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INTRODUCTION

While recently some authors (Engel, 1937, 1939, 1961; Holthuis, 1969) rather extensively described Seba's life, personality, and cabinet of natural history objects, or discussed his "Thesaurus" (Seba, 1734-1765), indications on the vicissitudes and the present whereabouts of his specimens are only haphazardly given (Engel, 1961) or are scattered throughout zoological literature, difficult to find, incomplete, and often erroneous. Therefore, here an attempt is made to trace Seba's specimens through history, and to indicate where those examples still extant should be looked for at the present time.

As Seba's cabinet was auctioned at a time when "Holland" was exceedingly rich in such collections, almost each of them at the death of its owner again being auctioned and dispersed, it goes without saying that of the extensive Seba collections only a small part may be traced, while even on these there usually will remain some shadow of doubt. On the other hand, as some of Seba's specimens do have the status of type, the present effort (though still far from exhaustive) seems well justified.

THE AUCTION OF THE SEBA CABINET

A discussion of this auction, based on the 1752 auction catalogue (pl. 1) now in the Amsterdam University library, has been expertly presented by Engel (1961). Nevertheless, it seems of interest to provide here some more information on some of the buyers, on the number of specimens they bought, and whatever became of their collections, as far as these data still could be found. To restrict the scope of the present paper, only the zoological objects are taken into account. Though the Seba auction catalogue lists the specimens
in several chapters, the contents of all are more or less heterogeneous and
usually do not or hardly cover the group (or groups) indicated in their titles
(see Engel, 1961). As an example, the chapter "Catalogus Van diverse Rare
en Uitmuntende Insecten, Uit alle de Wereld-Deelen, gevolgt zoo veel
mogelyk is na de Beschryvinge van den Thesaurus Rerum Naturalium, het
tweede Deel van wylen de Heer Albertus Seba" (Catalogue of various strange
and excellent insects, from all parts of the world, following as far as possible
the description of the Thesaurus rerum naturalium, the second volume by
the late Albertus Seba), starts with a large series of mammals (see pl. 2).
Only the first chapter, "Diverse Hoorns en Schulpen" (Various shells and
bivalves), almost entirely concerns molluscs, with but a few sea-urchins, sea-
stars, and corals, while a short second paragraph contains various "sea-
shrubs" and corals. The total number of lots for these two chapters is approx-
imately 1200+72. The remaining zoological chapters, covering almost all
larger divisions of the animal kingdom (though only few molluscs, echi-
derms, or corals, while most of the insects at the time already were lost (cf.
Engel, 1937: 93)) consist of about 1300 items, and are here taken together
as a second group. The buyers and the approximate numbers of specimens
each bought are subsequently listed; the number of lots from the final chapter
(see pl. 2), mostly consisting of fishes, is added in brackets:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Buyer</th>
<th>Group 1</th>
<th>Group 2</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>&quot;Fishes&quot;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sluyter (Sluiter)</td>
<td>403 ex.</td>
<td>180 ex.</td>
<td>583 ex.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baigrie</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>302</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brandt</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>286</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vosmar</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>(90)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Van Ro(o)yen</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>(20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ernst</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>166</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carelius</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>(14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burman</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>(30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duloung</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>91</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valencijn (Valenzijn)</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>(24)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deknatel</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>61</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oudaan (Oudaen)</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gale</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>(35)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1) In the auction catalogue some letters are often added to the name Sluyter which,
according to Engel (1961: 127), "probably indicate for whom this broker was bidding".
The following numbers of lots for the various "letters" were found: B 46; BD 1; D 92;
H 116; L 11; R 23; none 114, for the first group. And D 55; E 10; V(isser) 3; W 1;
none 111, for the second group. As a result of the large number of cabinets at the time,
it is impossible to interpret these initials. Only Visser may well stand for J. de Visscher,
whose cabinet was sold at Amsterdam in 1760 and has been recorded by Vosmaer in
his manuscript list of contemporary cabinets (Engel, 1939: 326). This interpretation
is confirmed by Vosmaer (1783: 3).
Hasselgrein(-grijin) 31 — 31
Vrolijk 2 26 28
Lionet — — 22
Za(a)ntcamp(-kamp) — 22 22
Blinkvliet 7 13 20
Orsoy (Oursooy) — 19 19
Meyer — 17 17
Gelt(e) — 16 16
Homoet (Hoomoet) 15 — 15
Lammert van Otten 13 — 13
Van Mollum — 10 10 (10)
Putman — 9 9
Laars(e) — 8 8
Canouw 7 — 7
Ratsouw (Ratlouw) — 5 5
Witzen — 5 5
Haringkaspel 4 — 4
Zijdervelt 4 — 4
Grenobius 3 — 3
Strabe 3 — 3
Gourne 2 — 2
Hostijn — 2 2
Van Henouw — 1 1

THE BUYERS AT THE SEBA AUCTION

In the present chapter an attempt is made to provide some information on the buyers. Most of the information could be found in papers by Engel (1939) and Van Benthem Jutting (1939), some in a biographical dictionary (Molhuysen & Blok, 1911-1937), while tentatively some surmised or deduced possibilities are given.

