

Van Dyck, Alessandro Scaglia and the Caroline Court: Friendship, Collecting and Diplomacy in the Early Seventeenth Century¹

'Friendship', with a rich variety of meanings, pervaded early-modern social and political culture, from the levels of individual interactions to the high politics of international relations. It meant more than affection, restricted to the realms of private life among social equals. Courtiers, clients, and patrons linked friendship with obligation, alliance and favouritism in the politicised worlds of public life and the court, encompassing horizontal and vertical social relations.² Princes too could have friends within their realms, when, as Francis Bacon (1561–1626) observed in his essay on friendship, 'they raise some persons to be as it were companions and almost equals to themselves'.³ Even at the level of international politics 'amicitia' had a political role to play in delineating mutual obligations between princes. For as the legal historian Randall Lesaffer has argued, early-modern treaties were in essence personal agreements between individuals where friendship had assumed specific legal connotations which 'amounted to the express declaration by the treaty partners not to damage each other's interests'.⁴

In this light, friendships between individuals and families could on one level express affection, but also much more – political affinity, dynastic affiliation, obligation, and social hierarchies, multiple identities that featured both openly and tacitly in many of Anthony van Dyck's portraits. His 'friendship portraits' marked for posterity the affection and intimacy between spouses, families and friends in conjugal, double and group portraits. While work has been conducted on gift-giving in early modern Europe stressing its functions in patron-client relations where the giver was inherently the subordinate seeking patronage, the gift of a portrait by Van Dyck could also affirm friendship and intimacy between social equals.⁵ This aspect of patronage was strikingly recorded in the artistic exchanges in 1635 between the Bourbon Henrietta Maria (1609–69) queen-consort of Charles I (1600–49), and her older sister, Marie-Christine (1606–63), duchess of Savoy.⁶ The delicate group portrait of the princes Charles and James Stuart, and princess Mary (1635), now in the *Galleria Sabauda*, Turin, served as a diplomatic gift from London

to Turin (the return gift of Marie-Christine's children is now lost), an act of communication between blood sisters from dynastically-related courts where the group portrait as a gift, and possibly the choice of Van Dyck as artist, held special significance for both courts.⁷

Van Dyck's portraits could also record a further type of friendship, between the artist and sitter. His pictorial output made references to the close affinities he himself established in the course of his travels around the sovereign states of Europe. The double portrait (c. 1627) of the brothers Lucas (1591–1661) and Cornelis de Wael (1592–1667) served as a gift to thank them for providing the artist with lodgings in Genoa during his stay in the city. Similarly the portraits of the collectors and artistic brokers Nicholas Lanier (1588–1666) and François Langlois (1588–1647) recorded their friendships with Van Dyck (respectively 1628 and c. 1634–7). The three probably met first in Italy and subsequently knew each other at the Stuart and Bourbon courts in London and Paris.⁸ This association between the artist and sitter can also be seen in the double portrait in The Prado, Madrid, of Van Dyck himself and Endymion Porter (1587–1649), a pro-Spanish client of George Villiers (1592–1628) duke of Buckingham, and an ambassador in the service of Charles I. Porter's credentials as a patron and broker, operating on behalf of the Caroline court, were strong. He was instrumental in the acquisition of the Mantuan collection for Charles I in 1628, the greatest cultural achievement of the king's reign, and he was on close terms with Daniel Mytens I (1590–1647) and Orazio Gentileschi (1563–1639), both of whom worked in London. He had probably first met Van Dyck even earlier, on the artist's first trip to England in 1620, and it is thought to have been Porter who brokered Charles I's initial commission from Van Dyck, *Rinaldo and Armida* (1628–9).⁹ Christopher M. S. Johns has suggested that it was the brokering of this painting that encouraged Charles I to invite Van Dyck to England, effectively affirming Porter, 'of polished manner and courtly ease', as an artistically sophisticated friend of Van Dyck. Moreover, the equestrian portrait of Charles I as the consummate courtier, *Le Roi à la chasse* (c. 1635), according to Johns, recorded this special relationship between king, broker and painter, as he tentatively identifies the unknown equerry in the painting as Porter.¹⁰ In a wider context, the double portrait of Porter and Van Dyck (c. 1635) opens up discussion for yet another type of friendship that possibly existed not so much between the patron and Van Dyck, but among a group of courtiers from around Europe who acted as artistic patrons and collectors, who viewed themselves as effective equals and for whom the very act of commissioning and collecting served to affirm a collective identity, or to demonstrate their social credentials.¹¹

Porter's family was not especially distinguished, but since the mid-sixteenth century his family had cultivated contacts with Spain, and he himself had an international profile as a courtier, coming from a relatively small but cosmopolitan world that mixed collecting with diplomacy. Another member of this European courtly world was one of his friends, the Abate Alessandro Cesare

Scaglia, who was born seven years before Van Dyck, in 1592, but who died, like the artist, in 1641. In fact, Scaglia is probably one of the best representatives of this early seventeenth-century international court circle. Scaglia was the second son of a noble family from Piemonte, a principality in the transalpine composite Savoyard duchy, and like other members of the Scaglia di Verrua family clan, he acquired wide-ranging experience through his family's loyal service to the ruling ducal House. This was especially true through diplomatic service, so important not only to the dynasty of Savoy for binding its élites to the court, but also to the Scaglia di Verrua for extending its own perspectives onto an international stage. This diplomatic and state service extended to cultural patronage and brokering on behalf of the ruling House of Savoy. It served the sovereign family's systematic campaigns to assert its cultural superiority over its state and dynastic regional rivals, Tuscany and Venice, as they were engaged in a long-running 'surrogate war' of precedence, largely provoked by the elevation of the Medici in 1569 to grand-ducal status.¹² And of all the members of the Scaglia di Verrua, Alessandro Scaglia was without doubt the pre-eminent patron and broker. His cultural expertise and association with skilled craftsmen was established early in his career – even before his first diplomatic posting, when he was twenty-two years old, he was the recipient of a dedication of a book from one of Savoy's major writers and historians, Francesco Agostino della Chiesa (d. 1662), indicating the high hopes that were invested in him as a potential patron.¹³

