

**JEAN-FRANÇOIS,
FRANCISQUE, MILLET
– A DOUBLE ENIGMA:
DISCOVERING THE
JOURNEY OF HIS TWO
VERSIONS OF *CLASSICAL
LANDSCAPE***

JELENA A. TODOROVIĆ, PHD
University of the Arts in Belgrade
jelena.a.todorovic@gmail.com

There is no doubt that important masters of the French Baroque landscape painting have been in the 20th and 21st century the subject of great scholarly interest with several exhibitions devoted to their work. While, undoubtedly the grandest of them all, Nicolas Poussin,¹ Charles Le Brun or Claude (Gellée) Lorrain are most thoroughly and meticulously researched, other Baroque painters, such as Sébastien Bourdon, Nicolas Chaperon or Gaspard Dughet received the attention their work merited, there is still one French artist who is unjustly overlooked and whose paintings are misattributed and often forgotten. This level of “neglect” for the life and *oeuvre* of Jean-François, Francisque, Millet (1642-1679/1680), is greatly due, respectively, to the brevity of his life and the sparseness of documentation he left behind. Even though he was considered in his time and the centuries to come one of the best landscape painters of his generation, he remained unjustly overshadowed by his paragon and predecessor Nicolas Poussin and his work was often mistaken

for the landscapes of the other, or another, slightly older colleague, Gaspard Dughet, which would be explored further.

A DOUBLE ENIGMA

As if the *artist enigma* was not enough, this paper would aim to unravel an even more complex, *dual enigma*, of an artist and his two landscapes: one version is kept in the collections of the Alte Pinakothek in Munich, *Classical Landscape* (inv. no. 1018), while the other is in the holdings of the State Art Collection in Belgrade, *Landscape with Two Classical Figures and a Beggar* (inv. no. 242/01), both dated in the 1660s. While the Munich picture, as we shall elaborate further, was on public display almost from the beginning of the 18th century; the Belgrade version could be rightfully named a “sleeper”, a picture that (for a multitude of reasons) remained forgotten and overlooked for centuries. After its acquisition in the mid-1930s as “a work by Poussin”, it was placed into the palaces of state where it remained (under several erroneous attributions) until the present date. While Belgrade was occupied and liberated, while the republic replaced monarchy and Yugoslavia – no longer a monarchy, became the Federal People’s Republic – Millet’s painting remained almost miraculously unscathed, its calm grandeur gracing the stately rooms of the White Palace in Belgrade.

The scene, represented in both paintings, is an idealized Arcadian landscape, with majestic trees in the foreground and harmonious undulating hills rhythmically repeated into the distance, with an elegant classical city upon a hill. The represented image of that particular vision of the land would become the epitome of the French



Figure 1. Landscape with Two Classical Figures and a Beggar, Jean-François Francisque Millet, 1660s. Source: State Art Collection Belgrade.

Baroque classicism. In the middle ground Millet depicts the eternal inhabitant of all the ideal worlds, the Arcadian shepherd peacefully descending the hill with his flock. It could be said that this painting possesses all the elements that constitute that idealized projection of a shining example, but long-lost land of the Golden Age. It is the very type of landscape that was first founded in the paintings of the artist to whom Francisque Millet looked upon during his entire, albeit brief, career, Nicolas Poussin. As a further reminder of both the classical ideal and Poussin's landscapes themselves, three classically clad figures are placed in the foreground. Near the edge of the road, on the ground, Millet depicts an old, poorly dressed man, offering with his right-hand directions to two young travellers dressed in elegant

classical attire (a man in red chiton and a woman in blue chiton over her white dress). In a manner highly characteristic of other landscapes by Millet, all three figures are painted with great care and precision, an element often overlooked by his contemporaries, even by Poussin himself who frequently left the execution of figures in a landscape to his workshop. Due to the meagre clothing of the old man, and the presence of a metal bowl in his left hand, he has often been (both in the case of Munich and Belgrade paintings) identified as a beggar with the alms bowl.² This detail also introduces further confusion in the interpretation of the narrative, since some scholars have suggested that it might depict the scene from the life of the ancient philosopher Diogenes (Munich) although it is ichnographically

totally unfounded.³ Beside the three main protagonists in the foreground, Millet's landscape displays several small figures that act as *staffages*, or mere "extras" in this harmonious scene – one is a figure strolling by the lake in the middle distance, and the other a lone figure in front of the antique city.

What immediately becomes apparent with both landscapes (Munich and Belgrade) is that they are considerably larger (approx. 120x200 cm) than other works attributed to Millet kept in different museum collections. The usual dimensions he used were, the so called *tela imperiale* of app. 100x130 cm (the Hermitage, *Landscape with Christ and his Disciples*, the Louvre, the National Gallery in London, *Landscape with the Lightning Bolt*, Berlin Staatliche Museum, *The Finding of Moses* paintings) or relatively smaller 70x80 cm/80x100 cm ones like *Landscape with Cattle and Sheep* in Basildon Park England (National Trust), or, alternatively, he created a number of *tondoes* such as *Classical Landscape* d.28 cm and *The Bay*, both in private collections.

An equally grand landscape, of Munich/Belgrade dimensions, firmly attributed to Millet, is one depicting the myth of *Mercury and Battus* in the collections of the Metropolitan Museum of Art in New York, measuring 119x177.8 cm (inv. no. 29.100.21). This painting holds a particular interest in our research since it initially came from the notable collection of the French nobleman collector François Laborde de Méréville (1761-1801). Besides being a renowned banker and Deputy for the Third Estate at the Estates General in 1789, he was a famed art lover and collector who acquired after the French

Revolution in 1792 a part of the Orleans collection for nearly one million francs.⁴ He subsequently transported his entire collection to London where it was sold to one of the great London dealers of the age, the man who would figure importantly in our story – Michael Bryan. Moreover, Laborde was a cousin and a collaborator of another exiled French financier and collector Charles Alexandre de Calonne (1734-1802) a remarkable persona with whom we would cross paths later as a possible one-time owner of the Belgrade landscape.

Notwithstanding the stark resemblance of our two main protagonists, the Munich and Belgrade landscapes, several elements show that they were *two variants* most probably created by Francisque Millet himself in the 1660s, and *not an original and its copy*. While neither of these paintings is signed (and it is known that Millet never signed his works)⁵, the Munich canvas represents in the Millet scholarship one of the precious few, undisputed paintings that are considered to be the creation of Jean-François (Francisque) Millet the Elder himself (based upon its provenance and the preparatory drawing for it, existing in Düsseldorf). The Belgrade image remained, despite its high quality, completely overlooked and absent from all the overviews of French landscape painting. It displays the same quality of execution, both in the treatment of the landscape and the main figures. Instead of meticulously following the Munich example which a mere copyist would usually do, it possesses minor variations in the depiction of tree tops in the upper left corner of the image, giving a slightly different, but equally ethereal shape, to the elegant tree whose feathery branches filter the mild morning



Figure 2. Classical Landscape, Jean-François Francisque Millet, 1660s. Source: Alte Pinakothek Munich.

light and whose presence dominates the centre of the painting.

