

The English venture: Dutch and Flemish artists in Britain 1550–1800

ERIC JAN SLUIJTER

I.I

In the preface of his treatise on painting of 1685, William Aglionby complained: 'I cannot forbear adding ... an observation that I have made abroad: which is, That of all Civilized Nations in Europe, we are the only one that want Curiosity for Artists: the Dutch in the midst of their Boggs and ill Air, have their Houses full of Pictures, from the Highest to the Lowest.' Later in his book he laments that: 'The World here ... has a Notion of Painters little nobler than of Joyners and Carpenters, or any of the Mechanick, thinking that their Art is nothing but daubing a few colours upon a cloth and believing that nothing more ought to be expected from them at best, but the making of a Like Picture of any Bodys Face.'¹ Some of the issues the conference at which the initial versions of the papers presented in this volume were read, dealt with are present in this quotation. Obviously, the supposed lack of interest in painting and the absence of good native artists in England, as well as the opinion that the English were only interested in portraits while in Holland everybody seemed to possess an enormous variety of paintings, had become clichés by this time. Contemporaries were well aware of the enormous contrast between the production of paintings in England and in The Netherlands.

English travellers were truly amazed when they visited Holland. The words of Peter Mundy, written in 1641, have often been cited:

'As for the Art off Painting and the affection of people to Pictures, I thincke none other goe beeyonde them... All in generall striving to adorne their houses, especially the outer or street roome, with costly peeces, Butchers and bakers in their shoppes, yea many times blacksmiths, Coblers, etts., will have some picture or other by their Forge and in their stalle. Such is the generall Notion, enclination and delight that these Countrie Natives have to Paintings.'²

Although the wide social range of Dutch owners of paintings—presumably from peasants to princes—became an exaggerated stereotype, the number

of paintings was staggering to English eyes, used as they were to see paintings, especially portraits, mainly in the houses of the aristocracy. And indeed, the large number of painters active in the Netherlands – in the 16th century especially in Antwerp, in the 17th century also in the Dutch cities –, the huge quantity of paintings produced in an incredible variety, and finally the eagerness with which the burghers crammed their houses with such paintings – from successful shopkeepers and artisans to the urban elite of wealthy merchants and regents – was, and still is, an astounding phenomenon.

But this situation was going to change. It is one of the amazing turns in the history of art that in the last decades of the seventeenth century, at the time that Aglionby complains bitterly about the lack of interest in England, the collecting of paintings increased rapidly, among the aristocracy, as well as the country gentry and the well-to-do merchants.

In the last thirty years of the century, not only large quantities of paintings were imported from the continent; by then a considerable number of English painters started their careers, often trained in studios of the Flemish and Dutch. It was exactly in the same period that the number of painters and the high production of paintings in the Netherlands dwindled dramatically: in the final decades the number of professional painters in the cities of Holland dropped by three-quarters of those active at mid-century.³ As a result the large variation of genres and types of pictures also decreased radically, as Arnold Houbraken noted early in the eighteenth century: ‘...one can see that several parts of our art have been torn off and have descended into the grave with their praiseworthy makers.’⁴ Houbraken specifically mentions the depiction of the sea and ships, of cattle, of horses, of peasants, and of architecture as victims of this development. In fact, those are precisely the genres that from that time onwards would flower in England.

As a chronological framework for the topics discussed in the papers assembled in this volume, I will present a concise survey of the best known Dutch and Flemish artists who tried their luck in Britain. My account of this still far too little researched area is a rather familiar one; on significant points the papers add important new knowledge and insight, which, in turn, will hopefully stimulate further research on the many fascinating and still unanswered questions about the reasons and effects of the migration of artists to England.

When considering the Netherlandish artists working in Britain, we should realise that Dutch and Flemish artists swarmed out all over Europe. Apart from the considerable communities of Netherlandish artists in Paris and Rome, the Netherlands supplied the many German courts with artists, as well those in Copenhagen, Stockholm, Prague and Vienna. The emigration of Netherlandish artists to England is just one aspect of the migration

of Netherlandish artists throughout Europe, where, in contrast to the situation in their own country, those artists were principally employed at courts. Nonetheless, Britain certainly is a special case: Horst Gerson’s monumental and still indispensable *Ausbreitung und Nachwirkung der holländischen Malerei des 17ten Jahrhunderts* (1942) – the first and only study of Dutch artists in foreign countries, with 60 pages crammed with information on Dutch artists in England – makes this abundantly clear.⁵ And we should not forget that, besides the better known artists, many more Dutch and Flemish immigrants in England worked in the textile manufactory and related trades, in the brewing industry, manufacture of pottery, printing, publishing, and in many other crafts. In those fields their influence on the economy and culture might often have been greater than in the much more conspicuous field of the arts, as was discussed in the little book by David Ormrod that accompanied an exhibition in 1973 in the London Museum about the Dutch community in London between 1550 and 1800.⁶ In this volume, the stimulating contribution of Victor Morgan on the creation of an Anglo/Dutch provincial artistic tradition in Norwich by ‘resident strangers’ working within a civic culture, reveals the great importance of research on the artistic communities outside London and outside the court circles upon which the attention of art historians has always been focused.

Starting this account of the more well known Netherlandish artists in the Elizabethan period, the first important Flemish artist we meet with is Hans Eworth, or Ewouts, from Antwerp, who had a successful career as a portrait painter during the reign of Queen Mary, which continued well into the reign of Elizabeth I.⁷ In the late sixties the first wave of quite famous artists came to England and those were in the first place immigrants who took refuge in England for religious or economic reasons. Most of them came from the cities in Flanders and Brabant, especially from Antwerp, the city that in the decades before had become the commercial capital of Europe and certainly also the most important centre for the production of paintings. Based on primary archival sources, the research of Maximiliaan Martens and Natasja Peeters, published in this volume and covering the period 1550–1600, sheds new light on the migration of the many Antwerp artists and artisans and the striking social variation among these emigrants – from potential court artists to simple craftsmen.