For most of the time between 1614 and 1623, Alessandro Scaglia was Duke Carlo Emanuele I of Savoy's ordinary ambassador to the papal court – his first foreign mission, and a major one at that (it was one of only a handful of permanent Savoyard embassies in Europe at the time).¹⁴ While in Rome, undoubtedly the most vibrant European city for cultural patronage, Scaglia purchased and commissioned books, bought manuscripts, designs for fountains, silks and silverware, and acquired classical sculptures that were sent back to Turin. The abate also commissioned and bought pictures from the Florentine painter and engraver Antonio Tempesta (1555–1630), and the Sieneese artist Antiveduto della Grammatica (1571–1626), also for Carlo Emanuele I, who wanted to lure them to Turin to contribute to his programme of developing and decorating his expanding palace complex.¹⁵ Nor was the duke the only member of the ruling family to employ Scaglia as a cultural broker. For Carlo Emanuele I's fourth son, the cardinal-prince of Savoy, Maurizio (1593–1657), the abate was equally energetic in acquiring precious goods and antique statues, central to Maurizio's own efforts to secure the so-called 'magnificentia principis' that was a key component of his dual identity as a son of the duke of Savoy and a prince of the church.¹⁶ Similarly, Prince Tommaso Francesco (1596–1656), the duke's second son, also used the abate to acquire finished goods in Rome, albeit on a lesser scale than his father and brother.¹⁷

Scaglia's diplomatic correspondence, deposited in Turin, shows that while in Rome he was much more than simply an unthinking or ignorant

buyer. His letters sent back to Carlo Emanuele I show a developing sense of aesthetic judgement, capable, for instance, of discerning the quality of a collection of silverware, or that of a collection of antique sculptures, of which he believed the nudes to be the best.¹⁸ This cultural expertise was moreover carried through to the abate's second mission, to the French Bourbon court between 1624 and 1627 (another of Savoy's permanent embassies). As Savoy's ordinary ambassador based in Paris, Scaglia continued to be an active cultural broker, looking to acquire paintings, tapestries, finished products such as jewellery and clothing, diamonds and animals, including horses and hunting dogs – reflecting the particular importance of hunting at the Savoyard court – and also exotic animals that included parrots and an elephant.¹⁹

But Scaglia's expertise in the arts did not stop with buying and commissioning for his princely patrons. He is without doubt best known today for the paintings he commissioned for himself from Anthony van Dyck, all dating from the 1630s, after he had left Savoyard service for self-imposed exile in the Spanish Netherlands (1632–41). He may well indeed have been one of Van Dyck's most significant individual patrons, both in terms of the number of commissions and also their quality. Arabella Cifani and Franco Monetti have established that the abate commissioned at least seven pictures, and possibly as many as ten, from the artist during a relatively short period of time, between Van Dyck's return to the Spanish Netherlands, from October 1633 and March 1635, until the abate's death in May 1641.²⁰ Most magnificent of all is the full-length portrait, one of Van Dyck's greatest achievements, and 1999 was a felicitous year indeed as the National Gallery in London not only commemorated the artist's own anniversary but also the formal acquisition of the picture.²¹ That this was an important portrait, recording a figure who was widely-known around the courts of Europe, was confirmed by the fact that a half-length version was later engraved by Paulus Pontius (1603–58), the ablest of Van Dyck's collaborators in the publication sponsored by Van Dyck, the so-called *Iconographia* (1641). The purpose of the collection is implied by the full title of the 1645–6 edition published under the direction of Gilles Hendricx. The *Icones principium virorum doctorum, pictorum, chalcographorum, statuariorum nec non Amatorum Pictoriae artis numero centum* comprised engravings of portraits of figures from the realms of high politics and the arts, most of whom Van Dyck painted. Essentially, it was a picture-book of some of Europe's most famous individuals, providing more affordable images for a buying market, principally in the Netherlands, though also in England.²² Furthermore, Van Dyck may have completed two additional versions of the 'Camrose' portrait, one in the *Koninklijk Museum Voor Schone Kunsten* in Antwerp, another in the *Alte Pinakothek*, Munich. The Antwerp version was painted after the 'Camrose' portrait on Scaglia's request by Van Dyck in 1635, with an inscription added after both Scaglia and Van Dyck had died. It was placed at his tomb in the Franciscan Convent of the Recollects in Antwerp, one of the city's premier places for burial.²³

Despite being the most spectacular of the abate's commissions, the 'Camrose' portrait (with its two copies) is not mentioned in the only known source of archival evidence specifically linking the abate and artist, Scaglia's will, which was drawn up shortly before his death and eventually deposited in his family's archive in Piemonte.²⁴ Another composition excluded from this exceptionally important document was *The Lamentation*, or *Mater Dolorosa*, possibly commissioned after Van Dyck's return to London to hang as the predella to the altar Scaglia planned for his tomb at a time when Scaglia himself was seriously ill.²⁵ Although the tomb was dismantled during the French Revolution, an eighteenth-century description illuminates how the painting was set, combining a sculptural setting with the Van Dyck portrait of the abate. The tomb referred to the Seven Sorrows of the Virgin, a theme of Marian devotion with a special significance in the Spanish Netherlands, experiencing a resurgence of Catholic piety in the early seventeenth century under the Archdukes Albert and Isabella. Indeed, not only was the belief in Our Lady of Seven Sorrows as protectress of the Spanish Netherlands 'one of the most original traits of archducal piety', but there was also a specific confraternity to the Seven Sorrows at Antwerp that became directly associated with Scaglia's altar.²⁶ At the top of the altar was a statue of Mary, Mother of Sorrows, with a sword piercing her heart, above a rich marble setting of the *Mater Dolorosa*, which was in turn flanked by statues depicting the flight of Mary and Joseph to Egypt, one of the Seven Sorrows (the Sorrows also represented in repoussé silver plaques). The central statue was possibly the work of the Flemish sculptor Artus Quellin the elder (1609–68), and was in 1804 moved to the Jesuit church in Antwerp, where its confraternity was re-located (with a feast day on the Sunday after Candlemass), and where it is still to be found.²⁷ The *Mater Dolorosa* itself shows the body of the dead Christ with Mary mourning on the left and two angels emerging from clouds to the right, a harrowing and unforgettable scene, according to Christopher Brown.²⁸

The remaining Van Dyck works feature in the will's 'Gratificationes', gifts set aside by the abate to friends in the Spanish Netherlands.²⁹ A second shoulder-length portrait of the abate, unusually (for Van Dyck) set in an oval frame, depicts Scaglia adoring the Virgin and Child, also in London in the National Gallery. The work has been the subject of close scrutiny over the identity of the virgin, painted, so Christopher Brown has argued, according to the conventions of seventeenth-century portraiture. Writing in 1938, the artist and journalist Herbert Granville Fell noted a long-standing view that she was the duchess of Arenberg, presumably Marie de Barbançon (1602–c.1675).³⁰ Other interpretations have also been offered. A mountain range sets the backdrop to the picture, which, given Scaglia's Piedmontese origins, has understandably been viewed as a reference to the Alps, thus indicating the abate's home state of Savoy. Accordingly, Brown has argued that the Virgin was Marie-Christine, duchess of Savoy, with Scaglia's devotional pose demonstrating

his continuing loyalty to the Savoyard House, despite the fact that he was in exile. Cifani and Monetti, for their part, have concluded that she was one of Scaglia's friends in exile in the Spanish Netherlands, Henriette de Vaudement, princess of Phalsbourg (c.1605–60), who herself commissioned a portrait in 1635 from Van Dyck, and who received the oval painting after Scaglia's death.³¹ Rejecting these three suggestions, Horst Vey unequivocally named the Virgin as Marie-Claire de Croy, duchess of Havré (c. 1605–64), presumably because of her likeness in a Van Dyck portrait of the duchess (1634).³²

