

# Anthony van Dyck in London: newly discovered documents

For an artist who is so famous, comparatively little is known from archival sources about Anthony van Dyck's life and studio in London. Newly discovered documents reveal George Geldorp and Remigius van Leemput as two related Flemings and fellow free masters with Van Dyck in the Antwerp Guild of St Luke who should be considered his core collaborators in the city. Other documents throw stark light on Van Dyck's financial losses in the last years of his life.

by JUSTIN DAVIES and JAMES INNES-MULRAINE

**A**NTHONY VAN DYCK arrived in England for his second visit to the country in the spring of 1632.<sup>1</sup> He was appointed 'principalle Paynter in Ordinary to their Majesties' and knighted at St James's Palace on 5th July 1632.<sup>2</sup> Ten days later, on 15th July 1632, a warrant for payment to him for pictures was issued, including the large portrait described as the 'great peece', *Charles I and Queen Henrietta Maria with their two eldest children, Charles, Prince of Wales, and Mary, Princess Royal* (Royal Collection).<sup>3</sup> Van Dyck is recorded as being in Brussels in October 1633 and he worked on the continent until he returned to London in March 1635.<sup>4</sup> He died in Blackfriars on 9th December 1641, aged forty-two.

This is the first in an occasional series of articles publishing research conducted under the aegis of the multidisciplinary Jordaeans Van Dyck Panel Paintings Project: [www.jordaeansvanddyck.org](http://www.jordaeansvanddyck.org).

**1** Van Dyck lodged with Edward Norgate from 2nd April 1632 until at least the end of May 1632, see National Archives, London (cited hereafter as NAL), E 403/2751, fol.95.

**2** W. Hookham Carpenter: *Pictorial Notices: Consisting of Memoir of Sir Anthony Van Dyck with a Descriptive Catalogue of the Etchings Executed by Him: and a Variety of Interesting Particulars Relating to Other Artists Patronized by Charles I. Collected from Original Documents in Her Majesty's State Paper Office, the Office of Public Records, and Other Sources*, London 1844, p.29.

**3** NAL, LC 5/132, fol.306. A second, almost identical warrant was issued on 8th August 1632, NAL, E 403/2566, fol.117v, and since its publication by Hookham Carpenter in 1844, *op. cit.* (note 2), p.71, is the date most frequently and erroneously given in the Van Dyck literature as the earliest payment order to Van Dyck by Charles I. For example, see S. Barnes, N. De Poorter, O. Millar and H. Vey: *Van Dyck. A Complete Catalogue of the Paintings*, New Haven and London 2004, p.459.

**4** D. Howarth: 'The "Entry Books" of Sir Balthasar Gerbier: Van Dyck, Charles I and the Cardinal-Infante Ferdinand', in H. Vlieghe, ed.: *Van Dyck 1599–1999, Conjectures and Refutations*, Turnhout 2001, pp.77–87, at p.81, citing NAL, SP 105/10, October 1633, for Van Dyck being in Brussels and p.82, citing NAL SP 105/11, 23rd March 1635, for his return to England.

**5** These questions also arise in, *inter alia*, O. Millar: 'The years in London: problems and reassessments', in Vlieghe, *op. cit.* (note 4), pp.129–38; K. Hearn: 'Van Dyck's London studio', in *idem et al.*: exh. cat. *Van Dyck and Britain*, London (Tate Britain) 2009, pp.153–55; *idem*: 'L'atelier londinese di Antoon van Dyck', in A. Bava and M. Bernardini: exh. cat. *Van Dyck. Pittore di Corte*, Turin (Musei Reali, Sale Palatine della Galleria Sabauda) 2018–19, pp.91–99; and C. White: *Van Dyck and the Art of Portraiture*, London 2021, p.214.

**6** Early publications that attempted to identify Van Dyck's assistants or pupils include the anonymous eighteenth-century author of the manuscript biography in the Louvre, see E. Larsen, ed.: *La vie, les ouvrages et les élèves de Van Dyck. Manuscrit inédit des Archives du Louvre. Par un auteur anonyme*, Brussels 1974, pp.111–28. See also J. Smith: *A Catalogue Raisonné of The Works of the Most Eminent Dutch, Flemish and*

1. *Anne, Countess of Middlesex*, by the studio of Anthony van Dyck. c.1636. Oil on canvas, 217 by 131 cm. (National Trust, Knole, on loan from the Trustees of the Sackville Estate; National Trust Images).



