UNIVERSITY OF AMSTERDAM

UvA-DARE (Digital Academic Repository)

Jan Davidsz. de Heem 1606-1684

Meijer, F.G.

Publication date
2016
Document Version
Final published version

Link to publication

Citation for published version (APA):
Meijer, F. G. (2016). *Jan Davidsz. de Heem 1606-1684*. [Thesis, fully internal, Universiteit van Amsterdam].

General rights
It is not permitted to download or to forward/distribute the text or part of it without the consent of the author(s) and/or copyright holder(s), other than for strictly personal, individual use, unless the work is under an open content license (like Creative Commons).

Disclaimer/Complaints regulations
If you believe that digital publication of certain material infringes any of your rights or (privacy) interests, please let the Library know, stating your reasons. In case of a legitimate complaint, the Library will make the material inaccessible and/or remove it from the website. Please Ask the Library: https://uba.uva.nl/en/contact, or a letter to: Library of the University of Amsterdam, Secretariat, P.O. Box 19185, 1000 GD Amsterdam, The Netherlands. You will be contacted as soon as possible.

UvA-DARE is a service provided by the library of the University of Amsterdam (https://dare.uva.nl)

Download date:18 Nov 2026

NOTES

Notes to **Introduction**

[1] THE HAGUE 1926 (2).
[2] ZARNOWSKA 1929 .
[3] AMSTERDAM 1933.
[4] VORENKAMP 1933.
[5] VROOM 1945 and VROOM 1980. The muddled-up sequel from 1999 cannot be counted as a serious art-historical publication.
[6] BERGSTRÖM 1947 and BERGSTRÖM 1956.
[7] HAIRS 1955 and GREINDL 1956.
[8] HAIRS 1965, HAIRS 1985 and GREINDL 1983.
[9] BOL 1969 and BOL 1982, BOL 1960 and BOL 1952/3, and BOL 1977.
[10] MÜNSTER /BADEN-BADEN 1979/80.
[11] AMSTERDAM/'S-HERTOGENBOSCH 1982, AMSTERDAM/BRUNSWICK 1983, DELFT/CAMBRIDGE/FORT WORTH 1988/9 and OSAKA/TOKYO/SYDNEY 1990.
[12] GRIMM 1988.
[13] TAYLOR 1995.
[14] AMSTERDAM / CLEVELAND 1999/2000 and VIENNA/ESSEN 2002.
[15] MEIJER 1989, WEBER 1989, MEIJER 2003, VON BERSWORDT-WALLRABE/HEGNER 2000, and exh. WAUSAU 1989/90 and EMBER 2011.
[16] VAN DER WILLIGEN/MEIJER 2003, SPIESSENS 1990 (Adriaenssen), BRUNNER-BULST 2004 (Claesz.), GRISEBACH 1974 (Kalf), KRAEMER-NOBLE 1973 and KRAEMER-NOBLE 2007 (Mignon), DECOTEAU 1992 (Peeters) and BERARDI 1998 (Ruysch).
[17] Respectively HOUSTON/WASHINGTON 2012, HAARLEM/ZÜRICH/WASHINGTON 2004/06, THE HAGUE 2008, ROTTERDAM/AACHEN 2006/07, and THE HAGUE 2015.
[18] DE BIE 1661, pp. 216-219. See also the quote in my Concluding Observations, p. 290. De Bie also discussed Cornelis de Heem on p. 369.
[19] VON SANDRART 1675-1680, vol. 1, p. 313.
[20] VAN HOOGSTRATEN 1678, p. 87.
[21] VAN HOOGSTRATEN 1678, p. 186. Van Hoogstraten probably referred to cat. no. A 133, which bears this motto. For my interpretation of de Heem's 'Niet hoe veel, maar hoe eel', see chapter Antwerp, p. 165-166.
[22] HOUBRAKEN 1753, vol. 1, p 209 (first edition 1718).
[23] WEYERMAN 1729/69, vol. 1, pp. 407-412. On p. 408, he writes: '.. zullen wy een Byzonderheyt aanhaalen, die *Arnold Houbraken* ons vertelt in zijn Schouwburg der Schilders en Schilderessen; waar of onwaar scheelt maar een paar letters, en dat laat men daar.' (we shall quote a peculiarity which Houbraken tells us in his Schouburg […], between true and untrue there is a difference of only a few letters, and one must leave it at that'. And on p. 411: '*Arnold Houbraken* vertelt die zaak gants verkeert, dat zal den Latynsche *Sandrart* uytwyzen pagina 313.' (Arnold Houbraken recounts this matter completely wrong, as the Latin *Sandrart* shows, p. 313). Nonetheless, Weyerman's texts lean heavily on Houbraken.
[24] Cat. no. 1, as will be argued here, is not by Jan Dz. de Heem, nor a portrait of the artist; cat. no. 6 must be a copy after Jan Dz. de Heem; cat. no. 25, as Segal himself concluded in the course of the exhibition, is a copy after cat. no. 26 (here, respectively, cat. nos. A 230 copy a, and A 230); cat. no. 34 is not by Jan Jz. de Heem, but by Jan Dz. de Heem (my cat. no. A 104) and the addendum, cat. no. 34A, as by Jan Jz. de Heem, is also by Jan Dz. de Heem (my cat. no. A 095); cat. no. 38, after subsequent cleaning and restoration, turned out to be by Jan Dz. de Heem and not by David Cz. de Heem (my cat. no. A 216).
[25] The term 'pronkstilleven' is a modern, and not a historic term that has crept into art-historical literature in the second half of the twentieth century. Before 1933, the term appears not to have existed, and when it first emerged, it did not have the same meaning it has acquired in recent decades. The first instance of 'pronkstilleven' I have found, is in CAT. BREDIUS 1933, where a painting by David de Coninck of a dog and a cockatoo with a chased silver dish laden with fruit was titled 'Pronkstilleven met hond en papegaai', a title the painting has retained since (see BLANKERT 1991, cat. no. 36, p. 64). A relatively large still life, probably of fruit, by Jacobus Linthorst (1745-1815), dated 1805, which has since disappeared from the Bredius collection (BLANKERT 1991, p. 124), was also catalogued as 'Pronkstilleven'. A. Vorenkamp, in VORENKAMP 1933 (p. 45) wrote "Toen tegen 1650 het ontbijtje meer en meer een pronkstuk werd en de zilverkleurige haring er door de kleurige

kreeft werd verdrongen, het tinnen bord vervangen door den zilveren schotel, het witte tafellaken door een fluweelen lap of een warm gekleurd Oostersch tapijt, behoorde Simon Luttichuys tot degenen, die deze verandering, waardoor het stilleven decoratief werd en de kleur terugkeerde, hielpen voorbereiden." (When towards 1650 the breakfast still life more and more became a show piece and the silvery herring was pushed aside by the colourful lobster, the pewter plate was replaced by the silver salver, the white tablecloth by a velvet cloth or a warm coloured Eastern rug, Simon Luttichuys was among the ones who helped prepare this change, as a result of which still life became decorative and colour returned". Vorenkamp, thus, wrote 'pronkstuk', show piece: "[de De Heem] In de verzameling Wallace te Londen is een groot pronkstuk van zijn hand." ([the de Heem] in the Wallace Collection in London is a large show piece by his hand) (p. 67). "Johannes Hannot […] componeerde geen overvloedige pronkstukken; hij schilderde kleine vruchtenstillevens [...]" (Johannes Hannot did not compose sumptuous show pieces, he painted small still lifes of fruit) (p. 68). Only much later, *pronkstilleven* became a more generally used term. The first 'pronk still life" I have found occurred in a Sotheby's auction catalogue of 6 May 1970, describing a still life by Cornelis de Heem (49. A pronk still life of fruit, shellfish and pewterware […]), and the term was used again in a Sotheby's catalogue of 4 November of the same year, describing a painting by Michiel Simons (143. A Pronk still life with cherries and peaches in a Delft dish and on a pewter plate […]). Segal, in his various publications, has often used *pronkstilleven* and devoted an exhibition to the genre : DELFT/HOUSTON 2006/07, in which the term 'sumptuous still life' was used, but also 'pronk still life' (see his Introduction on p. 15: "The pronk still life […] is a still life in which an overtone of luxury is lent by precious handmade objects"). In the present study, I mostly use the term 'luxury still life' which in my view clearly indicates what type of still life is meant: one that depicts costly items of a high standard. As an alternative, I use 'rich still life'.

[26] UTRECHT/BRUNSWICK 1991, p. 50: "In deze catalogus zijn niet alle voorlopige resultaten van het onderzoek vermeld" (In this catalogue not all preliminary results of the research have been reported), "Hoewel reeds veel materiaal verzameld is, kon dit onderzoek [naar de signaturen] nog niet geheel worden afgerond, daar het nog een nieuwe ronde van diepgaande technische analyse vereist."(Although already much material has been gathered, this research [of the signatures] could not yet be entirely concluded, while it requires a new round of profound technical analysis), and "Deze tentoonstelling zal de gelegenheid bieden tot nader onderzoek en daardoor mogelijk een aanzet tot enkele antwoorden geven […]"(This exhibition will provide the opportunity for further research and as a result may give a push towards some answers).

[27] See MEIJER 1988, MEIJER 2005, MEIJER 2009, MEIJER 2011, MEIJER 2012 and MEIJER 2013.

[28] In 1999, in an exhibition devoted to 'Techniques and style' of still-life painting, in conjunction with the major still–life show in the Amsterdam Rijksmuseum, an analysis was published of de Heem's festoon in the Rijksmuseum (cat. no. A 243), see exh. cat. AMSTERDAM 1999, cat. no. 6, pp. 60-64. Cat. no. A 242 was later also examined in detail, see WALLERT/DIK 2007.

[29] The catalogue of rejected works will be limited to works in museums that are still, or until recently have been, catalogued as by Jan Davidsz. de Heem, and to works in private collections and in the art trade that have been included in serious publications and/or exhibitions since *c*. 1950. Earlier misattributions, with some exceptions, are too many and too random, and often too obvious to be taken seriously. Several of the rejected paintings are already discussed and illustrated here in connection with de Heem's paintings in the texts in this study.

[30] For the moment, I have decided not to include an appendix of all early (say, pre-1750) mentions of paintings by de Heem, since this would require another run through, and meticulous copying, of the various notes and registers (such as Abraham Bredius' archival notes at RKD, BREDIUS 1915/22, the Getty Provenance Index, the Montias database etc. and this would, in my view, not add substantially to the data discussed in the various texts and in the Concluding Observations.

[31] Paintings up to 50 centimetres high are all illustrated at a height of five centimetres, and paintings higher than 80 centimetres are all illustrated with a height of eight centimetres, while heights in between 50 and 80 centimetres are illustrated at their relative height, so for a painting of 62 centimetres high the illustration is 6,2 centimetres high.

Notes to **Jan Davidsz. de Heem's name and effigies** pp. 19-22

[32] See also the *Biography* and *Appendix I*.

[33] See Appendix I, documents of 1658,1668 and 1683. In April 1658, she signed a notarial deed as 'gritgen davids de hem'.

[34] The Dutch word *heem* is neutral and should get the prefix *het*. In a name, the prefix could be expected to be *van* (from), *van het*, or *van der* (from the). In fact, the name van der Heem still occurs in the Netherlands, but no de Heems appear to survive. A quick survey of the various Dutch archives that now offer a *Digitale Stamboom* (digital family tree), an on-line genealogical search machine, turns up forms such as Heem, van Heem and van der Heem, and only a few, apparently unrelated, de Heems in the seventeenth century.
[35] After 1630, only three paintings appear to have been signed with the full first name, cat. nos. A 022, A 054, and A 057.
[36] Helmus and Segal, in exh. cat. UTRECHT/BRUNSWICK 1991, pp. 55, 57, opted that it was incorrect to call the painter Jan, since he would appear to always have referred to himself as Johannes, but they decided not to go against tradition and stuck to Jan. This argument seems somewhat forced to me since the artist only signed with the full first name early on, and in official documents. Furthermore, in Dutch virtually all of the men who were baptised Johannes were, and still are, customarily referred to as Jan.
[37] The spelling of artist's names in the RKD database RKD*artists* also consistently follows this rule, as we have done in VAN DER WILLIGEN/MEIJER 2003. On this point, consequently, my argument and my spelling differ from that of Segal and Helmus (cf. exh. cat. UTRECHT/BRUNSWICK 1991, p. 57).
[38] Again, see exh. cat. UTRECHT/BRUNSWICK 1991, p. 57. Their unexplained remark that 'De schrijfwijze J.D. de Heem is natuurlijk uit den boze' (The rendering J.D. de Heem is of course not done) is puzzling, particularly since it was printed next to a number of facsimiles of the artist's signatures, for several of which he himself chose precisely that from. Many of his paintings that originated after *c*. 1650 are signed J.D.De Heem.
[39] Black chalk, 265 x 202 mm, British Museum, London, cat. Hind, 1915, p. 84, no. 3. http://www.britishmuseum.org/research/collection_online/collection_object_details.aspx?objectId=710859&partId=1&searchText=jan+lievens&page=3 (retrieved July 2015).
[40] See Biography chapter, note 67 on p. 397.
[41] For Pontius's print see HOLLSTEIN, Vol. 17, p. 177, no. 85, with illustration. HOUBRAKEN 1753, Vol. 1, opposite p. 182.
[42] Already in the Reimer collection in Munich, which was auctioned in 1843, the young man in the painting was identified as Jan Davidsz. de Heem himself.
[43] See MEIJER 2003, pp. 217, 218 for a discussion of the painting's iconography, as well as p. 49.
[44] DE CLIPPEL 2003.
[45] Earlier I had suggested a date of about 1637/38 for the paining (MEIJER 2003, p. 219, note 9), opposing Segal's suggested dating to 1632 (S. Segal in exh. cat. UTRECHT /BRUNSWICK 1991, p.124). Following de Clippel's arguments, I readily accept her somewhat earlier dating of the painting, 1635/36.
[46] WEYERMAN 1729/69, vol. 2, p.69: 'Den beruchten Ridder *Karel de Moor* heeft ons gelieven te verhaalen, dat dien *Adriaan Brouwer* eens een historiestukje schilderde, bestaande in de Konterfytsels van *Jan David de Heem, Jan Koessiers*, en in zijn eygen portret, zittende die Heeren te rooken en een glaasje te drinken. Den voornoemden Ridder, die *J. D. de Heem* heeft gezien tot Antwerpen, zegt dat deszelfs konterfytsel wonderlijk wel was getroffen.' (It has pleased the famous knight *Karel de Moor* to tell us that this *Adriaan Brouwer* at one time painted a little history piece, which consisted of the effigies of *Jan David de Heem, Jan Koessiers*, as well as his own portrait, of those gentlemen sitting down smoking and having a glass to drink. The aforesaid knight, who has seen *J. D. de Heem* in Antwerp, says that his effigy was wonderfully accurate). The statement is the more remarkable since, if Carel de Moor (1655-1738) saw de Heem in Antwerp, it must have been after 1672, when he was already some forty years older than in Brouwer's painting.
[47] Oil on panel, 24,4 x 18,8 cm, with signature 'J.D. Heem, Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam, inv.no. SK-A-2396, as by J.Dz. de Heem, VAN THIEL 1976, p. 263, ill. The painting was also included as a self-portrait in exh. UTRECHT /BRUNSWICK 1991, cat. no. 1, colour pl. 1 on p. 69. I first dismissed the painting as a self-portrait in writing in MEIJER 2003, p. 219, note 9. Still as a self portrait: http://hdl.handle.net/10934/RM0001.collect.8639 (retrieved July 2015).
[48] MEIJER 2003, p. 219, note 9, where I still gave it the benefit of the doubt of being a portrait of de Heem.
[49] HOLLSTEIN, Vol. 43, p. 121, no. 124, illustrated, and exh. cat. AMSTERDAM 1997, pp. 266-267, fig. 6, as Lucas Vorsterman after Jan Davidsz. de Heem.
[50] These observations confirm that the painting was indeed the model for the print, which supports the suggestion that it was painted there. Vorsterman worked in Antwerp from 1630 onwards, but no precise date for this print has been established.
[51] I am grateful to Beatrijs Wolters van der Wey, Antwerp, for drawing my attention to this reference in a letter dated 2nd March 2000. The painting was an oil on canvas, 42 ½ x 31 ½ in (108 x 80 cm). Sale London, Christie's,

21 July 1924, lot 167, not illustrated. Previously, the painting had been lent to an exhibition in Edinburgh in 1883, by J.S. Fraser Tytler https://rkd.nl/explore/excerpts/432800.

Notes to **A biography of Jan Davidsz. de Heem (1606-1684)** pp. 23-32

[52] For convenience, dates and (references to) documents concerning de Heem's biography have been included in a chronological list, Appendix I, so as to avoid complex references in notes here.
In recent decades, research on the early biographical data has been carried out by Marten Jan Bok (for the Utrecht period) and Maarten Wurfbain (for the Leiden period), resulting in their respective articles BOK 1990 and WURFBAIN 1989. An early biography is VAN LERIUS 1880. These and other results were summarized and supplemented in de Heem's biography by Liesbeth Helmus and Sam Segal in exh. cat. UTRECHT /BRUNSWICK 1991, pp. 57-63, with a list of archival documents compiled by Liesbeth Helmus on pp. 226-232 (concerning the entire de Heem family)(HELMUS 1991). In many instances, VAN LERIUS 1880 provides more details concerning the Antwerp documents than HELMUS 1991. Information on Jan Davidsz. de Heem and Anna Ruckers and their children was collated in LAMBRECHTS-DOUILLEZ 1982. None of these authors was aware of de Heem's burial record and up to date, the date of his death has been indicated as 1683/84.
[53] BOK 1990 discusses archival information concerning de Heem from the years 1625 and 1626 and earlier. Unless stated otherwise, the information on this period in the present biography was derived from Bok's article.
[54] The statement that the artist would have a birthday at Easter can be interpreted in two ways. In Utrecht, where the Julian calendar was still in use, Easter Sunday in 1625 was the 17th of April. One interpretation would be that the artist was born on the 17th of April 1606, which happened to coincide with Easter Sunday in 1625. More likely, in my view, is the possibility that Jan Davidsz. de Heem was born at Easter in 1606 and connected his birthday to that festivity, even though annual dates vary. Easter Sunday in 1606 was on the 20th of April. Also, we should not exclude that the artist was not aware of his exact date of birth when he made his statement, but that his birthday 'at Easter' should in fact be interpreted more liberally as 'around Easter'. Whatever the case, his date of birth should most probably be situated in the third week of April of 1606 of the Julian calendar which is end April in the current Gregorian calendar.
[55] Presuming that Jan Martensz. van den Bosch, the grandfather, also used 'van den Bosch' as a reference to his, or his family's, place of origin.
[56] 'Kerver', also spelled as 'Kerner' sounds somewhat like 'Coornhert' and Johan may have adopted his new name out of admiration for the well-known *homo universalis* Dirck Volkertsz. Coornhert (1522-1590) – and perhaps to conveniently surf along on the latter's renown. There is no reason to assume that an actual family relationship between the two men existed.
[57] The stone that marked the facade of the house is illustrated in BOK 1990, p. 49, fig. 1 and in exh. cat. UTRECHT /BRUNSWICK 1991, p. 59, fig. B3.
[58] On the presumption that Balthasar van der Ast was de Heem's teacher in Utrecht, see the chapter *Leiden, Utrecht, Amsterdam,* pp. 42-48.
[59] WURFBAIN 1989, p. 434, noted that Vergeijl's occupation was 'witmaecker' (lit. 'white-maker'). Wurfbain argued that this could mean that he prepared (= grounded) panels for painters. This is not correct, however. The *Middelnederlands handwoordenboek*, edited by J. Verdam, The Hague, 1932, tells us that a 'witmaker' is an artisan who prepared chamois-leather. In any case it is most likely that the dispute concerned a debt of the young painter to Vergeijl.
[60] WURFBAIN 1989, p. 439.
[61] Jan Steen, *The Leiden baker Arent Oostwaert and his wife, Catherina Keyzerswaert*, c. 1658, signed, oil on panel, 37,7 x 31,5 cm. Amsterdam, Rijksmuseum, inv. no. SK-A-390.
[62] Potter's departure was registered in the archives of the Leiden Pieterskerk on the 10th of January 1632 (WURFBAIN 1989, p. 441 [note 14]).
[63] See also below, note 16.
[64] See the discussion of the paintings in question (cat. nos. A 023-045) on pp. 66-77
[65] See below for details.
[66] DE CLIPPEL 2004, pp. 196-203. She (newly) identifies the protagonists as (from left to right) Jan Lievens, Joos van Craesbeeck, Brouwer himself, Jan Cossiers and Jan Davidsz. de Heem, and dates the painting quite convincingly to 1635 (or early 1636).