A fifth suggestion has been advanced by David Howarth. Based on his reading of Balthasar Gerbier's previously unused entry books in the National Archives (London), he has suggested that the sitter was Marie de' Medici (1573–1642), the queen mother of France (and thus Marie-Christine's mother), who had entered self-imposed exile in the Spanish Netherlands following the Day of Dupes (11 November 1630). The painting, he argues, should be viewed together with the double portrait of Endymion Porter and Van Dyck, executed at the same time, reinforcing the close-knit nature of this international court circle. Porter travelled to the Spanish Netherlands in 1634, so Howarth contends, possibly as a prelude to a joint diplomatic mission with Van Dyck to Madrid, to inform the Spanish regime of the queen mother's intention to leave the Spanish Netherlands. The Scaglia portrait, in turn, with its references in the background to the Alps, was a signal, encouraged by the abate, that she should move to the Savoyard court of her younger daughter in Turin. The two oval paintings were possibly both commissioned by Scaglia and intended to be hung together, a suggestion that, if correct, would add another Van Dyck commission to the list of paintings indicated in Scaglia's will. They were therefore intended to act not merely as portraits but as components of a diplomatic strategy, with Van Dyck taking on a mantle that his mentor, the painter-diplomat Peter-Paul Rubens (1577–1640), also wore.³³

All of these interpretations are intriguing but ultimately unprovable. The claim that Mary was the duchess of Arenberg has no obvious basis, as Scaglia does not seem to have had much, if any, contact with her. While the abate was reticent when it came to criticising the Savoyard dynasty during his years in exile, an interpretation of the painting as a demonstration of loyalty to Marie-Christine must also be questioned. Van Dyck had probably only met her once, in 1623 when she was aged only seventeen, clearly at odds with the mature appearance of the Virgin in the painting. Aware of this problem, Brown suggested that Van Dyck 'would have worked from an engraving, a drawing by another artist or even from Scaglia's description.'³⁴ As for the identification as being of Phalsbourg, there is no compelling evidence for this, save the fact that Scaglia left his picture to the princess in his will and that he was on close terms with her. The fourth suggestion, that the sitter was the duchess of Havré, is also uncertain. To my knowledge, there is no reference of her in Scaglia's extensive correspondence, and Vey himself recognizes the absence of any connection between them.³⁵

Perhaps more might be said of Howarth's view that Mary was Marie de' Medici. The context seems promising, as there were good reasons for the isolated queen mother to leave the Spanish Netherlands in 1634, largely because her closest ally, the Infanta Isabella, had died in December 1633, though also because of the constant tensions with her second son, Gaston d'Orléans (1608–60), and his followers, who were also exiled in the Spanish Netherlands.³⁶ Furthermore, as will be seen below, Scaglia was continually involved in various informal negotiations with the English, not least because he was the effective point of contact between the Spanish regime in Madrid and the exiled queen mother. It would therefore have been his responsibility to have mediated a negotiation over her future in the Spanish Netherlands, perhaps strengthening a connection between the Scaglia portrait and Marie de' Medici. This would also support my wider argument about Van Dyck's significance to Scaglia in the abate's identity as a political actor. Finally, it would have been in his interests to destabilise the alignment of his home state of Savoy towards Cardinal Richelieu by placing one of Richelieu's most implacable opponents in the court of Turin.

There are nevertheless some difficulties with Howarth's interpretation too. It was certainly the case that the queen mother did not intend to remain perpetually in the Spanish Netherlands. However, Scaglia's own detailed correspondence, largely to Philip IV of Spain (1605–55) and his favourite, Olivares (1587–1645), does not give much away about any project for Marie de' Medici to go to Turin, a project that in any case would have infuriated Richelieu whose influence in Turin would have suffered as a consequence.³⁷ More credible were the reports that she might re-locate to England, despite, it should be added, Charles I's concerns at the financial burden of supporting his mother-in-law, or possibly even to Spain.³⁸ Alternatively, one near-contemporary history, Vittorio Siri's (1608–85) *Memorie recondite* (1677–79) suggests that she might indeed have returned to the Italian peninsula, though not to Turin but to her home city of Florence, possibly with Richelieu's agreement as a way of neutralising her threat to his regime (though nothing, of course, came of this).³⁹ There is also the question of Mary's age in the painting evidently mis-matching that of Marie de' Medici at the time the painting was executed, though Howarth provides an answer for this potential problem.⁴⁰ The identity of Mary in the painting thus remains elusive.

The other Van Dyck pictures owned by Scaglia are mentioned in the will, though they no longer appear to exist. It is not certain that he commissioned them. Most interesting was the unique quadruple portrait of Charles I and Henrietta Maria together with the painter and his wife, Van Dyck's only other self-portrait with a sitter being the Endymion Porter work. Unlike the portraits, and possibly *The Mater Dolorosa*, the quadruple portrait must have been painted at a later date, between Van Dyck's marriage in 1639 to Mary Ruthven and his death in 1641. The will also names, with no further details, a mythological picture of Thetis, and another Virgin and Child. As the

will records, the three paintings were left to Alexander Poliagus, a canon of Antwerp cathedral and one of the executors of Scaglia's will. The Franciscan convent where the abate had retired and where he was buried also received a Crucifixion with angels collecting Christ's blood, while Paul Dorkius, another of Scaglia's executors, was given a portrait of Queen Henrietta Maria.⁴¹

The Scaglia works thus represent a significant collection of paintings from Van Dyck, commissioned, or at least owned, by one individual patron, and this is how the abate has primarily been remembered for posterity. Yet to view the abate solely in the reflected glory of Van Dyck would be to divorce Scaglia's artistic commissions from a broader cultural, and possibly political, context. The commissions can be viewed the other way around, not merely as indicators of Scaglia's importance given Van Dyck's established historical renown, but as signifiers of the identity the abate wished to cultivate for himself as a patron and diplomat, drawing on Van Dyck's significance. They can be used as the point of departure for discussing a social and political culture that distinguished the early seventeenth century, and that furthermore locked the abate's home state of Savoy into a European dynastic and diplomatic system and located Scaglia himself in an international diplomatic culture.

