The Continence of Scipio and Katherine Manners

A. M. Trotter

Abstract: This work considers and connects the Jacobean-Caroline Era painting The Continence of Scipio, c.1620/1, Christ Church Gallery, Oxford, and the play ‘Hannibal and Scipio’ (1635) by Thomas Nabbes (1605-41). Recent art-historical study of the painting has questioned the identities of both artist and subject, and the dramatic source of the play remains unidentified. Here, the disciplines of art-history and literary studies are combined to suggest arts-patron Katherine Manners (c.1604-49) as the originator of both artefacts.

Figure 1 The Continence of Scipio. Oil on canvas, 182.9 x 232.4cm, Christ Church Picture Gallery, Oxford. By permission of the Governing Body, Christ Church, Oxford
This work examines the viewpoint that paintings and plays are guided by the patron or person who conceives an artefact rather than the hand that produces them, through Katherine Manners (c. 1604-49), the painting *The Continence of Scipio*, c. 1620/1, oil on canvas, 182.9 x 232.4 cm, Christ Church Picture Gallery (Fig. 1) and the play ‘Hannibal and Scipio’ (1635) by Thomas Nabbes (1605-41). Previous studies of the painting have questioned the identities of both artist and subject, and the dramatic source of the play is unknown. A combined examination of these two artefacts and their wider historical context reveals Katherine Manners, Arts Patron, as the person most likely to have conceived both. Accordingly it is shown that whilst artworks require some form of artistic imagination, the imagination is not necessarily always that of a painter or playwright.

Bequeathed as an Antony Van Dyck (1599-1641),¹ portraitist of St Luke’s Guild and the English School of large-scale canvas painting, the provenance of *The Continence of Scipio*, was thought to be that listed in the York House Inventory, Rawlinson Manuscript, Duke of Buckingham Collection, London, 11 May 1635.² Van Dyck was first brought to England in October 1620 by John Villiers,³ elder brother of the ‘lewd’ and ‘crude’ George Villiers,⁴ First Duke of Buckingham, Knight of the Garter and Lord High Admiral of England, Ireland and Wales (1592-1628).⁵ Van Dyck entered into the service of James I (1566-1625),⁶ and left during October 1621 for seven years in Italy by arrangement of the Earl of Arundel.⁷ From 1632 until his death, Van Dyck was ‘Principall Paynter’ at the court of Charles I (1600-49). Recently it has been suggested that the painting ‘Vandyck-One great Piece being Scipio’ - listed in the inventory is not the picture in Christ Church Picture Gallery but another held in a private collection in Florence.⁸

There have been alterations to the painting. A new face of delicate glazes modelled over impasto has been added to the central figure. The fingers of his left-hand have been enlarged and his footwear removed (pentimenti). A column has been erased (pentimento, mid-centre left) and a large marble added (lower left). The painting has been re-sized (reduced to its previous size) and

---

¹ The painting was presented to Christ Church by Lord Frederick Campbell in 1809. Source, J. Byam-Shaw, C. White, p. 445, and ‘The Christ Church Picture Gallery’, p. 235.  
cleaned. The colour is ‘cold and clear’ and the tones have none of the ‘glowing warmth’ of Flemish contemporaries. The brush-work is long, loose and quick and there is ‘some confusion in the spatial relationships’, typical of the period when Van Dyck was exercising his independence as a Master. Nevertheless, recent appreciation suggests this painting as ‘Alexander with the Family of Darius’ by Rubens and it is possible that the painting is not that listed in the York House inventory of 1635. This alone, however, does not prove conclusively that the painting is not by Van Dyck or that the subject matter is not Scipio.

Conventional interpretations of the painting identify the figure left as Roman General Scipio Africanus 236-183 BC (as representing James I), who in 209 BC nobly returned Lucretia (Katherine Manners) involute to Prince Allucius Llucias of Celtiberi (George Villiers). The other characters are Lucretia’s parents, two soldiers (one brandishing a sword) and three attendants. One attendant looks out at the viewer and points towards Lucretia’s lifted skirts. The quality of Allucius’ face is ‘high in every portion’, demonstrating the hand of a master. Lucretia, however, does not appear similar to contemporary representations of Katherine Manners. Standing before the painting, the architectural framing of drapery (left) and columns (right), costumes, and marble prop gives the impression of a stage. The characters are life sized, as they would be if the viewer were watching a play.