[67] In MEIJER 2003, p. 219, note 9, I dated Lievens' drawing and Brouwer's *The Smokers* (fig. B 1) to 1637/38. In view of Karolien de Clippel's convincing somewhat earlier dating of Brouwer's painting, Lievens' drawing – which must indeed have originated at about the same time – may also have been done somewhat earlier than I envisaged.

[68] ROMBOUTS/VAN LERIUS 1864/76, Vol. 2, pp. 50, 54.

[69] ROMBOUTS/VAN LERIUS 1864/76, Vol 2, p. 86. This appears to be the only record of the painter Vincent Cerneval in the guild records.

[70] ROMBOUTS/VAN LERIUS 1864/76, Vol. 2, pp. 114, 121.

[71] VAN LERIUS 1880, p. 221 still wrote: '1635 ou vers cette époque', HELMUS 1991, p. 228 set her year of birth firmly to 1635, while in the same publication, exh. cat. UTRECHT/BRUNSWICK 1991, p. 60, her year of birth is given as 'about 1635'. I have not been able to find any further archival records pertaining to Torentiana, other than the inventory upon her mother's death from November 1643 and the presumed testimony by Cornelis de Heem from May 1695 (quoted in VAN DEN BRANDEN 1883, p. 871), from which it pertains that she had lived till adulthood (and thus left an inheritance at her death), but died before 1695. The name Torentiana is highly unusual, in fact I have not found any other example of it. One would expect that it was inspired by the enigmatic artist Johannes Torrentius, whose still lifes de Heem may have admired, see also the chapter Utrecht, Leiden, Amsterdam, pp. 45-46. In some of the literature, her name is also given as Teresia, but I have not found any ground for that, other than a reference in the deed from 1st March 1669, concerning the debts of Cornelis de Heem to his father, which mentions 'ses gulden aen sijn suster Teresia de Heem, om een renth te lossen'(six guilders to his sister Teresia de Heem in order to pay an interest). This may have been a clerical error, due to the unfamiliarity of the name.

[72] See Appendix I, request of 14 April 1655. VAN DEN BRANDEN 1883, p. 869, notes, as far as I can tell without ground, that the attained prices were unexpectedly high.

[73] ROMBOUTS/VAN LERIUS 1864/76, Vol. 2, p. 139 (concerning the administrative year 1642/43).

[74] VAN LERIUS 1880, p. 224, says 'Adam van Lamoen', but in his note 2, proceeds to suggest that probably Abraham van Lamoen was meant. Since both versions of the inventory clearly name Abraham van Lamoen, however, there was no clerical error, as he suggests, but probably a transcription error by van Lerius himself.

[75] ROMBOUTS/VAN LERIUS 1864/76, Vol. 2, pp. 186, 193.

[76] De manner of writing the 'e's is highly similar to that of the same letter in de Heem's signatures.

[77] VAN LERIUS 1880, p. 234; HOLLSTEIN, Vol. I, p. 71, Bailliu, no. 16, ill.

[78] VAN LERIUS 1880, p. 225 : "Disons d'abord que le maître ayant à soigner trois enfants en bas âge, pouvait difficilement rester veuf."

[79] Zacharias de Vriese was Jacob Jordaens' brother-in-law. VAN LERIUS 1880, p. 226, 227 (note 4).

[80] The Gasthuisbeemden area included Papenstraat, so it seems likely that de Heem and his family had remained living there after Aletta's death.

[81] VAN DEN BRANDEN 1883, p. 869, speaks of "hare vier kinderen" (her four children). There may well have been four children at that time, but the number is entirely due to the author. Neither does she speak of "haren geliefden man" (her beloved husband), as van den Branden quotes, but simply of "haeren manne".

[82] VAN DEN BRANDEN 1883, p. 871, paraphrased by HELMUS 1991, p. 231, who gives the protocol of Notary J.M. Eliaerts, SA, N 1409, 16 May 1695, as its source. In that protocol, however, only Cornelis' testament of 12th May 1695 can be found. It appears to have been penned down by the clerck at great speed and Cornelis' signature is extremely feeble and almost illegible. I have found no entry for 16th May or any other entry pertaining to Cornelis de Heem around that date. It seems unlikely, that Cornelis, after apparently being on the verge of dying on the 12th and having been buried on May 17th could have made such a statement on the 16th. On the other hand, the wording of Van den Branden's note is too specific not to have been based on concrete evidence.

[83] HELMUS 1991, p. 231, writes that Cornelis had "van Torentiana en Jan de Heem, zijn zuster en broeder en van zijn stiefzusters Isabella, Hildegonda en Anna Maria de Heem niets meer tegoed" (all five had no dues with him), which suggests that all five were still alive at that time.

[84] VAN LERIUS 1880, p. 231, does not give their death dates, but remarks that Hildegonde "vivait encore en 1713, comme nous verrons dans la biographie de David de Heem, le troisième". In that biography (on pp. 260-262) there is no mention of her, however.

[85] VAN LERIUS 1880, p. 235; HOLLSTEIN, Vol. I, p. 70, Bailliu, no. 2, ill.

[86] BREDIUS 1934, passim.

[87] VAN DEN BOSCH 1650, pp. C3r, C3v: "En raeck ick eenmael Van de Heem/ Soo sal sich Van den Bos dat belgen/ En swaerlijck dese brock verswelgen,/ Dat ick quansuys sijn eer beneem.// O neen, gepresen jonge man,/ Geen lof en magh u meer verhoogen/ Hy heeft geen sinnen noch geen oogen/ Die uwe konst niet sien en kan." It is not known if the poet van den Bosch was related to the painter van den Bosch.
[88] ROMBOUTS/VAN LERIUS 1864/76, Vol. 2, pp. 311, 322.
[89] See the document of 1st March 1669, and the following paragraph.
[90] This issue is further addressed in the chapter concerning de Heem's oeuvre in relation to the dating of paintings.
[91] HOUBRAKEN 1753, Vol. 3 pp. 64, 65. Houbraken's remark that Mignon had been with Marrel since his seventh year (so from 1647) cannot be correct, since Marrel himself only returned to Frankfurt in 1649. In VAN DER WILLIGEN/MEIJER 2003, on p. 143, Houbraken's 'two times seven years' led me to incorrectly date Mignon's coming to Utrecht to 1661.
[92] No data could be found concerning Margaretha/Grietje de Heem, other than that she had a testament drawn up in Rotterdam in June 1669, and that she had died by August 1670.
[93] KRAMM 1857/64, Vol. 2, pp. 652, 654. Jan's grandson David was only five years old at the time and not yet a painter and moreover, still living in Antwerp with his father Cornelis de Heem. From later documents concerning this debt, it becomes clear that it had indeed been transferred to Jan Davidsz. de Heem.
[94] HOUBRAKEN 1753, Vol.2, p. 215.
[95] Regionaal Archief Leiden, Confirmations of departure, Pieterskerk: Maria van Oosterwijck, 2 mei 1660. With thanks to Noud Janssen for sharing this information with me (email of 26 February 2008).
[96] While Maria had relatives and relations in her previous domiciles, Delft and Leiden, this was not the case for Utrecht, as Noud Janssen affirmed in his email (see previous note).
[97] HOEVENAAR 1778, p. 11. The archival material that Hoevenaar based his remark on was lost, but his text was the source for much later literature. However, the type of text – a public talk – might be too casual to rely on for precise dates. It is of course highly likely that both de Heem and Mignon became members of the Utrecht guild at some point, but it would be most elucidating to have exact dates. See also exh. cat. UTRECHT /BRUNSWICK 1991, pp. 63, 67, 68 (note 24).
[98] Liesbeth Helmus and Sam Segal, in exh. cat. UTRECHT/BRUNSWICK 1991, p. 63, concluded from this remark that de Heem left Antwerp for Utrecht on 13th June 1667, even though in the same volume HELMUS 1991, on p. 229, includes mention of the document of 6 January 1665. For the full text of the document concerning Cornelis' debts, see Appendix I, 1669, March 1.
[99] HOUBRAKEN 1753, Vol. 1, p. 212, 213. Houbraken does not indicate when de Heem gave this advice.
[100] See also VAN DER WILLIGEN/MEIJER 2003, p. 178. Schoock's apprenticeship with Bloemaert must have occurred before the latter's death in 1651. Lievens was never in Utrecht, but Schoock may have been his pupil in Amsterdam or The Hague. No history paintings by Schoock have been identified, only a few, later and rather weak, genre paintings are known by him.
[101] HOUBRAKEN 1753, Vol. 1, pp. 209-213. According to Houbraken, de Heem left Utrecht in 1670, accompanied by two sons and four daughters. From the various records it is unclear how many of de Heem's children were still alive at that time. Cornelis and probably Torentiana lived to adulthood, but after 1643 no record of Thomas Maria is known. Maria Anna probably died as a child, Isabella Catharina, Hildegonda, and Anna Maria lived to old age. Jan Janz. probably lived to adulthood, but Jacobus may well have died as a child. In any case, by 1672, which is the correct date for de Heem's departure from Utrecht, Cornelis had already gone his own way and it seems unlikely that Torentiana, who was about 38 years old, was still living with her father and stepmother. Houbraken also misread Cornelis de Bie's text on de Heem and claimed that around 1660 Jan Davidsz. was working with his father David de Heem. His quote from Sandrart "dat Tomas Keyzer t' Amsterdam hem voor twee kleine stukjes schildery aanbood de somme van 450 gulden; maar dat hy dezelve, schoon hy een vrient van hem was, niet geven wilde" The quote most probably concerns Marten (not 'Thoma', as Sandrart has it) Kretzer and is about a still life (not two, but two yards [ellen] long [wide?]) by Cornelis de Heem.
[102] VAN EEGHEN 1979, p. 58.
[103] Only one dated painting by Elias van den Broeck is known, from 1676. As such, it does not help our insight in Elias' early development.
[104] On the 12th of July, Cosimo III visited Utrecht, where among other places, he visited the house of a painter. The suggestion that this painter was de Heem comes from G.J. Hoogewerf (*De twee reizen van Cosimo de' Medici prins van Toscane door de Nederlanden (1667-1669). Journalen en documenten,* Amsterdam 1919, pp. XLI and 284).
[105] CHIARINI 1989, p. 158.

[106] Both HOUBRAKEN 1753, Vol. 1, p. 212 and WEYERMAN 1729/69, p. 411, mention that de Heem fled as a result of the French invasion, but both mention the year in which this happened as 1670, which is in any case is historically incorrect.
[107] ROMBOUTS/VAN LERIUS 1864/76, Vol. 2, pp. 428, 434.
[108] VAN EEGHEN 1979, p. 59.
[109] ROMBOUTS/VAN LERIUS 1864/76, Vol. 2, p. 501.
[110] VAN DEN BRANDEN 1883, p. 870.
[111] ROMBOUTS/VAN LERIUS 1864/76, Vol. 2, p. 501. Under 'Ontfanck van dootschulde' (receipt of death dues) are listed, in this order : Peeter Slootmakers, (Jonas) van Herck, (de) huysvrouwe van (Jan Baptist Martina) Wans, (Jan) de Heem, Niclaes van der Heedt, Hendrick Verdussen, (van) Meurs, Den deken Gonsales Coques, De weduwe van Dynen, Jeronimus Artssens, Daniel du Pré, D'huysvrouwe van Jan Quintenbos, Marie Nootens, and Jacques de la Croix.
[112] Peeter Slootmakers was buried 16th November 1683; The wife of 'Capiteijn' Wans was buried on 19th January 1684; Hendrick Verdussen was buried on 19th April; Gonsales Coques was buried on 18th April (as Mons. Consaeles, schilder); Daniel du Pré was buried on 25th April; Jacobus van Meurs was buried on 5th May, and Jacques de la Croix was buried on the 2nd of August. It would appear that some of the inheritants were quicker in paying the death dues than others. For instance, the dues for Jacobus van Meurs were paid before those of Coques and du Pré, who had died earlier. But clearly the first on the list, Peeter Slootmakers, was also the first to be buried and the last, Jacques de la Croix, the last to be buried. (Antwerp archives, inv. PR 277, burial records for 1683-1685).
[113] See note 31 and Appendix I.

* In the following chapters, in which the development of de Heem's oeuvre is discussed chronologically, I try as much as possible to avoid literature references concerning specific paintings. Unless stated otherwise, statements made here other than on my own observations are based on literature cited with the work under discussion in the catalogue.

Notes to **Utrecht, Leiden and Amsterdam** pp. 33-79

[114] The first, oil on panel, 115,5 x 169 cm, North Carolina Museum of Art, Raleigh (see exh. cat. AMSTERDAM/CLEVELAND 1999/2000, cat. no. 104, colour ill.).
[115] Of the *Rich man's meal*, (indistinctly) dated examples are known that might go as far back as 1589. Of the *Poor man's meal* no dated examples are known. See the on-line database RKD*images* for further details.
[116] On these still lifes, see S. Segal in exh. cat. DELFT/CAMBRIDGE/FORT WORTH 1988/9, pp. 39-53.
[117] Compare ROBELS 1989, cat. nos. 110 and 113. Her cat. no. 89, as signed and dated 1603, is not by Frans Snijders, but probably a copy after a substantially later work by Peter van Boucle.
[118] No dated works by Osias Beert are known, but examples on copper plates dated by their maker from as early as 1607 are known.
[119] About the recognition of David Rijckaert II as a still-life painter, see MEIJER 2009 (2).
[120] VAN MANDER 1604, p. 294v.
[121] Now in the collection of the Fondation Custodia in Paris.
[122] Abraham Bloemaert also painted a vanitas skull early on, which Karel van Mander saw in the collection of Jaques Razet in Amsterdam, before 1604, see VAN MANDER 1604, p. 297v.
[123] For an elaborate discussion of the Dutch kitchen piece from c. 1590-1650, see KWAK 2014.
[124] In view of the development of the flower still life, as well as within the chronology of Savery's flower pieces, the date 1603 cannot be correct on a still life of flowers in a niche in the collection of the Centraal Museum, Utrecht (HELMUS 1999, cat. no. 574, vol. A, pp. 123-125, vol. B, pp. 1333-1335), of which a second version exists in an American private collection. It more likely originally read 1613. In my view, Savery's role as a flower painter was not as prominent as it is often considered to be and deserves more in-depth study in the context of the development of flower painting in general, rather than as a separate phenomenon, as which Savery's work is often treated.
[125] On the connection between Bosschaert and Brueghel, and on the early development of the Netherlandish flower painting, see DE CLIPPEL & VAN DER LINDEN 2015 (passim).
[126] De Heem's authorship of a still life of fruit bearing a signature and date "J. De Heem ƒ 1624" (oil on canvas, 41,9 x 62,9 cm) was already denounced by Abraham Bredius in 1890 (BREDIUS 1890(2), p. 13). The handling does

indeed differ substantially from de Heem's early efforts in van der Ast's style, discussed below. In several publications, however, Ingvar Bergström included the painting as de Heem's earliest work (including in BERGSTRÖM 1956(2), p. 173). In MEIJER 1988, p. 36, I also argued that the painting is not be by de Heem, and S. Segal in exh. cat. UTRECHT/BRUNSWICK 1991, p. 19-21, fig. 2, published it as a copy after Balthasar van der Ast. I studied the painting in a private collection in New Jersey in January 1996, which confirmed my views based upon scrutiny of the old, but excellent photo. In 2010, the painting resurfaced on the art market in sale Christie's New York, 9 June 2010, lot 37, colour ill., as 'attributed to Balthasar van der Ast'. In subsequent cleaning the signature (with the calligraphy of a post-1650 de Heem signature) and date vanished, giving way to remains of a coarse signature "Iohannes…". Also, to the right a small melon appeared. It conflicts, however, with the other fruit in that area, which was painted by a different hand at a later stage, in the manner of Jan Davidsz. de Heem, and Cornelis de Heem of the 1650s and 1660s. Although not a copy of a known van der Ast composition, this still life was clearly inspired by fruit still lifes by that artist from *c*.1623, compare, for instance, a still life from that year in the Musée des Beaux-Arts in Lille, inv. no. P 1937.

[127] Oil on panel, 130 x 80 cm, signed and dated 1624, Utrecht, Centraal Museum, inv. no. 2310.

[128] See MULLER 1880. There is no mention of de Heem in the remaining guild accounts from the years 1611-1644, published by Muller, pp. 92-126.

[129] Concerning the identification of the young man in the painting as Jan Davidsz. de Heem himself, see the chapter *Name and Effigies*.

[130] Last seen in sale London, Phillips, 5 December 1989, lot 104, colour ill.

[131] With Robert Noortman, Maastricht/London, 1994.

[132] I already made the comparison in MEIJER 1988, p. 30, fig. 3.

[133] For parrots, compare, for instance, a painting in the Hermitage, St. Petersburg, inv. no. 8472 (KUZNETSOV/LINNIK 1982, no. 246) and a painting that was offered at Sotheby's, New York, 28 January 2000, lot 121, colour ill. (BOL 1960, no. 117).

[134] Oil on panel, 40,7 x 61,2 cm, sale London, Christie's, 16 January 1992, lot 61, colour ill., as by B. van der Ast (expertise S. Segal, Amsterdam, as an early work with some possible collaboration from A. Bosschaert the Elder). Previously, Ingvar Bergström had identified the painting as a work by Bosschaert and dated it to 1605 or shortly thereafter (according to Christie's catalogue). In my view the painting is without doubt by the elder Bosschaert, and should be dated to about 1608/'09.

[135] For compositions with birds by Binoit, see BOTT 2001, pp. 204-206, Werkverzeichnis P. Binoit, nos. WV.B. 26-32.

[136] Previously with Charles Roelofsz, Amsterdam, see *Handbook* of The European Fine Art Fair, Maastricht, 2002, p. 129, colour ill.

[137] Compare a small painting from 1622, oil on copper, 16,9 x 23,6 cm, Sale London, Sotheby's, 3 July 1997, lot 43, colour ill. The same crayfish appears in another painting by van der Ast froom 1622, now in the North Carolina Museum of Art, Raleigh NC.

[138] On the symbolism of the lobster see S. Segal in exh. cat. DELFT/CAMBRIDGE/FORT WORTH 1988/9, p. 132. One may wonder whether the animal's colour change (from black/brown to bright red) when cooked may have added to associating it with inconstancy.

[139] See exh. cats. AMSTERDAM 1993/4, p. 605 and AMSTERDAM / CLEVELAND 1999/2000, p. 134, provenance note. Carlton saw seven paintings by Torrentius 'at a friends house lyes in Liss near Leyden', the best he deemed to be this one 'on a round bred donne 1614 […] w^{ch} is a glass wth wyne in it very well donne between a tynne pot and an earthen pott, a set song under it and a bitt of a bridle over it'.
The term Jan-Steen jug is probably a nineteenth-century invention, based on the fact that such jugs occur frequently in Steen's paintings. In fact, the type of jug existed long before Steen was born, the earliest examples date from the second half of the sixteenth century.

[140] From the fact that de Heem's daughter, who was born in (probably) 1635, was named Torentiana, we might deduct that Jan Davidsz. de Heem was impressed by Torrentius' work. See the Biography for further details.

[141] Oil on panel, 48 x 76,9 cm, signed with monogram. The Art Institute, Chicago, inv. no. 1935.300. BRUNNER-BULST 2004 included the painting as cat. no. 6 and dated it to *c*.1623 which, in my view, is too early.

