

A note on the young Van Dyck

by STIJN ALSTEENS

THE RECENT EXHIBITION in Madrid devoted to the work of the young Anthony van Dyck was not only an occasion to marvel at the singular talent apparent in his work almost from the start of his career,¹ but it also raised questions that are not so much new as still unanswered: the precise nature of the young painter's relationship with Peter Paul Rubens; his stylistic development in this early phase of his life; his surprisingly high production as a painter during the limited number of years he is assumed to have been active independently before leaving for Italy in 1621; and the patrons or intended clientele for his paintings, about whom next to nothing is known. The exhibition, splendid though it was, offered few definitive answers to these questions. Some of them can perhaps not be answered at all. Van Dyck's involvement with Rubens and his style seems to have changed constantly depending on the work at hand or the artistic challenge the artist had set himself. He may have produced independent works while at the same time collaborating on projects with Rubens, asserting his own artistic personality whenever he could, but adopting his master's idiom when required. The almost complete lack of firmly dated works before 1618 makes it especially difficult to assess or even to define the first stage of his career. In this context, the re-attribution to Van Dyck of a drawing at the Morgan Library & Museum, New York, which is the subject of this article, is of particular significance. A comparison with two

other sheets, both also in American print rooms, should bring Van Dyck's precocity into sharper focus.

The artist and collector Charles Fairfax Murray published the drawing (Fig. 11), which he had owned and which he thought represented a 'Siamese ambassador', as a work by Van Dyck shortly after it was acquired, together with much of the rest of his outstanding collection, by John Pierpont Morgan in 1910.² The drawing was subsequently connected with a group of studies of men in oriental costume by Rubens,³ the best of which is now at the Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York (Fig. 12).⁴ The fact that the robe and the peculiar biretta, oriental in style, are identical in the two drawings led to the attribution of the Morgan sheet to the older artist, which has become generally accepted.⁵ However, in recent years some scholars have expressed a preference for the original attribution, which is here discussed in print for the first time in detail.⁶ The Metropolitan's drawing has in the past also been given to Van Dyck, as witnessed by his name inscribed at lower right, despite the fact that it bears a lengthy inscription in Rubens's handwriting. In 1953 Henri Bernard-Maître determined that the man's features and clothes correspond to those seen in a painting in Douai (Fig. 13),⁷ representing the Jesuit Nicolas Trigault (1577–1628) – a native of Douai, a learned and indefatigable promoter of the Catholic faith and the Jesuit ethos in China, but also a fragile man who committed suicide in 1628 at the age of fifty-one, a

For their assistance in the writing of this article, the author is grateful to Joost Vander Auwera, Hans Buijs, Carole Decock, Margaret Holben Ellis, George R. Goldner, Nico Van Hout, Gregory Jecmen, Madeleine ter Kuile, Anne Labourdette, Friso Lammertse, Aleksei Larionov, Anne-Marie Logan, Olga Novoseltseva, Sarah Van Ooteghem, Véronique Van Passel, Justine Pokoik, Per Rumberg, Stephanie Schrader, Nanny Schrijvers, Marjorie Shelley, Alejandro Vergara, Bert Watteeuw, Catherine Whistler and Linda Wolk-Simon.

¹ A. Vergara and F. Lammertse, eds.: exh. cat. *The Young Van Dyck*, Madrid (Museo del Prado) 2012–13. For a recent discussion of Van Dyck's first Antwerp period, see also N. De Poorter in S.J. Barnes et al.: *Van Dyck. A complete catalogue of the paintings*, New Haven and London 2004, pp.15–19.

² Inv. no.III,179. For the drawing, see notes 3, 5 and 6 below. Fairfax Murray published the drawing in *J. Pierpont Morgan. Collection of drawings by the old masters formed by C. Fairfax Murray*, London 1912, III, no.179.

³ The attribution of the Morgan sheet to Rubens was first proposed in C. Stuart Wortley: 'Rubens's drawings of Chinese costume', *Old Master Drawings* 9/3 (December 1934), pp.41, 43–44 and 47, no.V, pl.45.

