

PROPERTY OF THE DUKE OF GRAFTON

47

SIR ANTHONY VAN DYCK

(ANTWERP 1599-1641 LONDON)

Portrait of Thomas Wentworth, 1st Earl of Strafford (1593-1641), half-length, in armour

oil on canvas
41¼ x 33½ in. (112.4 x 85.1 cm.)
inscribed 'Thomas Wentworth Comes Straffordiae & / Prorex Hyberniae / 163[7]' (upper left)

£3,000,000-5,000,000
US\$4,300,000-7,100,000
€3,500,000-5,800,000

PROVENANCE:
King Charles I (1600-1649), by June 1640, his stamp on the reverse.
(Very probably) Henry Bennet, 1st Earl of Arlington (1618-1685), and by descent through his daughter, Isabella, Duchess of Grafton (c.1668-1723), by whom held in trust for her son, Charles FitzRoy, 2nd Duke of Grafton (1683-1757), and by inheritance at Euston Hall, Suffolk to the present owner.

EXHIBITED:
London, British Institution, *Pictures by Italian, Spanish, Flemish, Dutch, and French masters*, May 1836, no. 88.
London, British Institution, *The Works of Sir Joshua Reynolds, together with a selection of pictures by ancient and deceased British masters*, June 1843, no. 120.
London, The Grosvenor Gallery, *Exhibition of the Works of Sir Anthony van Dyck*, 1886-1887, no. 46.
Norwich, Norwich Castle Museum, *Family and Friends: a Regional Survey of British Portraiture*, September 1992, no. 22.

LITERATURE:
G. Vertue, 'Vertue Note Book: Volume I', *The Walpole Society*, XVIII, 1929-30, p. 70; 'Vertue Note Book: Volume III', *The Walpole Society*, XXII, 1933-34, p. 112; 'Vertue Note Book: Volume IV', *The Walpole Society*, XXIV, 1935-36, pp. 114-115.
J. Smith, *A Catalogue Raisonné of the Works of the Most Eminent Dutch, Flemish and French Painters*, London, 1831, III, p. 170, under no. 588.
L. Cust, *Anthony Van Dyck: An historical study of his life and works*, London, 1900, p. 284.
E. Larsen, *The paintings of Anthony van Dyck*, Freren, 1988, p. 508, no. A290.
O. Millar, in S.J. Barnes, *et. al.*, *Van Dyck: A Complete Catalogue of the Paintings*, New Haven and London, 2004, p. 599, no. IV.217.
J. Peill, *The English Country House*, London, 2013, pp. 105 and 116, illustrated.
M. Hallett, *Reynolds: Portraiture in Action*, New Haven and London, 2014, p. 186.

ENGRAVED:
Houbraken



The stamp of King Charles I on the reverse of the original canvas





‘Of the portraits van Dyck painted in London in the years when he was in the service of Charles I, none are more compelling or magnificent than those he painted of the Earl of Strafford’

- Sir Oliver Millar, 1986

Painted in 1639-40 for King Charles I, this commanding portrait of Thomas Wentworth, 1st Earl of Strafford is an outstanding masterpiece from van Dyck’s crowning artistic period in England. It was almost certainly acquired by Henry Bennet, 1st Earl of Arlington in the seventeenth century and has remained in the collection of his descendants to the present day. Before Strafford’s impeachment and subsequent execution on 12 May 1641, no individual occupied a more powerful position at Charles’ court and, fittingly, no individual outside the king’s immediate family sat to van Dyck on more occasions. The portraits of this dominant figure can be counted among the most ambitious of van Dyck’s career and provided some of the defining images of this tumultuous period in British history. Painted shortly before van Dyck’s premature death in 1641, this portrait represents the culmination of all that the artist had learnt from his master, Peter Paul Rubens, and from his Venetian predecessors, notably Titian. By developing his own distinctive style of portraiture van Dyck both revolutionised portraiture in Europe and left a legacy for future generations of artists from Gainsborough and Lawrence, to Sargent and Freud.

Thomas Wentworth, 1st Earl of Strafford, was one of the most significant figures of the political world in England prior to the outbreak of Civil War in 1642. As a key advisor to Charles I during the Personal Rule, the period the king ruled without Parliament between 1629 and 1640, his generally unpopular government of Ireland as Lord Lieutenant between 1633 and 1639, and later his leadership of a calamitous campaign against the rebelling Scots in 1639, contributed to the eventual eruption of Civil War in England. Through his portrait commissions to Charles I’s ‘principalle Paynter in Ordinarie’, Wentworth was able to articulate and promote his central position at court.