Sluiter or Sluyter: evidently this indication concerns one of the three brokers (Th. Sluyter, J. Schut, and N. Blinkvliet) whose names occur on the title-page of Seba’s auction catalogue. Besides being a broker, at Amsterdam, he also possessed a cabinet which was sold in 1757 (Engel, 1939: 317; Van Benthem Jutting, 1939: 227). His cabinet and its auction were recorded in Vosmaer’s (1790) manuscript catalogue of contemporary cabinets, while Vosmaer seems to have obtained some Seba specimens for the Cabinet of the Stadholder at the Sluyter auction.¹ As a broker, like Balgrie, Dulong and Blinkvliet (see below), his purchases may have been made on behalf of various principals, e.g., the Petersburg Museum, the Bremen Museum (Merrem, 1821: 36), Janssen ², or Scandinavian principals.

¹) This may be deduced when comparing specimens figured in the “Thesaurus” occurring in the Seba auction catalogue and in a list of Paris material from the Stadholder’s Cabinet presented by Thomas (1892: 317).
²) Merrem (1821: 36) states: „Mit edler Bereitwilligkeit erlaubte mir der seel. Medi-
Brandt: J. C. Brandt (1703-1791) was an Amsterdam druggist. He possessed a large collection of natural history objects, mainly shells, which were sold in 1792. A considerable part of the shells and some zoophytes were eventually, presumably around 1851, obtained by the Amsterdam Museum (Engel, 1939: 261; Van Benthen Jutting, 1939: 1723).

Balgrie: although one of the principal buyers at the auction, this name is not found among those of known owners of eighteenth century cabinets, and it seems therefore most likely that he only bought on commission. Considering the amount bought, his principal(s) must have been very important, and it does not seem too wild a guess to presume that Balgrie bought his specimens on behalf of the St. Petersburg (Leningrad) Museum. A discussion of the material bought at the 1752 auction for the St. Petersburg Museum (now Zoological Institute of Leningrad) is given by Engel (1937: 83; 1961: 130); it seems to concern an impressive collection, and none of the other buyers (excepting possibly the broker Sluyter and the unknown Dulong) obtained that much, or had any apparent contact with Russia. But commissions also appear to have been given by Scandinavian institutions or collectors (Engel, 1937: 94), or by German principals (see remarks on Sluyter).

Vosmar: A. Vosmaer (1720-1799) possessed a cabinet himself, to which he considerably added at the Seba auction. He sold his cabinet to the stadholder in 1756, when he was appointed Director of the Stadholder’s Cabinets of Natural History and Art. After this, he must have added many specimens to the Stadholder’s cabinet at subsequent auctions up to 1795, when the French took care of it and transported most of it to Paris. But Vosmaer also retained a private collection (Van Benthen Jutting, 1939: 207), which was sold in 1800. Engel (1937: 94) records that he possessed an elephant embryo, but presumably this was not from the Seba collection. Vosmaer is known to have cooperated with Gronovius (see below).

Van Ro(o)yen: presumably professor A. van Royen (1704-1779), a botanist of Leiden University (Engel, 1961: 130). It is not known if he bought his numerous specimens for himself or, more likely, for the cabinet...
of Leiden University, but more information may be found in the Leiden University archives.

Ernst: there must have been in the eighteenth century a collection of J. F. Ernst at Amsterdam, but no particulars are known (Engel, 1939: 271). This cabinet was referred to by Vosmaer in his manuscript catalogue (1790).

Carelius: there is no direct information on Carelius in literature, but in a biographical dictionary (Molhuysen & Blok, 1914: 499) is stated that in 1744 a daughter was born to P. Carelius, surgeon in Amsterdam, who became a poetess of some renown subsequently. As a surgeon, he must have been well acquainted with Seba, and probably interested in natural history. But nothing is as yet known about his possession of a cabinet, which must anyhow have been of limited importance.

Burman: J. Burman (1706-1779) was a professor of botany at Amsterdam University, and a friend of Linnaeus (Engel, 1939: 262; 1961: 127). No indications have been found as to what happened with his collections (if he bought for private purposes and not for the university), but it seems most likely that they came into the possession of his son, N. L. Burman (1733-1793), also professor of botany at Amsterdam University. According to Engel (1939: 263) his cabinet contained plants, insects, shells, zoophytes, corals, fishes, etc. But again it is not known where his collections eventually went. Pallas (1767 (1): 9, 13, 16) and Boddaert (1767 (1): 6, 11, 14) refer to a collection of drawings of animals in the possession of Burman, some of which are considered to have been used as models for Seba's figures. Pallas at several places records to have used the facilities provided by the collections of his friend Burman (e.g., Pallas, 1772: 37).

Dulong: this name does not occur in the various lists of eighteenth century cabinets. As he did buy quite a large number of specimens, it seems likely that he bought on commission, like Balgrie and Sluyter, and possibly also for the St. Petersburg Museum. If not, he must at least have bought for some of the principal cabinet owners at the time, most of whose cabinets were subsequently auctioned again in the course of the century, and of most of which Vosmaer presumably finally obtained his share on behalf of the Stadholder, or for other foreign principals (see remarks on Sluyter).

Valencijn (Valenzijn): about this buyer nothing is known or can be surmised, except that he may have been related to the famous F. Valentijn (1656-1727).

Deknatel: Vosmaer, in his manuscript list of contemporary cabinets (1790) lists A. Deknatel, Amsterdam, whose cabinet was sold in 1765 (Engel, 1939: 267). Further particulars are not known.