The best known of those who fled for religious reasons, only stayed for a rather short period, like Lucas de Heere from Ghent who worked in London from 1568 to 1577 and Joris Hoefnagels who came in the same year but remained in London for only two years; both were members of a close knit group of humanist exiles.⁸ Although their stay was short, they produced some important works. De Heere made his series of *Costume Sketches* for his treatise on geography, customs and history of the British Isles. Some of

the works of Joris Hoefnagels, for instance the sketch of *Windsor Castle*, from which the preparatory drawing was made for the *Atlas* of Braun and Hogenberg, as well as his painting of *A fete at Bermondsey, with the Tower of London in the background* herald an important moment at the beginning of the development of topographical landscape in England.

Shortly after De Heere and Hoefnagels, in 1573, Cornelis Ketel from Gouda came to London. Karel van Mander describes his large paintings with allegories extensively, but none of those were known, until a few years ago a fragment turned up and was displayed in *Dynasties*, the important 1995 exhibition on painting in Tudor and Jacobean England mounted by Karen Hearn.⁹ Van Mander tells that Ketel left his native town for economic reasons and that he worked in London for the court. This might have been boasting, because the few English portraits by Ketel that are known today are not from the highest nobility.¹⁰ He returned in 1581 to settle in Amsterdam, disappointed because there was no interest for his history paintings but only for portraits in England, according to Van Mander.

An artist who did stay in England and had a successful career as portrait painter was Marcus Gheeraerts the Younger. In 1567/1568 he came to London as a seven years old boy with his father, the painter and engraver Marcus Gheeraerts the Elder, who fled for religious reasons. He belonged to the same circle as Lucas de Heere and Joris Hoefnagels. One of the few works we know from Gheeraerts the Elder's period in London is the beautiful *Portrait of Elizabeth as the progenitor of Peace*, of the early eighties.¹¹ One of the earliest works we know of his successful son is the spectacular *Ditchley portrait*, a large allegorical portrait of Queen Elizabeth, of around 1592.¹² In the beginning of the seventeenth century, during the reign of James I, Gheeraerts remained in favour and was paid as 'His Majesties Painter' for portraits of James and his wife Anne of Denmark, whose favourite he became. Only with the arrival of much younger painters from Holland, Paul van Somer and Daniel Mytens, was his art suddenly utterly out of fashion. However, during the second half of the sixteenth century more artists from Flemish descent were active around the court as portrait painters. A highly interesting new face has been added by Josua Bruyn, who identified paintings by Hubert Beuckelaer and convincingly argued that he worked in England as protégé of the Earl of Leicester in the 80's and 90's. Commissioning portraits from this artist must have been a conscious choice of Leicester and some other patrons in search of a more continental manner. Marcus Gheeraerts was a relative of the other quite successful portrait painter of this period: Johan de Critz the Elder, who might have been born in London as the son of an Antwerp goldsmith. De Critz began his career as a protégé of Sir Francis Walsingham and also worked for James I and Anne of Denmark. Since there are no signed works, all his paintings are attributions.¹³ Around de Critz we find a true family-network of portraitists in the important positions: de Critz was a pupil of Lucas de Heere and his

eldest sister became the second wife of Marcus Gheeraerts the Elder. A younger sister of De Critz married Marcus Gheeraerts the Younger and their daughter married the miniaturist Isac Oliver. James I seems to have favoured Johan de Critz. However, one look at his portraits makes clear why Michiel van Miereveldt and his followers must have come as a revelation.

An important moment, which seems to be the starting signal of the spectacular development of the Dutch depiction of ships and seascapes, is the commission of the Lord Admiral Charles Howard of Effingham to Hendrick Vroom, who was asked to design cartoons for tapestries of the *Victory over the Armada*. We know the tapestries only from eighteenth-century engravings by John Price, since the originals, hanging in the House of Lords, were lost in the fire of 1834.¹⁴ From the late 1590's onwards, largely by the incredible success of Hendrick Vroom, the seascape would grow into an immensely popular genre in The Netherlands. A few paintings by Hendrick Vroom, among them a large battle of Gibraltar that was part of the Dutch gift of 1610 to Henry Prince of Wales, and probably a few early works by Porcellis came in the Royal Collection.¹⁵ It is, however, quite amazing that this did not have any follow-up worth mentioning in England until late in the seventeenth century. No seascape painters of any importance worked in England until the arrival of the Van de Veldes in 1672; it was only then that the time was ripe for a spectacular offspring.

In great contrast to the enormous print production in sixteenth-century Flanders and Holland, it was only in the second half of the sixteenth century that anything noteworthy happened in the field of printmaking in England. However, until the 1590's this was very episodic. Not before the nineties did a regular production of single-sheet plates begin and those were almost exclusively portraits.

For a long time the top end of the market would be dominated by engravers trained in the Netherlands.¹⁶ Crispijn de Passe did some work for the English market after 1590 while he had his business in Cologne. Two of his sons, however, came to England: first Simon de Passe who arrived in London in 1616 but left in 1622, a year later his brother Willem de Passe arrived in London.¹⁷

The scant production of prints during the Elizabethan and Jacobean period, did not mean that there was a complete lack of such images at that time. Many prints were imported from the Netherlands, and the influence on British artists and artisans in furnishing, ornament and architectural decoration was overwhelming, as we know from the studies of Anthony Wells-Cole. The patronage of Bess of Hardwick, Countess of Shrewsbury at Chatsworth and Hardwick, discussed in this volume by Wells-Cole, is a great example of the complex, ingenious and idiosyncratic ways in which these were adapted for specific needs and purposes.

At the beginning of the seventeenth century the Netherlandish community still mainly consisted of religious refugees. It had grown enormously over the years and had the London Dutch Church as its institutional embodiment. On two occasions, studied by Gervase Hood in his contribution to this book, this community got engaged in extensive patronage of architects and painters: the coronation entry of James I in 1603–4 and of the planned entry of Charles I in 1625–6. In both cases the London Dutch Church commissioned ambitious triumphal arches, for which it contracted some well known architects and artists, the first time exclusively from their own circle, bringing over good artists from Antwerp. By the second occasion, there were enough artist of high quality available in England. This appears to document a movement from a period when the artistic community consisted of refugees who settled in England for religious and economic reasons, to one where its leading artistic figures came to England attracted by court patronage. Hood demonstrates how the iconography was not only meant to show off the learnedness of the makers, but that these commissions were designed to protect the religious and social position of the vulnerable Netherlandic community.

