynolds and Metcalfe went on another joint tour in 1785, as they wanted to look more closely at works by Rubens, and purchased some pictures in Brussels. Reynolds spent around £1,000 on art. "In the autumn of this year (1785), in consequence of the dissolution of many of the religious and monastic institutions in Germany and Flanders a grand sale of pictures, taken from these by command of the Emperor Joseph, took place in Brussels. Among them it was supposed would be included many of Rubens's best work. The sale commenced on the 12th of September, and continued to the end of October [...] Sir Joshua attended, and laid about £1000 at it"⁹⁵. After Reynold's death in 1792, his collection of 411 pictures was sold by Christie's in London, in March 1795. Catherine the Great, Empress of Russia, bought some of the pictures from his collection. Philip Metcalfe served as an executor of Reynold's estate, along with Edmund Burke and Edmond Malone, and he was left some money by the artist, to purchase one picture from his collection, but it is not known which one (an equestrian portrait by Rubens was not listed in Reynolds collection). Metcalfe never married and left considerable assets estimated at £400,000. His estate at Hawstead was leased in strict settlement upon his great-nephew, Henry Metcalfe. Philip Metcalfe's own collection of art (46 paintings sold in 1850) was much influenced by his friendship with Reynolds. In the first half of the 19th century, he acquired many pictures at London auction rooms, such as Christie's, Greenwood or Phillips. His eclectic collection included many famous names such as Claude Lorrain, Canaletto, Giordano, Van Ostade, Teniers, Rubens, Rembrandt or Titian. Some of the sellers were specified, such as the Earl of Halifax, Sir Joshua Reynolds or Sir Lawrence Dundas.

In all probability, we have managed to trace the previous owner of the equestrian portrait by Rubens from the Metcalfe collection, on the basis of similar dimensions and comparable description (even though the sitter was formerly misidentified as the Duke of Alva). Philip Metcalfe could have acquired the portrait of the Polish King not on his Grand Tour in Europe, as one would suspect, but at Greenwood auctioneers in London, at the sale of another well known British collector, Sir Lawrence Dundas, as lot "31. Rubens, Peter Paul (Flemish), *The Duke of Alva on Horseback*, possessing all the fine Qualities of the best Pictures of this Master, annotations: beautiful: Painting, 8'4"h × 6'w (so the equivalent of 253 × 183 cm, ann. KP); Seller: Dundas, Lawrence, Sir, 1st Bart. Sold, 126.0 £; Buyer: Metcalfe, Philip; Date: 1794 May 29 – 1794 May 31 (This Lot: May 30); Auction House: Greenwood; Sale Location: London, England; Lugt Number 5215"⁹⁶. As at the time of the sale of the Metcalfe collection in 1850, there were no other equestrian portraits by Rubens than that of the King of Poland, this could be the same picture. The dimensions are also nearly identical.

There were as many as 116 pictures listed in the Dundas 1794 sale described in "A catalogue of the magnificent collection of pictures of the late Sir Lawrence Dundas, Bart. which will be sold by auction, by Messrs. Greenwood, at their Room in Leicester Square, on Thursday, 29th May, 1794, and two following days, at twelve o'clock"⁹⁷. Unfortunately, the earlier provenance of the sold pictures was seldom specified, with some exceptions such as for instance 'Dr. Ward' or 'Sir Robert Strange'. No earlier provenance was listed for the Rubens equestrian portrait.

Redford also listed this sale in his *Art Sales*: "1794, Pt. Equestrian, *D. of Alva*, 100 × 72 (so the equivalent of 254 × 182.8 cm) by Rubens, "Fine" in W. Smith note, £126. Sir L. Dundas (Greenwood Auct.)", but no buyer (Metcalfe) was mentioned⁹⁸. Redford devoted a whole chapter to the important "Collection of Sir Lawrence Dundas, Bart" and stated that the sale catalogue was marked by W. Smith, MP, who wrote his opinions.

⁹⁵ Ch. Leslie, T. Taylor, *Life and times of Sir Joshua Reynolds: With notices of some of his contemporaries*, vol. 2, London 1865, p. 480.

⁹⁶ The Getty Provenance Index Databases (online).