⁴ Inv. no.1999.222; H. Vlieghe: *Rubens. Portraits of identified sitters painted in Antwerp (Corpus Rubenianum Ludwig Burchard, part XIX, II)*, London and New York 1987, no.154b, fig.227; A.-M. Logan and L.M. Brockey: 'Nicolas Trigault, SJ: a portrait by Peter Paul Rubens', *Metropolitan Museum Journal* 38 (2003), pp.157–67, fig.1; and A.-M. Logan, with M.C. Plomp: exh. cat. *Peter Paul Rubens. The drawings*, New York (Metropolitan Museum of Art) 2005, no.73. It has been suggested that the copy after the Metropolitan's drawing at the Nationalmuseum, Stockholm (inv. no.NMH 1968/1863), is by Van Dyck, but, although appealing as an explanation for its high quality, I can see no stylistic evidence for this assumption; see Logan in Logan and Plomp, *op. cit.*, no.74 (as attributed to Rubens or Van Dyck); and S. Schrader, ed.: exh. cat. *Looking East. Rubens's encounter with Asia*, Los

Angeles (J. Paul Getty Museum) 2012–13, p.42, fig.22 (as a copy after Rubens). Another drawn portrait representing a man in the same clothes and accepted as by Rubens was formerly in the collection of Ludwig Burchard, and later in an American private collection; see Stuart Wortley, *op. cit.* (note 3), p.41, no.II, pl.42; and Vlieghe, *op. cit.*, no.154c, fig.229.

⁵ For recent literature on the Morgan drawing, see *ibid.*, no.154d, fig.230; F. Stampfle, with R.S. Kraemer and J. Shoaf Turner: *Netherlandish drawings of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries and Flemish drawings of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries in the Pierpont Morgan Library*, New York and Princeton 1991, no.310; and A.-M. Logan: exh. cat. *Flemish drawings in the age of Rubens. Selected works from American collections*, Wellesley (Davis Museum and Cultural Center, Wellesley College) and Cleveland (Cleveland Museum of Art) 1993–94, no.49.

⁶ Compare the brief discussions of the drawing by A.-M. Logan in Vergara and Lammertse, *op. cit.* (note 1), p.84 (as attributed to Van Dyck); and in Schrader, *op. cit.* (note 4), pp.48–50, fig.25 (as attributed to Rubens or Van Dyck). Before these mentions, the drawing's attribution to Van Dyck, or at least its rejection from Rubens's *œuvre*, had already been reached independently by Anne-Marie Logan, George R. Goldner and the present writer. Notwithstanding her publication from 1993 (see note 5 above), Logan's first doubts about the attribution to Rubens were recorded in Stampfle, *op. cit.* (note 5), p.147.

⁷ Inv. no.27; see H. Bernard-Maître: 'Un portrait de Nicolas Trigault dessiné par Rubens?', *Archivum historicum Societatis Iesu* 22 (1953), pp.308–13, esp. pp.309–11 and 313; Vlieghe, *op. cit.* (note 4), no.154, fig.224; and B. Ducos in *idem*, ed.: exh. cat. *Rubens et l'Europe*, Lens (Musée du Louvre-Lens) 2013, p.163, no.146. An unpublished portrait of Trigault, previously in a Czech private collection and described as a 'somewhat simplified mirror image' of the Douai version, was exhibited by Rafael Valls at the European Fine Art Fair, Maastricht, in March 2013 (Copper, 20.6 by 10.8 cm.).



11. *The Jesuit Nicolas Trigault in Chinese costume*, by Anthony van Dyck. 1617. Black chalk and blue-green pastel, 42.4 by 24.4 cm. (Morgan Library & Museum, New York).



12. *The Jesuit Nicolas Trigault in Chinese costume*, by Peter Paul Rubens. 1617. Black, red and white chalks, yellow chalk or pastel and blue-green pastel, pen and brown ink, 44.6 by 24.8 cm. (Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York).

scandal which his colleagues almost managed to hush up.⁸ This identification was later confirmed by Rubens's inscription at lower left on the sheet, which includes Trigault's Latinised name, *Tricautius*, and the mention of a day corresponding to the period of his only visit to Brabant after his move in 1607 to the East, between November 1616 and February 1617 (*'delineatum die 17 Januariis'*).⁹ At upper right, Rubens comments on the colour of the costume, inspired by that of Chinese scholars, and intended by the Jesuit Matteo Ricci, who introduced it in the

late sixteenth century among his fellow-missionaries in China, to help their integration in influential circles. It can be safely assumed that neither Rubens nor any of his Flemish colleagues would have seen this costume except during Trigault's visit to the region. Consequently, the Morgan drawing must also have been made in the winter of 1616–17, possibly on the very same day as the Metropolitan's, on 17th January 1617.

