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Two irregular oak beams can be brought together with a hinge movement. On one side the pieces of wood are linked together internally by a flat, wrought-iron pin; on the other by two wrought-iron rings. There are nine notches in both beams which are designed to secure the ankles of enslaved men and women when the beams are brought together. The chain fastened to the wooden block, to which six separate wrist or ankle shackles are attached, serves the same purpose.

This unemotional description of the object cannot begin to convey the violent circumstances in which this instrument was used to punish enslaved people on plantations. Similar examples can be found in South America, particularly in Brazil, as part of museum displays on former sugar plantations, for instance in Museu Senzala Negro Liberto in Redenção in the northeast of Brazil, in an area that was colonized by the Dutch between 1630 and 1654. These *troncos* were used on plantations to punish people in slavery, or to chain them if the slave owner was afraid that they would run off during the night. As they lay on the ground with their feet clamped between the wooden beams, their freedom of movement was further curtailed by the heavy iron shackles.

The example presented to the Rijksmuseum in the run-up to the *Slavery* exhibition (12 February - 31 May 2021) comes from Zeeland, where the donor’s grandfather had found it in a barn in the nineteen-seventies. It is made of European oak, like a number of surviving *troncos* in Brazil. It was impossible to date the wood precisely by means of dendrochronological analysis because of its uneven growth, but the number of annual rings shows that it was at least 135 years old when it was used to make the object (dendrochronological analysis of this object was carried out by Dr Marta Domínguez-Delmás, University of Amsterdam and guest researcher at the Rijksmuseum, in the context of her NWO-funded project Wood for Goods [016.Veni.195.502]). A similar lock unearthed in Amsterdam is dated between the end of the sixteenth century and the first quarter of the seventeenth. A visit to various former plantations in Brazil in 2018 by the donor J.W. de Keijzer provided further information about similar objects. These shackles were probably made in Zeeland or elsewhere in the Republic, but they were never shipped to Dutch Brazil.

Until recently the Rijksmuseum had no objects in its own collection that could show the physical violence that formed the basis of colonial slavery. The acquisition of this important gift has changed that.

ESN

LITERATURE:

PROVENANCE:
Gift of J. W. de Keijzer, Gouda
This goblet is a highlight in the work of Paulus van Vianen, the most famous Dutch silversmith. The artists’ biographer Joachim von Sandrart (1606-1686) regarded him as a key figure and praised him as one of the most important artists in Europe. During his lifetime Van Vianen was acclaimed as the preeminent example of an artist in silver. He combined his exceptional technical talent with the intellectual capacity to develop a coherent concept and translate it into compositions and ornaments he devised himself.

In the cover there is a portrait of the client, Heinrich Julius, Duke of Braunschweig-Lüneburg and Prince-Bishop of Halberstadt (1563-1613), a pivotal figure at the court in Prague. The scenes on the side and the lid represent quotations from famous Roman authors. On the side of the goblet Ovid’s poem Diana and Actaeon demonstrates the consequences of adultery with the eyes. A line from Terence’s play The Eunuch on the cover shows that love (Venus) can only blossom if there is sufficient to eat (Ceres) and drink (Bacchus). Van Vianen then added ornamentation to emphasize that this was not reality, but showed a world he had conceived, and to depict a dividing line between heaven, where the gods live, and earth, where people and gods can be together. All the elements serve the theme: love does not tolerate betrayal.

The goblet is a unique contribution to the rivalry between the disciplines in the arts. Around 1600, learned artists sought ways of depicting poems, with Ovid’s Diana and Actaeon as an important example. The first striking difference between the pictorial and sculptural representations is that Van Vianen pictured the whole myth, without breaking the unity of time and place. His composition was based on a careful study of nature, so that the landscape and the figures portrayed in it are immediately recognizable to us. Von Sandrart maintained that the interaction between man and beast was new as well.

Unlike paintings and drawings, the scenes are brought to life not through colour and chiaroscuro contrasts, but by the reflection of the light on the surface. Sometimes barely discernible differences in height, in conjunction with an endless variegation of bright and dull, create a subtle and nuanced lighting effect. It was thus that Paulus van Vianen demonstrated his virtuoso mastery of chasing, and showed that it could also be used to suggest depth and different textures. He was competing with sculpture, too; with the relief portrait in the cover he showed that the worker in precious metal had options not available to sculptors in stone, wood or bronze. This is why the goldsmith’s art should be seen not as a derivative, but as an art form in its own right.

DJB

LITERATURE:
D.J. Biemond, Diana and Actaeon, Amsterdam 2019, with comprehensive literature list

PROVENANCE:
Made for the Kunstkammer of Heinrich Julius, Duke of Braunschweig-Lüneburg and Prince-Bishop of Halberstadt (1563-1613) and Elisabeth, Princess of Denmark and Sweden (1573-1625), 1610; by descent to the stadholders, and the royal family of the Netherlands, 1628; by descent to Princess Maria of the Netherlands (1841-1910), married Wilhelm Adolph, Fürst zu Wied (1845-1907), 1881; inherited by Maximilian, Fürst zu Wied (1999-); purchased by H. Wessels, 2019, from whom on long-term loan to the museum (inv. no. BK-2019-27).
The portrait on the inside of the cover of the goblet.