⁹⁷ *A catalogue of the magnificent collection of pictures of the late Sir Lawrence Dundas, Bart. Which will be sold by auction, by Messrs. Greenwood, at their Room in Leicester Square, on Thursday, 29th May, 1794, and two following days, at twelve o'clock*, Greenwood, London 1794, p. 15.

⁹⁸ Redford, *op. cit.*, vol. II, p. 319.

Sir Lawrence Dundas, 1st Bart (1712–1781), the probable earlier owner of the Cracow picture, was a Scottish merchant and politician, and one of the richest men of his time. He made his fortune through stock speculation and by provisioning the British army under the Duke of Cumberland, during their campaign against the Jacobites (1745–1746), and in Flanders during the Seven Years War (1756–1763). Hypothetically, he could have purchased the equestrian portrait by Rubens in Flanders. Dundas, who was an MP for Edinburgh and was created a Baronet in 1762, invested his considerable wealth in property and in works of art. Dundas House, his main residence built in Edinburgh by Sir William Chambers (1723–1796), later became the headquarters of the Royal Bank of Scotland, where he was at some time director. Dundas purchased a number of properties in England, notably Moor Park in Hertfordshire, bought in 1763 and improved by Robert Adam (1728–1792); Aske Hall in Richmond, Yorkshire, which remains the family home; and a house in London. By the time of his death, he owned as many as eight properties, most of which were sold by his son Thomas, created Baron Dundas in 1794, the same year he disposed of the bulk of his father's 116 pictures collection at Greenwood's, buying back only five pictures.

The best account of the Dundas art collection is in the *Apollo* article by Denys Sutton "The Dundas Pictures"⁹⁹. According to Sutton, the basic knowledge of the collection comes from the Dundas sale at Greenwood on 29 May 1794 (and two following days), and the Zetland sales (Earl of Zetland was a later title bestowed on the family members) held at Christie's on 27 April 1934 and 10 July 1953. Additionally, a group of letters and invoices relating to the formation of the collection were found in the Zetland archives now deposited in the North Riding Record Office at Northallerton, North Yorkshire. A number of these documents were published in the *Appendix* to the article, but the equestrian portrait by Rubens was not mentioned. As it transpires from the Sutton's article, one of Dundas' main sources of pictures was a well-known art dealer John Blackwood. John Blackwood (d. 1777), was one of the breed of London picture dealer of the first half of the 18th century, who "travelled extensively on the Continent, assembled a sizeable collection there and then returned to London to dispose of it at leisure from their own homes or through the auction rooms"¹⁰⁰. E. Edwards records that John Greenwood, an American native of Boston, New England, and later a successful London auctioneer, at the outset of his career "formed an acquaintance [in Holland sometime before 1763] with Mr. Blackwood, an English merchant, who dealt much in pictures"; he further informs us that Blackwood "traded to Spain, from whence he brought some very fine pictures of the Spanish masters, particularly of Murillo"¹⁰¹. Blackwood was apparently the only London dealer of his generation to acquire paintings in Spain. Four paintings given to Murillo which he purchased there in c. 1760 were bought by Lawrence Dundas, such as *St Francis da Paolo* or his *Self-Portrait* (now in the National Gallery, London). In the *Appendix*, we also find some receipts dating from as early as 1749, a few from Philip Van Dyke at The Hague, for the sale of a group of pictures to John Blackwood. Dundas patronized Blackwood on at least two more occasions, buying pictures at sales he held in London in 1750 and 1751, where for instance he purchased Poussin's *Crucifixion* (now in Wadsworth Atheneum, Hartford, Connecticut). Blackwood held a particularly large number of sales in the 1750s, culminating in the sale at Langford's, Covent Garden, on 19–20 March 1760. He also participated in the Van Haecken sale in 1758, as both seller and buyer, and such masterpieces as Poussin's *Moses sweetening the Waters of Maribah* (Baltimore Museum of Art) passed through his hands.