Although Van Dyck's output in England was prolific, the documentary sources for his life and studio in London are surprisingly sparse. An important question arises from the *tempo con brio* that characterised his relentless production of paintings, especially of studio copies. Who were his closest collaborators in London who maintained the core of his studio business?<sup>5</sup> Over the centuries, so many names have been proposed as pupils or collaborators that almost every portrait painter known or believed to be in London in the 1630s and 1640s has been associated with Van Dyck's studio. They include Jan van Belcamp, David Beck, Anne Carlisle, William Dobson, George Geldorp, Adriaen Hanneman, George Jamesone, Remigius van Leemput, Peter Lely, Daniel Mytens (remarkably and wrongly as he was already in the employ of the King when Van Dyck arrived in London), Jean de Reyn, Theodore Russell, Pieter Thys and Henry Stone.<sup>6</sup>

New research has now identified two Flemings, George Geldorp (d.1665) and Remigius van Leemput (1607–75), as being at the core of Van Dyck's London studio and related to each other. Geldorp was the son of the painter Gortzius Geldorp and became a free master in the Antwerp Guild of St Luke as a painter (*schilder*) in 1610.<sup>7</sup> Van Dyck was registered as an apprentice of Hendrik van Balen in the same guild year 1609–10 and became a free master in the guild year 1617–18.<sup>8</sup> Geldorp moved to London from Antwerp in 1623.<sup>9</sup> In February 1632, during a dispute about Van Dyck's authorship of a *Mystic marriage of St Catherine*, the sculptor Isaac Besnier wrote to Balthasar Gerbier, the British Ambassador in Brussels, informing him that Geldorp in London and Van Dyck on the continent were in constant communication.<sup>10</sup> It transpires that Geldorp, as well as evidently being close to Van Dyck, later lived near him, since he rented a house in Blackfriars from at least 1636.<sup>11</sup> On 15th August 1641, towards the end of Van Dyck's life, Geldorp and his wife borrowed £84 from the artist. Five years later, Jan Hooff, acting for the late painter's heirs, went to an Antwerp notary to arrange the repayment of the remaining £41, with the painter Adriaen van Stalbemt, formerly resident in London, representing Geldorp.<sup>12</sup>

Geldorp and Van Dyck had been in business together. A payment by Algernon Percy, 10th Earl of Northumberland, Van Dyck's most significant patron in England after Charles I, is recorded for pictures and frames bought from Van Dyck and Geldorp in the year ending 16th January 1639/40.<sup>13</sup>

*French Painters* [ . . . ] *Part the Third*, London 1831, pp.237–46, 'Scholars and imitators of Van Dyck'. For the historic confusion of Henry Stone (1616–53) with the Van Dyck copyist Simon Stone (d. after 1671), see E. Waterhouse: *Painting in Britain 1530–1790*, 5th edn, New Haven and London 1994, pp.85–86.  
**7** P. Rombouts and T. Van Lerijs: *De Liggeren en andere historische archieven der Antwerpsche Sint Lucasgilde*, Antwerp 1864, p.471.  
**8** Royal Academy of Fine Arts Antwerp / KASKA, Oud Archief Sint Lucasgilde, 70 3, f° 171, 1609–10 and 200 7, p.194, 1618. The date of 11th February 1618 given in the Van Dyck literature for when he became a free master is, rather, the date that Van Dyck's joining fee was received by the dean during the guild year. He most likely became a free master on St Luke's day, 18th October 1617, which feast day was the beginning of the guild year 1617–18.  
**9** Parliamentary Archives, London, HL/PO/JO/10/1/192, 'The humble petition of George Geldorpe Marchant stranger', 23rd September 1645.  
**10** 'Je vous donnez aussy advis que M<sup>r</sup> Gueldrop et Monsieur Vandei que s'ecrive l'un l'autre tout se qu'il se passe', Hookham Carpenter, *op. cit.* (note 2), p.60. The *Mystic marriage of St Catherine* may be the painting in the

Royal Collection, RCIN 405332, for which see the entry by Vey, in Barnes *et al.*, *op. cit.* (note 3), p.279.

**11** M. Green: *Calendar, Committee For the Advance of Money: Part 1, 1642–45*, London 1888, p.358.

**12** Antwerp City Archives, S.A. *Notaris J. Le Rousseau 2470* (1646), fol.119, transcribed in E. Duverger: *Antwerpsche Kunstinventarissen uit de Zeventiende Eeuw, Vol.5: 1642–1649*, Brussels 1991, pp.314–15. Hooff is the Johannes Huffe who took receipt of Van Dyck's £200 pension payment in London in October 1639, NAL, E 403/2198, fol.2. He was given power of attorney in Antwerp by Van Dyck's sister, Susanna, for Justina Van Dyck in 1645 after the death of the young girl's mother, see F.J. van den Branden: *Geschiedenis der Antwerpsche Schilderschool*, Antwerp 1883, p.743.

**13** 'pictures & frames bought of S<sup>r</sup>. Anthony Vandyke and M<sup>r</sup>. Gildrop XXI<sup>r</sup>'. O. Millar: 'Notes on British painting from archives: III', THE BURLINGTON MAGAZINE 97 (1955), p.255; and J. Wood: 'Van Dyck and the Earl of Northumberland: taste and collecting in Stuart England', in S. Barnes and A. Wheelock, eds: *Van Dyck 350*, Hanover NH and London 1994, p.309.

