

De verleiding van Flora/The Temptations of Flora: Jan van Huysum 1682-1749, exh. cat. Delft (Museum Het Prinsenhof, 22 September 2006 – 7 January 2007) and Houston (Museum of Fine Arts, 18 February – 20 May 2007), by Sam Segal, Mariël Ellens & Joris Dik, Waanders Uitgevers, Zwolle, 2006.

Jan van Huysum has an unusual artistic reputation. His art has been admired for centuries by royalty and millionaires: during his lifetime his best paintings sold for four or five times the value of a good Rembrandt, he currently holds the record for the highest price reached at auction by an Old Master still life (£4,400,000, at Sotheby's London, 11 December 2003; F8 in the catalogue under review), and throughout the centuries in between he has always fetched aristocratic sums. At the same time he has been dogged, ever since his own day, by critics who find his work too slick, too finely painted, too glibly decorative and too icily perfect for its own good.¹ The curators of this, the first exhibition ever devoted to the artist's work, hoped that their efforts would dispel the low critical opinion of his art, and while it may be asking too much to expect Van Huysum's detractors to change their mind at this late date, certainly his case could hardly have been more persuasively put than by this magnificent show, which brought together forty of his best flower and fruit paintings and drawings together with twelve of his landscapes, and set them in context with works by predecessors (Jacob Vosmaer, Ambrosius Bosschaert I, Balthasar van der Ast, Jan Davidsz de Heem, Abraham Mignon, Willem van Aelst and Maria van Oosterwyck), family members (Justus I van Huysum, Jacob van Huysum and Michiel van Huysum) and contemporaries and followers (Rachel Ruysch, Coenraet Roepel, Margareta Haverman, Jan van Os and Gerard van Spaendonck).

The catalogue to the exhibition was written for the most part by Sam Segal, with assistance from Mariël Ellens and Joris Dik.² The first third of the catalogue is taken up by introductory material, split into ten chapters. One chapter is written by Dik, one by Ellens, and one by Ellens together with Segal; the rest are written by Segal alone.

After a brief introduction by Segal, in which Jan van Huysum's great fame during his lifetime and great commercial value since are contrasted to his relative anonymity today, Ellens and Segal provide a chapter on Van Huysum's life, reconstructed from contemporary literary sources and archival material. There is much new information in this chapter, especially concerning the Van Huysum family tree, and previously published information is amplified and made more precise. Where Thieme-Becker tell us that Jan van Huysum was born on the 15th of April 1682 in Amsterdam, Ellens and Segal tell us that he was baptised on the 15th of April 1682 in the Zuiderkerk in Amsterdam by a *dominee* called Van Leeuwen, and that his father Justus, his mother Margrieta Rusen, his mother's uncle Jacob Gerritsz Rus and one Margrietie de Wijns (the wife of Rus?) were present at

the event. Mariël Ellens has checked all the details of Van Huysum's life with similar care, and after her extensive work in the archives we have a much clearer idea than we did about the structure of his family tree.

People rarely reveal much of their personality when they are in the company of notaries, and by far our most informative source on Van Huysum's character remains the biography by Van Gool, which is gratefully used by the authors throughout. What is missing is an analysis of how Van Gool came by his information. From a reading of the biography it seems unlikely that Van Gool knew Van Huysum personally. He does not claim that he did, and he never quotes the man verbatim, which suggests he was receiving his information at second hand. He may have been relying on the artist's half-sister, Maria van Huysum, or his half-brother, Michiel van Huysum. Both were considerably younger than Jan, Maria by 14 years, Michiel by 21, and so might be considered dubious witnesses to Jan's early career. Van Gool claims that Van Huysum worked on decorative landscapes when he was establishing himself as a master, and Segal, as we shall see later, uses this information as a rationale for giving later datings to certain of the flower pieces. However, one might ask if Van Gool's sources were so well-informed that he could be sure of knowing what Van Huysum was doing forty years earlier. Maria was a teenager and Michiel a child during the period of Jan's career which is most difficult to reconstruct, and while they may have been knowledgeable about his activities during those years, it is also possible that they were not.

