Piotr Borusowski

Lost and Found. The Drawing of *Joan of Arc* by Peter Paul Rubens at the National Museum in Warsaw

In December 1945, a shipment of works of art arrived in Warsaw, containing objects acquired during the so-called restitution campaign from the storeroom at the Paulinum castle in Jelenia Góra.[1] These included a small drawing, which for the next sixty years was kept at the Department of Prints and Drawings of the National Museum in Warsaw as the *Kneeling Knight* by an unknown Northern School artist, and dated to the seventeenth century.[2] In the course of research for the catalogue of Flemish drawings of the National Museum in Warsaw, conducted since 2009, I came to realize that it depicts Joan of Arc and that it is known to scholars working on Peter Paul Rubens, but has been considered lost since the Second World War (**fig. 1**).

Research on the Warsaw drawing dates back at least to the 1920s, when it was held at the Schlesisches Museum der bildenden Künste in Wrocław.[3] The first evidence of interest in the sketch is documented by a pre-war photograph showing the work with a fragment of the album folio on which it was placed (**fig. 2**). We do not know whether the annotation *Van Dyk* [sic] visible directly below it refers to *Joan of Arc*, but this attribution is repeated on the mat on which the photograph was mounted.[4] Rubens's hand was first recognized by Erhard

[1] For more information on the so-called restitution campaign see Witold Kieszkowski, "Składnica muzealna Paulinum i rewindykacja zabytków na Dolnym Śląsku," *Pamiętniki Związku Historyków Sztuki i Kultury*, vol. 1 (1948), pp. 135–58; Józef Gębczak, *Losy ruchomego mienia kulturalnego i artystycznego na Dolnym Śląsku w czasie drugiej wojny światowej* (Wrocław, 2000); Lidia Karecka, "Akcja rewindykacyjna w latach 1945–1950. Spór o terminologię czy istotę rzeczy," *Ochrona Zabytków*, nos 3–4 (2002), pp. 404–09.

[2] In the article I have deliberately chosen to use the title *Joan of Arc* for the drawing, as it is cited as such in English texts, whereas in its Polish version I added the adjective "kneeling" – *Kneeling Joan of Arc*. The drawing's inventory card containing the information was prepared in 1985.

[3] Alwin Schultz, who in 1877 provided the first description of the *Desseins originaux* albums, from which *Joan of Arc* comes from, refers to a drawing signed with Rubens's name ("Bezeichnet mit dem Namen P. Rubens eine Skizze, Feder und Bister, darstellend eine Frauengestalt"). This, however, is a different drawing, currently attributed to Lodewijk Toeput (*The Virgin of the Annunciation and Two Studies of Female Heads*, inv. no. Rys.Ob.d.1241 MNW). See Alwin Schultz, "Die Sammlung von Handzeichnungen in der Breslauer Stadtbibliothek," *Anzeiger für Kunde der deutsche Vorzeit*, 24, no. 5 (1877), col. 142.

[4] Below the photograph, in blue ink: *Dyck, Anthonis van*; on verso of the mat, in blue ink: *Aus den der Stadt gehörigen Klebebändern*, below an India ink mark of the Schlesisches Museum der bildenden Künste (L.2265f) and number: *23680* (the pre-war inventory number: "Lagerbuch"). The collection of photographic and collotype reproductions of the Schlesisches Museum der bildenden Künste comprises 15,720 items and is currently held at the Documents Collection of the National Museum in Wrocław. See Piotr Borusowski, "'Dessins Originaux.' Osiemnastowieczna kolekcja rysunków w Muzeum Narodowym w Warszawie. Stan i perspektywy badań / 'Dessins Originaux.' An 18th century collection of drawings at the National Museum in Warsaw. State and prospects of research," in *Między Wrocławiem*

Göpel, who in 1932 presented the photograph of the sketch to Ludwig Burchard.[5] Even though Burchard never had the chance to see the work itself, he regarded it as a genuine Rubens – a study for a painting currently held at the North Carolina Museum of Art in Raleigh (**fig. 3**) – and dated it c. 1620.[6] He associated the painting with a work listed in the inventory compiled after the artist's death: "A piece of Pucelle d'Orleans, vppon Cloth."[7] Since then, the drawing has been discussed in the context of the American canvas. Burchard, and other art historians after him (W.R. Valentiner,[8] Justus Müller Hofstede,[9] Michael Jaffé[10]), regarded the painting as a work by Rubens, but this attribution has come to be much qualified in the light of later stylistic and technological research. What began to be noticed was the lack of subtlety, harsh contours and perfunctory, even incompetent finish – the flat looking curtain, the mechanically painted elements of the armour and patterns on the rug – details which could not have been made by Rubens's hand. An X-ray photograph (**fig. 4**) revealed a painted-over fragment of a column, proving that the painting had been cut on all sides and repainted at an unspecified moment. Doubts related to the poor quality of the execution caused Michael Jaffé to revise his earlier view and see it as merely a workshop piece.[11] Elizabeth McGrath retained the attribution to Rubens, but with a question mark, listing all weak points of the work, but suggesting that the painting could, for some unknown reason, have been left unfinished by the artist and repainted – most likely after his death – by another painter, in order to be put up for sale. The disappointing execution of the work caused her to indicate one other possibility: that it might be a reduced and simplified copy of a lost original work.[12] Kristin Lohse Belkin rejected this hypothesis and claimed that the work was more likely begun by Rubens and finished (rather ineptly) after his death by an artist from his workshop.[13] Dennis P. Weller has recently voiced an opinion in favour of a fully workshop nature of the work, albeit recognizing that it was painted in two stages.[14]

a Lwowem. Sztuka na Śląsku, w Małopolsce i na Rusi Koronnej w czasach nowożytnych, Andrzej Betlej, Katarzyna Brzezina-Scheuerer, Piotr Oszczanowski, eds (Wrocław, 2011), pp. 231–38. The mat with *Joan of Arc* is numbered 49843 and is located in file no. 101. I wish to express my sincere thanks to Robert Heś, Head of the Documents Collection of the National Museum in Wrocław, for his kindness and assistance in looking through this vast collection.

5 See note on the verso of the pre-war photograph of the drawing held at the Rubenianum in Antwerp.

6 See the documentation of the drawing held at the Rubenianum. Cf. Elizabeth McGrath, *Rubens. Subjects from History*, vol. 1: *Texts and illustrations*, vol. 2: *Catalogue and indexes* (London, 1997). Corpus Rubenianum Ludwig Burchard, 13 (I).

7 "An Inventory of Pictures found in the howse of the late Sr Peter Paul Rubens...," in Kristin Lohse Belkin, Fiona Healy, *A House of Art. Rubens as a Collector*, exh. cat., Rubenshuis, 2004 (Schoten, 2004), p. 331. no. 159. See also McGrath, op. cit., vol. 2, p. 318.

8 W.R. Valentiner, "Joan of Arc by Rubens," *The North Carolina Museum of Art Bulletin*, vol. 1, no. 3 (1957), pp. 11–16.

9 Justus Müller Hofstede, "Beitrage zum zeichnerischen Werk von Rubens," *Wallraf-Richartz-Jahrbuch*, 27 (1965), pp. 304–06.

10 Michael Jaffé, "Rubens as Collector of Drawings. Part Three," *Master Drawings*, vol. 4 (1966), no. 2, p. 131, n. 20 and 21.

11 Id., *Rubens. Catalogo completo*, Germano Mulazzani, trans. (Milan, 1989), p. 240, cat. no. 493, p. 241, fig.

12 McGrath, op. cit., vol. 2, p. 318.

13 Lohse Belkin, Healy, op. cit., p. 142, n. 3.

14 Dennis P. Weller, *Seventeenth-Century Dutch and Flemish Paintings*, collection cat., North Carolina Museum of Art, Raleigh (Raleigh, 2009), pp. 311–15, cat. no. 65.