Oudaan (Oudaen): M. Oudaan, Rotterdam (ca. 1702-1766), was a mer-
chant and presumably a nephew of Houttuyn. He possessed a cabinet of shells, which was sold in 1766 (Engel, 1939: 302). His cabinet was also referred to by Vosmaer (1790) in his manuscript list of cabinets.

Gale: Jeremias Gale, as indicated in the Seba auction catalogue, is otherwise unknown in literature.

Hasselgrein (Hasselgrijn): unknown in literature.

Vrolijk: possibly Vrolik is meant, the name of a well known Amsterdam family which included two professors at Amsterdam University, but which lived at a later date. Nothing is known about this buyer.

Lionet: P. Lyonet (1706-1789) was a very well known shell collector, whose cabinet was sold at The Hague in 1796. Though this was after the abduction of the Stadholder’s cabinet, it is known that Vosmaer bought at the auction (Van Benthem Jutting, 1939: 206), apparently for his personal collection. Further particulars are given by Engel (1939: 293).

Za(a)ntcamp (-kamp): appears to be unknown in literature.

Blinkvliet: N. Blinkvliet, Amsterdam, must have been one of the brokers at the Seba auction, as his name is mentioned as such on the catalogue’s title page. No further particulars are known, but most likely he also bought on commission and, like his colleague Sluyter, possibly on behalf of the St. Petersburg Museum or other foreign principals (see remarks on Sluyter).

Orsoy (Oursooy): J. A. van Orsoy, Amsterdam, is known to have had a cabinet of anatomy, insects, etc., which was sold in 1754 (Engel, 1939: 302).

Meyer: probably Chr. P. Meyer, merchant at Amsterdam, whose cabinet was sold in Utrecht in 1802; another possibility is C. G. Meyer at Amsterdam, cabinet sold at Amsterdam in 1780. Both cabinets were listed by Vosmaer (1790) (Engel, 1939: 296).

Gelt(e): unknown in literature, but indicated in the Seba auction catalogue as the buyer of an elephant embryo. This embryo may subsequently have reached Stockholm. It is recorded by Lönnberg (1904: 323) to have been obtained by King Adolf Frederik, who died in 1771, and who may have been Gelt’s principal.

Homoet (Hoomoet): Homoet is known to have possessed a cabinet of shells which was sold at Amsterdam in 1757. It was referred to by Vosmaer (1790) (Engel, 1939: 282).

Lammert van Otten: unknown in literature.

Van Mollum: probably Van Mollem, who possessed a silk manufactory near Utrecht. He assembled a cabinet of shells etc., but it is not known what became of it (Engel, 1939: 298).

Putman: unknown in literature.

Laars(e): M. Laars possessed a cabinet, mostly consisting of shells, which
was sold at Amsterdam in 1764. It was listed by Vosmaer (1790) (Engel, 1939: 286).

Canouw, Ratsouw (Ratlouw): unknown.

Witzen: J. Witsen, a member of the Municipal Council of Amsterdam, whose cabinet was sold at Amsterdam in 1790 (Engel, 1939: 333).

Haringkaspel: or Haringcaspel, a name still occurring in Amsterdam, but not found in literature.

Zijdervelt: unknown.

Grenobius: probably J. F. Gronovius (1690-1760), a surgeon at Leiden. He was interested in natural history, especially botany, and appears to have possessed some zoological specimens which (Engel, 1939: 276) probably went to his much better known son L. T. Gronovius (1730-1777), who as well may have been the buyer. A detailed account about L. T. Gronovius and his collections has been given recently by Wheeler (1958). L. T. Gronovius possessed at Leiden a large cabinet of corals, fishes, vermes, insects, reptiles, mammals, shells, etc., of which an Index was prepared by Meuschen for the auction of 1778 in Leiden. His specimens were listed and partly described in his papers, of which some occasionally indicate that he compared specimens with those of Seba (1754: 12, 14, 17, 29, 30, 32, 33, 36, 37, 52, 53, 55, 58, 60, 63 — 17 species; 1756: 9, 10, 13, 19, 21, 22, 24, 27, 28, 36, 40 — 13 species), while he also records to have received specimens from Vosmaer (see above), or used such examples for comparison. In a later publication, the “Zoophylacii Gronoviani” (1763-1781), the same kind of information is sparsely given among which, beside the rather large number of fishes presented by Vosmaer, the records of three fish specimens received from A. Russell are interesting (1763: 101, 126, 132). Gronovius frequently collaborated with Pallas (e.g., see Pallas, 1772: 59, or Boddaert, 1769: 23, 33).

Strabbe, Gourne, Hostijn, Van Henouw: not found in pertinent literature.

Resuming the situation after the auction of Seba’s cabinet, we may observe that a few large parts presumably have been bought on commission, a major portion most likely on behalf of the St. Petersburg “Kunstkammer” or Museum, where it should still be found in the Zoological Institute of Leningrad, or for other foreign institutions or collectors (see remarks on Sluyter). Another large part was bought by Vosmaer, and subsequently went to the Cabinet of the Stadholder at The Hague. Other lots went to various cabinet owners of more or less importance; the collections of most of these again were auctioned during the second half of the eighteenth century, and it may be assumed that ultimately Vosmaer (or the Stadholder) got some share of these too. The same may apply to lots bought on commission for some
unknown cabinet owners not themselves present at the auction. Some specimens (shells) eventually went to the Amsterdam Museum.

