The Rijksmuseum holds ten drawings and a large pastel portrait by Christophe Karel Henri (Karel) de Nerée tot Babberich (1880-1909). Although the art historian Bettina Spaanstra-Polak regarded the ‘spectacular pen drawings by this extremely sensitive artist’ as highlights of fin de siècle Dutch art in her standard work Het Symbolisme in de Nederlandse schilderkunst in 1955, there are few art historical publications about his oeuvre.

One of his largest drawings in the Rijksmuseum’s collection is Allegorical Scene with Figures and a Peacock in a Garden, which has been neither exhibited nor reproduced until now (fig. 1). A central figure and a smaller figure are shown in an exotic garden landscape. The garden is filled with bizarre plants, a peacock and strange human figures drawn with and surrounded by fanciful lines.

In this article I will argue, in part on the basis of sources never studied before in this connection, that this drawing was inspired by a literary work. This means that it can be dated more accurately and interpreted more clearly, thus elucidating its relationship with the various other works by De Nerée in the museum’s collection. The literary source for Allegorical Scene sheds new light on this remarkable minor artist, his place in Dutch Symbolism and his contribution to it.

**Sander Bink**

![Detail of fig. 1](image)

**Le Jardin des supplices**

Le Jardin des supplices (The Torture Garden) was published in June 1899, the first novel in almost ten years by Octave Mirbeau (1848-1917), the angry young man of the French literary scene. Mirbeau suffered a debilitating literary crisis after his debut trilogy Le Calvaire (1886), L’Abbé Jules (1888) and Sebastian Roch (1890), although he did publish short stories, articles in journals and reviews. He was an ardent defender of modern art and worked hard for the post-impressionists, in particular for artists like Paul Gauguin, Camille Claudel and Vincent van Gogh. His great interest in Van Gogh is also evident in his short novel Dans le ciel, which he published in serial form in 1892-93 in L’Echo de Paris but never turned into a full novel in book form.

Mirbeau was considerably less impressed by Symbolism, the other movement in art around 1890. He thought it consisted of ‘snobs, Jews and pederasts’ and wanted nothing to do with ‘aesthetes’: ‘Ah, these aesthetes of evil caused harm when they discoursed in silken voices on the horror of nature, of life, on the uselessness of drawing, on the need to lead art back to the state of larvae; this is the exasperation of ugliness.’

This notwithstanding, for the majority of the twentieth century, Le Jardin des supplices, with which...
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Karel de Néée Tot Baberich’s Forgotten Torture Garden
Mirbeau resumed his career as a novelist in 1899, was regarded as a classic work of ‘decadent symbolism’. In his study of Symbolism, Dreamers of Decadence, fin de siècle expert Philippe Jullian described it as ‘the bible of modern exoticism’.3 Le Jardin des supplices was acknowledged in art history, too, thanks to the de luxe edition published by the French art dealer Ambroise Vollard in 1902, in which watercolour drawings by Auguste Rodin enhance and reflect Mirbeau’s text (fig. 2).4

In recent decades Le Jardin des supplices and Mirbeau’s entire literary oeuvre have both been considered primarily in the context of a subversive literary discourse, in which the convinced anarchist author wanted to shock ‘the citizen’ and hold up to him a mirror of his own hypocritical behaviour.5 Mirbeau described his novel as an account of murderous bloodlust, and prefaced it ironically thus: ‘To the priests, to the soldiers, to the judges, and to the men, who educate, lead and govern mankind I dedicate these pages of murder and blood.’6

The Chinese torture garden through which the narrator and Clara roam and where they see the most terrible things – in which Clara in particular takes pleasure – symbolises the endless sadistic cruelty of which mankind is capable: ‘And the universe seemed to me like an immense, inexorable torture garden. Everywhere there was blood and where life was most apparent, there were horrible tormentors to flay the flesh, saw up bones and turn the skin inside out with sinister expressions of joy on their faces.’7 The theme of the novel could be summarized with a quote taken from it, ‘in that atrocious second I realised that lust can attain the darkest depths of human terror and vividly imitate Hell in all its terror.’8