The sitter's biography

Wentworth’s early political career was marked by his opposition to the zealous anti-Spanish faction at Court and in Parliament, led by George Villiers, 1st Duke of Buckingham (1592-1628), a key advisor to both James I (1566-1625) and Charles I (1600-1649). His unsympathetic attitude to Buckingham and his party prompted Wentworth’s appointment as High Sheriff of Yorkshire in 1625, effectively excluding him from Parliament with duties which kept him in the North. By 1627, however, Wentworth had returned to London. On 22 July 1628, Wentworth was made Baron Wentworth and promised the presidency of the Council of the North (an administrative body responsible for improving governmental control and economic prosperity in Northern England), assuming the post later that year. With this appointment, Wentworth’s Royalist leanings became more pronounced.

The growing rift between Charles I and Parliament had reached a crisis by 1629 and Wentworth was forced to choose between supporting the Crown or his fellow Parliamentarians. He sided with the Royalist faction, arguing that the old Constitution, which he saw as threatened by a Parliament that wanted supremacy over the king, must be maintained. From this moment, Wentworth became a key figure of Charles I’s Personal Rule, leading the ‘Thorough Party’ alongside Archbishop William Laud (1573-1645) in the king’s council. By November 1629, Wentworth was serving as a Privy Counsellor and the following January was appointed

Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, arriving in Dublin in July 1633. Here, Wentworth rapidly established himself as a powerful, authoritarian ruler and, according to the diplomat Sir Thomas Roe, did: ‘great wonders and governs like a king, and hath taught that kingdom to show us an example of envy, by having parliaments and knowing wisely how to use them’ (J. Bruce and W.D. Hamilton, eds., *Calendar of State Papers of the Reign of Charles I*, London, 1967, VII, p. xxxviii). As Lord Lieutenant, Wentworth undertook to break the dominant power of the English landowners in the country, transform Ireland’s administration, establish a regularised system of legislation and promote trade. His handling of these matters proved widely unpopular, however, with many of his reforms viewed as serving English, rather than Irish, interests. Wentworth’s institution of the Castle Chamber (equivalent to Westminster’s Star Chamber, a judicial court composed of Privy Counsellors and common-law judges) became especially reviled for the ruthless and capricious manner in which cases were tried. Determined to impose English laws, customs and, crucially, religion on a resistant Ireland, Wentworth wrote in 1634: ‘I see plainly ... that, so long as this kingdom continues popish, they are not a people for the Crown of England to be confident of’ (cited in W. Knowler, ed., *The Earl of Strafforde’s Letters and Dispatches*, London, 1739, I, p. 351).

Following Archbishop Laud’s calamitous attempt to impose an episcopal system within the Church of Scotland in 1639, Wentworth was recalled to England. The following year, he was created Earl of Strafford and tasked with resolving the escalating Scottish crisis. His decision to wage war proved a decisive error. After eleven years of Personal Rule, Charles I had been forced to recall Parliament in an effort to raise funds for his campaigns against the Scots. The Commons, however, obstinately refused such demands and was again disbanded. Strafford’s military campaigns proved equally ineffective, failing to prevent Scottish forces overrunning England’s Northern counties. Unable to finance his troops or to pay off the Scots, Charles was forced to reinstate Parliament once more in November 1640. Attention soon concentrated on Strafford’s part in these events and he was held up as a chief object of vilification across the kingdom. On 10 November, he travelled to London, intent on impeaching the king’s most outspoken opponents in Parliament for treasonous correspondences with the Scots. Parliament, however, out-manoeuvred him with John Pym (1584-1643), leader of the House of Commons, impeaching Strafford himself before he was able to take his seat in the Lords.

In March 1641, Strafford was tried. Accused of subverting the law, offering to bring an army from Ireland to subdue the king’s opponents in England and of various administrative offences in the North and Ireland, he defended himself stoutly but his fate was sealed. Pym introduced a Bill of Attainder (a summary condemnation to death by special act of Parliament) on 13 April, which was soon passed through both Houses. The Bill was then handed to the king. Fearing any worsening of the already widespread national unrest and with Strafford’s resignation of the king’s promise for protection, Charles reluctantly gave his signature. On 12 May 1641, the Earl of Strafford was sent to the scaffold, maintaining even in his final speech his belief in: ‘the joint and individual prosperity of the King and his people’ (cited in C.V. Wedgewood, *Thomas Wentworth, 1st Earl of Strafford: A Revaluation*, London, 1961, p. 387). A year later, Civil War broke out across England.