As a whole, this biographical chapter's value is lessened by the authors' decision to excise a certain amount of information from the footnotes. The rationale for this is that the catalogue forms part of a broader project: Segal is at work, together with Ellens and Dik, on a catalogue raisonné of the artist. The Delft/Houston catalogue therefore forms an interim report on their investigations. Since the exhibition catalogue will eventually be replaced by the catalogue raisonné, the authors decided that some of the scholarly apparatus should be omitted: in particular, references to archival material are not given in the footnotes. Since ample references to other sources are given, one wonders why the archival references were held back. It can hardly have been for fear of scholarly theft: this exhibition catalogue would have established priority of publication. And, as Segal acknowledges, the catalogue raisonné is still a few years away. One cannot be sure anything will be published until it actually appears, and should the catalogue raisonné be prevented from reaching the press for whatever reason, the literature may lose the essential archival citations.

The third chapter in the catalogue is a survey by Sam Segal of flower and fruit painting in the Netherlands, telling the chronological story of its development in a straightforward way. The inclusion of works by Jean-Baptiste Monnoyer and Pieter Casteels is welcome, not only

because they may have had an important impact on Van Huysum, but also because their presence acknowledges, what we historians of art too often forget, that artistic ideas crossed political borders in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries.

Chapter Four, 'Art, Theory and Practice',³ is less mainstream. Segal opens it by politely distancing himself from those – in a footnote he singles out the present reviewer – who have tried to use seventeenth- and eighteenth-century Dutch art literature in an attempt to understand the thought processes behind the paintings of the time. He notes that 'Terminology is often defined differently in different sources, and many terms are too general: each one, in fact, possesses a whole spectrum of meanings in every language. In colloquial language too, speakers and writers use the same term to mean different things.'⁴ Segal suggests that we pay attention less to contemporary texts than to contemporary paintings, and in the rest of the chapter he treats the paintings themselves as sources which can inform us about the intentions of the artist. He treats the topic under a number of different headings, as follows: Composition, Image, Foreground,



1
Jan van Huysum, *Flower piece*, signed and dated 1706. Lille, Musée des Beaux-Arts.

Background, Objects, Disposition, Space, Shapes and lines, Depth and Perspective, Illumination, Colouring, Softness and Hardness, Harmony, Construction, Brushwork, Development, Studies and Frames.⁵ In some of these sections Segal simply describes what he sees in different paintings. 'Foreground' tells us what Van Huysum put in his foregrounds, while 'Objects' is largely devoted to a discussion of Van Huysum's flower pots. In parts of the chapter which are more theoretical there are too a number of obvious generalisations, e.g. 'Van Huysum pays particular attention to the placing of the vase, the separate flowers, the butterflies and other insects and animals in relation to the main elements and in relation to each other and in the space and depth'⁶ or 'In Dutch still life space determines to a large extent a work's atmosphere'⁷ or 'A Madonna and Child, or mother with child, projects a different emotional response than an execution, as in Goya's *Execution of the Rebels of the 3 May 1808*, or the aftermath of a bombing, as in Picasso's *Guernica*...'⁸ Pronouncements like these obstruct the reader's view of original and interesting insights, such as the sharp, sensitive analysis of 'softness and hardness' in still life, or the simple but pointed observation that, whereas some artists start their careers with a fine style and become broader with time, Van Huysum went in the opposite direction, or the brilliant, illuminating statement that 'Jan van Huysum was not so eager to achieve tonality – similar tonal values of different colors, as we see in the work of Balthasar van der Ast – but was more concerned to achieve harmonious color combinations with transitions between similar colors, sometimes in series.'⁹ Insights like these show that Segal's visual approach to art theory can bear real fruit; and of course this approach can work side by side with a method that makes use of texts on art from the period.