Dundas also employed John Greenwood, the Bostonian artist, who settled in 1758 in Holland, and later came to London and turned to art dealing. Greenwood told his friend Copley in 1770: "I have brought to London above fifteen hundred pictures and have had the pleasure of adorning some of the finest cabinets in England"¹⁰². Greenwood was scouting in Amsterdam for his client, where he purchased a number of Dutch pictures, which Dundas apparently favoured. In addition to buying pictures from Blackwood and Greenwood, Dundas also dealt with a firm Muilman and Sons from Amsterdam. In 1764, he employed another picture dealer called Charles Pye of Soho Square, London, who sold him several pictures from a collection in Holland. Interestingly, the *Apollo* article included a partial inventory of the Dundas collection (*Appendix* 15), but the present picture was not listed. Sutton mentioned another painting by Rubens and Breughel, *Nature unveiled by the Graces*, from the Dundas collection, now in the Glasgow Art Galleries

⁹⁹ D. Sutton, *The Dundas Pictures*, "Apollo", LXXXVI, 1967 (September), no. 67, pp. 204–214.

¹⁰⁰ F. Herrmann, *The English as Collectors: A Documentary Sourcebook*, London 1999, p. 27.

¹⁰¹ E. Edwards, H. Walpole, *Anecdotes of Painters who have resided or been born in England...*, London 1808, p. 170.

¹⁰² *Ibidem*, p. 205, quoting W.T. Whitley, *Artists and their Friends in England 1700–99*, 2 vols., 1928, vol. I, p. 261.

and Museums. According to M. Jaffé, the oil painting on panel, 106.7 × 72.4 cm, c. 1615, was acquired (by Dundas) at the 1771 sale of the collection of Gerrit Braamcamp in Amsterdam¹⁰³.

Sutton clearly did not know what had happened to the equestrian portrait by Rubens as he said: “It would be interesting to know what has become of *The Duke of Alva on Horseback* by Rubens (1794 Sale, 2nd day, Lot 31, bt. Metcalfe £126-0) and the *Portrait of the Archduke of Austria on a white horse* (3rd day, Lot 31, bt. Milnes £168)”¹⁰⁴. We might thus have solved the first part of the mystery. The latter picture was described in the Greenwood catalogue as by “Anthonie van Dyck, *A Portrait of the Archduke Albert of Austria on a White Horse*, infinitely surpassing any Picture of the Kind ever painted; the manly Elegance of the Prince, the correct Drawing and Foreshortening of the Horse, are the happiest Efforts of Art; and Praise cannot be too lavish on the Beauty and Delicacy of the Colouring, which form altogether one of the Finest Pictures of this inestimable Master; Painting, 7’ 6” h × 5’ w (228 × 152 cm)”¹⁰⁵.

What needs to be explained is why the portrait of the Polish Prince Ladislas-Sigismund could have been misidentified as the Duke of Alva?

Both Held¹⁰⁶ and Vlieghe¹⁰⁷ incorrectly assumed the equestrian portrait of *The Duke of Buckingham* by Rubens, oil on panel, 46.6 × 51.7 cm (now in Kimbell Art Museum, Fort Worth, Texas, USA) was the painting mentioned by G.F. Waagen in his *Galleries and cabinets in Great Britain* in 1857: “Rubens (?) 173. *The Duke of Alva on horseback*; only a picture of the school”, which was in Lord Radnor’s (also known as Lord Folkestone) collection at Longford Castle¹⁰⁸.

That was, however another work on canvas, more correctly identified as the *Portrait of Archduke Albert, Governor of the Netherlands*, formerly known as *Portrait of the Duke of Alva*. It was described by the Countess of Radnor, Helen Matilda and William Barclay Squire in the *Catalogue of the Pictures in the Collection of the Earl of Radnor*, London 1909, as no. “62. *The Archduke Albert* (1559–1621), Peter Paul Rubens, canvas, 48.5 × 37 in., full-length, on horseback [...] this picture, formerly known as a portrait of the Duke of Alva, was bought at Mr. Jeffreys’s sale at Salisbury in 1806. [...] this picture of the Duke of Alva came from the Warwick Castle”¹⁰⁹. As we know, the Earl of Radnor’s equestrian portrait (123.2 × 94 cm, whereabouts unknown), which was most probably one of the copies recording the original *Portrait of Archduke Albert, Archduke of Austria* by Rubens, showed an identical composition as the Cracow picture. It was described by Waagen, and also by Smith as “1168. *An Equestrian Portrait of the Duke d’Albe*. The face is presented in a front view, a morion helmet covers the head, and the body is clad in armour; the right hand poises a baton on the saddle, and the figure is gracefully seated on a prancing bay charger; the lines of a fortification and the sea are seen in the distance. A finished study for a large picture. 4ft 2 in by 3ft 4 in – C(anvas). Now in the collection of the Earl of Radnor”¹¹⁰. Crucially, Smith also mentioned in another entry that “There was an equestrian portrait, styled the Duke of Alva, sold in the collection of Sir Lawrence Dundas, Bart. in 1794, for 120 gs. 8ft 4 in. by 6 ft. C(anvas)”¹¹¹. The term “styled” reflects uncertainty as to the true identification of the sitter. It is to be noted that Smith did not list the equestrian portrait of Ladislas-Sigismund then in the Metcalfe collection in his *Catalogue raisonné*.