From 1580 onwards, variations of Scipio Africanus were staged at court but few productions capture more critical interest than Thomas Nabbes’ ‘Hannibal and Scipio - an Hystorical Tragedy’. Nabbes entered ‘the employ of a nobleman’ in 1623, possibly Sir Endymion Porter, patron of the poets and masques. Nabbes was a favoured member of the Tribe of Ben (Jonson), comprising: Robert Herrick, Thomas Carew, Edmund Waller, Sir John Suckling, and brothers’ William and Thomas Killigrew, amongst others. Nabbes wrote elegies, epithalamia and masques set in London, but not usually history plays. Written in English and

---

9The painting was cleaned by Horace Buttery and reduced to size in 1949. See O. Millar, ‘Van Dyck’s Contenence of Scipio at Christ Church’, ‘Van Dyck’s Contenence of Scipio at Christ Church’, The Burlington Magazine, Vol. 93, No. 577, (April, 1951), p. 125. By comparison see ‘The Masters from Christ Church: The Paintings’, Walker Art Gallery, Liverpool, 1964, who adapt Glück’s suggestion in Zeitschrift für Bildende Kunst, 1927 that the picture may be a work from Van Dyck’s Italian Period. Glück observes Van Dyck’s early handling is ‘rapid and vigorous […] characteristics which have all the value of a signature: long strokes of the brush are of frequent occurrence, especially in the execution of an arm or of the muscles of a leg’, p. 185.

10These characteristics are detectable in his Saint Sebastian, oil on canvas, 226 x 160cm, ca.1620-21, National Gallery Scotland; Study of a Soldier, oil on canvas, 91 x 55cm, ca.1617-18, Christ Church Picture Gallery, and, The Betrayal of Christ, oil on canvas, 141.9 x 113 cm, ca.1620-21, Minneapolis Institute of Art, amongst others.

11Alexander con la famiglia di Dario, the re-attribution of A. Tempestini, in VanDyckRubensVanDyck (Todi, Italy: Marco Vigevani Agenzia Letteraria, 2009). A Statement regarding Anthony van Dyck’s Continence of Scipio at Christ Church Picture Gallery, Oxford, December 2012, reads thus: ‘We remain firmly of the view that the traditional identification of artist and subject is correct, and that Dr. Tempestini’s alternative proposals are not persuasive.’ Jacqueline Thalmann, Curator of the Picture Gallery.

12Jacqueline Thalmann has pointed out that ‘It is of course possible that the Christ Church painting is not the one mentioned in the inventory, but we [Christ Church Picture Gallery] do not feel Dr. Tempestini’s arguments proves it either way’ (10 December 2012), adapted above.


14Katherine Manners, Van Dyck, 1628, oil on canvas, 218.5 x 131cm, National Trust, Katherine Manners, copy of Van Dyck, c.1633, oil on canvas, 92.2 x 78.5cm, National Library of Wales, The Duchess of Buckingham in Mourning, c.1628-32, attributed to Henri Beaubrun, oil on canvas, 59.7 x 48.9 cm, private collection, for example.


17Examples of plays with London setting by Nabbes include ‘The Bride, a Comedy’, dedicated to ‘the Generality of his Noble friends’ and ‘Sir John Suckling, Knight’ (acted 1633, printed 1640), ‘Covent Garden, a Comedy’ (acted 1632), and ‘Tottenham-
Latin, a series of five acts in tight blank verse with little enjambment,\textsuperscript{21} and musical interludes between acts,\textsuperscript{22} the play was performed by Queen Henrietta’s Men in 1635 at their private residence,\textsuperscript{23} Drury Lane in ‘Honoure of [unspecified] Memories’.\textsuperscript{24}

Henrietta was an enthusiastic supporter of Caroline-Era paintings and masques. Coquettish, she assumed leading roles in intermedios, bare-foot with lifted skirts and bare-toptless, often appearing unannounced at the point of performance.\textsuperscript{25} Lord de Bueil’s Seigneur de Racan’s Artenice (1626), Montagu’s ‘The Shepherds’ Paradise’ (1635),\textsuperscript{26} ‘The Temple of Love’ (1635), and ‘Luminalia’ (1638), produced in the style of the ballet de cour, are key examples.\textsuperscript{27} Henrietta usually performed in productions accompanied by French vocal music, not texts declaimed in verse.\textsuperscript{28} This raises the question why she would host a history play such as ‘Hannibal and Scipio’.

