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EXHIBITIONS: Salon de l'Académie de Saint-Luc de 1756 [P]


ICONOGRAPHY: (I) portrait attributed to Pierre Mignard, with his younger brother, the chevalier de Luynes, c.1692 (private collection), reproduced Cahiers Saint-Simon, XVIII, 1990, p. 24; (II) portrait by Pierre Gobert, oil on canvas, Salon de 1704, lost; (III, IV) entirely imaginary “portraits” of the hero of Gautier’s Mademoiselle de Maupin, by Aubrey Beardsley and Leconte de Nouy

GENEALOGY: Albert de Luynes

In the Salon de l’Académie de Saint-Luc of 1756, an obscure artist called Jean Chevalier exhibited “Le Portrait de M. le prince de Grimberghen, Prince du Saint-Empire Romain, &c., peint en 1755, dans la 84e année de son âge.” The critic of the Journal encyclopédique “[s’est arrêté] avec plaisir à considérer [ce] portrait…Le contraste de sa bonne mine avec sa vieillesse et le pinceau de M. Chevalier ont partagé notre admiration.”¹ That work is probably lost, but the present pastel, perhaps an earlier version by the same artist, gives us an idea of the appearance of a remarkable figure who today is known only, if at all, as a character in an opera by Grétry and a novel by Théophile Gautier (and by an imaginary and singularly inapt illustration by Aubrey

¹ Anon., “Observations sur cette exposition de peintures, sculptures et gravures à l’Académie de Saint-Luc”, Journal encyclopédique, 1756. We do not know if the work was in oil or pastel; the medium is unspecified in the livret (the critic’s reference to the artist’s “pinceau” is not decisive; critics of this period used these terms loosely).
Beardsley). His real life was at least as eventful as these mythical representations of derring-do, 
galanterie and gender confusion: we shall see how this French soldier, finding conventional  
avenues blocked, forged a trans-national identity to become a prince of the Holy Roman Empire,  
an intimate of the Bavarian ruler, and his agent charged with an important programme of art  
acquisitions for the Munich court.

Louis-Joseph d’Albert de Luynes (1672–1758) was prince de Grimberghen, comte  
d’Albert, comte de Wertiainghem, comte d’Arquennes, seigneur de Feluy, Escaille, Croquet,  
Montigny, Cantaing, pair du Cambrésis, ministre et conseiller d’État intime de Son Altesse  
Électorale de Bavière, lieutenant-général de ses troupes, and a great deal else. He was a member  
of an important French family which included a cardinal, two maréchaux de France, four  
lieutenants-généraux, and numerous chevaliers du Saint-Esprit as well as several members of the Académie  
française. The family origins were obscure prior to the  
emergence of Charles d’Albert de Luynes (1578–1621). Richelieu (whose strong bias against his rival contributed  
to the negative picture of Luynes that has only recently been challenged) said he was the illegitimate child of an obscure  
canon from Marseille and a chambermaid, taking his surname from a local farm. Other sources paint him as a  
foreigner, emphasising the family’s Tuscan origins (some suggesting a direct line from the Ghibelline Alberti who left  
Florence in the fourteenth century). Such concerns did not prevent Louis XIII from making his favourite and chief  
adviser a duc and appointing him connétable de France. The family’s social position was confirmed when Luynes  
made Marie de Rohan (1600–1679), a notorious figure  
whose intrigues provided the plots for novels by Dumas and an opera by Donizetti; through her the d’Albert de  
Luynes became connected with a family of even broader influence in government, the church and the army. Luynes, traditionally seen as a zealous Catholic and an incompetent soldier, died during the siege of the Protestant stronghold of Montauban in 1621. His widow then married Claude de Lorraine, duc de Chevreuse, a member of an even more important family with independence from royal authority. (In 1657 Chevreuse died without a direct male heir, and his peerage became extinct. ) Luynes’s only son, Louis-Charles, duc de Luynes (1620–1690), was a pious, shy man with Jansenist tendencies. The future prince de Grimberghen was the son of Louis-Charles by his second wife Anne de Rohan-Montbazon (a half-sister of Marie de Rohan, Louis-Charles’s mother), and half-brother of Charles-Honoré, duc de Chevreuse (1646–1712), who figures prominently in Saint-Simon’s Mémoires. The duc of Chevreuse’s son was Honoré-

---


5 For the Lorraine family and other princes étrangers generally, see Jonathan Spangler, The society of princes, Farnham, 2009.

6 A new duché de Chevreuse was created in 1667 for his wife’s grandson, Charles-Honoré, duc de Chevreuse, 3e duc de Laynes (1646–1712).
Charles, duc de Montfort (1669–1704); his son Charles-Philippe (1695–1758) was the duc de Luynes whose seventeen volumes of Mémoires cover the period 1735–58 (Paris, 1860–65).

Outstanding personal courage simplified the choice between army and church for this younger son. At 16, Louis-Joseph, then known as the chevalier de Luynes, became a volunteer in the first company of grenadiers in the régiment de Champagne, with which he took part in the sieges of Philippensburg and Mannheim. In July 1690, now known as comte d’Albert and having become captain in the Royal-Étrangers regiment, he was twice wounded at Fleurus.7 In 1692, he was promoted to lieutenant-colonel, and in May that year he purchased from M. de Longueval (for 100,000 livres) the dragons-dauphin regiment, which he commanded at the capture of Namur on 5 June 1692. In 1693, he received two bayonet wounds at the battle of Steinkerque (3 August). On 3 December 1694, the king had him imprisoned in the Conciergerie for involvement in a duel; he was released following a decision of the parlement the following February.8 In July 1695, at the siege of Namur, he is said to have entered the town from Dinant disguised as a boatman, swimming across the Meuse, his sword in his teeth, in order to avoid the enemy lines; he was wounded in the head, and Mme de Coulanges wrote with great concern to Mme de Sévigné,9 believing that his wound had required trepanning – fortunately, according to the marquis de Souches, he escaped this hazard.10

His liaison with the colourful opera singer Mlle Maupin (1670–1707) was the most celebrated of his many amours (fig. 1 shows a contemporary print published by Jean Mariette). The story was romanticised in Théophile Gautier’s Mademoiselle de Maupin (1835), where d’Albert is cast as the poet-narrator-hero. Apart from the theme of gender confusion,11 the novel, which inspired illustrations by Aubrey Beardsley and Leconte de Nouy, is chiefly remembered for its celebration of art for art’s sake: Gautier laid out his thesis in the preface, “Ce qui est beau physiquement est bien, tout ce qui est laid est mal.” Although information about her remains nebulous (consisting largely of stories of doubtful accuracy), the mythology of Mlle Maupin is inextricably tied up with that of d’Albert.12 Julie d’Aubigny, known as La Maupin, was the daughter of Gaston d’Aubigny, secretary of the comte d’Armagnac, grand écuier de France, whose mistress she became although she was married off to an obscure M. Maupin. Her skill in fencing brought her into contact with a man called Séranne, but the couple were forced to leave Paris by the chief of police Nicolas-Gabriel de La Reynie, who enforced the anti-duelling laws vigorously. They went to Marseille, where La Maupin joined the music academy recently opened by Lully’s associate Pierre Gaultier. Legend has it that this “nouvelle Sapho” (in the words of Clément & La Porte) was condemned to death in absentia by the parlement of Aix after an affair with a novice in a convent (in which La Maupin disinterred the dead body of another nun, placed it in her lover’s bed, and set fire to the room to conceal her