The drawing was first published in 1965 by Justus Müller Hofstede, who (also on the basis of a photograph) attributed it to Rubens, and like Burchard made a connection with the Raleigh painting, dating it, however, to a slightly earlier period.[15] In his opinion, the amount of detail, surprising in a study by Rubens for a painting, could mean that this was not the first, spontaneous sketch documenting the artist's invention, but a thought-out and refined *modello*, which could be presented to the client. It could also serve well as a design for a print – given the precision of many of the details, the sketch would not require additional comments for the engraver.[16]

The lost drawing became a subject of renewed investigation in the preparation of the thirteenth volume of *Corpus Rubenianum Ludwig Burchard*, devoted to subjects from history.[17] There, Elizabeth McGrath was more inclined to treat it as a copy which seems to faithfully convey Rubens's initial idea. In her opinion, the amount of detail would be surprising for a compositional sketch, although she did not definitely reject Müller Hofstede's arguments. She tied her analysis closely with the Raleigh painting and the sketch held at the Statens Museum for Kunst in Copenhagen (**fig. 5**).[18] McGrath provided an extensive description of the circumstances of the creation of the composition and also mentioned that another painting of Joan of Arc was registered in the inventory of Cardinal Giovanni Francesco Guidi di Bagno's collection in 1641, a fact that might be of interest given the Cardinal's relationship with Rubens. But there is no evidence of Rubens's authorship of this work or of its potential relationship with the Warsaw drawing.[19]

In 2004, Kristin Lohse Belkin referred to the drawing in the exhibition catalogue *A House of Art. Rubens as a Collector*.[20] Thinking it unlikely that the drawing was a preparatory sketch for the painting, she also regarded the Warsaw piece as a copy.[21] She agreed with McGrath that it probably presented a rather exact version of the original composition – in her opinion of the Raleigh painting, before it was cut and overpainted.

The most recent mention of the drawing appears in the catalogue of seventeenth century Dutch and Flemish paintings of the Raleigh museum.[22] There, Dennis P. Weller likewise saw it as a copy depicting the likely appearance of the painting's original composition.[23] He also suggested a new date of its creation: after 1640.[24]

The drawing comes from the collection of Albrecht von Sebisch (1685–1748), a Wrocław burghermaster, long-standing mayor and chairman of the City Council of the newly established

15 Müller Hofstede, op. cit., pp. 304–06.

16 Ibid., p. 305.

17 McGrath, op. cit., vol. 1, figs 217–19; vol. 2, pp. 317–23, cat. nos 57 and 57a.

18 Unknown artist, after Peter Paul Rubens, *Joan of Arc*, here dated before 1630, black chalk, brown wash, heightened with white, on blue paper, 33.2 × 26.2 cm, inv. no. Tu 82g,12, Statens Museum for Kunst, Copenhagen.

19 McGrath, op. cit., vol. 2, p. 321.

20 Lohse Belkin, Healy, op. cit., pp. 140–42, cat. no. 18.

21 Ibid., p. 140, caption below fig. 18a.

22 Weller, op. cit., pp. 311–15, cat. no. 65.

23 Ibid., p. 314.

24 Ibid., p. 315, fig. 65C (proposed date with a question mark).

Prussian municipality from 1741.[25] After his death, his collection of works of art (drawings, prints, paintings) was inherited by Ernst Wilhelm von Hubrig (1712–87), who in 1767 donated it to the city (*donatio inter vivos*).[26] It was then that the 1133 drawings were mounted into two albums – *Desseins originaux. Pars I* and *Desseins originaux. Pars II* – and deposited in the library of St Mary Magdalene's church in Wrocław.[27] In the process of consolidating the municipal book and art collections, some of the works of art stored in the library were transferred to the Stadtbibliothek in 1853. Between 1880 and the Second World War, the drawings and prints were held at the Schlesisches Museum der bildenden Künste. They were transferred to the National Museum in Warsaw at the end of 1945 under the so-called restitution campaign.[28]

Von Sebisch could have purchased the sketch during his trip around Europe in 1708–12 (Germany, The Netherlands, France, Switzerland, Italy).[29] He could have also acquired it in Vienna, where he served as a envoy of Wrocław at the court of Charles VI between 1728 and 1731. It was at that time that he greatly expanded his collection of paintings, first and foremost as a result of purchasing works of contemporary artists.[30] Even though this seems unlikely, it

[25] Otto Pusch, *Die Breslauer Rats- und Stadtgeschlechter in der Zeit von 1241 bis 1741*, vol. 4 (Dortmund, 1990), pp. 182–83.

[26] The owner of *Joan of Arc* has been mistaken for his first cousin, once removed, Albrecht von Sebisch (1610–88), also an outstanding collector (see Waldemar Deluga, "Netherlandish Sixteenth-Century Prints in Poland," *Print Quarterly*, 9, no. 3 (1992), pp. 285–87; Anita Frank, "Albrecht von Sebisch (1610–1688) – das Leben eines Vermittlers und Bibliophilen," *Acta Universitatis Wratislaviensis*, no. 1774, Stefan Kiedroń, ed. (Wrocław, 1995), pp. 73–93. Neerlandica Vratislaviensia, 8; Waldemar Deluga, "Prints by Balthasar van den Bos from the collection of Albrecht von Saebisch," *Delineavit et Sculpsit*, 17 (1997), pp. 1–6). The latter's collection of prints was deposited after his death at the library of St Elisabeth's Church in Wrocław and formed part of the renowned Rehdigerana; around 1856, like the collections of other Wrocław church libraries, it was transferred to the Municipal Library (Stadtbibliothek). The description and separation of the prints collections of both Sebisches will be a subject of a separate article.

[27] For the further history of the collection see Borusowski, "'Dessins Originaux'...," op. cit., passim; id., "Tehnilised uuringud ja päritolu selgitamine Albrecht von Sebischi (1685–1748) joonistuste kogu rekonstreerimisel / Technical examination and provenance research in the reconstruction of the drawing collection of Albrecht von Sebisch (1685–1748)," *Eesti Kunstimuuseumi Toimetised / Proceedings of the Art Museum of Estonia. Tehniline kunstiajalugu – kunstiajaloo tehnikad? / Technical Art History – Technics of Art History?*, 2(7) (2012), pp. 107–32 (with previous bibliography).

[28] See Borusowski, "'Dessins Originaux'...," op. cit., passim. Even though the drawing has never been held at the National Museum in Wrocław, this is what is stated in all post-war publications referring to the work. After the Second World War, the Schlesisches Museum der bildenden Künste ceased to exist (the seriously damaged building was demolished in the 1960s), and its collection was divided between several institutions, including the State Museum in Wrocław (established in 1947, opened to the public in 1948 in the former building of the Administration of the Silesian Province, renamed Silesian Museum in 1950 and National Museum in Wrocław in 1970), the Print Room of the Scientific Library of the Polish Academy of Learning and the Polish Academy of Sciences in Krakow and the National Museum in Warsaw.

[29] While we do not know the details of this journey (*Kavalierstour*), the collection of the Manuscripts Department of the Wrocław University Library includes the memoirs of Johann Christoph Eichbänder, who – according to the inscription on the first page – was accompanied by Albrecht von Sebisch and his brother Johann Siegmund (1692–1745) during a part of his European journey. See Johann Christian Eichbänder, *Bei Anno 1706. den 15. April von Breslau unter dem geleitte Gottes weg gangen und Anno: 1712 d. 14 Januari wieder Gott sey gelobet gesund an her kommen, mit beyden Herren von Sebisch*, Manuscripts Department, Wrocław University Library, Akc. 1949/749.