The fifth chapter is an overview of Van Huysum's stylistic development. This development is quite easy to plot for the last three decades of Van Huysum's life, since from 1720 until his death he dated paintings on a regular basis. However before that time he only dated four of his flower paintings, in the years 1706 (fig. 1), 1707, 1712 and 1714 (fig. 4). Since these early years are the period in which his style went through a number of dramatic changes, before emerging into the mature style of the 1720s that he maintained for the rest of his career, the problems of dating are not straightforward. One painting in the exhibition, a very beautiful work in the National Gallery, London (F9: fig. 2), is dated by Segal to ca 1718, whereas in the recent past it has been dated to ca 1710 – by, as it happens, this reviewer. I am still not entirely persuaded that I was wrong to give it so early a date, and would like to put my arguments at greater length than I have done hitherto.

As Segal observes (p. 164, cat nos F9.1, F9.2 and F9.3 – I am not sure that F9.4 should form part of the same group), there are a number of other undated flower pieces which are clearly related to the National Gallery's painting. To my mind, all of them should be assigned to the period before the 'transition period', when Van Huysum, while still using the dark backgrounds that he abandoned around 1720, began to use the complex, arabesque-filled compositions, and the choice of flowers, very often centred on roses, auriculas, and hyacinths, which characterised his mature years.



The resemblances between the paintings in fig. 4, dated 1714, and fig. 5, dated 1723, are close and obvious. With the sole exception of their differing backgrounds, the flower pieces are built on very similar lines. Both have a group of roses and auriculas at the centre of the composition, with hyacinths lifting up from the central mass; both place a peony, seen from above, at bottom right; both show tulips lolling blowsily, and poppies at the summit of the bouquet; both have their flowers placed in terracotta vases decorated in relief with putti, with a bird's nest nearby on the plinth. Moreover both have a compositional style built on a graceful, swooping interlace of arabesques, which is at once disorderly and elegant. The National Gallery's painting in fig. 2 shares none of these similarities. It contains no roses, auriculas, hyacinths or peonies, no bird's nest, and its stolid, centered composition is a world away from the trademark arabesques of the artist's later style.

Why does Segal prefer the 1718 dating? He gives two arguments. The first is that the painting shows hollyhocks, and we also find

hollyhocks in some paintings from the 1720s. Against this one might note, as already observed, that we find roses, auriculas, anemones and hyacinths in paintings of the 1720s, but do not find them here, and in any case, why should we suppose that, because Van Huysum did use hollyhocks in the 1720s, he cannot have used them around 1710? Segal's other argument is that there is a snail in this painting, and that there are numerous snails in paintings of the 'transition period'. That is fine, but since he dates only a tiny handful of paintings to before 1714, he cannot be sure that snails were not also common in the pre-transition phase.

Segal asserts (p. 50) that Van Huysum painted mainly landscapes before 1715, and only at that point began to devote his attention to flower pieces. Unfortunately for this argument, Van Huysum's landscapes are all dated to the 1720s and 30s, with one exception, a drawing dated 1718; and on stylistic grounds I would not be at all surprised to learn that this drawing has had its date misread, and should be assigned to 1728. It is of course possible that he was mainly



³
Jan van Huysum, *Flower piece*, ca 1713. Great Britain, private collection.

working on decorative landscapes before 1715, and that none of these have survived, but the only evidence we have that he was working on such paintings in the early years of his career is the testimony of Van Gool, and, as I suggested earlier, Van Gool may not have been perfectly informed. Even if Van Gool was right to say that Van Huysum painted many landscapes in his earlier years, he cannot have known how many flower pieces he was making in his spare time.

The best reason that I can see for giving a later date to the National Gallery's painting is its quality, which is quite outstanding. However, much of the quality of the picture is a result of its condition; hardly any of Van Huysum's transitional or mature works are as well preserved. So that this too can be used as an argument for an earlier date: it suggests that it was made before Van Huysum picked up the bad technical habits which damaged his later works.