While it may seem deplorable that this important collection has been dispersed thus widely, we may assume that the most important buyers bought most of the really valuable items, which means that a reasonable number may have found its way to Leningrad, Berlin, Bremen, and Stockholm or, directly or indirectly, to the Stadholder’s cabinet at The Hague, while an interesting portion of the shells at last safely arrived at Amsterdam. The specimens not obtained by any of these six institutions probably should be considered lost, though occasional specimens may still occur elsewhere in larger collections, presumably without any possibilities for recognition.

The next problem to solve must be: what became of the Cabinet of the Stadholder? Is the story that the whole cabinet, or at least everything important, was abducted by the French on behalf of the Paris Museum correct? The answer to these questions is given below.

**The Cabinet of the Stadholder**

Since the Cabinet of the Stadholder became established in 1756 under the directorate of A. Vosmaer, it gradually increased in size and importance as a result of Vosmaer’s efforts at various auctions and by shipments sent from abroad, especially from the Dutch colonies. This development came to an end when in 1794-1795, after invading the Low Countries, the French took possession of the cabinet and transported most of its contents to Paris, where it considerably enriched the collections of the Paris Museum. Some important information on this subject, mainly restricted to mammals, has already been given by Thomas (1892). The collection of fishes in the Stadholder’s cabinet proved to be a rich source for new species which were described by Lacépède (1798-1803) and Cuvier & Valenciennes (1828-1849), and in a few cases Seba specimens in Paris have been recognized (e.g., Valenciennes in Cuvier & Valenciennes, 1836: 325; or Bauchot, 1963: 67, 119, 154). Thus there is no question but that at least a major part of the Cabinet of the Stadholder, including Seba specimens, went to Paris, but it seems difficult to accept Lacépède’s frequent statements about the specimens having been presented or yielded to France by the Dutch of free will, as a token of friendship. Lacépède occasionally thus exaggerated his statements on the subject, adding various lyrical phrases (e.g., 1798: 134; “cédée à la France par la nation hollandaise son alliée, après que la victoire a eu faire flotter le drapeau tricolor jusque sur les bords du Zuiderzee, ...”), that we may suspect that the poor Count used this kind of words to prove his revolutionary enthusiasm.
before the scrutinizing eyes of the successors of Robespierre, suspicious of all remnants of French nobility.

Though these remarks may seem to diverge widely from the story of the Seba specimens, they are necessary to correctly interpret the available information on the Cabinet of the Stadholder during and after the French occupation. New information on what actually happened when the French tried to abduct the Cabinet was found in a letter written by H. Schlegel, Director of the Leiden Museum, to the Trustees of Leiden University, dated February 6, 1865. In this letter (Leiden Museum archives) Schlegel stresses the importance of the "Museum Van Lidth de Jeude" (see later), and gives extensively some most unexpected information on the final vicissitudes of the Stadholder's Cabinet. The pertinent paragraphs may be quoted subsequently (in English translation).

"I may be allowed to discuss here only a few of the collections which at the moment form part of the Museum of the late Van Lidth de Jeude.

The oldest part of it is a rich collection of beautiful and rare specimens on liquor, procured from the Cabinet of H.H. Prince William the Vth. It is generally known that this Cabinet, after the revolution, has been sent by the French to Paris, but in 1815 has been fetched back and presented to the Leiden Academy (—University—) by H.M. William I. Meanwhile, as is the case in any Museum, in the cellar-stores, there were at the time of transportation of the said Cabinet to Paris, several specimens available successively sent from the Colonies which, unprepared and not included (—in the Cabinet—) were not obtained by the French, and remained under the care of the Custos acting at the time. This faithful servant informed the Prince, then in Germany, about this with the request to be instructed whether he should send the specimens to Germany. The Prince answered him that H.H. then was not interested in "Naturalia", as the whole of His Cabinet had been robbed, but that He presented 1) these specimens to the said Custos, who had lost his job, with the permission to sell them. The man died shortly thereafter, and the specimens now remained in the possession of his destitude widow. The late Prof. Brugmans, who was not acquainted with the facts of this case, was willing to buy this collection privately but postponed this, being prevented by his manifold occupations. Meanwhile the late van Klinkenberg at Utrecht came to know where this treasure was hidden, and this active collector did not miss the occasion to obtain it, to enrich his Cabinet, already famous at the time, and which, after his death, including all the specimens mentioned previously (—as—)

1) The words in italics are underlined in the original letter.
coming from the Cabinet of H.H. Prince William V, was obtained by the late Prof. Van Lidth de Jeude. — This story, though with the request to keep it secret, has already in 1827 been told to me by Mr. Klinkenberg, when he gave me permission to use without restraint his collections to further my research and as a result of my expression of surprise considering the many rare examples which a private person would probably not have been able to procure. Moreover, this (story) has before his death been confirmed in writing by Prof. Van Lidth de Jeude in August 1863.

Though this whole story is most illuminating and, in general, obviously true, there are some details which apparently need correction. Schlegel may have recounted the story as he heard it from his informant(s), but he was not acquainted with the situation and the atmosphere during the occupation, having arrived in Leiden in 1825, at the age of only 21 years. Also, he was apparently not aware of the circumstance that the collection overlooked by the French included various most important specimens, e.g. from Seba’s cabinet, which were unlikely to ever have been stored in cellars or with newly arrived material. And also it seems most unlikely that the French would have just overlooked such an important collection, which also seems to have included two sets of Seba’s valuable Thesaurus and a large number of paintings of animals by Aert Schouman (see chapter on Klinkenberg).