[30] Including Johann Georg Platzer (1704–61), Christian Hilfgott Brand (1695–1756), Maximilian Joseph Schinnagel (1697–1762) or Franz Werner Tamm (1658–1724). As early as 1899, Theodor von Frimmel regarded Von Sebisch's collection of paintings as one of the most important collections of works by Viennese artists of the 1st half of the 18th century, comparing it to the collection of Prince Eugene of Savoy in Turin. See Theodor von Frimmel, *Geschichte der wiener Gemldesammlungen* [sic]. *Erster Halbband: Einleitung und Geschichte der Keiserlichen Gemäldegalerie* (Leipzig, 1899), pp. 25 and 65–66. See also Beata Lejman, *Malarstwo Europy Środkowej XVI–XVIII wieku. Niemcy, Austria, Czechy, Węgry, Słowacja*, collection cat., The National Museum in Wrocław, 2012 (Wrocław, 2012), p. 11, n. 22.

cannot be excluded that the drawing came into his possession after he had already returned to Wrocław.[31] Everything would point to the fact that von Sebisch did not look at the drawing in terms of its authorship or school. There is no inscription that would point to that. True, the verso is inaccessible (the drawing is mounted on a fragment of the album folio), but examination on a lighted tracing table did not reveal anything unexpected, only the number written right after the collector's death.[32] Even though two other drawings from his collection are inscribed with the name of Rubens, they were not grouped with *Joan of Arc*.[33] Since the collector placed that sketch in the sequence devoted to religious subjects, it would seem that this was how he must have interpreted the scene. However, it would be difficult to speculate whether he recognized the French heroine or simply thought it a figure at prayer. Besides, drawings are not the only works in von Sebisch's collection associated with Rubens. According to the 1817 catalogue of prints (which were already in the library of St Mary Magdalene's church at the time), one of the volumes contained 85 prints by the artist.[34] A *Bacchanal*, also attributed to him, was in the collection of paintings.[35] The drawings themselves include several later copies made after his paintings.[36]

The condition of *Joan of Arc* is closely associated with the history of the collection it comes from, which dates back over 250 years. Mounting the drawings into albums in the mid-eighteenth century was a guarantee of the collection's integrity at the time of its transfer to the library of St Mary Magdalene. At the same time, however, it prevented any attempts at presenting or making the works available individually.[37] This became a serious problem a hundred years later, when the initial function of the collection – a private set intended for individual contemplation – changed as a result of the establishment of the Stadtbibliothek and then the Schlesisches Museum der bildenden Künste. The works, now a group of museum artefacts in a public institution, were to be more democratically accessible. It was then, most likely after 1880, that the drawings began to be removed from the albums, mounted

[31] For the methods of acquiring works of art by Silesian collectors see Michał Mencfel, *Skarbce natury i sztuki. Prywatne gabinety osobliwości, kolekcje sztuki i naturaliów na Śląsku w wiekach XVII i XVIII* (Warsaw, 2010), pp. 196–228.

[32] For information on the significance of these numbers see Borusowski, "Tehnilised uuringud...," op. cit., pp. 121–23.

[33] See the aforementioned *Virgin from the Annunciation Scene and Two Studies of Female Heads* and a drawing *Nymphs and Satyrs*, inv. no. Rys.Ob.d.1242 MNW (the latter of the drawings will be a subject of a separate article).

[34] "No: I. (3). Ein Band mit Küpferstichen in großfol. | von Peter Paul Rubens – 85 Kupferblätter". See *Verzeichniss der von den Bibliotheks-Geldern neu angeschafften Kupfer-Werke und der Säbisch-Hubrigscher Kupferstiche gefertiget von Daniel Vogel Professor des Magdalenäums 1818*, Manuscripts Department, Wrocław University Library, Akc. 1949/766, p. 19.

[35] "Ein Bachanale – Rubens." See *Nachweisung wie die von Sabische Schildereyen und Kunst-Sachen in denen auf dem Maria Magdalenaischen Real Gymnasio dazu adaptirten Zimmern vorjetzo aufgehangen und placiret sich befinden*, Manuscripts Department, Wrocław University Library, Akc. 1949/761; later copy – Manuscripts Department, Wrocław University Library, Akc. 1949/562, fol. 2r. In 1863, the painting was already regarded as a copy after Rubens. See *Katalog der Bilder-Galerie im Ständehause zu Breslau*, 3. Ausg. (Breslau, 1863), p. 23, no. 256 (*nach Rubens*). Currently held at an unknown location.

[36] I.a., Willem Panneels after Peter Paul Rubens, *Saint Christopher* (before 1630, black chalk, pen and brown ink, brown wash on paper, inv. no. Rys.Ob.d.946 MNW), after a composition from the verso of the left wing of the triptych *Descent from the Cross* from the Cathedral of Our Lady in Antwerp (1612–14). The drawing used to form part of the so-called Rubens's *cantoor*. See Jesper Svenningsen, "The Classification of Drawings in the so-called *Rubens' Cantoor*," *Master Drawings*, vol. 51, no. 3 (2013), pp. 349–59 (with previous bibliography).

[37] See Borusowski, "Tehnilised uuringud...," op. cit., passim.

on separate passe-partouts and juxtaposed in entirely new constellations.[38] All of the above was made without proper photographic documentation, which is why there are no surviving images of the original folios, which have now disappeared. Perhaps the apparently careless treatment of the material resulted from the fact that knowledge about the albums' provenance had already been lost at that time, as testified by the 1877 article by Alwin Schultz.[39] Whatever the case, the practice continued, reaching its peak in the 1950s and then in the 1970s at the National Museum in Warsaw, where photographic documentation was made for only a few folios before they were dismounted.[40]

Joan of Arc was originally placed on folio number 59 of the *Desseins originaux. Pars I*,[41] in the sequence devoted to religious motifs, probably with four other drawings.[42] Three of them – *St John the Baptist*,[43] *The Virgin and Child with St Anne and St John the Baptist*[44] and *Calvary*[45] – were cut out from the album and then removed from the original mat. The only preserved folio fragment, in very bad condition, used to be underneath the third of them. The order of the drawings can be reconstructed from the numbers on the verso: 166, 167 and 168 respectively. *Joan of Arc* bears the number 169 and is still mounted on a fragment of the original folio, which makes it possible precisely to establish its original location. The right edge – even and characteristically smudged – is the outer edge of the album folio. The characteristic wrinkle across the paper appears on all preserved folios, almost in the middle, thereby establishing the exact location where *Joan* was formerly mounted. The bottom part of the folio (approx. one-third of the whole) has not survived. It featured another sketch, numbered 170, which had been lost before the collection was transferred to Warsaw. We know this for a fact, because after the war all the folios were recounted and given new numbers (in pencil at their bottom right corners). Since number 56 is still placed directly below *Joan*, this was where the folio must have ended when they were numbered. Unfortunately, the lost sketch and its subject are unknown. Its only trace is a fragment recorded on a pre-war photograph, showing its top right corner, with even edges (**fig. 2**). The annotation '*Van Dyk?*,' which is visible in the photograph,

[38] The process of removing prints must have begun considerably earlier, since when the paper collection was transferred from the Municipal Library to the Schlesisches Museum der bildenden Künste, Max Lehrs, who supervised the entire process, noticed that the prints were mounted on ugly, brown-yellowish paperboard. See Max Lehrs, "Die Kupferstichsammlung der Stadt Breslau," *Jahrbuch der Königlich Preussischen Kunstsammlungen*, vol. 3 (1882), p. 222.

[39] Schultz, op. cit., passim.

[40] For more information on the subject, see Borusowski, "Tehnilised uuringud...," op. cit., p. 119. For information on reconstructing the albums see id., "Wirtualna rekonstrukcja jako metoda badań nad dawnymi kolekcjami rysunków na przykładzie albumów *Desseins originaux* z Muzeum Narodowego w Warszawie / The Use of Virtual Reconstruction in Research of Historical Collections of Drawings. *Desseins originaux* albums from the National Museum in Warsaw," in *Metodologia, metoda i terminologia grafiki i rysunku. Teoria i praktyka*, Jolanta Talbierska, ed. (in preparation).

[41] Original folio numbers are made in red ink and located in the top right corner.

[42] For exceptions to the rule see Borusowski, "Tehnilised uuringud...," op. cit., pp. 122–23.

[43] Pier Francesco Mola (?), *Saint John the Baptist*, 1698, black chalk on paper, 19.7 × 11.8 cm, inv. no. Rys.Ob.d.266 MNW.

[44] Artist from the circle of Jan de Herdt (Monogrammist F.G.P?), *The Virgin and Child with St Anne and St John the Baptist*, brush and dark brown ink and gouache (whites) with a black chalk outline on paper (primed with blue gouache), 15.2 × 13.3 cm, inv. no. Rys.Ob.d.1175 MNW.

