

zierungsvermögen in Verbindung brachte, welches aus Raphaels Bemerkungen zum Skulpturenschmuck am Konstantinsbogen im Brief an Leo X. erschlossen werden kann. Außerdem gelang es Nesselrath, nach seiner Entdeckung der Recamator-Inschrift auf einem Blatt in München noch ein weiteres Indiz für die Rekonstruktion des zeichnerischen Oeuvres Giovanni da Udines ausfindig zu machen.

Der offene, globale Ansatz dieser durch keine übergeordnete Themenstellungen eingegrenzten Zusammenkunft machte vor allen Dingen auf den Gebieten der Architektur und der Antikenforschung die reichen Möglichkeiten zukünftiger Forschungsentwicklungen deutlich, erbrachte im übrigen aber eher eine Bereicherung in vielen Sachdetails als umwälzende Veränderungen oder eine zusammenfassende Klärung unseres Raphael-Bildes und dessen Einbettung in größere Zusammenhänge. Mit dem aus verständlichen Gründen aufgestellten Kongreßkonzept, das durch die „Verteidigung“ bereits publizierter eigener Forschungen zwangsläufig etwas Beharrendes mit sich bringt, mußte in Kauf genommen werden, daß von den Teilnehmern nicht mehr Neuland besritten wurde. Andererseits standen einer kritischen Gegenüberstellung und Abwägung offenkundig divergierender Positionen die Stofffülle und Dichte des Programms, oft die begrenzte Zeit für Diskussionen und nicht zuletzt das Bemühen der Teilnehmer um Harmonie entgegen. Trotzdem war die glückliche, von den Veranstaltern mit vorzüglicher Organisation verwirklichte Idee eines Raphael-Kongresses vor den Originalen ein eindringliches, vor allen Dingen auch durch den persönlichen Gedankenaustausch bereicherndes Erlebnis. Mehr als in den geplanten Kongreßakten wird das Anregende dieser Zusammenkunft vielleicht – so ist zu hoffen – in den Erträgen zukünftiger Forschungen nachwirken. – (Für die freundliche Überlassung der Abbildungsvorlagen danke ich F. Mancinelli und K. Oberhuber sehr herzlich.)

Rolf Quednau

Ausstellungen

VAN DYCK IN ENGLAND

Exhibition in the National Portrait Gallery, London, from 19 November 1982
to 20 March 1983

Van Dyck, whose work had received far less attention in the years since the war than his great Flemish contemporaries Rubens and Jordaens, has recently been the subject of three major exhibitions. Each has dealt with particular aspects of his work: his religious paintings (Princeton, 1979), his early years in Flanders (Ottawa, 1980) and, in this exhibition, held at the National Portrait Gallery in London from November 1982 until March 1983, his years working for the court of Charles I. The

London exhibition was selected and catalogued by Sir Oliver Millar, Surveyor of the Queen's Pictures, and the acknowledged authority on Van Dyck's English period. In his choice of paintings and drawings and the exemplary catalogue, Millar, who was responsible for the excellent *Age of Charles I* exhibition at the Tate a decade ago, fulfilled the highest expectations. The exhibition was not pioneering in the way in which its two predecessors explored little-studied aspects of Van Dyck's activity; rather it aimed to show both the quality and (within the limits of unadventurous patronage) the range of his achievement while in England. There were absentees, among them the Turin *Three Children of Charles I*, which had been promised (and therefore catalogued) but did not arrive, the *Roi à la Chasse* (the Louvre sent, by way of consolation, the superb double portrait of *Prince Charles Louis and Prince Rupert*), the *Self-Portrait with Endymion Porter*, and, especially regrettable, the *George, Lord Digby and William, Lord Russell*, the finest of the full-length double portraits, from Althorp. With these exceptions, however, the intention of providing a survey of the range of Van Dyck's activity was achieved.