In 1611 Henry prince of Wales, a great admirer of Prince Maurits, was anxious to bring the much sought after Michiel van Miereveldt to the Stuart court. Serious attempts were made to lure this artist—the most important portrait painter at the Stadtholder's court, who also counted many English noblemen among his sitters¹⁸—into moving to London, but this remained without success. Van Miereveldt was the first of several very successful painters, such as Gerrit Dou and Caspar Netscher, who were persuaded to come to London but refused. These painters undoubtedly felt that as a free and successful artists/entrepreneur in a Dutch city—with clients flocking to their studios—they were economically better off than they would be at the English court.

However, several painters trained in the Van Miereveldt's manner would come; they introduced with great success new types of portraiture. The first was Paul van Somer, born in Antwerp but living in Amsterdam, who arrived in 1616 and immediately took the place of Marcus Gheraerts as the favourite painter of Anne of Denmark.¹⁹ Two years later Daniel Mytens arrived, apparently as a protégé of Thomas Howard, fourteenth Earl of Arundel.²⁰ The ambassador at The Hague, Sir Dudley Carleton, dealt many times with Michiel van Miereveldt as an intermediary, as Robert Hill shows in his paper. Carleton may also have stimulated Mytens's move to England, but there is no real evidence for this. As Hill argues, the importance of Carleton's role as a patron of Dutch artists might have been exaggerated by art historians, but Carleton's letters offer fascinating insights in the ambassador's actions as a conduit through which Dutch works of art made their way to England, which promoted the reputation of Dutch artists.

Daniel Mytens soon took over the position of Van Somer at the court when Van Somer died in 1621. Many courtiers close to members of the royal family were patrons of Mytens and Van Somer, and also some others like Abraham van Blijenberch got a chance.

Mytens's successful career as painter for the court of Charles I is well known. He painted almost all the members of the highest nobility around the court until he was eclipsed in the early thirties by Van Dyck, which made him change London for The Hague. Several times he painted in collaboration with the specialist in architectural painting Hendrick van Steenwijck the Younger from Antwerp, who came to London in 1617. Under Charles I, who must have been very interested in architectural painting, full length portraits placed in an impressive fantasy of palace architecture to enhance the royal grandeur developed into an English type of court portraiture that was not known on the continent.²¹ Hendrick van Steenwijck collaborated with many other artists, from Van Somer, Mytens and Cornelius Johnson to probably even Van Dyck.

Charles I also gave Gerard Houckgeest a few commissions for architectural perspectives, after Van Steenwijck had left in 1637; one of those was a painting with the figure of Henrietta Maria by Cornelius Johnson.²² Johnson, born in London from German-Dutch immigrant parents, was probably trained in England and Holland. Though keeping a personal and always distinctive manner, he easily adapted his style throughout his career to new tastes in portraiture. His great flexibility as an artist which is also apparent from his cooperation with other artists, his production of portraits in every possible size and his copying of works of others, is discussed by Karen Hearn in this volume. For some time Johnson was quite successful at court, but his patronage, too, dwindled because of the success of a real genius, Anthony van Dyck. Johnson left England in 1643, after the outbreak of the Civil War, and spent the last eighteen years of his life portraying English refugees and Dutch burghers in Middelburgh, Amsterdam and The Hague, adapting his style once again to his environment.

A strange outsider in this company was Hendrick Pot from Haarlem, mainly known as a painter of finely crafted merry companies and small portraits. He must have been in London in 1632 and made a few small portraits of Charles I and of Charles with Henrietta Maria, utterly different from the grandeur one had become used to at the court.²³ There can hardly be a greater contrast than with the work of Gerard van Honthorst, who was born to be a court painter, good as he obviously was in self-promotion. In Italy he already managed to have men like Scipione Borghese, Vincenzo Giustiniani, Cardinal del Monte and Cosimo II as patrons. This must have been the best imaginable entry in high circles of aristocrats and connoisseurs upon his return to his home country.²⁴

Van Honthorst shrewdly offered Sir Dudley Carleton in 1621 to make a trial painting, for which Carleton should propose the subject himself. This

painting, an Aeneas with his father fleeing Troy, was presented to the Earl of Arundel and was much admired by the latter.²⁵ In 1628 Van Honthorst went to London, probably in the service of the Duke of Buckingham. A huge 'portrait historié' of six and a half meters wide was undoubtedly the most spectacular painting he produced there. It shows Buckingham in the guise of Mercury introducing the Seven Liberal Arts to the King and Queen who are sitting on the clouds as Apollo and Diana.²⁶ Although Van Honthorst earned a lot of money in less than one year—he was even promised a guaranteed annual pension of a hundred pounds—he returned to Holland in the fall of 1628. As of that time, he did many commissions for the sister of Charles I, Elizabeth, wife of the by then deceased Frederick, the 'Winter King' of Bohemia residing as exiles in The Hague. He also acquired the patronage of the Stadtholder Frederik Hendrik and Amalia van Solms who were actively seeking a quasi royal status; Van Honthorst could provide them with the right kind of images.

Another artist with high aspirations—without Honthorst's background but working hard to get a position in high circles—was Rembrandt's friend Jan Lievens. He might have been encouraged by Huygens to go to London, where he arrived in 1632, possibly with a recommendation of Elizabeth of Bohemia. Like Hendrick Pot, he came in the same year as Van Dyck. Although reported to have made a portrait of the king among other things, we know almost no works of this English period, which lasted less than three years.²⁷

All painters were cast in the shadow by the arrival of Anthony van Dyck. In the last two decades of the 20th century the interest in Van Dyck's work, especially in his Genovese and English period, seems to have gone through a true revival, marked by a series of large exhibitions: from *Van Dyck in England* in 1983, organized by Sir Oliver Millar, up to the large and spectacular exhibition in 1999 in Antwerp and the Royal Academy, mounted by Hans Vlieghe and Christopher Brown.²⁸ Van Dyck's style had a far reaching effect on portraiture, not only in England, but also on the continent. Especially in Holland his style seems to have arrived by way of England. Adriaen Hanneman, having thoroughly absorbed Van Dyck's portrait style in England, introduced it in The Hague after his return in 1640.²⁹ Hanneman had great success among the aristocracy in The Hague and also made many portraits of the English nobility who came there as exiles after the fall of Charles I.