[45] Unknown artist, *Calvary*, late 17th c. (?), pen and brown ink and grey wash on paper, 18.2 × 28.2 cm, inv. no. Rys.Ob.d.1177 MNW.

may serve as an indication of the author of the missing sketch. In the literature, the inscription has been associated with the Warsaw drawing, but it may refer to the work that was placed directly below it. Even though *Joan of Arc* and numerous other items from the albums were photographed before the war, I have not been able to find a photograph of the lost drawing.[46] It is also difficult to state when it was removed from the album. Many factors would indicate that this must have taken place suddenly. Rather than being precisely cut out, it was brutally torn away with a fragment of *Joan of Arc*, which indicates that whoever removed the drawing was acting in haste and – perhaps most importantly – regarded it as more valuable than those left on the folio.

All scholars are unanimous that Rubens was the author at least of the composition presented in the Warsaw drawing. The artist could have modelled himself on the sculpture which once decorated a bridge in Orléans and depicted Joan and Charles VII kneeling before a Pietà. Léonard Gaultier's frontispiece to *Heroinae nobilissimae Ioannae Darc... historia* by Jean Hordal (**fig. 6**) has been suggested as a second source of inspiration – it features the above-mentioned sculptural group in its top part.[47] Arguably, Rubens could have possessed a drawing or drawings of the figure of Joan from the Orléans bridge;[48] he could also have visited the town and seen the monument *in situ*. Yet I am more inclined to believe that it was the Gaultier frontispiece that was crucial for the iconographic concept,[49] as not only is the figure of the kneeling Joan taken over, but the symbolism of the personifications included below her: Fortitudo supporting the column and long-haired Virginitas holding a lily and a shield. Even though these figures are absent from the Warsaw drawing, the columns in the background and Joan's long, loose hair, placed directly on the axis of the composition, seem consciously to evoke these qualities.[50] The abstracted gaze and slight turn of the head, which suggest the action of listening closely, could stem from accounts that Joan was guided not so much by visions as by "heavenly voices."[51]

Joan is depicted in the foreground, in the middle, closest to the edge of the composition – her feet and the creases of the carpet, on which she is kneeling, even seem to reach beyond its surface. Unfortunately, the effect is weakened as the bottom part is torn off. The crucifix on a pedestal and gloves are placed in the same line as Joan, while her helmet is directly behind her. The background, only slightly shifted backwards, is represented by the curtain on the left, and the columns and balustrade on the right. The blank fragment constitutes almost one-third of the drawing's width, adding space to the composition and opening it up both to the right and to the inside. An interesting effect is achieved thanks to the dense composition on the left near the viewer and its gradual opening towards the right. This arrangement is emphasized, or even brought out, by measured light and shade, achieved by means of hatching and cross

46 During my research at the Department of Documents of the National Museum in Wrocław, I looked in vain through the set of pre-war photographs of works of art.

47 Jean Hordal, *Heroinae nobilissimae Ioannae Darc... historia* (Port-à-Musson, 1612). For the story of the Orléans sculpture and the iconographic relationship between the sculpture and the print see McGrath, op. cit., vol. 2, pp. 319–20 and n. 18 and 19. See also Valentiner, op. cit., in particular fig. 1 – woodcut depicting the condition of the sculpture before it was destroyed by Calvinists in 1562 and reconstructed in 1571.

48 McGrath, op. cit., vol. 2, p. 320; Lohse Belkin, Healy, op. cit., p. 140.

49 Michael Jaffé believed that the print itself could be insufficient for Rubens to create the composition presented in the drawing. See Jaffé, "Rubens as a Collector...," op. cit.

50 Thus, painting over the column destroyed Rubens's original idea.

51 McGrath, op. cit., vol. 2, p. 318.

hatching, in certain parts, and the use of black chalk. Two sources of light are placed beyond the composition: at top left (lighting the crucifix, Joan's hands and face and the creases of the curtain) and on the right, beyond the balustrade (lighting the columns, balustrade and feathers of the helmet).

The artist devoted most attention to Joan (**fig. 7**). Her eyes are wide open, her gaze is absent and directed slightly downwards (she is not looking at the crucifix in front of her), while the shape of her brows suggests a wrinkled forehead and emphasizes the impression of being deep in thought. Her thoughts seem to be elsewhere, perhaps with the battle that soon awaits her. Her hair falls on her back down to the waist – it is dishevelled, yet drawn with precise strokes of the pen and heightened with black chalk. The artist was meticulous in depicting the armour, especially in its shoulder and torso part. There too pen and brown ink are accompanied by black chalk, which supplements and heightens light and shade effects, otherwise achieved solely by hatching. In those fragments, the chalk acts as a legitimate means of expression, and contributes to the shape of the figure. The curtain, with its numerous folds and creases, is very suggestive. It is difficult to resist the impression that the dense hatching and cross hatching and use of black chalk to the left of Joan, especially around her head, was meant to bring the figure out from the background – especially her face and hands, drawn in outline. The use of chalk in the folds of the curtain as well as the shadow the fabric is casting on the shaft of the column add life to the space and contribute to the effect of depth. The crucifix is sketched in a very rudimentary manner, with a thin, bright line on blank paper. The pedestal underneath it is characterized by stronger strokes and hatching. The lines that create the curtain are also executed in a gradable manner – from delicate and thin strokes right next to the crucifix to more decided and stronger strokes towards the columns. Sharp light from above the crucifix illuminates Joan's hands and face as well as her breastplate. The left hand casts a strong shadow on the palm of the right hand, the left arm – on the backplate; as a result, the left elbow seems to be much closer to the surface of the drawing than the rest of the body. One should also pay attention to the columns: they have been executed with merely a few lines, probably also in order to emphasize that they are well-lit, especially from the right. Thus, it was possible to include the rather deep shadow cast by the curtain. The feathers adorning the helmet are also brightly lit. It is worth noting that the parts which are relatively more pared-down and sketch-like do not give the impression of being unfinished. This is a deliberate procedure, thanks to which the artist was able precisely to depict the areas which are "flooded with light," using his line sparingly and thereby achieving the desired effect. Only the right part of the composition seems merely signalled – we see one baluster (even though the drawing could include at least three more), and we do not know what was supposed to be visible beyond the balustrade – perhaps the battle of Orléans, as has been proposed by researchers.

Art historians who have doubted Rubens's authorship of the drawing have generally stated that it is (like the sketch from the Statens Museum for Kunst in Copenhagen) a copy of the original composition of a painting held at the North Carolina Museum of Art in Raleigh. However, how should we understand this original concept or composition that – according to McGrath, Lohse Belkin and Weller – the Warsaw drawing allegedly copies?[52]

In order to be copied, the original concept has to be expressed by means of an executed work of art, its composition. Taking into account how certain parts differ from the initial idea, allegedly conveyed in detail in the Warsaw drawing, it is difficult to believe that the latter merely

[52] See McGrath, op. cit., vol. 2, pp. 318 and 323; Lohse Belkin, Healy, op. cit., p. 142; Weller, op. cit., p. 314.

copies the painting in Raleigh before it was reworked. Of course, its composition would have been different then – first of all larger, both in height and in width, and encompassing the column and balustrade on the right, much of which is now cut off and (as proved by the X-ray photograph) painted over. However, these are not the only elements in question. Even though the drawing depicts the curtain in a very sketchy manner, the hatching and selective use of black chalk proved more than enough to transform it into something that adds depth to the composition. It falls down to the heroine's knees and also serves as a background for the crucifix. In the painting, the curtain is flat and painted with quick strokes, giving the impression of being unfinished; it is also decidedly shorter and narrower. The finial of the crucifix's pedestal has a different profile. Joan's head in the drawing is round and shown in profile, whereas in the painting it is oval and facing slightly more to the left (as a result, a fragment of the right eye is visible). In the latter, her lips are slightly parted and she is looking upwards – towards the crucifix. The change in the rendering of her face is significant. In the drawing, Joan seems to be deep in thought rather than prayer, her face expresses concentration and her gaze indicates that she is not contemplating the crucifix in front of her. Treating the Warsaw drawing as a copy of the original painterly composition leads to a number of questions. To what extent was the painting finished if its completion required so many alterations? Could the differences between the drawing – said to depict the assumed initial condition of the painting – and the work as we know it now be the result of the abilities (or rather limitations) of the artist who repainted the work when he was "finishing" it?