**14** MS account by Geldorp in the Heinz Library and Archive, National Portrait Gallery, London (hereafter cited as

Around 1636 Geldorp submitted an account to Lionel Cranfield, 1st Earl of Middlesex, for pictures and frames, which included a copy of Van Dyck's portrait of Anne, Countess of Middlesex (Fig.1), charged at £12, and a large copy of *The three eldest children of Charles I* (Royal Collection), for the price of £17.<sup>14</sup> Geldorp, described in the invoice as a picture drawer in Blackfriars, provided unknown paintings to Sir Arthur Ingram between 1636 and 1642, with only the last (10th September 1642) being identified, as 'my Lord Hollands picture' for £11, which is presumed to be a copy of Van Dyck's portrait of Henry Rich, Earl of Holland in a private collection.<sup>15</sup> It is no surprise, therefore, that Richard Symonds saw an 'abundance' of copies of Van Dyck's portraits in Geldorp's house on Orchard Street, Westminster in 1653.<sup>16</sup> Geldorp had moved there in 1643 for safety, having been forced out of Blackfriars by 'searchers' and questioned about his religion (he was Catholic) when the Civil War started.<sup>17</sup> Given that Geldorp was described by Horace Walpole and others as an indifferent painter, it seems likely that he was primarily Van Dyck's business partner in selling pictures and frames and that other hands produced the bulk of the copies.<sup>18</sup>

An inventory of the Duke of Hamilton's paintings datable to shortly after 1634 identifies a copy of an equestrian portrait of Charles I as having been done by 'Mr Geldrob his man' – Geldorp's man.<sup>19</sup> A later inventory identifies it as a copy after Van Dyck by 'Rameye'. The same inventory also includes a small painting of Henrietta Maria by 'Remmeye'.<sup>20</sup> The names refer to Leemput, a native of Antwerp who was a free master in the Guild of St Luke from the guild year 1628–29.<sup>21</sup> He is usually recorded in English sources as 'Remi', 'Remee' or 'Remy'. He is first noted in London in 1635, when he was living in St Martin-in-the-Fields, but it has been speculated that he may have followed Van Dyck to England in 1632.<sup>22</sup> Leemput painted both full-size and reduced copies of Van Dyck's portraits, producing more recorded copies than any other painter whose name has been associated with Van Dyck.<sup>23</sup> No later than July 1641, the King commissioned a copy of the 'great peece' from Leemput through his Lord Chamberlain, Philip Herbert, 4th Earl of Pembroke.<sup>24</sup>

A recent discovery in the National Archives, London, reveals that Geldorp and Leemput were both professionally and personally related. The case of *Geldorp v Leemput* (1656), a money dispute in the Court of Chancery

Heinz). As the Heinz has been closed for the duration of the research for this article, the information is taken from Oliver Millar's fair copy in his archive at the Paul Mellon Centre Library and Archives, London (hereafter cited as PMC), ONM/2/138, 'la Coppie de Madame la Contesse apres. M<sup>r</sup>. Vandyck' and 'une grande pieste etant de prins. Charles la princess et le duch de Yarck ensemble avecq la bordure Riche'; the first painting is cited by Millar in Barnes *et al.*, *op. cit.* (note 3), p.636.

**15** See the Steward's Accounts in the Temple Newsam Archives, Leeds City Archives, provided by David Connell to Oliver Millar, 5th February 1991, letter in the PMC, ONM/2/138, 'Mr Geldorpe the picture drawer in Black Friars'; also cited by Millar in Barnes *et al.*, *op. cit.* (note 3), IV.135, p.534, with reference to Van Dyck's portrait of Holland and Geldorp's copy.

**16** 'Abundance of Coppys of Ritrattos of Vandyke', British Library, London (hereafter cited as BL), Egerton MS 1636, fol.93v, 'The Diary of Richard Symonds', 4th June 1653; for Geldorp living in Orchard Street from 1643, rather than Archer Street, as recorded by Symonds, see J. Innes-Mulrairie: "'Mr Pullenbroke and Mr Kernings two Dutchmen and servants to his said late Majesty": new information on Cornelis van Poelenbergh and Alexander Keirincx', *Jordaens Van*

*Dyck Journal* 1 (2021), pp.76–79.

**17** Green, *op. cit.* (note 11).

**18** For example, see H. Walpole: *Anecdotes of Painting in England* [1786], London 1871, II, p.17.

**19** J. Wood: 'Buying and selling art in Venice, London and Antwerp. The collection of Bartolomeo della Nave and the dealings of James, third Marquis of Hamilton, Anthony van Dyck, and Jan and Jacob van Veerle, c.1637–52', *Walpole Society* 80 (2018), p.27, appendix 3, p.65, no.8.

**20** 'One piece of the Kinge on horseback, a copy after S<sup>r</sup>. Anthony: done by Rameye' and 'One little piece of the Queene to the knees of Remmeye', Wood, *op. cit.* (note 19), p.52, nos.215 and 216.

**21** Rombouts and Van Lerijs, *op. cit.* (note 7), p.664.

**22** J. Bruce, ed.: *Calendar of State Papers, Domestic Series, of the reign of Charles I. 1635, Preserved in the State Paper Department of Her Majesty's Public Record Office*, London 1865, pp.456–57; for speculation that Leemput followed Van Dyck to London, see Larsen, ed., *op. cit.* (note 6), p.114.