Before executing the full-length 'Camrose' portrait, Anthony van Dyck is known to have made four preparatory sketches in chalk, one of which, in the *Institut Néerlandais* in Paris, has been described as 'conversational in tone, as if he [Scaglia] were enjoying the encounter'.⁴² Frustratingly for the historian, there is scant archival information detailing their relationship, though it is quite possible that Scaglia and Van Dyck may have met as early as 1623. In that year Van Dyck stopped off in Turin on his two-year journey around the peninsula from his base in Genoa; at the same time the abate was back home in an interlude from his mission to the papal court.⁴³ Certainly this marked the point at which Van Dyck established contact with members of the ruling House of Savoy, and it has been suggested that while in Turin he might have painted portraits of the ducal family, though none of them survives.⁴⁴ Fortunately, later portraits of the dynasty still exist. When in Palermo in 1623, Van Dyck painted the Savoyard duke's second surviving son, Prince Filiberto Emanuele (1588–1624), as viceroy of Sicily, in armour decorated with Savoyard insignia, a portrait currently located in Dulwich Picture Gallery. 1634–5, the period of Alessandro's major commissions, was of course when Queen Henrietta Maria had her children painted by the artist and sent as a gift to her sister Marie-Christine in Turin to mark the dynastic affinity that still linked London and Turin. And in the same period Tommaso Francesco (1596–1656), the prince of Carignano and the youngest son of Carlo Emanuele I, had a spectacular equestrian portrait painted depicting him in his role as a commander in the Army of Flanders, and a second half-length portrait.⁴⁵

The problems of detailing the Scaglia-Van Dyck relationship nevertheless remain, not least because the majority of Scaglia's personal papers have yet to be found. The Scaglia di Verrua family archives in the Piedmontese town

of Biella contain very few of the abate's papers aside from a few financial documents, perhaps understandably so given he died in exile.⁴⁶ Nor is there much in Antwerp, where he died and was buried, a difficulty accentuated by the fact that the religious house of the Franciscan Recollects where he retired was demolished in the nineteenth century. The only significant archival source for the 1630s remains his political correspondence with the Spanish regime, mostly deposited in Brussels (with some material in Simancas), though some of these letters may well have been amongst the abate's personal documents. For his part, Van Dyck was notoriously reticent and has left equally little written documentation, let alone evidence for his connection with Scaglia. As an interesting inversion of this relationship, Scaglia's political friendship with Van Dyck's teacher, Rubens, was recorded in some detail in letters between the two and with other correspondents. To Rubens, Scaglia was, in a now famous letter, the highly-capable 'agent 2X', while Scaglia warmly described Rubens (the diplomat) as someone who could do much more than painting alone.⁴⁷ Though just as Scaglia was a significant patron and collector of Van Dyck, there is, continuing the inversion, no evidence that he commissioned for himself a single work from Rubens. The only substantive references made by Scaglia to Rubens the painter come from the commission to decorate the Queen's House at Greenwich (see below).

But while no direct archival evidence corroborates an early connection between Scaglia and Van Dyck during the 1620s, the existence of a friendship struck up between the two during the 1630s and borne out by the chalk sketches remains more credible. Added to this, they had other friends and contacts in common, not least Endymion Porter, whose relationship with Van Dyck, as one of his significant individual patrons, was close.⁴⁸ Yet friendship for the abate, as for Endymion Porter, was multi-dimensional and signified more than just 'private' affinities defined by affection alone. David Wootton suggests in his study of Francis Bacon and friendship that it not only encompassed horizontal relations between social equals but also, potentially, vertical political relations between patrons and clients, particularly between favourites and their friends.⁴⁹ With this in mind, the quadruple portrait of the English king and queen with Van Dyck and his wife owned by the abate was a record of a particular type of court friendship that expressed patronage and favour between the royal patrons and the artist.⁵⁰ More to the point, though the act of collecting images of princes was not in itself unique in early modern Europe, the painting, together with the portrait of Henrietta Maria in Scaglia's collection, recorded the special political relationship the abate himself enjoyed with the Caroline court, and his particular friendship with Charles I.

L. J. Reeve's description of the Caroline court as cosmopolitan and avant-garde 'from the world where international high politics merged with the arts and Roman religion' provides the key to understanding Scaglia's relationship with that court, established during the mid-1620s.⁵¹ Charles I, 'arguably the most single-minded connoisseur in Europe', was fascinated with the visual

arts and by extension with the sovereign courts of Catholic Europe in which favoured artists like Van Dyck operated.⁵² His foreign policies, particularly during the interventionist years of the 1620s when Scaglia's closest English friend, Buckingham, was at the height of his power, were moreover underscored by dynastic connections that linked London with the court of Turin, as well as the Bourbon court of Paris and the Habsburg courts of Madrid and Brussels. In this period, Scaglia served on two diplomatic missions to London, in 1625 and then in 1628–9. On both occasions, he was treated with exceptional favour and warmth by his hosts.⁵³ Charles I had treated the abate so generously during the 1620s and had evidently taken a liking to him, in part for who he represented – the duke of Savoy – at a time of close diplomatic co-operation between England and Savoy. But this favour possibly also had much to do with what, as a cultivated individual, he embodied, even though their relationship was still essentially one of social unequals. It was demonstrably the case that patronage and gift-giving had facilitated Scaglia's diplomatic negotiations with the Caroline court. Thus, a gift of paintings had in 1625 marked Scaglia's first meeting with the duke of Buckingham in Paris, as Scaglia recorded in a letter sent back to Turin:

You will see from the enclosed letter of Barozzio the news from England; I believe that he will not be back without achieving something, for the duke of Buckingham has always expressed himself well-disposed to serving you, to whom one thought appropriate to give a gift of a good painting, which may be all he desires. When [Vittorio Amedeo] was here I gave him a *Carita Romana*, which might be very valuable, for one I had by the same artist was greatly appreciated [by Buckingham] when he was here, and the style of that painter is infinitely pleasing to him [Buckingham]. It might be appropriate to give him another by an old master.⁵⁴

Scaglia evidently knew how to use art to flatter Buckingham when it mattered. Similarly, a gift of a painting signalled the eventual reconciliation of the two after a potentially serious dispute in January 1628, though because of the lack of evidence it is not clear as to what the gift comprised.⁵⁵