[142] In genre paintings, the phallic appearance of the Jan-Steen jug is often put to use in erotic symbolism, among others by Steen. An early example is the painting by Isaac Elias from 1620 (Oil on panel, 47 x 63 cm, Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam, inv. no. SK A 1754). This complex allegory includes many allusions. The young man in the centre is either about to place a glass on the spout of a Jan Steen jug, or has just removed it. While pointing at the action with his other hand, he whispers into the ear of the young woman beside him, who, judging from her garment, is probably a prostitute. It is not very likely that de Heem intended an erotic

reference in cat. no. A 004, but a more general allusion to fertility, in combination with all this fruit, should perhaps not be excluded entirely.
[143] Private collection, Fürth-Bayern, by 1960.
[144] Behind the large quinces in van der Ast's still life of fruit from 1620 in the Mauritshuis, The Hague (inv.no. 1066), there appear to be two pomegranates, but they are not rendered in much detail.
[145] Last seen in sale London, Sotheby's, 3 July 1997, lot 43, colour ill.
[146] For van Fornenburgh's painting, see exh. cat. DELFT/CAMBRIDGE/FORT WORTH 1988/9, cat. no.22, colour plate on p. 107.
[147] See MITCHELL 1973, p. 246.
[148] The first, on parchment, 173 x 143 mm, sale New York, Sotheby's, 23 Jan 2001, lot 119, colour ill. The second, 145 x 111 mm, Berlin, Staatliche Museen, cat. 1930, no. 135 (photos of both at RKD).
[149] The first, last seen in sale London, Sotheby's 3 July 1996, lot 66, colour ill.. The painting includes strips a few centimetres wide that were probably added later to top and bottom. The second, oil on panel, 66,5 x 90 cm, signed, Kunsthaus, Zürich, Koetser Stiftung, cat. 1988, no. 9, with colour ill.
[150] The same is true for a much later example from about 1673, cat. no. A 249.
[151] See my entry on the painting in MEIJER 2003, cat. no. 36, pp. 216-219.
[152] In reaction to an earlier version of this text, Eric Jan Sluijter suggested that it is likely that the painter of the work in Lille, instead, may have been inspired by de Heem's original concept and improved on the execution of the figure. To me it seems more likely that de Heem, as an inexperienced figure painter, adapted an existing model of high quality. As earlier, in the case of van der Ast's models, it was below his creative standard to copy it verbatim, however. Without an exact date for the Lille painting (dendrochronology may at some point result in a date *post quem*), the exact relationship between the two paintings will remain difficult to asssess, however. The possibility that both the de Heem and the painting in Lille are based on a common, unknown example should also not be ruled entirely.
See also my entry on the de Heem painting in MEIJER 2003, cat. no. 36, pp. 216-219. My suggestion that the painting in Lille cannot not be by Codde prompted Berhard Schnackenburg to suggest a tentative attribution to Rembrandt (SCHNACKENBURG 2006, passim, with colour ill.), which in my view is untenable. Jeroen Giltaij, in his entry on the painting in exh. cat. ROTTERDAM/FRANKFURT 2004/5, p. 72 argued in favour of the attribution to Codde on the basis of the monogram which, however, is different from the one he compares it with: in proper Codde monograms, the P hangs down from the C, in Lille – insofar as something remains of the monogram – the P stands on the lower end of the C. In Giltaij's view, the Lille painting originated later than the de Heem, he appears to adopt Liedtke's dating to 1631-33.
[153] The protagonist does not visibly hold any painting utensils, so theoretically he may also be a patron or an art lover.
[154] I am indebted to Frits Scholten, Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam, for this information (email correspondence, 4 December 2015). A related, but much smaller bronze, which is tentatively attributed to Alessandro Vittoria (1525-1608), is in the Herzog-Anton-Ulrich Museum in Braunschweig. Thus far, no example or cast of this model was known to have existed in the early seventeenth century in the North Netherlands. Of Tintoretto's design, several drawn studies are known, among others in the former Koenings collection, now in the Pushkin Museum in Moscow. Scholten also relates the type of this statue to Adriaen de Vries' *Bacchant*, which was acquired by the Rijksmuseum in 2014 (inv. no. BK-2015-2-1).
[155] Strangely, the lower edge of the door in the de Heem is not parallel to the upper edge, which makes for an awkward sense of perspective.
[156] Other attributions of figure paintings to de Heem, such as fig. 3 in MARTIN 1925, p. 45 must definitely be dismissed.
[157] BRUYN 1951, pp. 161-163 and ADAMS 1985, cat. no. 14.
[158] Oil on panel, 82,6 x 54 cm, signed and dated JDGHEYN FE AN° 1603, inv. no. 1974.1.
[159] The second, oil on canvas, 42 x 56 cm, collection Count Schönborn, Pommersfelden (still published as by David de Heem in exh. cat. AMSTERDAM / CLEVELAND 1999/2000, p. 15, fig. 6.; I corrected the attribution in BUIJSEN 1998, p. 138 and again in MEIJER 2000, p. 234 (note 2). A vanitas still life that has long been published as by Bailly, should in my view be considered as a late work by Jacob II de Gheyn: oil on panel, 42 x 68 cm, collection F.C. Bûtot, his sale, Amsterdam, Sotheby's, 16 November 1993, lot 39, colour ill., as by D. Bailly.
[160] See also exh. cat. AMSTERDAM / CLEVELAND 1999/2000, cat. no. 18, colour ill. and WALLERT 2006. Wallert demonstrates that the Lievens was painted on top of a finished female portrait, probably from the mid-1620s. Incidentally, his article opens with an inaccurate statement concerning de Heem's Leiden period, while he rather uncritically accepts the attribution to Jan Jz. den Uyl of the (added) 'breakfast' still life in the foreground

of the Lievens. He also illustrates a still life of books in Heino (his fig. 9), of which the attribution to Lievens is indeed not convincing in my view, although the painting must have originated in the same circle. The date inscribed on it, 1627, is most probably authentic. On the Heino painting see also my brief text in CAT. HEINO 2005, p. 26.

[161] See BRUNNER-BULST 2004, cat. nos. 8 (dated to *c.*1623 by the author but perhaps as early as from 1621), cat. no. 10 (1623) and cat. no. 18 (1625, Frans Halsmuseum, Haarlem).

[162] BRUNNER-BULST 2004, cat. nos. 31 (1627), 36 , 37, 38 (1628), 42, 43 (here fig. ULA 17) (1629) and 47 (1630).

[163] The panel of cat. no. A 015 is not bevelled to the right and at the top (i.e. to the left and at the top when looking at the back), and it may well have been reduced by a few centimetres on those sides, in which case the original composition will have approached that of cat. no. A 016 more closely: more space at the top and some space to the right of the document on the wall.

[164] Apart from the still life in Simferopol (cat. A 015). However, judging from photos, that background has at least suffered substantially and appears to have been largely repainted.

[165] Several of the photos that have been published of the painting do not show that de Heem has in fact included the left side of the partition, with the sides of the upper clamps picking up the light. Hana Seifertova, in her article on the painting from 1962 (SEIFERTOVÁ 1962) emphasizes the importance of lighting in the painting, but did not discuss how it was achieved.

[166] See Q. Buvelot's apt analysis of cat. A 011 and 010 in exh. cat. THE HAGUE 2002, pp. 96-101, 205 and in VAN DER PLOEG 2002, no. 15, pp. 76-79, respectively.

[167] See exhibition catalogue WASHINGTON/LONDON/THE HAGUE 2000/1, cat. no. 5, colour ill., where dated to *c.*1635.

[168] Oil on panel, 72,3 x 59,5 cm, The National Gallery of Victoria, Melbourne (Felton Bequest). With thanks to Eric Jan Sluijter for this reference.

[169] Most recently, in 2013/14, with Douwes Fine Art in Amsterdam.

[170] VAN DER WILLIGEN/MEIJER 2003, p. 217.

[171] For the first, see BREDIUS 1915/22, p. 1346. The second: sale Rotterdam, 23 April 1845, lot 144: *Een tafel met boeken en een dootshooft van Westerbaen* (A table with books and a skull by Westerbaen), measurements given as 30 x 31 d (= duim, which at that time was probably meant as centimeters), in view of which the painting cannot be identical to the Douwes picture.

[172] See Biography, p.22.

[173] The first, oil on panel, 27 x 35 cm, signed and dated 1636, Gemäldegalerie, Berlin, cat. nr. 921A. The second, oil on panel, 17,3 x 25,6 cm, signed and dated 1638, Fondation Custodia (collection Frits Lugt), Paris, inv. no. 807.

[174] Among them a painting in the Kröller-Müller Museum, Otterlo, inv. no. 617 (that can be attributed to Joost Ferdenandes) as well as examples in Lund and Bonn (Exh. cat. FRANKFURT 1993, nos. 67 and 68, with colour ills.) that, for the time being, will have to remain anonymous.

[175] BREDIUS 1888, pp. 188-190.

[176] Oil on panel, 52 x 68,5 cm, Brussels, Royal Museum for Fine Arts, inv. no. 3863.

[177] The painting has more bravura than Teniers' small still life, formerly in the Wachtmeister collection in Wanas, Sweden (exh. cat. ANTWERP 1991, cat. no. 10, colour ill.) which is dated 1635 and which, as Ingvar Bergström rightly suggested (in exh. cat. MÜNSTER /BADEN-BADEN 1979/80, p. 206), may well have been inspired by works by de Heem from that period. Strangely, the painting was not mentioned or discussed in LÜDKE 2005, even though that article focussed on Teniers as a still-life painter.

[178] Oil on panel, 48,6 x 64,7 cm, signed (authentic?), Frankfurt am Main, Städel Museum, inv. no. 1211. A lesser, (but generally considered autograph) version is in Karlsruhe, Staatliche Kunsthalle Karlsruhe , oil on panel, 49,8 x 64,2 cm, signed and indistinctly dated (formerly read as 1640), LAUTS 1966, no. 194.

[179] The first, oil on panel, 30,8 x 40 cm, formerly collection Sir William van Horne, Montreal. The second, oil on panel, 50 x 65 cm, Rouen, Musée des Beaux-Arts, inv. no. 907.1.125, as by D.Teniers II (BERGOT, PESSIOT & GRANDJEAN 1993, pp. 76, 77, colour ill.). The third, oil on panel, 33 x 42 cm, was most recently with Salomon Lilian in Amsterdam, see HILLEGERS 2012.

[180] See HILLEGERS 2012, where an attribution for the three paintings to Jan Davidsz. de Heem is proposed. Hillegers' arguments for attribution are far from convincing, however. While his motifs for placing these three paintings in Leiden in the second half of the 1620s are acceptable, their attribution to de Heem is absolutely incorrect. Discussing the painting (in front of it) with Hillegers in September 2011, I have argued that it expresses a completely different artistic personality than is to be found in de Heem's work. The composition

and the lighting of these still lifes differ substantially from de Heem's. The palette of the three still lifes, with dominating grey, white, and the brown accent of the violin, differs from de Heem's, in which the whites are more creamy and the greys are also warmer in tone. In all of de Heem's book still lifes, the books and manuscripts are in considered disarray, there is a flow of twists and turns of the pages that render a liveliness to the composition, while the lighting is relatively soft and the entire atmosphere rather poetic. In the 'trio', as Hillegers calls the group he discusses, the arrangement is rather rigid, staccato and matter-of-fact. In all three, the viewer is confronted prominently, face-to-face with the skull. Even in the painting in Leipzig, the only one of de Heem's book still lifes in which the skull is immediately identifiable, de Heem has turned it sideways in order to avoid immediate confrontation. Even in de Heem's most confronting and much later still life with a skull, cat. no. A 156 in Prague, the eye sockets are not fully facing the viewer as they do here. In none of de Heem's still lifes the globe is positively identifiable, while the artist who produced these three still lifes has clearly made an effort to make them recognizable. De Heem's globes (in cat. nos. A 009, A 015 and A 018) are not recognizable, but also they are certainly not the same object as in the three incorrectly attributed vanitas still lifes. The remains of 'signatures' Hillegers signals cannot, in calligraphy and handling, be connected with any de Heem signature from the 1620s. Moreover, as a young and ambitious artist, de Heem made sure to sign his works distinctly and in full during this period. Comparison with de Heem's work from 1627 and early 1628 (cat. nos. A 003 to A 014) makes it crystal clear that there is absolutely no similarity whatsoever with the three vanitas still lifes, in style, palette, or handling of the brush.

[181] LUGT 1929-1931, Vol. 2, p. 82, nos. 1101-1103, illustrated opposite p. 81.

[182] See KLINGE-GROSS 1976 and JAMES 1994.

[183] Wallraf-Richartz Museum, Cologne, fig. 1 in JAMES 1994, p. 132.

[184] Oil on panel, 63,8 x 47,4 cm, bears signature, London, National Gallery, inv. no. 4189.

[185] Oil on panel, 46 x 57,7 cm, signed and dated 1632. Sale London, Sotheby's 1 November 2001, lot 11, colour ill.

[186] BERGSTRÖM 1956(2), p. 194. Bergström claimed that Claesz.'s painting, which was lost in World War II, was dated 1623, but BRUNNER-BULST 2004, pp. 219, 220, correctly argued that the date was 1627.

[187] Since Leiden did not have a guild of St. Luke that protected the market of paintings at the time, products the of Haarlem artists could be sold in Leiden without restriction.

[188] See Biography and Appendix I, document from 6 June 1660.

[189] As Carla van de Puttelaar remarked (in private communication, 2015), de Heem's lemon peel was peeled off right-handed. Pieter Claesz., who was left-handed, always painted left-handedly peeled lemons.

[190] Although den Uyl was already called a painter at the time of his marriage in 1619, the earliest known dated painting by his hand is from 1632 and judging by their style and handling very few paintings in his fairly small extant oeuvre, if any, can be placed earlier than that painting, which is now in Prague. One still life bears an indistinct date that can perhaps be read as 163(.): sale Amsterdam, Paul Brandt, 16/20 May 1983, lot 5, ill.

[191] The tablecloth in the Budapest still life may be of the so-called 'Transylvanian' type. Compare YDEMA 1991, pp. 48-51.

[192] In some of his early still lifes, Pieter Claesz. included an oriental tablecloth, but it is always covered almost entirely by a white napkin. Cf. BRUNNER-BULST 2004, cat. nos. 20, 25 and 26; those paintings can barely have been a source of inspiration to de Heem.

[193] Cf. BRUNNER-BULST 2004, cat. nos. 20, 21, 22, 24.

[194] The relatively tall rummer appears to be the same object de Heem depicted in his emulation of Pieter Claesz.'s still life (cat. no. A 012), while it reappears in a still life from c. 1632 (cat. no. A 030).

[195] See Biography and Appendix 1, document of 10 February 1631.

[196] See Biography.

[197] About other such 'modernizing' jobs, some of which also involved Luttichuys, see MEIJER 1999, passim and F.G. Meijer in exh. cat. ROTTERDAM/AACHEN 2006/7, p. 96.

[198] See CAT. VALLS 2007, no. 15.

[199] The term *bijwerk* is often used in seventeenth- and eighteenth-century descriptions of paintings. It refers to objects that have no specific meaning in the image, but that furnish it and make it more attractive.

[200] This painting in the Staatsgalerie, Stuttgart, inv. no. 3323, has been praised as a de Heem by various scholars, but as I have argued in MEIJER 2000, p. 227, the execution is too weak to be by de Heem himself. The painting may, however, very well be a copy after a missing or lost original from 1634 by de Heem.

[201] See MEIJER 1997, p. 19.

[202] Prior to realizing its connection with cat. no. A 035b, I had difficulty accepting that it could actually be de Heem's work. In this judgment the state of preservation also played a role.

[203] As Carla van de Puttelaar (private communication, 2015) remarked, the lemon in this painting was peeled left-handed. Perhaps de Heem mirrored a study he had of it for the painting. See also the remark on Claesz.'s left peeled lemons in note 76, above.
[204] DE BOER 1940, p. 60: 'Dit stuk lijkt zóózeer op Den Uyl dat wij er hier over moeten spreken'. De Boer quoted the date of the painting incorrectly as 1638.
[205] The painting in fig. ULA 51 was first published as a den Uyl by P. de Boer in 1940 (DE BOER 1940, cat. nr. 5). Previously, like several other den Uyl still lifes, it had been catalogued as a work by Willem Claesz. Heda. Interestingly, Wilhelm von Bode had (incorrectly) suggested that this painting is by Jan Dz. de Heem (KRONFELD 1927, p. 162).
[206] For more on Gabron, see the next chapter, *Antwerp*, pp. 79-80.
[207] In view of de Heem's compositions from this period, one might expect a more vertical format. The photo of the painting also shows irregularities at the top of the panel that appear to be saw marks. Also judging from the photo, however, the grain of the panel appears to run horizontally, which rather suggests a horizontal format for the original composition – assuming that the panel was indeed reduced.
[208] During the mid-1620s, Claesz. already introduced hams and joints of meat into his still lifes. For a ham with den Uyl, compare for instance a painting in Berlin, Staatliche Museen, Gemäldegalerie, inv. no. 1641.
[209] With thanks to Martin Bijl, Alkmaar, who has researched Dutch local panel measurements and who indicated in private communication (November 2004) that the panels used for cat. nos. A 024, A 026, A 028 and A 030 may be Amsterdam panels. For other panels of which measurements were perhaps taken inaccurately or that have been cut down, no conclusion could be drawn. Only two panels are possibly from Antwerp, but for those same panels Bijl did not exclude a Leiden origin either (cat. nos. A 031 and A 043), while the measurements of three panels appear to indicate a Leiden provenance, A 021, A 023 and, more surprisingly, A 038. Upon inspection of cat. no. A 019 in December 2009, Bijl concluded that that panel must also have been produced in Amsterdam (oral communication, December 2009). This might indicate that already in Leiden de Heem had connections with Amsterdam. On the other hand, the odd Amsterdam panel may have been available in Leiden.
[210] Oil on panel, 40,7 x 33 cm, inv. no. 1932, as Dutch School. Bequest of the Marquess of Lothian, 1941. Formerly inscribed 'D Heem', in white at upper left and '502' at lower right.
[211] In decreasing order of quality: a. oil on panel, 40 x 32,5 cm. Sale London, Sotheby's, 29 October 1998, lot 46, colour ill., as by a follower of J.Dz. de Heem.b. oil on panel, 47 x 38,8 cm. Sale London, Bonhams, 9/10 July 2002, lot 45, from the estate of the late Mrs. D.M. Wind, colour ill., as by a follower of C. Mahu; with Galerie Jan de Maere, Brussels, cat. 2003, no. 20, as by C. Mahu.
c. oil on panel, 41,3 x 32,5 cm. Sale London, Phillips Bayswater, 5 December 1995, lot 51, ill., as attributed to S. Luttichuys.
[212] The first, oil on panel, 65 x 93 cm. Sale Munich, Helbing, 12 October 1909, lot 26, ill., as by W.Cz. Heda (here fig. ULA 35). The second, oil on panel, 72 x 105,3 cm. Châteauroux (Fr), Musée de Chateauroux, inv. no. 1330, exh. cat. CHÂTEAUROUX 2001, cat. no. 15, colour ill., as attributed to W. Gabron. The only difference between the two is a tall wine glass in the version in Châteauroux that appears to have been added later, since it seems to float above the napkin, rather than to stand upon it. There is a third, simplified and condensed version of this composition, oil on panel, *c*. 55 x 70 cm, bearing a Heda signature, in a Belgian private collection (photo received from P. de Séjournet, Tervuren, October 1997).
[213] Oil on panel, 53,5 x 63,5 cm. Sale New York, Christie's, 29 January 1999, lot 129, colour ill., see cat. no. B 33.02. A signed copy of this composition by G. Gabron is in the Museum Mayer van den Bergh, Antwerp, see exh. cat. UTRECHT/BRUNSWICK 1991, cat. no. 40, colour ill.
[214] Cf. BRUNNER-BULST 2004, cat. nos. 44, 48 and a vanitas still life that is probably a copy after Claesz., sold from the collection of the J. Paul Getty Museum, Los Angeles in sale Amsterdam, Sotheby's, 8 May 2007, lot 66, colour ill.

Notes to **Antwerp 1636-1656**, pp. 79-206

[215] VON SANDRART 1675, dl. 1, p. 313: 'man alldorten die seltsame Früchte von allerley großen Pflaumen/ Pfersingen/ Marillen/ Pomeranzen/ Citronen/ Weintrauben/ und andere/ in bässerer perfection und Zeitigung haben könte/ selbige nach dem Leben zu contafäten'.
[216] There is no reason to assume that Sandrart knew de Heem personally. The artists did not reside in the same town simultaneously at any given time.