**23** See O. Millar: 'Van Dyck in England', in Barnes *et al.*, *op. cit.* (note 3), pp.419–642; Leemput is identified as the most prolific copyist.

**24** BL, Miscellaneous Letters and Papers, Add MS 32476, fol.28.



over the purchase of a house in Antwerp, shows that Geldorp was Leemput's father-in-law.<sup>25</sup> In his deposition Geldorp stated that Leemput had been married to his daughter Anna Maria for a long time. According to the depositions, their business lives, including picture dealing, were as equally intertwined.<sup>26</sup> It included the production of copies after Van Dyck. Small copies of the portrait of Anne, Countess of Middlesex, presumably after Van Dyck's portrait mentioned above, were sold by Geldorp to the Earl of Middlesex around 1636, both at £4 with frames.<sup>27</sup> A further link between Geldorp and Leemput can be found in a group of fourteen paintings of women attributed to Leemput in the Royal Collection. They are on panel and their sizes range from 23 to 39 centimetres by 18 to 31 centimetres.<sup>28</sup> The fourteen panels can be subdivided by dendrochronological dating and same-tree origins into one group of six and four pairs.<sup>29</sup> The present authors have been able to identify two previously unknown sitters in one of the pairs. The portrait of a lady in sixteenth-century dress has been identified as Mary Boleyn, later Lady Carey and Lady Stafford (c.1499–1543; Fig.3),

**2. Portrait of a lady, here identified as Lady Herbert, probably Margaret Smith, Mrs Thomas Carey, Lady Herbert, attributed to Remigius van Leemput. c.1640–70. Oil on panel, 39.4 by 31.2 cm. (Royal Collection Trust; © Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth II, 2022).**

**3. A lady called Mary Boleyn, Lady Stafford, attributed to Remigius van Leemput. c.1640–70. Oil on panel, 39.4 by 31.2 cm. (Royal Collection Trust © Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth II, 2022).**

by comparison with an inscribed version at Southside House, London, confirming a possibility first mooted by Karen Hearn in 2016.<sup>30</sup> A portrait of an unknown woman in seventeenth-century dress (Fig.2), possibly after Van Dyck, has been identified as Lady Herbert (probably Margaret Smith, later Mrs Thomas Carey and Lady Herbert, d.?1678), by comparison with an inscribed version in the collection of the Earl of Roden, a Carey descendant.<sup>31</sup> The portraits of the two Careys from different centuries were painted as a pair since they are on panels made from the same tree, a Baltic-grown oak that was felled after 1629.<sup>32</sup> In the Court of Chancery case, Leemput stated that Geldorp's debt included £5 in overdue rent to

<sup>25</sup> NAL, C 5/23/112, 'Geldorp v Leemput 1656'.

<sup>26</sup> *Ibid.*, 'The complaint of George Geldorp'.

<sup>27</sup> 'une coppie de Madame [Countess of Middlesex] en petit avecq la bordure' and 'une autre petit portraict de Madame et la bordure', Heinz document cited in note 14 above.

<sup>28</sup> O. Millar: *The Tudor, Stuart and Early Georgian Pictures in the Collection of H.M. The Queen*, London 1963, pp.117–19, nos.218–30.

<sup>29</sup> A. Seim: 'The Remigius van Leemput series in the Royal Collection: its importance for dating small panels', *Jordaens Van Dyck Journal* 2 (2021), pp.28–34.

<sup>30</sup> 'Other versions of that image exist

in other collections and have been called variously Anne or Mary Boleyn', K. Hearn: "All decorated with gilded frames": a 17th-century British "Gallery of Beauties" in context', unpublished paper delivered to the Auricular Frame Conference, Wallace Collection, London, October 2016, p.3. Karen Hearn is the first modern scholar to map the territory of the Leemput/Russell panel sets and the authors are grateful to her for kindly sharing a copy of her paper.

<sup>31</sup> Courtauld Institute of Art, London, negative no.B69/1640, image in the Heinz Archive and Library.

<sup>32</sup> RCIN 402991 and RCIN 402357; for the dendrochronological dating and source of the wood, see Seim *op. cit.*

(note 29), pp.43–44.

<sup>33</sup> 'The Joint and severall Answer of Remigius Van Leemputt and Anna Maria his wife defendants to the bill of Complaint of George Geldorpe Complaynant', in document cited at note 25 above.

<sup>34</sup> For Jan Roos and Van Dyck, see A. Orlando: 'Jan Roos e Van Dyck', in A. Orlando, ed.: *exh. cat. Van Dyck e I suoi amici. Fiamminghi a Genova 1600–1640*, Genoa (Palazzo della Meridiana) 2018, pp.85–128; for the De Wael brothers and Van Dyck, see A. Stoesser: *Van Dyck's Hosts in Genoa: Lucas and Cornelis de Wael's Lives, Business Activities and Works, Pictura Nova XIX*, Turnhout 2018.

<sup>35</sup> NAL, PROB 1/7.

<sup>36</sup> NAL, SP 16/406, fols.16–17v,

'Memoire pour Sa Majestie Le Roy'.