Considering that the Dutch majority has never been very friendly inclined towards invaders, whether Spanish, French, or German, and also considering recent similar circumstances, we may assume that there must have been some resistance against the abduction of the Stadholder’s Cabinet, especially among the adherents of the House of Orange (probably including all persons attached to the Cabinet). Therefore, it seems plausible to assume that a part of the collection was not accidentally overlooked by the French, but has been actively hidden, while it goes without saying that those responsible for this action added to the hidden collection as many valuable specimens, books, etc. as could be taken from the main Cabinet without arousing the suspicion of the French.

1)

Resuming this chapter, we find that, though the main part of the Cabinet of the Stadholder has been abducted to Paris (of which probably few speci-

1) Thomas (1892: 311) remarks that "in 1795, the invaders, ..., brought back with them to Paris certain of the specimens of the Stadholder's collection", adding that the important specimens in spirits "would not have been very attractive to the French military and unscientific collectors, and (that) they therefore, no doubt, remained in Holland, ...". Though this statement appears to concern the mammal collection only, it does not seem an acceptable explanation. The French were likely to have added to their soldiery some specialists well aware of the value of various objects of art and science.
mens were returned after the restoration of the Dutch independence — see Gijzen, 1938: 25; Engel, 1937: 94, 1939: 301, 1961: 130), a considerable part was secretly retained and eventually went to Van Klinkenberg's Museum and hence to the Museum Van Lidth de Jeude. This must be an "other channel" through which animals from Seba's collections came to Dutch museums (Engel, 1961: 130). 1)

Van Klinkenberg's Museum

Gijsbertus Johannes van Klinkenberg (or Klinkenberg) was a druggist at Utrecht. He must have been born in 1768 or 1769, as he is known to have died at the age of 72 on April 26, 1841. In spite of my efforts, little became known about him except that he passed his druggist examination in 1802, that he wore a powdered wig (he even invented a new kind of hairpowder), that he was a faithful and generous subject of the House of Orange, and that he assembled a large collection of natural history objects, a large library covering the same subject, and also specimens of art; optical instruments and various curiosities had his attention too. Among these, only his natural history collection, which he proudly named Museum of Natural History of Van Klinkenberg, and his library are here of importance.

Nowhere in literature the importance of Van Klinkenberg's Museum has been stressed as much as in the letter by Schlegel extensively quoted before. To this may be added that Schlegel subsequently, in his extensive correspondence concerning the Museum Van Lidth de Jeude, never again referred to Van Klinkenberg. This is strange as Van Klinkenberg's collection must have been of considerable renown. In the Utrecht Municipal Archives there is a booklet containing the signatures of various guests during the years 1813-1817. Among these we find as visitors of Van Klinkenberg's Museum among others Lichtenstein from Berlin, Meckel from Halle, Van Swinderen from Groningen, the well known collector Van der Capellen (formerly Governor-General of the Dutch East-Indies), etc.

About the extent of the Museum, some conclusions may be drawn from a printed extract of a detailed catalogue of the Museum, prepared by Van Klinkenberg (1839). The following numbers of various animals are listed:


Birds: 350 stuffed, 70 in spirits, 61 skeletons, 33 skulls.

1) Still another channel is indicated by Temminck (1853: 203, footnote): "Il y a plusieurs années, (cinquante ans à peu-près), que je fis l'acquisition de quelques bocaux, provenant des débris des collections de Seba".
Reptiles: 16 stuffed, 380 in spirits, 37 skeletons, 14 skulls, 14 carapaces.
Amphibians: 50 in spirits.
Fishes: 300 in spirits.
Mollusks etc.: 4463 dry, 120 in spirits.
Arthropods: 3016 dry, 223 in spirits.
Lower invertebrates: 263 dry or in spirits.

This extract does not give any information on separate items, but on its last page Van Klinkenberg added: "Tous les objects ci-dessus désignés, formant un total de 11920, intacts et bien conservés, ont été recueillis avec beaucoup de soin et d'exactitude, durant 50 années consécutives, par le Possesseur actuel, qui les a décrits et détaillés dans le Catalogue appartenant au Musée." (There is also a Dutch version of this extract.) It is extremely unfortunate that this extensive and detailed descriptive catalogue appears to be lost. Presumably, it only existed in handwriting, having never been published, and with its disappearance we may have lost an accurate indication of the extent of Van Klinkenberg's acquisition from the Cabinet of the Stadholder as well as information on its contents. Also it may have included information facilitating the tracing of Seba specimens, and it is to be hoped that it still will be found somewhere.

Finally, some corroborative information may be found in an auction catalogue of Van Klinkenberg's library (Anonymous, 1841), in which the first two items are both sets of Seba's "Thesaurus" (Latin and French, and Latin and Dutch editions). ¹ This confirms the statement by Thomas (1892: 313), and there is ample reason to also accept Thomas's deduction that the possession of two sets of this work, extremely valuable even at that time, must point to a special interest in Seba by Van Klinkenberg. Actually, we may go slightly further and surmise that probably both sets belonged to the Stadholder's Cabinet, and were sold to Van Klinkenberg together with the hidden specimens. The possibility of Van Klinkenberg's obtaining books from this source seems supported by his also possessing 343 drawings of animals by the well known artist A. Schouman, "made after life, mostly after specimens from the menagerie of the late Prince of Orange, H.H. William V", which probably also were part of the Stadholder's Cabinet. Aart Schouman (1720-1792), who lived at Dordrecht, made many drawings for Vosmaer (Engel, 1939: 315), who published them between 1766 and 1804. At the present time, Schouman's drawings and paintings may be found in Amsterdam (library of Artis Zoological Garden, Rijksprentenkabinet),

¹) Both must have been bought by Van Lidth de Jeude, as almost identical references to two copies of Seba's "Thesaurus" may be found in the auction catalogue of Van Lidth de Jeude's library (Anonymous, 1866: 1 (no. 6) and 9 (no. 210).
Haarlem (Teyler’s Stichting), The Hague (Municipal Museum), and the Institut Néerlandais in Paris (200 water-colours) (Balis, 1968: 66, addendum: 12, 13).