Émile Zola could not afford after he published his J’Accuse! His plays were performed there too, the most popular being the cynical Les affaires sont les affaires of 1903. But his anarchic and anti-bourgeoisie prose work, full of violence and perverted sexuality, seems to have been condemned to be sold under the counter. Any mention of Le Jardin des supplices in the press was invariably disapproving: ‘It is an atrocious book and a bad book, for it does not achieve its objective with the vast majority of readers, who instead of horror would find morbid titillation in it.’9

Although French literature was usually read in the Netherlands in the original language around 1900, translations aimed at the wider, more popular market were also published. French authors who were initially revolution-
ary because they openly dared to describe the sexuality and dark desires of mankind, were admittedly controversial in their own country, but were soon accepted and even became canonical, and this continues to the present day. Zola’s oeuvre, long controversial in the Netherlands, is a good example of this, and fifty years after the publication of Gustave Flaubert’s *Madame Bovary* it was still being praised as a ‘salacious book’. ‘This is one of the most famous books in French literature, but at the same time one of the most infamous. It is a literary jewel, and when one knows that it embroiled the author in a heated obscenity case, it is patently obvious that this is not a book for children.’10 This recommendation came from the small Amsterdam publishing house of Bauer which specialized in erotica – according to the standards of the time teetering on the edge of pornography – and in translations of modern French literature.11 The reception of Mirbeau’s work in the Netherlands must also be seen in this context.

Although there is no known Dutch translation of *Le Jardin des supplices* dating from around 1900, it is not out of the question that one actually was published. Several of these kinds of translations by Bauer and similar small publishing houses we know of from advertisements seem to have completely disappeared, as there is no trace of them whatsoever in any public collection or in the antiques trade. The first known Dutch translation of *Le Jardin des supplices* in full was published in 1929 under the racy title *O, vrouw!*... (Oh, Woman). As yet no physical copy of this publication has been found.12 Between 1890 and 1910 the rather more liberal Dutch-Indonesian periodicals published some translations of Mirbeau stories. In 1898 among others ‘The Dead Pearls’ and ‘The Little Fairy Dum-Dum’, which the author went on to rework into chapters of *Le Jardin des supplices*.13

The fact that Dutch publishers around 1900 saw that good money could be made from Mirbeau’s novels is evident from the translation of his next novel, the equally controversial *Le Journal d’une femme de chambre* (Diary of a Chambermaid). This was immediately published in 1900 as *Het dagboek van een kamenier* (Diary of a Lady’s-Maid): ‘Banned in Austria because the moral degeneracy of the bourgeoisie is too vividly described,’ trumpeted the Amsterdam bookshop Fortuijn.14 There was evidently so much demand for moral degeneracy that a second edition was needed; it was published in 1907 under the title *Dagboek van een kamermeisje* (Diary of a Chambermaid), likewise untraceable. In the Netherlands Mirbeau’s novels were read more or less on the quiet: by ‘the public at large’ in search of soft porn and by a more broad-minded, artistic hard core. At least we can infer the interest of the more liberally-minded from the ‘coming of age’ novel *Het liefdeleven van Leo Trelong* (The Love Life of Leo Trelong) by De Nerée’s contemporary L. de Rooy van Heerlen (pseudonym of P. Valkhoff) which was published in 1905 and has also been consigned to oblivion. In it, Leo Trelong reads *Le Calvaire* by Mirbeau with close attention. The subversive character of this novel is emphasized in a discussion about it.15

Thanks to the bestseller *Moeder* (Mother) by Anna van Gogh-Kaulbach, countless readers from 1908 onwards – the fifteenth edition was published in 1937 – were indirectly warned about Mirbeau’s shocking novel. In *Moeder* the innocent Hermien reads it with fear and trembling: ‘Would I dare to enter the *Jardin des Supplices*? No, it’s far too cruel. It can hardly be true.’ Hermien says that her young friend Anton would likewise be ‘upset’ by the book which also made her ‘miserable.’16 But there was one Dutch reader who,
in the not unlikely event that he had read *Moeder* in 1908, must have smiled at this passage. *Le Jardin des supplices* did not upset this budding artist or make him miserable, but almost nine years earlier had inspired him to make one of his first works of art in its own right.