Another group of paintings which is hard to date is made up of cat. nos F 10 (fig. 3), F10.1 and F10.2. Segal does not give a precise date for F10, but suggests the end of the transition period, so ca 1719/1720; F10.2 he assigns to ca 1723, while F10.3 he thinks was made ca 1716. Again, I would like to suggest he consider assigning all of them to the period before the *overgangperiode*. Segal prefers later dates since in his view these paintings are related to a picture in Braunschweig, which is signed and dated 1724 (fig. 6). The Braunschweig painting



⁴
Jan van Huysum, *Flower piece*, signed and dated 1714. Karlsruhe, Staatliche Kunsthalle.



⁵
Jan van Huysum, *Flower piece*, signed and dated 1723. Amsterdam, Rijksmuseum.

does contain certain elements which seem to be throwbacks to the artist's youth: the dark background, the glass vase, and the relatively restrained composition, which here is very reminiscent of Verelst. But it nevertheless has closest affinities to our figs 4 and 5, not to figs 2 and 3, which do not share its elegant orderliness of composition: fig. 3 looks positively gawky in comparison. A comparison of the irises in figs 3 and 6 suggests that the two paintings were made some years apart; in the earlier work the artist has not yet learned how to keep his flowers in order, with the iris peering round from behind the anemone at top in a spatially awkward way. And this ungainliness also suggests, to my eyes, that fig. 3 predates fig. 4; perhaps by a couple of years.

Chapter 6 of the catalogue, by Joris Dik, is devoted to Van Huysum's painting technique, and contains much interesting material, largely the result of Dik's own researches. We are taken through underdrawing and paint layers before dealing with pigments, telling us which he used and which have miscoloured and why, all of which is of course extremely useful, and will be consulted by anyone writing about Van Huysum in future. As well as providing us with important information, the chapter also features some breathtaking close-up photos of Van Huysum's flowers, showing how he painted the tiniest ribs on a tulip stroke-by-stroke with a miniscule brush.¹⁰ We are told by Van Gool that Van Huysum had a suspicious and difficult personality: the effort involved in making these paintings would have been enough to turn the mind of any man.

The seventh chapter, by Mariël Ellens, is devoted to reception history, charting Van Huysum's critical fortune from his own time till the present. This too is a very useful chapter, assembling a great deal of new material. However Ellens prefers summary to direct quotation, which is I think unfortunate: the reader wants to know not just what was said about Van Huysum, but in which exact words it was said. This is all the more important on occasions when authors have surprising opinions ascribed to them. She writes for example that Arnold Houbraken 'propounded views that were closely linked to physico-theology, a popular and widespread doctrine in the eighteenth century according to which God reveals himself in nature. This implies that flowers, for example, should be treated with a certain respect. This viewpoint was a complete departure from classical art theory, represented by earlier authors such as Samuel van Hoogstraeten and Gerard de Lairese.'¹¹

This is misleading. The idea that physico-theology was 'widespread' in the eighteenth century is not substantiated with any evidence, not even a footnote to a secondary text. Nor are any footnotes provided which would allow us to find these physico-theological conceptions in Houbraken. So far as I am aware there is just one passage in the *Groote Schouburgh* in which ideas of the sort are encountered, in the life of Maria Sibylla Merian.¹² The rest of the book shows no interest in physico-theology at all, but does show an enormous interest in the doings of the pagan gods, so partaking of the classicising attitude of Hoogstraeten and Lairese. And even the passage from the life of



6
Jan van Huysum, *Flower piece*, signed and dated 1724. Braunschweig, Herzog Anton Ulrich Museum.

Merian needs to be treated with caution, for two reasons: one, we do not know to what extent Houbraken took such pious sentimentalities seriously – given the tone of the rest of the book, it does not seem likely that he was a *very* religious man – and two, we do not know to what extent he was reliant at this point in the book on a pious source. As I have argued in a review of Hessel Miedema's edition of Van Mander's *Lives*,¹³ authors of artists' biographies rely very heavily on informants, and often quote their informants word-for-word, without bothering to alter what they have said; and do this even when they might not be particularly sympathetic to the ideas being expressed. I have the strong impression that this is what has happened here; that Houbraken received a letter from some relative of the recently deceased Merian, and that he did not bother to make many changes in what he had received, since it seemed to fit his purpose well enough. Thus the physico-theological sentiments are not necessarily Houbraken's. As with Ellens' use of Van Gool in chapter two, more questions need to be asked before a text can be taken as evidence.