As the Earl of Radnor’s picture was very similar to the present portrait of Ladislas-Sigismund on horseback, both in composition and in style, and was misidentified in the past as the portrait of the Duke of Alva, so could be the large equestrian portrait of similar composition and style in the Dundas collection. All this seems to indicate that the Dundas’ equestrian portrait of the Duke of Alva was most probably the same picture as the equestrian portrait of the Prince Ladislas-Sigismund now in Cracow.

Incidentally, there were others records of portraits of the Duke of Alva by Rubens, not necessarily on horseback. One was in *The Orléans Gallery*, exhibited in the Great Rooms of The Royal Academy,

¹⁰³ Jaffé, *op. cit.*, n. 322, p. 209.

¹⁰⁴ Sutton, *op. cit.*, p. 210.

¹⁰⁵ Getty Provenance Index (online).

¹⁰⁶ J. Held, *The Oil Sketches of Peter Paul Rubens: a critical catalogue*, 2 vols, Princeton 1980, p. 393.

¹⁰⁷ Vlieghe, *op. cit.*, p. 66.

¹⁰⁸ G.F. Waagen, *Galleries and cabinets of art in Great Britain: being an account of more...* vol. IV, London 1857, p. 362.

¹⁰⁹ H. Matilda, Countess of Radnor and W. Barclay, *Catalogue of the Pictures in the Collection of the Earl of Radnor*, 2 vols., London 1909, pp. 37–38.

¹¹⁰ Smith, *op. cit.*, n. 1168, p. 313.

¹¹¹ *Ibidem*, no. 821, p. 239.

no. 125, Pall Mall, London, April 1793, lot 112, as *'Portrait of the Duke of Alva by Rubens'* (sold for £80 to an unidentified purchaser). Another picture was at the Hampton Court Palace: "In the Council Chamber, formerly the Cartoon Gallery, are *The Duke of Alva, Rubens*"¹¹². This portrait was showing the Duke on Alva on horseback as indicated by William Gilpin in *An Essay on Prints*, London, 1802: "...and Rubens too, at Hampton-court, has made a noble picture of the duke of Alva; tho his horse is ill drawn"¹¹³.

THE COOK COLLECTION

The Cook Collection, where the picture was later found was formed by Sir Francis Cook (1817–1901), and later his grandson Sir Herbert Cook (1868–1939) at Doughty House, Richmond. Sir Francis was a collector of antiquities until his middle age when, with the help of his advisor of thirty years, Sir John Charles Robinson (1824–1913), Surveyor of Pictures to Queen Victoria, he began to collect paintings with the aim of assembling an encyclopaedic collection to rival the public galleries of Britain and Europe. Robinson trained as an artist in Paris, and then worked in the newly formed South Kensington Museum, frequently travelling to Italy and other countries. He sold his own collection of about thirty pictures to Cook. Sir Francis Cook was the son of a prosperous textile businessman, and became an avid art collector. He went on a Grand Tour and later in 1849 settled at Doughty House in Richmond. There is no evidence that he owned any paintings before 1868. Yet in 1876, just eight years after starting his picture collection, he owned as many as 510 pictures. He also had acquired a magnificent summer residence Monserrate Palace in Sintra in Portugal. At his death in 1901, his collection included 545 pictures, with works by Rubens, Rembrandt, Van Dyck, del Sarto, Titian, Tintoretto and Raphael, among others. His collection of late Flemish and Dutch paintings numbered 197. He bequeathed the greater part of his collection to his elder son Sir Frederick Cook; the rest, excluding pictures, to his other son, Mr Wyndham. Sir Frederick died in 1920, and left the collection to Sir Herbert. Sir Herbert Cook continued adding to the collection as well as playing a major role in the founding of *The Burlington Magazine*. His independence from received opinion became clear early on. He sponsored and wrote the preface to the attribution-topping pamphlet on the 1894–1895 New Gallery's exhibition of Venetian art in London, written by his friend Bernard Berenson¹¹⁴. As the Second World War approached, it became difficult to house and maintain such a substantial private collection, and so began significant sales. Sir Francis Cook (1907–1978) ensured that dispersals of the collection were largely to the benefit of institutions around the world, and in 1942 donated one of the most impressive masterpieces, Titian's *La Schiavona*, to the National Gallery in memory of his father.