Van Dyck would have been received in England not so much as the great Flemish painter from Antwerp, but rather, as Christopher Brown recently argued, as the great painter completely immersed in the Venetian manner—as a *Titian redivivus*.³⁰ Venetian painting was undoubtedly paramount in the truly royal collection that Charles I assembled. However, he and his great fellow collectors Buckingham and Arundel, whose sophisticated tastes were geared towards Italy rather than the Netherlands, must also

have had a considerable interest in paintings from the Low Countries, as their collections testify.³¹

A man whose name always turns up in relation to the formation of such collections as well as in dealings with Honthorst, Van Dyck, or, for that matter, Rubens's work for the London court, is Balthasar Gerbier, painter, miniaturist, architect, art dealer, political agent, and general art busybody, as Waterhouse called him, in the service of Buckingham as well as the King.³² In her contribution to this volume Marika Keblusek describes him as a typical example of the cultural and political broker, who could satisfy the cultural as well as political demands of his patrons because of his versatility and his extensive networks throughout Europe

The rich tradition of topographical views reached its first high point in an anonymous painting with a View of London from Southwark, perhaps painted around 1630 by a master from the Netherlands,³³ and in the remarkable views of Claude de Jongh of around the same time. Those paintings, based on drawings made on the spot—his only certain visit to England was in 1627—all seem to have been made in the years after his return, the most beautiful being the Old London Bridge of 1630 in Kenwood House.³⁴

In the thirties the first landscape painters were attracted by the court. The awareness that landscape was a Netherlandish specialty was nicely expressed by Edward Norgate who wrote in 1641 that landscape is 'an Art soe new in England, and soe Lately come a shore, as all the Language within our fower Seas cannot find it a name but a borrowed one, and that from a People, that are noe great Lenders, but upon good Securitie (the Dutch) perhaps they will name their owne Child. For to say the truth the Art is theirs, and the best in that kind, that ever I saw spake Dutch, viz. Paulo Brill, a very rare Master in that Art, ...'³⁵ Like Gerard van Honthorst, Cornelis van Poelenburch, who had studied the works of Brill in Italy and developed his own refined type of idyllic Italianate landscapes there, had the perfect background.³⁶ When in Italy he found patronage at the grand ducal court of the Medici in Florence; back in Holland his work soon became popular among the aristocracy in Utrecht and The Hague, where he got commissions from Elizabeth of Bohemia and Amalia van Solms.³⁷ His connection with Elizabeth probably brought him to England where he stayed between 1637 and 1641 and lived in a house for which the rent was paid by the king. He seems to be about the only Dutch landscape painter in England who did not paint topographical views during this period. Alexander Keirincx, a specialist in fantastic wooded landscapes, joined Van Poelenburch in London and they apparently lived for some time in neighbouring houses. He certainly had to adapt his style to the painting of specific sites when he got the commission to depict the castles of the king. As Richard Townsend demonstrates in his contribution to this volume, these paintings occupy an important position in the early development of

the 'portraiture' of castles and country houses, which soon became a highly popular and typically English genre. Van Poelenburch and Keirincx both seem to have left London in 1641.

The Civil War and the Commonwealth Period meant a severe rupture. We noticed already that several of the most important painters left in the early forties. However one gifted painter arrived in 1641: Pieter van der Faes, better known as Sir Peter Lely. Not only did he become the true successor of Van Dyck, who had died in 1641, he also became the most successful English artist of the seventeenth century. Lely was trained as a history and portrait painter in Haarlem in the studio of Frans and Pieter de Grebber, but after a few years in England he turned to portraiture exclusively. He often worked for the same families that in the thirties had patronized Van Dyck, developing his own, heavier and somewhat less subtle brand of Van Dyckian elegance.³⁸ After the Restoration he became 'principal painter' of the king in 1661, with a yearly pension of two hundred pounds 'as formerly Sr. Vandyke', as a document states. 'But a mighty proud man he is, and full of state', remarked Samuel Pepys in his famous diary.³⁹ Lely organized a large studio with many assistants, some of whom became portrait painters of their own, like Willem Wissing, who was for a short period quite successful after Lely's death.⁴⁰ By that time, however, Lely's style had fallen out of fashion and his position was taken over by the German (but Dutch trained) Godfrey Kneller, who had arrived in 1674 and would have a brilliant career as the principal painter at the court of William and Mary.

Among the other many interesting passages in Pepys diary is his description of the paintings that Samuel Hoogstraten made for the London house of Thomas Povey: 'But above all things I do the most admire his piece of perspective, especially, he opening me the closet door and there I saw that there is nothing but only a plain picture hung upon the wall.'⁴¹ When the enterprising Van Hoogstraten came to England in 1662, he had already great success at the court in Vienna with his illusionist paintings. He undoubtedly envisioned acclaim at the court of Charles II with his *trompe l'oeil* and perspective paintings, but somehow he seems not to have penetrated the highest circles, returning to his hometown in 1667.

Another work Samuel Pepys writes enthusiastically about, shows again his admiration for convincing illusionism, is a flower painting by Simon Verelst. Pepys was fascinated by 'the drops of dew hanging on the leaves, so that I was forced again and again to put my finger to it to feel whether my eyes were deceived or no...'⁴² This was in 1669, shortly after Verelst had arrived in England. These are among the best known utterances about Dutch paintings in a diary, a kind of source that is almost completely lacking in The Netherlands.⁴³

After the restoration the scene changed radically. Quite a number of Netherlandish painters, almost exclusively from Holland,⁴⁴ followed in

the wake of the many royalist exiles who had resided in the Netherlands and had become acquainted with the art market there. Patronage was no longer clustered around the court and many painters found work with patrons embellishing their homes in and outside London; as a consequence the variety of subjects grew.