[217] We do not know whether his eldest son David was still alive at that time. Torentiana was about to be born or had been born recently and Cornelis was about four years old.
[218] De Boer (1940, p. 60) attributed the de Heem to Gabron on the basis of the copy signed by that artist (copy 35.01 I, fig. A 1), and upon the simple notion that the de Heem (cat. no. A 044) did not fit his image of the artist's oeuvre.
[219] Of this painting there is a liberal copy in a private collection in Spain, oil on canvas, 53 x 63 cm, previously sale New York, Christie's, 29 January 1999, lot 129, colour ill.
[220] GRIMM 1995, pp. 34-36.
[221] Unfortunately, I only know the painting from a photo at the RKD, The Hague.
[222] Interestingly, the earliest catalogues of the collection give the painting to 'de Heem', but fairly early in the nineteenth century the attribution was changed to Willem van Aelst.
[223] A third, but perhaps less likely possibility would be that he had sold them to (an) Antwerp collector(s) or dealer(s) while still residing up north.
[224] Compare, for instance, a copy signed by Mahu (oil on canvas, 49,5 x 67,5 cm, sale London, Phillips, 7 December 1993, lot 27, colour ill.) after Heda's original from 1637 (oil on panel, 49,2 x 63,7 cm, sale London, Sotheby's, 17 December 1998, lot 40, colour ill., subsequently with Richard Green Gallery, London). Several copies by Mahu and from that artist's studio are recorded, as well as numerous copies after other Heda compositions.
[225] Upon inspection in July 2010, I can fully confirm the lecture of the date as 1636. Although there has been some discussion about it in the past, LE BIHAN 1990, p. 145, already stated that 1636 is the only correct transcription.
[226] It must be remarked however, that the appearance of crispness is in part due to strengthening and retouches of the napkin.
[227] It is unlike de Heem to make such a compositional error. When the pipe stem is 'Photoshopped' out, the painting wins substantially in force. Moreover, the angle of the stem at the bowl differs slightly from that of the 'reconstructed' part in front of the cup.
[228] Unfortunately, I only know this portrait from a poor black-and-white photograph which, moreover, is in reverse (in fig. A 5 it is shown in the proper direction). From the photo, it is impossible to decide whether the bouquet belongs to the original composition or, instead, was a later addition.
[229] Previously, the painting was attributed to Bartholomeus van der Helst, also an Amsterdam artist.
[230] With thanks to Carla van de Puttelaar for this suggestion, November 2015.
[231] See, among other references, exhibition cat. AMSTERDAM 1984, cat. no.33, with colour ill. The monogram CVB on the painting appears not to be authentic, and stylistically this work does not connect in any way with that of Christoffel van den Berghe as we know it, while, as a painting from the late 1630s or early 1640s, it is probably also too late for him.
[232] Showing only the skull, the glass bottle and smoking implements. This painting was with Jack Kilgore, New York, in 1995: oil on panel, 18,4 x 23,2 cm. In analogy with the larger painting, it was presented by Kilgore as by Christoffel van den Berghe.
[233] Oil on canvas, 51 x 65 cm, sale London, Sotheby's, 6 April 1977, lot 48, ill. When the painting reappeared at auction in 1986, the skull had been painted out and had been replaced by a (much too small) body of a lute. Judging from a photo, the signature on this painting was substantially strengthened, but may have been original (the 1977 auction catalogue says: 'inscribed with the artist's name'). The attribution to Benedetti, judging from the photo, appears to be acceptable.
[234] CAVALLI-BJÖRKMAN 2005, cat. no 224, as by Jan Dz. de Heem. From the rim on the forehead, an angle in the upper edge of the eye-socket and the configuration of the teeth, it can be concluded that this is the same skull. Between the Stockholm painting and the so-called van den Berghes, it appears to have lost its front teeth.
[235] The Westerwald jug appears to be a very 'modern' object for the period. Although Westerwald potters already combined cobalt blue glazes with colourless *appliques* on their grey jugs during the late sixteenth century, examples with *appliques* of this type are usually assigned to the second half of the seventeenth century (cf. REINEKING-VON BOCK 1976, pp. 303-307). I have not found an example of the shape of de Heem's jug, which also does not reappear in any other of his still lifes, but I have no reason to consider that the date of the jug would interfere with the suggested date of 1638 (or perhaps 1639) for this still life.
[236] In cat. no. A 048, one could imagine that perhaps a curtain had originally been draped around the column, like in cat. nos. A 050 and 065, but the Bamberg copy clearly shows a broken column.

[237] Judging from the two known copies of it, the painting was reduced at the left, top and bottom, which had an unfavourable effect on the composition, which now feels somewhat cluttered, while in the copies it is rather well balanced.
[238] In this respect it is interesting to note that N.R.A. Vroom attributed one of the copies to the Haarlem painter Cornelis Kruys (he writes Cruys), who did indeed paint several such compositions and who was influenced by such artists as Pieter Claesz. and Willem Claesz. Heda.
[239] LIEDTKE 1992(2) as by Jan Jansz. de Heem, following suggestions by I. Bergström and S. Segal. However, in LIEDTKE 2007, pp. 319-322, the author is "inclined to support [my] argument that the Museum's picture is by Jan Davidsz de Heem about 1639" (p. 321). Walter Liedtke has undertaken research concerning the objects represented in this still life (ibid, pp. 320, 321) and concluded that their probable dates do not impede dating the painting to 1639.
[240] WEBER 1989, cat. no. 2, ill.
[241] PAUWELS 1984, p. 300, inv. no. 4731. To call the painting an immediate forerunner of de Heem's large luxury still lifes, as Segal did in exhibition cat. UTRECHT/BRUNSWICK 1991, p. 25, is taking things too far, I would say, in view of the substantially different composition.
[242] Examples in the Museum of Fine Arts, Boston (inv. no. 54.1606) and in the Staatliche Museen, Gemäldegalerie, Berlin (inv. no. 1641), which are not dated, have a similar setting.
[243] The painting was with H.M. Cramer, The Hague, during the mid-1970s. I studied it in a private collection in Germany in June 1991.
[244] The fact that it is about 18 cm higher and 18 cm wider results in a surface that is just under 1,4 times larger (2,5 square meters in New York to 3,42 square meters in Paris).
[245] On the role of the diagonals and other important lines in the compositions of de Heem's large luxury still lifes, see further on.
[246] It is not quite clear what the structure in the background is. Due to the treatment of the texture of the wall and the shadows on it of the drapery, one gets the initial impression that there are two structures under different angles, but upon closer inspection, the top line continues from front to back.
[247] Due to incorrect interpretation of the date as 1691 by various scholars, this painting has been considered to be the work of Jan Davidsz. de Heem's son Jan Jansz. de Heem by various authors (see catalogue for literature references) and, as a result, served as one of the main stepping stones for the 'reconstruction' of the latter's oeuvre. This has resulted in the attribution to Jan Jansz. de Heem of a number of works by Jan Davidsz. or from his circle from the 1640s – which are indeed related to the Brussels painting. Thus far, I have found no period reference to Jan Jansz. de Heem as a painter nor have I seen any painting with a signature that can be that of Jan Jansz. de Heem. If Jan Jansz. painted at all, works could be expected at the very earliest from the mid-1660s (he was born in 1650) and – assuming that he opted for still life as his subject – they could be expected to follow his father's late style, or that of his half-brother Cornelis de Heem rather than his father's manner of the early 1640s. In recent years, several works that were considered as by Jan Jansz. de Heem have been reattributed to Jan Davidsz. de Heem, such as cat. nos. A 050, 095, and 104. Even S. Segal, who (in exhibition cat. UTRECHT/BRUNSWICK 1991) propagated Jan Jansz. de Heem as a still-life painter, noted more recently (in exhibition cat. DELFT/HOUSTON 2006/07, p. 347 [341 in the Dutch edition] , note 17) "In any case, there is some doubt as to whether Jan II ever was a painter". In exh. cat. AMSTERDAM 2012, on p. 55, however, he noted that de Heem had many followers, among them 'his sons Cornelis and Jan Jansz'.
[248] If we were to reduce the painting by some 30 cm at the left and right, the composition would become very similar to that of cat. nos. A 051 and 065. However, it is more likely that it was even larger than it is at present, see my reasoning for this supposition under the analysis of the compositions of the large luxury still lifes.
[249] Thomas Willeboitrts Bosschaert was a witness at the baptism of Thomas Maria de Heem on 11 April 1638, see Appendix 1, p. 300. The handling of the figure fits well with Willeboirts Bosschaert's style of the early 1640s, compare for instance his *Amor Triumphans*, previously in the collection of the Mauritshuis, The Hague (lost to fire in 1940 when on loan in Middelburg, HEINRICH 2003, cat. no. A9) and a *Toilet of Venus* (HEINRICH 2003, cat. no. A11), both dated by Axel Heinrich to c.1643/44. The rendering of the page's hand is particularly characteristic of Willeboirts Bosschaert's manner of painting hands.
[250] The first: i.e. not counting the rather decorative parrot in cat. no. A 006.
[251] No monkeys can be found in Willeboirts Bosschaert's oeuvre, however, so due to the lack of material for comparison, the attribution of the animal can only be highly tentative. Nevertheless, the obvious interaction between the dark page and the monkey seems to suggest that they were conceived together. The monkey has become slightly transparent over time and was clearly painted on top of the finished tablecloth. The painter of

the monkey, whether he was de Heem or Willeboirts, has made clever use of the existing tablecloth by following the lines of the folds in the construction of the animal. The page, too, appears to have been included after the painting was (largely) finished. His left hand was certainly painted around the bow of the bass viol in front of it, while the right hand does not really fit into the space that the split branch it is holding allows for it.

[252] This would appear to be a Persian carpet, compare a very similar example in a painting by Thomas de Keyser from 1630, YDEMA 1991, p. 10, fig. 4.

[253] S. Segal, in exhibition cat. DELFT/CAMBRIDGE/FORT WORTH 1988/9, p. 195, suggested that such objects could have interchangeable parts. For the most part, however, the varying details in de Heem's (and other artist's) paintings will be due to artistic freedom of the painter. If objects with interchangeable parts existed at all, none have survived, to my knowledge.

[254] From the photo I have at my disposal, it is unclear whether behind the lobster there is a pentiment of another columbine cup and cover, or a very thin, complex glass vessel. I appear not to have noticed this phenomenon when inspecting the painting itself in 1992.

[255] It is interesting to note that de Heem tends to show the side of his large porcelain salvers that is turned towards the viewer as slightly concave and pointed, while the remaining edge is shown as rather smooth and round. In reality, such salvers tend to have a slight accolade shape (see RINALDI 1989, pp. 70-72. Good examples of such large dishes (diameter c. 53 cm) are illustrated on pp. 101 and 105. In the larger dishes, the accolades are usually more prominent in the decoration than in the edge itself.

[256] It is not entirely clear to me whether the foreground of that landscape represents a stretch of water with high waves, or an undulating landscape.

[257] As Eric Jan Sluijter suggested, personal communication, January 2009.

[258] With all due respect, I have never succeeded to make sense out of the 'composition sketches' Segal included in exhibition cat. UTRECHT/BRUNSWICK 1991, such as the one concerning cat. no. A 065 on p. 137 (fig. 7a).

[259] Interestingly, the large luxury still life by Andries Benedetti in the Szépmüveszéti Muzeum (inv. no. 255), which will be discussed below, has a similar construction of the background that runs substantially higher up.

[260] Theoretically, taking the central axis into account, we could speak of a vertical division into four equal parts, but considering the object density, I prefer to see it as 1:2:1.

[261] See catalogue.

[262] Cf. DUVERGER 2002, p. 210, no. 4063.

[263] The fact that the way in which the blackamoor holds the bunch of grapes is strongly reminiscent of emblems representing virginity (cf. exhibition cat. AMSTERDAM 1976, cat. no. 6, figs. 6a and 6b) is probably purely coincidental, even though the juxtaposition of this hand and the monkey, a well-known symbol of vice and lust (and grasping his bunch of grapes very irreverently) might suggest otherwise.

[264] ROMBOUTS/VAN LERIUS 1872, Vol. 2, p. 114, 121.

[265] Oil on canvas, 168 x 240 cm, signed lower right A. Benedetti Fe: and on the lid of the jug: AB fe. Budapest Szépmüvészeti Muzeum, inv. no. 255 (EMBER 2011, cat. no. 4, colour ill.).

[266] Oil on canvas, 122 x 139 cm, Vienna, Kunsthistorisches Museum, inv. no. 5663.

[267] ROMBOUTS/VAN LERIUS 1872, pp. 146, 153, 165, 172, 298.

[268] The painting was auctioned by Bonhams, London, 4 July 2012, lot 37, but apparently remained unsold.

[269] De Coninck's still life: Oil on canvas, 136,5 x 170 cm, signed, formerly J.Paul Getty Museum, Los Angeles, inv. no. 78.PA.218, sold Sotheby's, New York, 26 January 2007, lot 132, colour ill.

[270] The largest (o/c, 121 x 173 cm), here fig. A 22, was published in exhibition catalogues LONDON 1990 (p. 16) and MAASTRICHT 1992 (2) (no p. no.), as dated 1643. Previously it had been included in sale London, Christie's, 10 July 1981, lot 102, as dated ..63 and in GREINDL 1983, p. 359, no. 9, as dated 1663, which is certainly incorrect. A smaller example (o/c, 83 x 119 cm) is in the Museum Van der Keelen Mertens in Louvain, where it is catalogued as dated 1632; GREINDL 1983, p. 359 quotes the latter date as 1652, but on an excellent photo (KIK-IRPA B176101) I read the signature and date as : [Joh]annes van den/ [He]cke fecit 1643/ .. 4 octob.. Another example, similar in type and size (o/c, 76 x 95 cm), with P. de Boer, Amsterdam, 1956, is dated 1645. The latter two are in fact substantially smaller than de Heem's luxury still lifes and fall outside of this category from this point of view.

[271] Budapest, Szépmüvészeti Muzeum, inv. no. 53.434, oil on canvas, 78,5 x 98 cm. The painting was probably reduced substantially on all sides. In the front appears to have been a still life that includes the exact same large shell as de Heem's still life from 1642 (cat. no. A 065) and like that painting it has a modest bouquet of pink roses in the centre of the still life and a tall lemon peel hanging down in front of the table. It was attributed to Jan Frans van Son until I recognized it as van der Hecke's work in 1985 (EMBER 2011, cat. no. 36, colour ill.).

[272] Oil on canvas, 118 x 169,5 cm, with signature, lower left: DE HEEM F. London, Wallace Collection, inv. no. p 76. The painting was traditionally catalogued as by Jan Dz. de Heem and included in INGAMELLS 1992, pp. 140, 141, as attributed to Jan Jz. de Heem, following a suggestion by Sam Segal from 1990.
[273] Oil on canvas, 221 x 310 cm, signed and dated 1642. Madrid, Museo del Prado, inv. no. 1852.
[274] Oil on canvas, 185 x 242,5 cm, signed and dated 1642. Amsterdam, Rijksmuseum, inv. no. SK-C-301, see exhibition cat. AMSTERDAM / CLEVELAND 1999/2000, cat. no. 42, colour ill.
[275] Compare, for instance, an example in the collection of the J. Paul Getty Museum, Los Angeles, inv. no. 69.PA.13, oil on canvas, 116,8 x 249 cm, signed and dated 1650.
[276] Leipzig, Museum der bildenden Künste, inv. no. 1627, signed, oil on canvas, 134,5 x 171,5 cm. Another example, oil on canvas, 113 x 164 cm, was with Salomon Lilian, Amsterdam, cat. 2000, no. 2, colour ill., incorrectly attributed to A. Benedetti. In 1916, the painting had been auctioned as a work of Adriaen van Utrecht, the attribution to Benedetti was first suggested in 1971. My attribution to Gillemans stems from 1985.
[277] Netherlands Institute for Cultural Heritage (ICN), inv. no. NK 2388, oil on canvas, 116 x 167 cm. The painting was attributed to de Heem until 1984, when I recognized it as a work by Joris van Son.
[278] Oil on canvas, 118 x 170 cm. GRITSAY & BABINA 2008, p. 344, no. 410, colour ill.
[279] Inv. no. 1961.003. The painting was bought from Thomas Agnew & Sons in London in 1961, as a work of Cornelis de Heem, which attribution it carried until recently.
[280] The painting in fig. A 25, formerly in the Heinz Family Collection (exhibition cat. WASHINGTON/BOSTON 1989, cat. no. 26, colour ill.) and another, oil on canvas, 130,2 x 176,8 cm, with traces of signature, last seen in public in sale New York, Sotheby's, 27 January 2006, lot 246, colour ill.
[281] In 1998, the painting turned up in an auction at Bukowskis, Stockholm, with an attribution to Alexander Coosemans. On 17th December of that year it was auctioned at Sotheby's, London, lot 38, colour ill., properly attributed to Marrel.
[282] BRUNNER-BULST 2004, cat. nos. 167 (art market, dated to *c*.1648) and 206 (Wallraf-Richartz Museum, Cologne, dated 1653).
[283] Oil on canvas, 180 x 230 cm, and as such larger than any of de Heem's large luxury still lifes.
[284] Madrid, Museo del Prado, inv. nos. 2091 and 2093. DÍAZ PADRÓN 1975, pp. 23, 24, ill. pl. 12, 13, as by A. Benedetti.
[285] Madrid, Museo del Prado, inv. no. 2092. DÍAZ PADRÓN 1975, p. 24, ill. pl. 13. Due to its present location I have not had the opportunity to study it in person, but judging from a good photo the attribution to Benedetti, first suggested by M. Diaz Padron during the 1970s, appears to be convincing, in contrast with the attribution of the other two in which I am unable to recognize Benedetti's hand.
[286] See DENUCÉ 1931.
[287] At the time of inspection, in 2000, the painting was very dirty and difficult to read. It was offered as by 'Jan Davidsz. de Heem and studio'. The execution of the grapes and vine in particular would appear to differ from de Heem's, but this may be due in part to later retouching, rather than to involvement of another hand in the initial stage of the painting.
[288] ARA 1990, pp. 2 and 3.
[289] ARA 1990, p. 13. Perhaps he had initially planned a landscape view in the background.
[290] For a while, it was attributed to Jan van den Hecke I (see catalogue for provenance data). Also, the painting appears to have lost some glazes locally, particularly in the grapes, which complicates judgment of it.
[291] With thanks to Carla van de Puttelaar who joined me in the inspection in the reserves of the museum in July 2010.
[292] The porcelain bowl, however, is an unusual motif that does not appear to return similarly in any other work.
[293] The composition distinctly feels cramped to the right – compare, for instance cat. nos. A 089 and particularly A 095 – while cutting off the rim of the porcelain bowl is also not in keeping with de Heem's aesthetics. When inspecting the painting, I noted that the background has been largely repainted. In most, if not all of his still lifes that include such baskets, de Heem has painted a branch of leaves hovering over it, but in the present condition no evidence is visible that such a branch was painted out, here.
[294] Probably the painting was cropped all around, particularly at the top (the tall wine glass is cut off by the edge of the painting) and to the left and right, but probably by no more than a few centimetres and not to the extent that the character of the image changed completely. Unfortunately, the painting has not been preserved in optimal condition. There is some abrasion and retouching in several areas (the background, tall glass, foliage and peaches), while some highlights, particularly those on the grapes, appear to have been added.