>> pp. 278-79
Two sides of the goblet.
Not only is this unusually large, detailed and lively painting by Jacob Vosmaer the most ambitious flower still life by this Delft artist, it is also one of the most amazing and well-preserved examples from the earliest years of the Dutch flower genre. It is a painting of a beautiful bouquet of flowers arranged in an earthenware vase decorated with delicate rosettes, set in a stone niche. Vosmaer painted a wealth of flowers, including rare and expensive varieties. The orange fritillary from Asia Minor had been introduced into Europe from Turkey by way of Vienna only a few decades previously. This majestic flower is surrounded by roses, irises, tulips, carnations, a snake’s head fritillary, lilies and more. The lithe grace of their curved stems, curled leaves and colourful flowers is arresting. Vosmaer created a powerfully staged, narrative composition by using different lighting effects – from bright highlights and refined colour reflections to strong shadows – and adding the cracks and crevices in the wall, the fallen petals and the little mouse. He painted on a broad plank of tropical wood with a narrow strip of oak on either side. This painting is very similar to Vosmaer’s still life in the collection of the Metropolitan Museum of Art in New York (inv. no. 71.5), which had probably been reduced on three sides as far back as the eighteenth century, so that the petals of the fritillary are only half visible.

The flower still life is regarded as a typically Dutch genre. Even though the Fleming, Jan Brueghel the Elder, was the first artist in the Low Countries to specialize in painting flower arrangements in the late sixteenth century, it was the masters in the northern regions, like Ambrosius Bosschaert, Jacques de Gheyn and Roelant Savery, who took the genre further and boosted its popularity shortly after 1600. Jacob Vosmaer was one of these early pioneers who devoted more attention to the volume of the flowers and the curvature of the bouquet. With its monumental size, lavish detailing and dynamic flowers, Flower Still Life with a Fritillary in a Stone Niche is a crucial link between the opulent Flemish still lifes from the period around the turn of the sixteenth century and the more naturalistic Dutch flower still lifes of Willem van Aelst and many others in the first half of the seventeenth.

Vosmaer was the most important painter of flower still lifes in Delft in the generation before Johannes Vermeer. His name features in the list of master painters of the Delft guild for the first time in 1613, the year this painting was made. Today we know of fewer than ten of his flower still lifes, yet he was a productive painter and his fellow townsmen, Dirck Evertsz van Bleyswijk, described him as very successful in his Beschryvinge der stad Delft (1667-[80]). In his time his paintings commanded high prices.

Remarkably, the early flower still life has until now been under-represented in the Rijksmuseum’s collection. With the acquisition of this monumental painting by Vosmaer the specific genre can now be represented at the highest level in the permanent display.
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LITERATURE:
Peter van der Ploeg, entry no. 27, in Beatrijs Brenninkmeyer-de Rooij et al., Bouquets from the Golden Age: The Mauritshuis in Bloom, exh. cat. The Hague (Mauritshuis) 1992
Sam Segal, A Flowery Past: A Survey of Dutch and Flemish Flower Painting from 1600 until Present, exh. cat. Amsterdam (Gallery P. de Boer)/Den Bosch (Noordbrabants Museum) 1982, no. 31
Natures mortes hollandaises, 1550-1950, exh. cat. Luxembourg (Musée de l’État)/Liège (Musée des Beaux-Arts) 1957, no. 64
Unbekannte Schönheit: Bedeutende Werke aus fünf Jahrhunderten, exh. cat. Zürich (Kunsthaus Zürich) 1956, no. 270

PROVENANCE:
…; collection of Ernst Heinrich Ehlers (1875-1940), Göttingen, before 1944; his widow, Marthilde Ehlers (1891-1978), Göttingen, 1944:…; the dealer, Klaus von Francheville, Hannover and Göttingen, 1944:…;? the dealer Wildenstein, New York, 1950:…; collection of Dr H.A. Wetzlar, 1955;
by descent through the family to a private collector; purchased with the support of the Mondriaan Fund, the 'Nationaal Aankoopfonds' of the Ministry of Education, Culture and Science, the Rembrandt Association (through its 'Nationaal Fonds Kunstbezit' and 'themafonds 17e eeuwse schilderskunst' and with additional funding from the Prins Bernhard Cultuurfonds), the BankGiro Lottery, the Rijksmuseum International Circle and H.B. van der Ven/Rijksmuseum Fonds, 2019 (inv. no. sk-a-5069).
Since its early existence, the Rijksmuseum has held a collection of historic flags, most of which had a maritime connotation (cf. Marijke van den Brandhof, *Vlaggen, vaandels & standaarden van het Rijksmuseum te Amsterdam*, Amsterdam 1977). As a seafaring nation, the Netherlands employed a wide array of flags, in the navy, commercially and for pleasure, which found their way to the museum. However, a large part of this collection is made up of foreign flags, captured during sea battles or as reprisals. As symbols of a nation, city or company, flags were the ultimate trophy with which the enemy could be humiliated while those back at home would be satisfied with evidence of a victorious battle. Nowadays these nationalistic objectives are placed in a far broader perspective and often seen as the opposite of the originally intended justification of war and colonialism. As bearers of collective memory, these flags can shed new light on history. The same goes for historical vexillology (the study of flags) and the contemporary documentation and literature. In this light the museum acquired two important manuscript flag books, one dating from around 1669-70 and a second from 1834-40, with later additions in 1852.