Scaglia's expertise in the high arts gave him a language through which he could communicate with like-minded diplomats attached to Charles I's court, and a means of strengthening bonds with them. It also gave him a means during the 1630s of perpetuating contact with the court while operating beyond official service to Savoy in a diplomatic environment that had been further changed by the murder in 1628 of his closest English friend, Buckingham. Rumours abounded that Scaglia would in fact return to the Caroline court during the decade, and he also deposited large amounts of money with the English-based financier Peter Ricaut, who was himself closely attached to the court.⁵⁶ Scaglia furthermore maintained his friendship with the English diplomatic agent, Balthasar Gerbier (1592–1663), a friendship that, as with Endymion Porter, provides a striking case study of how an interest in the arts could overlap with politics.⁵⁷

The abate and Gerbier had first met in 1627 during the informal negotia-

tions for an Anglo-Spanish peace when Gerbier was part of that network of clients operating under the direction of Buckingham, mixing diplomacy with the patronage and brokering of the arts, a contact that also introduced Scaglia to Rubens for the first time.⁵⁸ Between January 1631 and April 1641 Gerbier served in Brussels as Charles I's accredited diplomatic agent, where he was the most significant and direct English point of contact available to the abate, as well as a friend. One letter between the two experienced diplomats from May 1636, for instance, implied a level of intimacy, in which Gerbier explored and defined the meanings of the word 'ablegatus' following a conversation from the previous day.⁵⁹ Gerbier both regularly informed Scaglia of news from London, and also sought to include him in the various informal negotiations during the 1630s for closer political ties between the English and Spanish, as did Scaglia in his role as the 'oracle' of the Spanish regime.⁶⁰

Again, their relationship, as reciprocal points of contacts, encompassed other friends from the realms of politics and the arts. In 1633, for example, Gerbier wrote to the widow of the duke of Buckingham, Katherine Manners (1603?-49) that 'The Abate d'Escaglia doth return many and many thousand thanks for your grace's favourable remembrance & hopes one day to see your grace'. Gerbier's letters, recorded in his entry books, are revealing since there is no evidence of Scaglia contacting the duchess directly, and the abate's own surviving correspondence from the 1620s rarely mentioned her. Yet Scaglia was evidently on close terms with the duchess. Gerbier's role, here, as a go-between also recalled the special relationship between Scaglia and the dead favourite, and Gerbier's former identity as a client of Buckingham.⁶¹ More importantly, in 1634 Endymion Porter travelled as Charles I's agent to Brussels, ostensibly to congratulate the Cardinal-Infante Ferdinand (1609-41) on his assumption of the governor-generalship of the Spanish Netherlands following Isabella Clara Eugenia's death in December 1633. Porter took suggestions about strengthening Anglo-Spanish relations over the still-unresolved Palatinate question, and Scaglia, supported by Gerbier (who described Porter as 'my good friend'), was seen as an obvious agent to organise the talks. It was also this mission that, according to David Howarth (mentioned above) was concerned with negotiating the transfer of the queen mother from the Spanish Netherlands, and during which the closeness between Scaglia and Porter was recorded in the two oval portraits by Van Dyck, possibly paired together.⁶² Even after Scaglia's semi-retirement from politics and public life in 1636, Gerbier continued to use him in secret and informal negotiations. The notorious Marie de Rohan (1600-79) duchess of Chevreuse, and the princess of Phalsbourg, both of whom were themselves in exile in the Spanish Netherlands and also personally known to the abate, undertook their own initiatives with the English to secure closer co-operation with Spain following a renewed interest in Anglo-Habsburg relations in the mid-1630s. Once again, Scaglia was involved, with Gerbier's knowledge. The princess of Phalsbourg, whose association with the abate was confirmed

by Scaglia's pictorial bequests in his will, specifically asked for him (rather than any Habsburg subjects) to be used as a confidant in her talks because of her particular trust in him.⁶³

Appropriately, Scaglia's last contact with Gerbier was for an artistic commission. Gerbier was charged by Charles I with brokering the commission for the decoration of the Queen's House in Greenwich, completed in 1635; a set of instructions for Edward Norgate (1581–1650) recorded that 'the said Abate, living at Antwerp, and having good skill in handling such mercenary men, was by sieur B. Gerbier, thought the fittest hand to guide the said business', a task Scaglia took on 'very willingly and cheerfully.'⁶⁴ While both Rubens and Van Dyck had been considered for the project (the only documented occasion on which Scaglia seems to have discussed Rubens's artistic skills), they were both deemed to be too expensive – Rubens, instead, was only consulted. In their place Scaglia approached Jacob Jordaens (1593–1678), though Scaglia's suggestion that his friend Frans Snyders should also be involved was rejected by Gerbier. Scaglia was also asked to keep the identity of the royal patron secret to keep the cost of the commission to a minimum, a commission that was to comprise a cycle of twenty-two works depicting the mythological history of Psyche. When in May 1641 Alessandro Scaglia died, only seven of the works had been completed while five other had been started. In Antwerp, Jordaens took a lawsuit out against the abate's executors seeking payment for both the completed and uncompleted paintings, believing that he had been the anonymous patron.⁶⁵

With Alessandro Scaglia's long-established expertise as a patron of the arts, this was an entirely justifiable assumption and serves as a fitting reflection on his life. His friendships cultivated over the course of his career mixed politics and diplomacy with cultural patronage and collecting. His sharp mind, refined personal qualities and smooth manners were ideally suited to cultivating friendships at the courts in which he served as an ambassador of the duke of Savoy from 1614 until his exile in 1632. Such links could establish points of diplomatic contact between individuals in different states, and while they did not necessarily create compelling political bonds in themselves, they could nonetheless encourage favourable conditions for negotiating or influencing policy-makers. Through his identity as a patron and broker, Alessandro Scaglia could move more freely among the sovereign states of Europe and make contact with courtiers, not least because he often shared their political aspirations, though also because he was in a position of buying, or receiving, goods or works of art from them.

Looking back over Alessandro Scaglia's career it is clear that his commissions from Anthony van Dyck reveal much more than just a warm relationship between a patron and a painter. Even though they all took place during Scaglia's exile, the commissions signified his continuing membership of a definable social and political world. Indeed, the timing of the Van Dyck commissions – during the 1630s – and the content of Scaglia's collection

of Van Dyck paintings (even if he himself did not specifically commission them) seems potentially more than a coincidence. In the absence of archival evidence, some speculation is inevitable, but Scaglia's association with Van Dyck, the court artist to Charles I and portrait painter of members of the House of Savoy, may well have served as a mechanism for the exiled Scaglia to display his political and cultural connections with both courts, more so if the Virgin in the Scaglia portrait can be identified as Marie-Christine or indeed as her mother, Marie de' Medici. For Scaglia, patronage of Van Dyck was thus important as much because of whom the artist worked for as for his intrinsic abilities. The painter was inalienably associated with a web of court relationships that Scaglia, in exile, wished to perpetuate.