The key argument in that respect is provided by the analysis of the Copenhagen drawing (**fig. 5**). So far, literature on the subject has seemed oblivious to the fact that it comes from the set of several hundred works referred to as Rubens's *cantoor* and held at the Statens Museum for Kunst.[53] These include numerous copies of the artist's original works – mostly drawings, but also paintings – accumulated by and for the most part also attributed to his pupil, Willem Panneels (c. 1600–34). This origin of the drawing is confirmed by a number on the verso of the sketch, *109*, which places it in the sequence of works depicting male torsos and armours.[54] Panneels left Rubens's studio in 1630 and, as is currently supposed, took the aforementioned drawings with him.[55] Consequently, *Joan of Arc* would have to be created before that year and thus depict a fragment of the composition many years before Rubens's death and the overpainting of the unfinished work by the artist form his workshop.

When he was copying the painting, the artist responsible for the Copenhagen version focused on the figure of Joan, also taking into account the carpet, gloves and helmet. The background is marked with wash, especially on the left. Even though the drawing does not feature the column, which could suggest that the sketch was made already after it had been painted over, it would seem that the author intentionally omitted not only this element, but also the curtain and pedestal with the crucifix, focusing on the kneeling figure in armour

53 For Rubens's *cantoor* see, in particular: Jan Garff, Eva de la Fuente Pedersen, *Rubens Cantoor. The Drawings of Willem Panneels*, vol. 1: *A Critical Catalogue*, vol. 2: *The Plates* (Copenhagen, 1988); *Rubens Cantoor. Een verzameling tekeningen ontstaan in Rubens' atelier*, Iris Kockelbergh, Paul Huvenne, eds, exh. cat., Rubenshuis, 1993 (Antwerp, 1993); Svenningsen, op. cit., passim.

54 Svenningsen, op. cit., p. 352, figs 4a–g. I would like to thank Chris Fisher, Head of Centre for Advanced Studies in Master Drawings, Senior Researcher from the Department of Prints and Drawings of the Statens Museum for Kunst in Copenhagen for information on the drawing.

55 Jesper Svenningsen, whom I would like to thank for his opinions expressed in e-mails from December 2013, is convinced that the drawing used to belong to the set of works taken from Antwerp by Panneels.

rather than on the composition as such.[56] In both the Copenhagen drawing and the painting, Joan's face and hair (especially its smoothness and manner of pinning), the position of her hands (although they are slightly lower than in the painting), the position of her legs and their relation to the gloves lying nearby are analogous. The same is true for details of her armour and weaponry: the decorative finish of the vambrace, breastplate and tasset (the latter also featuring decorative vertical strips of different-coloured metal), the joint between the breast and back plates, poleyns and sollerets, as well as the hilt of the sword, whose crossguard has the same length and characteristic finish. In my opinion, the Copenhagen drawing gives us an opportunity to look at Joan before the painting was cut and repainted, while the noticeable differences between the two works stem from how Joan's figure, the carpet on which she is kneeling and her helmet were repainted after Rubens's death. The armour we now see in the Raleigh painting is not very different from that shown by the artist responsible for the Copenhagen sketch. The reflections of light on metal surfaces are practically identical in both works. The way in which this area is painted does not give the impression of completion, quite the contrary – it seems sketchy and unfinished. What is more, analysis of this part of the painting confirms that it has not been repainted or even retouched.[57] As in the Copenhagen sketch, the head in the Warsaw drawing is more round. The artist who finished the painting for unknown reasons made it more oval – it is this manner of repainting that could suggest the impression described by McGrath that the background around the head was painted after the latter had been finished.[58] Perhaps the head, painted by an artist from the studio, was to be touched up by Rubens himself, but since this did not happen, it had to be done by someone else, already after the painter's death. The carpet in the drawing is not patterned, the remaining elements are practically analogous. But if the association of the Copenhagen drawing with Rubens's *cantoor* confirms that the Raleigh painting was present in Rubens workshop c. 1628, it still does not prove it is the work which is listed in the inventory made in 1640, after the artist's death.[59] Whatever the case, if the painting was largely unfinished before it was repainted, the Warsaw drawing may not be a copy at all, given that it is so specific in its details and shows more than the work supposedly copied. The obvious conclusion is that it is a concept for a painting and shows not its condition before it was repainted but its desired appearance, which was never achieved.

The discovery of the sketch in the National Museum in Warsaw provides the first opportunity in seventy years to analyse the work directly and thoroughly, which is crucial for its attribution.

[56] Cf. unknown artist, *Knight with Outstretched Arms*, before 1630, black chalk, pen and brown ink and wash, heightened with white, on blue paper, inv. no. VI.73a, Statens Museum for Kunst, Copenhagen. The drawing annotated on the verso with the number *118*, like other drawings from the so-called Rubens's *cantoor*, in this case in the sequence with works depicting armours (executed in the same technique, on blue paper, the figures' background is similarly marked with wash). It is evident that the artist who made them focused on depicting elements of armours rather than entire compositions of reproduced works. The sketches are likely to have been made on one sheet of paper cut into smaller fragments at an unknown time.

[57] I would like to thank Noelle Ocon, conservator of paintings from the North Carolina Museum of Art in Raleigh, for information on the execution of the painting.

[58] As proposed in McGrath, op. cit., vol. 2, p. 319.

[59] Elizabeth McGrath (McGrath, op. cit., vol. 2, p. 317), and recently Dennis P. Weller (Weller, op. cit., p. 311) have expressed their uncertainty as to this fact.

The drawing measures 18.4 × 18.5 cm[60] and its entire surface is glued onto a piece of an album folio measuring 20.2 × 20.8 cm.[61] It is executed in pen and brown ink, with strokes of varied thickness and tone, and black chalk, which in many places, as indicated above, serve as a legitimate means of expression, emphasizing the light and shade effects and contributing to the sensation of three-dimensionality. It is drawn on smooth, fine light cream paper.[62] The side edges are even, the upper edge is slightly jagged, while the more irregular nature of the lower edge results from the fact that approximately 1 cm of the drawing has been torn off.[63]

The sketch is made with a sure hand; the columns and sword are drawn with single, resolute strokes. Already Müller Hofstede noticed that this sketch did not depict a rough, first idea, but was a fully-fledged and thought-out work that could be presented to the patron for approval (*videmus*).[64] Scholars have later seen this meticulousness, rare in designs for paintings, as an argument against the originality of the work, being more inclined to treat it as a copy after a painting by Rubens. However, close analysis of the sketch brings some very interesting information. In daylight, we may see where the fine, bright line in pen and ink (similar to the one used to depict the crucifix) is altered, sometimes several times, using thicker and more resolute strokes. And so, the fingers of Joan's left hand were initially positioned in a slightly different way, while her right hand was placed higher (**fig. 8**). There are changes in the joint between the backplate and the tasset; the tasset itself and the chainmail underneath it have also been lowered and widened. Initially, they were drawn so as to reveal a part of Joan's thighs – the lines delineating them are still clearly visible. The first, fine line, which outlines the arrangement of the thighs, knees and ankles, is almost lost underneath subsequent strokes, defining their width and drawing the poleyns (**fig. 9**). The original position of the sword's blade was different and the helmet also changed its size – three times. The alterations are even more visible in UV light (**fig. 10**). In daylight, the places where black chalk was used are also clearly visible. Infrared reflectogram (IRR) analysis reveals that the chalk was not only used to emphasize the light and shade effects – it also delicately marks the contour of Joan's face, her lips, eye and brow, the outline of the pedestal on which the crucifix is placed and the blade of the sword.[65] However, the most interesting detail is that with the legs – even in daylight we may see a very fine line, delineating an oval shape slightly to the left of the feet, and then, slightly upwards, continuing left towards the thighs (**fig. 11**). The infrared reflectogram gives a clearer indication that right next to the said oval shape there is another one, while the line going to the left shifts upwards after a few centimetres. This trace should be interpreted as the first idea for the position of Joan's feet and legs. This initial sketch depicted legs in parallel; neither of them was moved backwards as in the later drawing in pen. Thus, the whole resembled Joan's pose from Gaultier's frontispiece. This is first and foremost a proof that the Warsaw drawing is not a copy; the artist who executed it came up with creative solutions to problems which arose in

[60] Maximum dimensions.