Dimensions also differ slightly: the Belgrade painting (198 cm) is 19 cm longer than the Munich version (179 cm) and few centimetres higher (122.5 cm vs. 119 cm), which also indicates that an exact copy was never an aim of the artist. This becomes even more evident if these two paintings were compared with a fine period copy of the Munich landscape that was sold at Christie's in Amsterdam in 2007 as a painting "after J.F. Millet", for 11.050,00 euros.⁶ Unlike the Munich and Belgrade landscapes, the "period copy" sold in 2007 lacks richness and depth in the treatment of nature. Similarly, the figures lack calm

classical elegance and appear lifeless and almost two-dimensional.

However, comparing our two paintings is just the beginning of our quest to establish the provenance and the history of both works, to try to unravel for whom they were painted and in whose collections they resided throughout the centuries. And that would be a curious journey, since as we noted at the beginning of our text, Francisque Millet is a highly enigmatic and elusive persona. Thus, before we embark upon the re/discovery of the two paintings, we need to unravel more of their painter's life. What would make this task even more complex is that Francisque Millet had a son of the same name

Jean-François (1666-1723) who also called himself Francisque and also became a landscape painter (often referred to as Francisque II).⁷ Although working more in the style of Rococo and collaborating with François Boucher, he was known to be sometimes executing copies of his father's work. To make matters worse, there was also a third generation, Francisque Millet's grandson (known as Francisque III), named Joseph but called Francisque (born in the late 17th century and died in 1773) known mainly for his religious paintings. This family situation unsurprisingly created a considerable level of confusion in the attribution of Francisque Millet I ("the Elder") in the centuries to come. It did not help that either his son or the grandson signed his paintings and few surviving documents and connoisseurship remained as the only sources for attribution. Additionally, there was another, not fully reliable source for attribution of Francisque Millet's paintings. In the second half of the seventeenth century a certain Theodore made 28 engravings after Millet's paintings, and they have served as bases for attribution of Millet's works ever since.⁸ Considering that, Theodore remained an even more elusive figure than Millet (not even his full name is known), made his engravings a very questionable source.

At the age of just seventeen Millet travelled to Paris to pursue his artistic career. Some scholars claim that he travelled from Antwerp with the artist Laurentius Frank and subsequently worked in his Paris studio, while the others state that Laurentius Frank was already in Paris when young Millet arrived there in 1660. What remained a certainty is that Millet learned, from Frank, the foundations of art

together with the landscape construction, and the importance of light and shade. After having established his own "studio" in Paris and married his master's daughter Millet was really fortunate to attract the attention of his first (and presently only known) patron, the notable banker and even more renowned collector Everhard Jabach (1618-1695).

A GERMAN AT THE FRENCH COURT

Born into a powerful German banking family in Cologne, Everhard Jabach ran his family's banking affairs in the Low Countries and England before taking permanent residence in France in 1638. Together with honing his financial skills, at this time Jabach built the foundations of his impressive collection and had himself painted during his sojourn in London by none other than the leading portraitist of the day Antoin Van Dyck in 1637.¹⁰

Part of his positioning among the key collectors of early modern Europe was nowhere more evident than in the outstanding portrait he commissioned (in the early 1660s) of himself and his family from the key artist of the age, the painter to the crown, Charles Le Brun.¹¹ This impressive canvas presented the greatest private portrait painted at the time, its scale 280x328 cm and grandeur previously only reserved for the state portraiture. Although depicted in the presumably informal surroundings of his own home and family, Le Brun's image of Jabach was focused on the prize elements of his collection, and upon his image of an ultimate collector and connoisseur. Deemed lost for centuries, this painting



Figure 3. Jabach Family, Charles Le Brun, 1660s, Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York. Source: public domain.

was “rediscovered” after its bequest to the Metropolitan Museum in 2013, and had a history as incredible and as calamitous as our Millet landscapes, as we shall see further on.

Everhard Jabach certainly made a “good deal” in the early 1660s, when he commissioned the young prodigy, Francisque Millet, “a painter who could copy anything he saw”, to execute some high-quality copies of those masterpieces that were lacking from the magnificent Jabach collection. Acquiring a collection of copies, and particularly commissioning copies to be

placed beside the original artworks was considered in no way demeaning for a collector in the early modern Europe.¹² A collector of Jabach’s calibre would certainly have no financial difficulties in acquiring originals, but in several instances a commission of copies was considered a necessary element. It was particularly an established practice in case of bronze casts after the antique which were often considered to be *as fine as the originals*¹³ since they were the most faithful replicas that could be produced. Beside the copies after the antique, Jabach owned original

classical marble statues, or at least then considered to be originals.¹⁴

Consequently, the making as well as commissioning of copies and replicas of famous paintings was an accepted practice in painters' studios throughout Europe.

Jabach not only collected copies of important artworks but was known to commission two versions of the same artwork.¹⁵

According to the latest research into the history of the mentioned portrait *Jabach Family* by Le Brun, a rather intriguing fact was discovered, that would bear importantly upon our research of the Munich/Belgrade landscapes. It appears that Everhard Jabach himself commissioned *two almost identical versions* of this grand family portrait from Le Brun: the first was for his *hotel particulier* (now sadly lost) in Rue Neuve-Saint-Marri, the other for the Jabach family home in Cologne where it was recorded as early as 1694.¹⁶

While for the banker the employment of the young artist was an excellent prospect of expanding his art collection, for young Millet this was the opportunity of a lifetime. It was in Jabach's collection that Millet had the opportunity to study some of the great masterpieces of European Renaissance and Baroque art, and even more importantly he had first-hand experience of the paintings by the artist who would make a lasting influence on his career – Nicolas Poussin.¹⁷ Considering that Millet never travelled to Italy, his knowledge of Poussin's works must have been previously acquired primarily through engravings. Moreover, it was most probably through Jabach that young Francisque Millet made necessary contacts that brought him the grandest commission of his career, often called "twelve of his finest landscapes," done for the Queen's apartments at the

Royal Palace of Tuileries. Sadly, all those landscapes were lost in the fire of Tuileries at the end of the nineteenth century which, naturally, makes the entire endeavour of attributing works to Francisque Millet (the Elder) even more complicated.

Although we still lack detailed documents recording Millet's work for Everhard Jabach he must have been in his service sometime between the early 1660s (when Millet arrived in Paris) and his untimely death in 1679. Apart from the statements of Florent le Compte¹⁸ and Houbraken, about Millet's work for Jabach, there is also an inventory of Jabach collection created on 7 July 1695, after Jabach's death, listing a considerable number of works that Millet executed for the notable financier. Even though we ought to take the contents of this inventory with a certain reserve, considering it was the only one as well as the last one preserved, it was still indicative of the scope of works, copies and originals that Millet created for Everhard Jabach. In the rather extensive list (fully transcribed and published in 1894 by Vicomte de Grouchy)¹⁹ it is evident that Jabach left more than 600 paintings, an important collection of bronzes after the antique, few dozens of original antique marbles and thousands of drawings in portfolios. The extent of Millet's copies in Jabach inventory was a vivid proof that Millet could indeed work in a great variety of styles and copy truly anything he saw. It would bear considerable importance in understanding the creation of our two landscapes was that Jabach often commissioned Millet to copy works *he already had in his collections*,²⁰ as well as *to make two or three copies of the same painting* (most probably designated for

one of his children or to be taken to other Jabach residences).