The exhibition was hung in a loosely chronological sequence. At the entrance hung the *Portrait of Arundel* (cat. no. 2) from Van Dyck's first visit to London in 1620/21: now in a private collection in Washington and little-known, it had made a powerful impression in Ottawa where, as in London, it was hung close to the exactly contemporary *Continence of Scipio* (3) from Oxford. Millar also included here the *Portrait of a Man* (1) from the National Gallery, London, whom he brilliantly identified as George Gage and which he believes to have been painted in Antwerp in 1620 or London in 1620/1. Although close dating of the young Van Dyck is a difficult as well as an unrewarding occupation, this portrait could equally well have been painted in Rome in 1622/23, as it possesses strong affinities in its dynamic composition and rich, dark palette with the two portraits of Lucas van Uffelen executed in Venice in 1622. Nearby were the magnificent full-length portraits of Sir Robert and Lady Shirley (4, 5) in their Persian robes, painted in Rome in 1622 and included presumably because of their accessibility (at Petworth) and Sir Robert's nationality rather than their relevance to the exhibition's theme. It was his position at the court of Charles I that presumably explains the inclusion of Nicholas Lanier (6), whom Van Dyck painted in Antwerp in 1628. Also in this first group was a small replica of the portrait of *Venetia Stanley, Lady Digby, as Prudence* (9), the composition of which is described at length by Bellori in his *Life of Van Dyck* on the basis of her widower's account. Bellori mentions that the artist was so pleased with this unusual allegorical portrait that he painted a small-scale version of it and Millar implies that this is it. While in the more freely painted areas, such as the figure of Deceit, it might seem possible to detect Van Dyck's hand, Venetia Digby's own head, and the *putti* who crown her, are highly finished, with a smoothness and polish difficult to parallel elsewhere in his work. Although its provenance can apparently be traced back to a 1659 inventory of the palace of Tervuren, the choice of Christopher Loyd's *Queen Henrietta Maria* (8) to represent the early three-quarter length portraits of the Queen was surprising: the painting in

the Royal Collection, the Wrightsman collection and (least well-known) that owned by Lord Radnor are superior.

Dominating the first half of the exhibition was the newly-cleaned "greate peece" (7), the portrait of the royal family for which Van Dyck was paid in August 1632. The painting had been extended – apparently during the reign of George III, in order to form a pair with the *Charles I and Monsieur St. Antoine* at Buckingham House. During its recent treatment these additions were turned over the edge of the new stretcher and the picture restored to its original dimensions. It is now possible to see the portrait for the first time: it was formerly so damaged and repainted that it was necessary to rely on the evidence of early copies for its original appearance. It is painted, surprisingly, on a coarse herring-bone canvas which with repeated relinings has become distressingly obtrusive while the darker colours have "sunk". The impact, however, that the portrait must have had on the artistically provincial English court can still be sensed. It was Van Dyck's first full-length portrait group since he had left Italy and with its imposing architectural backdrop and rich, gold curtains possesses the air of remote grandeur which characterises the Genoese portraits. It is a formal portrait – the dignity of the king is insisted upon – and yet, as in many of the Genoese paintings, the formality is eased by the lively presence of the two children and, in particular, by the tender glance of Henrietta Maria towards her husband.

Also noteworthy in the first rooms of the exhibition were the imposing full-length portrait of Strafford in armour (15), probably painted on the eve of his departure for Dublin as Lord Deputy General of Ireland in 1633, and the full-length of the *Abbé Scaglia* (17), painted in Flanders in the following year (and, again, peripheral to the exhibition's theme). The *Archbishop Laud* (14) from the Fitzwilliam has emerged from cleaning as the original of this composition, clearly, superior to the Hermitage version, although – as Millar stresses – there is no evidence of Laud having given a commission to Van Dyck himself. The pose of the powerful posthumous portrait of the *9th Earl of Northumberland* (13), as Michael Levey pointed out in his review of the exhibition in *The Burlington Magazine*, is probably taken from a North Italian sixteenth-century source, probably Moretto or Moroni (the latter Van Dyck confused with Titian in his *Italian Sketchbook*). It should be possible to identify his robe, which must refer to a particular office: the inscription on the paper at his elbow is legible and should have been transcribed and identified in the catalogue. One of the revelations of the exhibition was the splendid three-quarter length of *Mrs Endymion Porter* (36). Endymion Porter and his wife were friends of Van Dyck, members of the Catholic court circle which centred on the Queen. As might be expected in a portrait of a friend, it is wonderfully animated; she appears to have just seen something which has startled her. No date is suggested for the painting in the catalogue, but by its place in the sequence (though not in the sequence of hanging) Millar presumably thinks that it was painted in about 1637, which is surely correct. (This is not the only point at which the catalogue displays a reluctance to be tied down to precise dates.)