[295] The shell of the same type shown in a still life from the following decade, cat. no. A 175 (Wallace Collection), appears to be a different specimen. In this painting, it stands out rather strongly, probably because it contains white, while the areas around it have darkened quite substantially.
[296] He was obviously not working from existing studies, since the rendering and shape of the fruit differs in each individual painting. Interestingly, the inventory of Joseph Coijmans and Jacobe Trip, recorded in Haarlem, 19th August 1678 (BIESBOER 2002), includes a 'Granaet appel' by de Heem. No extant painting by de Heem includes a pomegranate so prominently that its title could be derived from it .
[297] Oil on canvas, 107 x 164 cm. Musée de Brou, Bourg-en-Bresse inv. no. 853.4, see exhibition cat. LYON/BOURG-EN-BRESSE/ROANNE 1992, p. 371, ill., as attributed to J. van Son (previously attributed to A. van Beijeren).
[298] Which, in its turn, is another indication that Gillemans trained under de Heem for some time during the first half of the 1640s.
[299] See references in the catalogue under cat. no. A 073.
[300] I inspected the painting, which is in a Dutch private collection, in March 2010. There can be no doubt that it is seventeenth century and quite possibly from the 1640s. There is some restoration: the 'leaf' in front of the silver cup to the right is a misinterpretation of existing remains by the restorer. There is no indication that this copy ever included a view to the left.
[301] I have not (yet) had the opportunity to inspect the painting itself, but judging from good photos, it is clear that the lemon (which has become somewhat transparent) and the changes to the leaf were added as afterthoughts, while shades in the background behind the parrot appear to indicate the remains of a window sill and clouds.
[302] I only know the painting from the somewhat unsharp old photo reproduced here. The overall quality would appear to be that of de Heem himself and justifies inclusion here.
[303] I know the painting, apart from the rather poor sale catalogue illustration from 1955, from a good photo. It appears to have suffered, particularly in the right foreground. The poorly painted snail at lower right was certainly not executed by de Heem himself.
[304] Judging from the photo. Its whereabouts are unknown and I have not had an opportunity to inspect it in person.
[305] The handling, moreover, appears to be not dissimilar to other de Heem landscape backgrounds, but on the other hand its placement looks a little cramped. A somewhat liberal copy attributed to Theodoor Smits (active around 1657-1659) omits the window and has a strictly horizontal format (oil on panel, 37,5 x 46,7 cm, Hamburg, Kunsthalle, inv. no. 369).
[306] The same halved peach appears in cat. nos. A 161, 068, and 075, as well as in the large luxury still life from 1642, cat. no. A 065.
[307] Fred G. Meijer in CAT. LILIAN 2008, no. 9, pp. 32-33, colour ill.
[308] The execution of the column and that of the drapery in particular are very rudimentary and without depth or texture. Perhaps an early owner thought it too empty and decided to have made to look more like a 'proper' de Heem luxury still life. When writing my entry on the painting for MEIJER 2003, I failed to observe that the drapery and column are probably later additions.
[309] Gammelbo (1960) associated the painting with de Heem's still life from 1652 in Copenhagen. While the subject matter of both paintings is similar, we must conclude on the basis of style and handling that they are certainly not of the same date, however.
[310] It would be interesting to have the painting examined with IRR, which might reveal preparatory work. In any case, there are some visible changes in the poses of the central figures. Apparently the drapery to the left initially continued down to the floor, but Teniers appears to have shortened it to be able to show more of the dog. This would imply that Teniers also painted the lower part of the basket at lower left.
[311] A variant of the composition from the period, but by a much lesser hand, is in a private Dutch collection (o/p, 35,5 x 40,5 cm). It omits the vase of flowers and the apricot, but includes a wine glass in which a lemon peel is draped.
[312] See biography, p. 26.
[313] On the other hand, de Heem rarely worked on copper, so it can barely have been difficult to distinguish this copper plate from other supports he had in stock, so perhaps it was indeed Casspeel himself who marked it with his name.
[314] Inspection of the reverse of the panel might reveal data on its original shape. The only still life I know that is thematically reminiscent of it is a painting by Abraham van Beijeren from about 1650 – so at least some five years later – of a garland of flowers hanging over a niche that holds a wreathed rummer, in front of which there

is a still life of a lobster, a nautilus shell, grapes and a columbine cup lying on its side (o/c, 105 x 95 cm, signed with monogram, private collection, see BUIJSEN 1998, p. 99, colour ill.).
[315] COUVREUR 1967. Of the 239 paintings that Seghers lists, the numbers 11- 28 are or must be works painted in Rome (so 1625-1627), while only the first ten were apparently painted before that sojourn (i.e. between 1614 and 1625).
[316] See also the discussion further on, pp. 221-222, about Jan van Huysum's additions to de Heem's painting now in the National Gallery of Art in Washington DC (cat.no. 63-72.08b).
[317] An interesting precedent, however, is Adriaen van Nieulandt's vanitas still life with a bouquet that was later cut down, see F.G. Meijer, 'Not Ambrosius Brueghel (1617-1675), but Adriaen van Nieulandt (1587-1658); a mutilated image of Vanity', *Oud Holland* 109 (1995), pp. 158-164. Van Nieulandt's painting does not include fruit, however. Possibly during the 1640s, Joannes Fijt painted a floral bouquet with a skull at the foot of the vase, oil on canvas, 85 x 53 cm, signed, private collection, U.S.A.
[318] Transcribed after the earliest version. The inscription on the Munich painting reads 'Maer naer d'Alderschoonste Blom/ daer en siet' men niet naer'om,'.
[319] S. Segal in exhibition cat. UTRECHT /BRUNSWICK 1991, p. 193. 'In het dagelijks leven schijnt men niet om te zien naar de door hen gesymboliseerde geestelijke waarden en de nadruk te leggen op het materiële'.
[320] With thanks to Eric Jan Sluijter for suggesting this straightforward interpretation.
[321] The case of the watch differs from those rendered by de Heem during the 1640s (with a straight side) but also from the rather bulky case Verendael included in some of his still lifes (cf. for instance an example from 1674 in Montpellier, BUVELOT/HILAIRE/ZEDER 1998, cat. no. 62, colour ill.).
[322][322] See also below, p. 154-155.
[323] DE MEYERE 2015, pp. 65 and 268, in my view incorrectly argues that the painting is a copy. The accuracy and fluency with which many of the details have been painted (the perfect shape and sharpness of the pewter plate, the elegance of the onion's thin roots, of the herring's intestines draped over the edge of the plate, and that of the branches) betray de Heem's own hand, just like the beautifully calligraphed signature and date, which leave nothing to be desired. The 'pasty layer of brown, which is strange' (De Meyere, p. 65, note 32) is in fact a common feature in Antwerp panels. It is a (now dirty, and thus brownish) layer of gesso protecting the painting from the effect of moisture and it appears to have been used particularly for paintings destined for export.
[324] The date is somewhat indistinct, but it appears to be the same type of 5, slanted backwards, as on the painting in Ghent.
[325] The Dutch text runs: "Soo vermomt Bacchus de oogen/ Soo met druijven so met groen;/ Soo heeft hij veel bedroogen/ Die geen oogen open doen/ [signed:] T liefslijck [?]. Perhaps de Heem copied an existing text here, but if so, I have not succeeded to identify its source. The 'signature' of the inscription is confusing: 'lieflijck' would be 'lovely', but with the added s between 'lief and 'lijck' the second part could be read as 'slijck', which is 'mud', which might suggest a *double entendre*. Perhaps, however, the s is simply included as connection between the two parts. The spelling 'lief'lijck' (for 'liefelijck') does occur in seventeenth-century Dutch.
[326] See also my discussion of the painting in MEIJER 2003, pp. 24-25.
[327] With thanks to Eric Jan Sluijter for suggesting this interpretation.
[328] FRITZSCHE 2010, pp. 226 (note 451), 227 (note 454) also observed this, referring to cat. no. A 186 (Vienna).
[329] Unfortunately the painting has suffered to some degree under relining and wear, which makes its judgment more difficult than average.
[330] The same cup-and-cover appears to return in some still lifes from after 1660, such as A 199, 209, 224, 225 and 261. It may be that de Heem retained the cup as a studio prop and did not use it between 1649 and ca. 1663, but perhaps for the later works he reused studies he had produced in the 1640s. As usual, de Heem renders the object with some artistic freedom, adding on or leaving out details in benefit of the effect in the final image.
[331] On the other hand, the differences may be due to the fact that A 078 is on panel and well preserved (judging from the photo), while A 089 has suffered somewhat and is on canvas.
[332] When the painting first appeared on the market in 1998, it bore a date 1647 after the signature. In subsequent cleaning, that date vanished. While (1644 or) 1645 is quite possible as date of execution for this painting, 1647 is certainly too late.
[333] Since its paint layers have become somewhat transparent, the finished windowsill and landscape under it have become somewhat visible again.
[334] On this cup-and-cover, see also above, note 330.

[335] Cup screws occur in de Heem's oeuvre at irregular intervals and he appears to have employed various models. Virtually the same object as the one shown here also is found in cat. nos. A 091, 095, and 111. Like with other such objects, de Heem appears to have varied their details at will, rather than to have used examples with detachable parts, a practice suggested by Segal in exhibition cat. DELFT/CAMBRIDGE/FORT WORTH 1988/9, p. 195 (see also note 253).
[336] In cat. nos. A 104, 138, and 190, but rendered very differently in the latter. When he wanted to feature a nut in its peel, de Heem appears to have preferred the chestnut with is prickly skin.
[337] With more emphasis on the white lines in the flesh.
[338] The confusion that arose about the attribution of this painting when it came up for auction in Amsterdam in November 1986 was the incentive for me to start to concentrate on Jan Davidsz. de Heem in order to bring clarity in the confusing amalgam of works featured under his name in museums and in private hands.
[339] In cat. nos. A 104, and 112, and once more in cat. no. A 188.
[340] Already in the sale of the collection of J. Wubbels, Amsterdam, 16 July 1792, lot 153, the painting was presented as a work of Jan Dz. de Heem (sold 15 guilders 10 stuivers to A. Barends).
[341] The painting was auctioned from the property of James Simon, Berlin, Lepke, 29 November 1932, lot 36, and subsequently with Kunsthandlung Abels, Cologne, Summer 1939, on both occasions as by Cornelis de Heem.
[342] For such a glass, I prefer the general term 'rummer'. The shape with a conical cuppa and thorn-shaped appliques on the stem is often called 'berkemeier' in the literature, but I prefer to stick to that term only for rummers with a conical cuppa, thorn appliques and a 'pearly' stand, not a foot of a spiral glass thread. On the subject, see BRONGERS & WIJNMAN 1968.
[343] A small example from 1646, cat. no. A 102, certainly appears to suggest a shallow niche in the back wall on the left half of the image. The shadows clearly suggest a round (hollow) surface. The same effect can be found in cat. no. A 120, in Karlsruhe.
[344] Interestingly, de Heem already included non-flat back walls in some of his earliest still lifes such as cat. nos. A 003, 007 and 014, but subsequently apparently abandoned such details for more than a decade.
[345] See the discussion of Verendael's work on it above, pp. 127-129.
[346] Unfortunately, cat. no. A 098 is only known to me through a (very good) black and white photo, so I am unable to make any remarks concerning the palette. I would be very surprised if it turned out to divert much from that of cat. no. A 097, however.
[347] This may be due to loss of some red and/or yellow lakes, which makes it look very bright and come forward as a result. The same goes for the peach below it, but to a somewhat lesser degree.
[348] The fact that it is shown from a different angle in each painting would point to the existence of several studies. De Heem seems to have included this particular ewer only in these two still lifes. Probably the same object appears in a still life I attributed to Jan Pauwel Gillemans, probably from about 1650 (o/c, 80 x 113 cm), last recorded in a private collection in Rome, *c*.1960, as by A. Leemans (photo at RKD, The Hague). A similar – but not the same – ewer can be found in still lifes attributed to Alexander Coosemans, offered at Sotheby's New York, 10 January 1991, lot 27, colour ill., and in Mannheim, Reiss-Museum der Stadt Mannheim.
[349] Unless Marrel copied the painting elsewhere and only finished and inscribed it in Utrecht, at that time his home town.
[350] The earliest known date, 1646, is on a still life in Leerdam, Hofje van Aerden, inv. no. 21.
[351] Both Jan and Julius Porcellis died before de Heem painted this work, in 1632 and 1645 respectively. Moreover, de Heem and father and son Porcellis never worked in the same town simultaneously, which makes the event of an actual collaboration unlikely. The attribution to Peeters is unconvincing from the point of view of style and handling. This is the only known painting by de Heem, however, in which the background view can properly be called 'a seascape'. On de Heem's capacities as a landscape painter, see also the discussion of a small landscape from *c*.1646 (cat. no. A 103) below, as well as MEIJER 2013 (passim).
[352] See the reference under remarks in the catalogue. Churches and/or boats appear more often in de Heem's background views, cf. cat. nos. A 065, A 071.
[353] A similar tazza already appeared in cat. nos. A 051 and A 085; the one in cat. no. A 105 differs slightly, but may derive from the same object. The tazza in cat. no. A 110 shows similarities, but appears not to be the same object, while the tazza in cat. no. A 134 is most likely a different object.
[354] In exhibition cat. UTRECHT /BRUNSWICK 1991, cat. no. 34, S. Segal attributed this painting and related others to Jan Jansz. de Heem, based on its relationship with, among other paintings, cat. no. A 054, for which Segal read the date as 1691, which made him conclude that it originated after Jan Dz. de Heem's death and consequently must be by his son Jan Jansz. de Heem. See also note 32.

[355] In LIEDTKE 2007, p. 316, the little painting in New York is dated to "probably [..] the late 1630s or about 1640", which is too early, in my view. Apart from stylistic features that place it in the mid-1640s, its signature, "J.De heem.f" is characteristic in spelling and calligraphy for this period. The spelling with capital D and under-case h first occurs in 1638 (cat. no. A 047, indistinct), but until the mid 1640s the calligraphy is more curly and elaborate. See also Appendix 2, signatures.

[356] On the Museum's website, www.fitzmuseum.cam.ac.uk, consulted September 2010, the late 1650s are proposed as date of origin, which is definitely far too late. Sam Segal, in exhibition cat. UTRECHT /BRUNSWICK 1991, p. 198 (note 2), suggested that this still life was painted by Jan Jansz. de Heem, so in the late 17th century. Earlier, Claus Grimm (GRIMM 1988, pp. 228, 230) had suggested Alexander Coosemans as its author. Neither attribution holds any ground, in my view; there is no reason whatsoever to deny Jan Davidsz. de Heem's authorship.

[357] In its present shape, the diagonals of the picture plane do not in any way match up with compositional lines. Looking for a compositional diagonal in the image, we find that one runs from upper right, across the top of the cluster of vine leaves, crosses between the two lemons and is guided further down by the shrimp's back. The original lower left corner, following this line, would have been some 14 centimeters to the left of the present one. The resulting opposing diagonal, from upper left to lower right, is somewhat less obvious, but it follows the oblique lines in the right-hand fig in the tazza and in the pomegranates and crosses the other diagonal where the window sill and the fruit on the tazza intersect.

[358] Since the painting appeared in 1932 and has disappeared since, I unfortunately only know it from a black-and-white photo which, however, is of good quality.

[359] The black-and-white photo suggest a rather monochrome palette.

[360] Since this little landscape was done on panel, it is unlikely that it is a fragment of a larger composition, such as cat. nos. A 101 and 104, which have generally been painted on canvas.

[361] HOLLSTEIN Vol. 55, pp. 179, 181, ill.

[362] According to Denucé 1932, pp. 338-340 (Inventaris van alle goederen competerende den sterffhuyse van wylen Heer Jan van Weerden, in syn leven Riddere Heer van Blocqlant overleden op 25 April 1686, des nachts om twee uren), Jan Baptist van Weerden owned two pieces with snakes by Ellias van den Broeck, Een stuck fruytagie (a fruit piece), by de Heem, as well as paintings by (Joris) van Son, (Jan) van Kessel, many works by (Nicolaes van) Verendael, (Gaspar Peeter) Verbruggen (the Elder or the Younger), (Jacob Melchior) van (H)Erck, (Daniel) Seghers, in all a large collection of flower paintings and still lifes.

[363] In a private discussion with Belgian optician Koen de Groeve, May 2012, he suggested that in 1647 de Heem's vision may have started to decline (he was about 41 years old at the time) which caused a less refined handling. After 1647, de Groeve suggested, de Heem will have found (a) proper lens(es) to enhance his vision, resulting in a returning refinement in his handling some time during 1648.

[364] All three (old) copies (see catalogue) show at least a large part of the construction. The background appears to have been very well preserved in the right half of the painting. There is some thinness in the entire background on the left half.

[365] See the paragraph on bricks and nails above.

[366] I only know the painting from a rather good photo from *c.*1937 (when it was with Guy Stein, Paris) in the collection of the RKD. There is no mention of a signature and I have not found one on the photo. In view of the strong similarities of several details, as mentioned, I give the attribution the benefit of the doubt.

[367] Unfortunately the state of preservation of this painting is far from ideal, mainly due to abrasion and too much heat during relining in the past. Also, it has probably been reduced somewhat on all sides. On the whole, however, the painting does show many distinct traces of de Heem's autograph quality.

[368] A very similar, but more elaborately decorated ewer appear in still lifes by Joris van Son (cf. exhibition cat. DELFT/CAMBRIDGE/FORT WORTH 1988/9, cat. no. 46, colour plate on p. 163). That or another similar example also appears in a dated still life from 1655 by Jan Pauwel Gillemans the Elder, last seen in sale Bukowskis, Stockholm, 30 October 1990.

[369] Ben Broos (BROOS & SCHAPELHOUMAN 1993, p, 97) opinionated that the figure studies on the reverse of the various drawings are not by one hand.

[370] The painting , oil on canvas, c. 110 x 140 cm, is in a private British collection. I only know it from snapshots, which suggest that it is a studio work or a period copy.

[371] See provenance data in the catalogue.

[372] The absence of decoration on the other version, cat. no. A 106, does not appear to be due to discolouring. There are no traces of decoration to be found on the white whatsoever.

[373] The brown-red casket in cat. no. A 112 is an exception.