However, the absence of our landscapes from 1695 inventory should not be the reason to abandon the association with Jabach in the research regarding our paintings. Considering the scale and the refinement of execution of both Munich and Belgrade landscapes, it was a great probability that they were executed for such a distinguish patron as Everhard Jabach (at least one copy) or for someone from his immediate circle.

***LA PASSION MIA PER LA PITTURA*²¹**

Landscape with Three Figures by Francisque Millet, that now resides in the Alte Pinakothek in Munich under inv. no. 1018, was first documented at the beginning of the eighteenth century as a part of the magnificent collection of Johann Wilhelm II von der Pfalz (1658-1716), duke Palatin of Neuburg, Jülich und Berg; who was proclaimed an Elector Palatin in 1690. He was one of twelve electors that had the power of electing the Holy Roman Emperor, and was renowned for great wealth and passion for collecting.

In creating his art collection Johann Wilhelm II von der Pfalz was rather fortunate. On the one hand, he inherited an already substantial art collection from his father who was a notable collector Philip William (1615-1690), while on the other, Johan Wilhelm made two rather auspicious marriages. Primarily, he married the Archduchess Maria Anna Josepha of Austria in 1678, and after her premature death of tuberculosis, he wedded the last scion of the Medici family, a daughter of the Grand Duke Cosimo III Medici,

Anna Maria Luisa de Medici in 1691. With family connections to two of the greatest collecting dynasties, Medicis and Habsburgs, he had a perfect background for art acquisitions and was given some of the masterpieces from Florence by his father-in-law. It was noted that both Cosimo III and Johann Wilhelm, being both passionate collectors, regularly exchanged not only ideas and advice but also artworks.²² Duke Palatin starkly stood out even among the great princely collectors of the late Baroque Europe – in the last decades of the seventeenth and the first of the eighteenth century he managed to accumulate a unique collection of his day that could easily rival only the collections of the Spanish Habsburgs. But, Johann Wilhelm II von der Pfalz not only amassed an impressive collection of paintings, sculptures, drawings and casts after the antique, he was also the first collector of his age to make his treasures truly accessible to the public, in the form of the notable Kunsthaus (Gemälde Galerie) in Düsseldorf that he opened in 1714.²³ Possessing notable works of art and classical antiquity was an indispensable element of princely self-presentation, but one's collection also had to serve the public good, to be accessible to scholars and connoisseurs. In both aspects, Johann Wilhelm II was a pioneer by creating the first private museum in Düsseldorf, and employing a painter and printer Johann Georg Karsch (?-1753) as its superintendent responsible for the first printed catalogue of the collection.

Although collecting defined his entire life, in the period between 1680 and 1716 Johann Wilhelm II displayed such a lavish collecting activity that could be rivalled only by his contemporary and “fellow Elector”, Augustus the Strong from

Dresden. Besides the court artists that created paintings for him and helped him secure some acquisitions he also actively involved his family, particularly his second wife, Anna Maria Luisa de Medici, to help him secure important acquisitions.²⁴ Between 1679 (the year of Francisque Millet's death) and the first years of the 18th century, Johann Wilhelm II also acquired Millet's grand *Landscape with Classical Figures*. Although details of the purchase are not known, the painting regularly appeared in the inventories of the Kunsthaus from its opening in 1714.²⁵

While a cast collection was undoubtedly impressive, the real treasures of Johann Wilhelm II were in his collection of paintings and sculptures housed in the upper two levels of the Kunsthaus, among which the pride of place took Millet's *Landscape with Three Figures*.²⁶ The first keeper of the Kunsthaus and the one responsible for the initial presentation of the Elector's treasures was Johann Georg Karsch, a court painter and the gallery superintendent (1661-1753). Even though Johann Wilhelm II unexpectedly died in 1716 (and was succeeded by his son Elector Carl Filip III), Johann Georg Karsch continued his care of the Kunsthaus and in 1719 published the first printed catalogue of the Elector's collection. This handsome volume inventoried in detail all the treasures exhibited in the Kunsthaus and under number 239 Karsch noted Francisque Millet's *Classical Landscape*. Moreover, Karsch's catalogue showed that in 1719 paintings were put together according to the wish of the Elector and not yet according to the school or period. For such reform of the Kunsthaus one would have to wait for the second half of the eighteenth century under the rule of Johann Wilhelm

II's grandson Carl Theodor (1724-1799). However, the greatest reorganisation of the gallery would be done in the second half of the eighteenth century under the directorship of Lambert Krahe (1713-1790), the painter and drawing teacher.²⁷

His novel arrangement of the Kunsthaus was lavishly presented in the grand illustrated catalogue published in 1778 by Nicolas de Pigage: *La Galerie électorale de Dusseldorf*. This splendid publication offered to the viewer, page upon page, a meticulous view of the display rooms in the Kunsthaus, where each wall was depicted in detail with the position of every artefact on display. This impressive arrangement was accompanied by the minute lists of all works presented, enabling us today to identify undoubtedly that Francisque Millet's *Classical Landscape* was on display in Kunsthaus (room 1), under the inv. no. 6. Despite the rather crude linear drawing in Pigage's catalogue, it is not difficult to recognise Millet's Arcadian landscape, with three figures in the foreground and a classical city upon a hill in the background, particularly as de Pigage also gave a detailed description of the painting.²⁸

It is rather striking to perceive in Pigage's catalogue, how early in history the work of Francisque Millet the Elder (Francisque I) was confused with his slightly older colleague Gaspard Dughet. Although Poussin was always the most important model for Francisque Millet, due to the common subject matter of landscape he was very early on connected to Gaspard Dughet (Poussin), to such a measure that it truly became a fixture in Millet's biographies of the 19th century.²⁹ This new attribution in Pigage's catalogue seemed even more curious since the director of the gallery



Figure 4. Nicolas de Pigage, *La Galerie électorale de Dusseldorf ou Catalogue raisonné et figuré de ses tableaux* (Basle: C. de Méchel, 1778), https://www.getty.edu/research/exhibitions_events/exhibitions/display_arthistory/digitized_resources.html (accessed January 14, 2025).

Lambert Krahe was aware of Millet's authorship and presumably, as we shall see had a particular interest in this painting. It was Krahe who purchased for himself in mid-eighteenth century several French seventeenth century drawings, nowadays in the collection of Düsseldorf Kunstpalast (art gallery), one of which, *Landscape with classical buildings and a tomb monument* (inv. no. KA (FP)

4713), was Millet's preparatory drawing for our Arcadian landscape. The stamp upon the drawing inscribed with "Status Montium" confirmed that the sheet came from Krahe's private collection of prints and drawings, and that it never formed a part of the Elector's collection in the Kunsthau.³⁰ This delicate landscape done in pen and ink wash, (Lugt no. 2309), represents the undulating landscape with an

antique city upon a hill in the right-hand corner, that matched perfectly the upper part of the Munich/Belgrade landscape. Thus, it could be rightfully considered an authentic preparatory drawing for the composition produced in two versions of which one is in Munich and the other in Belgrade. Despite the attribution to Millet at the time of Krahe's purchase, during the centuries it became misattributed (as Millet's works often did) to Gaspard Dughet. Only in 1981 this erroneous attribution was corrected when Christian Klemm organised an exhibition devoted to *Gaspard Dughet and the ideal landscape*. Out of all three, Klemm had no doubts about the *Landscape with Classical Buildings and a Tomb Monument* as it could be directly linked to one of the rare undisputed paintings by Francisque Millet in the Alte Pinakothek.³¹

