DD

Bruxelles, le // / 19 0

Peinture et de Sculpture

BELGIQUE

Nº 1069124

Objet :

ANNEXE

RÉDACTEUR

Expédié copie le

Notes:

A M' Marry Hopkins

Nous avons l'honneur de vous taire connaître qu'il n'est pas dans les intentions de la Commission Directrice d'acquérir, pour les collections de l'Etat, le Lableau que vous avez bien voulu offrir de céder à ces fins par pote lette lu 10 ch

Veuillez agréer, M. M. M., l'assurance de notre considération distinguée.

POUR LA COMMISSION DIRECTRICE, Le Secrétaire, 21/8/g West- find which of Garry Lodge, 69, Oglander Road, to believe) is fenuive Grove Wale, East Dulwich. The Wirector the in fact foresonelly I have some Royal Olef Gallery The enclosed descrip to Dear Six will Ihope be I have much pleasure in bring nig to your conclusive and notice an Oil after it's Yourusal of Trush you will be Painting which is inducted of favour in my passession me with an offer vis a Tortrait of for the same Sir A. Van Dyck As this mugue The great Flemish Pariting

would creatly enrich the very valuable Pollection of Met Treasures under your control A refoly will be esteemed By yours faithfully Hourry Hopking CH. Y. 3

m Kopkins habitant l'angleterre offre en vente Isans indication de pris, un portrait de a lanseyek par lui mime Il sent a la lettre une notice Vingremer, it une. reproduction en photogranue

Oil Painting of Van Dyck, by Himself.

46 inches in height by 34 inches wide.

Painting \(\frac{3}{4}\) size, i.e., to the knees, almost life size. In Old Gilt Frame.

As the Canvas was slightly torn from age, fortunately not near the Portrait itself, it was restored and relined by Gooden & Fox in November, 1906.

HISTORY.

My grandfather, Mr. Floyd Hopkins, of Manor Cottage, Rochester Row, Westminster (who was married in 1803), had a collection of many very fine old paintings (mostly religious). Amongst them was the one described above, and which he impressed upon his children was an Original and very valuable.

We cannot at present trace when it first came into his possession, but he led those around him to believe that it had been in the family for a considerable time.

He died in 1854, at the age of 71.

It then passed into the hands of my father, John Edwards Hopkins. My father said it was always spoken of as a genuine Painting by Van Dyck, and reputed to be very valuable, and he always strongly held this opinion.

In my father's life time (about 40 years since) he paid a fee to an expert from the National Gallery to examine and report upon this Painting. His report (verbal) was to this effect:-

The "Canvas" was of the date and period of the great painter, Van Dyck, and he had but little doubt that the Painting was genuine; it was, however, very difficult to be quite certain, inasmuch as Van Dyck only put his name to a picture under exceptional circumstances.

Shortly after this examination my father had several callers (unsolicited) who were anxious to purchase this picture; but as they were picture dealers, and he was not in need of money, he declined to part with it—in fact he was annoyed at their persistency.

In 1886 my father died, at 72 years. It then passed to me, John Barry Hopkins. The Painting has thus been in our family over 100 years.

The following Notes are interesting as bearing upon its great value.

My father had several offers—one I know was £50, but he would not entertain it. In November, 1894, £94 or £98 was offered for it, which I would not accept. "Dealers" do not generally offer such price for a mere copy.

In the Peel Collection, No. 877, and in the National Portrait Gallery, No. 1291, there is a painting of the head only of this picture, $22\frac{1}{4} \times 19$ ins.

In the Collection of the Duke of Grafton there is a painting, evidently a replica of this one, there being practically no difference. It was evidently one of those he fancied, as he also

See Notes 1, 4, 7, 8.

See Note II.

Note II.

See Notes 2,

3, 5, 6 and 8.

commenced an etching of it; hence we have another reason for assuming that he (Van Dyck) painted more than one of this portrait of himself, especially if the "heads" only (see above) were painted by him. We know that he was specially fond of portraits.

The following notes and extracts from art books are specially interesting.

This particular picture was painted by himself, it is said, about 1620.

See Note 10.

I would place the date somewhat later, as the hunds are not in his best style.

The following extracts from the work (condensed version) of Lionel Cust, M.V.O., on the Life and Works of Anthony Van Dyck, published by the Chiswick Press (Charles Whittingham & Co., Took's Court, Chancery Lane), tend, in my opinion, to confirm its genuineness, of which I personally have no doubt.

The photogravure frontispiece of this book is a very fine representation of this picture.

Note 1.—"In very few cases did he put his name to his pictures—in many cases it is only by contemporary history that they can be identified."

Note 2.—"Isabella Clara Eugenia of the Netherlands. He painted a number of her portraits, in all cases the same, though varying in size. Repetitions exist in at least three Galleries."

Note 3.—"Genevieve d'Urfe Marquise de Havre, whose portrait, seated in a chair, was one of those most frequently repeated by Van Dyck."

Note 4.—" Many Paintings are considered to be the work of Van Dyck, notably that of Helena Fourment in Sir Robert Walpole's Collection."

Note 5 -" Charles the First and his Queen was repeated by Van Dyck several times."

Note 6.—"He in many cases painted more than one picture of a given kind, especially where he seems to have been interested in his subject."

Note 7.—" Several paintings which bear his name at Rome, Florence, Lucca and elsewhere in Italy, must be regarded with suspicion."

Note 8.—In 1780 the painter Carlo Guiseppe Ratte says that at Genoa there were no less than 99 paintings by Van Dyck (72 of them being portraits)."

Note 9.—The manner of resting the hands is seen in hundreds of repetitions."

Note 10.—" And towards his later years he was very careless in finishing off his hands."

Hence it will be seen that each and everything points to the genuineness of this Painting, and of which I feel compelled to conclude, that it is a portrait of Van Dyck, painted by himself, and I must again repeat that personally I have no doubt.

The Duke of Grafton has a similar one to my own. Query: from whence did he obtain it; what is its history? It seems another confirmation of my several notes, i.e., that there are two genuine Paintings of

The $\frac{3}{4}$ Portrait of Van Dyck, painted by himself.

The enclosed picture is a guide to the Painting I wish to bring to your notice.

All the several statements I have made in good faith, believing them to be absolutely true.

J. BARRY HOPKINS.

February, 1907.

P.S.—Your reply and comments will be esteemed.—J. B. H.