[374] I date cat. no. A 118 to 1648 on the basis of stylistic comparison with de Heem's other paintings from the period, in particular cat. A 116, which is dated. The date would appear to fit as well for the oeuvres of the other collaborators. In any case the larger part of painting must have been finished before March 1651, when Gerard Seghers died. Cornelis de Vos died in May of that year.
[375] Transcription from BERGER 1883.
[376] BERGER 1883, p. 125, no. 183.
[377] The columns (by C. de Vos??) and the Madonna and angels (by G. Seghers) appear to have been finished before the flowers and fruit were inserted, but the designs for the garlands and festoons had already been prepared in the ground layers, so the artists must have worked in close collaboration.. The weaponry by Paul de Vos could have been done before or after de Heem's contribution; the two do not overlap. Teniers' contribution, the battle scene to the right and the scene with the Archangel Michael to the left, appear to have been done on top of the dark background, so it is feasible that Teniers added them after he was appointed court painter, perhaps out of his own initiative, rather than at the request of Leopold Wilhelm.
[378] The inscription (see below) also suggests that it was intended for the Archduke, however, that inscription may have been added after the painting had entered his collection.
[379] It is interesting to note that the host in J.A. van de Baren's Eucharist painting for Leopold Wilhelm (Vienna, Kunsthistorisches Museum, inv. no. 549) is virtually identical to that in the De Heem. Van der Baren, who was the archduke's court chaplain and court painter, may well have borrowed it from the de Heem.
[380] A. van Utrecht, a garland of fruit, oil on panel, 53 x 73,5 cm, signed and dated 1634. Last seen in sale The Hague, Vendue Huis, 24/26 April 2002, lot 326, colour ill.
[381] In Seghers' painting, they may well be the work of Thomas Willeboirts Bosschaert, who certainly painted the statue of the Virgin and Child, and this may also be the case for de Heem's painting. As I indicated above, de Heem and Willeboirts Bosschaert were probably friends.
[382] The inscription is clearly related to a text in Vergil's *Georgica*. However, Virgil used the name Liber instead of Bacchus and employed a different construction of the sentence: "Vos, o clarissima mundi lumina, labemtem caelo quae ductis annum, Liber et alma Ceres […]" . In Joost van den Vondel's translation of the *Georgica* from 1646, the sentence runs "O Bacchus en voedtzaeme Ceres, die door uwe klaerheit de weerelt verlicht" (see http://www.dbnl.org/tekst/vond001dewe06_01/vond001dewe06_01_0018.htm, retrieved 5 March 2008). Thus, curiously, the inscription on de Heem's painting would appear to be a translation back into Latin of Vondel's Dutch translation, rather than a direct quote from Virgil.
[383] See HOUTZAGER 1967, pp. 178, 179.
[384] It may be that the tazza, too, belonged to the consigner and that de Heem made several studies of it, one of which he used for the Boijmans painting. If owned by the consigner, the ewer would have been to specific an object to reuse in another still life, while the tazza is a less conspicuous object.
[385] In this respect, also see the remark in note 363.
[386] Without the putti, it returns in cat. no. A 188.
[387] The fact that this painting is extremely well preserved adds to its overall appearance of quality and refinement.
[388] The painting in Edinburgh is also better preserved than cat. no. A 126. Particularly the black grapes in A 126 have suffered.
[389] A difference in appearance is also caused by the fact that the Edinburgh still life has been enlarged at a later date by about 3,5 centimeters. In the illustrations here I have chosen to leave out the addition in order to give a better impression of the original painting.
[390] The bunch of grapes and its leaf are also close in modeling and handling to the grapes in the porcelain dish in cat. no. A 132 in Vaduz, which fits best among work from 1651, while the rendering of the fig is close to that of cat. no. A 133.
[391] This does not include a dragonfly, but it does include snails and several insects, such as bugs, grasshoppers and butterflies. A somewhat similar dragonfly can be found at upper left in cat. no. A 129.
[392] Unfortunately, I only know the painting from the illustration in the 1961 Paris auction catalogue reproduced here.
[393] Compare, for instance, a painting signed and dated 1644, oil on copper, 88 x 767,5 cm, Hermitage, St. Petersburg, inv. no. 8482, one signed, oil on panel, 77 x 53,5 cm, Tokyo, National Museum of Western Art, inv. no. P.1981-003 and one signed, oil on canvas, 112,5 x 94 cm, Worcester Museum of Art, Worcester MA, inv. no. 1966.37. See also the discussion of cat. no. A 116, above.
[394] I have not found them in the works of other artists for whom Quellinus worked, such as Daniel Seghers. Only in a signed painting by Jan Philips van Thielen, undoubtedly excecuted with Quellinus, I have found them, in

fact with the same pair of angels as in cat. no. A 131: oil on canvas signed and indistinctly dated by van Thielen, probably painted *c*. 1650, Sale London, Sotheby's, 1 April 1992, lot 53, colour ill.
[395] In his entry on p. 340 in exh. cat. VIENNA/ESSEN 2002, on de Heem's painting from 1651 (cat. no. A 138), W. Prohaska suggested that these works, too, could represent the Eucharist.
[396] As noted above, the date on the painting has always been recorded as 1650, but upon inspection the last digit turned out to be virtually illegible, so a slightly later date should not fully be ruled out. The rosebud to the left reappears in a dated vanitas still life from 1652 in Prague, cat. no. A 156.
[397] A copy of cat. no. A 131 (Sale London, Christie's, 10 July 1987, lot 17, colour ill.) was incorrectly attributed to G. de Vries, just as its companion (cat. no. 16, also illustrated in colour), which is closer in composition to the Cambridge painting (with more room above the stone cartouche), but of a lesser quality of execution.
[398] For an explanation of the painting's iconography, see W. Prohaska in exh. cat. VIENNA/ESSEN 2002, pp. 340 (cat. no. 119).
[399] For the suggestion that the symbolism might include that of the Eucharist, see the remarks above concerning cat. no. A 129, including note 177.
[400] S. Segal in exh. cat. UTRECHT /BRUNSWICK 1991, p. 146, described it as glass in the *façon de Vénise*, but the green glass as well as the style suggest that this is German *Waldglas*, possibly from the Spessart region.
[401] See exh. cat. UTRECHT /BRUNSWICK 1991, p. 147, 148 (notes 4-7) for further references.
[402] VAN HOOGSTRATEN 1678, vol. 5, chapter 4, p. 186.
[403] S. Segal in exh. cat. UTRECHT /BRUNSWICK 1991, p. 148. He goes on to suggest that de Heem's image is reflected upside-down in both glasses: too much turns the world upside-down. I fail to see any such reflection or to understand de Heem's reasoning if that was indeed his intention.
[404] The inscription "MODICUM ET BONUM" on cat. no. A 143, to be discussed further on, judging from the old photo, must be a later addition and as such not expressing de Heem's intentions.
[405] To be precise: cat. nos. A 133, 134, 136, 146, 147, 151, and 187.
[406] The one illustrated here was with Kunsthandel Hoogsteder & Hoogsteder, The Hague, 2002, the second in sale Christie's, London, 7 July 2000, lot 123, colour ill. A third version, probably also by van Deynum is only known from the poor reproduction in the catalogue of sale Bukowski's, Stockholm, 5 November 1958, lot 221.
[407] Cat. no. A 144, copy a, oil on panel, 54,5 x 42,5 cm, signed, private collection, Belgium, see Exhibition TAICHUNG 1988, cat. no. 57, colour ill. Another copy of this composition, on the art market in 1990 as by J. Hannot, may also be the work of van Deynum (copy b).
[408] Compare RINALDI 1989, pp. 78, 79, pl. 53, 54.
[409] *Still life with dead game, a bronze mortar, porcelain and fruit*, oil on panel, 60 x 73 cm, formerly Collection W.R.J. Dreesmann, Amsterdam (by 1933), subsequently collection Mrs. Roelants, Vaduz, by Sept. 1969, when stolen (advertised in *Die Weltkunst*, 15 March 1970, p. 336, illustrated, as stolen on 23/24 September 1969).
[410] Snapshots were received from Koller auction house, Zurich, 5 November 2015.
[411] For such a suggestion, see exh. cat. DELFT/CAMBRIDGE/FORT WORTH 1988/9, p. 140.
[412] De Heem appears to have used the same study of oysters in cat. no. A 119, separating them, however.
[413] There is no reason to assume that cat. no. A 137 was reduced, however, and also the tables in both paintings point in the same direction and both have the highest spot in the composition on the right-hand half of the panel.
[414] If a copy, it may be the work of G. van Deynum.
[415] It also appears in what must be an even earlier painting that most probably originated in de Heem's studio, probably around 1645. The decoration of the jar varies somewhat in the three paintings, but appears to have been at least strengthened in all.
[416] Its decoration, at least on the lower half, was clearly based upon Chinese Wanli porcelain from the early 17th century, but the decoration on the shoulder of the vessel can certainly not have been inspired by such examples.
[417] The quite different appearance of the bunch in cat. no. A 162 appears to be due mainly to the rather over-cleaned condition of that part of the painting.
[418] The fact that the lemon in cat. no. A 155 is strongly reminiscent of a fat, smiling face, may very well be intentional.
[419] In exh. cat. AMSTERDAM/BRUNSWICK 1983, p. 76, S. Segal transcribed 'Menon' instead of 'Mensch', explaining that Menon was a Greek general who was defeated and who is the subject of one of Plato's dialogues. 'Mensch' (Man[or Mankind]) is much more logical in this context, however.
[420] S. Segal, in exh. cat. UTRECHT /BRUNSWICK 1991, pp. 185-186, has discussed these inscriptions extensively.

[421] See Segal, in exh. cat. UTRECHT /BRUNSWICK 1991, pp. 186, notes 9 and 10. Segal did not associate the grainy signature with the custom of using drying salt/sand.
[422] My transcription differs substantially from that by Segal in exh. cat. UTRECHT /BRUNSWICK 1991, pp. 186, note 2 (".. is .. syt/ .. goeds/ .. daer/ .. dienst .. oogh/ .. van .. gaen/ .. tijdt/ .. daer"). I read: "den .. ge[baar?]/ .. ee .. g[erechtig?] heijt/ .. d .. [gh]y sijt/ .. de[..] .. goede[n]/ .. de .. [pp]en ../ .. eer .. d .. daer/ .. ge[..] ../ laet ú oogh/ altijt gaen/ tot ú rechter/ o. want daer/ ghij eerst/mael quaemt/v .. daen/ J. d.de Heem.", and to the left of the scroll: " .. dienst o[p?]/ .. der daer ../ .. m[..] v op[?] gelet w[..]/ ..e[rt] godes we[tten]/ [zoude] plaetsen inde [g.] ú[..]". Connecting the sentences before and after the scroll seems to make little (additional) sense.
[423] As I had expected before inspecting the painting in detail. The handling is somewhat reminiscent of Cornelis de Heem's flowers from the 1670s.
[424] The painting may have been reduced slightly to the right, and perhaps at the top and bottom. Due to the fact that the panel has been shaved down and was transferred onto a new piece of board at some point during the twentieth century, inspection of the original back of the panel is impossible.
[425] Perhaps, however, the inversion remained unnoticed and the combination 'wine' and 'wreath' automatically recalled the term 'quality'.
[426] J.R. ter Molen recognized the silver dish as a work of Adam or Christiaen van Vianen from 1627, cf. TER MOLEN 1979, fig. 6.
[427] During the first half of the seventeenth century, Netherlandish artists such as Abraham Bloemaert, Claes van Heussen and Gommaert van der Gracht placed fruit and vegetables in a landscape, mostly in connection with a historical theme. Compare examples in the on-line database RKD*images*, respectively art work numbers 65800, 186291 and 117583 (consulted December 2012).
[428] Unfortunately, I only know that painting from the rather poor illustration in the 1967 sale catalogue, which suggests that it may very well be autograph. Final judgment is pending until inspection of the original is possible, however.
[429] MAGNUS 2012 categorically rejects the option that all paintings in this gallery were executed by the respective different artists without providing any proper arguments.
[430] The painting is dated in a cartouche above the fireplace, see WHITE 2007, p. 111.
[431] MAGNUS 2012, p. 45-46, sweeps my arguments for dating the painting to *c*.1654 (referring to http://www.rkd.nl/rkddb/dispatcher.aspx?action=search&database=ChoiceImages&search=priref=116509) off the table as 'unfounded', applying the same term to Ariane van Suchtelen's carefully argued conclusion (in VAN SUCHTELEN & VAN BENEDEN 2009) that the painting is the result of a collaboration of many artists. In Magnus' article I have searched in vain, however, for 'founded' arguments that the painting should be dated to 1659 and that it is the work of only two hands – and why the collaborator of de Formentrou must be identified specifically as Erasmus Quellinus. While the earlier suggestion that the painting was produced as a gift to the lawyer Jan van Baveghem in 1683 was rightly dismissed, no documents have been found that can shed light on the reasons for this collaboration, which most likely was the result of some special occasion. Magnus' conclusion that the painting is an allegory of connoisseurship is at most the form which it was given, certainly not its *raison d'être*.
[432] I have not had an opportunity to study cat. nos. A 164 and/or 165 in person.
[433] Judging from the rather poor photo at my disposal. Several emails to the museum inquiring after the painting have not prompted any reaction.
[434] The state of preservation of the three paintings is quite different and the quality and colour of the photos also differs, which makes a proper match visually difficult.
[435] The date of the still life in the Wallace collection (cat. no. A 175) is indistinct, but the last numeral is almost certainly a 3.
[436] The painting in Reims is the only one of the four grouped together in this paragraph that I have had the opportunity to view in person.
[437] I attributed the painting to Jan Dz. de Heem in 2010 on the basis of the excellent colour illustration in EGOROVA 1998.
[438] At some point, probably during the 1950s, the head of the herring was painted out, however. Probably it was considered as too confronting.
[439] Compare my entry in exh. cat. UTRECHT 2004, cat. no. 47, p. 315, on Joseph de Bray's *In praise of pickled herring* (Gemäldegalerie Alte Meister, Dresden, inv. no. 1407).
[440] It should not be excluded, however, that de Heem painted the bust himself. There is no reason to assume that he would not be capable of doing so.

[441] They appear, for instance already in paintings by Balthasar van de Ast from 1622 (see fig. ULA 7 and 8) and Adriaen van Utrecht from 1636 (fig. A 12). As early as 1612, Frans Francken the Younger prominently featured a pair of macaws in a painting of a cabinet of curiosities: https://rkd.nl/explore/images/52549 (retrieved April 2015).
[442] The handling of the landscape and the trees in the background appears to be too unspecific to assume that de Heem sought the assistance of a specialized landscape painter to execute it.
[443] Although rather far-fetched: the Dominican Friar Fransicus de Retza (died 1425) is quoted to have said that if a bird (a parrot) can say 'Ave' why could a woman not become pregnant after Gabriel's 'Ave' to her.
[444] See the remark in the catalogue, under cat. no. A 172.
[445] Among others by Renger in exh. cat. VIENNA/ESSEN 2002, p. 152.
[446] It may be, however, that the combination of bread and wine of whichever colour, prompted an association with the Eucharist to the average seventeenth-century viewer.
[447] Either as a symbol for the church or for Christ's wounds (see S. Segal in exh. cat. UTRECHT /BRUNSWICK 1991, p. 180 and C. Renger in exh. cat. VIENNA/ESSEN 2002, p. 152. Rengers reference is to Picinelli, whose *Mondo Symbolico*, was only first published in Italian in 1653 and as such unlikely to have been de Heem's source).
[448] The suggestion that de Heem would have been inspired by such relief in paintings by Gerard Dou (see S. Segal in exh. cat. UTRECHT /BRUNSWICK 1991, p. 179 and C. Renger in exh. cat. VIENNA/ESSEN 2002, p. 152) seems unfounded. Dou's reliefs have quite a different function, in my view.
[449] Exhibition UTRECHT /BRUNSWICK 1991, cat. no. 37, colour ill.
[450] Also discussed by S. Segal in exh. cat. UTRECHT /BRUNSWICK 1991, p. 199, fig. 35a.
[451] Upon inspection in 2007, I initially supported the painting's attribution to Jan Dz. de Heem, but had to reject that upon further study and comparison.
[452] See exh. cat. ANTWERP/THE HAGUE 2009/10, cat. no. 2 (fig. 70 on p. 107 an pp. 134-135), G. Coques, W. Schubert van Ehrenberg, J. Jordaens e.a., 1666, *Art Cabinet with ' Candaules and Gyges*', Staatsgalerie Neuburg an der Donau, inv. no. 896. This appearance may mean that a study of the tazzas was retained in the Antwerp studio.
[453] INGAMELLS 1992, p. 140 also mentions a reflection of the artist in the rummer, which I fail to see.
[454] S. Segal, in exh. cat. UTRECHT /BRUNSWICK 1991, pp. 153-155 (note 5), fig. 16b, under cat. no. 16, published cat. no. A 180 as copy after J. Dz. de Heem with a false signature. Segal incorrectly considered copy a (Aranjuez) as the original (p. 155, note 3).
[455] See MEIJER 2003, pp. 210, 211.
[456] On Pieter de Ring, see MOES 1888 and, with some additional information, TUCKER KINDER 1979.
[457] The report by Jan Alensoon (born 1680), the grandson of the patron in question, probably written in the early eighteenth century was quoted in MOES 1888, who claimed he had seen it in the Brussels Royal Library, but there it can not be traced nowadays.
[458] A still life with a ham and a Westerwald stoneware jug, oil on canvas, indistinctly signed and dated 1645 and marked with a ring, was offered at Christie's Amsterdam, 18 May 1988, lot 163, with colour illustration in the auction catalogue. A still life by Gerret Heda from 1646 (signed and dated, with David Koetser, Zurich, in 1991) had some fruit added to it by de Ring at a later date, probably in the mid-1650s. A large still life by Willem Claesz. Heda from about 1647 was also supplemented with fruit as well as with a back-drop curtain by de Ring in the 1650s. That painting was with Johnny van Haeften, London, in 1995.
[459] Signed and dated P. de Ring f. 1650, oil on canvas, 105,6 x 81,7 cm, Berlin, Staatliche Museen, cat. no. 918.
[460] The painting in Amsterdam: signed with a ring, oil on canvas, 100 x 85 cm, inv. no. SK-A-135; the one in Antwerp: signed and dated 1651, oil on canvas, 117 x 170 cm, Royal Museum of Fine Arts, inv. no. 659.
[461] The painting was included in exh. DELFT/CAMBRIDGE/FORT WORTH 1988/9, cat. no. 43, illustrated in colour.
[462] To the left and to the right 2 centimetres the original surface have been folded around the later stretcher (TRNEK 1992, p. 171). At the bottom, the composition appears to lack some breathing space.
[463] The vanitas connotations signalled by Trnek (1992), p. 174, are part of the general still-life image tradition rather than intentionally making up an intrinsic iconography specific to this painting.
[464] Trnek (1992), with assistance of M. Schenkevelt-van der Dussen, has attempted to identify the source for this poem without avail. She suggested that de Heem himself may have been its author, for or against which suggestion no evidence can be found.
[465] Oil on canvas, 131,5 x 199,5 cm, inv. no. GK 132 (SCHNACKENBURG 1996, Vol. 1, p. 325, as by Th. Willeboirts Bosschaert, Vol 2. Pl. 61).
[466] See KOSLOW 1999, pp. 188, 189, figs. 259-261.

[467] See Appendix 1, attestation of 1 March 1669.
[468] Unfortunately, I know this copy only from a black-and-white photo, which is , however, of excellent quality.
[469] Oil on panel, 54,4 x 41,2 cm, signed and dated C. DE HEEM ƒ. 1656. (upper right), most recently with Salomon Lilian, Amsterdam, 2003-2004.
[470] Oil on panel, 56,5 x 42 cm, signed and dated 'C. DE HEEM ƒ. 1656 (upper right), sale Sotheby's, London, 2 July 1986, lot 162, colour illustration.
[471] The grapes look somewhat pale, they may have lost some glazing of yellow lake in the past.
[472] Oil on canvas, 94 x 118 cm, signed and dated C.De.HEEM.ƒ.1657, inv. no. 708.
[473] Oil on canvas, 68 x 84 cm, signed and dated C.DE HEEM.ƒ.1658, inv. no. 721. Both this and the previous painting are included in the exhibition catalogue Frankfurt / Basel 2008/09, cat. nos. 76 and 82, with excellent colour illustrations and full-page details.
[474] The paint of the wall has grown somewhat transparent and an earlier arrangement is vaguely visible. In the urn with fruit (which in my view is not sculpted as B. Brinkmann suggested in exh. cat. FRANKFURT / BASEL 2008/09, p. 296) I recognize the hand of Jan Pauwel Gillemans the Younger (1651-1702), which would mean that it was probably added sometime around the 1680s in Antwerp.

Notes to **Antwerp-Utrecht 1656-1672** pp. 207-253

[475] For this and the following biographical data, see also the chapter on de Heem's biography, and Appendix 1 with a list of documents.
[476] Interestingly, Gillemans signed his copy without referring to de Heem as the composition's originator, in contrast with, for instance, Marrel's copies after cat. no. A 099 (copies a and b).
[477] With Richard Green Gallery. London, 1998. At that time I dated the painting to the first half of the 1650s, but in retrospect, in view of the comparisons made here, it must have been painted somewhat later, probably around 1658.
[478] These are among the relatively few rummers with egg-shaped cuppas that de Heem painted. The majority of rummers he depicted have conical cuppas, resulting in a different reflection of the studio windows. Cat. no. A 195, undoubtedly painted in Utrecht, shows a different configuration of the reflected windows. We must beware, however, of overestimating the significance of such features, since the artist must have worked from studies of individual objects most of the time and in Utrecht could well have used a study already produced Antwerp, showing a reflection of his Antwerp window.
[479] It is unlikely that cat. no. A 193 was the still life described as 'being the Four Elements' in the collection of Diego Duarte in 1682, since the description mentions fruit in the plural, while here only one orange is present.
[480] In exh. cat. Utrecht /Brunswick 1991, pp. 182-184.
[481] The caterpillars are not those of the red admiral butterfly, I have not succeeded to identify them.
[482] Taylor 1995, p. 112.
[483] S. Segal in UTRECHT/BRUNSWICK 1991, pp. 140-141, interpreted the orange as a symbol of the choice between good and evil, since, in his view, it can be seen as the fruit of the Tree of the Knowledge of Good and Evil from the Bible book Genesis. Segal assigned a distinct Christian symbolism to the painting.
[484] See also the remark concerning cat. no. A 180 (and A 182), on p. 197-198 in the previous chapter.
[485] Oil on canvas, 76 x 60 cm, Amsterdam, Rijksmuseum, inv. no. SK-A-269; KRAEMER-NOBLE 2007, cat. no. 39, incorrectly as Mauristhuis/Gallerij Willem V, The Hague.
[486] The copy in the Rijksmuseum, cat. no. A 230 copy a, has been considered as a copy off and on. In 1928, Ralph Warner (WARNER 1928, p. 96) commented: "The Museum Catalogue mentions this picture as probably being an old copy after the original signed one in the Dresden Gallery. This is difficult to believe, as the colour and finish especially in the vine leaves has the technique which is so characteristic of the Master". In VAN THIEL 1976, p. 263, it was still (or again) included as an autograph work. Segal in 1991, wrote: "Maar hoewel het een knappe kopie is, zijn er toch aanmerkelijke verschillen" (S. Segal in exh. cat. UTRECHT /BRUNSWICK 1991, p. 175), probably meaning with 'verschillen' differences in quality. Nevertheless, the painting is indeed a copy of high quality, painted with sensitivity and sensibility, but overall lacking the strength of the original.
[487] S. Segal, in exh. cat. UTRECHT /BRUNSWICK 1991, included the painting in Leipzig as the prime version (pp. 175, 176, cat. no. 25) and the Dresden original as an autograph variant (cat. no. 26). Comparing the paintings side by side during the exhibition, however, made it obvious that the Leipzig version is a copy. Already at that time, Segal suggested Jan Mortel as its possible author to the museum, which attribution was confirmed by revelation of the signature in subsequent cleaning.