While Millet's print is still in Düsseldorf on a permanent loan to Kunstpalast Düsseldorf, his *Classical Landscape* remained there only until the beginning of the nineteenth century. The treasures of the Kunsthaus, together with the collections of different branches of the Wittelsbach family (to which both Electors Palatin and Elector of Bavaria belonged) began to be accumulated in Munich from 1799 onwards. The last to arrive to Munich, during the Napoleonic wars in 1806, were the holdings of the Düsseldorf galleries, including Millet's *Classical Landscape*. From that date onwards, this painting has formed an inseparable part of the collections of, initially just Pinakothek, and later Alte Pinakothek in Munich. The presence of Millet's landscape, at first under inv. no. 212 and later inv. no. 1018, could be easily traced in the catalogues of the Alte Pinakothek from 1853, 1885,

1890, up to the more modern editions of the twentieth century (1938, 1957, 1961, 1983), and ending in the most recent publications like those published in 2010 to commemorate an exhibition organised for the 350th anniversary of the birth of Johann Wilhelm II von der Pfalz.³² However, these catalogues do not mention the Belgrade version of the painting, nor has the wider scholarship been aware of the existence of two almost identical versions of Millet's elegant *Classical Landscape*.

A SLEEPER

At the time when the Munich version of Millet's *Classical Landscape* was acquired by the Elector Johann Wilhelm II von der Pfalz for his future Kunsthaus, we do not have any decisive confirmation of the whereabouts of the Belgrade piece. However, we know that it was not designated for the sale of Everhard Jabach's estate organised in 1695, since it did not appear in the inventory. Due to its size and refinement, we can only presume that it already formed a part of one of the French grand collections, where it would rightfully belong.

From very early on in history Millet's work was confused (intentionally or unintentionally) with his better-known and slightly older colleague Gaspard Dughet (better known at that time as Gaspard Poussin). This case of "mistaken identity" continued throughout the nineteenth and well into the twentieth century. One such example was, for a long time, the Belgrade *Landscape with Classical Figures* that was purchased, most probably, in 1934 as (Gaspard) Poussin, and was catalogued both as *Nicolas and Gaspard Poussin* in the inventories of the Yugoslav State

well into the early 1990s. Not only that under a “false” name Millet’s paintings could be sold for a higher price, but it was often genuinely believed that many of his landscapes *were works by Dughet*. This was particularly evident in the paintings’ descriptions given in auction catalogues where the landscapes of one “Poussin” were often compared to the canvases of the other: *in the best manner of G. Poussin, in the style of the great master, or even worthy of notable Nicolas Poussin...* One of the difficulties in our quest for the provenance of the Belgrade painting is the sheer abundance of landscapes that passed through European salerooms from 1700 to 1945 bearing the name of Francisque Millet (as evident in the Getty Provenance Index), precisely 2173 of them! The majority of the works offered at auctions under the name of Francisque Millet were sold as series of three and sometimes even six landscapes, or at least as pendant pairs of landscapes. Such descriptions most probably implied entire painted decorative schemes created for French villas or palaces, like Millet’s famous lost series of twelve landscapes painted upon Royal Commission, for Palais du Tuileries.³³ The other curious fact was that a great number of paintings attributed to Millet were of rather modest dimensions 20x30, 30x40, 30x50 cm, and quite often of oval or polygonal shape. The presence of a large canvas, of a grand painting like Munich/Belgrade *Classical Landscape*, was exceptionally rare. Combined, these two elements greatly helped to “weed out” the list of Millet’s paintings listed in the Getty Provenance Index.

Among the abundance of landscapes offered, there was only ONE painting that appeared on the market and could possibly



Figure 5. *Wehrmacht stamp from the back of the Belgrade Millet's Landscape. Photographed by Vidak Orlović.*

fit the description of the Belgrade canvas. It came from the esteemed de Calonne collection, and it repeatedly appeared in auctions in the 1790s (1794/1796/1798) in London, at the time when Munich painting was already well established in the Kunsthau gallery of the Palatine Electors.³⁴ Described as *Francisque Mille, A landscape. Very grand composition. It is painted in the manner of G. Poussin, and is equal to his best works.* (lot. no. 0048, Lught 5764), it was sold finally in 1798 for 31£.10s, by a notable art dealer and one of the first art historians Michael Bryan (1757-1821). This grand piece, that could presumably be the Belgrade *Landscape* brought into our story two very prominent figures of the age: one was the renowned and later exiled prime Minister of France, Charles Alexandre Marquise de Calonne (1734-1802), and the other was the *art dealer extraordinaire* Michael Bryan.

In the last decades of the eighteenth century, as one of the leading economic capitals

of Europe, London was gradually also becoming an important centre of the art trade. The combination of peace, prosperity, and the presence of exiled French aristocratic families that settled in London with their collections (like de Calonne and Laborde) created an ideal environment for transforming this city into a flourishing art market.³⁵

At the London art market of the late 18th century, Michael Bryan was undoubtedly one of the most successful and distinguished art dealers and one of the leading purveyors of French 17th and 18th century art.³⁶ Due to the incredible success of his famous *Dictionary of Painters and Engravers*, first published in London 1813-1816 and repeatedly republished as late as the 1920s, Michael Bryan is mainly remembered as one of the first British art historians. However, that was only one aspect of his career. Bryan could be rightfully named as one of the most influential dealers of the late 18th century and one of the agents who contributed the most to the internationalisation of the British art market.³⁷

De Calonne and Bryan were “old acquaintances” since as early as 1788, when Bryan acquired in Paris a large part of de Calonne collection (namely his Italian paintings) that was offered for sale at the auction of M. Le Brun, *Catalogue d’une tres belle collection de tableaux, d’Italie, de Flanders de Hollande et de France, Provenance du Cabinet du M. (de Calonne), Chez M. Le Brun, 1788*. Thus, by the beginning of the 1790s Bryan possessed the majority of de Calonne collection, including several works by the famous French landscape painter Jean-François Francisque Millet. Among those canvases offered in 1798 was the painting by Francisque Millet described as *A landscape. Very grand composition*, sold for 31£.10s, while the high figures were

reserved for Rubenses and David Teniers from de Calonne collection. It was not a staggering amount of money but, quite a usual one paid for Millet’s work at the time. Although we would never be able to say with certainty that this painting *was* the Belgrade *Classical Landscape*; it is the grandest work by this artist that ever appeared on the art market in the entire 18th and 19th centuries. Moreover, it is a very rare instance that Millet’s work was correctly attributed to Millet himself, at the time when his works were already generally confused, intentionally or unintentionally, with his older and more famous colleagues Gaspard Poussin (Dughet) and Nicolas Poussin. The reasons for such surprisingly accurate attributions were dual. On the one hand, the painting came from France, from the de Calonne collection where Millet’s work was correctly recognised. On the other, Michael Bryan was one of the rare British dealers with a comprehensive knowledge of French 17th and 18th-century art³⁸ that was best exemplified in his opus magnum, his famous *Dictionary of Painters and Engravers*, published in London between 1813 and 1816. In his *Dictionary*, Bryan gave one of the most comprehensive accounts of Millet’s work in the entire 18th century.³⁹ Despite being offered at the sales of 1795 and 1796, de Calonne’s Millet was finally sold only in 1798 to an unknown buyer.⁴⁰ From this moment on, commenced the yet unresolved part in the history of the Belgrade *Landscape*. It most definitely went into one of the British aristocratic collections, disappearing from the art market for over a hundred years, only to reappear in the mid-1930s. Its absence from the European salerooms was confirmed by its absence from the auction catalogues and

Getty Provenance Index on the one, and by the lack of any material references to auctions (stencilled stock numbers or lot numbers) from the back of the painting.