The unknown sources for ‘Hannibal and Scipio’ are directly related, like the painting, to its theme. The prologue refers to ‘borrowing from a former play’.\textsuperscript{29} Conversely, it is emphasised that the play is an original work. Analysts have made several attempts to resolve this aporia. The assertion that it was modelled on Marston’s ‘Sophonisba’ (1598),\textsuperscript{30} or Dekker, Drayton, and Wilson’s ‘Hannibal and Hermes’ (1598),\textsuperscript{31} or a fragment of a sixteenth-century play in Latin, proved untrue.\textsuperscript{32} The idea that it refers to a play of the same name by Hathway & Rabkins (1601) was overturned.\textsuperscript{33} Comparative sources offer the works of Livy or North’s translation of Plutarch (1579)\textsuperscript{34} – but these are not ‘plays’.\textsuperscript{35}

Earlier English history plays typically concern themselves with Scipio’s triumphant

\textsuperscript{21}A Jonsonian trait often implemented in the verse and scripts of his ‘Tribe’.

\textsuperscript{22}The Drexel Manuscript 4041 in its present state consists of 144 folios including the two prefatory leaves. It confirms that Nabbes’ ‘Hannibal and Scipio’ was set to song in keeping with the following: Ben Jonson’s ‘Epicoene’ (1609); Thomas Killigrew’s ‘The Princess’ (1636); Sir John Suckling’s ‘The Goblins’ (1638); and, William Killigrew’s ‘Selindra’ (1662), amongst others. See, J. P. Cutts’ ‘Drexel Manuscript 4041’, Musica Disciplina, Vol. 18 (1964), note 2, p. 151.

\textsuperscript{23}The play was published 1637 after the performance in keeping with the tradition of Caroline Era plays and masques.

\textsuperscript{24}I am grateful to Lynne Farrington, Curator of Printed Books, and Elton-John Torres, Administrative and Reprographic Services Coordinator, Rare Book and Manuscript Library, University of Pennsylvania, for providing a facsimile copy of Nabbes’ Quarto 1637.

\textsuperscript{25}E. Hamilton, Henrietta, (London and New York: Coward, McGann & Geoghegan, 1976), introduction. Not only was her appearance kept secret until her entry on stage her name was often kept off published editions due to a fear of Puritan objections.

\textsuperscript{26}K. Britland, Drama at the Courts of Queen Henrietta, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006), p.113.

\textsuperscript{27}Ibid, p.116.


\textsuperscript{29}In full, ‘Our sphæres| Have better musick to delight your eares,| And not a strain that’s old, though some would taskel| His [Nabbes] borrowing from a former play.’ Q (Prologue) II. 26-29.


\textsuperscript{31}Drayton’s and Wilson’s ‘Hannibal and Hermes’ was non-extant after the only three known copies were lost to fire at the Fortune Theatre (not rebuilt until 1624). See C. Moore, p.33 and R. W. Vince p. 328.


\textsuperscript{33}This ‘identification’ by A. H. Bullen’s Old English Plays (1887) and F. G. Fleay’s Chronicle History of the Stage, (1890), was discredited in G. E. Bentley’s The Jacobean and Caroline Stage, (1941-68) on the grounds that there was a vast difference between the ‘publiclie’ actors of 1601 and the Queen’s private Servants of 1635, p. 936, reproduced in R. W. Vince, p. 328.


victory over Hannibal at Zama 202 BC\textsuperscript{36}, as in ‘Quintas Fabious’ (1574) and ‘The Four Sons of Fabyous’ (1580).\textsuperscript{37} Nabbes’ play, however, spans thirty-five years and is set in five different geographical locations, telescoping time and space. Unusually, Nabbes’ play is equally concerned with Scipio’s virtue or continence\textsuperscript{38}: ‘One I [Scipio] must confesse| I glory to be master of.’\textsuperscript{39} The touch of language is generally light, smooth, and sentimental, but at times Scipio is surprisingly cavalier, bawdy and lewd.\textsuperscript{40} Upon meeting the future Queen, he remarks ‘Perhaps my selfe would take you to my bed’. Despite being ‘o’recome’ he returns her to her fiancé inviolate, ‘see| Passion’s the noble soules worst enemy’. He is ‘all for action’\textsuperscript{41} and goes off to war instead.\textsuperscript{42}