Yet the differences in style and technique between the two drawings – one angular and slight, all done in black chalk except

⁸ For Trigault, see C. Dehaisnes: *Vie de Père Nicolas Trigault de la Compagnie de Jésus*, Tournai, Paris and Leipzig 1864; E. Lamalle: 'La propagande du P. Nicolas Trigault en faveur des missions de Chine (1616)', *Archivum historicum Societatis Iesu* 9 (1940), pp.49–120; and L.M. Brockey in Logan and Brockey, *op. cit.* (note 4), pp.161–67.

⁹ Trigault travelled from Liège to Antwerp on 20th November 1616, and from there went to Brussels on or before 16th December; between 2nd January and 3rd February, Trigault travelled from Brussels to Tournai via Ghent, during which time

he may well have revisited Antwerp; see Lamalle, *op. cit.* (note 8), pp.60–63; and Bernard-Maitre, *op. cit.* (note 7), pp.312–13.

¹⁰ The use of yellow chalk or pastel, also found in the Stockholm copy (see note 4 above), has not been noted previously.

¹¹ Inv. no.D.1952.RW.1664; see H. Vey: *Die Zeichnungen Anton van Dyckes*, Brussels 1962, I, no.14, and II, fig.19; and A.-M. Logan in Vergara and Lammertse, *op. cit.* (note 1), no.20.

for a few touches of blue-green pastel, the other much more finely drawn, *aux trois crayons*, with in addition blue and (for the face) yellow¹⁰ – are hard to explain if one assumes they were made by the same artist and at the same time. They must be the work of two draughtsmen, working in proximity to each other. In fact, the angularity of the drawing at the Morgan is entirely characteristic of Van Dyck, and probably could be more easily recognised if the model had not hidden his hands in his broad sleeves, or if the costume had been rendered in more detail. This angular quality of the lines is sufficiently evident in the model's face, however; Rubens typically handled chalk in a softer and at the same time more determined manner. The emphasised bridge of the nose, with the accentuated nostrils, is another sign that betrays Van Dyck's hand, and similar passages abound in his early *œuvre*, in paintings as well as in drawings (compare Fig. 14).¹¹ The delicate yet nervous strokes delineating the man's beard and moustache, and the gaze of the eyes have their parallels in works by Van Dyck, such as a recently (but entirely convincingly) attributed drawing after the antique in St Petersburg (Fig. 15).¹² In contrast, it would be hard to find similar details in Rubens's works of this period. Once suggested, the attribution of the Morgan drawing published by Fairfax Murray seems obvious.

This re-attribution also reopens the discussion about the identity of its model. If one accepts that the Morgan drawing and the Metropolitan's are by different hands, one should wonder if the former could also represent Trigault, as Hans Vlieghe proposed but Felice Stampfle rejected. The undeniable discrepancies between the features of the men in the two sheets can now partly be explained by the fact that they are the work of two different draughtsmen. In fact, Rubens's drawing already deviates quite substantially from the painting in Douai (Fig. 13), which is presumably based on a now-lost work – either a painting or a drawing – by his own hand. It is this painting, inscribed with Trigault's name, rank and age, that first prompted the identification of the sitter in the Metropolitan's sheet. Yet, even apart from the absence of the melancholia that subtly elevates the drawing above the level of a costume study, it cannot be denied that the Jesuit's small beard is depicted differently in the two works: long and pointed in the drawing, much shorter in the painted portrait. The beard in the painting is in fact quite close to the one in Van Dyck's drawing at the Morgan. But in other aspects the latter is more comparable with Rubens's drawing, notably the deep-set eyes and their inward-looking gaze, and the structure of the face. A comparison of the three works places the Morgan sheet somewhere between the two others: all share a long nose and prominent ears; the men in the two drawings have similar deep-set, staring eyes; and the short beard in the Morgan drawing is closer to the one seen in the painting than to the long goatee in the Metropolitan's.