The same might be said of Ellens' quotation of a passage from John Smith's *Catalogue Raisonné of the Works of the Most Eminent Dutch and Flemish Painters*,¹⁴ in which it is claimed, controversially, that '[Van Huysum's] pictures have not the least appearance of laborious tameness; they seem to have been executed with the most easy freedom of hand...' Once again, this is taken at face value, without considering whether Smith was frankly giving his honest opinion, or puffing an artist for reasons of his own. And in fact the latter seems not unlikely, since if we turn a few pages on from the passage of the

Catalogue Raisonné quoted by Ellens, we learn that Smith, who was an art dealer, had recently sold a Van Huysum for 270 guineas.¹⁵ Art dealers are not, I think, always the most unbiased of art critics, and their enthusiasms can on occasion be taken with a pinch of salt.

Chapter Eight deals with flowers, fruit and animals, with Segal writing about the history of gardening and providing a brief history of the flowers most commonly found in Van Huysum's oeuvre, all of which is of great interest. Indeed, I hope that in their forthcoming catalogue raisonné the authors will give the flowers their own headings in the index, so that one can follow the fortune of individual flowers through the introductory material and through the paintings of Van Huysum.

Together with the botany Segal gives one or two thoughts concerning symbolism. We are told for example that the morning glory, the *dagschone* and *dagbloem*, was a symbol of the day, 'in opposition to the opium poppy';¹⁶ which was presumably meant as a symbol of the night. This iconographic terseness needs amplification: what evidence do we have that the morning glory was thought of as a symbol of the day, and what was meant by this? Was the morning glory widely recognised to be a symbol of the day, in the same way that the thistle is widely recognised as a symbol of Scotland? Or was it used as a symbol of the day by one or two obscure emblematisers who were little read? And was it actually a symbol, or was it rather a metaphor, a simile, a comparison? The fact that both Dutch names for the morning glory contain the word *dag* does not mean that it must have been a symbol of the day: the morning glory is not generally considered 'a symbol of the morning' in England, although it could of course be used as such by a painter or poet under certain circumstances.

The ninth chapter consists of three pages on the question of 'symbolism'. Once again there are a number of statements that will not surprise the reader, e.g. 'Besides aesthetic expression, a work of art may convey some symbolic import';¹⁷ and one or two thoughts that need further unpacking, e.g. 'Any rose, regardless of species and color, may signify love, but there are different kinds of love – physical, mental, and spiritual.'¹⁸ Moreover the fact that the latter sentence – together with the first two pages of this chapter – is not thought to deserve a footnote, reveals a certain insouciance about the relationship of iconographic statements to primary sources. Nevertheless, the chapter does make a number of interesting points; one particularly perceptive one concerns those flower pots on which putti are seen playing with a lamb. Segal contrasts these to the Duquesnoy relief of putti playing with a goat which turns up in works by Dou, Van Aelst and others, and suggests that the meaning of the scene in Van Huysum is fundamentally different, with the lamb an attribute of Innocence, not Luxury. This does seem very possible, and makes one wonder if more research into the associations of putti might not prove fruitful.

The final chapter of the introduction is devoted to Van Huysum's landscapes. Segal takes us through a brief history of Italianate landscape painting in the Netherlands, to show us in which tradition Van

Huysum's landscapes were placed, before telling us something of his immediate predecessors, Isaac de Moucheron, Jean-François Millet and the artist's father, Justus van Huysum. He then provides an analytic description of Van Huysum's landscapes, before concluding with a survey of criticism, both positive and negative, of Van Huysum's landscapes over the years. Van Huysum painted idyllic Arcadian landscapes without, so far as we can tell, ever leaving Amsterdam, and so critics who feel that art must be rooted in reality have found it easy to dismiss him, but whatever our theoretical positions may be, the fact remains that, as Segal puts it, 'ze gewoonweg heel mooi zijn', they are usually very attractive. Van Huysum, who did so much to strip the Dutch flower piece of its sense of space, was a master of spatial construction in landscape.