The quarto lists twenty-nine characters and their players from the performance of 1635, excluding ‘mutes’ (‘souldiers’, ‘attendants’, and ‘senators’). There are two Scipios: one deceased (a ‘Ghost’\textsuperscript{43} and one present (‘a Memorie’). The name of the person playing Lucretia is left blank. The stage keepers are ‘blue cloaked’ in the uniform of the Knights of the Garter,\textsuperscript{44} unlike the ‘Parliament of Souldiers’ who call Scipio to court.\textsuperscript{45} Oddly, some of the soldiers are portrayed as ‘treacherous’.\textsuperscript{46} Overall, Scipio’s fate is that of good men who attain recognition and glory due to their exceptional virtue but then fall victim to envy, recalling Petrarch: \textit{est enim livor antiquus virtutum hostis et glorie.}\textsuperscript{47} Scipio is aware that his after-life, at least, will be free from the ‘feare of their leane envie.’ ‘The Author warrents us the story’s cleare| Unlesse to fit the stage he doth transfer| Some actions that were ones to other men.’\textsuperscript{48} The stage is ‘transformed’\textsuperscript{49} into ‘a rich subject drawne’,\textsuperscript{50} albeit of ‘imperfect colours’, suggestive of a painting.\textsuperscript{51}

English Renaissance oil paintings commemorating Scipio’s victories and virtues are virtually unknown. Representations of Scipio’s accomplishments do, however, appear frequently in \textit{quattrocento} and \textit{cinquecento} painting. In terms of Scipio’s victories, these images tend to focus on two key episodes in Scipio’s life. First, when he pleaded with Senate for more troops as in \textit{il percorso di Scipione} (‘The Trail of Scipio’), panel, previously attributed to Bernardo Parentino of Padua (c.1450-1500).\textsuperscript{52} Second, when he was brought to judgement by Senate on a

\textsuperscript{36}ibid, pp. 331-332
\textsuperscript{37}ibid pp. 331-332
\textsuperscript{39}Q.C.253-256
\textsuperscript{40}The Spanish play \textit{Los Amantos de Cartago}, performed in England 1603 and 1608, enacts the continence, but Scipio is neither bawdy nor lewd. Nabbes was less than three years of age at the date of its second performance in England. Nabbes neither spoke nor wrote Spanish.
\textsuperscript{41}Q.C.255-256
\textsuperscript{42}Q.C.253-255
\textsuperscript{43}Q.A.20-33
\textsuperscript{45}Q.C.11,1957
\textsuperscript{46}Q.Act 5, scene 2
\textsuperscript{47}Petrarch’s \textit{Vita di Scipione l’Africano}, (Milan and Naples, 1952), Book 38.52.1
\textsuperscript{48}Q.B.37-39
\textsuperscript{49}Q (Prologue) 27
\textsuperscript{50}Q.B.32-33
\textsuperscript{51}Q.B.35
series of accounts, including the misappropriation of funds as represented in *il processo di Scipione* (‘The Trial of Scipio’). In both scenes Scipio is represented as semi-naked, as in Crespi Chronicle, fol.13r, Leonardo da Besozzo, (fl.1421–81), Crespi Morbio Collection, Milan and MSS. Varia.102, fols.76v–7r, Biblioteca Reale, Turin, artist unknown. Scipio's left hand is positioned across his chest to emphasise wounds sustained in service, as in the modified figure of Allucius (Fig.1). Scipio is not regally seated, as Caesar or as a king would be. Scipio stands centre-stage before his ruler.

Scipio’s virtue or conitnence features in the Renaissance literature of Boccaccio’s ‘Famous Men’, Petrarch’s *I Trionfi* and De Viris Illustrious, Dante’s ‘Divine Comedy’, Machiavelli’s ‘Prince’, and the wedding orations of Ludovico Carbone. It also appears in the domestic imagery of wedding chests (*forzieri-cassoni*) and screens (*deschi da parto*), as in Apollonio di Giovanni, panel, 1460, St Luke's Guild 1443-1489, V&A Museum, London, and Marco del Buono, panel, St Luke's Guild 1443-89, where Van Dyck sojourned prior to 1620. The play appears, therefore, to combine both the continental literary and painted histories of Scipio’s victory and virtue. There is no record of Nabbes having any direct experience of Italian manuscripts, panels or painting. Nabbes was, however, familiar with Van Dyck.