**Karel de Nerée**

In the summer of the year in which *Le Jardin des supplices* was published, Karel (or Carel) de Nerée tot Babberich was working in the Consular Department of the Dutch Ministry of Foreign Affairs. He had started in late 1898 but rapidly became bored to death:

> I did a lot of work today, read and re-read almost three books … Really satisfying though, doing that little bit of work, in the empty day. Working is actual a silly thing; people work from necessity, like walking and sleeping – or eating, but with more frenzy, with more affectedness.\(^7\)

His reading matter consisted chiefly of works by French symbolist poets and Dutch authors like Herman Gorter, Louis Couperus and Frederik van Eeden. Initially his ambitions were mainly literary, but as far as we know he did not publish during his lifetime; a few poems in French were not published until after his death.\(^8\) In the summer of 1898, more or less by accident, he had discovered that he had a talent for drawing and went on increasingly to devote himself to it.\(^9\) As was not unusual in Symbolism, literature became an important source of inspiration for his art. He also made drawings while he was at work: many of his drawings from 1899 to around 1901, when he left the ministry, were done on his employer’s paper. One example in the Rijksmuseum’s collection is the *Self-Portrait Reclining in a Dune Landscape*; the pre-printed text of the file number and letterhead appear on the right-hand side of the sheet (fig. 3). This previously undated work can consequently be placed in
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**Fig. 3**

the 1899 to 1901 period. A further argument in support of this is that he spent most of his time in The Hague during those years and frequently went to the dunes at Scheveningen.

In the high society of The Hague, De Nerée was a high-profile figure whose dandified appearance attracted attention (figs. 4, 5). From 1897 or 1898 onwards – greatly influenced by the French symbolists – he penned poems and sketches, and although he did not publish them, people were aware of them. Around 1903, according to a witness, he raised eyebrows in the Kurhaus ‘because of his exceptional clothes and the stories that were told about his literary works’.20 A roman à clef about him, titled Het eerste principe (The First Principle) by Hans Steengracht (pseudonym of Adriaan David van der Gon Netscher), was published in 1903. The artist René Richell in Jacob Israël

Fig. 4
Portrait photograph of Karel de Nerée tot Babberich, 1901. Private collection.

Fig. 5
KAREL DE NERÉE TOT BABBERICH,
Self-Portrait with Cap, 1902.
Black chalk, heightened with white chalk, on grey paper, 275 x 249 mm.
Amsterdam, Rijksmuseum, inv. no. RP-T-1964-57.
de Haan’s 1908 novel Pathologieën was probably based on him, too. In both novels he is portrayed as a rather decadent, totally eccentric artist.

Although De Nerée died of tuberculosis in October 1909 at the age of twenty-nine, he left an oeuvre which, including sketches, is estimated to amount to some four hundred works. This is quite a lot for an artist who was in fact only active for a few years and who seems not to have contemplated a professional career. The greater part of his oeuvre consists of pencil and pen and ink drawings, probably three hundred or so, but De Nerée also made a few pastels, around forty works in oils and watercolours and, together with his mother, a number of embroidered works.

The art he made can be roughly divided into three periods. The first ran from 1899 to 1901, when he made pastels like Black Swans (fig. 6),

*Fig. 6*

KAREL DE NERÉE TOT BABBERICH, *Black Swans*, 1901. Chalk, pastel and paint on canvas, 97.5 x 54.5 cm. The Hague, Kunstmuseum Den Haag, inv. no. 0322792.
Henri van Booven as a Young Priest (fig. 7) and the ink drawings based on Couperus’s novel Extaze (Ecstasy). Over the course of 1901 the tuberculosis he had contracted earlier that year in Spain worsened and in 1902, in his own words, he did nothing. In 1903 the artist picked up his drawing pen again but produced no more than five to ten works. From that year onwards, he also collaborated with his mother, the artist Constance de Nerée tot Babberich-van Houten (1858-1930), and together they created large embroidery works such as Colloque Sentimental (fig. 8) and The Seven Princesses based on Paul Verlaine and Maurice Maeterlinck respectively.