While the Munich *Classical Landscape* was accessible since 1716 first in Düsseldorf and later Munich (from 1806), Belgrade painting was concealed from public view. It came to the market only in the 1930s, at the time when many great aristocratic collections were dissolved.

When King Aleksandar Karađorđević built a royal residence at Dedinje in Belgrade in 1929, to be a new seat of power of the recently proclaimed Kingdom of Yugoslavia, he also laid foundations for what would become a significant state art collection. In this endeavour an important role was given to a renowned connoisseur and collector in the family, his cousin Prince Paul Karađorđević (1893-1975). It was symbolically founded in 1929 with the proclamation of the Kingdom of Yugoslavia (previously it was the Kingdom of Serbs, Croats and Slovenes), and the last works were added to it in the late 1970s prior to the death of President Tito.⁴¹

A notable collector himself, Prince Paul was incredibly well connected in the art world of the 1920s and 1930s.⁴² During his time at Oxford Prince Paul made acquaintance that would grow into true friendship with the then keeper of the Ashmolean Museum, Kenneth Clark as well as with Bernard Berenson and Joseph Duveen.⁴³

It was with the help of Joseph Duveen that Prince Paul acquired the majority of French Baroque landscape paintings for the State Art Collection. Behind this keen interest in the French classicist Baroque art lay a dual intention. One was to form a collection that would reflect the glorious European heritage to which

the young state belonged, and the other was the collection of Arcadian visions to symbolically reflect the Arcadian abode of the state of Yugoslavia. In 1930s the SAC would be thus enriched with several examples of Arcadian landscapes by the key artists of French classicism primarily Nicholas Poussin (his *Landscape with Three Monks* was acquired in 1931), then Gaspard Dughet, Sébastien Bourdon, Simon Vouet (nowadays reattributed to Nicolas Chaperon), and one *Landscape with Two Classical Figures and a Beggar* by Francisque Millet which was, at the time of purchase attributed to Gaspard (Dughet) Poussin. This misattribution of Millet's painting was, as previously noted, a common occurrence at the time since the scholarship did not yet properly distinguish the works of these two Baroque masters. Thus, in the mid-1930s this was not an omission to be suspicious about.

Although we do not at present possess the bill of sale for the Belgrade *Landscape* we do have two indications of its date of purchase. According to several documents, it must have been acquired between 1932 and 1934, since in this exact period Prince Paul was, according to his correspondence with Joseph Duveen, actively searching for another landscape by Poussin.⁴⁴ The other possible lead was the log book of the dealer who already supplied the Prince with Poussin's *Landscape with Three Monks*, Julius Böhler. In his log book Böhler noted the sale of a certain *Landscape* by Gaspard Poussin/Dughet on 9 April 1934 to Prince Paul. Regardless of the source, the painting was already on display in 1935/36 in the White Palace in Belgrade according to the photo documentation. By 1938 it was mentioned in two scholarly articles that discussed the collection on display

in Royal palaces in Belgrade – one was a text by young art historian Pavle Vasić (as a work by *Nicholas* Poussin), and the other an overview of French art in Yugoslav collections by a French art historian Boris Lossky (who attributed it to Allagrain).⁴⁵ With the onset of the WWII the fate of Millet's Belgrade landscape had an unexpected turn. After the capitulation of the Yugoslav army in 1941 and the subsequent flight into exile of the government and the royal family, both the White Palace and the Royal Palace in Belgrade were appropriated by the SS troupes and turned into the main headquarters of Wehrmacht which remained there until 1944. Upon careful examination of the back of Millet's painting one can discern two very distinct ink stamps bearing the crest of the Third Reich, which indicate that Millet's Belgrade *Landscape* was chosen among other works in the collection by the troupes of ERR to be ceased and subsequently shipped to Germany for the notorious Führer museum. Fortunately, the attacks of the Allied forces on Belgrade in 1944, and the haste flight of Nazi troupes from Yugoslav capital, meant that the painting of such considerable dimensions as Millet's could not be easily taken or shipped. Thus, our Millet remained and awaited the liberation of Belgrade *in situ* completely unscathed.

After the liberation and the proclamation of the Federative Peoples Republic of Yugoslavia in 1945, the Royal Residences continued to be used as the main official places of state presentation, under direct auspices of the Cabinet of the President of the Republic (Tito) from 1952. During the history of the Republic of Yugoslavia the entire contents of the palaces were annually inventoried and Millet's painting

was always duly recorded as a work by ... Nicolas Poussin.

Despite the obvious importance of Millet's Belgrade *Landscape* two articles from 1938 were the only scholarly pieces ever written on it up to this present paper, not greatly surprising because the painting was hidden from public view since the mid-1930s, similarly to its fate in the previous centuries.⁴⁶ Therefore, this paper aims to unravel its story together with the story of the equally forgotten painter Francisque Millet and his other version of the *Classical Landscape* in the Alte Pinakothek. Despite all our efforts there are still many questions that need to be answered, and that would be possible only after a detailed technical analysis which is not possible now, due to the very bad condition of the painting.

NOTES

¹ For recent exhibitions devoted to the work of Nicolas Poussin see the exhibition *Poussin and the Dance* in the National Gallery London and *Poussin and Love* at MBA Lyon: The National Gallery, "Poussin and the Dance," <https://www.nationalgallery.org.uk/exhibitions/past/poussin-and-the-dance> (accessed January 15, 2025); Musée des Beaux-Arts de Lyon, "Poussin et l'amour," <https://www.mba-lyon.fr/fr/fiche-programmation/poussin-et-lamour> (accessed January 10, 2025). For the books on Claude Gellée (Le Loraine) see: Carel van Tuyll van Serooskerken and Michiel C. Plomp, *Claude Lorrain* (Haarlem: Teylers Museum, 2011); Humphrey Wine, *Claude: The Poetic Landscape* (London: National Gallery Publications, 1994). For Gaspard Dughet see: *Nature et idéal: Le paysage à Rome 1600-1650* (Paris: Éditions de la RMN – Grand Palais, 2011); Marie-Nicole Boisclair, *Gaspard Dughet: sa vie et son oeuvre (1615-1675)* (Paris: Arthéna, 1986); Mauro Chiarini, "Gaspard Dughet: Some drawings connected with paintings," *The Burlington Magazine* 111, no. 801 (1969): 750–754.

² A reference to Diogenes in the description of the Millet's landscape is present in the older literature,

like: Boris Lossky, “L’Art Français en Yougoslavie,” *Annales de l’Institut Français de Zagreb* 2, no. 7 (1938): 370–425. For the Belgrade landscape, and the description of the painting in Munich see: Bayerische Staatsgemäldesammlungen, “Jean François Millet (gen. Francisque) (1642-1679): Klassische Landschaft, um 1665,” <https://www.sammlung.pinakothek.de/de/artwork/apG9nzd4Zn> (accessed January 15, 2025).