Van Dyck was a close associate of The Tribe of Ben and its leading figures. He painted the poets *Sir John Suckling*, oil on canvas, 216.5 x 130.2cm, 1632, Frick Collection, *Sir William Killigrew*, 1638, oil on canvas, support 105.2 x 84.1cm and *Thomas Killigrew*, oil on canvas, 105.2 x 84.1cm, 1638, both Tate London. Scholars agree that the portrait of Suckling, at least, was envisioned by the patron and not the painter. A double portrait, *Endymion Porter and Anton van Dyck*, oil on canvas, 119 x 144cm, c.1635, Prado, Madrid, attests to the depth of relationship between patron and his charge. Van Dyck’s portrait of Thomas Carew has not survived, but is known to have been executed c.1632.

The Tribe of Ben celebrated Van Dyck’s English work. Waller considered him higher than Prometheus, no less, in his Epistle ‘To Vandyck’:

Rare artisan! [...]  
O let me know  
Where these immortal colours grow  
That could this deathless piece complete!  
[…] thou hast climb’d higher  
Than did Prometheus for his fire".

Carew, poetic arbiter and lover of the Petrarchan lyric, praised the accuracy of Van Dyck’s portraiture in his ‘Dedication Prelude’ to the *Complete Poems and Masques*: ‘Fairest face that Vandyck drew [...] Since to grace his Queen he toil’d’. Herrick combined both accolades in his
tribute ‘To the Painter’: ‘[he] makes his cheeks with breath to swell| for to speak, if possible’. 61 The poets, all intimately connected with Nabbes, evidence Van Dyck’s preference for portraiture over literary motifs and his ‘perfect’ use of literary ‘colour’. 62

Analysts have observed that Van Dyck’s ‘English pictures are analogues to the themes and conventions of Caroline poetry and masques.’ 63 Others note that ‘Van Dyck was not the first painter to reintroduce allegorical motifs ‘[...] but he was responsible for handling them with a grace and wit long lacking in English portraiture;’ 64 Some critics consider his iconography ‘entirely derivative’ of contemporary literature. 65 Returning to the painting, the ‘blackened Moor’ emphasises the female’s unnatural masque-like whiteness: a Petrarcan conceit and a motif of Elizabethan and Jacobean literature. It is possible that the ‘Moor’ is intended as an allusion to an unidentified literary reference. Jonson, court dramatist between 1620-37, during Van Dyck’s residencies, made this contrast the subject of his ‘Masque of Blackness’ (1605) and ‘Masque of Beauty’ (1608). It has been suggested that Van Dyck ‘absorbed’ the notion of the ‘sun-burned character’ as a ‘foil’ to the masque-like ‘white radiance of women’ from literature, 66 introducing an interesting notion of the artist representing dramatic works directly in his painting.

Conventionally it is thought that James I gave his permission for George Villiers to marry Katherine Manners in 1620. Documents show, however, that he first refused permission for the union. Cavalier Villiers married the seventeen year old regardless. Significantly, between 1618 and 1619, Villiers had acted as ‘broker’ in the relationship of James’ son Prince Charles and Henrietta, who married in 1624 before ascending the throne in 1625. 67 It was a familiar anecdote at court that upon meeting Henrietta, Villiers had ‘lost his head’ at her ‘fitness’ – ‘I´d have thee!’, he exclaimed in front of her mother, the austere Regent Queen of France, Marie de Médicis. 68 This diplomatic gaffe became a continuing source of amusement to Charles, Henrietta, court poets and playwrights, and even Villiers’ later wife Katherine. His lewd approach directly recalls Scipio’s similar lines in Nabbes’ play, and it would appear that, on this occasion, Villiers too conserved his continence.