---

7 One of the bullets lodged in his body was never located, causing complications many years later. For these exploits, see, e.g., Charles Sevin de Quincy, Histoire militaire du règne de Louis le Grand, 1726, ii, pp. 261, 538; iii, p. 109.
8 Sourches, op. cit., iv, pp. 408, 424.
9 Letter 1244, 29 July 1695; Lettres de madame de Sévigné, Paris, 1818, xi, p. 444.
10 Ibid., v, p. 19; see also Saint-Simon, op. cit., i, p. 242.
11 Among the more obscure discussions is that in Magnus Hirschfeld’s Jahrbuch für sexuelle Zwischenstufen, V, 1903, pp. 694ff; Fernande Gontier, Homme ou femme? La confusion des sexes, Paris, 2006 is a more recent account. As Michael Levey pointed out (The case of Walter Pater, London, 1978, p. 109), the novel was seriously respected by Swinburne, Pater and Wilde but today only seems silly.
12 The main source for most of the Maupin stories is J. M. B. Clément & J. de la Porte, Anecdotes dramatiques, 1775, iii, pp. 328ff, although the earliest source appears to be L’Histoire de madame de Mucy, published anonymously by Guillaume Valdory with a false Amsterdam imprint, 1731. See also G. Letainturier-Fradin, La Maupin (1670–1707), Paris, 1904, pp. 47, 78ff, 131, 183ff, 198ff, 237ff; Adolphe Jullien, “L’Opéra sous l’ancien régime”, Les Lettres et les arts, iii, 1888, pp. 128–157. Among more recent books may be cited Richard Cohen, By the sword, London, 2002; most scholarly sources largely repeat the same information.
elopement). She attempted suicide when her love for the soprano Fanchon Moreau was spurned. Her first encounter with d’Albert was about 1690 when, travelling from Poitou to Paris dressed as a man, she encountered him at an inn; a fight broke out (versions differ as to precisely what trivial dispute provoked hostilities), which led to her pinning his shoulder to the wall with her sword. Filled with remorse, she nursed him, and they promptly fell in love before d’Albert had to rejoin his regiment. La Maupin continued her journey to Paris and launched her operatic career, making her name in operas by Lully, Destouches and Campra. D’Albert and Maupin resumed their affair in 1695 for a few months, until he left for Namur in July. La Maupin also continued her enthusiasm for duelling. Following a ball in the Palais-Royal, where apparently she fought three male rivals over a young lady they were all interested in, she escaped to Brussels, becoming mistress of Max Emanuel von Bayern. When he dismissed her in favour of comtesse d’Arco, he sent the latter’s husband to La Maupin with an order to leave Brussels and 40,000 francs, which, we are told, she flung in the emissary’s face, saying the present was worthy only of a cuckold. She then travelled to Madrid, returning to Paris, to d’Albert and to the stage around 1698. She played contralto (“bas dessus”) roles such as Medée in La Grange’s opera Médée (1702) and Clorinde in André Campra’s Tancredé (1702), which was written for her. Dangeau, describing her performance in Destouches’s Omphale (1701), said she had the most beautiful voice in the world, and her enduring musical legacy is that of being the first contralto diva on the operatic stage.

D’Albert’s sister, Jeanne-Baptiste, comtesse de Verrue [contessa di Verrua] (1670–1736) was the famous connoisseur of Dutch and Flemish art, and a noted bibliophile, with a library of over 18,000 volumes (fig. 2 shows a later mezzotint of an anonymous portrait). Having married the heir to the Scaglia di Verrua family at the age of thirteen, she lived in an apartment in the Royal Palace of Turin. Vittorio Amedeo II, duca di Savoia, made her his mistress; two illegitimate children were born, Vittorio Francesco (1694–1762), and Vittoria Francesca (1690–1766), who married Vittorio Amedeo di Savoia, principe de Carignano. The duke’s jealousy became insupportable, and in the winter of 1699 she prepared a plan for her escape, enlisting the aid of her younger brother, Charles-Hercule d’Albert, chevalier de Luynes (1674–1734; fig. 3 shows a double portrait at the château de Dampierre of the chevalier with Louis-Joseph, attributed to Mignard). Visiting a friend near Turin, she adopted disguise, crossing the frontier dressed as her brother’s page. The story of her escape (the cross-dressing offers a curious counterpoint to her brother’s antics) provided the plot of an historical novel by Alexandre Dumas père, La Dame de volupté, and was no doubt in Saint-Simon’s mind when he summed up her life: “Voilà un vrai roman; ma is il s’est passé de notre temps au vu et au su enfin de tout le monde.” Vittorio Amedeo is said by some sources to have behaved generously to
his former mistress, sending her many of her favourite paintings, and she continued to be paid
the revenues from her estates in Savoy. But the duke turned away from France, thus
marginalising the pro-French Scaglia clan, and the cuckolded conte di Verrua abandoned Turin
for Paris, where he entered the French service.  

In August 1700, Louis-Joseph, together with the comte d’Uzès, fought another duel, with
the comtes de Rantzau and de Schwarzenberg, about the duchesse de Luxembourg, mistress of
both Louis-Joseph and Rantzau.  
The duel was the talk of the court, and only M. de
Luxembourg was unaware of the cause, his close friend the prince de Conti being too
embarrassed to explain (in Mme du Noyer’s phrase, Mme de Luxembourg was “un peu
tympanisée”). Unlike a scuffle with an opera singer, an organised duel involving four aristocrats –
and in which both foreigners (one Danish, the other Austrian) were wounded – could not be
overlooked. The king ordered d’Uzès and d’Albert to the Conciergerie, but d’Albert fled to
Brussels, where, his old wounds having reopened, he remained for some time before delivering
himself to prison. Notwithstanding his bravery at Namur, Louis XIV was furious with both his
persistent duelling and his disobedience, and insisted on demoting d’Albert, ordering the
Dauphin to withdraw his commission despite the intervention of the duc de Chevreuse. It was
not until November 1702 that, through d’Albert’s relationship with Max Emanuel, the king
could be persuaded to allow d’Albert’s release from prison, even though he had been acquitted
by the parlement. Although the marquis de Souches reported that d’Albert was received by the
king “avec humanité” on 2 December 1702, Louis was never prepared to see him reinstated in
the French army. The issue of duelling raised profound issues concerning the developing
concepts of honour and the conflict between personal glory and service to the State, and it is not
surprising that there was mutual incomprehension between d’Albert and the king. Exile would
prevent d’Albert combining both goals in the exercise of his profession.

Given the background to the Luxembourg duel, it is ironic that d’Albert’s daring escape
from prison should be the subject of an opera Le Comte d’Albert (1787) by the liégeois composer
André Grétry (1741–1813), based on a libretto by Michel-Jean Sedaine (1719–1797), in which his
stratagem was made possible by his fictional wife who makes it appear that she had forced a
street-porter (whose life d’Albert had previously saved) at knife-point to exchange clothes with d’Albert and to take his
place in the cell. The duet expressing the couple’s conjugal
devotion has been called one of Grétry’s best compositions.
The theme is echoed also in the La Fontaine fable Le Lion et le Rat (cited as Sedaine’s source), in which the noble lion, caught
in the hunter’s net, is rescued by the rat, who gnaws through
the mesh. The opera, and in particular d’Albert’s aria “Quelle
fatale journée”, set in the prison cell, anticipated Beethoven’s
Fidelio, which shares the climactic release of a prisoner by his
wife as the focus of the plot.

Maximilian II. Emanuel (1662–1726), to whom d’Albert
owed his release, was a member of the Wittelsbach dynasty (fig.
4 shows Vivien’s portrait of him in the Louvre). He became
Kurfürst von Bayern in 1679 and ruled for 46 years. He was a

---

18 See Robert Oresko, “The Sabaudian Court 1563–c.1750” in John Adamson (ed.), The princely courts of Europe 1500–1750,
London, 1999, p. 242. I am particularly grateful to the late Robert Oresko who reviewed a draft of this article (private
communication, 15 January 2005).

19 See the marquis de Souches, ibid., VI, pp. 280ff; Saint-Simon, ibid., I, p. 736.

20 Madame de C*** [Anne-Marguerite Petit, Mme du Noyer], Lettres historiques et galantes, 5e éd., Cologne, 1733, ii, p. 258.

21 See below. D’Albert enlisted the Kurfürst’s aid in seeking a pardon in a letter of 12 February 1702 which Max Emanuel did
through his envoy in Paris, the Piedmontese Ferdinand-Auguste Solaro, comte de Monasterol.

22 Dedicated to Mme Vigée Le Brun, perhaps in return for her 1785 portrait of Grétry now in Versailles.


24 Technically he was Herzog von Bayern, and a Kurfürst of the Holy Roman Empire; but the abuse of language is convenient.
cousin of Vittorio Amedeo II, and the courts of Munich and Turin were closely linked in the seventeenth century. Both faced similar challenges to their sovereignty and independent existence in post-1648 Europe; to avoid the fate of Tuscany and Lorraine, they were obliged to keep disproportionate armies, to construct splendid palaces and to maintain prestigious courts in pursuit of the objective of acquiring a crown (such as that of Spain) through inheritance or marriage to royal or imperial daughters, or even in return for mercenary services. Bavaria also lacked a class of higher nobility of its own, making the services of a d’Albert particularly attractive.