Manuscript flag books in the early modern and modern eras are extremely rare. The first flag book is one of the earliest and depicts 126 flags on 140 folios. It is dated to 1669-70 on an iconographical basis and the dating of the watermarks (Sierksma 1966). The flags reflect the focus of the expansive European seafaring nations of the time. As well as European and British flags, it includes flags from Northern Africa, Asia Minor and South-East Asia. Some of the flags bear handwritten titles, especially those of the Dutch cities and regions, almost all in non-idiomatic Dutch. Although Sierksma attributes the flag book to a Dutch author, we believe its origins lie in France. The style of the watercolours closely resembles the drawings in *Les Pavilions et Les Stendars des Mers* by J. Moutton offered to Charles Bosquet, ‘controller de la marine au port de Toullon’ (c. 1665-70, now with an art dealer) and the *Bandiere usate in mare manuscript* (Naples 1667) in the collection of the US Naval Academy Library in Annapolis (Maryland). It is interesting that the flags in the book are raised at the top ends of ships’ masts, as they would have been flown. The manuscript was sewn into a book in the nineteenth century, most likely in France according to inserted printed paper fragments. Analysis of the stitching marks helped in reconstructing the original order of the folios.

The nineteenth-century flag book was commissioned by the Dutch Ministry of the Navy in 1832 and compiled in the following years at the naval base in Amsterdam. It includes 848 flags and 13 pages of signal flags. The watercolours, heightened with ‘gold’ (bronze), are very detailed and show the dynamics that belong to real flags. The objective was to compile the flags of all nations and publish them for use on board Navy ships. This flag book is of particular interest because of the international political developments in this period, which saw the establishment of new nations and the disappearance of others, such as Liberia and the German and Italian States. The unidentified artist used information from embassies and legations in foreign countries as well as publications on flags (Carel Allard, *Nieuwe Hollandsche scheepsbouw*, Amsterdam 1695; R.H. Laurie, *The Maritime Flags of All Nations*, London 1832; J.W. Norie, *Plates Descriptive of the Maritime Flags of All Nations*, London 1832). Although calculations for the design and printing were made, no book was ever published.

**literature:**

Timothy Wilson, *Flags at Sea: A Guide to the Flags Flown at Sea by British and Some Foreign Ships, from the 16th Century to the Present Day, Illustrated from the Collections of the National Maritime Museum*, London 1986, p. 113
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**Anonymous (possibly French)**

*Flag Book Depicting Flags of the World, c. 1669-70*

Paper bifolio leaves in sections, watercolour, 26.5 x 19 cm

**Anonymous (employee of the Royal Dutch Navy)**

*Verzameling der vlaggen by alle natien in gebruik* (Flag book depicting (known) flags of all nations), 1834-40, 1852

Paper bifolio leaves in sections, watercolour heightened with bronze, 31.1 x 19.4 cm
**Provenance:**

...; French collection; British collection; English auction, c. 1960; from which to N. Israel Rare Books, Amsterdam; sold to S. Emmering Old Books and Prints, 1964; ...; purchased by the Flag Heritage Foundation (Danvers, MA), 1984; the dealer Arine van der Steur, The Hague; from whom purchased with the support of the Johan Huizinga Fonds/Rijksmuseum Fonds (inv. no. NG-2018-301).

Inv. no. NG-2018-301-138.