Contrasting with the exuberant informality of Mrs. Porter, *The Five Eldest Children of Charles I* (26) are carefully posed, in a semi-circle around the Prince of Wales. As, however, with the "greate peece", any hint of stiffness is dispelled by, in this case, the half-naked baby, Princess Anne, who reaches out towards her brother. For the group of the baby and Princess Elizabeth, who nurses her, Van Dyck painted a coloured oil sketch (27) from the life, unique in his English period. Presumably the pose of the two heads could not be held and Van Dyck felt that he must get it down on canvas before turning to the painting itself, which was a major royal commission.

The astonishingly fresh and accomplished *Charles I with Monsieur St. Antoine* (17), one of Van Dyck's greatest portraits about which Millar writes with great eloquence and feeling, was displayed in a circular room flanked by full-length portraits. A number of these had been chosen for their unfamiliarity, notably the two ladies (51, 52) from the series of family portraits painted for Lord Wharton, now in the Munthe collection. While it was fascinating to have the chance to study these paintings, the surfaces were dulled by opaque varnish. To judge from the catalogue entries, Millar has a high opinion of both portraits, but in fact much of the handling of the draperies is routine and suggests the hand of an assistant. The same is true of two other rarely exhibited full-lengths, *Anne Cavendish, Lady Rich* (33) and *Elizabeth Howard, Countess of Peterborough* (34). Far finer were two of the men, the *Arthur Goodwin* (55) from Chatsworth and the less well-known *James, Third Marquess of Hamilton* in armour (60). Such comparisons raise the most intractable problem of the English period, the degree of studio participation. The catalogue is reticent on this question, which is a disappointment because Millar's profound familiarity with the paintings of the English period make his opinions on the matters of workshop procedure especially valuable. The robes, for example, in the "*Madagascar*" *Portrait of the Earl and Countess of Arundel* (59) seem to be the work of an assistant, despite the importance of the commission. In the newly-cleaned half-length portraits of *Sir John and Lady Borlase* (49, 50) from Kingston Lacy Van Dyck's participation is limited to the heads, and, perhaps, to Sir John's right hand.

Outstanding in the last two rooms of the exhibition were the stately full-length of the *Earl of Danby* in the robes of a Garter Knight (209) from Leningrad, the *Charles I in Three Positions* (22), Van Dyck's only mythological painting from the English period, the Titanesque "*poesia*" *Cupid and Psyche* (58), both from the Royal Collection, the *Sir Thomas Hanmer* (37) from Weston Park, the *Countess of Bedford* (41) from Petworth and, less well known, the sensuous *Portrait of a Girl as Erminia* (42) from Blenheim. She has been called Venus in the armour of Mars, but her identification as Erminia from Tasso's *Gerusalemme Liberata*, which Van Dyck knew well, is entirely convincing. The *portrait historié* is a form rarely used by Van Dyck and so it was not surprising to discover, when looking at the small group of drawings in the exhibition, that the pen and wash portrait of *Margaret Lemon* (80), from the Institut Néerlandais is a study for this unusual portrait. (The connection is

not made by Millar and was first made by Levey in his *Burlington Magazine* review.) It is entirely characteristic of Van Dyck, as we know him from the historical evidence, that he should have chosen to show his mistress in the guise of Tasso's heroine.

Far less attractive were *Elizabeth Stuart, Lady Maltravers* (19) – which the inscription on the back of the original canvas apparently attests Van Dyck's authorship but the slick treatment of the head, the crudeness of the draperies and the unusual format suggest is an early copy – and the *Anne Crofts, Duchess of Cleveland* (31), which has a dryness of handling at odds with Van Dyck's usual technique. It was also difficult to share Millar's enthusiasm for *Thomas Killigrew* (39), whose clumsy and formless sash is a particularly jarring element in a portrait which recalled Michael Wright's *Sir William Bruce* (Scottish National Portrait Gallery). The *Portrait of an Unknown Man* (46) from Palazzo Pitti was a real puzzle. It is certainly not by Tinelli, as has recently been suggested, but it looked out of place amongst the English Van Dycks. If it is by Van Dyck, it must be an Antwerp period painting but, alternatively it may be a Dutch portrait, perhaps by Bartholomeus van der Helst in Van Dyckian mood.