[488] Compare a still life of fruit, signed and dated 1688 by Mortel, oil on panel, 63,2 x 51,8 cm, on the art market in about 2006-2014: https://rkd.nl/explore/images/191083 (retrieved August 2015).
[489] Oil on canvas, 87,5 x 72,5 cm, Brussels, Royal Museums of Fine Arts, inv. no. 3166. PAUWELS 1984, p. 134, still catalogued the painting as autograph, and S. Segal, in exh. cat. UTRECHT /BRUNSWICK 1991, pp. 175, 176 (note 1 and fig. 25b), also included it as by de Heem himself. In correspondence with the museum in 2000, I suggested that the painting must be a copy and the museum now holds it as 'circle of Jan Dz. de Heem': http://www.fine-arts-museum.be/nl/de-collectie/jan-davidsz-de-heem-omgeving-van-stilleven-met-kreeft?string=de+heem (retrieved August 2015).
[490] The painting in fig. AU 10 was submitted to me for judgment by Sotheby's New York in 1999. On the basis of photographs, I suggested that this might be de Heem's example for the Brussels painting, after which it was included as such in Sotheby's New York sale of 28 January 2000, lot 134, with colour ill. At the viewing of the auction, however, I had to conclude that this painting, too, is a copy, after which it was taken out of the sale. See also https://rkd.nl/explore/images/64633 (retrieved August 2015).
[491] KRAEMER-NOBLE 2007, cat. no. 2.
[492] A still life of flowers and fruit in a private collection, see exhibition cat. WASHINGTON 1999, p. 70, fig. 61.
[493] "… meer en meer in prys gesteigert hebben, zoo niet het overheerlyk konstpenceel van Juffr. R. Ruisch en J. van Huisum de natuur veel nader gekomen, en dusdanige voorwerpen meer luister had bygezet.". HOUBRAKEN first edition 1718/21, vol. 3, p 83.
[494] HOUBRAKEN 1753, vol. 3, p. 82, 83. Houbraken contradicted himself by claiming that Marrel had guided Mignon from the age of 7, however.
[495] KRAEMER-NOBLE 2007, p. 12.
[496] KRAEMER-NOBLE 2007, p. 31, curiously indicates Mignon's period of activity as "Mignon was no doubt active for a period of around 10 years between 1665 and 1678, perhaps for two or three years longer years [sic] at most."
[497] KRAEMER-NOBLE 2007, p. 18, 19, gives a rather inaccurate view, in my opinion, of Mignon's relationship with de Heem, stating that the younger artist only settled in Utrecht in 1669, which would have been the year of his registration in the Utrecht guild. That date is most probably not accurate and is only based on a secondary, eighteenth-century source (see my chapter on de Heem's biography, note 46).
[498] KRAEMER-NOBLE 2007 presents the paintings in subject groups and also within those she does not seem to have strived for any kind of chronological order. In her introductory text, she also does not suggest any chronology beyond the remark: "His style only altered in minimal nuances with a move towards a more graphic style, while still retaining a high degree of finish." (p. 31). On p. 32, she writes "In each category, the author has tried to show Mignon's evolution based on topics from de Heem and from other painters. Each painting is […] accompanied by an individual catalogue entry and a stylistic evaluation and attribution of date, where possible." She rarely goes further, however, than stating that a painting "can be dated to the late 1660s" (cat. no. 3), "can be dated to the period before 1670" (cat. no. 10, 38, 39), or "belongs to the 1670s" (cat. nos. 7, 8), or is "typical of Mignon's later works" (cat. no. 43). Under cat. no. 70, she summarizes a number of flower paintings, stating that "They date from between 1660 and 1670 when Mignon's and de Heem's work showed a similar stylistic approach" and under cat. no. 93: "Flower pieces of this kind [woodland scenes] were no doubt for the most part created between 1669 and 1672, during Jan (I) de Heem's stay in Utrecht, when Mignon probably shared his studio." Cat. no. 1 she calls "no doubt one of the earliest works known by Mignon", without furnishing a date. Only cat. no. 57 is dated specifically "around 1669", and cat. no. 65 "around 1670", while cat. no. 74 is described as a "flower piece from the late 1670s". For the vast majority, however, her entries do not include a suggestion for a date of origin. For none of Mignon's game still lifes a date is suggested.
[499] Oil on canvas, 34,5 x 29 cm, with an apocryphal signature 'J.D. De Heem f', KRAEMER-NOBLE 2007, pp. 44-45, cat. no. 1, colour ill. The signature is not visible on the excellent illustration in Kraemer-Noble's book (p. 45). In contrast with the museum she transcribes it in capital letters. She further mentions that the painting was originally smaller, 32 x 17,5 (sic) cm. Judging from the illustration, the canvas may have been enlarged by about a centimetre all around, so perhaps the original width was 27,5 cm.
[500] The first, oil on panel, 52 x 40 cm, KRAEMER-NOBLE 2007, no. 40, as whereabouts unknown; collection of the Prince of Liechtenstein, Vaduz, as by J.Dz. de Heem. The second, oil on panel, 40 x 32,5 cm, with monogram AM, was offered at Sotheby's New York, January 2014, lot 32, colour ill., as by Mignon and de Heem.
[501] The Mignon is KRAEMER-NOBLE 2007, cat. no. 10, with colour ill.
[502] KRAEMER-NOBLE 2007, cat. nos. 38, 35 and 34, respectively, all illustrated in colour.
[503] KRAEMER-NOBLE 2007, cat. no. 47, with colour ill.
[504] KRAEMER-NOBLE 2007, cat. no. 59, with colour ill.

[505] KRAEMER-NOBLE 2007, cat. no. 61, with colour ill.
[506] "Waarom zy ook ziende dat hare geneigtheid tot het schilderen van Bloemen, en ander stilstaande leven helde, voor zig een geagt en bekwaam Leermeester uitkoos, namentlyk Johan de Heem tot Utrecht" (Seeing that her love tended to painting flowers and still life, she chose herself a competent master, being Johan de Heem in Utrecht). HOUBRAKEN 1753, vol. 2, p. 215.
[507] Oil on canvas, 73 x 88,5 cm, signed and dated 1668, Vienna, Kunsthistorisches Museum, inv. no. 5714.
[508] http://explore.rkd.nl/explore/images/59308 (retrieved April 2015).
[509] http://explore.rkd.nl/explore/images/59092 (retrieved April 2015).
[510] In Dresden, the painting entered the collection in 1740, together with a still life of flowers of almost the exact same size (inv. no. 1334). It is not impossible that both paintings originated around the same time, even if not specifically as pendants. The flower painting would appear to belong to Maria's Amsterdam period, probably to the (early) 1670s.
[511] On this 'abklatsch' technique, see BEIER 1987and WEBER 1993.
[512] Exhibition cat. Utrecht/Brunswick 1991, under cat. no. 18, p. 158-159, includes an identification of the various motifs by Sam Segal.
[513] Diekamp 2001, p. 65 and fig. 13 on p. 99. For the print, see HOEFNAGEL 1592, Pars II, no. 7.
[514] KRAEMER-NOBLE 2007, cat. nos. 93, 94 and 95.
[515] In an earlier phase of my research, I had consequently dated this painting earlier, to the second half of the 1650s, which dating was adopted by Frits Duparc in his entry on the painting in DUPARC 2011.
[516] The yellow rose, originally painted with orpiment, has faded (as usual) and was poorly restored, which detonates in the otherwise excellent state of preservation of the painting.
[517] MEIJER 2003, cat. no. 57, colour pl. 67 and KRAEMER-NOBLE 2007, cat. no. 72, colour ill.
[518] Oil on canvas, 98,1 x 78,1 cm, signed, Private collection, KRAEMER-NOBLE 2007, cat. no. 73, colour ill. Kraemer-Noble designates it as in "Mignon's later style". This is incorrect, in my view, due to its close connection with the Oxford bouquet (fig. AU 26) – for which she does not suggest a date – and due to the strong dependence and possible collaboration of de Heem on this painting.
[519] Oil on canvas, 88 x 68 cm, signed, inv. no. 1556, KRAEMER-NOBLE 2007, cat. no. 66, colour ill.
[520] The second, oil on panel, 46,7 x 35,9 cm, private collection, KRAEMER-NOBLE 2007, cat. no. 77, colour ill.
[521] Not counting cat. no. A 194, of which the signature is an imitation of handwriting on the letter at lower right, and which can be read as 'J D.De Heem r'.
[522] HOUBRAKEN 1753, vol 2, p. 210, mentions that de Heem "het teeken van de Ridderschap […] droeg" (bore the sign of knighthood), "een bewys van de agtinge die zyn Konst gehad heeft" (proof of the esteem for his art), but there are no other sources pointing to any such knighthood. See also S. Segal in exh. cat. UTRECHT/BRUNSWICK 1991, pp. 30, 31. Segal has suggested that the R could be explained as an abbreviation of 'refecit', indicating that Jan Davidsz. de Heem 'completed, improved or corrected' the painting. As I have argued above, the only, or one of the very few, paintings de Heem did arguably 'refecit' is cat. no. A 191, now in Rotterdam. That painting does not bear an R as suffix to the signature, which seems to refute Segal's suggestion.
[523] Marianne Berardi, in BERARDI 1998, p. 323 (note 564), suggested that the R stands for de Heem's possible Utrecht studio address, the house *Die Rose* on De Rosendael, which de Heem's father had bought in 1594. Her suggestion that house was still in the possession of de Heem's sister (together with her brother?) in 1668 is based on an incorrect interpretation of a deed of November 3, 1668 (see Appendix 1). It was not de Heem's sister who put down a house on the south side of Rosendael as colateral, but her debtor, Beernt Beerntsz. van Ulden and his wife. Berardi acknowledged, however, that such an hypothesis would not be supported by the fact that de Heem still used the R after his return to Antwerp.
[524] See Appendix 2, signatures.
[525] See Biography, pp. 28-29, and Appendix 1, March 1, 1669.
[526] See also note 5 to this chapter.
[527] Information derived from http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Diego_Duarte (retrieved May 2014).
[528] Duverger 2001, p. 154-164, no. 3580, no. 151. The concise description does not allow identification of this piece, but in view of the estimate it was probably a smaller, simpler work.
[529] De Heem's tulip also differs in several details from Mignon's (see KRAEMER-NOBLE 2007, cat. nos. 61, 72, and 73). It may be that both de Heem an Mignon made a study or studies of the same tulip, probably on the same day.
[530] The Louvre painting: Oil on canvas, 88 x 68 cm, signed, inv. no. 1556 (KRAEMER-NOBLE 2007, cat. no. 66).
[531] For a related example, see RINALDI 1989, p. 158, fig. 191, which is dated by that author to c.1610-1620.

[532] Respectively oil on panel, 36,5 x 47,3 cm, signed, Rheinisches Landesmuseum, Bonn, inv. no. 37.36 and oil on panel, 36,5 x 49 cm, signed, Narodni Galerie, Prague, inv. no. DO4142, KRAEMER-NOBLE 2007, cat. nos. 26 and 29. Kraemer-Noble's cat. nos. 30 and 31 also include a porcelain bowl in analogy to de Heem's example, but Mignon's bowl is not the same as de Heem's. The same porcelain bowl as in de Heem's work appears in KRAEMER-NOBLE 2007, cat. no. 28, which unfortunately is only known from a poor black-and-white illustration. That painting appears to be much more de-Heem related.
[533] Cf. KRAEMER-NOBLE 2007, cat. nos. 24 and 25 (of which cat. no. 23 is a rather weak copy by a later hand, in my view).
[534] DIEKAMP 2001, p. 64.
[535] DIEKAMP 2001, p. 65 and fig. 13 on p. 99. It had previously appeared in cat. no. A 210.
[536] Oil on canvas, 60,5 x 75 cm, signed, Amsterdam, Rijksmuseum, inv. no. SK-C-187, KRAEMER-NOBLE 2007, cat. no. 35, colour ill.
[537] Earlier rummers with conical cuppas painted by de Heem had sharp appliques and/or a different foot rim.
[538] See also the remark concerning cat. no. A 154, in the previous chapter, p. 178.
[539] See also the Biography chapter above, p. 29.
[540] For his apprenticeship with Cornelis Kick in Amsterdam, van den Broeck had paid 140 guilders annually, plus another 100 guilders at the end of the four-year apprenticeship. This included housing and food, however, but with Kick, too, van den Broeck could sell his work at his own profit. Thus, de Heem's fee was substantially higher, no doubt due to his excellent reputation.
[541] Oil on panel, 21,6 x 28,9 cm, signed and dated 1676, see exh. LONDON 2005, p. 7, colour ill. A possible pendant to this painting was sold at Christie's, London, 3 December 2014, lot 146, colour ill. I will return to Elias van den Broeck in the following chapter.
[542] Oil on panel, 34,2 x 44,5 cm, signed or with signature 'J.D.De Heem', sale New York, Christie's, 15 January 1986, lot 151, colour ill., as by Jan Davidsz. de Heem ("According to Professor Bergström an early work by de Heem"). Previously, the painting had been sold as a work of Joris van Son, sale London, Christie's, 15 April 1983, lot 70, ill.
[543] See also MEIJER 2013, in which I dated this work to around 1670. After further reconstruction of the chronology of the artist's oeuvre, I tend to think that it may have originated it somewhat earlier, sometime during the 1660s.
[544] Received at the RKD, The Hague, in 1974, from the then owner. The photo is of excellent quality.
[545] Knowing the palette of the painting might help in dating it more accurately.
[546] The painting is very well-preserved, which allows full appreciation of its quality of execution and attention to detail.
[547] Segal, in exh. cat. UTRECHT/BRUNSWICK 1991, p. 162, opined that the signature followed by an R suggested that it might be a collaborative work, possibly with Abraham Mignon ("De vraag of één of meer leerlingen of assistenten hem bij dit werk hebben geholpen, wat de R in de signatuur doet vermoeden, is nog niet geheel opgelost en verdient nader onderzoek. Als mogelijke medewerker komt Abraham Mignon in aanmerking").
[548] Compare de Heem's frog facing right at the lower centre with such an animal in virtually the same pose in paintings by Mignon in Northampton MA, Ansbach, Washington, and Warsaw (KRAEMER-NOBLE 2007, cat. nos. 87, 89, 92, and 97, colour ills.).
[549] Mignon's painting: Netherlands Office for Cultural Heritage collection, on loan to the Noordbrabants Musem, Den Bosch (KRAEMER-NOBLE 2007, cat. no. 90, colour ill.).
[550] The comparison is not easy, however. The large Liechtenstein painting (cat. no. A 232) is very well preserved and on canvas, while the Thyssen flower piece (cat. no. A 233) is much smaller, on panel and in a rather poor state of preservation (in contrast to the remark in GASKELL 1989, p. 86: "Very good condition") with many very thin and abraded areas missing glazes and definition, and numerous (old?) retouches, particularly in the whites.
[551] Marianne Berardi, in BERARDI 1987/8, passim, and BERARDI 1998, pp. 321-338, discussed Rachel Ruysch's still lifes inspired by this de Heem extensively. In her note 564 on p. 323, she discussed the attribution history of de Heem's painting. In her dissertation, she also pays much attention to Frederick Ruysch's subsequent cabinets. From the inventory of Frederick Ruysch's possessions drawn up in 1731, it becomes clear that he owned a substantial collection of paintings, but no names were specified (BREDIUS 1915/22, p. 1208 and BERARDI 1998, p. 104). No copies of the catalogue of the sale held after his death appear to have survived, but from newspaper advertisements for it some artists' names are known, among them 'De Heem' (BERARDI 1998, pp. 104-105).
[552] Segal, in exh. cat. UTRECHT/BRUNSWICK 1991, p. 163, wrote "de uitvoering doet eerder aan Ernst Stuven denken".

[553] Unfortunately the known history of both the original and the copy do not go back very far. In view of the quality and accuracy, the copyist must have had the original at his disposal for quite a while.
[554] As suggested in BERARDI 1998, p. 328. The painting is in the Museum Boijmans Van Beuningen, Rotterdam, inv. no. 1751, oil on canvas, 98,8 x 82,5 cm, signed and dated 1685.
[555] Oil on canvas, 114 x 89 cm, signed and dated 1686, Rochester NY, Memorial Art Gallery, inv. no. 82.9.
[556] Notes A. Bredius at RKD, The Hague, file on Ernst Stuven, p. 4.
[557] HOUBRAKEN 1753, vol. 2, pp. 209-210.
[558] Upon close scrutiny, it would appear that the portrait was also prepared in the ground of the painting.
[559] In BRENNINKMEIJER-DE ROOY 1983.
[560] Anonymous print in P. Screvelius the Elder, *Oude en nieuwe beschrijvinghe van Holland, Zeeland en Vriesland*, The Hague, 1667. A copy of the print is in the collection of the Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam: http://hdl.handle.net/10934/RM0001.COLLECT.527110 (retrieved December 2014). In RKDimages, the print is given to Anthony van Zijtvelt (c.1640-1695 or later): https://rkd.nl/explore/images/174760 (retrieved December 2014).

Notes to **Antwerp 1672-1684** pp. 254-284

[561] Curiously, in the literature on Erasmus Quellinus (DE BRUYN 1988 and exh. cat. CASSEL 2014) there is no mention of any of the collaborations with Jan Dz. de Heem.
[562] The head of Christ in cat. no. A 239 is reminiscent of that of *Christ as the good shepherd*, painted by Quellinus in 1666 (DE BRUYN 1988, p. 268, cat. no. 233, ill.p. 269). The painting in fig. A2 2 was with Senger Bamberg Kunsthandel in 1993 (see also DE BRUYN 1988 , p.273, fig. 241).
[563] Most descriptions in the auction catalogue are quite detailed and many of the paintings can still be identified. The top lot, in terms of revenue, interestingly enough, was an interior scene by Willem van Herp on a large copper plate and with many figures, fetching 2040 guilders. Three paintings by Gabriel Metsu also fetched high prices, 1000 and 1100 (twice) guilders (see WAIBOER 2012, cat. nos. A 22 (lot 31 [now Staatliche Museen zu Berlin, Gemäldegalerie]), A 68 (lot 32 [now Royal Collection, Great Britain]), and A 106 (lot 33 [now collection Duke of Sutherland]), but none of the many other lots topped the 900 guilders hammered down for the de Heem. A Wouwerman brought 610 guilders and a pair of large marine paintings by Willem van de Velde 1200 guilders (600 each). Among the many lots were two Jan Steen paintings that are now in the Rijksmuseum, *Bakker Oostwaard* (inv. no. SK-A-390), hammered down at 160 guilders, and a drinking couple (SK-C-233) that fetched 135 guilders.
[564] In the case of the accepted works from 1650-1655, for only 17 out of 67 paintings a (probable or possible) provenance before 1800 is recorded. Three of the 17 were sold in the Northern Netherlands and four in the Southern Netherlands, while nine examples first appeared outside of the Netherlands before 1800, so there is no overwhelming connection with Antwerp, where they were painted. For the Utrecht period, *c.*1657-1672, a (probable or possible) provenance before 1800 is recorded for 20 out of 55 paintings. Half of those turned up in the Northern Netherlands, three in the Southern Netherlands and four outside of the Netherlands. A slightly stronger connection with the North appears to be present for this period than with the South for the previous years. For the 1640s, when de Heem was working in Antwerp, for only 19 out of 72 paintings a (probable or possible) provenance before 1800 could be traced. Here, the balance for the Netherlands topples slightly towards the North, five paintings, against four first recorded in the Southern Netherlands, while ten paintings first turned up outside of the Netherlands, a result similar to that for the 1650s. Conclusions can hardly be drawn from these numbers, however, since much has to do with the availability (or rather, unavailability) of data and the numbers are too small to allow any firm conclusions.
[565] The yellow rose is a typical example of a flower painted with orpiment, 'schietgeel' which becomes translucent and colourless only decades after having been applied.
[566] KRAEMER-NOBLE 2007, cat. nos. 65, 75, 76 and 77.
[567] KRAEMER-NOBLE 2007, cat. no. 77.
[568] In MEIJER 2012, which was devoted to this painting, I concluded that it was probably painted in about 1671, shortly before de Heem's move back to Antwerp. After revision of the hypothetical chronology of de Heem's work in the following years, I tend to date it somewhat closer to de Heem's dated garland from 1675, and after his move back to Antwerp. Wallert and Dik (WALLERT/DIK 2007, p. 46) also concluded that, in view of working similarities with a painting by Rubens, de painting was likely done in Antwerp.
[569] The inclusion of this painting towards the end of the catalogue was prompted by the fact that the artist appears to have worked on it until late in his life, but since the majority of work on it appears to have been done in the first half of the 1670s it is discussed here in the text. I have written a report on the painting in 1999 for the art dealer Robert Noortman and revised this in 2013 for art dealer Bob Haboldt after the painting had been treated by Martin Bijl, Alkmaar. I am indebted to Martin Bijl for many of the technical observations mentioned here.
[570] For instance in cat. nos. A 218, 241, 248 and 251, which painting also includes quite similar figs and apricots.
[571] Such as cat. nos. A 244, 251 and 253, to be discussed below.