If the introductory part of this volume could have been given some polish by an assertive editor, the catalogue section, written by Sam Segal alone, shows little room for improvement. Segal is thorough, meticulous and extraordinarily knowledgeable about Van Huysum, as this excellent catalogue shows. For each painting the full paraphernalia of provenance, exhibitions and literature are provided – sometimes with essays appended for the provenance of important pictures like the Fattorini fruit and flower piece (cat. F8), or in order to disentangle confusions in the literature (F15) – and the discussions of the individual paintings are all botanically and art historically learned. The diagrams of the flowers in the paintings – a feature of Segal's publications for many years – are as welcome as ever, and my only complaint about these is that they do not appear for every flower painting in the catalogue. Much of the description in the catalogue essays is botanical, but there are also useful comparisons with other works, and sensitive analyses of the colour relations within the compositions. On the dating of F9 and F10, I disagree, as stated above; but with those two exceptions all of the paintings in the catalogue seem to me to be plausibly dated (and of course over half of them are actually dated by the artist). I also do not think that there are any possible controversies over the authorship of these paintings, all of which seem fiendishly hard to forge, and almost all of which have provenances going back to the nineteenth or eighteenth centuries, indeed sometimes to the artist's own studio. The only real blemish on the catalogue is what was presumably a computer error during the final editorial stages of the Dutch edition; catalogue F4, discussed on pp. 150-53 of the English edition, is entirely omitted from the Dutch edition. As a result all the page numbers of the Dutch edition from p. 150 onwards are four pages behind the English edition.¹⁹

The colour plates are, as one would expect, of very high quality, with only two exceptions, F11 and F17, both of which are blurry. Both, surprisingly, were made from transparencies provided by the Getty Museum. For the rest the illustrations are superb, even of the paintings from the transition period, which are often hard to see in real life, let alone in reproduction. Another feature of this catalogue which deserves thanks is the exhaustive index: so few exhibition catalogues contain indices, which are after all such useful things, that it is a real pleasure to encounter one that does.

Despite the scattered criticisms expressed above, this exhibition catalogue is much the most important publication on Jan van Huysum to appear to date, and is a major event in still life studies, where scholarly studies of individual painters are still too rare. It is clear from this considerable achievement that the catalogue raisonné which is in preparation will be the standard work on the artist for many decades to come.

PAUL TAYLOR

NOTES

¹ For detractors during his lifetime, see Johan van Gool, *De nieuwe schouburg der Nederlantsche Kunstschilders en Schilderessen*, The Hague 1751, vol. 2, p. 18. For detractors since, see the catalogue under review, pp. 80-83.

² The catalogue was published in Dutch for the Delft show, and translated into English for the Houston show by Beverley Jackson, David McKay, Lynne Richards and John Rudge. English quotations in what follows are taken from the Houston catalogue.

³ 'Kunst, theorie en praktijk', pp. 38-47.

⁴ 'De terminologie in verschillende bronnen leidt lang niet altijd tot eenduidige definities en is voor veel begrippen te globaal om goed mee te werken. In feite heeft ieder begrip in ieder taal een zwaarm van betekenissen en is het ook in onze dagelijkse omgangstaal dikwijls noodzakelijk ons te realiseren wat een spreker of auteur bedoelt met een bepaalde term.' p. 38

⁵ 'Compositie, Beeld, Voorgrond, Achtergrond, Objecten, Ordening, Ruimte, Vormen en lijnen, Diepte en perspectief, Belichting, Koloriet, Zachtheid en hardheid, Harmonie, Opbouw, Penseelvoering, Ontwikkeling, Studies and Lijsten.' pp. 38-47

⁶ 'De plaatsing van de vaas, de afzonderlijke bloemen, de vlinders en andere insecten en dieren ten opzichte van de hoofdbestanddelen en ten opzichte van elkaar en in de ruimte en diepte is niet toevallig.' p. 41.