Especially in 1672—in Dutch history named the Year of Disaster—many Dutch painters emigrated to England for economic reasons. Painters still worked by commission mainly and had to adapt themselves to English preferences. The genre of the country house in bird's eye view in particular, of which a painter like Leonard Knyff made his specialty, expanded enormously.⁴⁵ Such paintings were also produced by other landscape painters from Holland; Hendrick Danckerts, Johan Vorsterman, Adriaen van Diest and Jan Griffier all had to apply themselves to this new specialization. Jan Siberechts from Antwerp, who had developed a quite idiosyncratic type of landscape with carts and peasant girls, turned to this genre as well after his arrival in England.⁴⁶

The versatile Abraham Hondius already made a career as a history painter in Rotterdam. In London he had success with paintings of hunters, dogs and game in landscapes. In this volume Sir Oliver Millar describes how Jan Wyck—one of those who arrived in 1672 and a painter whose art would have a lasting influence on English painting—had immediate success with his scenes of cavalry battles. His sporting paintings, that sprang from the battle scenes, stand at the beginning of a long and specifically English tradition.

In the seventies and eighties still lifes were painted by Van Roestraten, flowers especially by the already mentioned Verelst, landscapes by Jan Looten and Gerard van Edema, and genre paintings with peasants and other droll figures by Egbert van Heemskerck. Father and son Van de Velde had also arrived in 1672. They had realised that their prospects in England were much better than in the Netherlands. Other marine painters came as well in the seventies: Jacob Knyff and Adriaan van Diest were prolific in this field.⁴⁷

Never before were there so many Dutch painters of reasonable to good quality working in England as in the eighties. In contrast to the first half of the century most of them stayed and made (with varying success) their career, or the last part of their career, in England.⁴⁸ Many still worked there during the reign of William and Mary. By that time, however, the number of native painters had been growing rapidly. They would soon take over completely. Also in this period, the boom of the London art sales got under way, at first mainly depending on imported pictures.⁴⁹ Daniel Defoe commented that during the reign of William and Mary 'the love of fine paintings so universally spread itself amongst the nobility and persons of figure all over the kingdom, that it is incredible what collections have been made by English gentlemen since that time.'⁵⁰

The business of printmaking also picked up speed from the sixties onwards. The output vastly increased and especially the new technique of mezzotint created a new industry; for the transfer of the Dutch mezzotint to England Abraham Blooteling was a key figure.⁵¹ At the end of the century the production of topographical and architectural prints became extensive as well. This market, too, was at first still dominated by Dutch artists, especially by Leonard Knyff and Jan Kip. For David Jacques' studies of English gardens in the late seventeenth and early eighteenth century those prints were a primary source. In this volume Jacques discusses the function of these prints and demonstrates their important role in publicizing the great garden layouts of the day, as in the *Brittannia Illustrata* for which Knyff made the designs and Kip the engravings.

The arrival of William III in 1688 did not cause a new wave of painters coming to England. Not only was the formerly inexhaustible source running dry, the competition of English artists had become a serious threat to Dutch domination. During this period it was especially in garden design, architecture and the decorative arts that there was a marked Dutch influence.⁵² However, it was the French inspired court culture in particular that had the greatest impact. Its most important representative was the French huguenot Daniel Marot, who had moved from Holland to Hampton Court in 1694.⁵³ King William was accompanied by friends and relations who were placed in key positions in the Royal household and became active as patrons of architects and painters. Caroline Knight considers in this volume how the move to England of the two most important ones, Hans Willem Bentinck, made 1st Earl of Portland, and Arnold Joost van Keppel, made 1st Earl of Albemarle, affected their patronage, showing that they followed the King's taste: they used his architects, Jacob Roman and perhaps William Talman; his designer, Daniel Marot; his gardener, George London; and the same painters, such as Kneller for portraits and Bogdani for decorative painting.

If one considers the role of Netherlandish artists in Britain, the art of painting will always be most conspicuous: in that field they were seminal and is their contribution clearly marked. In sculpture, the decorative arts and architecture the Dutch influence was considerable, but less easy to define.

Mainly through prints and the treatises of Vredeman the Vries and others, knowledge of Flemish architecture and ornaments was available in England. But a strong architectural tradition developed in the wake of Inigo Jones who drew on the examples of Palladio and Scamozzi, and whose influence was felt throughout the seventeenth century. As Ormrod remarked: with the exception of William Wande, who was born in Holland of English parents, the entire succession of seventeenth- and early eighteenth century architects were native born, which differentiates this par-

ticular field from all others.⁵⁴ However, the Dutch classicism of Van Campen, Post and Vingboons as a source of inspiration for architects of a younger generation has recently been studied by Alison Stoesser. In this volume she considers the eclectic and creative way in which Robert Hooke made use of Dutch examples.

Under the reign of Queen Elizabeth the art of sculpture was already dominated by Flemings and Dutchmen; this meant that there was an Anglo-Dutch fundament when Nicholas Stone became the pupil (and son in law) of Hendrick de Keyser.⁵⁵ Other English sculptors, like Grinling Gibbons, also received their training in the Low Countries. François Dieussart, born in the Southern Netherlands, but with an international—especially Italian—training, introduced a modern baroque style not only in Holland but also in England, where he worked for some time for Charles I and the Earl of Arundel.⁵⁶

If we think of the relations between the Netherlands and England in the decorative arts, one of the few well known names that comes to mind is that of the younger member of the Van Vianen family, the silversmith Christiaan van Vianen, who was brought to England by Arundel, worked in London from 1635–1649 and introduced the lobar ornament there.⁵⁷ Although many Dutch craftsmen must have been working in England, especially in the second half of the seventeenth century, very little is known about who they were and what they produced. In furniture, the influence of the Southern Netherlands, especially of the style of Vredeman de Vries, was mainly through prints. In the second half of the seventeenth century important changes took place in English furniture, and in this development Gerrit Janssen or Jensen, possibly a Dutch craftsman, played an important role.⁵⁸ Jensen worked for the royal household of Charles II, James II, William and Mary, as well as Queen Anne. However, in some cases the importance of Dutch examples and Dutch immigrant craftsmen has in the past been exaggerated. It has generally been assumed, for instance, that floral marquetry furniture was a Dutch importation of about 1670, but Adriana Turpin argues in her contribution to this volume that influences from the continent were more complex: floral marquetry originates in France and it seems to have been taken up quickly in England. There is no supporting evidence that immigrant Dutch cabinet-makers were the transmitters.