<sup>37</sup> NAL, E 403/2757, fol.91; NAL, SP 16/417, fol.196; and SP 16/417, fol.195.

<sup>38</sup> NAL, SP 29/52, fol.114. See Appendix 2. Justina was awarded an annual pension of £200 in 1662, the same amount that her father received from the King's father, NAL, SO 44/5, fol.215. As previously, payment from the Crown proved difficult, which resulted in further petitions, see Hookham Carpenter, *op. cit.* (note 2), pp.79–80.

<sup>39</sup> NAL, C 8/90/16, 'Vandike v Thoroughgood 1639'.

<sup>40</sup> NAL, C 5/404/299, 'Stepney v Digby 1655'. See Appendix 1. Further cases relating to the settling of Van Dyck's estate, especially his collection of

his landlord, Henry Carey, 2nd Earl of Monmouth, which Leemput paid for him since he was owed the same amount by the Earl.<sup>33</sup>

The emergence of Geldorp and Leemput as Van Dyck's closest collaborators in London is not surprising. The common bond was that all three were Flemish and free masters of the Guild of St Luke in Antwerp. Van Dyck would certainly have become acquainted with Geldorp during his period of activity as a painter in Antwerp before he left for Italy in 1621 and with Leemput after Van Dyck's return from Italy in 1627 and before his departure to London in 1632. The familial relationship between Geldorp and Leemput further strengthened the bond. Having fellow Flemings at the heart of his artistic production in London mirrors Van Dyck's establishment of his studio in Genoa during his Italian period, where his closest collaborators, notably Jan Roos (1591–1638), and closest friends, Lucas (1591–1661) and Cornelis de Wael (1592–1661), were Flemish and connected to Antwerp's Guild of St Luke.<sup>34</sup>

The discovery of documents related to Van Dyck's estate sheds light on the extent of the artist's financial losses, which could not have been recuperated by selling pictures alone in a country on the verge of civil war, however fast he and his studio could paint. His will, made on 4th December 1641, mentions that all recovered debts owed by the King or any of the nobility or other persons were to be divided equally between his wife, Maria (c.1622–44), and daughter, Justina (or Justinia) (1641–88), born just three days before, on 1st December.<sup>35</sup> It is well known that towards the end of 1638 Van Dyck petitioned Charles I for payment of £1,295 for paintings and £1,000 for the arrears of five years unpaid pension. The King agreed to pay only £603 for paintings valued by Van Dyck at £815, with a further nine, valued by him at £480, to be rated and paid for by the Queen.<sup>36</sup> Van Dyck received a payment of £603 and a further £403 in 1639.<sup>37</sup> At the time of his death the King still owed him £1,500, presumably for arrears of pension, which amount is mentioned in a previously unpublished petition by Justina to Charles II in 1662 (Appendix 2).<sup>38</sup> The extent of the debts owed to Van Dyck by aristocratic and other patrons for paintings is unknown.

Further findings show that Van Dyck was also owed significant sums of money in unredeemed loans and investments. In one case, he invested £200 in Robert Booth, a Member of the Salters' Company, who traded in oils, herbs and great quantities of other wares. By 1639 Booth's business had failed. Van Dyck and the other creditors sought the repayment of their loans from one George Thoroughgood, who had guaranteed Booth's debts. As a knight of the realm, Van Dyck headed the list of creditors who petitioned the Court of Chancery in the hitherto unpublished court case *Van Dyck v Thoroughgood* (1639), when Thoroughgood refused to discharge Booth's debts. There is no evidence that their action was successful.<sup>39</sup>

In another previously unpublished court case, *Stepney v Digby* (1655), Justina van Dyck, who was then aged thirteen, and her husband, John Stepney (they were married in 1653), attempted to recover debts due to Van Dyck's estate (Appendix 1). They claimed outstanding bonds for

£1,000 from 'Sir William Curteen' and Sir Edward Littleton and for £1,600 from Van Dyck's friend Sir Kenelm Digby (Fig.4).<sup>40</sup> Sir William Courten (1572–1636) was a trading magnate and collector of curiosities who had lost all his money and the money of his investors, including the King, on an East India trading venture in the last years of his life.<sup>41</sup> Courten's leading business partner was Van Dyck's friend Endymion Porter, a Gentleman of the King's Bedchamber.<sup>42</sup>

Such financial ventures were the rage in Van Dyck's London. According to Porter's biographer Dorothea Townshend, writing in 1897:

By the middle of the seventeenth century gentlemen had grown too highly civilised to keep their money in an old stocking, or even in a painted money chest with many locks [. . .] men now wished to make their gold increase; trading was made more aristocratic as well as more profitable by monopolies granted by the Crown to favoured individuals and companies, and many undertakings were now started by Court gentlemen as well as by London merchants.<sup>43</sup>

High risks and high living went hand in hand for those associated with the Court. Van Dyck had a reputation for living and entertaining well.<sup>44</sup>

The Stepneys also demanded £880 due from Digby for paintings that he had commissioned from Van Dyck but for which he had never paid. Digby resisted forcefully, saying that Van Dyck's workmanship was too hasty or careless, that the colours had failed or that the paintings were otherwise impaired and almost worthless.<sup>45</sup> This statement provides valuable contemporary evidence to support the view expressed by some scholars that the quality of Van Dyck's painting in London deteriorated towards the end

4. *Sir Kenelm Digby*, by Anthony van Dyck. c.1640. Oil on canvas, 117.2 by 91.7 cm. (National Portrait Gallery © National Portrait Gallery, London).



paintings, can be found in C. Brown and N. Ramsay: 'Van Dyck's collection: some new documents', *THE BURLINGTON MAGAZINE* 132 (1990), pp.704–09.