As a young man Max Emanuel distinguished himself as an ally of the Emperor in the Turkish wars between 1683 and 1688, becoming known as the “blaue Kurfürst” (from his blue coat, in the colours of Bavaria). One sister, Marie Anne Christine, married the Dauphin of France in 1679, while another, Violanta Beatrix, married Gran’Prinipe Ferdinando de’ Medici, heir to Tuscany, in 1688. In 1685, Max Emanuel married Antonia (1669–1692), daughter of Kaiser Leopold I. Their son, Joseph Ferdinand (1692–1699), was recognised as heir to the kingdom of Spain, and in consequence Max Emanuel was created governor of the Spanish Netherlands by Carlos II on 13 December 1691, making his entry into Brussels on 26 March of the following year. Following Antonia’s death, the Elector obtained a different (weaker) claim on a throne in 1695 through his second marriage to a daughter of the king of Poland, Theresa Kunigunda Sobieska (1676–1730), but this failed to avert the European war that followed Joseph Ferdinand’s early death in 1699.

Max Emanuel came from an extremely musical family: he had been taught by the organist Johann-Kaspar Kerll, and could sing, dance and play the guitar, harp and viola da gamba. Artistic life in Brussels gained a new stimulus under Max Emanuel: he was a passionate champion of all the arts, acting as patron for musicians such as Marais, Steffani, Charpentier and d’All’Abaco, and also bringing to Brussels the maître de chapelle Pietro Torri and about a quarter of the musical establishment of the Munich court. Here they joined other foreigners, such as the Venetian composer Pietro Antonio Fiocco and the Roman Gio Paolo Bombarda, a former musician now happily occupied in a new career as trésorier général et conseiller des finances to Max Emanuel. The arts, music and opera in particular were not mere pastimes: they were an essential part of courtly ceremonial (“Hof-Cermoniell”), considered, in the words of the elector’s son Clemens August, essential to the high-ranking prince’s “Ansehen und Pracht” [reputation and magnificence].

It was under Bombarda’s enlightened influence and sponsorship that an opera house was established in Brussels which in 1700 formally took the name of Théâtre de la Monnaie. Fiocco, as its musical director and successor to Torri as Max Emanuel’s maître de chapelle, was responsible for the emphasis on the French repertoire, including the operas of Lully, and probably introduced the Kurfürst to La Maupin with whom, as we have seen, he had an affair. Of the many other women pursued by Max Emanuel the most important was his official mistress, Agnès-Françoise Le Louchier, comtesse d’Arco (c.1660–1717) (fig. 5 shows Vivien’s portrait). It is impossible today to decide on how far she or Grimberghen should be credited with introducing Max Emanuel to French art, or to the crucial introduction of the Kurfürst to the artist Joseph Vivien.

25 For a recent study of the significance of opera in court, see Juliane Riepe, “‘Essential to the reputation and magnificence of such a high-ranking prince’: ceremonial and Italian opera at the court of Clemens August of Cologne and other German courts”, in Melania Bucciarelli & al., eds. Italian opera in Central Europe, 2007, 1, pp. 147ff. See also Peter Claus Hartmann, “De la musique à la finance pendant la guerre de Succession d’Espagne”, Annales. économies, sociétés, civilisations, XXIV/2, 1969, pp. 322–36 for Bombarda in particular. Portraits of Bombarda and his wife, signed and dated by Vivien, 1701, are reproduced in Jeffares 2006, p. 557.
(1657–1734), premier peintre to Max Emanuel from the late 1690s. Vivien’s portrait of d’Arco, executed around 1704, was sent to Brussels at Max Emanuel’s request: “J’ay une impacience demesurée a voir ce charmant portrait.”26 The Kurfürst described it as a “parfait ouvrage” even though the glass was broken on arrival in August 1705: “Pour les glaces je ne scay ce qui manque cela ce pora bien remmettre apre la Campagne, les portrets de Vivien sont chère … et je croins que les pastelles ne durent pas.” 27 In a further letter to her of 2 October 1705, he refers to it:

Votre derniere lettre me console, mais ne me guerit pas du chagrin que vous scaver que j’ay et qui ne me quitte pas plus mon desir de vous voir s’augmente a quoy votre grand portrait que Vivien a apporté contribue parfaitement, je le contemple toute les jours et le trouve toujours plus beau.28

The comtesse later also introduced the architect Germain Boffrand to Max Emanuel, whose artistic interests were extremely broad ranging.

D’Albert first met Max Emanuel in Brussels; evidently the Kurfürst warmed to this courageous soldier from an influential, noble family with a liking for court ceremony and a reputation as a passionate lover. On his release (with the Kurfürst’s help) from the Conciergerie following the duel over the duchesse de Luxembourg in November 1702, d’Albert continued his liaisons with both Mme de Luxembourg and with La Maupin. Aware that Louis XIV’s view of his behaviour would block future promotion in the French army, d’Albert sought and obtained permission to seek his fortune in the service of Bavaria, an opportunity opened up by a remarkable turn in international affairs.

Before the War of the Spanish Succession war was fully underway, the Kurfürst signed a secret treaty with France in 1701 under which he received substantial payments to build up his army. Soon after he opened negotiations with both France and the Empire, playing off the parties to secure the most advantageous terms for the support of his newly strengthened army (of some 21,000 men), eventually pursuing what has been called “as black a scheme of greed and deceit as has ever been committed to paper” (in a letter to Louis XIV).29 This alliance with France remained secret until, in September 1702, Bavaria declared its hand by capturing Ulm by stealth. France was to send a large force to the Rhine to support the Kurfürst. Throughout the war France continued to pay Bavaria huge subsidies in exchange for its support (the annual level in the period 1707–10 exceeded 4 million livres).30

D’Albert travelled with Monasterol to Strasbourg in April 1703, where he joined the maréchal de Villars, travelling on to reach the army of Bavaria where he was made a lieutenant-general. This brought an end to d’Albert’s affair with La Maupin, who addressed to him a poem, including verses which were extravagantly compared to those of Ovid and allegedly attributed to Isaac de Benserade:31

... Je suis faite aux périls, ainsi qu’à la tendresse.
Que ne m’est-il permis de voler après toi?
Si je suivois tes pas je n’aurois nul effroi:
J’oirais braver la mort…

He responded, also in verse, with more measured ardour.

On 20 September the united French and Bavarian armies defeated the Austrians at the first

26 Letter from Brussels, 4 January 1705. Max Emanuel’s correspondence with the comtesse is in the Bavarian state archives, Geheimes Staatsarchiv, Kasten schwarz, 352/2 & 3; some extracts are included in Börchers-Supan 1963, pp. 192ff, while others are included on Ioana Herbert’s website, “Mit trockenen Farben”, accessed 9 December 2013.
27 Letter of 16 August 1705, cited Herbert, loc. cit. See also Peter Volk, “Court art in 1700”, The Connoisseur, September 1976, pp. 39–49; H. Glaser, Kurfürst Max-Emanuel: Bayern und Europa um 1700, exhibition catalogue, Schleißheim, 1976, ii, no. 772. It is not clear whether this, or an earlier portrait engraved by Vermeulen in 1700, was the Vivien portrait of comtesse d’Arco in the Salon of 1704, where it hung beside that of Max Emanuel.
28 Cited Herbert, loc. cit.
31 See Letainturier-Fradin, op. cit.; Benserade had been dead for more than ten years; in fact, they were written by Danchet, as revealed by the Correspondance littéraire for January 1759, p. 67. The verses were included in the Ami des muses.
battle of Höchstädt. In December 1703, d’Albert was charged with bringing Louis XIV the news of the taking of Augsburg. As he was crossing the lines in disguise, he was recognised and pursued; jumping a barrier near Schaffhausen, he dislocated his foot and had to give up his mission. He was however able to return to Paris, where Louis XIV finally pardoned him, and he resumed his liaison with La Maupin. The following year, Pierre Gobert exhibited at the Salon de l’Académie royale the portraits of d’Albert and of Mlle Maupin, both of which are now lost; although not hung as pendants, it is difficult not to believe that they were commissioned together. It may be suspected that this portrait of Mlle Maupin, or another portrait by Gobert, was the source of Fig. 1.