In another area the Flemish and Dutch played a decisive role: the first London pottery was set up in 1571 by Jasper Andries and his son, together with Jacob Jansen. By 1700, nine delftware factories were functioning in London, including those of the Rotterdam immigrant potter John de Wilde, and of Jan van Hamme, who arrived from Delft in 1676, accompanied by his family and sixteen servants and workmen.⁵⁹

In the decorative arts, as in all other fields, the tables are turned in the eighteenth century, but in the case of furniture this is especially clear. English

furniture would become the great example for the Netherlands by the middle of the century. By that time, in all the arts the situation had changed radically. In the diagram of David Ormrod which shows the proportions of British and foreign artists from the Elizabethan period up to 1760, the Dutch have completely disappeared after the first quarter of the eighteenth century, while only a few Flemings are left.⁶⁰ There was, however, one field in which Dutch and Flemish painting would remain of great importance, in England as well as in other European countries. Especially in the second half of the eighteenth century the Dutch and Flemish masters of the seventeenth century, now old masters, became highly fashionable among all the great collectors. Andrew Moore presents fascinating insights in the acquisition and display of one of the most important earlier collections of Dutch and Flemish paintings: that of the Prime Minister Sir Robert Walpole, who acquired his many works of Dutch and Flemish masters between 1717 and 1742. Although the Walpole collection did not stay in England, it is through men like Robert Walpole that Britain can still boast some of the best and largest collections of Dutch paintings of the seventeenth century. These came to England and Scotland in a period that the Dutch really sold off the huge amounts of paintings they had amassed in their homes during the seventeenth century.

There is still much we would like to know and to understand about the role of the considerable numbers of Dutch and Flemish artists who took the risk to cross the North Sea and to work in an entirely different social and artistic climate; there are many questions about the road to success (or the causes for the lack of it), the adaptation to special demands of the English market, and the attitude of intermediaries and patrons towards Netherlandish art. The papers in this volume shed new light on several aspects of those issues, but they also have the purpose to stimulate further research on the many fascinating questions concerning this significant migration of artists.

NOTES

- 1 W. Aglionby, *Painting illustrated in three dialogues*, London 1685, pp. 23–24 and 98 respectively.
- 2 P. Mundy, *The travels of Peter Mundy in Europe and Asia, 1608–1667*, vol. 4, *Travels in Europe 1639–47* (ed. R. Carnac Temple), London 1925, p. 70.
- 3 J. de Vries, 'Art History', in: D. Freedberg and J. de Vries (eds.), *Art in History/History in Art. Studies in Seventeenth-Century Dutch Culture*, Santa Monica 1991, p. 264.
- 4 A. Houbraken, *De Grootte Schouburgh der Nederlantsche Konstschilders en Schilderessen*, Den Haag 1718–1721, dl. 2, p. 132.
- 5 H. Gerson, *Ausbreitung und Nachwirkung der holländischen Malerei des 17. Jahrhunderts*, Haarlem 1942. Here one still finds the most complete survey of Dutch painters working in Britain (pp. 365–431). For other important surveys of Dutch painters in Britain: O. Millar, 'Painting', in: exh.cat. *The Orange and the Rose. Holland and Britain in the Age of Observation, 1600–1750* (Victorian and Albert Museum), London 1964, pp. 22–25 and C. White, *The Dutch Pictures in the*