Royal Dutch Navy, Marine-établissement Amsterdam; ...; anonymous sale, Amsterdam (Mak van Waay), 13-14 April 1965, no. 664; from which to Nico Israel Rare Books, Amsterdam; from whom to Mr Kenneth Nebenzahl, Chicago, 1966; ...; the Flag Heritage Foundation (Danvers, MA); by which donated to the museum, 2020 (inv. no. NG-2020-3).
Flags and pennant of the Kingdom of Naples and the Two Sicilies, from Verzameling der vlaggen by alle natiën in gebruik, 1834-40, nos. 7-12.
Inv. no. NG-2020-3-11-1-3-9.
Flags and pennant of the Province of Buenos Ayres (Argentina), from Verzameling der vlaggen by alle natiën in gebruik, 1834-40, nos. 19-24.
Inv. no. NC-2020-3-22-13.
Classical garden ornaments became all the rage in the second half of the seventeenth century, chiefly because wealthy citizens were increasingly investing in country estates. While there are numerous surviving examples of taller, classical garden vases made of sandstone or marble, flower-pots or garden pots are much rarer (cf. De Jong 1993, p. 107, fig. 10; De Jong and Schellekens 1994, pp. 54, 55). They are vases in the form of urns or kraters on low bases without covers. Filled with unusual plants and miniature trees, they were placed on terraces and beside flowerbeds, along garden paths or against garden walls. It is clear from contemporary engravings, paintings and references in inventories that flowerpots like these, usually made of terracotta, were commonplace in seventeenth- and eighteenth-century country houses, in large city and palace gardens and in orangeries (cf. Rijksmuseum, sk-a-3932, sk-a-171; Scholten 2004-05, figs. 37, 38; Reintjes and Vels Heijn 2016, pp. 26, 27, 57). There are relatively few surviving examples of elaborate cast lead garden pots, like this pair, dating from that period. The undamaged condition of the Rijksmuseum vases, with exceptionally well preserved, finely chased surfaces, makes them extremely rare.

The two identical urn-shaped flowerpots have S-shaped handles on each side in the form of a seahorse ending in a decorative curled fish tail. The vases are decorated on both front sides with an identical scene of the drunken old satyr Silenus, supported by the young Bacchus in the company of three bacchantes. The figures of Silenus and Bacchus were taken straight from the marble Borghese Vase. This famous urn from classical Antiquity, which was excavated in Rome in the sixteenth century, had been in Villa Borghese since 1645 and then in the Louvre from 1811 (Haskell and Penny 1981, no. 81). The bacchantes, one sitting and two standing, may be the modeller’s own inventions.
We are not certain where the two urns were made, given that similar and identical lead statues, fountains and garden ornaments were cast in large numbers in both the Dutch Republic and England. For a long time, casters from the Low Countries dominated the production of lead sculpture on both sides of the North Sea (Fulton 2003; Scholten 2004-05). Models and moulds circulated widely. We find comparable flowerpots in Simon Schijnvoet’s Voorbeelden der lusthofcieraaden (after 1717) (De Jong 1993, fig. 119), while some similar examples of these lead flowerpots were to be found in English country houses in the early twentieth century (Weaver 1909, figs. 333, 334, 342, 343): they either have an identical vase body and different handles, or a different body and identical handles. Evidently, those vases and the two flowerpots in the Rijksmuseum were products of one or a few workshops that efficiently varied the modelling of the handles, bodies and ornamental friezes so as to offer a wider range.
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LITERATURE:
Francis Haskell and Nicholas Penny, Taste and the Antique: The Lure of Classical Sculpture 1500-1900, New Haven/London 1981
Lawrence Weaver, English Leadwork: Its Art & History, London 1909

PROVENANCE:
The Rijksmuseum collection holds several works made by young Dutch artists who were sent to Rome to complete their training during the reign of King Louis Bonaparte. Artists from the Southern Netherlands studied there at the same time.

Aside from a painting by Frans Vervloet (*Interior of St Peter’s Church in Rome*, 1824, SK-A-1155), the collection lacks paintings by these fellow-Netherlandish artists. This striking portrait of Joseph-Charles De Meulemeester (1774-1836) by Joseph-François Ducq is consequently a welcome addition.

Ducq made the portrait of his friend in Rome, where they had both arrived in 1806. De Meulemeester made it his life’s ambition to publish prints of all Raphael’s paintings in the Vatican Loggias. In the portrait he points to a watercolour, depicting a part of the ceiling above him. On the chair lies his palette, a Reeves watercolour box, a glass of water and a brush. In the corridor one painter is at work sitting on top of a platform; another has a portfolio of drawings under his arm and a Swiss guardsman stands in front of the huge door. The window arches on the left are decorated with the grotesques that made Raphael’s Loggias so famous.

What this attractive painting has to offer, apart from a glimpse into artists’ practice, is the unprecedented historical documentary value of the barely legible list of names noted on the foremost pillar in the shadows, in red and brown paint alternately. These are the artists from the Southern Netherlands who were in Rome at the time, with the year of their arrival. They include Joseph-Denis Odevaere, Martin Verstappen and Joseph Paelinck. The name of Joseph-Benoît Suvée, who taught many of the Flemish artists who went to Rome, also appears. He died in 1807.

In the first half of the nineteenth century, the painting was in the Cabinet of the Bruges collector Joseph de Huerne de Puyenbeke. He also owned the pendant, a self-portrait of Ducq in his studio in Rome (whereabouts unknown). De Huerne may also have had a copy painted on panel. Pieter Jan de Vlamynck (1795-1850) made a lithograph of it (RP-P-1940-342). In the Royal Academy of Bruges there is a sketch, virtually the same size, and an unsigned and undated copy is held in the Royal Museums of Fine Arts of Belgium in Brussels. The names of the Belgian artists do not appear in this copy.