Following the decisive second battle at Höchstädt (known as Blenheim to the English) in 1704, Bavaria was occupied by the Austrians and (until his return to Munich in 1715) Max Emanuel was forced to live in exile in Paris and Brussels, where he remained governor of the Spanish Netherlands. In August 1704, the Kurfürst named d’Albert as maréchal de camp of the Spanish troops. In 1706, he received the title of captain of the Flanders guards. The following year, he fell seriously ill as a result of one of the gunshot wounds sustained at Fleurus sixteen years previously: the marquis de Sourches reported, “on parloit de l’effroyable opération qu’on a voir fait au comte d’Albert pour une ancienne blessure…on disoit que l’ouverture prenoit au droit de la hanche et qu’elle alloit jusqu’à la mamelle; qu’on lui avoit tiré une pinte de pus, sans néanmoins qu’on eût pu encore trouver la balle, et qu’il étoit dans un extrême danger de sa vie”. Nevertheless he seems to have made a full recovery.

His private life continued its troubled course. He had several mistresses apart from his liaisons with La Maupin and Mme de Luxembourg. The third daughter of the duc de Choiseul, born in October 1697, whom the family refused to recognise, was his. Saint-Simon described d’Albert as “fait comme les amours, et qui en usa comme eux…. Distingué partout à la guerre par les plus éclatantes et les plus singulières actions, favorisé par les plus belles dames, envié et attaqué par beaucoup de gens…”.

For the two years since the end of her affair with d’Albert, La Maupin had been involved with Marie-Louise-Thérèse de Senneterre, marquise de Florensa (“la plus belle femme qui fût peut-être en France” according to Saint-Simon). Her tragic death in 1705 led the singer to contemplate taking the veil; held back only by her residual love for d’Albert, she wrote to him for advice. He responded with a letter which has been described as beautiful and touching, but whose tortuous logic, pointing out that it was unreasonable for her to have asked him a question which he can only answer in good faith by acting against his interests, displays egotism, a subtle mind and an astute ability to escape from an awkward situation:

Songez vous à qui vous vous adressez? Est-ce ma Religion, est-ce mon cœur, est-ce mon complaisance, que vous voulez mettre à l’Épreuve? Et comptez-vous, en me consultant, que je sois assez le maître de mes sentiments, pour vous fortifier dans les vôtres? Avez-vous perdu l’idée de ce que je suis à votre égard? N’est-ce pas insulter à mon malheur, que de me forcer à l’approuver? Et ne mériteriez-vous pas, que pour vous punir de votre injustice, je me rangeasse du parti du monde?

32 For Gobert, see Eugène Thoison, “Recherches sur les artistes se rattachant au Gâtinais: Pierre Gobert”, Réunion des Sociétés des beaux-arts des départements, 1903, pp. 98–137; 1906, pp. 296–305. Thoison incorrectly identifies the “comte d’Albert” as the duc de Luynes.
33 Alternatively this may be based on another lost portrait of her, by Nicolas Fouché (1653–1733), recorded in the cabinet of Blondel de Gagny; see Baron J. Pichon, “Notes supplémentaires sur les cabinets des curieux de Paris”, Livre -journal de Lazare Duvaux, marchand-bijoutier, 1748–1758, ed. J. Courajod, Paris, 1873, I, p. ccxlix.
34 According to the marquis de Sourches, op. cit., IX, p. 43, this was a device to provide d’Albert with a title which Louis XIV would not permit.
36 Augustine-Françoise, known as Mlle de Saint-Cyr; notwithstanding the formidable evidence against her legitimacy (see Mémoires de Saint-Simon, ed. A. de Boisiste, Paris, 1886, V, p. 347), she won a court case before the parlement of Paris and was declared the legal daughter of the duc de Choiseul by the Grand’Chambre on 18 July 1726 (La Chesnaye des Bois, V, col. 693; Journal et mémoires de Mathieu Marais, Paris, 1864, pp. 85–86, 11–14 February 1724). She died two years later, unmarried.
37 Écrits inédits de Saint-Simon, 1893, p. 281; cited Letainturier-Fradin, op. cit., p. 78.
38 The text is printed in extenso in the anonymous Annales dramatiques, ou Dictionnaire général des théâtres, Paris, 1810, vi, pp. 172ff.
contre vous-même? Je sais que vous ne doutez pas de la part que je prends à tout ce qui peut faire
votre bonheur; mais ignorez-vous que vous ne pourrez parvenir à celui où vous aspirez, qu’aux
dépens du mien propre, & sans qu’il m’en coûte mon repos? Ne devez-vous pas craindre qu’a force
de m’intéresser à ce que vous faites, je ne tâche de vous en dissuader? & pouvez-vous sagement vous
confier à un homme qui ne sauroit agir de bonne-fois, sans trahir ses intérêts? Vous le savez; depuis
que vous renoncez au monde, mes intérêts deviennent bien différents des vôtres. A quelle extrémité
me réduisez-vous donc, pour répondre à la bonne opinion que vous avez de moi! & qu’il m’en coûte
cher de vous avoir persuadée de ma sincérité! Il faut que je me détache de moi-même, pour me
conformer à vos intentions; il faut que j’étouffe tout sentiment de sensibilité & de délicatesse; il faut
enfin que je vous tienne un langage tout opposé aux mouvements de mon cœur, & que je m’immole
pour vous plaire. Jamais la raison n’a tant pris sur la nature. Mettez donc à ce sacrifice tout le prix
qu’il mérite: c’est le plus grand que j’aie fait, & que je puisse faire de ma vie.

This was possibly not what she expected to hear. She went to her convent and appeared no more
at the Opéra. The cloistered life did not agree with her, and she died two years later at the age of
37.

In November 1706 d’Albert visited his brother’s close friend, François de Salignac de La
Mothe-Fénelon (1651–1715), archevêque de Cambrai, perhaps to seek spiritual guidance. Fénelon
described the visit in his letter to the duc de Chevreuse of 12 November 1706: 39

Il est doux, commode, plain de complaisance et d’agrément dans la société. Il paroit s’accommoder
avec nous; et je lui dis qu’il est comme Alcibiade, qui savoit être austère à Lacédémone, poli et savant
à Athènes, magnifique et voluptueux chez les Perses. C’est un esprit doux, insinuant, souple, et qui
prend toutes les formes selon les lieux et les personnes. Il sait penser très-sérieusement, et sur des
principes approfondis: on ne sauroit lui dire aucune vérité, qu’il ne soit dite avec force; mais la même
facilité d’esprit qui le tourne au bien, l’entraîne vers le mal dans le torrent du mode, où il est plongé.
Quand il nous quittera, je le regretterai.

In 1709, d’Albert’s family opposed his marriage to Marie-Madeleine-Honorine-Charlotte
de Berghes (1680–1744), known as Mlle de Montigny (fig. 6 shows an anonymous portrait in a
Belgian private collection which is apparently by or after Gobert), who had succeeded the
comtesse d’Arco as official mistress of the Kurfürst von Bayern. Mlle de Montigny was the
daughter of Philippe-François, comte de Grimberge, prince de Berghes (1646–1704), chevalier
de la Toison d’or, bailli de Hainault, 40 governor of Brussels and of Mons when Louis XIV
captured the town in 1691; her brother married Anne-Henriette de Rohan (daughter of Louis de
Rohan-Chabot, duc de Rohan) in 1710. She was chanoinesse de Mons, and, in contrast to her
brother, was “belle et bien faite” according to Saint-Simon. 41 The Kurfürst, who proposed the
union as a cover for his liaison, promised his mistress a pension of 40,000 livres, while d’Albert
was offered 100,000 livres, the territory of Wertingen in Swabia and (with the French king’s
permission) the position of grand écuyer to the court of Bavaria; Max Emanuel also offered to
ask the Spanish king to award him the Toison d’or, but nothing seems to have come of this.
D’Albert, who had no fortune of his own, accepted the remaining terms, signing the contract in
Madrid on 30 May 1713, after the death of the duc de Chevreuse; but the wedding was not
celebrated until 18 March 1715 (at Compiègne), after d’Albert’s return from Madrid where he
had been sent as the Elector’s envoyé extraordinaire (and been accorded the entrées de la
chambre by the Spanish king). D’Albert was however supported by his sister, Mme de Verrue,
and the marriage contract confirms that, having returned to France in 1714, he was living with
her in the hôtel de Verrue, rue du Cherche-Midi (where Mme de Verrue housed her important
collection of books). The Kurfürst had remained in France after the Peace of Rastatt had
brought the War of the Spanish Succession to an end (and opened the way for his reappearance
in Bavaria); he attended the wedding in Compiègne just before his return to Munich, where Mme