As already stated by Schlegel in his letter of February 6, 1865, and also in a supplement-catalogue of the library concerning Utrecht in the Utrecht Municipal Archives, and by Engel (1939: 285), Van Klinkenberg’s Museum was sold in 1841 in Utrecht to Th. G. van Lidth de Jeude, professor at Utrecht University, who included it in his Museum. Only Engel states that the birds were sold separately to Kat van Barendrecht (a statement copied by Brouwer, 1954: 51), surprisingly adding about these birds the words “which he had drawn by Schouwman” (sic), though this artist died already in 1792! Evidently this statement is erroneous and has been induced by the fact that at the auction of Van Klinkenberg’s library, the Schouman drawings have been bought by “De Katt” (= Kat van Barendrecht) as indicated by a handwritten annotation in the consulted auction catalogue (Anonymous, 1841: 19).

Therefore, we may assume that during the time Van Klinkenberg possessed part of the Stadholder’s Cabinet, no specimens were lost, and that after Van Klinkenberg’s death his whole collection came into the possession of Th. G. van Lidth de Jeude at Utrecht, who incorporated it in his Museum.

**The Museum Van Lidth de Jeude**

Theodoor Gerard van Lidth de Jeude (1788-1863) was appointed professor of medicine at the University of Harderwijk already in 1815. He left there when he became professor of zoology at the University of Utrecht, where he remained until he resigned in 1858. In 1821 he also became the first director of the newly founded Veterinary School at Utrecht, an office he kept till 1826, after which he continued his lecturing there until 1851. In the course of his lifetime he assembled a large collection of natural history objects, which was named the Museum Van Lidth de Jeude, on which he must have spent much of his time and his financial possibilities. Like Van Klinkenberg’s Museum, his collection was of considerable renown. Some lyrical remarks on the subject may be found in notes compiled by his contemporary and colleague G. Moll, professor of mathematics and physics, in 1836 (Bannier, 1936: 145): “Did you ... see the cabinet of Professor Van Lidth de Jeude and the anatomical and pathological collection of the Veterinary school and that of the Baron van der Capellen ... and that of the Druggist Klinkenberg ...? Yes, those are beautiful collections, which show Utrecht’s interest in science. In Leiden one does not find such exceptional collections” (in translation). Moll apparently did not distinguish himself as an objective observer, and also his remarks
on the activities of Van Lidth de Jeude are rather obnoxious: “Professor van Lidth — who sometimes during the whole of the Academic year does not even lecture three times. First this was because the Cabinet was not in good order. He had to start arranging it; this he has done with exemplary tidiness and in exquisite order. Subsequently, he had no room for lecturing; his friend Craejvanger had one built for him at the expense of the country, in this time of retrenchment”. To the defence of Van Lidth de Jeude should be stated that he may not have spent much time on lecturing at the university, but that he appears to have been quite active at the Veterinary School, though during much of his time he must have been occupied with his Museum.

Already in 1835, Van Lidth de Jeude appears to have offered his Museum for sale to the Minister of the Interior, who asked from Temminck, Director of the Leiden Museum, information on its importance and value (letter of January 2, 1836, Leiden Museum archives). Surprisingly, Temminck restricted himself to merely answer that “he was completely unacquainted with the collection of Prof. van Lidth de Jeude”, adding that, if the Minister thought this advisable, he was willing to go to Utrecht. Temminck and Van Lidth de Jeude must have known each other (both were members of the Hollandsche Maatschappij der Wetenschappen at Haarlem), but though in a letter (January 1858, Leiden Museum archives) Van Lidth de Jeude actively tries to establish better contacts with the Leiden Museum, this was never accomplished, possibly because the effort came too late (Temminck died in the course of 1858) or because Temminck did not sufficiently appreciate Van Lidth de Jeude and (or) his Museum.

Schlegel, on the other hand, already became acquainted with Van Lidth de Jeude’s Museum in 1827, as he states in the important letter of February 6, 1865 (Leiden Museum archives). In the course of time he became well befriended with the Van Lidth de Jeude family and, after the death of his wife in December 1864, Schlegel again married, in 1869, Van Lidth de Jeude’s stepdaughter, Albertina C. P. Pfeiffer (Schlegel, 1884: 73; Molhuysen & Blok, 1911: 1274). Schlegel’s son states in the 1884 biography of his father that he must have made his acquaintance with his second wife already at a considerably earlier date, as in 1866 he had dedicated to her a bird, Charitornis Albertinae, an apparent token of appreciation. 1)

As already stated before, Van Lidth de Jeude for the first time offered

1) With his description of the bird, Schlegel (1866: 3) presents the following explanation for the proposed specific name: “L’épithète conférée à ce charmant oiseau rappelle le nom de l’une des aimables filles de notre défunt ami, le professeur VAN LIDTH DE JEUDE; qui, mainte fois, a eu la bienveillance de nous faire, avec une grace parfaite, les honneurs des riches collections de son père”.