JR

* With thanks to Dominique Marechal, KMSK Brussels, for additional sources.

LITERATURE AND SOURCES:
Edmond de Busscher, *Biographie historique et artistique de J.-C. de Meulemeester de Bruges. Graveur de taille-douce, éditeur des Loges de Raphael*, Ghent 1838, p. 42
Catalogue des collections de Tableaux etc formant le Cabinet Van Huerne, Bruges, 21 Octobre 1844, no. 57
Johan Immerzeel, *De levens en werken der Hollandsche en Vlaamsche kunstschilders etc.*, Amsterdam 1842-43, pp. 202, 219
Salon d’Exposition des productions des artistes vivans … de la ville de Gand, Ghent 1817, no. 67 (self-portrait of Ducq in his studio) and no. 68 (portrait of De Meulemeester)

PROVENANCE:
...; Joseph de Huerne-De Puyenbeke, Bruges; his sale, 1844; ...
Jean-Jacques was the only member of the celebrated Feuchère dynasty of Parisian bronze-founders to achieve fame as a sculptor, but he also remained closely involved with the family firm’s production of ornamental works of art. His powerful figure of Michelangelo shows the artist, who has downed his sculptor’s tools, sitting pensively, his left arm resting on a figure reminiscent of his Slaves.

Feuchère submitted the model to the Paris Salon of 1843, but it was rejected by the jury. He then sold it, and all the rights pertaining to it, to the bronze founder Vittoz, his favourite collaborator for the creation of bronze sculptures. Vittoz used it as the central feature of this monumental clock; for the design of the base he probably turned once again to Feuchère. Featuring two somewhat Michelangelesque crouching figures, the base combines classical borders with mannerist strapwork featuring a mask and a garland of fruit, in a romantic evocation of ornament in the style of Fontainebleau. A design in the Rijksmuseum, almost certainly by Feuchère, shows a clock with a lady in ‘Renaissance’ costume on a comparable base (cf. Esther van der Hoorn, ‘Feuchère Designs in the Rijksmuseum’, The Rijksmuseum Bulletin 66 (2018), pp. 24-43).

Vittoz showed this clock at the French national Exposition des produits de l’industrie held in Paris in 1849, and again at the Great Exhibition in London in 1851. What is probably the first example, presumably that shown in 1849, was recently acquired by the Victoria and Albert Museum (inv. no. M.151:2019; see Artists by Artists, exh. cat. London (Stuart Lochhead Sculpture) 2019). The clock featured in the Illustrated Art Journal Catalogue of the 1851 exhibition (p. 90). The commentator, who does not mention Feuchère’s name, wrote: ‘The boldness and breadth of the composition are strikingly apparent: there is an entire absence of everything approaching to petitesse in its details, the introduction of which would have marred the noble simplicity of the design’. Following the 1851 exhibition, Vittoz ceded his affairs to E. de Labróe, who continued to produce some examples of the Michelangelo clock, as is evident from a signed version in the Louvre (Daniel Alcouffe (ed.), Nouvelles acquisitions du département des Objets d’art 1995-2002, exh. cat. Paris (Musée du Louvre) 2003, no. 111).

Sculptures and decorative objects in a style derived from the Italian Renaissance and executed in patinated bronze were in high fashion in Paris from the 1830s onwards, in line with a general shift towards sombre interiors evoking an imaginary historical past. The Michelangelo clock is an unusually imposing as well as fairly early instance of a mantel clock created around a sculpture of this kind. Intriguingly, the 1851 Catalogue states that it formed ‘the centrepiece to a candelabrum’, suggesting that a chimneypiece garniture was exhibited, consisting of the clock flanked by two candelabra. Nothing further appears to be known about these latter pieces.

PROVENANCE:
…; private collection, Portugal; Robin Martin Antiques, London; from whom purchased with the support of the Ambaum Haks Fonds/Rijksmuseum Fonds, 2019 (inv. no. BK-2019-101).

Attributed to JEAN-JACQUES FEUCHÈRE,
Design for a Chandelier, a Clock and a Ewer (detail), c. 1840.
Graphite, 201 x 315 mm. Amsterdam, Rijksmuseum, inv. no. RP-T-2015-46-4; purchased with the support of the Decorative Art Fund/Rijksmuseum Fonds.
ACQUISITIONS: FINE AND APPLIED ARTS, AND HISTORY
PIETER DE JOSSELIN DE JONG (Sint-Oedenrode 1861-1906 The Hague)

Sketchbook with Drawings, 1887

Black chalk, pencil, pen with black ink and one gouache on paper, 8 x 12 cm (with cover), 7.7 x 11.8 cm (without cover)

This small sketchbook, which can easily be tucked into a trouser or breast pocket, contains sketches made by the artist Pieter de Josselin de Jong for a series of parliamentary portraits. The final portraits were published in several issues of the popular illustrated magazine Eigen Haard in 1887. These issues and the preliminary studies on paper are also part of the Rijksmuseum’s collection (NG-1980-77 ff. and RP-O-1889-A-15233 ff.). This sketchbook was therefore the missing piece our collection needed to reconstruct De Josselin de Jong’s creative process.