Van Dyck's portraits of the Earl of Strafford

Van Dyck painted five portraits of Wentworth during the latter's lifetime, all but one of which depicted the sitter in armour and holding a military commander's baton. The Grafton picture is the last of this martial series. The soldierly overtones of the majority of Wentworth's portraits by van Dyck can be regarded as part of the sitter's carefully articulated visual propaganda, deliberately using his portrait commissions to establish and fashion his public identity. Wentworth's self-fashioning was ably served by van Dyck. Wentworth's several commissions to the artist frequently relied on prototypes by Old Masters (O. Millar, *Van Dyck in England*, exhibition catalogue, London, 1982, p. 56). His full-length portrait in armour, the first painted by van Dyck between 1635 and 1636 (fig. 1; Trustees of the Rt Hon. Olive, Countess Fitzwilliam's Chattels Settlement and Lady Juliet Tadgell), for example, derived from Titian's *Portrait of Charles V with a dog*, which was then in the Royal Collection and displayed in the Bear Gallery at Whitehall Palace (now Madrid, Museo Nacional del Prado). Recording Wentworth's position as Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, the portrait creates an image which amply conveys a sense of considerable power, serving as a 'magnificent statement of authority' (O. Millar, *op. cit.*, 2004, p. 597). The sitter is shown in armour, holding a military baton, his hand resting on the head of a hound, whose counterpart in Titian's portrait had been identified by van der Doort as 'a bigge white irish dogge' (O. Millar, ed., 'Abraham van der Doort's Catalogue of the Collections of Charles I', *Walpole Society*, XLIII, 1970-72, p. 4). This identification seems clearly to have been appropriated in van Dyck's portrait as a means of subtly visualising Wentworth's rule over Ireland.

The second of van Dyck's likenesses of Wentworth (Petworth House, Sussex), depicting the sitter in three-quarter-length holding a commander's baton and gesturing to a military encampment beyond, was modelled in part on the principal figure in Titian's *Allocution of Alfonso d'Avalos*, which was at the time hanging in the First Privy Lodging Room at Whitehall (now Madrid, Museo Nacional del Prado). Van Dyck had begun the picture in the summer of 1636, when Wentworth briefly returned to England and sat to van Dyck at Eltham Palace. Two pictures were produced from this sitting, the second being an extended version of the first, painted for William Cavendish, Earl, and later 1st Duke, of Newcastle (1592-1676), a prominent Royalist who had been promoted Governor to Prince Charles in 1638 (Private collection, England). The Petworth portrait was intended for 'my Ladye of Carlile', Lucy Percy, Countess of Carlisle (1600-c. 1660). The presentation of his portrait to Lady Carlisle was reciprocated early the following year when she had her own portrait by van Dyck given to Wentworth (Trustees of the Rt Hon. Olive, Countess Fitzwilliam's Chattels Settlement and Lady Juliet Tadgell). The significance of this exchange is important in demonstrating the ways in which Strafford utilised his portraits as a means of assuring and displaying his political associations and allegiances. Lucy, Countess of Carlisle was a favourite of Queen Henrietta Maria and had been appointed Lady of the Bedchamber in 1626. A 'beautiful, intelligent and dangerous *politique*', she was a conspicuous figure at court and a valued ally of Strafford (O. Millar, *op. cit.*, 1986, p. 118). Rumoured to have been Wentworth's mistress, she fervently supported the Royalist cause during the Civil War, pawning jewellery to raise money for the war effort and helping to established communication between Prince Charles, scattered bands of Royalist supporters and the Queen. The exchange of portraits by van Dyck between the Countess and Wentworth, at the height of their influence and power, demonstrates the importance attached to painted images, whose display served as a means to visually affirm political and social loyalties.