---
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his Museum for sale in 1835, apparently to have it incorporated in the collections of the Leiden Museum and in the Anatomical Cabinet of Leiden University. Probably as a result of Temminck’s lack of enthusiasm, nothing came off. In 1858, when resigning as professor at Utrecht University, Van Lidth de Jeude again offered his anatomical and zoological collections for sale, this time in a letter directly to Temminck and Schlegel (January 1858, Leiden Museum archives). To this letter he added a short inventory of the collections. In the letter Van Lidth de Jeude states (in translation): “As it has always been my purpose to retain this collection for our Native Country 1), I have made one more effort to prevent, if possible, the for me so sorrowful public auction, by which everything will be dispersed. To know: I have respectfully requested H. M. the King to have both parts of the Cabinet bought for the Government to be distributed between the Museums of Leiden, Utrecht, and Groningen. In the added inventory, the first part of the collection is shown to contain 1662 mammals (of which 362 in spirits), 3300 birds (60 in spirits), 1580 reptiles and amphibians (1460 in spirits), and 1345 fishes (920 in spirits); the second part contains an enumeration of skeletons (mammals 309, birds 300, reptiles 100, fishes 50), skulls (mammals excl. Homo 561, other vertebrates 305), and numerous anatomical objects.

This time Schlegel, as acting director during the illness of Temminck, quickly responded by writing a letter to the Minister of the Interior (March 16, 1858, Leiden Museum archives) requesting permission to attend the first Van Lidth de Jeude auction which was scheduled to take place in Arnhem on April 6, 1858, and following days. Apparently Schlegel saw no possibilities in complying with Van Lidth de Jeude’s request for a direct transaction covering the whole collection. The Leiden Museum archives do not contain an answer to Schlegel’s request, but it is known that Schlegel attended the auction.

For this first auction, Van Lidth de Jeude had compiled a catalogue covering his stuffed mammals and birds, as well as his fishes both stuffed and in spirits, numbering 697, 3267, and 427 + 909 items respectively. These groups comprise the first, second and fourth (a + b) chapters, while of a third chapter, intended to list the reptiles (and amphibians), only the title-page is given. According to a remark in his letter of 1858, Van Lidth de Jeude had not yet completed the reptile chapter, and he intended to have these animals sold at a later date together with his anatomical cabinet. Of this auction catalogue, the Leiden Museum archives contain

1) The words in italics are underlined in the original letter.
a handwritten copy as well as the printed version, both unfortunately without annotations.

Interesting is also the preface to the catalogue in which Van Lidth de Jeude states to have bought collections from “feu Mr. le Baron van der Capellen, ancien Gouverneur général des Indes Orientales; de (f)eu Mr. van Klinkenberg, amateur zèle à Utrecht; des Mrs. Muller, Draak, etc.” While Van Klinkenberg has already been extensively discussed on previous pages, it seems worth while to also provide some information on the other listed contributors to Van Lidth de Jeude’s Museum.

Baron van der Capellen: G.A.G.P. Baron van der Capellen (1778-1848), was a Governor-General of the East Indies during the period 1816-1826, when he must have met some members of the Natuurkundige Commissie at the time exploring the natural resources of the archipelago. 1) In his letter of February 6, 1865, Schlegel also stresses the importance of Van der Capellen’s contribution to Van Lidth de Jeude’s Museum. He even records that Van der Capellen, when assembling his collections in the East Indies, had been assisted by C.G.C. Reinwardt, member of the Natuurkundige Commissie, and presumed to collect only for the Leiden Museum. Engel (1939: 264) states that (only?) Van der Capellen’s cabinet of shells was bought by Van Lidth de Jeude, but this is not confirmed by Schlegel’s remark.

Muller: probably S. Müller, also a member of the Natuurkundige Commissie, who visited the East Indies during the period 1825-1837. After his return he remained in The Netherlands till 1850, subsequently living in Heidelberg and Freiburg. Further particulars are given by Veth (1879, especially: 41), but nothing seems to be known about his possessing a collection. Still, also Van Benthem Jutting (1939: 211) adheres to this interpretation of Van Lidth de Jeude’s “Muller”.

Draak: R. Draak, a pupil of Temminck, possessed a cabinet including birds, fishes, etc., which at first he kept in the garret of the Amsterdam Orphanage, of which he was an attendant. Afterwards it is claimed to have formed the first Museum of the Amsterdam Zoological Garden (Engel, 1939: 269). After a quarrel Draak seems to have withdrawn this collection (Van Benthem Jutting, 1939: 168) and apparently it went to Van Lidth de Jeude. But Gijzen (1938: 308) records that Draak also sold mammals and birds to the Leiden Museum.