He had his second productive period in 1904 and 1905, when he also introduced more colour into his work, as in the watercolour Rococo or the gouache The Meeting. From 1906 onwards De Nerée concentrated more on his
social career and tried to penetrate the highest diplomatic and royal circles. Nevertheless there are various striking works from this third period made in pencil but also in pastels and watercolours, which have less to do with Symbolism, Art Nouveau or Decadenism. They most resemble the more modernist works by Ferdinand Hodler after 1900. The fact that De Nerée was a great admirer of Hodler is documented, because the art critic Albert Plasschaert – a good friend of De Nerée’s – remarked that Hodler was one of the artists ‘around whom De Nerée’s life revolved’.

This later work is very hard to find and seldom appears on the market. The Rijksmuseum has a rare example of it in the 1907 ink drawing Fantastic Landscape (fig. 9). This is probably not an imaginary landscape as the title given to the work later suggests, but an Italian landscape, possibly near Florence, where the artist spent some months in the first half of that year.

De Nerée frequently gave his work to friends. They could be finished works or portrait sketches he had made at a dinner, for instance. He did not exhibit during his lifetime, despite the plans that Plasschaert proposed around 1904. The first exhibitions were staged between 1910 and 1914, after his death, in Amsterdam, The Hague, Groningen, Utrecht and Rotterdam and in Berlin and Munich. Plasschaert was the only person to write about De Nerée’s art while he was alive: in his one-man magazine Kritiek van Beeldende...
Karel de Nerée tot Babberich’s forgotten torture garden

An Early Drawing Inspired by Literature
Modern literature was a major source of inspiration for De Nerée’s art, as it was for many symbolist artists. As well as the *Extaze* (Ecstasy) drawings he made series of drawings based on Henri Borel’s *The Last Incarnation* (1900), Henri van Booven’s *White Nights* (1901) and Van Eeden’s *Johannes Viator* (1892). De Nerée called these works ‘dust jackets’, although they were never used as such. One example in the Rijksmuseum’s collection is the undated ink drawing *Ornament with Female Figure* which De Nerée likewise described as a ‘dust jacket’ (fig. 10). On the basis of this title and the handling of line and style, which is reminiscent of the English artist Aubrey Beardsley, it can be dated to 1900-01, or at the very latest 1903.

One of De Nerée’s closest friends, from early 1899 to around 1903, was the writer and journalist Henri van Booven (1877-1964), who devoted his life to keeping alive the memory of his friend who had died so young. Among other things, he wrote a lavishly illustrated commemorative article for *Elsevier’s Geïllustreerd Maandschrift* which was published at the end of 1911. In it Van Booven referred to an early drawing:
The 1899 work was important, but the steely permanence which would later characterize it was still largely lacking. I recall from that time a drawing in pencil, which had not been in the exhibitions in the Kunstkring in The Hague or in Arti in Amsterdam, titled Le Jardin des supplices after the book of that name by Octave Mirbeau.29

In his own copy of the catalogue of the exhibition at Arti in December 1910, Van Booven made a note next to entry number fourteen, the Extaze drawing Finale, probably as a reminder for himself: ‘Illustration for Le Jardin des Supplices by Octave Mirbeau’.30 The existence of a work by De Nerée that had been based on Mirbeau’s novel can also be inferred from the recollection of Hermine Schuijlenburg, an actress in Eduard Verkade’s famous theatre company. Verkade was an extremely close friend of De Nerée’s from 1900 until the end of the artist’s life. She recalled that he ‘was very impressed by Mirbeau’s Le Jardin des supplices’.31

What must have appealed to De Nerée was the recalcitrance and the condemnation of bourgeois mentality it contained. As far as he was concerned, to be bourgeois was almost the worst thing you could be, as Van Booven recalled: ‘If I objected to Karel’s urges or desires with cool determination, he said that I had become “bourgeois” and he lost more “grip” on me.’32 It was not entirely original to write people off as bourgeois, for in the higher social, aristocratic and patrician circles in which the artist primarily moved it was ‘an easy term to dismiss anything to which one felt superior, but with a pleasurable undertone of objectivity’, to quote the historian Ileen Montijn in her study Leven op stand: 1890–1940.33 The fact that De Nerée took this anti-bourgeois attitude seriously is evident from the novel Burgerdom, which he is said to have written. Van Booven recalled that when he posed for the ‘priest portrait’, ‘Karel sat very industriously writing a work aimed at “the citizen” as he said’.34 However this novel, possibly inspired by Mirbeau, remained unpublished and only fragments of it appear to have survived.35