The Catalogue of the Paintings at Doughty House, Richmond, 1914, edited by Herbert Cook, listed the present picture in the volume II, prepared by J.O. Kronig, Director of the Haarlem Gallery which "incorporated the views of Dr. Bredius, Dr. Hofstede de Groot, etc"¹¹⁵. The catalogue entry "n. 344, Rubens, Petrus Paulus, *Equestrian Portrait of Wladislas-Sigismund, Prince of Poland*", described it in the following terms: "Life-size, sitting on a brown horse, facing the spectator, holding a field-marshal's staff in his right hand. He is clad in armour, and wears a black hat with feather, and round his left arm a red scarf. In the background is a landscape with soldiers besieging a town. Canvas, (262.25 cm × 186.25 cm), Garden Gallery, n. 179"¹¹⁶.

The catalogue stated that there were four similar pictures, all ascribed to Rubens:

1. In the Longford Castle, Salisbury, Earl of Radnor's collection, n. 62. *A sketch of the Archduke Albert*.
2. In the Stockholm Museum, n. 598. "Called a copy by Soutman after Rubens, but apparently an original from Rubens's own hand. A dog is here added, and the picture is smaller".

¹¹² B. Lambert, *The history and survey of London and its environs*, 4 vols., London 1806, vol. IV, p. 266.

¹¹³ W. Gilpin, *An Essay on Prints*, London 1802, p. 139. (original spelling)

¹¹⁴ Danziger, *op. cit.*, p. 453.

¹¹⁵ Cook, *A Catalogue...*, p. 91.

¹¹⁶ *Ibidem*.

3. In the Viennese collection of Count Clam-Gallas. Reproduced in Dillon, *Rubens*, pl. V. canvas, 98½ in. × 71 in (250 × 180 cm). *Portrait of Duca del Infantado*.
4. In Genoa, in the Palazzo Durazzo. 40 in. × 32 in. “Called the Prince of Poland. This example is considered by Max Rooses to be the original”.

The Earl of Radnor’s portrait (123.2 × 94 cm) was, as we have seen, one of the copies recording the original *Portrait of Archduke Albert, Archduke of Austria*, now of whereabouts unknown, presumably lost, and executed earlier, c. 1615. Other copies were in the collection of the Prince of Liechtenstein, Vaduz (109 × 67 cm), and in the collection of Paul Eeckhout, Conservator at the Museum voor Schone Kunsten in Gand (122 × 98 cm)¹¹⁷. The relatively modest size of the portrait could perhaps correspond to the small version of the picture depicted in miniature in 1617 in the *Sight* by Jan Breughel the Elder and Peter Paul Rubens. The Viennese picture was later identified as the portrait of Don Diego Messina Felipe de Guzmán, Marquis of Leganés, presently in the Kunsthistorisches Museum¹¹⁸, where it is now attributed to Caspar de Crayer. The Stockholm picture is the equestrian portrait of Sigismund III, now in Gripsholm Castle, and the Durazzo portrait is the previously discussed portrait of Ladislas-Sigismund in bust.