³ A similar scene from the life of Diogenes is famously depicted by Nicolas Poussin in 1648 (nowadays in the collections of the Louvre), but both in its iconography and treatment it differs dramatically from Millet’s landscapes.

⁴ See: Victor Champier and G.-Roger Sandoz, *Le Palais-Royal d’après des documents inédits (1629-1900)* (Paris: Société de propagation des livres d’art, 1900), 447.

⁵ The problem with attributions in the case of Francisque Millet would be elaborated further.

⁶ Considering that Munich version of Millet’s *Classical Landscape* was on permanent display since 1716 (first in Düsseldorf and later in Munich), meant that in 18th and 19th centuries several copies were created and appeared with surprising frequency on the contemporary art market. They greatly varied in quality and level of craftsmanship and were painted from the mid-18th, until possibly even the early 20th century.

⁷ See: Martin Davies, “A Note on Francisque Millet,” *Bulletin de la Société Poussin*, no. 2 (1948): 13–26.

⁸ On the mysterious Theodore see *ibid.*

⁹ I am quoting a title of the most important exhibition ever organised in honour of Everhard Jabach and his collection of the Northern European art at the Louvre in 2013, by Blaise Ducos and Olivia Savatier Sjöholm, *Un Allemand à la cour de Louis XIV: De Dürer à Van Dyck, la collection nordique d’Everhard Jabach* (Paris: Le Passage, 2013).

¹⁰ Nowadays this portrait is in the collection of the State Hermitage Museum in St. Petersburg.

¹¹ See: Stephen Wolohojian, “A Grand Tableau: Charles Le Brun’s Portrait of the Jabach family,” in: *A Grand Tableau: Charles Le Brun’s Portrait of the Jabach family*, eds. Stephen Wolohojian, Melinda Watt and Michael Gallagher, The Metropolitan

Museum of Art Bulletin 75, no. 1 (New York: The Metropolitan Museum of Art, 2017), 9. The painting, deemed lost for centuries was almost miraculously rediscovered after its purchase by the Metropolitan Museum in 2013 and the meticulous restoration by the brilliant restorer Michael Gallagher who was also restorer of one the State Art Collection’s most important pictures, Nicholas Poussin’s *Landscape with Three Monks*, in 2008 for the exhibition *Poussin: Arcadian Vision* organised by Keith Christiansen and Pierre Rosenberg at the Metropolitan Museum of Art. For this see: Michael Gallagher, “Pulling Back the Curtain: Conservation Treatment, Painting Technique, and Questions Raised,” in: Wolohojian, Watt and Gallagher, 43–45.

¹² On collecting copies see: Thomas DaCosta Kaufmann, “Sculpture Collecting and the *Kunst-kammer*,” in: *Sculpture Collections in Europe and the United States 1500-1930*, eds. Malcolm Baker and Inge Reist (Leiden: Brill, 2021), 27–45.

¹³ Soldani in: John Philip O’Neill, ed., *Liechtenstein: The Princely Collections* (New York: Metropolitan Museum of Art, 1985), 65.

¹⁴ For example, “1 (one) Venus, classical figure, one Hercules, classical figure, one Mercury, classical figure, one Bacchus with a glass in his hand [...]”. Emmanuel-Henri de Grouchy, “Éverhard Jabach: collectionneur parisien (1695),” *Mémoires de la Société de l’Histoire de Paris et de l’Île-de-France* 21 (1894): 282–284.

¹⁵ The issue of Jabach collecting copies is evident from the two sources – the first is the inventory made after his death in 1695 which presents an impressive number of copies created after famous works of art, and the second is the case of the grand portrait of Jabach family created in two versions for his two principal residences, on that respect see: Wolohojian, “A Grand Tableau: Charles Le Brun’s Portrait of the Jabach family,” 9–10.

¹⁶ On the fascinating history of these two paintings see *ibid.*

¹⁷ On Millet and Jabach see: Davies, “A Note on Francisque Millet,” 13–26.

¹⁸ Florent le Comte, *Cabinet des Singularités d’Architecture, Peinture, Sculpture, et Graveure*, Vol. II (Paris: chez Nicolas le Clerc, 1699), 329–333.

¹⁹ De Grouchy, “Éverhard Jabach: collectionneur parisien (1695),” 282–301.

²⁰ The majority of works are described as *de Francisque*, but *après* Guide (Guido Reni), Poussin, Carache (Annibale Carracci), Rubens, Domeniquan (Domenichino), Gentilese (presumably Orazio and not Artemisia), Vandereck (which must be Van Dyck), and even Titian in two instances.

²¹ Johann Wilhelm von der Pfalz in: Susan Tipton, “La Passion Mia per la Pittura,” *Münchner Jahrbuch der bildenden Kunst* 57 (2006): 71–331.

²² While Cosimo III sent Raphael’s *Holy Family* to his son in law as a wedding present, Johann Wilhelm commissioned one of his renowned court painters, Rachel Ruysch to create a special set of two pendant still-lives for the Grand Duke of Florence (*Fruit and Insects*, and *Basket of Flowers*), that still form the part of the Uffizi holdings. See also *ibid.*, 71–331.

²³ For the politics of collecting of Johann Wilhelm II see: Thomas W. Gaehtgens and Louis Marchesano, *Display & Art History: The Düsseldorf Gallery and Its Catalogue* (Los Angeles: Getty Research Institute, 2011), 1–15.

²⁴ On more details of Johann Wilhelm acquisitions as well as archival documents recording his purchases and gifts see the splendid study by Susan Tipton, “La Passion Mia per la Pittura”.

²⁵ For the construction of the Kunsthhaus as well as the designs and ground plan see: Gaehtgens and Marchesano, *Display & Art History*, 16–20.

²⁶ For the Kunsthhaus and Johann Wilhelm II as a collector see: Angela Maria Opel, “Art’s Emancipation from the Ceremonial. The Development of Spatial Separation of Art Collections from the Princely Apartments: The Wittelsbach Residences in Düsseldorf and Mannheim,” in: *Collecting and the Princely Apartment*, eds. Susan Bracken, Andrea M. Gáldy and Adriana Turpin (Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2011), 115–131.

²⁷ For the work of Lambert Krahe at the Kunsthhaus see: Gaehtgens and Marchesano, *Display & Art History*, 4–5.

²⁸ “The represented landscape mountainous and very varied. It offers us, in the foreground on the right, a group of large trees that cast a fresh and agreeable shade; in the middle ground, up to the furthest background we see verdant hills, ornate with

antique edifices. On the large road a young man and woman are represented in conversation with an old beggar sitting by the road is asking for alms. Further up in the picture (middle ground) a shepherd is leading his flock down the path. All figures are clothed in classical dress. It is a fine picture, and it was thought to be the work of Gaspard Poussin (Dughet) as well as master Mille.” See digitised facsimile version of Pigage’s book: Nicolas de Pigage, *La Galerie électorale de Dusseldorfou Catalogue raisonné et figuré de ses tableaux* (Basle: C. de Méchel, 1778), https://www.getty.edu/research/exhibitions_events/exhibitions/display_arhistory/digitized_resources.html (accessed January 14, 2025).