According to Schuijlenburg, he may also have made drawings for Mirbeau’s novel: she remembered a drawing of a fat executioner in the torture garden.36 She had seen this drawing when she visited De Nerée in his room in The Hague to choose a work. It must have been before 1901, because that was when De Nerée went to Madrid to start work as a junior consul. Van Booven visited him there in May and wrote about that stay in the roman à clef Een liefde in Spanje.37

It was probably because Van Booven had criticised De Nerée’s first works, as he also wrote in Elsevier’s magazine, that despite their close friendship he was not allowed to choose a work:

I’ve never understood why he never gave me anything (I don’t even know who has my portrait Henri van Booven as a Young Priest). To be honest I believe he thought that I found that his first work had too little “of himself” in it, looking in vain for the mature individuality, that alas! alas! I was never allowed to see in him, not even in the upcoming exhibition.38

De Nerée’s works rarely have established titles given to them by him or by others, but in the catalogues of the exhibitions staged from 1910 to 1914, which generally featured a hundred or so works, there is not one that could be linked to Mirbeau’s novel. There is, though, a plausible candidate: the drawing the Rijksmuseum has entitled Allegorical Scene with Figures and a Peacock in a Garden.

De Nerée hardly ever made drawings larger than around twenty by forty centimetres. At forty-eight by slightly
more than seventy-three centimetres Allegorical Scene is an exception in his oeuvre. The paper mounted on linen is, or has become, yellowish brown and the drawing was made with a pencil, Indian ink and a little white and red paint here and there. That the artist was more or less happy with the work can be gathered from the signature ‘CDN’, lower right in pen, which looks very much like the signature on the pencil and pen and ink drawing of The High Priest from 1900-01. That work is also a similarly unusual size and was made on the same kind of paper.

Allegorical Scene came from De Nerée’s estate, which was administered by his mother and brother Frans (1882-1929) and went
under the hammer on 21 March 1933 as lot 52, *Le Jardin Symbolique*, at the Mak van Waay auction house, where it was purchased by a certain Van der Linde. At the sale held from 7 to 9 May 1951 at the auction house of Paul Brandt, the Rijksmuseum bought a drawing (lot 21) entitled *Fantasy of Figures and a Peacock in a Garden* from the collection of Jan Knoef (1896-1948) for twenty guilders. We do not know who in the Rijksmuseum gave the work its present title or when this happened.

Preliminary studies by De Nerée are extremely rare, so it is unusual to find what appears to be one for the *Allegorical Scene*. There is a pencil drawing of a swan-like figure of a man, *Study of a Stylized Man’s Head* (fig. 11), and on the back he drew a horizontal, elongated landscape in looping lines with trees and a peacock (fig. 12). This drawing was made on the Ministry of Foreign Affairs’ paper in De Nerée’s drawing style of 1899-1901. It may be a design for the landscape in *Allegorical Scene*. Van Booven’s remark that the Mirbey drawing was in pencil, whereas the work in the Rijksmuseum was done in Indian ink, is puzzling. However, it was started in pencil and Van Booven may well have seen a first version that De Nerée had begun in 1899 which became the drawing Schuijlenburg had seen before April 1901.

**Possible Influences**

The large drawing in the Rijksmuseum was never finished. De Nerée seldom if ever completed his works anyway. ‘Oh, richness of the unfinished’, wrote one of De Nerée’s favourite poets, J.H. Leopold, in about the same period. In part this failure to complete things came about because the ‘dilettante’ De Nerée always did art ‘on the side’, but according to Van Booven it was a deliberate artistic process, particularly in his early works:
… it may well be called a peculiarity of the first drawings, most of which appear unfinished, an impression that was created on purpose and in a particular way, where undivided attention was focused on the quality of certain lines. By postponing a final version De Nerée was reflecting a symbolist aesthetic, in which the search for the rendition of an idea was key and signified ‘a state of perpetual incompleteness’. In the words of the symbolism expert Rodolphe Rapetti: ‘This rejection of a “definitive” version suggested the mental possibility of extending a work beyond its physical limits, which would also lead to a redefinition of the technical characteristics of any given mode of artistic expression.’ Van Booven, however, also provides a more prosaic and less art-theoretical explanation:

In the first drawing of Le Jardin des supplices – at any rate when I knew it; it is quite possible that De Nerée made changes to it later – the artist appeared to be at an utter loss with the grouping of the strange miscellany that had to be incorporated.