That interpretation of Scaglia's relationship with Van Dyck would be in keeping with his career as a whole. Scaglia's interest in the visual arts, which had been signalled at the outset of his public life as a diplomat, brought him into contact with like-minded courtiers from European courts that had dynastic affinities with his home state of Savoy. Alessandro Scaglia built his diplomacy not merely on the practical issues of international power politics and on a narrowly defined notion of Savoy's political role in Europe, but equally, if not more so, on his 'friendships' with other artistic patrons and brokers involved in diplomacy. When L. J. Reeve described the Caroline court as cosmopolitan and avant-garde, he went on to say that Alessandro Scaglia and Balthasar Gerbier were exotic fruit whose presence in London effectively gave it distinctive and sophisticated flavour. That flavour was not in fact particular to Charles I's court; rather, it was the essence of a broader European court culture, a social and political world embodied by Scaglia and vividly captured in the paintings of Anthony van Dyck.

Durham University

TOBY OSBORNE

Notes

- 1 All dates are given according to the New Style, with the year beginning 1 January, and all spellings from quotations have been modernised.
- 2 David Wootton, 'Francis Bacon: Your Flexible Friend', in J. H. Elliott and L. W. B. Brockliss (eds), *The World of the Favourite* (New Haven and London, 1999), pp. 184–204; Sharon Kettering, 'Friendship and Clientage in Early Modern France', *French History*, 6 (1992), 139–58.
- 3 Francis Bacon, *Essays*, ed. Michael J. Hawkins (London 1986 ed.), p. 81; Antonio Feros, 'Images of Evil, Images of Kings: The Contrasting Faces of the Royal Favourite and the Prime Minister in Early Modern Literature, c. 1580–1650', in Elliott and Brockliss (eds), *The World of the Favourite*, pp. 205–22.
- 4 Randall Lesaffer, 'Amicitia in Renaissance Peace and Alliance Treaties', *Journal of the History of International Law*, 4 (2002), 17. For another view of friendship between princes see Tobias Mörschel, *Buona amicitia? Die römisch-savoyischen*

- Beziehungen unter Paul V. (1605–1621). Studien zur frühneuzeitlichen Mikropolitik in Italien* (Mainz, 2002), especially the introduction.
- 5 For example, Lisa M. Klein, 'Your Humble Handmaid: Elizabethan Gifts of Needlework', *Renaissance Quarterly*, 50 (1997), 461–2.
 - 6 The political-dynastic exchange can be followed in Ermano Ferrero (ed.), *Lettres de Henriette Marie de France Reine d'Angleterre à sa sœur Christine Duchesse de Savoie* (Turin, 1881), pp. 40, 43.
 - 7 The importance of the gift inalienably linked to the giver and recipient, and to their relationship, was famously explored in Marcel Mauss, *The Gift* (Abingdon, 2006 ed.). For a discussion of Mauss and subsequent accounts of gift-giving see James Carrier, 'Gifts, Commodities, and Social Relations: A Maussian View of Exchange', *Sociological Forum*, 6 (1991), 119–36. For an early modern perspective see Natalie Zemon Davis, *The Gift in Sixteenth-Century France* (Oxford, 2000), introduction.
 - 8 Descriptions of all three paintings can be found in Christopher Brown and Hans Vlieghe (eds), *Van Dyck, 1599–1641* (London, 1999), pp. 194, 206, 284–6; Susan J. Barnes, Nora de Poorter, Oliver Millar and Horst Vey, *Van Dyck. A Complete Catalogue of the Paintings* (New Haven and London, 2004), pp. 210–11, 321, 547–8.
 - 9 Gervas Huxley, *Endymion Porter: the life of a courtier, 1587–1649* (London, 1959). See also Brown and Vlieghe (eds), *Van Dyck*, p. 298, and the *Dictionary of National Biography*.
 - 10 Christopher M. S. Johns, 'Politics, Nationalism and Friendship in Van Dyck's "Le Roi a la Ciasse"', *Zeitschrift für Kunstgeschichte*, 51 (1988), 257–61.
 - 11 Jonathan Brown, *Kings and Connoisseurs. Collecting Art in Seventeenth-Century Europe* (New Haven and London, 1995), especially chapter 1; Kristin Lohse Belkin and Fiona Healy (eds), *A House of Art. Rubens as Collector* (Antwerp, 2004), p. 34. See also David Howarth, *Images of Rule. Art and Politics in the English Renaissance* (Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1997), chapter 7, which demonstrates that collecting could also express competition among courtiers.
 - 12 A. Spagnoletti, *Le dinastie italiane nella prima età moderna* (Bologna, 2002), p. 129; Toby Osborne, 'The Surrogate War between the Savoys and the Medici: Sovereignty and Precedence in Early-Modern Italy', *The International History Review*, 29 (2007), 1–21.
 - 13 Francesco Agostino della Chiesa, *Catalogo di tutti i Scrittori Piemontesi et altri de i stati dell'A. di Savoia* (Turin, 1614), preface.
 - 14 For further information on his missions in Rome see Mörschel, *Buona amicitia?*, especially pp. 119–25, and G. B. Adriani, *Memorie della vita e dei tempi di Monsignor Gio. Secondo Ferrero-Ponziglione Referendario Apostolico, primo Consigliere e Auditore Generale del Principe Cardinale Maurizio di Savoia* (Turin, 1856).
 - 15 For instance, Archivio di Stato, Turin [hereafter AST] Lettere Ministri Roma [LMR], m. 30, fasc. 1, 94, Scaglia to Crotti, 3 August 1619; m. 33, fasc. 8, 18, Scaglia to Carlo Emanuele I, 21 June 1623. On the links with Tempesta and Della Grammatica see Alessandro Baudi di Vesme, *Schede Vesme: l'arte in Piemonte dal XVI al XVIII secolo*, 3 vols (Turin 1963–8), II, 537; III, 1040.
 - 16 For some examples see AST LMR m. 29, fasc. 1, 51, Maurizio to Scaglia, 14 December 1617; fasc. 2, 79 Scaglia to Maurizio, 13 October 1618; A. Cifani and