Assuming that the Morgan drawing and other works thought by Hans Vlieghe to represent Trigault were all by Rubens, Felice Stampfle insisted on the differences between the features and



13. *The Jesuit Nicolas Trigault in Chinese costume*, attributed to the workshop of Peter Paul Rubens. 1627(?) or after. Canvas, 220 by 136 cm. (Musée de la Chartreuse, Douai).

suggested that the Morgan drawing showed Johann Terrenz Schreck, known as Terrentius (1576–1630).¹³ This doctor, scientist and Jesuit – a member of the Accademia dei Lincei in Rome, where he was an esteemed colleague of Galileo Galilei, among others – accompanied Trigault on his European tour from the Spring of 1615. However, no portrait of Terrentius is known, and there are good arguments against Stampfle's suggestion, which has never been fully accepted. Like Trigault (and Rubens, for that matter), Terrentius was around forty when he visited Antwerp, but the model of the Morgan drawing seems to be well past that age. In the case of Trigault, an older appearance can

¹² Inv. no. OR 5498; see M. van der Meulen: *Rubens. Copies after the antique (Corpus Rubenianum Ludwig Burchard, part XXIII)*, II, London 1994, no. 99, and III, London 1995, fig. 175, as by Rubens; A. Balis in H. Vlieghe, ed.: *Van Dyck 1599–1999. Conjectures and refutations*, Turnhout 2001, pp. 29, 33, 35 and 37, fig. 1; and A. Larionov in C. Corsiglia, ed.: exh. cat. *Rubens and his age. Treasures from the Hermitage Museum, Russia*, Ontario (Art Gallery of Ontario) 2001, no. 100.

¹³ Stampfle, *op. cit.* (note 5), pp. 147–48, under no. 310. For Terrentius, see G.

Gabrieli: 'I Lincei e la Cina', and 'Giovanni Schreck Linceo gesuita e missionario in Cina e le sue lettere dall'Asia', *Rendiconti della R. Accademia nazionale dei Lincei. Classe di scienze morali, storiche e filologiche*, 6th series, 12, 3–5 (March–April 1936), pp. 242–56 and 462–514; I. Iannaccone: *Johann Schreck Terrentius. Le scienze rinascimentali e lo spirito dell'Accademia dei Lincei nella Cina dei Ming*, Naples 1998; and E. Zettl: *Johannes Schreck-Terrentius. Wissenschaftler und China-Missionar (1576–1630)*, Constance 2008.



14. *A man leaning forward with studies of his outstretched arm*, by Anthony van Dyck. c.1617–18. Black chalk, heightened with white chalk, on buff paper, 27 by 42.8 cm. (Courtauld Gallery, London).

be explained perhaps more easily, for by the time he visited Antwerp, he had lived for several years under difficult circumstances in China, and had already travelled twice between Europe and Asia – once in 1607, and a second time between February 1613 and October 1614.¹⁴ His constitution seems to have been weak; he described himself on his 1607 voyage as ‘*pulmonique et demy-mort*’.¹⁵ Mentally, he appears to have been unstable, and it has been suggested that his suicide in 1628 may have been prompted in part by exhaustion.¹⁶ Terrentius, in contrast, led a more stable life until his encounter with Trigault, and he can be assumed to have longer retained a youthful appearance: born in the region of Constance, he had only travelled between Germany and Italy before joining Trigault. More to the point, he had entered the Jesuit order in November 1611 (arguably to enable himself to travel to Asia, to which he may have been drawn because of his interest in medicinal plants),¹⁷ but embarked with Trigault and other recruits on a ship near Lisbon only in April 1618, arriving in Macau in July 1619. It seems highly improbable that he would have worn the costume of the Jesuit missionaries in China before ever having set foot

there. As the men had no other companion during their European tour, this leaves Trigault as the only possible candidate for the sitter of the Morgan drawing.¹⁸

A second important implication of the re-attribution is that the Morgan drawing is no longer the work of a thirty-nine-year-old artist of international fame at the height of his powers, but that of a seventeen-year-old (Van Dyck reached his eighteenth birthday two months later, on 22nd March 1617), who entered the Antwerp guild as a master only in the following year.¹⁹ Made most probably in January 1617, as argued above, the drawing is not only Van Dyck’s earliest securely dated work on paper, but also his earliest securely dated work *tout court*, with the sole exception of a painted portrait of a man inscribed with the date 1613 in the *Musées Royaux des Beaux-Arts de Belgique*, Brussels.²⁰ This raises the Morgan drawing rather unexpectedly to the status of a benchmark in dating Van Dyck’s early drawings. Its style, inspired by, yet distinct from, Rubens’s, is already entirely the artist’s own. It need not lead to a revision of the dating of such drawings as the one in London illustrated in Fig.14, which relates to Van Dyck’s painting of around 1618 for

¹⁴ For a detailed description of Trigault’s two intercontinental trips predating his final return to China, see Dehaisnes, *op. cit.* (note 8), pp.25–67 and 108–18.