The dating of 1899-1901 is supported by the echoes of the symbolist works of Jan Toorop, one of his great examples. The kneeling, dark-haired female figure with upturned face calls to mind the figure in Toorop’s poster Venise Sauvée (1895) (fig. 13). Similar female figures also feature in his Staatskas lithograph (1895) and his ribbon design for Couperus’s Metamorfoze (1897). These fragile female figures looking away from the earth – from the material – link the work of both Toorop and De Nerée with the neo-mysticism so fashionable at the time. The piously folded hands are also present in De Nerée’s works made between 1899 and 1901, such as the Ecstasy series, Two Women by a Tree-trunk with Sunflower, Female Figure and the Claartje Rijnbende Triptych.

In his earliest years as an artist, De Nerée had certainly also looked at the work of Johan Thorn Prikker, as is evident from one of his first drawings, Thesbe from 1899. The parallel lines that De Nerée used to shape the large figure in the centre seem to have been borrowed from Thorn Prikker’s Moine épique (1894) (fig. 14) or Le Forgeron (1895). Although Thorn Prikker’s work was rarely exhibited in the eighteen-nineties, De Nerée had seen reproductions of these works in the magazine De Tuin (1899) and in Maandschrift voor Vercieringskunst (1896-97).
Finally, a hint of Antoon Derkinderen can be found in the dress of the central figure. The circular elements resemble the decorations on the title page of the *Gedenkboek der Hollandsche schilderkunst* (1898) he designed. The artist invariably used the text as a starting point for the extremely individual, totally subjective representation of his reading experience. A direct link with the original text is therefore often difficult to establish. For example, when Van Booven saw the drawings De Nerée had based on *White Nights* published in September 1901, the writer was initially angry because ‘I thought that none of the four drawings he made for my first work showed even the slightest connection with the content’.

As far as we know De Nerée did not give the drawing in the Rijksmuseum a title, but in the light of the information we have found it can be linked to the text in Mirbeau’s novel. The fact that the scene in the drawing is the garden from the novel is clear from the winding path flanked by exotic plants and flowers that gives the narrator and his cruel lover Clara access to the torture garden. These figures do not appear in the drawing, but the path does.

In the novel, the ground is fertilized with the remains of the Chinese ‘coolies’ who constructed the garden: ‘Mixed with earth as manure (for they were buried on the spot), the dead fertilized it with their slow decomposition. In any event, nowhere else in the world does an earth richer in natural humus exist – not even in the heart of the most fantastic tropical forest.’ De Nerée represented this by incorporating human figures in the bushes on the left of the female figure with black hair and having eye sockets spring out from the shrubbery lower left. The Chinese character of the whole drawing is emphasized by the dragons on the dress of the figure in the middle.

The pale, emaciated figure on the left could refer to the passage in the novel in which someone is tortured by having their skin flayed off. His hands are clasped, but not in mystical resignation, more in an appeal for mercy. Schuijlenburg thought that she recalled a ‘fat executioner’ but what she meant by that is unclear. It may be the figure in the middle although – as in the novel – it is not fat, nor does it have an instrument of torture.

Mirbeau describes how the garden is populated by peacocks, and these birds can be seen in the preliminary study and in the drawing in the Rijksmuseum. In the novel Clara feeds them human flesh and encourages them to take part in unnatural, ‘decadent’ behaviour. The peacock motif is conspicuous in late nineteenth-century modern art. The bird is perhaps the overarching symbol of the Aesthetic Movement with its most famous examples *The Peacock Room* (1876-77) by James Abbott McNeill Whistler and *The Peacock Skirt* (1893) by Aubrey Beardsley. From the variations in the *Salomé* series that De Nerée made in 1900 and 1901, part of which is *The Peacock Skirt*, it is obvious that he was familiar with that work.