²⁹ See: Michael Bryan, *Dictionary of Painters and Engravers: Biographical and Critical* (London: G. Bell and Sons, 1889), <https://archive.org/details/bryansdictionary05bryauoft> (accessed January 17, 2025).

³⁰ For all the details about Millet’s preparatory drawing in Düsseldorf I am greatly indebted to Dr. Anna Schuetz, a research associate at the Düsseldorf Kunsthpalast.

³¹ See: Christian Klemm, *Gaspard Dughet und die ideale Landschaft* (Düsseldorf: Kunstmuseum Düsseldorf, 1981), 67, cat. no. 42. Together with the entire Krahe’s art collection this drawing was purchased in 1778 by the Duchy of Berg for the use of the art Academy in Düsseldorf. It remained in the Academy collections until 1932 when part of the Academy’s holdings was given on permanent loan to Kunsthpalast museum in Düsseldorf where it is presently kept. On this drawing and Klemm’s reattribution see: Pierre Rosenberg, “Notes on Some French Seventeenth Century Drawings: Saint-Igny, Vignon, Mellin, Millet and Others,” *The Burlington Magazine* 124, no. 956 (1982): 694–698.

³² Upon that occasion, no less than three important studies devoted to Johann Wilhelm II and his collection, were published including the facsimile edition of the Pigage’s lavishly illustrated catalogue of the Kunsthhaus from 1778.

³³ See: Davies, “A Note on Francisque Millet,” 7–13; Bryan, *Dictionary of Painters and Engravers*.

³⁴ J. Paul Getty Trust, “Getty Provenance Index,” <https://www.getty.edu/research/provenance/> (accessed January 17, 2025).

³⁵ Camilla Murgia, “The Artistic Trade and Networks of the Italian Community in London Around 1800,” in: *Art Crossing Borders: The Internationalisation of the Art Market in the Age of Nation States, 1750-1914*, eds. Jan Dirk Baetens and Dries Lyna (Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2019), 164–192. See also: Julia Armstrong-Totten, “The Rise and Fall of a British Connoisseur: The Career of Michael Bryan (1757–1821), Picture Dealer extraordinaire,” in: *Auctions, Agents and Dealers: The Mechanisms of the Art Market 1660–1830*, eds. Jeremy Warren and Adriana Turpin (London: Archaeopress, 2007), 141–150.

³⁶ Bénédicte Miyamoto, “‘Making Pictures Marketable’: Expertise and the Georgian Art Market,” in: *Marketing Art in the British Isles, 1700 to the Present: A Cultural History*, eds. Charlotte Gould and Sophie Mesplède (Farnham: Ashgate Publisher, 2012), 119–133.

³⁷ After a formative life in Holland, Bryan established his galleries in London in Pall Mall and Saville Row in the 1790s where he specialised in selling *pictures from the continent*. He achieved the greatest renown with two notable art sales, that of the de Calonne collection in 1795, and the entire Orleans collection in 1798, which introduced up to then an unseen number of important European masterpieces to the British art market. For Bryan see: Armstrong-Totten, “The Rise and Fall of a British Connoisseur,” 141–150.

³⁸ Bryan, *Dictionary of Painters and Engravers*.

³⁹ Millet François (or Mille) sometimes known as Francisque. The family of this artist was originally French, though he was born in Antwerp in 1644. His father was a turner in ivory born in Dijon and accompanied the prince de Conde, to whom he was attached to the Netherlands, at the time of the revolt and settled in Antwerp. Having shown an early inclination for art, young Mille was placed as a pupil of Laurent Frank. His father dying when he was still young, he had no other resource than the exercise of his talents, and when he was 18 years of age, he had acquired sufficient reputation to induce his master to give him the hand of his daughter in marriage. He soon afterwards went to Paris, where he painted history and heroic landscapes with figures representing historical or fabulous subjects. He is stated by M. d’Argenville to have visited Holland and England, in both of which countries he left proofs of his ability. On his return to Paris he was received into the Academy, and his

works were held in high estimation. Millet died in 1680. His sons Henri and Jean-François were also painters. The latter died in 1723. *Ibid.*, 343.

⁴⁰ See GPI (Getty Provenance Index) for Michael Bryan sale of 1794.

⁴¹ Jelena Todorović, *Catalogue of the State Art Collection*, vol. I (Novi Sad: Platoneum, 2014).

⁴² Archives of Yugoslavia, Prince Paul’s Legacy Archive of Yugoslavia, Fund AJ-74.

⁴³ For Joseph Duveen see: Meryle Secrest, *Duveen: A Life in Art* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 2005).

⁴⁴ For more information in the primary sources see: Getty dealers’ papers, Duveen Brothers records, 1925-1940, box 497, roll 352.

⁴⁵ Pavle Vasić, “Nikola Pusen kod nas,” in: *Umetnički pregled* 8 (1938): 129–134; Lossky, “L’Art Français en Yougoslavie,” 370–425.

⁴⁶ Displayed only once outside the palaces of the state (National Museum in Belgrade, in 1961, catalogue number 14) and accessible only to the chosen, often international diplomatic audience, the painting did not receive any scholarly attention.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Armstrong-Totten, Julia. “The Rise and Fall of a British Connoisseur: The Career of Michael Bryan (1757–1821), Picture Dealer extraordinaire.” In: *Auctions, Agents and Dealers: The Mechanisms of the Art Market 1660–1830*, eds. Jeremy Warren and Adriana Turpin, 141–150. London: Archaeopress, 2007.

Bayerische Staatsgemäldesammlungen. “Jean François Millet (gen. Francisque) (1642-1679): Klassische Landschaft, um 1665.” <https://www.sammlung.pinakothek.de/de/artwork/apG9nzd4Zn> (accessed January 15, 2025).

Boisclair, Marie-Nicole. *Gaspard Dughet: sa vie et son oeuvre (1615-1675)*. Paris: Arthéna, 1986.

Bryan, Michael. *Dictionary of Painters and Engravers: Biographical and Critical*. London: G. Bell and Sons, 1889. <https://archive.org/details/bryansdictionary05bryauoft> (accessed January 17, 2025).

Champier, Victor and G.-Roger Sandoz. *Le Palais-Royal d’après des documents inédits (1629-*

1900). Paris: Société de propagation des livres d'art, 1900.

Chiarini, Mauro. "Gaspard Dughet: Some drawings connected with paintings." *The Burlington Magazine* 111, no. 801 (1969): 750–754.

DaCosta Kaufmann, Thomas. "Sculpture Collecting and the *Kunstammer*." In: *Sculpture Collections in Europe and the United States 1500-1930*, eds. Malcolm Baker and Inge Reist, 27–45. Leiden: Brill, 2021.

Davies, Martin. "A Note on Francisque Millet." *Bulletin de la Société Poussin*, no. 2 (1948): 13–26.

de Grouchy, Emmanuel-Henri. "Éverhard Jabach: collectionneur parisien (1695)." *Mémoires de la Société de l'Histoire de Paris et de l'Île-de-France* 21 (1894): 217–292.

de Pigage, Nicolas. *La Galerie électorale de Dusseldorff ou Catalogue raisonné et figuré de ses tableaux*. Basle: C. de Méchel, 1778. https://www.getty.edu/research/exhibitions_events/exhibitions/display_arthistory/digitized_resources.html (accessed January 14, 2025).