Fig. 1 Sir Anthony van Dyck, *Thomas Wentworth, 1st Earl of Strafford*, Private collection © Bridgeman Images

The present portrait of Wentworth can be dated to a few years after the Eltham sitting and was certainly based on a renewed *ad vivum* sitting between the Earl and van Dyck. This is most likely to have taken place in London between September 1639 and March 1640. George Vertue recorded an early-eighteenth century inscription (now lost and presumably added slightly later than the completion of the canvas) recording a date of 1637, which cannot record the date of execution, since Strafford was absent from the capital that year. The new sittings also provided the model for the celebrated portrait of Wentworth with his secretary Sir Philip Mainwaring, one of van Dyck's most significant and lauded English pictures, which became hugely influential to later painters (fig. 2; Trustees of the Rt Hon. Olive, Countess Fitzwilliam's Chattels Settlement and Lady Juliet Tadgell). That picture was based on Titian's portrait of Georges d'Armagnac with



Fig. 2 Sir Anthony van Dyck, *Thomas Wentworth, 1st Earl of Strafford, with his secretary Sir Philip Mainwaring*, Private collection

Guillaume Philandrier (Alnwick Castle), a work van Dyck would have seen when in the collection of the Earl of Northumberland, and which in turn was almost certainly influenced by Sebastiano del Piombo's *Cardinal Ferry Carondelet with his secretaries* (c. 1512; Madrid, Museo Nacional Thyssen-Bornemisza). Van Dyck may well have encountered Sebastiano's masterpiece when it was in the collection of the Earl and Countess of Arundel, key early patrons of the artist, after which the picture entered the collection of the Earl of Arlington, where it hung alongside the present portrait of Strafford.

As with Wentworth's other portraits, this picture is modelled closely on a painting in the Royal Collection. In this case, rather than relying on the example of Titian, van Dyck modelled his painting on the depiction of Saint William, painted in *circa* 1530-35 by the Ferrarese master Dosso

Dossi, which had been acquired by Charles I for the Royal Collection (Hampton Court, Royal Collection). Included in the inventory compiled in 1639 by Abraham van de Doort, this painting had been initially attributed to Michiel Coxcie and identified not as St William but as 'the Picture of Charles Ardox the last duke of Burgon [Burgundy]' (O. Millar, *op. cit.*, 1970-72, p. 20; the picture was later catalogued in the 1649-51 catalogue of the sale of the king's goods as by Sebastiano del Piombo, but the subject still identified as a portrait of Charles the Bold, Duke of Burgundy). The pose of Wentworth's portrait closely follows the depiction of the armoured saint, presenting the figure at bust-length, one arm leaning on a stone ledge, the other resting on a helmet. The martial aspect of Dosso's canvas, and the historical reputation of Charles the Bold's military prowess, perhaps provided the initial impetus for van Dyck's choice of model.



Fig. 3 Tim Watson examining the stamp of King Charles I as revealed when the old relining canvas was removed © Christie's

Restoration

Recent restoration of the picture, carried out by Shepherd Conservation (London), has revealed the paint surface to be extremely well preserved, allowing for a full appreciation of van Dyck's celebrated *ad vivum* technique. In the 2004 catalogue of van Dyck's paintings, Sir Oliver Millar noted the: 'excellent quality throughout, particularly in the handling of the armour, and the head has considerable power', but suggested the canvas appeared to be 'fairly severely rubbed' (*op. cit.*). The recent cleaning has dispelled this last assessment by showing that those passages previously judged to be worn, no doubt on account of the layers of old discoloured varnish, are in fact the areas where van Dyck has employed the canvas ground, brilliantly combined with rapidly applied flashes of lead white, to create a sense of the three dimensional, solid form of the sitter's glistening armour. Moreover, the startling fluency and economy of brushwork in the Grafton portrait confirm that here, unlike many of his late works from this period, van Dyck refrained from delegating any element of the composition to an assistant.

It was during the picture's restoration that the remarkable discovery of the original collector's stamp of Charles I on the reverse of the original canvas was made following the removal (by Tim Watson) of the old relining canvas (fig. 3). This marking indicates that the portrait of Strafford was either commissioned by, or given to the king and was displayed with his extensive collections at a royal palace in London. It must thus have been among the last pictures to receive the stamp which King Charles I's Surveyor, van der Doort stamped on the reverse of pictures in the king's collection, before he committed suicide in June 1640. The picture presumably was acquired too late to be included in his great catalogue, and may well have been discarded when the earl was impeached in 1641. Had it been kept, the king might well have disposed of it in embarrassment after he realized how disloyal he himself had been to his most accomplished servant. In any case, it is not recorded in the Commonwealth sales of 1649-53.



detail of the present lot during restoration with the old discoloured varnish partially removed from the sitter's face © Shepherd Conservation