With their dystopian visions of the garden, De Nerée and Mirbeau reinforce a theme from Symbolism, in which the picturesque spot is an allegory of wilderness. Consider, for instance, the dark, occult forests by Arnold Böcklin (like *Forest View of 1882*) or by Pierre Puvis de Chavannes (for example *The Sacred Grove* of 1884). In the most modern literature from that period J.-K. Huysmans’ *En rade* (1887) is an example of a dystopian perception of nature.

If a landscape in a symbolist artwork is populated, it is usually by apparitions from dreams or fantastical beings, often animal and human hybrids. In a broader sense this is a recurring theme in Symbolism,
of which Franz von Stuck’s *Die Sünde* (1893) and Fernand Khnopff’s *Caresses* (1896) are famous examples. The woman in these works is portrayed allegorically as a highly dangerous animal. Mirbeau follows the same path by taking the thin line between human civilization and animal rawness as the principal theme of his novel. In what is probably De Nerée’s best known work, the pastel *Black Swans* of 1901, this is represented by zoomorphic beings: swans fused with female figures. In *Allegorical Scene* the synthesis of raw nature and man is represented by the heads floating like birds in the centre at the top. He may have taken his inspiration for this from Odilon Redon (fig. 15), whose art was associated with De Nerée’s: ‘The artist, who died young, was akin to Odilon Redon. His imagination was rich and dramatic,’ commented De Arnhemse Courant decades later. In 1901 he embarked on a Da Vinci-esque self-portrait in pencil in which he depicted his own head floating in a nebulous vacuum (fig. 16). The floating head in one of De Nerée’s drawings for *Johannes Viatore* of 1903 is also like Redon’s (fig. 17).

As a landscape drawing the *Allegorical Scene* in the Rijksmuseum fits seamlessly in the trends of Symbolism. At the same time, it is an exceptional work in De Nerée’s oeuvre, in which nature is virtually absent. As a true ‘decadent’ the natural held no attraction for him whatsoever: “His soul had no aspiration towards nature, the fantasies of his mind provided him with ample nourishment.”

**Conclusion**

With the purchase of *Fantasy of Figures and a Peacock in a Garden*, later renamed *Allegorical Scene with Figures and a Peacock in a Garden*, in 1952, the Rijksmuseum’s Print Room acquired one of Karel de Nerée tot Babberich’s rare drawings.
Babberich’s very first drawings. The fact that he made it after eagerly consuming Mirbeau’s novel gives it an extra dimension.

To call this drawing a ‘dust jacket’ or ‘illustration’ would rank it alongside other drawings based on literary sources, but that is to demean this Rijksmuseum work. It is precisely the licence he allowed himself so as to depict his experience of what he read, which can in part traced back to the text, that makes it a valuable work of art in its own right. The proposal is that from now on we acknowledge the literary origin of this 1899-1901 drawing and give it the explicit title *Torture Garden: Allegorical Scene of Human Cruelty (after the Novel by Octave Mirbeau)*.

---

*Fig. 17*

**KAREL DE NERÉE TOT BABBERICH**, *Illustration for Johannes Viator, no. 3, 1903.* Pencil and brush and Indian ink, 195 x 144 mm. Meentwijck Collection.
In her standard work *Het Symbolisme in de Nederlandse schilderkunst* (1955) Bettina Polak regarded the oeuvre of C.K.H. de Nerée tot Babberich (1880-1909) as one of the highlights of *fin de siècle* Dutch art. A fine example is the pastel portrait of *Henri van Booven as a Young Priest* (1900-01) that the Rijksmuseum acquired in 2019. The museum's collection already had nine sheets by Carel de Nerée in different techniques (pencil, ink and bodycolour). One of them, an allegorical scene of figures and a peacock in a garden, is striking in its relatively large size, the Symbolist style and the exotic subject. Based on technical characteristics of form and previously unknown or little studied sources, it is argued that the scene is based on *Le Jardin des supplices* (1899) by Octave Mirbeau. This novel was regarded as pornographic in the Netherlands, but it nonetheless inspired the contrarian young artist to create one of his first works, which proves to have been made between the summer of 1899 and the spring of 1901. In the article the drawing is placed in its biographical context and a number of other sheets by De Nerée from the collection are interpreted in more detail.
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