Ducos, Blaise and Olivia Savatier Sjöholm. *Un Allemand à la cour de Louis XIV: De Dürer à Van Dyck, la collection nordique d'Everhard Jabach*. Paris: Le Passage, 2013.

Gahtgens, Thomas W. and Louis Marchesano. *Display & Art History: The Düsseldorf Gallery and Its Catalogue*. Los Angeles: Getty Research Institute, 2011.

Gallagher, Michael. "Pulling Back the Curtain: Conservation Treatment, Painting Technique, and Questions Raised." In: Wolohojian, Watt and Gallagher, 37–48.

J. Paul Getty Trust. "Getty Provenance Index." <https://www.getty.edu/research/provenance/> (accessed January 17, 2025).

Klemm, Christian. *Gaspard Dughet und die ideale Landschaft*. Düsseldorf: Kunstmuseum Düsseldorf, 1981.

le Comte, Florent. *Cabinet des Singularités d'Architecture, Peinture, Sculpture, et Graveure*. Vol. II. Paris: chez Nicolas le Clerc, 1699.

Lossky, Boris. "L'Art Français en Yougoslavie." *Annales de l'Institut Français de Zagreb* 2, no. 7 (1938): 370–425.

Miyamoto, Bénédicte. "Making Pictures Marketable": Expertise and the Georgian Art Market." In: *Marketing Art in the British Isles, 1700 to the Present: A Cultural History*, eds. Charlotte Gould and Sophie Mesplède, 119–133. Farnham: Ashgate Publisher, 2012.

Murgia, Camilla. "The Artistic Trade and Networks of the Italian Community in London Around 1800." In: *Art Crossing Borders: The Internationalisation of the Art Market in the Age of Nation States, 1750-1914*, eds. Jan Dirk Baetens and Dries Lyna, 164–192. Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2019.

Musée des Beaux-Arts de Lyon. "Poussin et l'amour." <https://www.mba-lyon.fr/fr/fiche-programmation/poussin-et-lamour> (accessed January 10, 2025).

Nature et idéal: Le paysage à Rome 1600-1650. Paris: Éditions de la RMN – Grand Palais, 2011.

O'Neill, John Philip, ed. *Liechtenstein: The Princely Collections*. New York: Metropolitan Museum of Art, 1985.

Opel, Angela Maria. "Art's Emancipation from the Ceremonial. The Development of Spatial Separation of Art Collections from the Princely Apartments: The Wittelsbach Residences in Düsseldorf and Mannheim." In: *Collecting and the Princely Apartment*, eds. Susan Bracken, Andrea M. Gáldy and Adriana Turpin, 115–131. Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2011.

Rosenberg, Pierre. "Notes on Some French Seventeenth Century Drawings: Saint-Igny, Vignon, Mellin, Millet and Others." *The Burlington Magazine* 124, no. 956 (1982): 694–698.

Secrest, Meryle. *Duveen: A Life in Art*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 2005.

The Getty Research Institute. "Digitized Resources." https://www.getty.edu/research/exhibitions_events/exhibitions/display_arthistory/digitized_resources.html (accessed January 14, 2025).

The National Gallery. "Poussin and the Dance." <https://www.nationalgallery.org.uk/exhibitions/past/poussin-and-the-dance> (accessed January 15, 2025).

Tipton, Susan. "La Passion Mia per la Pittura." *Münchener Jahrbuch der bildenden Kunst* 57 (2006): 71–331.

Todorović, Jelena. *Catalogue of the State Art Collection*. Vol. I. Novi Sad: Platoneum, 2014.

van Tuyll van Serooskerken, Carel and Michiel C. Plomp. *Claude Lorrain*. Haarlem: Teylers Museum, 2011.

Vasić, Pavle. "Nikola Pusen kod nas." *Umetnički pregled* 8 (1938): 129–134.

Wine, Humphrey. *Claude: The Poetic Landscape*. London: National Gallery Publications, 1994.

Wolohojian, Stephen. "A Grand Tableau: Charles Le Brun's Portrait of the Jabach Family." In: Wolohojian, Watt and Gallagher, 5–27.

Wolohojian, Stephen, Melinda Watt and Michael Gallagher, eds. *A Grand Tableau: Charles Le Brun's Portrait of the Jabach Family*. The Metropolitan Museum of Art Bulletin 75, no. 1. New York: The Metropolitan Museum of Art, 2017.

SOURCES

Archives of Yugoslavia. Prince Paul's Legacy Archive of Yugoslavia, Fund AJ-74.

Getty dealers' papers. Duveen Brothers records, 1925-1940, box 497, roll 352.

JEAN-FRANÇOIS, FRANCISQUE, MILLET – A DOUBLE ENIGMA: DISCOVERING THE JOURNEY OF HIS TWO VERSIONS OF CLASSICAL LANDSCAPE

Despite the fact that Jean-François Francisque Millet was considered in his time, and the centuries to come, one of the best landscape painters of his generation, he remained unjustly overshadowed by his paragon and predecessor Nicolas Poussin and his work was often mistaken for the landscapes of the other, or another, slightly older colleague, Gaspard Dughet. This level of "neglect" for the life and oeuvre of Jean-François Francisque Millet (1642-1680), is greatly due,

respectively, to the brevity of his life and the sparseness of documentation he left behind. As if the artist enigma was not enough, this article would aim to unravel an even more complex, dual enigma, of an artist and his two landscapes: one version is kept in the collections of the Alte Pinakothek in Munich, Classical Landscape (inv. no. 1018), while the other is in the holdings of the State Art Collection in Belgrade, Landscape with Two Classical Figures and a Beggar (inv. no. 242/01), both dated in the 1660s. While the Munich picture, as we shall elaborate further, was on public display almost from the beginning of the 18th century; the Belgrade version could be rightfully named a "sleeper," a picture that remained forgotten and overlooked for centuries.

JEAN-FRANÇOIS, FRANCISQUE, MILLET – DVOSTRUKA ENIGMA: TRAGOM DVAJU NJEGOVIH KLASIČNIH PEJZAŽA

Unatoč činjenici da je u svoje vrijeme, kao i u potonjim stoljećima, smatran jednim od najboljih pejzažista svoje generacije, Jean-François Francisque Millet (1642. – 1680.) nepravедno je ostao u sjeni svojega mnogo slavnijeg prethodnika Nicolasa Poussina, kao i još jednoga, malo starijeg kolege, Gasparda Dugheta. Za to nepravедno zanemarivanje Milletova života i djela uvelike su zaslužni njegov kratak život te oskudnost dokumentacije. Kao da nije bila dovoljna ta umjetnička enigma, tekst će se pozabaviti dvostrukom enigmom, enigmom umjetnika i njegovih dvaju pejzaža iz šezdesetih godina 17. stoljeća: jednim koji se nalazi u zbirci Stare pinakoteke u Münchenu kao „Klasični pejzaž“ (inv. br. 1018) i drugim koji pripada Državnoj umjetničkoj zbirci Dvorskog kompleksa u Beogradu pod nazivom „Pejzaž s dvije klasične figure i prosjakom“ (inv. br. 242/01). Dok je pejzaž iz Münchena bio javno dostupan još od početka 18. stoljeća, beogradska inačica s pravom se može nazvati „spavačem“, slikom koja je ostala zaboravljena i zanemarena tijekom više stoljeća.