The year 1887 was a turbulent one in the Dutch House of Representatives. The upcoming revision of the Constitution made for heated debates, especially when it came to hot-button issues such as funding for denominational education and the extension of the right to vote. However, in his sketches De Josselin de Jong did not so much focus on the political disputes themselves, but more on the parliamentarians and the chaotic course of the debates in which they were engaged. From the public gallery, the twenty-six-year-old artist managed to capture the facial features and postures of these gentlemen in his sketchbook.

The art critic Pieter Haakxman (1847-1935), a contemporary of De Josselin de Jong’s, wrote that in the sketches ‘the smallest, seemingly insignificant scribbles were usually the most striking in picturing posture and expressions of behaviour’ (‘Pieter de Josselin de Jong’, Elsevier’s Geillustreerd Maandschrift (1897), pp. 393-407, esp. p. 402). The little sketchbook confirms this. Its small pages are filled with striking pen and chalk lines in which the parliamentarians are easily recognizable, among them the myopic Prime Minister Van Heemskerk, bent over his papers to decipher the text in front of him. De Josselin de Jong also made composition sketches in which the chaotic atmosphere is conveyed by the disorderly attitudes of the men he drew. Many of the sketches have been incorporated wholesale into the final prints.

Unfortunately, some of the more experimental scenes did not make the cut. Examples include the striking gouache of a view of the House of Representatives in green, red, white and black tones, as well as some atypical sketches of a cat and a little girl. The latter had nothing to do with the parliamentary portraits, but certainly merit our attention.

LITERATURE:
Eigen Haard. Geillustreerd Volkstijdschrift (1887), nos. 17, 24, 25, 26, 28, 29, 30, 31, 35, 38

PROVENANCE:
...; gift of Eveline Koolhaas-Grosfeld and Sophie-Eska Houtzager (great-great-grandchild of Pieter de Josselin de Jong), 2019
(inv. no. NG-2019-501).
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The French Symbolist writer and theoretician Joséphin ‘Sâr’ Péladan maintained that an artist, like a priest, should reveal the beauty behind reality: ‘Artiste, tu es prêtre’. In this pastel portrait of his friend, the writer Henri van Booven (1877-1964), De Nerée reflected this Symbolist creed in a wholly individualistic way by literally picturing him as a priest. It is the visual expression of an intense friendship in which they both discovered the latest art and literature and encouraged one another to draw and to write. The literary outcome was Van Booven’s collection of poems, prose and prose poems Witte nachten (September 1901), which also contains the poem ‘The Evening Hours’ dedicated to ‘K. d. N. t. B.’, in which he recalls their meetings in De Nerée’s room in The Hague. They met in February 1899 but the friendship had soured by 1903. In the unpublished novel Stille wateren (1951-53) Van Booven describes sitting for the work and presents it as Rik as Hamlet.

De Nerée called it an ‘idealized portrait’ in which he portrayed the sitter as he saw him. In a review of one of the posthumous exhibitions of it in Rotterdam a critic wrote: ‘And so De Nerée saw his friend Van Booven, who in vain extended the mind to pure perversities, as a young priest …’ (Nieuwe Rotterdamsche Courant, 22 February 1914). De Nerée never gave the work to Van Booven. ‘I’ve never understood why he never gave me anything (nor do I know who has my portrait, Henri van Booven as a Young Priest),’ the sitter was still wondering in 1951 (Henri van Booven en Hendrik De Vries. Briefwisseling, Baarn 2013, p. 62).

Even though it was the only time he used pastel on canvas, aside from The Black Swans (1901, Kunstmuseum, The Hague, inv. no. 0322792), it is representative of the first phase of De Nerée’s artistic output from 1899 to 1901. In the foreword to the catalogue of the first De Nerée exhibition in Arti et Amicitiae in December, 1910 the art critic Albert Stheeman wrote: ‘Although by a beginner, a psychological masterpiece.’ The artist may have looked at Odilon Redon’s pastels, while the ‘magnificent dream background of faraway lands and water by night’ (Nieuwe Rotterdamsche Courant, 22 December 1914) appears to have been inspired by Leonardo da Vinci or Lucien Lévy-Dhurmer.

The portrait of Henri van Booven as a Young Priest can be dated to the end of 1900 or early 1901. Their mutual friend Hermine Schuijlenburg (1875-1971) remembered having seen it with the artist ‘before he went to Spain’. He left in April 1901 and stayed for some months.

SB

LITERATURE:
S. Bink, Carel de Nerée tot Babberich en Henri van Booven. Den Haag in het fin de siècle, Zwolle 2014
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PROVENANCE:
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In 1946, the artist Trubus Soedarsono painted a portrait of his mother, who is known to her grandchildren as Mbah Putri Wates (indicating her place of origin or home) or Mbah Podho (c. 1890-1975), according to Monica Daryati, Soedarsono’s daughter. The appellation of a Javanese grandparent often refers to his or her first child. Soma Podho is the name of Mbah Podho’s first child.