[61] Maximum dimensions.

[62] Watermark not visible.

[63] The original dimensions of the sketch according to Müller Hofstede are 21.9 × 20.3 cm. See Müller Hofstede, op. cit., p. 305.

[64] Ibid.

[65] I would like to thank Piotr Lisowski and Anna Lewandowska from the Conservation Workshop of Canvas Painting for taking the photograph and their assistance in its interpretation.

the drawing process, departing from the available – perhaps commissioned – model. Could this artist be Rubens?

The matter which still raises controversy is the amount of detail in the drawing, not found in most of Rubens's compositional designs for paintings. Understandably, this has been the principal (if not the only) reason for regarding the Warsaw drawing as a copy. The vast majority of Rubens's drawings serving as first concept sketches for paintings are indeed very laconic. They have even been given their own name within his diverse oeuvre: *crabbelingen*, "scribbles." The nature of these sketches may be explained by their role in the multi-stage process of creating a painting in the artist's studio (from the initial sketch, through a more detailed oil sketch and anatomical drawings depicting individual figures from the group or fragments of their bodies, to the finished painting) – they were the first, spontaneous and quick drawings. As such, they were not suitable to be given to assistants who were to execute the painting, or – all the more so – to be presented to the patron. Rubens himself admitted it: "Please be advised that the final work will be very different from these drawings, which are lightly and quickly put on paper to give merely an idea, but later we will make the sketches and also the painting with all possible care and diligence."[66] In order to give an example of this type of sketch, let us recall the one from Kupferstichkabinett in Berlin, depicting a historical scene once interpreted as the condemnation of Joan of Arc (**fig. 12**).[67] The Warsaw drawing cannot be counted among the *crabbelingen*, neither is it a "neat" compositional drawing[68] (executed based on a more concise sketch in order to be presented to the commissioner), as proved by the alterations of the position of the legs and other small corrections. This is an example of a work, in which – to borrow the words of Anne-Marie Logan used elsewhere – the artist was thinking with his pen, looking for the best compositional solutions.[69] Changes introduced in the course of creating the drawing indicate an original work and not a copy. In my opinion, here again we have a justification for attributing the Warsaw sheet to Rubens. However, the circumstances of preparing the sketch also have to be taken into account.

Already in her volume of *Corpus Rubenianum*, Elizabeth McGrath noted the interest in Joan of Arc c. 1620 in the circle of Rubens.[70] In her opinion, the fact that the artist should have created a "historically accurate image," which in so many respects depends on the Orléans statue, could be associated with the initiative undertaken by Charles du Lys (c. 1560 – before 1632), who in 1613 published the first group of proposed inscriptions that were to appear on the monument.[71] Subsequent verses were obtained with the assistance of Nicolas-Claude

[66] Peter Paul Rubens, *King David Playing the Harp*, c. 1612, pen and brown ink and brown wash, 18.1 × 15 cm, inv. no. 20.221, Cabinet du Dessins, Musée du Louvre (inscription below composition). See Anne-Marie Logan in collaboration with Michiel C. Plomp, *Peter Paul Rubens. The Drawings*, exh. cat., The Metropolitan Museum of Art, 2005 (New York–New Haven, 2005), p. 7.

[67] Peter Paul Rubens, *Historical Scene* (*The Condemnation of Joan of Arc*?), pen and brown ink, 19.2 × 26.2 cm, inv. no. KdZ 5397, Staatliche Museen zu Berlin Preussischer Kulturbesitz (Kupferstichkabinett), Berlin. See Hans Mielke, Matthias Winner, *Peter Paul Rubens. Kritischer Katalog der Zeichnungen. Originale, Umkreis, Kopien* (Berlin, 1977), pp. 62–64, cat. no. 18, fig. 18v. Cf. McGrath, op. cit., vol. 2, p. 321.

[68] Logan, Plomp, op. cit., pp. 7–9.

[69] Ibid., p. 136.

[70] McGrath, op. cit., vol. 2, pp. 320–21.

[71] Charles du Lys, *Recueil de plusieurs inscriptions pour les statues du roy Charles VII et de la Pucelle d'Orléans qui sont eslevées... sur le pont de la ville d'Orléans, dès l'an 1458, et de diverses poésies faictes à la louange de la mesme Pucelle* (Paris, 1613).

Fabri de Peiresc (1580–1637). Thanks to his broad contacts, the project could count on the participation of representatives of the intellectual elite of early seventeenth-century Europe, including Nicolas Rigault, Nicolas Bergier, François Maynard, Étienne Pasquier, François de Malherbe, Marie le Jars de Gournay, Hugo Grotius and Rubens's close friend, Jan Gaspar Gevaerts (Gevartius). The publication began with prefaces by Louis XIII and Marie de' Medici. Interestingly enough, Peiresc also wrote to Rubens about the inscriptions – he asked him in 1622 to exert some pressure on Gevartius, who had begun work on his poem on Joan back in 1617, but had failed to deliver it.[72] In the end, the work was published in 1628 and apart from inscription proposals, it also contained poems glorifying the Maid of Orléans.[73] Considering the subject of the painting, it is not surprising that McGrath (and then Lohse Belkin and Weller after her) suggested that the painting was created for a French client, such as du Lys or the authorities of Orléans, if not for Peiresc himself. Even though the long-standing correspondence between Rubens and the French scholar and antiquarian began in late 1619, the painting could have been created in connection with the painter's trip to Paris in 1622, when both of them met for the first time.[74]

The peculiar nature of the drawing in terms of its precision could therefore be justified in two ways. First of all, as a design for a painting, a sketch on paper was easier to send over a long distance for the commissioner's approval than an oil *modello*, as was indicated by Müller Hofstede.[75] The second circumstance is related to who actually painted the Raleigh canvas. It is practically impossible to establish to what extent Rubens contributed to it – or whether he did at all. Of course the composition and physiognomic type are Rubens's, but the master himself need not have been responsible for the first stage of the painting. There is not much that can be said in that respect based on the X-ray photograph which shows the elements that were painted over, but does not allow any attempt at an identification of the "hands." As is proved by the analysis of the Copenhagen drawing, the part of the painting depicting the figure of Joan was in a similar condition during the artist's lifetime to what we see today. Therefore, one could speculate that its current appearance is not so much the result of inept finish, but of being cursorily painted. The rest of the composition was executed in such a sketchy manner that the painter who undertook to finish the work removed a considerable part of it, painted over several elements (columns, fragment of the curtain) and retouched others (e.g., the rug). It is difficult to explain the alteration of the shape of Joan's head and facial expression. Although Dennis Weller supported the assumption of two stages of creating the work, he attributed both of them – rightly so, in my opinion – to Rubens's workshop, as there are no grounds for thinking that the master could have begun it.[76] However, if the painting was indeed the product of the workshop, we must assume that the artist (or artists) who worked on it had to have a *modello* to use as a basis for its execution that could not have been simply a first, general concept of the

[72] Unfortunately, the published letters do not include Rubens's reply. Gevartius delivered his poem c. 1622–23. See McGrath, op. cit., vol. 2, p. 320 and n. 28.

[73] Charles du Lys, *Recueil de plusieurs inscriptions proposées pour remplir les tables d'attente estans sous les statues du Roy Charles VII et de la Pucelle d'Orléans, qui sont élevées, également armées, et à genoux, aux deux costez d'une Croix, et de l'image de la Vierge Marie estant au pied d'icelle, sur le pont de la ville d'Orléans, dès l'an 1458. Et de diverses poésies faites à la loüange de la mesme Pucelle, de ses frères et de leur postérité...* (Paris, 1628).

[74] McGrath, op. cit., vol. 2, pp. 320–21.

[75] Müller Hofstede, op. cit., p. 305.