40 He was created prince de Berghes in 1686. The impressive but empty mausoleum said to be of the “prince de Grimbergen” in
the Norbertine abbey of Grimbergen is his rather than his son-in-law’s. On the family, see Prinz zu Isenburg, Stammtafeln zur
41 Ibid., iii, p. 984.
d’Albert would remain his mistress until his death in 1726. For Saint-Simon, the marriage was particularly detestable: he supported his friend Chevreuse’s objections to this union “dont l’infamie avoit toujours été rejetée par le duc de Chevreuse avec toute l’indignation qu’elle méritoit”; not only was d’Albert’s rôle mercenary, but Mlle de Montigny herself was one of the “bâtards de Brabant”.42

A number of documents demonstrate close contact between d’Albert and Joseph Vivien, premier peintre to Max Emanuel. Vivien painted d’Albert’s wife before 1715 – the pastel was sent from Paris to Munich in that year; a few years later it was again in Paris in the possession of the sitter. It appears that Vivien’s daughter, Suzanne, lost the Kurfürst’s payment order and depositions made to obtain a duplicate payment exist.43 While Vivien earned very large payments for his Wittelsbach portraits, very little of this money was actually paid to him (with most still outstanding by the time his daughter died), but d’Albert was responsible for the two payments, totalling 2660 livres (made in 1719 and 1726), against the outstanding 64,242 livres shown in an account of 1731.44

In 1709, d’Albert was sent to France as minister plenipotentiary; in 1711, 1713 and 1714 he was sent to Spain in the same position. He was active on his master’s behalf in the Spanish capital, seeking unsuccessfully to arrange a marriage between Philip V and the Bavarian princess Maria Anna Carolina as well as being involved in numerous financial transactions. The long exile of the Kurfürst von Bayern finally ended with his return to Munich in 1714 following the Peace of Rastatt, just after his purchase of the pavillon de Saint-Cloud (where d’Albert was subsequently to live until its sale to the fermier général Chalut de Vérin in 1749). On 2 April 1715 d’Albert took up the post of grand-bailli of Liège, to which he was appointed by Max Emanuel’s brother, the Joseph Clemens Kurfürst von Köln.45

By 1717, Max Emanuel had developed suspicions that his envoy in Paris, the comte de Monasterol, was abusing his position financially, and he decided to send d’Albert to investigate.46 The background to this was the 1701 Franco–Bavarian alliance and the large payments made under it. In view of the logistical difficulties of transferring money across Europe, commissions to agents were often enormous: Gio Paolo Bombarda took 10% of everything that passed through his hands, while Samuel Bernard took as much as 50% from the capital he supplied.47 D’Albert arrived in the French capital in the autumn of 1717, on the pretext of having to sort out his own affairs, while undertaking the investigation into Monasterol’s affairs with such zeal that the ambassador committed suicide in 1718.48 On 8 May d’Albert

42 Ibid., iv, p. 173. A factual statement, alluding to the cluster of noble families descended from illegitimate offspring of the ruling house of Brabant, by now several centuries in the past; but bastardy was Saint-Simon’s particular hobby-horse.


44 Börsch-Supan 1963, p. 201.

45 Joseph Clemens was succeeded as prince-évêque de Liège in 1724 by the uncle of d’Albert’s wife, Georges-Louis de Berghes.

46 The marquis de Sourches records such concerns as early as 1708 (ibid., xi, p. 222), suggesting that Monasterol “lost” 8000 écus from the Kurfürst and 12,000 from Louis XIV each year, and that he had been recalled and replaced by Simeoni. But Monasterol seems to have survived these rumours.

47 On Bavarian finance, see also Herbert Lüthy, La Banque protestante en France, 1, 1959, pp. 263ff in addition to the sources previously cited.

48 Saint-Simon saw Monasterol as an honest man with inadequate records: “Monasterol étoit un Piémontois dont la famille, assez médiocre, s’etoit transplante en Bavière comme quelques autres italiennes. C’étoit un homme fort agréable, toujours bien mis, souvent paré, d’un esprit très-médiocre, mais doux, liant, poli, cherchant à plaire, fort galant, qui, en fêtes, en chère, en meubles, en équipages et en bijoux, vivot dans le plus surprenant lüxe, et joiroit le plus gros jeu du monde. Sa femme [the widow of La Chétardie], encore plus splendide, augmenta encore sa dépense, et mêla un peu sa compagnie qui auparavant n’etoit que du meilleur de la cour et de la ville. On ne pouvoit comprendre comment un homme de soi si peu avantage de biens, et ministre d’un prince si longtemps sans États, pouvoit soutenir, et tant d’années, un état si généralement magnifique. Il payoit tout avec
succeeded as senior Bavarian representative in Paris, a position he retained (as envoy or ambassador) until 1749. He frequented the salon of his sister, Mme de Verrue, whose circle included a number of important art collectors such as the comte de Lassay, lover of her close friend, Louise-Françoise de Bourbon (still known as “Madame la Duchesse”), as well as Jean-Baptiste Glucq de Saint-Port, her own lover, and possibly secret husband, heir to the fortune made by his father at the Gobelins factory. Glucq, himself an art collector, was close to the art collectors Jean-François Lériget de La Faye, Jean-Baptiste de Montullé and, most significantly, the legendary connoisseur Jean de Jullienne. Mme de Verrue’s influence at the French court was (according to some stories) due to Louis XV’s debt to her: when the ducs of Bourgogne and Bretagne died in quick succession in 1712, suspected of having been poisoned, Mme de Verrue is said to have provided the duchesse de Ventadour, gouvernante des Enfants de France, with an antidote which was believed to have saved the life of the new dauphin.49

In 1721 he had an affair with Louise-Madeleine de La Motte, Mme Poisson, mother of Mme de Pompadour. According to the manuscript memoirs of Mme de La Ferté-Imbault, written in 1774 but not published until 1897,50

Elle avait été la maîtresse du prince de Grimberg, l’homme de son temps le plus à la mode pour la galanterie, puis de M. Paris-Montmartel. Elle était liée avec la fameuse Tencin, et quant elle accoucha de madame d’Étoiles, il lui donna la Tencin pour marraine, et persuada au prince de Grimberg et à Montmartel que c’était leur fille.

D’Albert acted as agent for the Kurfürst in his huge programme of acquisitions of French decorative art.51 His status as ambassador enabled him to export expensive goods free of duties and taxes. Correspondence with Graf Törring, the Bavarian Obersthofmeister, reveals the care and discerning taste reflected in the Residenz collection, d’Albert’s guiding principle being to acquire “tout ce qu’il y avait de plus agréable en ce genre, et de plus nouveau à Paris”. A marble and gilded bronze overmantel by Slodtz, for example, was commissioned by d’Albert for Schloß Nymphenburg by contract signed on 1 June 1719, for an amount of 3700 livres; the final cost was 12,521 livres 17s.52 On 15 October 1720, d’Albert paid the architect Pierre-Alexis Delamair the sum of 10,000 livres for a “livre de dessins”.53 D’Albert’s role as agent has inevitably masked the evidence of his interactions with artists, leaving little indication of the stamp of personal connoisseurship as a collector. When Max Emanuel’s four sons travelled to Paris for the wedding of Louis XV in 1725, d’Albert organised their trip and conducted their sightseeing in Paris for several weeks after the formal ceremonies. He ensured they visited the Louvre with the premier architecte du roi, Robert de Cotte, who had just delivered the plans for the Bonn Residenz (for the third son, Clemens August), and they were shown artworks in the Académie royale, meeting the artists and craftsmen who were to supply the Bavarian court, including Boule...
and the goldsmiths Ballin and Thomas Germain.

In 1726, d’Albert negotiated for the Kurfürst the renewal of the 1714 treaty with France. After the death of Max Emanuel, in 1726, he settled briefly in Flanders, but the following year Louis XV’s new chief minister cardinal de Fleury sent him to Munich to continue negotiations with the new Kurfürst von Bayern, Max Emanuel’s eldest son Karl Albrecht (1697–1745). In April 1728 Karl Albrecht and his brothers travelled with d’Albert to Mannheim, to renew their allegiance with the Palatine branch of the Wittelsbach family. D’Albert returned to Paris as ambassador.