Royal Provenance

King Charles I was undoubtedly the greatest collector of pictures of his time in Europe, forming the most remarkable collection of masterpieces that has ever been assembled in this country, and one that ranked on equal terms with the collections formed over successive generations by the great royal houses of Europe. No visitor to any of the royal palaces from the mid-1630s could have been in any doubt as to Charles I's admiration for van Dyck, who returned to England in April 1632 and two months later was knighted and appointed 'principalle Paynter in Ordinarie to their Majesties'. The 'greate peece' of the king and queen with their two elder children for Whitehall (Royal Collection) and the double portrait, now at Kroměříž, must immediately have demonstrated his superiority as an artist to Daniel Mytens whom the king had previously employed. The sequence of portraits of the royal family that followed was of immense distinction. Van Dyck transformed a man who was less favoured by nature than his elder brother into an exemplar of the qualities of kingship in a way that no artist since Titian had achieved. From the equestrian portrait of 1633 for the Gallery at St. James's (Royal Collection), by way of the portrait of the king hunting of about 1636 (Paris, Louvre), to the second equestrian portrait intended for Hampton Court of 1636-7 (London, National Gallery) and the formal whole-length (Royal Collection), supplied, with five other family portraits and a pair of the queen's brother, the duc d'Orleans and his wife, for the Cross Gallery at Somerset House, the progression of van Dyck's portraits of King Charles still condition our vision of the Stuart monarchy and no doubt influenced the king's own sense of his role. But it was not merely as a court portraitist that van Dyck was admired by Charles I. For he acquired portraits of a very different kind, of the artist's mistress Margaret Lemon (Royal Collection), of the agent Nicholas Lanier (Madrid, Prado), of the musician Henri Liberti (private collection), and also commissioned, in 1638-9, the poetic *Cupid and Psyche* (Royal Collection). In all he owned about thirty pictures by the artist.



Fig. 4 Sebastiano del Piombo, *Cardinal Ferry Carondelet with his secretaries*, Museo Nacional Thyssen-Bornemisza, Madrid © Bridgeman Images



Sir Peter Lely and Studio, *Henry Bennet, 1st Earl of Arlington* (detail), Euston Hall, Duke of Grafton

The king's ownership of this portrait, whether it was commissioned by Charles or a gift from Strafford, demonstrates the highly significant position the Earl came to possess in the Royal counsel. Painted as it was in late 1639 or early 1640, the portrait was made after Wentworth's return from Ireland when his influence at Court had reached its apogee. The strong military power of the pose, adapted from the presumed portrait of the famously warlike Duke of Burgundy, must have made a strong and imposing statement about Strafford's military prowess at the moment he was embarking on his campaigns in Scotland and the North of England. At the same time, it shows the culmination of his ascendancy at Court and the height of his favour with the king before his dramatic fall only a year later.

This royal provenance is all the more remarkable when one considers that, excluding portraits of the king himself and his immediate family, only three portraits of noble sitters can be definitively placed in the Royal Collection (this is excluding the posthumous portraits of James I and Prince Henry Frederick, which van Dyck painted in *circa* 1633). Of these, two depicted the children of the deceased Duke of Buckingham: a portrait of Lady Mary Villiers, Lady Herbert, later Duchess of Lennox and Richmond (either that now in the Timken Museum of Art, San Diego, or her portrait in the Royal Collection) and the *Double Portrait of George Villiers, 2nd Duke of Buckingham and his brother Lord Francis Villiers* (Royal Collection). These were hung together in the Gallery at St James's Palace. The other portrait by van Dyck depicting noble sitters which certainly belonged to the king was the double portrait of his nephews, Prince Charles Louis, Elector Palatine and Prince Rupert (Paris, Musée du Louvre), though this should perhaps more properly be included amongst the king's family portraits.

Given Strafford's reputation, there would have been little or no market for a portrait of him until after the Restoration in 1660. In the changed artistic atmosphere of the times, collecting was then once more in vogue. Strenuous efforts were made to recover pictures from his father's collection for King Charles II. Of his early ministers, Edward Hyde, 1st Earl of Clarendon, the architect of the Restoration who served as Chancellor from 1660 until 1667, formed an outstanding collection of portraits; while Henry Bennet, 1st Earl of Arlington, who also acquired portraits, was an altogether more discriminating buyer. He had travelled extensively on the



Euston Hall, Euston, Suffolk, the seat of the Duke of Grafton

continent during the interregnum, visiting France and Italy, before settling in Flanders and being sent as Charles II's envoy to Madrid in 1658.