Although the present painting was listed as by Rubens in the collection catalogue, Herbert Cook was well aware of its inadequate quality and wrote the following: “The present picture can hardly be from Rubens’s own hand, although he is known to have painted the Prince of Poland when the latter came to Brussels on a visit to the Archduke.” In fact, in other catalogues of the collection dated 1913–1915, the picture was listed as “after Rubens”, so as a copy. Yet according to *Corpus Rubenianum*, Ludwig Burchard had no doubts that the portrait was an authentic work by Rubens¹¹⁹. This composition, however, clearly reflects earlier equestrian portraits by Rubens such as the *Portrait of Archduke Albert, Archduke of Austria*, so Vlieghe from the *Corpus Rubenianum* disagreed with Burchard’s original opinion. Had Rubens needed an equestrian pose in 1624, he would have used the one created only shortly before for the portrait of *Maria de Medici at the Battle of Jülich* – “a new frontal equestrian type in the somewhat more flowing style of the 1620’s”¹²⁰.

Burchard thought the present painting to be an original by Rubens; Glück and Van Puyvelde believed only the head to be by the master¹²¹. Yet the overall quality of the picture and the rigidity of the pose point to a collaborator/follower of Rubens, who was also aware of the equestrian *Portrait of Sigismund III* from the Gripsholm Castle.

As noticed by Szablowski, the Stockholm and the Cracow equestrian portraits of the Prince and his father are almost identical in composition, size (265 × 184 cm, and 261 × 187 cm, respectively) and many details (except for the head gear, the dog and the landscape), and he suggested that they might have been hanging as a pair in a palace or castle¹²².

We can add that De Crayers’s *Portrait of Marquis of Leganés* from Vienna, previously attributed to Rubens also had similar dimensions (250 × 180 cm) and a similar composition. Nevertheless, all these pictures were clearly not executed by the same hand, and the Stockholm picture is arguably of higher quality than the Cracow one. According to Szablowski, Chrościcki and Vlieghe, and I concur, the Cracow picture might not even come from Rubens’ workshop, but from his school or his circle (the latter attribution is stated by Wawel Castle), as it is evidently an amalgamation/compilation of the two pictures (Ladislas to the knees and Sigismund on horseback) into one.

Further research into earlier origins of the painting, before it came to the Dundas collection in the 18th century, might provide some more answers as to its authorship.

¹¹⁷ Szablowski, *op. cit.*, p. 102.

¹¹⁸ As reported by Szablowski, *op. cit.*, p. 95 and p. 106.

¹¹⁹ Vlieghe, *op. cit.*, pp. 124–125.

¹²⁰ *Ibidem*, p. 125.

¹²¹ Chrościcki, *Rubens w Polsce...*, p. 166.

¹²² Szablowski, *op. cit.*, p. 108. It is to be noted that Crayers’s, *Portrait of Marquis of Leganés*, from Vienna, once attributed to Rubens also had similar dimensions (250 × 180 cm) and a similar composition.

ANALIZA ATRYBUCJI DWÓCH PORTRETÓW KRÓLEWICZA WŁADYSŁAWA ZYGMUNTA WAZY ZE ZBIORÓW ZAMKU KRÓLEWSKIEGO NA WAWELU

Streszczenie

Artykuł dotyczy dwu przechowywanych na Wawelu portretów Władysława Zygmunta Wazy. Pierwszy (depozyt Metropolitan Museum w Nowym Jorku): *Portret królewicza Władysława Zygmunta Wazy* (olej na płótnie, przeniesiony z deski, 125,1 × 101 cm), powstały po wrześniu 1624, przedstawiający królewicza w ujęciu do kolan, dziś uznawany jest za dzieło pracowni Rubensa. Drugi: *Portret konny królewicza Władysława Zygmunta Wazy*, powstały po 1624 (olej na płótnie, 259 × 185,5 cm), jest dziełem z kręgu/szkoły Rubensa.

Autorka podsumowuje dotychczasowe ustalenia dotyczące atrybucji i pochodzenia tych dzieł i wzbogaca o nowy materiał fakto-graficzny. Podstawą analizy są przeprowadzone w Londynie kwerendy (oba obrazy pochodzą bowiem z kolekcji brytyjskich), a także badania między innymi J.A. Chrościckiego, Z. Ważbińskiego, J. Szablowskiego, E. Duvergera, R. Szmydkiego oraz H. Vlieghe'a.