On 18 May 1729, Kaiser Karl VI. (as duc de Bourgogne) created d’Albert prince de Berghes et de Grimberghen in Brabant, the territories for which had been acquired from his wife’s family. The letters patent (which were registered with the feudal court at Brabant on 16 January 1734) granted “permission de pouvoir porter le nom et la qualité de prince de Berghes, appliqué sur la terre et comté de Grimberghen”. The recitals rehearsed the difficulties that had beset the Glimes family following the death of Mlle de Montigny’s brother in 1720 and the falling into abeyance of the titles he had inherited from their father. Nevertheless the new prince de Grimberghen had faced vigorous opposition from his sisters-in-law and the creditors of the deceased prince since then. He never used the Berghes title, and it was as prince de Grimberghen that he was subsequently known. The territory (some 10 km north of Brussels) dates back to before the 12th century, when the Berthout family rivalled the ducs de Brabant in power; Gérard III, seigneur de Grimberghen (–1225) had only daughters and the territory subsequently had a complex history, passing through the Nassau, Orange, d’Ongnies and de Berghes families.

On 29 September 1729 Grimberghen and his wife formally entered his principality; an eyewitness account by a captain of the Bavarian foot-guards, Jean-François Nopère (1675–1753), Relation de l’entrée de S. E. Mgr le prince de Grimberghen en ses Etats, includes a detailed narrative of lengthy ceremonies from the arrival by boat in the morning to the fireworks late that night. Nopère was made bailli and intendant of Grimberghen. The princely couple thereafter devoted themselves to improving the château (fig. 7 shows a contemporary print), furnishing it with pictures and works of art, and even (in 1734) constructing the chapel of Notre-Dame d’Alten in the grounds. In 1732 Karl Albrecht awarded him a “gratification” of 250,000 livres for his work in sorting out the Bombarda affair; a decision of the Conseil des finances also entitled him to receive and retain the remaining Bombarda assets. Grimberghen also continued his diplomatic role, signing on behalf of Karl Albrecht a further treaty with France (represented by Chauvelin) at

55 Dansaert, op. cit, pp. 20–23.
56 His acquisition of the territory of Grimberghen committed him to paying annuities totalling 16,000 livres to his brother-in-law’s widow and his two sisters-in-law.
57 See Jules Carly & J.-Th de Raadt, Relation de l’entrée de son excellence monseigneur le prince de Grimberghe à Grimberghe le 29 septembre 1729 & Note sur Louis-Joseph comte d’Albert prince de Grimberghe, Brussels, 1889, extrait des Annales de la Société d’Archéologie de Bruxelles, III.
58 Jacobus Harrewijn after Guillaume De Bruijn, for Jacobus Le Roy, Castella et prætoria nobilium Brabantiæ, Bruxellis, 1699 ed., engraving.
59 After Grimberghen’s death the property reverted to the d’Ongnies and Merode families. It was ruined by fire in September 1944, and eventually sold to the local authority in 1978. The château, on its island, remains in ruins today, with only the left wing and its two towers standing.
60 See Joseph de Peglion, Mémoire aux maîtres des requêtes…contre Louis-Joseph d’Albert de Luynes, Prince de Grimberghe, Paris, 1758, p. 71, where the basis of the litigation concerning Grimberghen’s malversation is set out.
Fontainebleau on 15 November 1733. On 10 January 1734, at Marly, he signed a five year treaty on behalf of the Kurfürst von Köln, Clemens August. Four years later, Grimberghen entertained Clemens August at his château.61

An important event for Grimberghen was the marriage in 1735 of his only legitimate daughter,62 Thérèse-Pélagie (1719–1736), to her first cousin, twice removed, Marie-Charles-Louis d’Albert, duc de Montfort (1717–1771), later duc de Chevreuse. The contract was signed on 12 January 1735 and was witnessed by ten members of the royal family, including the regent’s widow, her son, the duc d’Orléans and prince de Condé, as well as Vittorio Amedeo, prince de Carignano (Mme de Verrue’s son-in-law), the duc de Chaulnes, the marquis de Dangeau, the duc de Saint-Simon and cardinal de Fleury. Grimberghen gave a dowry worth more than a million livres. However the new duchesse de Montfort, having given birth to a stillborn boy in October 1735, died eight months later at the château de Suresnes, near Paris. Grimberghen nevertheless settled on Montfort capital of 197,268 livres immediately prior to his remarriage, with Henriette d’Egmont-Pignatelli.63 A life interest in the income from the capital was settled on the prince de Condé, who died in 1740. Although not legally required, Grimberghen generously arranged for the interest to be passed to the son, Louis-Joseph de Bourbon-Condé, by a new deed executed at the hôtel de Grimberghen in Paris, 2 August 1741. These settlements were quite possibly related to the terms of the so-called Chaulnes secundogeniture, an arrangement made in 1732 to ensure that the Chaulnes title descended with the eponymous territory, requiring complicated entails which, being contrary to statute, required the ratification of parlement.

On the death of his sister Mme de Verrue, also in 1736, Grimberghen was one of the main beneficiaries (much to the irritation of the duc de Luynes, who had expected his son to inherit her considerable fortune); her bequest64 was to “monsieur le prince de Grimberghen mon frère, que j’aime tendrement et qui n’a point de maison de campagne aux environs de Paris la jouissance à vie durant de ma grande et de ma petite maison à Meudon...de tous les meubles meublants, glaces, tableaux étant de présent dans les dites maisons et qui y seront au jour de mon décès sans exception, dans l’état fait inventaire: dans lesquels meubles néanmoins n’est comprise aucune vaiselle d’argent.” The “jolie petite maison” of Le Grand Écu at Meudon had been acquired by Mme de Verrue in 1718; the prince de Croÿ visited Grimberghen there in September 1752.65 Although the picture collection was extensive, numbering 193 items, they were valued at only 6731 livres (while the 420 pictures in her Paris property were valued at 179,604 livres).66 Among other beneficiaries was the comte de Lassay, to whom Mme de Verrue left paintings to the value of 46,000 livres, including Van Dyck’s portrait of Charles I now in the Louvre.67 Grimberghen’s Paris residence at that time was on the quai Malaquais, but he was shortly to move to the hôtel de Bauffremont (87 rue de Grenelle), which he rented from Paul de Grivel, comte d’Ourouer. The hôtel was completed in 1736, occupied by the Austrian Embassy from 1742 to 1745 and sold in 1756 to Jean Pâris de Montmartel.68

The events leading up to the War of the Austrian Succession provided new opportunities for international diplomacy. Kaiser Joseph I. died in 1711 without male heirs, although one of his sons-in-law was Karl Albrecht of Bavaria. Joseph I. was succeeded by his brother, Karl VI. who

61 M. Braubach, Maria Theresia’s jüngster Sohn, Max Franz, letzter Kurfürst von Köln und Fürstbischof von Münster, Vienna, 1961, p. 70.
62 Two sons died in infancy.
63 The deed, dated 17 May 1738 (cited Dansaert, op. cit.), was drawn up by the notary Simon Hurtrelle.
64 See Tillerot, op. cit., pp. 113, 116.
66 See Tillerot, op. cit., p. 116; the numbers seem to differ slightly from those given in Mireille Rambaud, Documents du Ministère central concernant l’histoire de l’art, Paris, 1971, ii, pp. 890ff from the estate inventory; the Paris hôtel contained more than 400 pictures, of which only six are portraits; a further 150 pictures were in two houses in Meudon, including a series of 74 anonymous equestrian portraits. None appears to be in pastel.
67 The provenance of this painting before Mme de Verrue is uncertain. While it is believed to be the “Roi a la ciasse” in a 1638 memorandum submitted by Van Dyck to the king (but does not appear on any subsequent inventory of the royal collection), Charles’s annotation on that list marked the price down heavily, from £200 to £100: perhaps Van Dyck withdrew it and passed it to his patron Alessandro Scaglia, great-great-uncle of Mme de Verrue’s husband.
issued the Pragmatic Sanction in 1713 permitting the Habsburg titles to pass to his eldest daughter, Maria Theresia, in default of a male heir; the title of Emperor however could not be held by a female. In the years leading up to Karl VI.’s death (which took place in 1741), Karl Albrecht, who had never accepted the Pragmatic Sanction, saw an opportunity for the Wittelsbach family to replace the Habsburgs as Holy Roman Emperors, an ambition his father had been unable to accomplish. He was however wholly dependent on French support, promises of which the Bavarian chief minister Graf Törring obtained from Fleury on a mission to Paris in 1738.