41 Document cited at note 38 above; for Courten, see J.C. Appleby: 'Sir William Courten (c.1568–1636), baronet, merchant and financier', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, 2008, available at <https://www.oxforddnb.com/>, accessed 15th November 2021. Sir Edward Littleton had married Courten's daughter Hester. See A.M. Mirmardière: 'Sir Edward Littleton 2nd Bt. (c.1632–1709)', in B. Henning, ed.: *The History of Parliament: the House of Commons 1660–1690*, available at <https://www.historyofparliamentonline.org/>

[org/volume/1660-1690/member/littleton-sir-edward-1632-1709](https://www.historyofparliamentonline.org/volume/1660-1690/member/littleton-sir-edward-1632-1709), accessed 12th November 2021.

42 D. Townshend: *Life and Letters of Mr. Endymion Porter: Sometime Gentleman of the Bedchamber to King Charles the First*, London 1897, pp.152–54; and G. Huxley: *Endymion Porter, The Life of a Courtier, 1587–1649*, London 1959, pp.206–10.

43 Townshend, *op. cit.* (note 42), p.148.

44 For the scope of Van Dyck's living and entertaining, drawn from early biographical sources, see L. Bauer and G. Bauer: 'Van Dyck's club', *Zeitschrift für Kunstgeschichte* 71, no.2 (2008), pp.259–71.

45 Document cited at note 40 above. See Appendix 1.

## Anthony van Dyck in London

of his life.<sup>46</sup> Although it should be noted that Digby's comments were made in the context of a court case where he was being sued for money, his line was consistent. He considered that he had discharged the debt by agreement at £500 and that this sum was far more than the paintings were worth.<sup>47</sup> These pictures are unidentified. They may be identical with the works that Digby mentioned to Van Dyck's early biographer Giovanni Bellori but which appear to have disappeared without trace. It seems probable that, since he was unable to sell them in London, Digby took these pictures with him to France in 1643. Bellori records that he gave a *Crucifixion* to Princess Guéméné in Paris and lists other Van Dyck works belonging to Digby as a *Deposition of Christ with Sts Joseph, Nicodemus, Mary and the Magdalene*; a *St John the Baptist in the desert*; a *Magdalene in ecstasy at the music of two angels*; a *Judith with the head of Holofernes*; and a *Lady as Pallas in a plumed helmet*.<sup>48</sup>

Symonds records that towards the end of his life Van Dyck charged £80 for a full-length portrait and £40 for a half-length.<sup>49</sup> On the evidence of Geldorp's sales to the Earl of Middlesex around 1636, copies of Van Dyck portraits sold for £12 for a single life-size figure, £17 for a group portrait of three with frame and £4 for a framed small-scale singleton.<sup>50</sup> It would have been difficult, therefore, to raise large sums of money in the short term by painting pictures in England alone, in a country on the verge of civil war

and with a consequent loss of patronage. The extent of Van Dyck's financial losses found so far provide some possible context for Bellori's comment that the artist proposed to make designs for hangings and tapestries, through the good offices of Digby ('*per mezzo dei Cavalieri Digby*'), for Whitehall, but at an excessive price refused by Charles I.<sup>51</sup> Van Dyck tried desperately to find a release from his situation in England by seeking work on the continent but by 1640 he was a sick man, mentally and physically.<sup>52</sup>

The Flemish painter from Antwerp, whose impact on court painting and portraiture was felt immediately in London when he arrived in 1632 at the age of thirty-three, suffered serious reverses of fortune before his death less than a decade later. These recently rediscovered documents reveal that he was owed thousands of pounds, including by his friends. Van Dyck lived his life in England to a fast tempo in terms of generous high living and in the relentless production of portrait paintings. This production included copies after his originals, for which it is now possible to identify two fellow Flemings and free masters of the Antwerp Guild of St Luke as his major collaborators. There would have been other assistants in the studio, but none feature more in contemporary accounts of copies after Van Dyck than Remigius van Leemput, working with his father-in-law George Geldorp, both in league with Van Dyck.

## APPENDIX

### I. Stepney v Digby. Plaintiffs: John Stepney and Justinia Stepney his wife. Defendants: Sir Kenelm Digby, Kt and another. 1655.

The National Archives, London, C 5/404/299.

[m.1] The demurrer of Sir Kenelm Digby Knight one of the Defendants unto the Bill of Complaint of Thomas Stepney Esquire John Stepney and Justinia his wife the said Justinia being under the age of Fifteene yeares by the sayd Thomas Stepney father of the sayd John and administrator during the minority of the sayd Justinia aswell of the goods and Chattells of Sir Anthony Vandike Knight deceased not administred as also of the goods and Chattells of Dame Mary wife of the sayd Sr Anthony Vandike since deceased nott administred Complainants.