- Collection of Her Majesty the Queen*, Cambridge 1982, pp. xxxix–l. About Dutch and Flemish artists: S. Kollmann, *Niederländische Künstler und Kunst im London des 17. Jahrhunderts*, Hildesheim/Zürich/New York 2002 (with a useful appendix of Dutch and Flemish artists in Britain).
- 6 D. Ormrod, *The Dutch in London. The Influence of an Immigrant Community 1550–1899*, London 1973.
- 7 About Eworth and his contemporaries, see: exh.cat. *Dynasties. Painting in Tudor and Jacobean England 1530–1630* (ed. K. Hearn), London (Tate Gallery), 1995, pp. 63–76 with references to further literature, a.o. R. Strong, 'Hans Eworth reconsidered', *The Burlington Magazine*, 108 (1966), pp. 225–233.
- 8 For De Heere and Hoefnagels, with references to further literature, see exh.cat. *Dynasties* (1995), cat. nos. 35, 62 and 101. See about the group of humanist exiles a.o. K. Bostoen, *Bonis in bonum. Johan Radermacher de Oude (1538–1617), humanist en koopman*, Hilversum 1998.
- 9 Exh.cat. *Dynasties* (1995), pp. 109–112. T. Schulting, "'Sterckheyt van Wijsheyt en Voorsichticheyt verwonnen". Overwegingen bij een Allegorie van Cornelis Ketel', *Oud Holland*, 111 (1997), pp. 153–162. For Ketel in general: T. Schulting, 'Cornelis Ketel en zijn familie: een revisie', *Oud Holland*, 108 (1994), pp. 171–201. See also: exh.cat. *Dawn of the Golden Age*, Amsterdam (Rijksmuseum) 1993–1994 (W. Kloek a.o. eds.), Amsterdam/Zwolle 1993, pp. 383–384, 585–586.
- 10 Exh.cat. *Dynasties* (1995), pp. 104–105. Also see exh.cat. *Kunst voor de beeldenstorm* (J. P. Filedt Kok et. al. eds.), Amsterdam (Rijksmuseum) 1986, The Hague 1986, pp. 442–443.
- 11 Exh.cat. *Dynasties* (1995), pp. 86–87, with further references.
- 12 About the Ditchley portrait of Elizabeth I, see most recently: K. Hearn, *Marcus Gheeraerts II, Elizabeth an Artist in Focus*, London 2002, pp. 31–35, with further references. The most important literature being R. Strong, 'Elizabethan Painting, An Approach through Inscriptions – III. Marcus Gheeraerts the Younger', *The Burlington Magazine*, 105 (1963), pp. 149–157. Exh.cat. *The Elizabethan Image. Painting in England 1540–1620* (R. Strong ed.), London (National Portrait Gallery), 1969–1970 and R. Strong, *The English Icon: Elizabethan and Jacobean Portraiture*, London/New York 1969.
- 13 See the titles in note 12 and R. Strong, *Tudor and Jacobean Portraits*, 2 vols., Catalogue National Portrait Gallery, 1969, Exh.cat. *Dynasties* (1995), pp. 171, 184–185 and 192–193, with further references.
- 14 For the history of the tapestries, see M. Russell, *Visions of the Sea. Hendrick Vroom and the Origins of Dutch Marine Painting*, Leiden 1983, pp. 117–140.
- 15 J. G. van Gelder, 'Notes on the Royal Collection – IV: The "Dutch Gift" of 1610 to Henry, Prince of "Whalis" and Some Other Presents', *Burlington Magazine*, 105 (1963), pp. 541–544. J. Walsh, 'The Dutch Marine Painters Jan and Julius Porcellis – I. Jan's Early Career', *The Burlington Magazine*, 116 (1974), pp. 653–662.
- 16 See exhibition catalogue *The Print in Stuart Britain 1603–1689* (A. Griffiths ed.), London (The British Museum), 1998.
- 17 About the de Passe family in England, see exh.cat. *The Print in Stuart Britain 1603–1689* (1998), pp. 39–70 and I. Veldman, *Crispijn de Passe and his Progeny (1564–1670). A Century of Print Production*, Rotterdam 2001, chapter 9.
- 18 For instance, see: exh.cat. *Dynasties* (1995), pp. 203–204.
- 19 Idem, pp. 206–207, with further references.
- 20 On Mytens in general, see O. ter Kuile, 'Daniel Mytens', *Nederlands Kunsthistorisch Jaarboek*, 20 (1969), p. 1–106.
- 21 One of the earliest commissions must have been the portrait of Charles I as Prince of Wales before an architectural décor painted by Hendrick van Steenwijck; the portrait is probably by Paul van Somer or Abraham van Blijenberch. Exh.cat. *Dynasties* (1995), pp. 212–213.
- 22 Mentioned in the inventory by Van der Doort: 'Item a Prospective peece painted; by Gookgest and the Queenes Picture / therein at length don by Cornelius Johnson; O. Millar, 'Abraham van der Doort's Catalogue of the Collection of Charles I', *Walpole Society*, 37 (1960), p. 158, no. 9. For other references of works by Houckgeest, see: Chr. White, *The Dutch pictures in the Collection of Her Majesty the Queen*, Cambridge 1982, p. 63, no. 87.
- 23 White 1982, xxxii–xxxiii and no. 152.
- 24 About Honthorst in Italy, see J. R. Judson and R. E. O. Ekkart, *Gerrit van Honthorst*, Doornspijk 1999, pp. 6–14.
- 25 W. N. Sainsbury, *Original Unpublished Papers Illustrative of the Life of Sir Peter Paul Rubens, as an Artist and a Diplomatist*, London 1859, pp. 290–292. Also cited in H. Braun, *Gerrit und Willem Honthorst* (diss.), Göttingen 1966, pp. 340–388.
- 26 See White 1982, xxiii–xxix, and nos. 74–79. For the documents concerning Honthorst's stay in England, see Braun 1966, pp. 340–388. For the portraits painted in England: Judson and Ekkart 1999, pp. 25–28.

