

restoration the canvas was restored to its present large stretcher and a strip 2.5 cm in width was added to the top to provide some space between the hat and the top edge of the painting area.

Notes

1. According to HdG 1907–1927, 3: 294, bequeathed by Lord Frederick Campbell to an ancestor of Earl Amherst. According to notes of Edith Standen, Widener's secretary for art, in NGA curatorial files, the painting was bequeathed about 1820 by Lord Frederick Campbell to Lord Amherst. Getty Provenance Index identified this ancestor of Earl Amherst as William Pitt.

2. Although the ownership of the 2nd and 3rd Earl Amherst cannot be documented, Sedelmeyer 1911, no. 11, lists the work as from the collection of Lord Amherst, in whose family it had been for nearly one hundred years. Transcript of bill of sale (in NGA curatorial files) from Sedelmeyer Gallery to Widener repeats this information.

3. Slive 1970–1974, 1: 182.

4. Mauritshuis 1977, 103, no. 459 repro.; Slive 1970–1974, 3: no. 32.

5. Inv. no. 91.26.9; Slive 1970–1974, 2: no. pl. 298, 3: no. 190.

6. Inv. no. M.I.927, 108 x 80 cm; Valentiner 1921a, 320; Slive 1970–1974, 2: pls. 252, 254; 3: no. 171.

References

1907–1927 HdG, 3 (1910): 84, no. 294.

1909 London: no. 9, repro.

1909 Moes: 107, no. 162.

1910 “New Prints”: 237–238.

1911 Paris: no. 11.

1913–1916 Widener, 1 (1913): unpaginated, no. 16, repro.

1914 Bode and Binder: 2: 66, no. 247, pl. 156 (also English ed., 2: 19, no. 247, pl. 156).

1921a Valentiner: 320, 242 repro. (also 1923 rev. ed.: 321, repro. 256).

1923 Widener: unpaginated, repro. opp.

1930 Dülberg: 194, 198, repro. 196.

1931 Widener: 84, repro. 85.

1932 Hind: 89, pl. 64.

1935 Tietze: 336, 164 repro. (also 1939 English ed., New York).

1936 Valentiner: unpaginated, no. 97, repro.

1938 Waldmann: 335–343.

1942 Widener: 5, no. 625.

1948 Widener: 50, no. 625, repro.

1963 Walker: 337, repro. 312.

1965 NGA: 66, no. 625.

1968 NGA: 170, no. 625, repro. 58.

1970–1974 Slive, 2 (1970): pl. 302; 3 (1974): 88, 99, cat. no. 191.

1972 Grimm: 110–111, 155, 205, no. 145, figs. 163, 167.

1974 Montagni: 106, no. 183 repro. (also 1976 French ed.).

1975 NGA: 170–171, no. 625, repro.

1976 Walker: 268–269, no. 355, color repro.

1985 NGA: 197 repro.

1986 Sutton: 309.

1989b Washington: no. 71.

1989 Grimm: 189, fig. 69, 194–195, 289, no. 135, repro.

Adriaen Hanneman

c. 1603/1604–1671

ADRIAEN HANNEMAN was born in The Hague in either 1603 or 1604. In 1619, he became a pupil of The Hague portrait painter Anthony van Ravesteyn the Younger (before 1580–1669), and from this point on was exclusively a portraitist.

In 1626, Hanneman went to England, where he lived and worked until 1638. In 1630, he married an Englishwoman named Elizabeth Wilson, the first of three marriages, none of which seems to have produced any children. A crucial event in Hanneman's career was the arrival of Anthony van Dyck in London in 1632. Van Dyck's style had a lasting effect on Hanneman, who was described by Cornelis de Bie in 1661 as a counterfeiter of the style of Van Dyck. Although the pejorative implications of this comment are perhaps misplaced, it is certainly true that some of Hanneman's better works, including

the National Gallery's *Henry, Duke of Gloucester* (1937.1.51), are so strikingly Van Dyckian that their correct attribution has on occasions gone undetected.

In 1640, shortly after his return to The Hague, Hanneman was married for the second time, to Maria, daughter of Jan Anthonisz. van Ravesteyn, the elder brother of his teacher. Hanneman entered the city's Guild of Saint Luke in the same year. During the 1640s he assumed leadership positions within the guild: in 1643 he was elected *boofdman*, and two years later he was named *deken*, the highest position in the guild. In 1656, Hanneman played an important part in setting up a rival guild for painters, engravers, and sculptors—the Confrerie—serving as *deken* and *boofdman* several times during the 1660s.