⁷ 'In Hollandse stillevens bepaalt de ruimte een deel van de atmosfeer van het werk.' p. 43.

⁸ 'Een Madonna met Kind of moeder met kind heeft een andere gevoelsimpuls dan een executie, zoals bij Goya's *Executie van de Opstandelingen van 3 mei 1808*, of de gevolgen van een bombardement, zoals bij *Guernica* van Picasso, die minstens even sterk van expressie kunnen zijn.' p. 45.

⁹ 'Jan van Huysum streefde niet zo zeer naar tonaliteit: gelijke toonwaarde van verschillende kleuren, zoals we zien in werk van Balthasar van der Ast, maar eerder naar harmonieuze kleurencombinaties met overgangen van verwante kleuren, soms in reeksen.' p. 45.

¹⁰ Although fig. 6.6b is a flip.

¹¹ 'Zo komen we bij de kunstenaarsbiograaf Arnold Houbraken (1660-1719) opvattingen tegen die nauw verwant zijn aan de in de achttiende eeuw zo populaire en wijd verbreide fysicotheologie. Volgens de fysicotheologie openbaart God zich in de natuur en dit impliceert dat bijvoorbeeld bloemen met een zekere eerbied moeten worden bekeken. Dit was een totaal andere visie dan de classicistische kunsttheorie, zoals we die bij zijn voorgangers Samuel van Hoogstraeten en Gerard de Lairese aantreffen.' p. 77.

¹² 't Was haar niet genoeg, de natuur in opzicht van der zelve menigvuldige diertjes, met hare eygen levendige koleuren op perkament na te bootsen, maar zy kreeg ook een drift om de veranderinge der gedierten, en de wonderbare hervorminge van Rupsen in gevleugelde Uiltjes, Witjes enz nevens den menigvuldigen verschilligen aart, en wyze van voortkomsten t'ontdekken, als ook het voedsel

waar door zy bestaan na te sporen; op dat de menschen door klare beschouwingen dier wonderheden de wonderbare wysheit, en kragt Gods, in de minste schepselen zouden leeren beschouwen, en zien, en op dat de waerelt te gereeder hare konstige afteekeningen, en vlytige nasporingen zoude deelagtig worden, nam zy voor dezelve in koper te doen snyden, en nevens, of met byvoegingen van hare naaukeurige agtgevingen in druk uit te geven: gelyk zy dan gevolgelyk het eerste stuk te Noremborg in den Jare 1679. onder dezen tytel uitgaf: *Der Rupsen begin, voedsel, en wonderbare verandering. Waar in de oorspronk, spys, en gestaltenwisseling: als ook de tyd, plaats, en eygenschappen der Rupsen, Wormen, Kapellen, Uiltjes, Vliegen, en andere diergelyke bloeddelooze Beesjes, vertoont worden.*' A. Houbraken, *De groote schouburgh der Nederlantsche konstschilders en schilderessen*, 2nd edn, The Hague 1753, III, pp. 221-222.

¹³ *Oud Holland* 115 (2002), pp. 131-154.

¹⁴ Vol. VI, London 1835, p. 462: in the Van Huysum catalogue this is incorrectly given as vol. V, p. 462.

¹⁵ Vol. VI, p. 478.

¹⁶ '...contra de slaapbol...' p. 89.

¹⁷ 'In de kunst kan, naast esthetische uitdrukking, ook symbolische inhoud een rol spelen.' p. 93.

¹⁸ 'Elke roos kan teken van liefde betekenen, ongeacht de soort of kleur, maar liefde bestaat wel op verschillende niveaus, fysiek, mentaal en spiritueel.' p. 93.

¹⁹ I am grateful to Fred Meijer for pointing this out to me.