[N059 12<sup>rb</sup> Sjs]<sup>53</sup> The sayd defendant not confessing any of the matters and things in the Bill mencioned to be true in such sort manner and forme as therein they aer sett forth and declared this defendant saith that he is advised that he this defendant by the rules and Orders of this Honourable Court is not compelled or compellable to make any Answer unto the sayd Bill of Complaint for the apparent defect and default therein conteyned for this defendant saith that the Bill of Complaint is exhibited against him to be relieved for a debt of One Thousand six hundred pounds due by bond from this defendant unto the Complainant Thomas Stepney as administrator of the sayd Sir Anthony Vandike during the minority of the sayd Justinia of his goods not administred And it doth nott appeare that the sayd administracion hath continuance but it may be determined and then the Complainants have no cause to trouble and molest this defendant for the sayd debt for albeit it is sett forth by the Bill that the sayd Justinia is under the age of Fifteene yeares yett it appeares by the bill that the sayd Justinia is married and hath taken to husband John Stepney one of the Complainants And it is not sett forth what age the sayd John Stepney is of whether he be under the age of One and Twenty yeares and if he be of full age as he may

be for any thing appearing by the Bill then the administracion granted unto the plaintiff Thomas is determined and ended and then the Complainants have no cause to question or molest this defendant for the sayd debt for which cause this defendant doth demurr in Lawe and humbly demands the Judgment of this Honourable Court whether he shalbe compelled to make any other or further Answer and humbly prayeth to be hence dismissed with his costs herein wrongfully susteyned.

[Signature] Robert Nushych

[m.2] – The xxiiiith day of July 1655- [Illegible signature]

The severall answer of Nicholas Nicolls to the Bill of Complaint of John Stepney and Justina his wief infants by Thomas Stepney Esquire father of the said John Complaynante

All advantage of Excepcion to the insufficiency and incertainty of the said bill of Complaint to him this defendant now and at all tymes hereafter saved and reserved for answer to soe much thereof as any wayes materially concerneth him this defendant to make answer unto Hee sayeth That he doth not know that a principall debt of one Thousand poundes was or is due from Sir William Curteene late of London Knight and Sir Edward Littleton Barronett to Sir Anthony Vandike Knight in the Complainants bill named or that Dame Mary his wief hath renewed the same in her owne name And this defendant denyeth that he hath or ever had or saw any bond wherein the said Sir William Curteene and Sir Edward Littleton stood bound either to the said Sir Anthony Vandike in his lieftime or to the said Dame Mary since his death and this defendant denyeth that Sir Richard Price (for the reason in the bill alleaged or for any other) did agree with this defendant or any other of the defendants or Creditors of the said Sir Anthony Vandike to his knowledge to compound the debts oweinge by them to the said Sir Anthony or the said Dame Mary his wief without that that any other matter

46 Millar in Barnes *et al.*, *op. cit.* (note 3), p.422; and White, *op. cit.* (note 5), p.212.

47 Document cited at note 40 above.

See Appendix 1.

48 G. Bellori: *Le vite de' pittori, scvltori*

*et architetti moderni*, Rome 1672, p.261.

49 Document cited at note 16 above, fol.102r.

50 Millar, *op. cit.* (note 14).

51 Bellori, *op. cit.* (note 48), p.263.

52 For Van Dyck's failing health, gout and fragile mental state towards the end of his life, and his attempts to secure commissions in France, see the collation and dissemination of the

known contemporary sources in the 'Chronology' in Barnes *et al.*, *op. cit.* (note 3), pp.11-12 and 425.

53 This is an old index number between the paragraphs.

or thinge in the said bill of Complaint containd materiall to be answered unto by this defendant and not before herein answered unto confessed or avoyded traversed or denyed to be true to the knowledge of this defendant All which matters and thinges this deft is ready to averr and prove (as this Honourable Court shall award) and humbly prayeth to be hence dismissed with his reasonable costs and Charges in this Case wrongefully sustained

[Signature] Robert Nelson

[m.3] Sworne ye 27th of July 1655 before me [illegible signature]

The Plea and demurrer of Sir Kenelm Dighbie Knight one of the defendants unto the Bill of Complaynt of John Stepney and Justinia his wife infants by Thomas Stepney Esquire Guardian and father of the sayd John Stepney and administrator during the minority of the sayd Justinia) of the goods and Chattells of Sir Anthony Vandike Knight deceased and likewise of the goods and Chattells of Dame Mary Price Complaynants