Bennet was a more mercurial politician than Clarendon, serving the king as Keeper of the Privy Purse, as Secretary of State and as Lord Chamberlain until his death. At differing times he had varying degrees of influence on Charles II. The rewards of office, and perhaps the secret grant of 10,000 crowns paid by King Louis XIV to his wife in connection with the 'Secret' Treaty of Dover, enabled Arlington, as he became in 1666, to build Goring House in London and Euston Hall in Suffolk. John Evelyn documented his serious interest in pictures. On 19 August 1673 he 'dined with my L. *Arlington*, & then went with him to see some Pictures in Lond[on]' (*The Diary of John Evelyn*, E.S. de Beer, ed., Oxford, 1955, IV, p. 23). On 16 November 1676 he wrote:

My *sonn* & I dining at my *Lo: Chamberlaines*, he shewed us, amongst others that incomparable piece of *Raphaels* being a *Minister of state* dictating to *Guicciardine*, the earnestnesse of the Secretary looking up in expectation of what he was next to write, is so to the life, & so natural, as I esteeme it for one of the choices[t] pieces of that admirable Artist: [Sebastiano del Piombo, *Cardinal Ferry Carondelet and his Secretary*; Madrid, Museo Thyssen]. There was another womans head of *Leonardo da Vinci*; a Madonna in a leaning posture [New York, Metropolitan Museum of Art]; the other an *Eunuch* singing [Henri Liberti]; but rare pieces indeede:

Evelyn later visited Arlington at Euston, recording the mural decoration there that had been Antonio Verrio's first English commission.

Arlington was closely involved with the 'management' of the king's mistresses and as early as 1662 sided with Barbara Villiers, then Countess of Castlemaine, but later Duchess of Cleveland, against Clarendon. His only daughter, Isabella, was married to Villiers' second son by the king, Henry FitzRoy, on 1 August 1672. On 16 August FitzRoy was created Earl of Euston and in 1685, after his father-in-law's death, was elevated as Duke of Grafton. He died in 1690.

On 5 June 1718 thirty-nine pictures were assigned by his widow Duchess, who had married Sir Thomas Hanmer, 4th Bt., in 1698, in trust for her

son, Charles, 2nd Duke of Grafton. All the pictures Evelyn had recorded at Goring House were included; and with the exception of portraits of the Duchess of Cleveland by Lely and Lord Euston by Kneller at the bottom of the list, which is not numbered, it seems likely that all the pictures in question had been acquired by Arlington and placed in Goring House rather than at Euston. Over half the pictures were by Italian artists. Thirteen were given specific attributions: the 'Raphael'; the 'picture of a man in the dark by Leonard di Vinci' which Evelyn had thought was of a woman; three Palmas; a 'Perino del Vaga'; a portrait by a Giorgionesque painter given to Beccafumi; a Tintoretto portrait; a devotional picture by the 'young Palma'; a *Noah* assigned to Camillo Procaccini; a version of Guercino's *Dido*; an Albano; and Carlo Dolci's *David with the Head of Goliath* (presumably the picture of the subject ordered by the diplomat Sir John Finch in 1670). In addition there were portraits of a doge and a procurator of S. Marco. There were two early-sixteenth-century portraits: one of 'Erasmus writing ... In little', the other 'A picture of a Man in little half length by Quentin [Massys]'. Of the three van Dycks, the Stafford [no. 8] was listed before the self-portrait [no. 10] and the picture of Liberti, recorded as 'A musician ..., a golden chain about him' [no. 13]. A three-quarter length of Arlington in black by Lely no doubt had a particular meaning for his daughter, as must the two miniatures on the list by Cooper, one of Arlington, the other of King Charles II. Arlington no doubt had himself commissioned the seapiece showing the vessel on which the king had escaped after the Battle of Worcester. Taken in conjunction with Evelyn's account, the 1718 document establishes that although Arlington's collection was small by comparison with the Duke of Buckingham's, he owned in the Sebastiano (fig. 4) one of the very greatest portraits of the High Renaissance, as well as three very different masterpieces by van Dyck. We do not know from whom the latter were obtained, but it is likely that a vendor of the Strafford would have had this relined, as otherwise Arlington would surely have considered that it should be returned to the Royal Collection: it was perhaps for a similar reason that the portrait of Lady Mary Villiers formerly in the Dartmouth collection (Millar, *op. cit.*, 2004, no. IV. 203) was lined, covering the CR stamp. It may not be coincidental that like the Grafton portrait of Strafford that picture was not listed by van der Doort or recorded in the inventories of the King's Goods of 1649-53.