Since the nineteen-thirties, pioneering Indonesian artists like Sindudarsono Sudjojono (1913-1986) and Affandi (1907-1990), with whom Trubus studied painting during the Japanese occupation of Indonesia (1942-45), painted portraits of their mothers as a kind of special tribute to the women who gave birth to them and nurtured them. Trubus depicted his mother in great detail, intending to commemorate and immortalize her in a single image. At lower left he wrote the word: Iboekoe, meaning ‘my mother’. Painted in 1946, it is titled and signed using the Van Ophuijsen Spelling System, which was used for the Indonesian language between 1901 and 1947. As of 17 March 1947, Indonesians started using the Republican Spelling System, which is also known as the Soewandi system, named after the Indonesian Minister of Education at the time. The small pin she wears on the left lapel of her kebaya is the red and white flag, clearly showing her strong affiliation and commitment to the Republic of Indonesia, which was proclaimed by Sukarno on 17 August 1945.

Associated with the notion of motherland, in Indonesia the figure of the mother may also have been considered by artists as relating to nationhood, especially during colonial times, the period of the Revolutionary War (1945-49) or even the era of the new republic. The mother became a new focus. Located within the inner (spiritual) world of the home, she was clearly tied to ideas about belonging, spirituality and the nation that required protection (Matthew Cox, The Javanese Self in Portraiture from 1880-1955, Sydney 2015 (unpublished Ph.D. thesis, University of Sidney), p. 134).

In 1946 the Seniman Indonesia Muda (SIM) association of young Indonesian artists, of which Trubus was a member, had just been established
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Lower left: Troeboes S./ ‘46 Djokja

by Sudjojono in Madiun. SIM’s members produced revolutionary artworks as well as anti-Dutch posters, which were widely distributed (Claire Holt, Art in Indonesia: Continuities and Change, Ithaca, NY, 1967, p. 201). Trubus himself was caught when he was putting up an anti-Dutch poster, but unfortunately we do not know when, how and for how long he was detained. Daryati mentioned that although her father never told her the story, she read about it in one of his notebooks. We do know that he eventually joined the Pelukis Rakyat, the ‘People’s Painters’ group which was established by the painter Hendra Gunawan in 1947.

After the Revolutionary War, Trubus’s affiliation with Pelukis Rakyat continued, earning him a seat in Yogyakarta’s House, as a representative of the Indonesian Communist Party. His talents as an artist, not only as a painter, but also as a sculptor, were recognized by President Sukarno, who commissioned him to make some sculptures for the Presidential Palace in Bogor (Sri Sudaryati and Sri Sulistyantutti, Trubus Sudarsono, Yogyakarta 2013, pp. 12-18). Unfortunately, following the attempted coup d’état blamed on the Communists in 1965, his affiliation with the Communist Party led to his arrest and imprisonment. His closeness to Sukarno did not help either; it may even have contributed to his disappearance during the difficult and dangerous times of 1965.
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PROVENANCE:
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Suzanne Perlman neé Sternberg was born in Budapest on 18 October 1922. She grew up in an orthodox Jewish family. In 1939, just before the war began, Suzanne moved to Rotterdam to marry Henri Perlman, a grain merchant, whom she met in Budapest. While the couple were visiting Paris in May 1940, their house was bombed by the Luftwaffe and the Nazi occupation made it impossible for them to return. They travelled to the Caribbean on the last ship to leave France and found a new home there on Curaçao. Suzanne painted the landscape, typical buildings like the Mikvé-Israel-Emmanuel synagogue and the cathedral, and portraits of revellers during carnival. Her own history as a refugee led to a close involvement with the local population, an involvement that went beyond what was usual in the Jewish circles on the island, into which she and her husband had been welcomed soon after their arrival.

In 1959 Suzanne painted *Dry Dock in Curaçao*, an industrial landscape with cranes, pipelines and ships. Like the colours she used, the large cactus on the right shows that this is not a European landscape. Perlman depicted an interesting aspect of the Antillean landscape – a surprising one from a Dutch viewpoint: not the clichéd image of a tropical Dutch island with palm trees and a beach or an old country house on a former plantation, but the large-scale international oil industry, which at that time played a major role in Curaçao and left its mark on the landscape.

In 1918, the Dutch oil giant Shell opened a refinery on Curaçao, a few years after it had taken a stake in the extraction of oil in neighbouring Venezuela. The oil industry provided many jobs on the severely impoverished island, but it also meant a continuation of the colonial relationships that had their origins in the time of slavery. When Shell’s fortunes took a downturn at the end of the nineteen-fifties, the company outsourced some of its activities to subcontractors like Wescar. As a result, the employees saw their wages cut in half and the social climate on Curaçao deteriorated. On 30 May 1969 there was a revolt on the Wescar site. What began as a protest against low wages swiftly developed into a popular uprising in reaction to the skewed economic and social relationships. The revolt became an important theme in Perlman’s work. She had painted this industrial landscape – the very place where the resistance had found its breeding ground – ten years earlier.