- 27 C. Brown, 'Jan Lievens in Leiden and London', *The Burlington Magazine*, 125 (1983), pp. 663–671.
- 28 Exh.cat. *Van Dyck in England* (O. Millar ed.), London (National Portrait Gallery) 1982–1983. Exh.cat. *Anthony van Dyck* (A. Wheelock, S. J. Barnes, J. S. Held eds.), Washington (National Gallery of Art) 1990–1991. Exh.cat. *Van Dyck 1599–1641* (C. Brown and H. Vlieghe eds.), Antwerpen (Koninklijk Museum voor Schone Kunsten), London (Royal Academy) 1999. C. Brown, *Van Dyck*, Oxford 1982.
- 29 O. ter Kuile, *Adriaen Hanneman, 1604–1671. Een Haags portretschilder*, Alphen aan den Rijn 1976.
- 30 Paper presented at Groningen University, October 21, 2000.
- 31 M. Bulder-van Nes, *Nederlandse schilderkunst in de collecties van Karel I (1600–1649) en Thomas Howard, graaf van Arundel (1585–1646)*, MA-thesis, Leiden University 1997. White 1982. A. M. Mc Gregor (ed.), *The Late King's Goods. Collections. Possessions and Patronage of Charles I in the Light of the Commonwealth Sale Inventories*. London/Oxford 1989. O. Millar, 'The inventories and Valuations of the King's Goods, 1649–1651', *Walpole Society*, 43 (1970–1972). D. Howarth, *Lord Arundel as a Collector and Patron* (diss.), New Haven/London 1985. R. Davies, 'An Inventory of the Duke of Buckingham's Pictures at York House in 1635', *The Burlington Magazine*, 10 (1907), pp. 376–378. J. Woods, 'Orazio Gentileschi and some Netherlandish artists in London; the patronage of the Duke of Buckingham, Charles I and Henrietta Maria', *Simiolus*, 28 (2000–2001), pp. 103–128.
- 32 I. G. Philips, 'Balthasar Gerbier and the Duke of Buckingham's Pictures', *The Burlington Magazine*, 99 (1957), pp. 155–156.
- 33 Exh.cat. *Dynasties* (1995), pp. 229–230, with further references.
- 34 M. J. Bok, 'Claude de Jongh, "Painter, Sorely Incapacitated in His Arms": A Study of His Milieu', *Mercury*, 10 (1989), pp. 41–56.
- 35 E. Norgate, *Miniatura, or the Art of Limning* (J. M. Muller and J. Murrell eds.), New Haven and London 1997, p. 82. See also: H. V. S. Ogden and M. S. Ogden, *English Taste in Landscape in the Seventeenth Century*, Ann Arbor 1955, p. 13.
- 36 N. C. Sluijter-Seijffert, *Cornelis van Poelenburch* (diss.), Leiden 1984.
- 37 About these paintings, see: N. C. Sluijter-Seijffert in: exh.cat. *Het gedroomde land. Pastorale schilderkunst in de Gouden Eeuw*, Utrecht (Centraal Museum), 1993, Utrecht/Zwolle 1993, pp. 245–247.
- 38 Exh.cat. *Sir Peter Lely* (O. Millar ed.), London (National Portrait Gallery), London 1978.
- 39 S. Pepys, *The Diary of Samuel Pepys*, 11 vols. (W. Matthews and R. Latham eds.), London 1970–1983, vol. 8, p. 129.
- 40 E. K. Waterhouse, *The Dictionary of 16th and 17th-century British Painters*, Suffolk 1998, vol. 1.
- 41 Pepys, vol. 4, p. 26. See C. Brusati, *Artifice and Illusion. The Art and Writing of Samuel van Hoogstraten*, Chicago and London 1995, p. 93 and M. Roscam Abbing, *De schilder en schrijver Samuel van Hoogstraten*, Leiden 1993, p. 61.
- 42 Pepys, vol. 3, p. 392.
- 43 For remarks on paintings in diaries, see S. Kollmann, *Niederländische Künstler und Kunst in London des 17. Jahrhunderts*, Hilderheim/Zürich/New York 2002, chapter V.
- 44 Up till this time the proportion of Flemish and Dutch were more or less in equilibrium. After the restoration the Flemish were far outnumbered by the Dutch. See figure 10.2 in: D. Ormrod, 'Cultural production and import substitution: the fine and decorative arts in London, 1660–1730,' in: Patrick O'Brien et al. (eds.), *Urban Achievement in Early Modern Europe. Golden Ages in Antwerp, Amsterdam and London*, Cambridge 2001, p. 217.
- 45 For a survey of the depiction of the country house, see J. Harris, *The artist and the country house*, London 1979.
- 46 For a concise survey of Dutch landscape painters in England, see G. M. G. Rubinstein, 'Artists from the Netherlands in Seventeenth-Century Britain: an Overview of their Landscape Works', in S. Groenvelt and M. Wintle, *Britain and the Netherlands*, 11 (1994), pp. 163–191.
- 47 On the Van de Velde, see especially M. S. Robinson, *Van de Velde. A Catalogue of the Paintings of the Elder and the Younger Willem van de Velde*, 2 vols., London 1990. See also exh.cat. *The Art of the Van de Velde. Paintings and drawings by the great Dutch marine artists and their English followers*, London (National Maritime Museum), London 1982. On the English followers of the Van de Velde's: F. N. B. Crocket, *Early Sea Painters 1660–1730. The Group who worked in England under the shadow of the Van de Velde*, Woodbridge (Suffolk), 1995.
- 48 About success and lack of success, especially of the painters arriving in the seventeenth century, see P. Hecht, 'Dutch Painters in England: Readings in Houbraken, Weyerman and Van Gool', in Groenvelt and Wintle 1994, pp. 150–163.
- 49 I. Pears, *The Discovery of Painting. The Growth of Interest in the Arts in England, 1680–1768*, New Haven and London 1988, pp. 52 and 58.
- 50 D. Defoe, *A Tour through the Whole Island of Great Britain* [1724], D. C. Browning ed., London 1974, vol. 1, p. 178.
- 51 Exh.cat. *The Print in Stuart Britain 1603–1689* (1998), chapter 8 and 9. D. Alexander, 'Dutch Mezzotint Engraving in Holland and England in the Seventeenth Century', *The Connoisseur*, 193 (1976), pp. 136–139.
- 52 Exh.cat. *The Age of William II and Mary II. Power, Politics and Patronage 1688–1702. A reference encyclopedia and exhibition catalogue* (R. P. Maccubin and M. Hamilton-Philips eds.), Williamsburg (The College of William and Mary in Virginia), New York (The Grolier Club), Washington D.C. (The Folger Shakespeare Library), 1988–1989, Williamsburg 1988, Part IV, 'Visual Arts', pp. 217–311 (essays by L. G. Schwoerer, J. Harris, J. Dixon Hunt, M. Hamilton-Philips, L. de Vries, D. Alexander, C. Schuckman, C. Saumarez Smith, A. Ray).
- 53 Saumarez-Smith, 'Decorative Arts', in: *The Age of William II and Mary II*, pp. 293–300.
- 54 Ormrod, 'Fine and decorative arts', p. 225.
- 55 For instance the Johnson (Jansen) family from Amsterdam, William Cure (Cuer) from Gouda, Richard Stevens from Brabant and Maximiliaan Colt from Arras. Frits Scholten presented an excellent survey of the sculptors working in England during the conference 'Dutch Artists in Britain, 1550–1750'. See M. Whinney, *Sculpture in Britain, 1530–1830*, Harmondsworth 1988 and E. Neurdenburg, *De zeventiende eeuwse beeldhouwkunst in de Noordelijke Nederlanden. Hendrick de Keyser, Artus Quellinus, Rombout Verhulst en tijdgenooten*, Amsterdam 1948, chapter vi.
- 56 F. Scholten, 'François Dieussaert, Constantijn Huygens, and the classical ideal in funerary sculpture', *Simiolus*, 25 (1997), 303–328.
- 57 J. ter Molen, *Van Vianen. Een Utrechtse familie van zilversmeden met internationale faam* (diss.), Leiden 1984.
- 58 Th. H. Lunsingh Scheurleer, 'The Decorative Arts', in: Exh.cat. *The Orange and the Rose. Holland and Britain in the Age of Observation, 1600–1750*, London (Victorian and Albert Museum) 1964, pp. 25–28.
- 59 F. Britton, *London Delftware*, London 1986, pp. 8–23.
- 60 Ormrod, 'Fine and decorative arts', table 10.2, p. 217.

Flemish far more than a dialect of Dutch. I'd like to congratulate you on the fact that you make a difference between Dutch and Flemish in your feature on Languages across Europe. Some people here in Belgium and the Netherlands are still fighting over the question whether there even is one. Officially Flemish does not exist, but every day life proves that it does. It pleases me even more that you indicate the nuances correctly. There is one big difference however. I can't imagine English television programmes being subtitled in the States and vice versa. Flemish drama series are! That is an important indicator of the language being similar, but not quite the same.