At the end of the exhibition, easy to miss in a dark corridor, was the magical grisaille sketch for the Garter Procession (43), with its resonant echoes of Veronese, a reminder – with the *Cupid and Psyche* – of what Van Dyck might have done had English patronage been more enterprising. Opposite hung two of Van Dyck's last royal portraits *Charles II as Prince of Wales* (63) and the marriage portrait of *William and Mary* (62). Painted in the artist's last months, when his health was failing, they reveal a heavy reliance on assistants.

The small selection of drawings, which were displayed in a cubby-hole which admitted only two or three visitors at a time in comfort, was well-chosen, both to complement the paintings (there were, for example, black chalk studies for *Lanier, Charles I and Monsieur St. Antoine*, and *François Langlois*) and represent other aspects of Van Dyck's activity – drawings for the *Iconography* and both landscape drawings and watercolours. All are well-known: the only new attribution was a drawing from the Institut Néerlandais, catalogued by Carlos van Hasselt as by Pieter Soutman, but thought by Millar to be a portrait of James I and tentatively attributed to Van Dyck on his first visit to London. As Levey has already commented, it is difficult to recognise either the features of the king or the hand of Van Dyck in this sheet. Amongst the drawings was the Earl of Jersey's oval painted *Self-Portrait* (65), which has been rarely exhibited. It is a vivid, arresting image, with the collar and doublet boldly sketched in. Millar places it at the end of the sequence of paintings in the catalogue but it should not be dated to Van Dyck's very last years, but rather to c. 1637.

One substantial criticism, already hinted at, must be made of the exhibition, responsibility for which must be laid at the door, not of the organiser, but of his hosts: the area in which the exhibition was housed at the National Portrait Gallery was unsuitable. The sequence of small rooms with no natural light in which the

paintings were hung very close together was particularly inappropriate for the two great canvases from the Royal Collection, the "greate peece" and the *Charles I with Monsieur St. Antoine*, both designed to be seen at the end of very long vistas. (Salt was rubbed into the wound by Pierre de la Serre's account, quoted in the catalogue, of the stunning impression the latter made at St. James' Palace in 1638.) The exhibition had a deserved popular success which made the rooms crowded and hot, and the sense of claustrophobia was increased by the choice of chocolate brown as a wall colour.

It would be most unjust to end a review of this excellent exhibition on a critical note. While not introducing us to a neglected aspect of Van Dyck's work as its predecessors at Princeton and Ottawa had done, it succeeded magnificently in its aims of showing both the highlights and the range of Van Dyck's work during his years in England. The catalogue is a major addition to the modern literature on Van Dyck, providing the best (and certainly the most elegantly written) concise introduction to the artist's life and career and, in the entries for individual paintings, the fruit of Sir Oliver Millar's researches into Van Dyck's English period carried out over many years. It can only be hoped that, in time, he will publish a complete *catalogue raisonné* of the English paintings.

Christopher Brown

FERDINAND HODLER

Ausstellung in der Nationalgalerie, Berlin (2. 3.–24. 4. 1983),
im Petit Palais, Paris (11. 5.–24. 7. 1983) und im Kunsthaus,
Zürich (19. 8.–23. 10. 1983)

Schon zu Lebzeiten Hodlers riefen seine Werke heftige Kritik hervor, und auch heute noch stoßen Hodlers Bilder, besonders seine allegorischen Kompositionen und seine Historiengemälde, auf Unverständnis. Es war daher ein Wagnis, Hodlers Werk von neuem zur Diskussion zu stellen, um so mehr, als der Ruhm des Malers außerhalb der Schweiz in den letzten Jahrzehnten zusehends verblaßt ist. Im Zentrum der Ausstellung, der größten seit der umfassenden Retrospektive ein Jahr vor Hodlers Tod 1917 im Kunsthaus Zürich, stehen seine mehrfigurigen Großformate, seine Landschaften, die späten Selbstbildnisse, der Zyklus der sterbenden Valentine Godé-Darel sowie eine Reihe von Genfersee-Landschaften, die in den letzten Lebensjahren entstanden.

Bei einer Beschäftigung mit Hodlers Kunst wird man seine Anfang 1891 vollendete „Nacht“, mit der er im selben Jahr in Paris seinen künstlerischen Durchbruch erzielte, nicht entbehren können. Denn schon in diesem Werk zeigt sich die charakteristische Verbindung von naturalistischer Formgebung und symbolischer Expressivität, die Hodlers Figurenbilder bestimmen sollte, wie ihm auch im Thema des Bildes die Umsetzung einer subjektiven Empfindung in eine Metapher des be-