**LITERATURE:**
H.E. Coomans et al., *Curaçaose motieven geschilderd door Suzanne Perlman*, Bloemendaal 2006, p. 87 (fig.)

**PROVENANCE:**
In the winter of 1969, Jan Dibbets and a group of students from Cornell University walked to the woods near Six Mile Creek, a few kilometres to the south of the campus in Ithaca, New York. Arriving at a clearing, they dug up two strips of earth around one and a half metres wide and thirty metres long with shovels and pickaxes inside outlines they had marked out with washing lines and stones. The two strips formed an angle of thirty degrees, making an enormous V. The ground was left unexcavated where the path crossed the point.

Entitled *A Trace in the Wood in the Form of an Angle of 30° – Crossing the Path* this work in the woods was one of the two contributions by Dibbets to the *Earth Art* exhibition in Cornell University’s Andrew Dickson White Museum of Art (11 February-16 March 1969). The catalogue, which was published a year later, dryly mentioned that ‘Dibbets considers the long walk through the woods to the site of his work to be part of the piece’. The compilation of the exhibition had been the task of Willoughby Sharp (1936-2008), an independent curator and film maker, who in addition to Dibbets had also invited Hans Haacke, Neil Jenny, Richard Long, David Medalla, Robert Morris, Dennis Oppenheim, Robert Smithson and Günther Uecker to make works of art with ‘earth as a medium’ on site, some in the museum galleries rooms and some in nature.

Sharp’s decision to select him for the exhibition was due not least to Dibbets’s short period of study at St Martin’s School of Art in London in 1967, when Richard Long was one of his fellow students. It was a turning point in his education as an artist. Two years earlier he had won the Royal Subsidy for Free Painting, but now he abandoned that time-honoured medium and from then on used photography as a means of recording visual interventions in his surroundings.

These interventions were part of a spectrum of movements which now seem to be quite clearly demarcated as *arte povera*, land art and concept art, but were far more diffuse at the time. Dibbets became one of the protagonists of these radical, new movements, primarily because of his perspec-

---
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Sold through Art & Project, Amsterdam to Roger Matthys and Hilda Colle, Sint-Martens-Latem, 1973; their sale, Amsterdam (Christie’s), *Post-War & Contemporary Art*, 25 November 2019, no. 6; from which purchased by the museum with the support of Pon Holdings b.v. (inv. no. BK-2019-111).
In the mid-nineteen-eighties, the Amsterdam-born painter Rob Scholte provoked a wide-ranging discussion in art criticism about the value of painting at a time everyone felt free to quote from art history and image culture to their heart’s content. Scholte used, seemingly without any scruples, the most trivial illustrations as well as unrivalled iconic works of art as visual sources for his paintings. High culture with its ‘profundity’ and low culture with its ‘superﬁciality’ were regarded equally. Many people felt that the démasqué of painting was taking place before their eyes. Ten years later, the art historian Camiel van Winkel summed up Scholte as ‘a personiﬁcation of the guile that characterizes the art of the nineteen-eighties’, albeit with ‘an artistic integrity which, beyond good and evil, was pushed to the limit: the artist drops all the pretences of creative genius and openly shows and lays bare the blank sheet or the “zero degree” that proves to be hidden behind it’ (Camiel van Winkel, ‘1980’ in Cor Blok (ed.), Nederlandse kunst vanaf 1900, Utrecht 1994, p. 215).

Scholte not only proved capable of assimilating different visual ideas superbly, but was also able to orchestrate all the opinions about his work – for and against – as demonstrated in How to Star, an exhibition in Museum Boijmans Van Beuningen in Rotterdam in 1988. The exhibition was an anthology of ﬁve years of his work, accompanied by a catalogue with text made up exclusively of quotations. Extracts from the 154 art reviews that discussed his work – a cacophony of pronouncements, opinions and interpretations – were cut and pasted at will to make a more or less coherent story about the alphabetically arranged groups of works. The art of quotation was raised to a great height to make Scholte’s star shine.

Seen against this background, Illustration is a striking example of Scholte’s association with stardom and the process of quotation. It was part of his ﬁrst international solo exhibition at Galerie Paul Maenz in Cologne which, under the title Mastercards, showed a hotchpotch of motifs, with the 175 x 175 cm square as the linking factor. Frontally in the painting there is a popular educational book from the second half of the nineteenth century, with a lavishly decorated front cover and spine, placed in an inﬁnity space by a reﬂection and a shadow. But by standing it upright, enlarging it and placing it between quotation marks, Scholte turns Famous Boys and How They Became Great Men into an epitaph that puts fame into perspective and emphasizes its transience: an ironic postmodern Vanitas still life.
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