- F. Monetti, 'New Light on the Abbé Scaglia and Van Dyck', *The Burlington Magazine*, 134 (August, 1992), 509. On Maurizio's cultural aspirations more generally consult Matthias Oberli, "Magnificentia Principis". *Das Mäzenatentum des Prinzen und Kardinals: Maurizio von Savoyen (1593–1657)* (Weimar, 1999).
- 17 AST LMR m. 32, fasc. 4, 1, Tommaso Francesco to Scaglia, 3 January 1621.
 - 18 AST LMR, m. 27, fasc. 4, Scaglia to Carlo Emanuele I, 30 January 1616; m. 30, fasc. 1, Scaglia to Carlo Emanuele I, 9 March 1619.
 - 19 These acquisitions can be followed in the abate's diplomatic correspondence, such as AST Lettere Ministri Francia [LMF] m. 25, 119, Scaglia to Carlo Emanuele I, 8 November 1624; 114, Scaglia to Carlo Emanuele I, 1 November 1624; m. 27, fasc. 3, 195, Scaglia to Carlo Emanuele I, October 1626, with attached list of expenditure; 248, Scaglia to Carlo Emanuele I, 8 December 1626; 259, Scaglia to Carlo Emanuele I, 21 December 1626.
 - 20 Cifani and Monetti, 'New Light', p. 511.
 - 21 National Gallery, press release, September 1999. It had been given to the gallery in lieu of death duties from the estate of the second Viscount Camrose, following his death in 1995, and his wife, who herself died in 1997.
 - 22 Marie Mauquoy-Hendrickx, *L'iconographie d'Antoine van Dyck*, 2 vols (2nd ed. Brussels, 1991), I, chapter 3. See also Alfred Moir, Francine de Nave and Carl Depauw (eds), *Antoon van Dyck & Antwerpen* (Antwerp, 1991). The Scaglia engraving was marked out from all but two others in the collection by the fact that it was accompanied by a verse inscription.
 - 23 The convent was founded under the direction of Duke Philip the Good (ruler from 1419–67). In the year before Scaglia's burial there, the burgher-master, bibliophile, numismatist, patron and collector, Nicolaas Rockox (1560–1640) was interred in the convent, below a triptych he commissioned from his friend, Rubens. Augustin Thys, *Historique des rues et places publiques de la ville d'Anvers* (Antwerp, 1873), pp. 182, 224. Rockox, it should be added, lived on the *Keizerstraat* in Antwerp, where the abate had a residence, though it is not clear as to whether they directly knew each other.
 - 24 For a partial transcription of the will, containing the relevant information on Scaglia's artistic donations, see Cifani and Monetti, 'New Light', p. 514. The original can be found in the Archivio di Stato, Biella [hereafter ASB]: Archivio Scaglia, Testamenti, XCVI, 2537, will of Alessandro Scaglia, 11 May 1641. A version of the will also exists in the *Staatsarchief* in Antwerp, Notarissen Rousseau, 1641, fol. 163.
 - 25 Though see Barnes *et al.*, *Van Dyck*, p. 272, which dates the painting to 1640.
 - 26 Luc Duerloo, 'Archducal Piety and Habsburg Power', in Werner Thomas and Luc Duerloo (eds), *Albert and Isabella: Essays* (Brussels, 1998), p. 272; Luc Duerloo and Marc Wingens, *Scherpenheuvel. Het Jeruzalem van de Lage Landen* (Leuven, 2002), pp. 146–55, especially p. 150. I am grateful to Professor Duerloo of the University of Antwerp for advice on this matter.
 - 27 For details on the tomb see *Inscriptions funéraires et monumentales de la province d'Anvers*, VI (Antwerp, 1871), p. 183; A. Monballieu, 'Cesare Alesandro Scaglia en de "Bewening van Christus" door A. van Dijk', *Jaarboek van het Koninklijk Museum voor Schone Kunsten* (1973), 267, and 256–60 on its fate. On the statue of Mary see H. Maho, *La Belgique à Marie: Belgium Marianum* (Brussels, 1929), pp. 20–21.

- 28 Christopher Brown, *Virgin and Child by Anthony Van Dyck* (London, 1971).
- 29 Two other Antwerp-based artists are mentioned in the will – the Jesuit Daniel Seghers (1590–1661) and the still-life and animal painter Frans Snyders (1579–1657), another of Scaglia’s friends who also had a residence on the same street in Antwerp as the abate. ASB Archivio Scaglia, Testamenti, XCVI, 2537, will of Alessandro Scaglia, 11 May 1641; L. Schlugleit, ‘Labbé de Scaglia, Jordaens et “l’Histoire de Pysche” de Greenwich-House (1639–1642)’, *Revue Belge d’archéologie et d’histoire de l’Art*, 7 (1937), 146, 155. The Seghers paintings are also mentioned in the artist’s own inventory. Walter Couvreur, ‘Daniël Seghers’ Inventaris van door hem geschilderde bloemstukken’, *Gentse Bijdragen tot de Kunstgeschiedenis en de Oudheidkunde*, 20 (1967), 105–6.
- 30 H. Granville Fell, ‘Some Topics of the Moment’, *The Connoisseur*, 101 (1938).
- 31 Brown, *Virgin and Child*; Cifani and Monetti, ‘New Light’, p. 512.
- 32 Barnes *et al.*, *Van Dyck*, pp. 258, 316.
- 33 David Howarth, ‘Van Dyck, Marie de Médicis and a proposed visit to Madrid in 1634’, in Chantell Grell and Klaus Malettke (eds), *Hofgesellschaft und Höflinge an europäischen Fürstenhöfen in der Frühen Neuzeit (15. – 18. Jh.)* (Münster, 2001), pp. 175–95. However, Oliver Millar dates the painting earlier, to 1633, which would weaken Howarth’s argument. Barnes *et al.*, *Van Dyck*, p. 433.
- 34 Brown, *Virgin and Child*.
- 35 Barnes *et al.*, *Van Dyck*, p. 258.
- 36 Toby Osborne, ‘“Chimeres, Monopoles and Strategemes”: French exiles in the Spanish Netherlands during the Thirty Years’ War’, *The Seventeenth Century*, 15 (2000), 149–74.
- 37 For Scaglia’s correspondence with Philip IV and Olivares during 1634 see, principally, Archives Générales du Royaume, Brussels, Secrétairerie d’Etat et de Guerre, 597. Nor does a possible transfer to Turin appear to have featured in discussions in the Spanish *Consejo de Estado* during 1634. See, for example, Archivo General, Simancas, Sección de Estado y Guerra, 3860.
- 38 Though see National Archives, London [NA] SP105/11, Gerbier to Coke, 19 May 1634. Eventually, in 1638, she arrived in England, where she remained until 1642.
- 39 For Vittorio Siri’s account of 1634 see *Memorie recondite dall’anno 1601 sino al 1640*, 8 vols (Lyon, 1677–79), vols VII–VIII.
- 40 Howarth, ‘Marie de Médicis’, p. 190.
- 41 ASB Archivio Scaglia, Testamenti, XCVI, 2537, will of Alessandro Scaglia, 11 May 1641.
- 42 Brown and Vlieghe (eds), *Van Dyck*, p. 272.
- 43 *Ibid.*, p. 272; Cifani and Monetti, ‘New Light’, p. 513.
- 44 M. Vaes, ‘Il soggiorno di Antonio Van Dyck alla Corte di Torino: 4 Dicembre 1622–Febbraio 1623’, *Bolletino storico-bibliografico subalpino*, 43 (1942), 227–39.
- 45 For further information on these Van Dyck portraits consult Brown and Vlieghe (eds), *Van Dyck*, pp. 172, 275–6, 295–7; Barnes *et al.*, *Van Dyck*, pp. 200–3, 347–9, 477–9. The connections between the House of Savoy and Van Dyck might be extended further if De Winkel and Manuth are correct in identifying the so-called ‘Palatine princes’ in the Vienna Kunsthistorisches Museum (c. 1634–5) as grandsons of Mary, a legitimised daughter of Duke Emanuele Filiberto of Savoy (1553–80). Marieke de Winkel and Volker Manuth, ‘“Los Meninos” by Van Dyck?: new identifications and dates for the “Palatine princes” in Vienna’, *The Burlington*