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, pp.19, 119–120 and 177. The quotation is taken from a letter written by Trigault in December 1607, published *ibid.*, p.28.

¹⁶ L.M. Brockey in Logan and Brockey, *op. cit.* (note 4), pp.162 and 165–66.

¹⁷ Iannaccone, *op. cit.* (note 13), pp.14 and 86–95; and Zettl, *op. cit.* (note 13), pp.22–24.

¹⁸ Another Jesuit missionary from Douai is depicted wearing the same costume in the pendant of Trigault’s portrait reproduced in Fig.13, likewise at the *Musée de la Chartreuse*, Douai (inv. no.28); see Vlieghe, *op. cit.* (note 4), no.155, fig.225; and B. Ducos in *idem*, *op. cit.* (note 7), p.163, no.147. But apart from the fact that its subject, Pieter (or Pierre) van Spiere, known as Petrus de Spira (1584–1628), does not look at all like the man in the Morgan drawing, he was only thirty-three in 1617, and appears never to have returned to Europe after he left for China in 1609; see J. Masson: *Missionnaires belges sous l’ancien régime (1500–1800)*, I (*Ceux qui versèrent leur sang*), Brussels 1947, pp.84–95; and J. Van Hecken: ‘Spiere, Pieter van’, in J. Duverger *et al.*, eds.: *Nationaal biografisch woordenboek*, II, Brussels 1966, cols.802–03. His portrait

in Douai cannot have been based on a study from life done by Rubens.

¹⁹ P. Rombouts and T. Van Lierus: *De liggeren en andere historische archieven der Antwerpsche Sint Lucasgilde, onder zinspreuk: ‘Wt ionsten versaemt’ / Les liggeren et autres archives historiques de la gilde anversoise de Saint Luc, sous la devise: ‘Wt ionsten versaemt’*, I, Antwerp 1872, p.545.

²⁰ Inv. no.6858; D.J. Lurie: exh. cat. *Van Dyck and his age*, Tel Aviv (Museum of Art) 1995–96, no.2; N. De Poorter in Barnes *et al.*, *op. cit.* (note 1), no.I.149. The date and monogram on this painting have occasionally been questioned, most recently by Gregory Martin in this Magazine, 155 (2013), p.125.

²¹ For the related painting, see N. De Poorter in Barnes *et al.*, *op. cit.* (note 1), no.I.25; and J.J. Pérez Preciado in Vergara and Lammertse, *op. cit.* (note 1), no.21.

²² Inv. no.1972.15.1; see K. Oberhuber in D. DeGrazia Bohlin *et al.*: exh. cat. *Recent acquisitions and promised gifts. Sculpture, drawings, prints*, Washington (National Gallery of Art) 1974, no.48; N. De Poorter in Barnes *et al.*, *op. cit.* (note 1), p.112, under no.I.116; N. Van Hout in A. Merle du Bourg: exh. cat. *Antoon van Dyck. Portraits*, Paris (*Musée Jacquemart-André*) 2008–09, p.48, under no.2, fig.26; and A.-M. Logan in Vergara and Lammertse, *op. cit.* (note 1), pp.83–84, fig.29, as attributed to Van Dyck.

the Rosary cycle in the church of St Paul, Antwerp.²¹ But the new date of the Morgan sheet does suggest that the dates of certain other drawings are in need of revision. In particular, its medium and subject-matter press for a comparison with the only other preserved portrait study from Van Dyck's first Antwerp period, a large sheet in black and red chalks in Washington (Fig.16).²² From its discovery in 1971, the drawing's attribution to Van Dyck has been based on a comparison with a portrait in Antwerp, which together with its pendant are the only full-length portraits known from his early period (Fig.17).²³ It is thought to represent a member of the Vincque (or Vincx) family of merchants of luxury goods, although Max Rooses warned in 1900 that 'the name of Vinck must be attributed to tradition for we cannot find any historical reason to prove it to be the true one'.²⁴ The drawing differs enough from the painting to rule out that it is a replica or copy; in other words, it must be a preparatory sketch. Its robust manner, the use of the two chalks, and the focus on the costume and pose rather than on the face have parallels in some of Rubens's portrait drawings.²⁵ At the same time, the drawing is undeniably weaker, not only than Rubens's drawings of this type, but also than Van Dyck's own drawing at the Morgan. The conclusion must be that it is the work of the younger artist, and as such a very valuable testimony of his working process at the start of his career as a portraitist.