Grimberghen was sent to France by the Kurfürst, as an ambassador extraordinary, to negotiate an alliance turning these vague assurances into specific measures, a challenge under any circumstances. One of his tasks was to conduct negotiations at the end of 1740 to marry the duc de Chartres (heir to the duc d’Orléans) to one of the Kurfürst von Bayern’s daughters (in fact he married Mademoiselle de Conti). As to the broader treaty, the French were unhappy negotiating with Grimberghen, both Fleury and Amelot insisting that he be passed over. They preferred to deal with Jean-Baptiste, comte de Sade, who had been dispatched as French ministre plénipotentiaire to Bonn, and appeared to enjoy a good relationship with the capricious Clemens August of Cologne (France had a real concern that Clemens August might support Maria Theresia against Karl Albrecht, his own brother). Moreover, like Grimberghen, he had close connections with the leading Parisian financiers, Pâris de Montmartel, Lenormant de Tournehem and François Poisson. When the Kurfürst von Bayern became Kaiser Karl VII. in 1742, de Sade made arrangements for Poisson to attend his coronation, to the financier’s evident delight. The Bavarian ambassador’s position was also made difficult by the appointment of the maréchal de Belle-Isle, who enjoyed Louis XV’s confidence, to represent France at the election of the Kaiser. Although the Elector gave Grimberghen full powers to deal with the Spanish envoy to Paris, the conde de Montijo immediately travelled to Frankfurt and Munich to deal directly. The outcome of these various negotiations was the Treaty of Nymphenburg concluded between Bavaria, France and Spain at the end of May 1741.

Grimberghen was commissioned to order in Paris the coronation throne and the liturgical vestments worn by Karl Albrecht for his coronation in 1742, comprising no fewer than 22 gold embroidered robes. So valuable was this commission that Grimberghen sought Amelot’s support in ensuring that the work was supervised by Feydeau de Marville, the lieutenant général de police in Paris, who intervened when the work was delayed. There were also financial problems: of a bill for 183,550 livres dated 21 December 1741 for a fine chalice and embroidered vestments, only half could be paid in cash. Six months later he had to negotiate bills of exchange drawn on Dutch bankers with Pâris de Montmartel.

Grimberghen was appointed counsellor of state and field-marshal of the Imperial armies, and was made a hereditary title of Prince of the Holy Roman Empire on 1 September 1742, an honour which cost him approximately 40,000 livres. He was also named conseiller d’État intime, a position entitling him to be called “Excellence”, even by electors; his wife was also entitled to be seated before the Empress. Ten days later Karl VII. named him as his ambassador

---

69 See Friedrich Christoph Schlosser, History of the eighteenth century and of the nineteenth..., London, 1844, iii, p. 334, which cites a letter from Fleury: “Je n’ai aucune méfiance de M. de Grimberghen, qui vous est fort attaché et fort zélé, mais je crois pourtant si V. A. E. le trouve ainsi, qu’il sera bon que je ne lui en dise que ce qui est absolument nécessaire qu’il sache pour son instruction.”

70 See Laurence L. Bongie, Sade: a biographical essay, Chicago, 2000, pp. 23ff. François Poisson had evidently kept Sade informed, for example in a letter to him reporting a dinner on 25 November 1741 with Grimberghen and Lenormant de Tournehem (Bibliothèque de l’Arsenal, M 11636, f.129).

71 Belle-Isle was related to the new Emperor: their grandmothers were the La Grange sisters, who married respectively Jan Sobieski and François-Gaston de Béthune.

72 See Boeselager, op. cit.

73 See Boeselager, op. cit., p. 77ff.

74 Dansaert, op. cit.
extraordinary to Louis XV. The princely title could only be passed to Grimbergen’s children, and his daughter was already dead; but the duc de Luynes tried to persuade Louis XV to allow him to apply to the emperor for the honour to be transmitted to his son, Thérèse-Pélagie’s widower; however, Fleury told him that the king did not wish to see princes de l’Empire in his service (a rule recently broken for Belle-Isle). Nevertheless Louis XV gave Grimbergen a special audience on 7 March 1743 and later (1748) sent him his portrait, in a diamond setting, worth 18,000 livres, and a snuff-box surrounded with 178 diamonds worth 12,000 livres. Only a few months later (June 1743), however, Grimbergen made representations to the king on behalf of the Emperor about the abandonment of Bavaria by the French, complaining also that the duc de Broglie had treated him “avec moins d’égards qu’un maître n’en a pour un valet.”

Following a long illness, Grimbergen’s wife died in 1744; the duc de Luynes relates the profound depression into which his cousin was thrown. On her death many of the properties she had inherited reverted to the Berghes family even though Grimbergen was named as sole heir in her will: the territory of Feluy, for example, was returned to Marie-Louise, princesse de Berghes, chanoinesses aînée du chapitre de Sainte-Aldegonde at Maubeuge by decision of the court at Douai in 1751. He still appeared in society, and was part of the select group (including the king and queen, the maréchaux de Saxe and de Noailles, the duc d’Aumont and the duc and duchesse de Luynes) that attended the private performances at the petit théâtre at Versailles where Mme de Pompadour starred as Colette in Les Trois Cousines. Grimbergen’s own health began to fail in 1748 he was unable to attend the baptism of his godson, Louis-Joseph d’Albert; his place was taken by Mgr Paul d’Albert, the future cardinal. However he still managed to attend the private masked ball which Mme de Pompadour secretly arranged for the king at La Celle: when Louis donned a mask, “tous les hommes et femmes prirent en même temps des dominos et des masques, sans excepter les ministres, M. de Grimbergen lui-même.” He was at this stage 77 years old – but he may still have believed the marquise to be his daughter.

The warm relationship which Grimbergen enjoyed with Karl VII. was not continued with the Emperor’s son Maximilian III. Joseph, who succeeded in 1745. According to d’Argenson, the new Kurfürst was small minded, pedantic and avaricious, and especially distrusted his father’s retainers. Grimbergen had already been the subject of diplomatic exchanges concerning his expenses – the inevitable result of his long-standing role in acquiring the best art at the highest prices for a bankrupt state – and when Chavigny was sent as French ambassador to Bavaria in 1743 he was specifically briefed on the subject. At the end of 1747, as part of the unwinding of the complex estate of the deceased banker Bombarda in which Grimbergen had been involved for many years, he sent La Salle to Munich as his envoy to reclaim some dues; the new Kurfürst
responded by sending to Versailles the cavalry colonel Pierre-Antoine-Joseph de Peglion (or Pegliony) as chargé d’affaires with judicial powers\textsuperscript{86} to pursue Grimberghen as a debtor of the emperor; he was charged with embezzling vast sums (some 640,000 livres, representing approximately one-third of the annual revenues of Bavaria) for which he had not accounted to the court at Munich. The Kurfürst wrote at the same time to the king and the chancellor to support these claims. Unlike Monasterol, however, Grimberghen was able to produce various documents, including a 270-page memorandum justifying his position. Peglion’s unsuccessful attempts to extradite Grimberghen were to occupy the next ten years, until the defendant’s death. Whether Grimberghen’s escape was on merit or through the influence he exercised on the parlement de Paris, or simply that, having been in the service of Bavaria for nearly 50 years, he was better able to cover his tracks is almost impossible to decide now – although Peter Hartmann’s 1967 study examines carefully the enormous complexity of Bavarian finances in this period, resulting from French subsidies paid during Max Emanuel’s exile, and the opportunities they gave his ambassadors and bankers to enrich themselves. The court’s “final” decision, given in 1765, awarded Peglion 513,401 livres together with capital producing an income of 40,000 livres. But matters did not stop there: litigation continued until 1789, and was resumed by the State of Bavaria in 1837 until finally abandoned in 1842.\textsuperscript{87}

Another cause of distress was the death of his friend Jean-François Nopère in 1753. Rising from a humble ensign in the grenadiers of the Kurfürst von Bayern’s guards commanded by Grimberghen, Nopère had, in 1730, been trusted with the rôle of intendant and bailli of the principality of Grimberghen; he had also become a family friend. Even the chanoiness de Maubeuge wrote affectionately to him (notwithstanding their disputes), while Grimberghen had addressed him in familiar terms:

\begin{quote}
Je vous suis bien obligé, mon cher Nopère, des vœux que vous faites pour ma santé, qui grâce au Ciel, est assez bonne, et telle que je la puis désirer, surtout quand on a toujours un ennemi à combattre; je souhaite que la vôtre vous fasse continuer pendant de longues années les mêmes vœux que vous faites pour la mienne, et que vous soyez toujours bien persuadé de l’envie que j’ai de vous servir en tout ce qui dépendra de moi, étant de tout mon cœur, mon cher Nopère, entièrement tout à vous.
\end{quote}