[76] Weller, op. cit., passim.

work. Normally such a *modello* would have been an intermediate oil-sketch. But in this case it seems possible that the Warsaw drawing, detailed as it is, would have been able to perform this function, provided it was supplemented by verbal instructions about colouring.

Might the drawing then have been created during Rubens's stay in Paris in 1622, when he visited Peiresc for the first time?[77] The artist could have executed it during the discussion on the possible commission for a painting for Charles du Lys, the authorities of Orléans or a person involved in the inscriptions project. The picture was presumably meant to convey the appearance of the Orléans sculpture, which explains this particular pose of Joan, referring to the monument.[78] It is worth remembering that Peiresc, who was no art connoisseur, would be concerned about precision and clarity of the drawing, which would make it immediately understandable to those interested in Joan, including the commissioner himself. Rubens may have modified his style accordingly. This could explain the detailed representation of the heroine in comparison with the more sketchy background. If we accept some such course of events, Rubens would have returned to Antwerp with the sketch which could then be given to one of the artists he cooperated with in order to execute the commission. The project, however, was ultimately not finalized and the unfinished painting remained in the workshop for years to come. This hypothesis is supported by the manner of executing the drawing: the point of departure was a figure much closer to that in Gaultier's print (as proved by the traces of the initial sketch in black chalk). Only later did Rubens depart from the original position of the body, but he did not introduce significant changes. While the similarity between Joan's figure and the sculpture from Orléans could have been prescribed by the terms of the commission, the idea of showing her in an unidentified palace interior, kneeling in front of a crucifix against a curtain, columns, balustrade and the sky was an original element. The sketchy rendering of the background in the drawing could stem from the fact that the appearance of this section was not that important for the commissioner.

There is also another possibility regarding the function of the drawing and the circumstances of its creation. Even though Müller Hofstede suggested that it might have been a design for a print[79] this notion has hitherto not been taken into account. This way the drawing would be directly connected with the initiative of du Lys and Peiresc and the publication they planned. Müller Hofstede thought that the detail of the Warsaw composition turned it into an ideal template, conveying individual elements of the curtain, armour and face with appropriate detail.[80] Indeed, the elements of the composition he mentioned would have been easily interpreted by the engraver, especially Joan's torso, which was depicted using light and shade effects.

Here it is worth emphasizing that this would not have been the first project of Peiresc and Rubens related to prints. In 1621, the French scholar wrote to the artist, asking him to lend him the drawing after the *Gemma Augustea*.[81] Soon afterwards, the pair began to plan a publication that would contain some thirty images of antique cameos (i.a., from the painter's collection);

[77] This idea developed from a suggestion made to me in an e-mail by Elizabeth McGrath of 4 December 2013.

[78] For information on how non-standard Joan of Arc's depiction is in many aspects see McGrath, op. cit., vol. 2, pp. 320–21.

[79] Müller Hofstede, op. cit., p. 305.

[80] Ibid.

[81] Peter Paul Rubens, *Gemma Augustea*, pen and brown ink and brown wash, 22.5 × 25 cm, inv. no. AB245, Sankt Annen-Museum, Lübeck. See Marjon van der Meulen, *Copies after the Antique*, vol. 2 (London, 1994), pp. 179–80, cat. no. 164a; vol. 3, fig. 314. Corpus Rubenianum Ludwig Burchard, 23.

the designs for prints were to be made by Rubens, the explanatory text – by Peiresc.[82] A few sketches for this project survive. At least two of them were probably executed in early 1622, during the artist's stay in Paris. The first, depicting a cameo with Claudius and Agrippina, is difficult to recognize as a proper design for a print (**fig. 13**).[83] This sketch was made with a view to including the cameo in the publication. It is of linear and contour-like character; shadows are marked with parallel lines, which turn into dense cross hatching to the right of the chariot. It is not a literal copy of the antique model – the artist gave Claudius his right hand and windblown cape which were missing from the original.[84] Although no print was made after that drawing, such a print was planned: Peiresc's manuscripts include a description of the cameo, which was to be included in the projected publication.[85] The drawing after *Gemma Tiberiana*, which Peiresc discovered in the Sainte-Chapelle treasury in Paris in 1620, is of a different nature (**fig. 14**).[86] Rubens put considerably more effort into it – it is no longer merely a note registering the cameo's appearance, but a complete sketch executed using pen and wash on a delicate outline made with black chalk.[87] Also visible is gouache, used to highlight the spots which stood out the most against the background. It is significant that in a few places of the central area of the drawing Rubens used dense hatching combined with wash in order to introduce deep shadows – above all in order to underline where the relief was the deepest. One also gets the impression that they bring out the main figures depicted in the cameo from the otherwise rather uniform background. Even though a print was made after the drawing (**fig. 15**),[88] and a painting as well (**fig. 16**),[89] here too it is difficult to regard the latter as a typical design, being rather a detailed image of the cameo. Both the Berlin and Antwerp drawings were discussed not in the volume of the *Corpus Rubenianum* devoted to book illustrations and title pages, but in that on copies from antique works. They are rightly regarded primarily as copies, not independent designs. An interesting and not altogether unlikely supposition

82 For the planned publication and associated drawings, see, i.a., Oleg Neverov, "Gems in the Collection of Rubens," *The Burlington Magazine*, vol. 121, no. 916 (Jul. 1979), pp. 424 and 426–32; David Jaffé, "Reproducing and Reading Gems in Rubens's Circle," in *Engraved Gems: Survivals and Revivals*, Clifford Malcolm Brown, ed. (Washington, D.C., 1997), pp. 181–93. Studies in the History of Art, 54; Marjon van der Meulen, "Nicolas Fabri de Peiresc and Antique Glyptic," in *Engraved Gems...*, op. cit., pp. 195–227; Logan, Plomp, op. cit., pp. 116–17.

83 Peter Paul Rubens, *Cameo with Claudius and Agrippina*, c. 1622, pen and brown ink, 14.8 × 22.3 cm, inv. no. KdZ 3379, Staatliche Museen zu Berlin Preussischer Kulturbesitz (Kupferstichkabinett), Berlin. See Mielke, Winner, op. cit., pp. 88–91, cat. no. 31; Van der Meulen, *Copies...*, op. cit., vol. 2, pp. 180–82, cat. no. 165; Logan, Plomp, op. cit., cat. no. 24, pp. 116–17.

84 The cameo is currently held at the Bibliothèque nationale de France in Paris (inv. no. Bab.276).

85 Logan, Plomp, op. cit., p. 116.

86 Peter Paul Rubens, *Gemma Tiberiana*, c. 1622, pen and brown ink and brown wash on a black chalk outline, gouache (whites), 32.7 × 27 cm, inv. no. PK.OT.00109, Museum Plantin-Moretus, Antwerp. See Van der Meulen, *Copies...*, op. cit., vol. 2, pp. 190–91, cat. no. 168a. See also Anke van Wagenberg-Ter Hoeven, "A Matter of Mistaken Identity. In Search of a New Title for Rubens's *Tiberius and Agrippina*," *Artibus et Historiae*, vol. 26, no. 52 (2005), pp. 113–27, in particular p. 125 and figs 12 and 13. According to Nico van Hout the sketch was made by an unknown artist and only retouched by Rubens. See Nico van Hout, "D'après l'antique. Rubens et l'Archéologie," in *Rubens et l'art de la gravure*, Nico van Hout, ed., exh. cat., Koninklijk Museum voor Schone Kunsten Antwerpen; Musée national des beaux-arts du Québec, 2004–2005 (Gand, 2004), pp. 109–110, fig. 79.

87 See Van der Meulen, *Copies...*, op. cit., vol. 2, p. 174.

88 Unknown artist after Peter Paul Rubens, *Gemma Tiberiana*, engraving, 32.3 × 27.4 cm, inv. no. 1891,0414.1233, The British Museum, London.

89 Peter Paul Rubens, *Gemma Tiberiana*, oil, canvas, 100.7 × 78 cm, inv. no. 1963.8.1, Ashmolean Museum, Oxford.

is that both sketches of cameos were made in Peiresc's presence, who (as the rediscoverer of *Gemma Tiberiana*) might have wanted to analyse them with Rubens on the spot. Could it be possible that Rubens and Peiresc, as in the case of the cameo publication, could have planned a cooperation which would have resulted in a print design for *Recueil de plusieurs inscriptions proposées...*?