When judging the Antwerp painting and its pendant on their own, one might be inclined to date them around 1619.²⁶ The sitter and his wife clearly did not feel bound by the traditional format of bourgeois portraiture, opting instead for aristocratic full-lengths, which make the paintings seem more advanced than a group of rather conservative portraits, several of which are dated 1618.²⁷ On the other hand, the 'Vincque portraits' lack the mastery and refinement of some dated 1620 and 1621.²⁸ But while there is no reason to doubt this *terminus ante quem*; the restrained use of colour and simple composition of the portraits from 1618 should be understood as the painter's response to a request of the sitter, rather than the reflection of an early stage of his development. The discrepancy between the group of portraits from 1618 and the Vincque portraits only illustrates, in other words, Van Dyck's successful juggling of styles and modes to satisfy his own and his patrons' tastes, and not a linear stylistic evolution. There is no good reason why the Vincque portraits could not date from before 1618. Unless one would doubt that the Washington drawing was made directly before the making of the painted portraits, the obvious jump in quality between that



15. Detail of *Mars and Venus (after the antique)*, by Anthony van Dyck. c.1622–23. Black chalk, 45.8 by 31.4 cm. (State Hermitage Museum, St Petersburg).

drawing and the Morgan's Jesuit advances the former's date and that of the related painting in Antwerp and its pendant to before January 1617, that is to 1616 or even earlier. In its turn, this second new date could help to identify more precisely the sitter of the Antwerp painting, who, if he is indeed a member of the Vincque family, must be either Alexander or his brother Jan, both of whom were married. Donor portraits of Alexander and his wife, Geertrui Wiggers, are included in a stained-glass window by Jean de Labaer depicting the Visitation, which Alexander funded in 1644 for the chapel of Our Lady in the church of St James, Antwerp.²⁹ Although the window is dated at least twenty-five years after Van Dyck's paintings, a comparison between the likenesses leaves open the possibility that they are of the same sitters. Indeed, the glass portrait of Geertrui Wiggers, who died in 1638 (before the windows were conceived), may have been an updated version based on Van Dyck's painting.

This is probably not the end of the domino effect caused by the re-attribution of the Morgan drawing. A good number of Van Dyck's portraits and other paintings from his early period

²³ Inv. no.5044; see N. De Poorter in Barnes *et al.*, *op. cit.* (note 1), no.I.116; and N. Van Hout in Merle du Bourg, *op. cit.* (note 22), no.2. For the pendant, see note 26 below.

²⁴ M. Rooses: *Fifty masterpieces of Anthony van Dyck in photogravure selected from the pictures exhibited at Antwerp in 1899, described and historically explained with a sketch of the life of the artist*, London and Philadelphia 1900, p.77. To my knowledge, the family name was connected with the portrait for the first time in print in J. Guiffrey: *Antoine van Dyck. Sa vie et son œuvre*, Paris 1882, p.281, no.927. For the Vincque family, see R. Baetens: *De nazomer van Antwerpens welvaart. De diaspora en het handelshuis De Grootte tijdens de eerste helft der 17de eeuw*, Brussels 1976, I, pp.209–10.

²⁵ Compare, for example, a study of a young halberdier at the Bibliothèque Royale de Belgique, Brussels (inv. no.S.V 95843) related to a painting from 1604 from Rubens's Mantuan period; see Logan, *op. cit.* (note 4), no.15.

²⁶ For the pendant in the collection of Lord Brabourne at Broadlands, Hampshire, and currently on loan to the Ashmolean Museum, Oxford, see N. De Poorter in Barnes *et al.*, *op. cit.* (note 1), no.I.117. A date of c.1619 was proposed for the pair by Christopher Brown in *idem* and H. Vlieghe, eds.: *exh. cat. Van Dyck, 1599–1641*,

Antwerp (Koninklijk Museum voor Schone Kunsten) and London (Royal Academy of Arts) 1999, p.119, nos.13–14.