[572] Since it does not properly show a landscape and because in its present state the execution of the view can barely be attributed to de Heem himself, I omitted it from my article on de Heem's landscape views, MEIJER 2013.
[573] See my remark on early appearances of such parrots in paintings, p. 186, and note 441.
[574] No paintings of those subjects by Ruysch and Berkheyde are recorded that could properly fit the frame.
[575] AMSTERDAM 1999, pp. 60-64, sp. p. 63, fig. 32a and b.
[576] Sunflowers in de Heem compositions (cat. nos. A 093, 118, 138, 248, and 252) must have been coloured with orpiment on an ochre-yellow ground, which after the inevitable discoloration of the orpiment has resulted in a dull orange colour. Here the de Heem may have used a different type of yellow. For the small yellow roses at the centre, like in many such bouquets, de Heem will have used orpiment. They were clearly retouched here, rather unsubtly, by a restorer. In the Mauritshuis bouquet (cat. no. A 244), the yellow rose appears to have been given an extra layer of a brighter yellow under the orpiment, as a result of which it looks brighter than in other examples.
[577] See also the remarks in the last paragraph of this chapter and note 53.
[578] The Cheltenham Museum owns a still life of fruit and flowers, oil in canvas, 47,3 x 41,4 cm, which was traditionally considered as a work of Jan Davidsz. de Heem from *c.* 1650. In contrast, it can be recognized as a work of Cornelis de Heem, probably from the 1660s. See, among others, SCHNEIDER 1989, p. 132, colour ill., as by Jan Davidsz. de Heem.
[579] The fruit on the porcelain plate is, in my view, not, as suggested in VAN OS 2004, p. 29, an orange, but a lemon. Compare the same discoloration of an orpiment component in other de Heem lemons, such as cat. nos. A 191 and 229).
[580] VAN OS 2004 and SCHENKEVELD-VAN DER DUSSEN 2004 both take the premise that de Heem painted this work during his stay in Utrecht, and consequently before William III was reinstated. This influenced their interpretation of the image. Concluding on a basis of stylistic chronology that de Heem painted this piece in or after 1672, so after the beginning of William's stadtholdership, its interpretation becomes much simpler: a celebration of the prince's victory and the resulting prosperity.
[581] https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/De_Neufville_baronets (retrieved June 2015).
[582]
https://books.google.nl/books?id=rcDSAQAAQBAJ&pg=PA74&lpg=PA74&dq=maria+de+neufville+frankfurt&source=bl&ots=-Whz1XgrRF&sig=wY3cczMfbftvUKxgkW-w8TlMdc8&hl=nl&sa=X&ei=WbuRVefpCcXZU9OqgtAP&ved=0CDkQ6AEwBA#v=onepage&q=maria%20de%20neufville%20frankfurt&f=false (retrieved June 2015).
[583] For the proper border types of flat plates, see RINALDI 1989, pp. 71 and 69, for a decoration of a *klapmuts* similar to what de Heem painted, see p. 127. I do not second the suggestion in exh. cat. AMSTERDAM 2015, p. 271, note 1, that "De Heem may have combined decorative motifs from different ceramics to give the painted dish an even richer appearance than originals would have offered."
[584] Occasionally, de Heem made similar errors in his reflections, see for instance cat. no. A 229 and the reflection of an empty plate rather than a full one in cat. no. A 088.
[585] Nicolaisen recognized a "pausbäckigen jungen Maler an der Staffelei". Although the figure indeed appears to have a rather round face, if a reflection of de Heem himself, which we must assume to be the fact, he cannot be young: in 1675 he was about 69 years old.
[586] An earlier one occurs in cat. no. A 175 (Wallace collection), from 1653.
[587] The fact that the two bouquets in Leipzig, cat. nos. A 235 and 255, share the tulip is pure coincidence. There is at least five years between their dates of origin and they have a totally different (early) provenance.
[588] Van Suchtelen's collection, as auctioned on 17th April 1715 in Hoorn, included several more still lifes by Jacob Rotius: a festoon of fruit (lot 32), a vase of flowers as a pendant to it (lot 33), and 'a little table of flowers and fruit' (lot 34). Van Suchtelen also owned four still lifes by De Heem's pupil Elias van den Broeck (lot nos. 24-27). Like the de Heem, he may have bought them when van den Broeck was working in Antwerp, but he may just as well have purchased them after van den Broeck had settled in Amsterdam in 1685.
[589] Signed and dated "JROTIUS FECIT 1674". Oil on canvas, 95 x 75 cm, see CAT. KOETSER 2003, cat. no. 12, colour ill. See also https://rkd.nl/explore/images/263553 (retrieved July 2015).
[590] "Deze was een leerling van den ouden de Heem wiens wyze van schilderen hy wonder wel wist na te bootsen, zoo dat hy in zyn tyd geld en agting aanwon". HOUBRAKEN 1753, vol. 2, pp. 11, 12.
[591] See also WIJNMALEN 1930.
[592] Signed and dated 1662, oil on canvas, 66 x 54 cm, last recorded in sale New York, Sotheby's, 17 January 1985, lot 61, colour ill. See also F.G. Meijer in exh. cat. ROTTERDAM/AACHEN 2006/07, pp. 152-153, fig. 13, and my contribution on Jan Albertsz. Rotius as a still life painter in the catalogue of an exhibition in Hoorn, 2016, in preparation at the time of finishing up this dissertation. Unfortunately, the painting is only known from a (good) black-and-white photo and from the colour illustration in the auction catalogue.
[593] The painting was with the art dealer J. Dik, Amsterdam/La Tour de Peilz (CH), in 1959/60, together with a pendant which is also signed and dated. Before Rotius's signature and the date 1668 turned up in cleaning, the painting had been attributed to Rachel Ruysch. The presumed pendant, oil on canvas 68 x 56 cm, resurfaced in a sale at Sotheby's London, 11 December 1996, lot 61, colour ill. It is less de Heem-inspired than the painting illustrated here.
[594] Oil on canvas, 63,5 x 49,5 cm (Illustrated London News, 21 June 1952).
[595] See: https://rkd.nl/explore/images/263491 (retrieved July 2015).
[596] For the data, see https://rkd.nl/explore/images/196739 (retrieved July 2015).

[597] For the data, see https://rkd.nl/explore/images/71922. A much smaller example also appears to have been inspired by de Heem's example: https://rkd.nl/explore/images/48467 (both retrieved July 2015).
[598] With thanks to Amy Walsh, who in 2011 sent me the draft of her entry on the painting for a collection catalogue which has remained unpublished to this day.
[599] There appears to be some similarity with an anonymous still life of flowers that was clearly inspired by de Heem's flower paintings from the 1670s: https://rkd.nl/explore/images/118256 (retrieved July 2015), but of which the overall execution is different. In correspondence in 2004, I did not exclude that it was produced in some degree of participation with de Heem, but I after further research exclude that possibility.
[600] S. Segal, in exh. cat. UTRECHT/BRUNSWICK 1991, p. 184, rather cryptically suggested that this painting may be an early work, preceding de Heem's other flower paintings ("kan men […] als een vermoedelijke voorganger van het thema bloemstukken opvatten").
[601] See also the discussion of this motif under cat. no. A 225 on p. 214.
[602] Compare, for instance, KRAEMER-NOBLE 2007, nos. 88 to 96. In KRAEMER-NOBLE 1973, p. 62, it was already included under no. B 207, as probably not by Mignon. Unfortunately, I only know the painting from a good black-and-white photo and from a colour illustration.
[603] According to HOUBRAKEN 1753, Vol. 3, p. 372, Stuven, after having followed his teacher Johannes Voorhout to Amsterdam in 1675, studied under Willem van Aelst (presumably shortly after 1675) and subsequently under Abraham Mignon, who died in 1679.
[604] In part, the handling looks less vigorous than in cat. no. A 259, but this is partly due to some abrasion and retouching. The texture of the white napkin and the bread roll at lower right look almost plastic probably due to repainting or strengthening early on.
[605] Compare the discussion of cat. no. A 225 on p. 217.
[606] The first was offered at Christie's London auction of 18 April 1980, lot 56, as by Joris van Son. Van den Broeck's authorship is beyond doubt, however. The second was with S. Nystad, The Hague, in 1967, see https://rkd.nl/explore/images/20542 (retrieved August 2015).
[607] The painting is only known to me from a 1940s black-and-white photo, which makes it difficult to judge.
[608] In cat. no. A 263, they may have been more prominent originally. Before restoration by Nancy Krieg, New York, 2006-2007, much of the background had been abraded and/or painted out. The reconstruction of the niche to the left is problematic, however, apparently too much of the original paint had been lost to allow proper interpretation.
[609] It has come out rather harsh in restoration.
[610] The handle of the jug seems strange and is probably apocryphal. Although I have not found the same shape in Chinese porcelain or Delftware as a vase, on jugs, the handle always ends just above the shoulder or halfway the neck, never at the rim. Moreover, the handle was executed with a different paint than the vase/jug itself.
[611] See Appendix 2, deeds from 9th August and 14th September 1683. When catalogue A 266 first appeared in Arnhem in April 2010, the initial J was intact, when it reappeared in France only two months later, it was damaged beyond recognition.
[612] That on cat. nos. A 254 and 261 looks more like the signature on a document from 6th August 1670 (see facsimile in exh. cat. UTRECHT/BRUNSWICK 1991, p. 56), which would seem to support their slightly earlier date of execution.

Notes to **Concluding observations** pp. 285-297

[613] Also, no archival data for this period, 1631 to 1635, have been found in any other Dutch city.
[614] One may wonder whether his Leiden creditors could not easily trace him in Amsterdam, rather than in , for instance London or Antwerp. The fact that he appears to have left no trace in Amsterdam – nor in Antwerp or London – seems to confirm that he 'disappeared' successfully. While the choice for Amsterdam can be argued for on stylistic grounds, for the time being it must remain hypothetical.
[615] See the elaborate discussion in chapter *Antwerp – Utrecht*, p. 239.
[616] Nico Vroom, in VROOM 1945 and VROOM 1980, while including some pupils/followers of de Heem as painters of 'monochome banketjes', such as Andries Benedetti, Laurens Craen and Jasper Geerards, mentioned de Heem himself, usually in one breath with Abraham van Beijeren, only as painting the contrary of *monochrome banketjes*.
[617] Intriguing, though, is a still life with a dead hare, dead partridge, and dead finches which includes an almost identical combination of a Wanli porcelain plate and dish as in cat. no. A 183 (oil on panel, 60 x 73 cm). That painting is known via a rather poor photo and a small reproduction, as well as from some recent snapshots. While it is a work of rather high quality in the handling of the details, it is clear that none of them were executed by de Heem himself, but rather by an excellent copyist. According to an advertisement in *Die Weltkunst* of 15 March 1970, p. 336, the painting was stolen in Switzerland in September 1969.
[618] Notes A. Bredius at RKD, Kunstinventarissen, 1639, photocopies of pp. 938 and 940 from an unidentified publication. Gaillard's collection numbered 166 paintings. It was not restricted to works by Amsterdam artists,

however. See also the Montias database: http://research.frick.org/montias/browserecord.php?-action=browse&-recid=1361.

[619] BREDIUS 1888, pp. 188-190.

[620] Inventory of the estate of Joan van Harlaer, 23 September 1644, notary P. de Bary, Leiden. Notes A. Bredius at RKD, Kunstinventarissen 1644.

[621] Inventory of the estate of Reyncke Gerrits, Amsterdam, June 1647, Notary L. Lambert, Amsterdam. Notes A. Bredius at RKD, Kunstinventarissen 1647.

[622] DE BIE 1661, p. 216.

[623] DE STUERS 1877-1878, p. 83, no. 28, 'Een copy nae de Heem met citrons daerin' (a copy after de Heem with lemons), p. 85, no. 61 'Een fruytgen nae de Heem' (a little fruit[piece] after de Heem), p. 86, no. 67, 'Een copye nae de Heem synde een gouwe cop' (a copy after de Heem being a gold cup), no. 68, 'Een copye na de Heem synde rasynen en vyge' (a copy after de heem being grapes and figs', p 91, no. 154, 'Een frugt nae de Heem'. The lottery included two originals, p. 85, no. 55, 'Een fruitgen van Van Heem op 66-0-0 [guilders]' and p. 91, no. 155, 'Een stuck van de Heem met een roemer, 200 [guilders]' (a piece by de Heem with a rummer). The copies were valued at 12, 27, 50, 21, and 30 guilders. There was also (p. 83, no. 14) 'Een schotel met fruyt, copye nae de Jonge de Heem'(a dish of fruit, copy after the young de Heem), for which De Stuers noted (pp. 76, 77: "waarmee zoowel Jan David [meaning Jan Jansz. de Heem?] als Cornelis kan bedoeld zijn" (with whom both Jan David as Cornelis can be meant). DE MEYERE 2015, p. 65, remarked: "ongetwijfeld een kopie naar Cornelis de Heem" (undoubtedly a copy after Cornelis de Heem). Both authors probably did not realize that Cornelis de Heem was just 18 in 1649 and living in Antwerp, that we do not know any work by his hand from the 1640s, and that it is consequently unlikely that in 1649 a copy after a painting by him was offered in Wijk bij Duurstede in that year. It is more likely that a copy after a work by Jan Davidsz. de Heem from his young years was meant – which type of work the Utrecht appraisers were probably well acquainted with.

[624] Interestingly, both Willem de Heusch (1625-1692) and Jan Baptist Weenix (1621-1659) were among the five appraisers of the lots. The third and last painter-appraiser, Jan Both (1618-1652) was represented with one original, estimated at 70 guilders, and by a copy after a work by Cornelis van Poelenburch and himself at 15 guilders. The organizer, the Utrecht (fish)still-life painter Jan de Bondt, included about eight of his own paintings in the lottery, valued from 16 to 70 guilders. The most costly items were a silver ewer plus basin at 274 guilders and 1 stuiver, and a 'ledikant'(a bed) at 225 guilders.

[625] For instance, an account mentioning a fruit piece by 'de Heem', having been sold for 23 guilders in The Hague in 1688 probably concerns a work by Cornelis de Heem, who lived in The Hague from 1676 to *c*.1691. Notes A. Bredius at RKD, Kunstinventarissen 1688.

[626] The fact that van Straten compiled the list himself and had nothing to gain by exaggerating their value suggests that the amounts reflect the prices he had paid for the paintings.

[627] In this list of 60 paintings, it is the third most expensive, after a *Burning of Troy* by Adam Elsheimer ('Adam Helshamers') at 1800 guilders and an Annunciation to the Shepherds by Cornelis van Poelenburch at 1200 guilders, and above a Rembrandt *Mary and Elisabeth* at 800 guilders. See UIL 1978, pp. 111-113. Another possible identification might be cat. no. A 065, but that panting has a more likely early provenance (see catalogue).

[628] Notes A. Bredius at RKD, Kunstinventarissen 1652.

[629] Notes A. Bredius at RKD, Kunstinventarissen 1689.

[630] This is also confirmed in WALLERT/DIK 2007, p. 48 and p. 49.

[631] See the article by Sven Van Dorst in exh. cat. ANTWERP 2015/16, sp. pp. 56-61.

[632] D. King, *Secrets in the Noble Arts of Miniature or Limning*, British Museum, M.S. 12.461. Page 42vo. and 43 contain recipes for the rendering of 'fruit and plums', but no specific reference to (a) de Heem is given as their source. In the essay on (my) cat. no. A 243 in exh. cat. AMSTERDAM 1999, p. 62, discrepancies between the Heems handling of that painting and these recipes are signaled. And, for instance, the indications to paint 'cucumbers' with a blue(ish) layer with a glaze of yellow lake does not square with Jan Davidsz. de Heem's technique. The manuscript contains a dedication to Mary Fairfax by Daniel King, but the majority of the manuscript is a copy in a different hand of a treatise by Edward Norgate from 1621-1626. The recipes mentioning 'Deheem' might be additions that were added even after the presentation to Mary Fairfax, which is suggested to have occurred between 1650 and 1657, by a later owner (scattered information resulting from Google search 'daniel king manuscript limning', November 2015, see also: https://arb.mpiwg-berlin.mpg.de/node/91938 retrieved November 2015).

[633] My transcription, December 2006. Only the directions for painting blue grapes and the shadow of linen are thus directly connected with 'Deheem'. It is unlikely that the directions for painting green in a landscape would have been provided by (a) de Heem. See also exh. cat. AMSTERDAM 1999, pp. 29, 30.
[634] In exh. cat. AMSTERDAM 1999, it has been taken for granted that the source was Jan Davidsz. de Heem. In view of the uncertain date of the later pages, Cornelis should not entirely be ruled out.
[635] For such changes in the work of the still-life painter Willem van Aelts, see M. Gifford e.a., 'The Making of a Luxury Image: Van Aelst's Painting Materials and Artistic Techniques', exh. cat. HOUSTON/WASHINGTON 2012, pp. 67-89.
[636] On the subject see Bodo Beier's ground-breaking article, BEIER 1987, as well as WEBER 1993.
[637] On Jan Dz. de Heem as a landscape painter, see also MEIJER 2013.
[638] WALLERT/DIK 2007, p. 41-42, "Of course it is impossible to decide with any degree of certainty whether the vermillion dead-colouring layer could be by the hand of an assistant or by De Heem. Segal assumed that Jan Jansz. De Heem may have contributed to the making of the painting. This contribution could have been the partial or full preparation of the dead colouring [..]". Segal's assumption, however, concerned the execution of parts of the final painting, not its preparation. There is no indication that the dead-coloured panels in Jacob Marrel's 1649 inventory were not the work of the artist himself, so they cannot be forwarded as proof that "In De Heem's environment this was also common practice" (p. 41). Moreover, Utrecht in 1649 was not 'De Heem's environment'. The quote from van Mander, on p. 41, which claims that diligent pupils would set up paintings for a master and even improved their composition "invent[ing] freely" seems alien to de Heem's art, which transpires complete control by the master from start to finish.
[639] See also the discussion in chapter Antwerp-Utrecht, pp. 235-238, about shared motifs by de Heem and Mignon.
[640] DE BIE 1661, pp. 216-219. In his praise, de Bie also involves Cornelis de Heem, whose work, he says, can barely be discerned from that of his father "Die t'werck van Vaer en Soon ghestelt siet bij malcand'ren / Can geensints speuren dat sy in Pinceel verand'ren" (p. 217).
[641] Ibid. p. 216.
[642] Ibid. p. 219.