Similarities between George Villiers and the Scipio of Nabbes’ play continued beyond his encounter with Henrietta. In October 1625, George Villiers led the English and Dutch expedition to Spain, comprising 100 ships and 15,000 soldiers. During this trip, Buckingham ‘stabb’d Spayne’, 69 gathering antiquities, some possibly sourced from Itálica, founded by Scipio 206 BC during the Second Punic War and dedicated to the Roman god Mercury. 70 Otherwise, this expedition was not a success: Villiers lost two major ships and, like Scipio at Senate before him, was forced to appear before Parliament to request more troops for his military ‘trail’. In 1626, Katherine commissioned a masque for the royal couple at York House: a theatrical drama of Villiers’ real-life military activity, the optimistic planning and outfitting to relive the French

---

62 Goodman acknowledges the relationship between Waller, Carew, Herrick and the painter but does not provide these examples of their literary works, p. 137.
66 E. Goodman, p. 137.
68 G. Martin, p. 613.
69 Ashmolean MS, Vol.39, art.24.20
70 Votive remains at the Museo Arqueológico de Seville re-located from Itálca after 1781 show that Roman divinities coexisted with those from the East. See, Room XIV for a colossal marble statue of Mercury and delicate marbles of the Gorgon.
Protestants at La Rochelle. At the climax of the masque, the Duke set forth, accompanied by figures of Fame and Truth and pursued by Envy. In September 1627, the expedition ended in a fiasco with the Seige of Saint-Martin-de-Ré, starting the Anglo-French War (1627-29). Villiers would have been impeached for the misappropriation of military funds, again as was Scipio, but Charles dissolved Parliament before that ‘trial’ could occur.

By spring 1628, a Latin distich was in wide distribution signalling impending tragedy for Villiers: ‘Thy numerous name with this year doth agree But twenty-nine God grant thou never see.’ On the 23 August 1628, Villiers was assassinated by John Felton (c.1595-1628), a ‘treacherous soldier’ (recalling those of Nabbes’ play) who administered a sword to his naked chest - Villiers had been sleeping when his dormitory was stormed. Charles ordered his burial in Henry VII's apsidal chapel, Westminster Abbey. The ceremony was a secretive affair, due to a genuine fear of parliamentarian dissent and public uproar. The Duchess in mourning commissioned Van Dyck to paint a large group portrait of her, two images of Villiers, and their children. In this painting Villiers appears as a ghost through a telescopic looking-glass and in a memorial pendant – paralleling the distinct representations of Scipio in the play written several years later. In 1629, Katherine commissioned a massive monument of bronze and black and white marble in the chapel at Westminster. Translation of the Latin memorial reads: ‘His life was terminated by the most frightful and terrifying murder; to ravenous Envy - which is always the partner of Virtue.

The similarities between the real-life character of George Villiers, his life and death, and Scipio as represented in Nabbes’ play, may be taken further by considering links with the painting The Continence of Scipio attributed to Van Dyck until recent association with a different artist and subject. Regarding the latter reattribution, Villiers met Rubens in Paris in 1625 to discuss the project for the Whitehall ceiling allegorising him as Mercury; a matter first broached during Villiers’ Embassy to collect Charles’ future bride, Henrietta, in 1621. Numerous artworks by Rubens represent Villiers and Envy: The Duke of Buckingham Triumphing over Envy and Anger, oil on canvas, 541x498cm, formerly collection of the Earl of Jersey, destroyed 1949; The Duke of Buckingham assisted by Minerva and Mercury triumphing over Envy and Anger, oil on panel, 63.5x63.6cm, National Gallery, London; and, Mercury Conducting Psyche to Olympus, c.1625-28, collection Prince of Liechtenstein, for example. The Tribe of Ben commended Ruben’s allegory in a thousand poems, including Herrick’s ‘A Hymn to Graces’:

[...] winning postures, and withal

---

71E. Hamilton, pp. 84-85.
72E. Hamilton, pp. 84-85.
73J. Held, p. 548.
75Katherine Manners, With Her Three Children, Lady Mary Villiers (1622-85), George Villiers, Second Duke of Buckingham (1628-87), and Lord Francis Villiers (1629-48), c.1633, oil on canvas, 138.5 x 110cm, Government Art Collection (UK).
76Translation sourced from http://www.westminster-abbey.org/our-history/people/villiers-family
77G. Martin, p.617. See, Rubens’ sketch George Villiers, Duke of Buckingham, c.1625, black and white chalk, Vienna Academy.
79G. Martin, p. 613.
80Emphasis is given to the maritime deities (lower left); and the Armada (in the distance). The canvas was extended (left) to reposition the Duke near-right (rather than centred). See, G. Martin, pp.147-53, reproduced in J. Held, p. 551.
Manners, each way musical [...] You can make a Mercury’.  