The sayd defendant not confessing or acknowledging any of the matters and things in the Bill of Complaynt to be true in such sort manner and forme as therein is sett forth and declared for Plea thereunto this defendant sayth the debt of Eight hundred and Fourescore pounds in the Bill mencioned to be due from this defendant unto Sir Anthony Vandike in the Bill named become due and payable for some pictures made and sold by the sayd Sir Anthony Vandike to this defendant Which pictures did soe fayle in Colour and were otherwise soe ympared by reason as this defendant believeth of too hasty or carelesse workemanship of them that they were of very small value to be sold and the sayd pictures were and are of little or noe Ornament and of noe pleasure or handsomenes and by reason thereof this defendant hath very often offered for to deliver upp the sayd pictures soe hee might be freed and discharged of the sayd debt and have his bond and security delivered upp unto to this defendant the which being not accepted of and this defendant being often threatened for about the space of yeare and a halfe to be arrested and troubled for the said debt by John Vaughan in the Bill named being administrator of the goods and Chattells of the sayd Sir Anthony Vandike not administered and there being some persons sett on worke and authorized by the sayd John Vaughan and Sir Richard Price or one of them for to arrest and ymplead this defendant for the sayd debt this defendant haveing as long as he might forbear to take Order for the payment of the sayd debt did at last and before any administration was granted as this defendant believeth unto the sayd Thomas Stepney for to avoid trouble arreste and Charges in Lawe and without any intencion to defraud or deceive the Complainant of the sayd debtor of any of the estate of the sayd Sir Anthony Vandike did in full discharge of the sayd debt in the moneth of Aprill last pay the summe of Five hundred pounds being much more as this defendant believeth then the pictures were worth into the hands of him that was authorized and appoynted by the sayd John Vaughan and the sayd Sir Richard Price or one of them for to receive the sayd debt and had full powre and authority from the sayd John Vaughan for to sue and arrest this defendant for the sayd debt and theupon and in Consideracion of the sayd Five hundred pounds this defendants bond which was given for the payment of this defendants sayd debt of Eight hundred and Fourescore pounds was delivered upp unto this Defendant to be cancelled and made voyd and the sayd John Vaughan Administrator of the sayd Sir Anthony Vandike and the defendant Sir Richard Price did at or about the sayd moneth of Aprill seale and deliver unto this defendant severall Realeses of all bonds and demands as by the sayd severall Releases whereunto for more certaynty this defendant referreth himselfe appears And this defendant further sayth that he hath not intermeddled with any

of the goods Chattells or estate of the said Sir Anthony Vandike and Dame Mary his wife or eyther of them or have any wayes practized or endeavoured to deprive the Complaynants of any of the estate of the sayd Sir Anthony Vandike and Dame Mary his wife or eyther of them and if this defendant had intemeddled with any of the estate of the sayd Sir Anthony Vandike and Dame Mary his wife or eyther of them Or if the defendant had not payd the sayd Five hundred pounds for the pictures aforesayd and for the discharge of his bond for the payment of the sayd Eight hundred and Fourescore pounds aforesayd Yett this defendant is advised that the Complaynants or eyther of them being not administrators of the goods and Chattells of the sayd Sr Anthony Vandike and Dame Mary his wife or eyther of them or have any wayes that the Complaynants hath noe right to question this defendant for any of the matters in the bill mencioned but that the sayd Thomas Stepney who as is pretended hath obtained administration of there sayd estates not administred should if any such administration be granted unto him exhibit his bill in his owne name as Administrator of the sayd Sir Anthony Vandike and Dame Mary his wife and not in in the name of the Complaynants and as guardian of the Complaynant John Stepney For all which causes and reasons this defendant demandeth the Judgment of this Honourable Court whether he is compellable or shalbe compelled to make any other Answer unto the sayd Bill And humbly prayeth to be hence dismissed with his reasonable costs herein wrongfully susteyned.

[Signature] Robert Nushych

## 2. Petition of Justina Van Dyck to King Charles II. 1662.

The National Archives, London, SP 29/52 fol.114.

To the Kings most Excellent Majestie

The humble Peticion of Justina Vandick only Daughter of Sir Anthony Vandick Deceased Sheweth That whereas your Petitioner two Moneths since humbly prayed your Majestie to take into your Majesties Serious Consideration the Debt of Fifteen hundred Pounds owing by your Majesties Father of ever blessed Memory, to Sir Anthony Vandick your Petitioners father to which your Majestie was pleased to returne the gracious answer that your Majestie would Order satisfaction, as appears by the annexed Petition, and your Majesties Order thereupon

And your Petitioner having Contracted some Debts since her lyeing in Childbed and haveing received very little of her Fathers Estate, it being imbezilled in these late times hath nothing to trust too, but what shee expects from your Majesties Clemency

Your Petitioner therefore humbly prayes your Majestie to Ordaine her one of the Dressers to your Majesties Royall Consort or to take her distressed Condition into your Serene Consideracion and to make some Order for her livelyhood as your Majesty shall think fitt And she shall ever pray Etc.

[In the right margin] Justina Vandyke only daughter of Sir Anthony Vandyke deceased

Shee petitioned your Majestie about 2 months since to take into consideracion the debt of £1,500 lent by her said father to his late Majestie whereupon your Majestie was pleased to promise to take Order for her satisfacion as appears by the annexed. Being in great want & necessity. Praying Your Majesty, she may be one of the dressers to your Royall Consort, or to order such satisfaction for the said debt as your Majesty shall please for her support.