In this context, Rubens's participation in the project of honouring Maid of Orléans need not have been limited to his intervention with his friend Gevartius – it could have also included preparing the illustration. We know that, as a rule, Rubens executed book illustrations in his spare time (usually on Sundays and holidays), treating them – at least so he claimed – as an "intellectual exercise."[90] Admittedly, if a print to be made by Rubens was planned in connection with du Lys's publication, and the figure of Joan was to be inspired by the sculpture from the Orléans bridge, one might have expected more of a similarity between the two images of the heroine.[91] Moreover, the lack of precision in the background and visible changes in many parts of the sketch might seem to contradict this hypothesis.[92] The different manner of execution of known designs for prints which are more "painterly" than other drawings by Rubens, also speaks against such an eventuality. There, wash is used much more often than hatching, since it was better equipped to inform the engraver about the distribution of light and shade in the future print. It should also be added that the Warsaw drawing bears no marks of transferral of the composition onto a different surface. However, there is one known example of a proper design preceded by an initial, more superficial sketch,[93] while in many cases engravers used the painter's design to prepare their own drawings, which then became the model directly traced onto the plate.[94] In my opinion, the "extraordinary" circumstances surrounding the origin of the sketch proposed here could explain both the atypical appearance of the drawing whether as a first draft for a painting (i.e., too detailed), or as a design for a print (i.e., too imprecise). The Warsaw drawing could have later become a point of departure for further development. However, the *Recueil...* features no composition even remotely similar to the one by Rubens. Although it includes an image of the heroine, she is depicted in a completely different manner: in half-figure, with a sword in her hand, wearing a dress and a hat (**fig. 17**).[95] Like the frontispiece, the composition was made by Gaultier, though it is in no way similar to the figure from the bridge in Orléans – it is modelled on a painting commissioned by the city's councillors c. 1580.[96] Could it then be possible that the work under discussion is an unrealized design for a print which came to be used as a design for a painting? It is not unlikely that the function of the Warsaw drawing might be more ambiguous than has been thought until now.

The above pages on *Joan of Arc* largely leave aside stylistic or comparative questions. These matters have already been subject to debate. Doubting the originality of the drawing, Anne-Marie

90 See J. Richard Judson, Carl van de Velde, *Book Illustrations and Title Pages*, vol. 1 (London, 1977), p. 27. Corpus Rubenianum Ludwig Burchard, 21.

91 E-mail from Elizabeth McGrath of 4 December 2013.

92 Ibid.

93 Judson, Van de Velde, op. cit., vol. 1, pp. 214–15, cat. no. 47a; vol. 2, figs 159, 160.

94 Ibid., vol. 1, pp. 27–28.

95 Du Lys, *Recueil de plusieurs inscriptions proposées...*, op. cit., p. 11.

96 McGrath, op. cit., vol. 2, p. 321.

Logan pointed out to me that if Rubens's sketches are made in pen and ink, in a precise and detailed manner, they usually represent copies of a work rather than designs. Preliminary compositional drawings executed in this technique are, in turn, hasty and rather imprecise.[97] However, one should bear in mind that *Joan of Arc* was probably created on commission and based on a specific design or designs presented to the artist. Therefore, a typical, rough compositional sketch would have been inappropriate; to a certain extent, the figure of Joan is a copy of a sculpture, although Rubens has altered the appearance of the armour.[98]

Another point raised by Logan is that the Warsaw drawing should first and foremost be analysed in the context of portrait drawings. She noted that Rubens used specific techniques depending on the function and purpose of a sketch – and was consistent in this division.[99] To create portrait studies, he predominantly used black crayon, sometimes supplementing it with white and red crayons. The justification for this practice is very simple – crayons lend themselves perfectly to registering the subtleties of the human face. However, what is striking is that the drawings in question are, above all, studies of heads, more rarely busts and torsos – these are studies of the physiognomy of posing figures, rather than designs for compositions of entire paintings.[100] There is only one exception: *Man on Horseback* of 1603 held at the Staatliche Graphische Sammlung in Munich, which is executed in pen and brown ink and represents a study for a monumental painting, the portrait of the Duke of Lerma (**fig. 18**).[101] In fact, interestingly enough the face of the rider does not correspond to that of the Duke.[102] Rubens probably copied his image from the official portrait by Juan Pantoja de la Cruz in the final stages of work on his painting. The functions of the Munich drawing and Rubens's other portrait sketches are different – with the former serving as a *modello* or *vidimus* of the entire composition, created to be presented to the commissioner, and the latter representing studies of the physiognomy of individual characters to be portrayed in the final painting.[103] This difference surely explains the use of different techniques. Essentially, however, I believe that *Joan of Arc* should not be compared with portrait drawings. Her face bears no specific characteristics that would enable her to be recognized as the French heroine. On the contrary: she is more of a type and, in addition, only partially visible, as she is depicted in profile. It is the composition of the drawing, the armour, long hair and, perhaps most importantly, the direct reference to the figure from the Orléans bridge that enable the "kneeling knight" to be identified. This reference would be particularly clear to those from the circle of Peiresc and du Lys, who – knowing the sculpture – could immediately recognize the figure depicted in the

97 E-mail from Anne-Marie Logan of 31 March 2014. I would like to thank Anne-Marie Logan for her stimulating comments on the first draft of this article (even if this revised version probably still will not allay her scepticism about Rubens's authorship).

98 McGrath, op. cit., vol. 2, s. 320.

99 E-mail from Anne-Marie Logan of 31 March 2014.

100 See, in particular Frances Huemer, *Portraits Painted in Foreign Countries* (London, 1977). Corpus Rubenianum Ludwig Burchard. 19 (1); Hans Vlieghe, *Portraits of identified sitters painted in Antwerp* (New York, 1987). Corpus Rubenianum Ludwig Burchard. 19 (2); Logan, Plomp, op. cit., passim.

101 Peter Paul Rubens, *Man on Horseback*, 1603, pen and brown ink over the black chalk outline, 76.1 × 41 cm, inv. no. 1983.84 Z, Staatliche Graphische Sammlung, Munich (the painting is in the collection of Museo Nacional del Prado, Madrid).

102 For exhaustive information on the drawing and the circumstances of its creation, see Logan, Plomp, op. cit., pp. 90–93, cat. no. 13.

103 In consequence, the portrayed sitter could avoid long hours of posing.

sketch. McGrath rightly regarded the Raleigh painting not as a portrait but a historical scene (or rather a painting depicting a historical figure) and as such included it in her volume of *Corpus Rubenianum*. Therefore, the composition of the Warsaw drawing can be compared – and justifiably so, in my opinion – with a much broader group of drawings, rather than just portraits.

In short, the question of the authorship of *Joan of Arc* should be reopened given that it is surely an original composition and not a copy. Even though the manner of its execution might appear in some ways problematic, I believe that the circumstances of the creation of the work speak against the authorship of any artist other than Rubens himself. The idea of honouring the heroine originated with and was implemented by a small group of people. Rubens could have been aware of the planned publication as early as 1619, when he began his correspondence with Peiresc – maybe even earlier, through his friend Gevartius. During the following years, Rubens and Peiresc frequently exchanged letters, not only – as mentioned before – on scholarly and artistic matters. The correspondence concerning the poem by Gevartius is proof that the artist was aware of the circumstances surrounding the publication. In this context, commissioning an image of Joan from Rubens seems only too natural, if not self-evident. It is difficult to imagine the artist entrusting someone else with the intellectually challenging design in the situation when it was so deeply associated with the circle of his closest friends. Further research by specialists may focus on stylistic matters, perhaps allowing the master's hand to be more generally recognized.

I am sincerely grateful to Bert Watteeuw (Rubenianum) for his support and invaluable help in acquiring materials for the article, Prof. Elizabeth McGrath (The Warburg Institute) for the inspiring e-mail discussion and Dennis P. Weller (North Carolina Museum of Art) for information on the Raleigh painting.

Translated by Aleksandra Szkudłapska