- Magazine*, 142 (2000), 147–56; Barnes *et al.*, *Van Dyck*, pp 310–12.
- 46 Maurizio Cassetti, ‘L’Archivio S. Martino-Scaglia’, *Studi Piemontesi*, 10 (1981), 198–202.
- 47 NA SP77/19/145, Rubens to Gerbier, 19 May 1627; AST Lettere Ministri Inghilterra [LMI] m. 4, 17, Scaglia to Carlo Emanuele I, 26 July 1627.
- 48 Johns observes that Porter commissioned a number of portraits of himself and his family from Van Dyck. Johns, ‘Politics, Nationalism and Friendship’, p. 260.
- 49 Wootton, ‘Flexible friend’, especially pp. 196–9.
- 50 Though there is also evidence that Van Dyck had no particular desire to see his days out at the Caroline court. See, for example, Oliver Millar, *Van Dyck in England* (London, 1982), especially p. 33.
- 51 L. J. Reeve, *Charles I and the Road to Personal Rule* (Cambridge, 1989), p. 201.
- 52 Malcolm Rogers, ‘Van Dyck in England’, in Brown and Vlieghe (eds), *Van Dyck*, p. 79.
- 53 Toby Osborne, ‘Abbot Scaglia, the Duke of Buckingham and Anglo-Savoyard relations during the 1620s’, *European Studies Review*, 30 (January 2000), 5–32.
- 54 AST LMF m. 26, fasc. 1, 258, Scaglia to Carlo Emanuele I, 1 November 1625. The painter was possibly the Carravagist, Bartolomeo Manfredi (1582–1622). An inventory of Savoy’s ducal collection from 1635, drawn up by Antonio della Cornia, included a *Carità* by Manfredi, while an inventory of Buckingham’s collection, also from the 1630s, mentioned a *Carità romana* by Manfredi. Alessandro Baudi di Vesme, ‘La regia pinacoteca di Torino’, *Le Gallerie Nazionali Italiane*, 3 (Rome, 1897), 43; Randall Davies, ‘An Inventory of the duke of Buckingham’s pictures, etc., at York House in 1635’, *The Burlington Magazine*, 10 (1906), 380; Romano (ed.), *Le collezioni*, p. 362.
- 55 Osborne, ‘Abbot Scaglia’, pp. 5–6.
- 56 As Gerbier reported, ‘The Abbot of Escaglie wishes himself in England and that he might contribute to your grace’s contentment’. NA SP105/10/184v, Gerbier to the duchess of Buckingham, 6 July 1633. See also Calendar of State Papers Venetian 1632–6, pp. 106, 109; AST LMI m. 5, Ciza to Vittorio Amedeo I, 26 June 1637. For further information on Ricaut consult the *Dictionary of National Biography*.
- 57 Hugh Ross Williamson, *Four Stuart Portraits* (London, 1949), pp. 26–60, and the *Dictionary of National Biography*. More recently, Jerry Brotton has pointed to tensions that existed between Gerbier and Van Dyck. By inference, Scaglia’s friendships with both individuals add a further layer of complexity to this view, though curiously Scaglia gets no mention in this study of Stuart collecting. Jerry Brotton, *The Sale of the Late King’s Goods. Charles I and His Art Collection* (Basingstoke and Oxford, 2006), pp. 153–4. For further insights into the relationship between the two see David Howarth, ‘The *Entry Books* of Sir Balthazar Gerbier: Van Dyck, Charles I and the Cardinal-Infante Ferdinand’, in Hans Vlieghe (ed.), *Van Dyck 1599–1999. Conjectures and Refutations* (Turnhout, 2001), pp. 77–87.
- 58 This diplomatic contact has been closely discussed in a variety of accounts. For Rubens, the ‘classic’ account remains L. P. Gachard, *Histoire politique et diplomatique de Pierre Paul Rubens* (Brussels, 1877). See also Toby Osborne, *Dynasty and Diplomacy in the Court of Savoy. Political Culture and the Thirty Years’ War* (Cambridge University Press, 2002), chapter 4.
- 59 NA SP105/13, Gerbier to Scaglia, 14 May 1636.
- 60 NA SP105/9, Gerbier to Charles I, 14 April 1632. See also *ibid.*, Gerbier to Coke,

- 3 October 1632, and 105/11, Gerbier to Charles I, 7 July 1634.
- 61 NA SP105/10/90v-91, Gerbier to the duchess of Buckingham, 5 March 1633.
- 62 Bodleian Library, Oxford: Clarendon State Papers, 15, fol. 71r-v, Secret instructions for Porter, 11 November 1634 [old style ?]. On the friendship between Porter and Gerbier see, for example NA SP105/11, Gerbier to the duchess of Buckingham, 16 March 1635; SP105/12, Gerbier to Porter, 11 April 1636; Howarth, *Entry Books*, p. 79.
- 63 NA SP77/28/549-50v, Gerbier to Windebank, 6 November 1638; fols 563-5, Gerbier to Windebank, 13 November 1638.
- 64 William Noel Sainsbury (ed.), *Original unpublished papers illustrative of the life of sir Peter Paul Rubens, as an artist and a diplomat* (London, 1859), p. 212. On Norgate's colourful career, consult the *Dictionary of National Biography*.
- 65 Schlugleit, 'L'abbé de Scaglia', *passim*. For some recently uncovered material on the commission, see Howarth, *Entry Books*, pp. 79-80.

Address for Correspondence

Dr Toby Osborne, Department of History, Durham University, 43 North Bailey, Durham DH1 3EX, UK, email: toby.osborne@durham.ac.uk