Dzieła te powstały w czasie podróży Władysława Zygmunta po Europie Zachodniej i Południowej, jaką odbył w latach 1624–1625. Rubens namalował portret królewicza w Brukseli (szkic) oraz w Antwerpii w 1624 r., na zlecenie infantki Izabeli Klary Eugenii. O ich spotkaniu pisali m.in. ambasador Francji N. de Baugy, S. Pac i później G.P. Bellori. Ten (lub podobny) obraz był odnotowany w inwentarzu z 1643 r. kolekcji brukselskiego pałacu na Coudenbergu pośród siedmiu wizerunków polskich monarchów. Znamy również rycinę Paula Pontiusa według zaginionego portretu Rubensa (w ujęciu do kolan), 1624 (z napisem poprawnie wymieniającym tytuły polskiego królewicza), oraz kilka innych rycin. Inna wersja portretu (w popiersiu), mniejsza, lecz lepszej jakości znajduje się w Palazzo Durazzo-Palavicini w Genui (olej na płótnie, owal, 75 × 65 cm, wg M. Jaffé i Roosesa, 100 × 80 cm). Istnieje także kilka innych wersji portretów polskiego królewicza (przypisywanych P.C. Soutmanowi) oraz zapisów archiwalnych. Zarówno opis portretu Rubensa w brukselskim inwentarzu, jak i rycina wskazują na zasadnicze różnice w porównaniu z warsztatowym obrazem z Nowego Jorku. Najwcześniejsze wzmianki o dziele sięgają XVIII wieku i dotyczą szkockiej kolekcji Johna Campbella, lorda Glenorchy. Autorka przedstawia postać arystokraty oraz sugeruje związki między rodziną Campbellów i George'em Jamesonem (1588–1644), „szkockim Van Dyckiem”, portrecistą, który uczył się w pracowni Rubensa.

Naturalnej wielkości portret konny, wykazuje podobieństwo do namalowanych przez Rubensa wizerunków: Władysława Zygmunta do kolan, i wcześniejszego (ok. 1615), zaginionego, *Portretu arcyksięcia Alberta*, a którego zamysł kompozycyjny został wykorzystany również w *Portrecie konnym króla Zygmunta III Wazy* (warsztat Rubensa; zamek Gripsholm, Szwecja, po 1624, olej na płótnie, 266 × 184 cm). Dokumenty sprzedaży analizowanego portretu jako dzieła Rubensa w 1850 r. w Christie's w Londynie zawierają pewne nieścisłości w opisie. Właścicielem obrazu był Philip Metcalfe (1733–1818), zamożny kupiec i przemysławiec z Londynu, członek parlamentu, przyjaciel – Joshuy Reynoldsa. Autorka podaje wiele nowych informacji o Metcalfie, jego podróżach po Europie i kolekcji sztuki. Co ważniejsze, najprawdopodobniej udało się ustalić poprzedniego właściciela portretu. Metcalfe zakupił malowidło w 1794 r. w domu aukcyjnym Greenwood w Londynie jako pracę Rubensa *Portret konny księcia Alva*, olej na płótnie, ok. 254 × 183 cm, z dużej kolekcji 116 obrazów sir Lawrence'a Dundasa (1712–1781), szkockiego kupca i polityka, jednego z najbogatszych ludzi tamtych czasów. Dundas być może zakupił portret we Flandrii, gdzie bywał w latach (1756–1763), lub od londyńskich marszandów, takich jak John Blackwood lub John Greenwood. Portret Władysława Zygmunta został błędnie uznany za wizerunek księcia Alva na podstawie podobieństwa do konnego portretu o tym samym tytule w dawnej kolekcji hrabiego Radnora w zamku Longford, Salisbury. Później portret trafił do kolekcji sir Francisa Cooka (1817–1901) i jego syna Fredericka w Doughty House, Richmond (być może w 1903 r.); obraz opisano w kolejnych inwentarzach kolekcji Cooka jako *Portret konny Władysława Zygmunta, polskiego królewicza*, dzieło Rubensa lub jako kopię.