Hanneman continued to paint portraits in an aris-

tocratic, Anglo-Flemish manner in The Hague, where a great demand existed for portraits made in the style of Van Dyck. His patrons included the exiled members of the English court, a number of whom visited Mary Stuart, the daughter of Charles I and the wife of Willem II, the Prince of Orange.

Hanneman's work was favorably received. By 1641 he was wealthy enough to buy a house in The Hague's fashionable Nobelstraat and to purchase the adjoining property in 1657. After 1668, however, he appears to have had serious financial problems, and it is possible that an illness from which he is known to have suffered in that year left him unable to paint. He was married again in 1669, to Alida Besemer, but died not long after, in July 1671.

Bibliography

- De Bie 1661/1971: 412.
Bredius 1896.
Toynbee 1950.
Toynbee 1958.
Ter Kuile 1976.

1937.1.51 (51)

Henry, Duke of Gloucester

c. 1653

Oil on canvas, 104.8 x 87 (41¼ x 34¼)
Andrew W. Mellon Collection

Technical Notes: The original support, a medium-weight, plain-weave fabric, was lined with the tacking margin cropped, but the original dimensions retained. Paint has been applied fluidly over a smooth, moderately thick white ground layer. Dark sketchy glazes were employed to create shadows and broad outlines of forms, and small lumps of impasto were applied to the brocade and highlights. A gap between the background paint and the hair reveals a lighter underpaint layer and creates a halo effect around the head.

X-radiography reveals minor adjustments by the artist to the folds of the white cuffs. Discolored retouchings cover numerous small losses in the lower quarter of the painting. Moderate abrasion is found overall, and glazes have been thinned around the collar and hands. A thick, discolored varnish layer covers the surface. The painting was last treated in 1931, when it was cleaned and lined.

Provenance: Count Heinrich von Brühl [1700–1763], Dresden; his heirs, until 1769; Catherine II, empress of Russia [1729–1796], Saint Petersburg; Imperial Hermitage Gallery, Saint Petersburg; sold November 1930 through (Matthiesen Gallery, Berlin; P. & D. Colnaghi & Co., London; and M. Knoedler & Co., New York) to Andrew W. Mellon, Pittsburgh and Washington; deeded 30 March 1932 to The A. W. Mellon Educational and Charitable Trust, Pittsburgh.

THE SPLENDIDLY DRESSED YOUTH in this three-quarter-length portrait looks out assuredly at the viewer from a landscape setting. With a commanding gesture, he rests his right hand on a staff before him while he turns to his left and places his near hand over the hilt of a gold-topped rapier. His gold doublet, richly brocaded with gold and silver threads, has split sleeves that reveal a white blouse with large, pleated cuffs. His breastplate is crossed by a blue ribbon that lies under his flat, white collar and tassel. The brown rock cliff, which provides a neutral background for this elegant figure, is broadly painted, as is the distant landscape vista to the left.

Both the identity of the sitter and the artist who painted him have been the subject of much speculation in the literature.¹ Descamps, who was the first to mention the painting, while it was in the possession of Count Heinrich von Brühl (1700–1763) in Dresden, identified it as a portrait of Willem II by Hanneman.² Smith catalogued it in 1831 as a portrait by Anthony van Dyck,³ and most, although not all, subsequent writers followed suit. Just prior to the sale of the painting from the Hermitage in 1931, the attribution issues were so intense that, as Walker recounts, large amounts of money were paid to ensure that scholarly authorities upheld the Van Dyck attribution.⁴ However, neither the attribution to Van Dyck nor the identification of the sitter as Willem II, Prince of Orange, can be supported. As Toynbee has pointed out, other depictions of Willem II are quite different from the youth represented in this portrait.⁵ Moreover, while this youth wears the blue sash of the Order of the Garter, Willem II was only made a Knight of the Garter on 2 March 1644 at the age of nineteen,⁶ some years after Van Dyck's death in 1641. Since the sitter in this painting must be about twelve or thirteen years of age he cannot represent this prince. An alternative suggestion that he represents Prince Willem III of Orange is also unlikely. Willem III received the garter at the age of two-and-a-half in April 1653. He was invested in the following May and was installed by dispensation in 1661.⁷

Toynbee was the first writer to identify the sitter properly as Henry, Duke of Gloucester, on the basis of an inscription on a bust-length copy after this painting in the collection of Earl Fitzwilliam at Wentworth Woodhouse (fig. 1).⁸ Staring suggested that *Henry, Duke of Gloucester* was painted at the time of Henry's investiture as Knight in the Order of the Garter, to which he had been appointed by a decree of his brother Charles, the Prince of Wales, on 25 April 1653, and which took place in The Hague on 4