Rubens’ association of Villiers with Mercury became well-known to the extent that it was satirised by adversaries:

The ships, the men, the money cast away
Under his only all-confounding sway [...]  
Himself triumphant, neither trained in lore [...]  
To make him the restorer Mercuric  
In an heroic painting, when before  
Antwerpian Rubens’ best skill made him soare’.  

Rubens represented Villiers as Mercury over a seven year period, but never as Scipio, placing him at odds with the strong literary connections described above and also with Katherine Manners’ apparent desire to associate the memory of her lost husband with an earthly hero, rather than a deity.

The timing, circumstances and apparent motivation for alterations made to The Continence of Scipio invite further consideration. Aside from the stylistic association outlined earlier, Van Dyck was in Katherine’s patronage from c.1628 onwards. Portraits of Charles I, Villiers and Henrietta by Van Dyck display physical likeness to the faces in the painting. James I as Scipio is not a ‘fair’ portrait but, interestingly, subsequent alterations to the central figure do make Villiers so. The original painting may well have presented King James I as Scipio, but the alteration does not. Interpreting the characters in this light would yield Charles I as Allucius (seated), Villiers as Scipio (standing centre-stage, hand to chest emphasised, dressed in the pale-blue robes fitting of a Knight of the Garter), and Henrietta as Lucretia.

It is plausible that Katherine’s idea of Villiers as Scipio was transformed from the painted scene into a stage and text. Viewed in this way, the ‘former play’ to which the Prologue refers is the drama in the painting; as a text, therefore, it is an original work. This explains nicely why Katherine attended the panegyric performance of the play in 1635 in ‘Honoure of Memories’. It would be fitting also that Henrietta made her customary unannounced appearance in the lead-role, this time as ‘Lucretia’, albeit that she did not master English until five years later in 1640.

The marble, which depicts Envy, dominates the painting and provides a compelling connective between the two artworks and Katherine Manners. The marble features as a drawing of a frieze by the neoclassical architect and stage designer John Webb (1611-72), The

81 R. Herrick, Hesperides, Poem No.569 (pages not numbered).
84 Examples are, Charles I, oil on canvas, 93 x 82cm, The Chequers Trust, George Villiers and Katherine Manners, 223 x 160cm, c.1620, private collection and, Henrietta, oil on canvas, 93 x 79cm, The Chequers Trust.
85 E. Hamilton, p. 85 onwards.
86 Professor Setti in his introduction to Tempestini’s VanDyckRubensVanDyck, points out that permission for the excavation dates for Smyrna was after 1621, p. 11. The Christ Church Picture Gallery statement notes: Prof Setti’s information regarding the official excavation permission date at Smyrna is the one point that we do not dispute. However, the fact of a dated excavation permission does not affect the decisive stylistic and iconographic arguments for this painting being the work of Van Dyck and its subject the Continence of Scipio. There are at least two possible explanations of the fragment appearing in the painting. It may have been a later addition, since Van Dyck might have added it after his return from Italy, but it is also conceivable that the fragment was already in England before official excavation rights were granted.’, December 2009.
Scipio Marble, 145x89cm (monumental size), Arundel Collection, Ashmolean, Oxford, 1639.\textsuperscript{87} The antique marble has been identified as that in ‘The Larger Talman Album’, Ashmolean, in which Webb’s drawing is inscribed Ex malmooro Antico Aundeliano. Lost after the demolition of York House in 1660, the marble was recovered during the Arundel House excavation\textsuperscript{88} and connects the painting and play directly via an obscure record of Webb’s set-design for ‘Scipio and Hannibal’ (1635, destroyed) - a drawing of The Scipio Marble in the quarto of the play.\textsuperscript{89} Drawing this information together, it is plausible that, as owner of both the Scipio painting and the marble, Katherine commissioned alterations to the painting to represent her husband as she conceived him to be, i.e. the Scipio of victory and virtue.

To conclude, the play, ‘Hannibal and Scipio - An Hystorical Tragedy’, incorporates the scene of virtue from the painting The Continence of Scipio. By association, the painting allegorises the scene of victory from the play. Katherine Manners is offered as the person to have originated the idea of victory and virtue in both. Van Dyck is suggested as the hand most likely to have transformed her idea into paint. The unknown dramatic source for Nabbes’ play is thus identified as the painting. Previous studies have failed to identify the creative source of either work. A complementary study of the disciplines of art-history and literature offers an answer to the identity of both.
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