Le prince de Grimberghen, Paris, le 10 janvier 1749

In addition to the country houses at Meudon inherited from the comtesse de Verrue, Grimberghen was now in need of a suitable property in Paris. In the rue Saint-Dominique, the former hôtel du Lude, which had been occupied by Joseph Bonnier de La Mosson (1702–1744), had come into the hands of the d’Albert de Luynes family through the celebrated financier’s sister, who had married Michel-Ferdinand d’Albert d’Ailly, duc de Chaulnes. After several attempts to let the property, the usufruct was sold to Grimberghen in 1756, and he immediately commenced some improvements, while preserving the arrangement de parade laid out for the duchesse du Lude (but installing his princely arms around the dais). A rock crystal chandelier from his sister, the marquise de Saissac, was installed in his bedroom; on the first floor, Bonnier’s largest cabinet was turned into a music salon, while the porcelain cabinet was replaced with mirrors.\textsuperscript{88}

In these last days, Grimberghen turned to literature. He had an important library of finely bound volumes, decorated with the Luynes arms, embellished with a princely mantle and closed crown; some of these appear on the market from time to time, and are highly sought after. Much earlier, he is credited with two pamphlets, written in 1701:89 \textit{Timandre instruit par son génie, traduction du poème de Jean Racine}, Paris, 1701.
du grec and *Suite de Timandre, ou Lettres de M. de C*** D***, avec les réponses*, Paris, 1702, 37 and 72 pp. These were probably written by his ex-preceptor, the abbé Pic, on the occasion of d’Albert’s captivity; they contain excellent advice from the master to his pupil, as does *Le Songe d’Alcibiade* (Paris, 1735), the title no doubt derived from his conversation with Fénelon in 1706. \(^{90}\) He now assembled a *Recueil de différents pièces de littérature* (which appeared in Amsterdam, 1759);\(^ {91}\) among other works, letters to Danchet and the abbé de la Bourlie-Guiscard are also mentioned. Apart from Latin, Grimbergen was also fluent in German, Spanish and Catalan.\(^ {92}\)

Grimbergen died in Paris on 8 November 1758. Barbier reported the death, six days after that of the duc de Luynes, adding that Grimbergen “avoit été un grand débauché dans sa jeunesse.” The heirs of his French assets were his nieces, the Duchesse de Duras and her sister, the marquise de Mailly (both daughters of the princesse de Bourbonville); and his nephew and niece (by another sister, the marquise de Heilly), whom thus became involved in the Bombarda litigation brought by Peglion.\(^ {93}\) The Grimbergen title passed through another niece, Maximilienne-Thérèse d’Ongries, duchesse de Croÿ, to Henri-Othon, comte d’Ongries de Mastaing. Other assets,\(^ {94}\) including the present portrait, the only surviving portrait of Grimbergen as an adult, evidently passed to his nephew, Charles-Antoine Gouffier, marquis d’Heilly, whose son-in-law was Marie-Gabriel-Florent-August, comte de Choiseul-Gouffier (1752–1817), of the Académie française, ambassador to Constantinople, director of the Academy and Imperial Library in St Petersburg. Choiseul-Gouffier’s great-granddaughter Alix maintained a palatial hôtel particulier at 12, rue de Marignan; her first husband was the collector, vicomte Louis-Frédéric de Janzé (1817–1900); two years after his death, she married Charles-Marie de Faugny-Lucinge, prince de Lucinge, a descendant of illegitimate branches of two royal houses (Bourbon d’Artois and Württemberg). Her sale took place in 1917, where the present pastel appeared as Lot 3.

Identifying the author of this portrait is not easy.\(^ {95}\) Despite their close association, an attribution to Vivien cannot be sustained for stylistic reasons; but the pastel may relate to the lost portrait by Chevalier. The frame bears a label with the date 1732, perhaps the date of execution (coinciding with his financial windfall from the Bombarda affair).\(^ {96}\) It is also possible that Chevalier based his 1755 painting on his own earlier pastel.\(^ {97}\) The handling and the treatment are

---

\(^ {90}\) The abbé Desfontaines erroneously suggested that Pic was also responsible for *Le Songe d’Alcibiade* (see Antoine-Alexandre Barbier, *Examen critique et complément des dictionnaires historiques…* , Paris, 1820, p. 22). This cannot be right: Grimbergen, not Pic, met Fénelon and Pic, the librettist of Lully, died c.1712 according to Evrard Titon du Tillet’s *Le Parnasse français*, Paris, 1732, p. 543.

\(^ {91}\) “Vous parcourrez ce recueil avec plaisir”, according to the *Correspondance littéraire* for January 1759 (Quérard). It contains the verses by Mlle Maupin referred to above.

\(^ {92}\) Hartmann, *op. cit.*, 1967, p. 10.

\(^ {93}\) See, e.g., the manuscript “Tableau ou état général de la succession de M. le prince de Grimberghen 1762”, bound among contrats de mariages, testaments et autres pièces concernant diverses familles, BnF, Département des manuscrits, Clairambault 940.

\(^ {94}\) An example of what may have happened to some of Grimbergen’s assets is provided by the exquisite edition of Lesage’s translation of Aristénète’s *Lettres galantes*, Rotterdam, 1695, in a binding bearing his arms. This copy was in the comtesse de Verne’s sale organised by Gabriel Martin in 1737 (p. 135), where it was acquired by Grimbergen, and was then in the libraries of Mosbourg (1893, no. 240), Lebeuf de Mongermond (1914, 2002) and Edouard Rahr (iv, 1936, no. 957). It was sold in Paris (Drouot, Laurin-Guilloux-Buffetaud, 5 June 2002, Lot 16), where it achieved €4100. Grimbergen’s papers on the Bombarda and Monasterol affairs are with those of the émigré Marie-Gabriel-Florent-August, comte de Choiseul-Gouffier, ambassadeur à Constantinople, in the Archives nationales (T 153/29–60, 93–106).

\(^ {95}\) The pastel was catalogued as *École française XVIII* in the 1917 sale; in the 1988 and 1994 sales, it was catalogued as “circle of Maurice-Quentin de La Tour”, but the work has nothing in common with the master. Christine Debrée, on the basis of a photograph (letter, 20 June 1994), described the portrait as “de toute évidence une œuvre de qualité”, and suggested the possible authorship of Joseph Vivien. Xavier Salmon, who examined the work *di visu* (personal communication, 15 March 1997), attributed the work to Gustaf Lundberg, who was heavily influenced by Vivien, and was possibly his pupil; but, as Merit Laine points out (personal communication, 2002), although Lundberg’s technique varied over quite a wide scale, the treatment here is outside his normal range. The attribution to Chevalier is suggested by the author. In particular, one notes his characteristic depiction of mouths with thin lips and heavily dimpled corners, found, for example, in his copy of Nattier’s portrait of Maupeou (see below).

\(^ {96}\) We know that Grimbergen employed the sculpteur-doréur Van Heck as framemaker (Pons 1987, p. 42), but there is no stamp on the frame to confirm whether the present one is an example.

\(^ {97}\) The costume evidence between 1732 and 1755 is inconclusive (Aileen Ribeiro, private communication, 26 October 2005).
close to the few known works of Chevalier, to whom the work is here attributed. The portrait is of course retrospective in any case, depicting the ambassador in the guise of a warrior; even the leopard skin (found also in the much earlier Mignard) may be associated with the Dauphin-Dragons regiment of which he took command in 1692.

The choice of these attributes of the noblesse de l’épée is a reminder of the weight of the chivalric tradition underpinning a distinguished career beyond armed service. His trajectory to Belgian prince and Bavarian minister depended as much upon the remarkable family into which he was born as to the bravery, energy and wiliness abundantly demonstrated over half a century of diplomacy, in which large-scale financial irregularities were navigated with consummate skill. His transition from France to Bavaria, with its origins in an opportunistic alliance between the two countries in 1701, was however never entirely complete. Despite the cosmopolitan background of the Wittelsbach electors, their trust in their ambassador remained qualified (no doubt this was reciprocal). Grimberghen never became fully German; his cultural roots and family ties remained French – and those (with the promise of a touch of Versailles gloire) remained his greatest value for the Bavarian court (until the 1740s, when the French ministers ceased to have confidence in him). For us today the interest is in this personality, as much as the art collection he formed for Munich, as the embodiment of princely “Ansehen und Pracht”.

Neil Jeffares