²⁷ For the portraits dated 1618, see N. De Poorter in Barnes *et al.*, *op. cit.* (note 1), nos.I.118 and I.119, and nos.I.130 and I.131; P. Kubissa in Vergara and Lammertse, *op. cit.* (note 1), nos.13–16; and U. Neidhardt: 'Der junge Anton van Dyck als Porträtist. Das Dresdner Bildnispaar von 1618', in C. Dumas, ed.: *Face book. Studies on Dutch and Flemish portraiture of the 16th–18th centuries. Liber amicorum presented to Rudolf E.O. Ekkart on the occasion of his 65th birthday*, Leiden 2012, pp.117–26. A portrait dated 1619 is in the Musées Royaux des Beaux-Arts de Belgique, Brussels, inv. no.2746; see Barnes *et al.*, *op. cit.* (note 1), no.I.150. Martin, *op. cit.* (note 20), pp.125–26, casts some doubt over the authenticity of the date on these paintings.

²⁸ See, for instance, a portrait of a man dated 1620 at the Museum of Fine Arts, Houston, inv. no.52.57, and a portrait of Nicolaas Rockox, of which a copy bore the date 1621, in the State Hermitage Museum, St Petersburg, inv. no.6922; see N. De Poorter in Barnes *et al.*, *op. cit.* (note 1), nos.I.139 and I.105; and T. Posada Kubissa in Vergara and Lammertse, *op. cit.* (note 1), no.85.

²⁹ I am indebted to Bert Watteuw for bringing this window to my attention.



16. *Portrait of a standing man (Alexander Vincque?)*, by Anthony van Dyck. 1616 or before. Black and red chalks, 52.6 by 35 cm. (National Gallery of Art, Washington).



17. *Portrait of a standing man (Alexander Vincque?)*, by Anthony van Dyck. 1616 or before. Canvas, 199 by 126 cm. (Koninklijk Museum voor Schone Kunsten, Antwerp).

could, on stylistic grounds, be dated around the same time as the Vincque portraits. Although a detailed exploration of this possibility falls outside the scope of this article, it can be noted that a reconsideration of the date of some of Van Dyck's early portraits could contribute towards a more satisfactory repartition of works in his first Antwerp period. Despite the fact that Van Dyck is readily called a child prodigy, most modern scholars date most of the approximately 160 known early paintings attributed to him to the four years leading up to his trip to Italy. In contrast, not more than a handful of paintings are generally situated between 1609, when the young artist entered the studio of Hendrick van Balen as *'leerjonger'*, and his entry in the guild nearly a decade later.³⁰ Recently, even the famous

self-portrait in the Akademie der bildenden Künste, Vienna, usually considered to be by the very young painter, has been argued to be in fact of a later date.³¹ Few authors seem ready to embrace the possibility that Van Dyck, notwithstanding guild regulations, could have produced and sold independent work before being enrolled as a member of the guild.³² However, the conclusions drawn here from the re-attribution and new date attached to the portrait in the Morgan Library suggest that a more even distribution of Van Dyck's early production between 1609 and 1621 may be called for. The exceptional bravura and ambition that were so vividly conveyed by the paintings shown in Madrid must have been apparent already in Van Dyck's paintings made when he was still in his mid-teens.

³⁰ Rombouts and Van Lierus, *op. cit.* (note 19), I, pp.457 and 545. For the difficulty of dating any painting by Van Dyck before 1618, see N. De Poorter in Barnes *et al.*, *op. cit.* (note 1), pp.15–16. The Madrid catalogue situates a few works between c.1615 and 1618; Vergara and Lammertse, *op. cit.* (note 1), nos.1–4, 6, 8 and 10.

³¹ Inv. no.686; N. De Poorter in Barnes *et al.*, *op. cit.* (note 1), no.I.99; and Posada Kubissa in Vergara and Lammertse, *op. cit.* (note 1), no.1. Often dated to

c.1613–14, Posada Kubissa suggests a date of c.1615. N. De Poorter in Barnes *et al.*, *op. cit.* (note 1), p.92, has suggested dating the Vienna self-portrait even later, to c.1618–19.

³² An exception is K. Van der Stighelen: 'Young Anthony: archival discoveries relating to Van Dyck's early career', in S.J. Barnes and A.K. Wheelock, Jr, eds.: *Van Dyck 350 (Studies in the history of art, XLVI)*, Washington 1994, pp.29–30; and *idem* in Brown and Vlieghe, *op. cit.* (note 26), pp.38–39.