1) The Natuurkundige Commissie voor Nederlandsch-Indië (Natural History Commission for the Netherlands Indies) was installed in 1820 with the object to explore and further the knowledge of the natural history of the East Indies. It existed till 1850, and included among its members such well known explorers as H. Kuhl, J. C. van Hasselt, H. Boie, H. C. Macklot, S. Müller, etc.
About the actual sale nothing hitherto appears to have been published, and in fact it was not even known until recently, during the preparations for the present paper, whether Schlegel indeed was present at the Arnhem auction. As a result, Gijzen's (1938: 168) chapter on Van Lidth de Jeude proves to be rather incomplete and incorrect. Fortunately, the official act of the auction was still available at the Rijksarchief in Gelderland (Government Archives in the province of) Gelderland, and a xerox-copy was obtained for the Leiden Museum archives. In this official paper all purchasers are listed with the numbers of the lots bought, and the prices. From this it is clear that the auction was not a success, as of the 697 stuffed mammals only 272 were sold, of the 3267 stuffed birds only 799, while the whole fish collection was withdrawn from the auction. A short review of the principal buyers may now be given.

Reviewing the buyers according to the numbers of specimens they obtained, we have to start with Mulder. Presumably, this was C. Mulder (1796-1867), professor of chemistry at the University of Groningen and, after his colleague Van Swinderen (previously mentioned as one of the important visitors of Van Klinkenberg's Museum) died, since 1841 also of natural history (Engel, 1939: 298). Engel also states that already in 1841 he sold his collections to the University Museum of Groningen, which was unfortunately destroyed by fire in 1906. Presumably, Mulder bought his Van Lidth de Jeude specimens, including 48 mammals and 95 birds, for this Museum, and we may assume that none escaped destruction in 1906.

Schlegel succeeded in obtaining 35 mammals and 90 birds for the Leiden Museum, which should still be there. Lists of these acquisitions were found in the Leiden Museum archives.

Warwick, a trader in natural history objects, bought 36 mammals and 80 birds. As he is indicated in the auction catalogue as to have lived in London, it seemed obvious that at least a part ultimately went to the British Museum. Actually, transactions with Warwick are recorded by Sharpe (1906: 507) dating up to 1858, but these are only provided for birds, not for mammals (Thomas, 1906: 61). However, Mr. P. J. P. Whitehead kindly provided the following information from the British Museum registers: among acquisitions purchased from Warwick in 1858 are 22 stuffed mammals (B.M. 1858.11.28.1-22) with the indication “Purchased of Mr. Warwick. From the Museum of Mr le Dr Th. G. van Lidth de Jeude of Utrecht en Hollande”; among the birds, there is only one lot of 32 stuffed specimens (B.M. 1858.4.27.1-32) with about the same information on its derivation. Several other collections obtained from Warwick by the British Museum
during the same period may include Van Lidth de Jeude material, but this is not indicated in the registers; these include mammals, birds, reptiles and fishes. Gijzen (1938: 334) also lists Warwick as having traded skins to the Leiden Museum, but apparently he never sold any Van Lidth de Jeude specimens to Leiden.

Frank, at Amsterdam, was a well-known trader. He bought 34 mammals and 80 birds. Considering that he is known to have made transactions with most of the important museums at the time, including both the British and the Leiden Museum, nothing can be said about what happened to his specimens.

Hartink at Utrecht: evidently this indication concerns P. Harting (1812-1885). He became professor of medicine at Franeker in 1841, and in 1843 (when the Franeker Athenaeum was closed) was appointed professor of pharmacology and plant-physiology at the University of Utrecht. However, gradually his interest changed to zoology, in 1855 he started lecturing in zoology, and in 1856 he became Director of the Zoological Museum (Molhuysen & Blok, 1933: 322). He is not known to have ever possessed a private collection, thus must have bought his Van Lidth de Jeude specimens, 53 mammals and 18 birds, for the Utrecht University Museum. It is not known whether any of these specimens are still there, after the last world war a considerable part of the Utrecht zoological collections were presented to the Leiden Museum, while also some material went to the Amsterdam Museum.

Esman, Norway: this indication presents some problems, especially as the name may well have been spelled erroneously (as was the case with Harting). An indication limiting the possibilities of interpretation is the fact that “Esman” only bought 65 birds, apparently not being interested in the mammals. Therefore, he presumably was not responsible for non-avian Seba specimens in Scandinavian collections (Engel, 1939: 94). This bidder may have been a subordinate buying specimens on behalf of one (or some) major Scandinavian collectors or institutions. The only name of an ornithologist found to be more or less similar appears to be L. Esmark, of Christiania (Oslo), and this seems a more likely interpretation.

Other buyers obtaining important collections were Groneman, from Zutphen (4 mammals, 41 birds); Van Lijnden (Lynden?), from Arnhem (7 mammals, 38 birds); Brunnenwasser, from Arnhem (3 mammals, 37 birds); Van der Meulen (or Vermeulen), from Arnhem (2 mammals, 35 birds); Tack, from Arnhem (no mammals, 31 birds); Tromp, from Arnhem (no mammals, 28 birds); Beelaarts, from Arnhem (no mammals, 16 birds); while
still smaller lots were bought by IJzendoorn, Bleekman, Kok, and Spengler, all from Arnhem, and by G. F. Westerman (1807-1890, founder of the Amsterdam Zoological Garden, 11 mammals), W. C. H. Peters (1815-1883, professor of zoology at the University of Berlin, and Director of the Zoological Museum, 4 mammals), and M. E. de Selys-Longchamps (1813-1900, of Liège, Belgium, 1 mammal). It seems reasonable to assume that most of these buyers (from Arnhem and Zutphen) merely bought for private purposes, being encouraged by having the auction near at hand, and that the items bought, unless subsequently obtained by more important collectors or institutions, now should be considered lost. Only the few items obtained by Westerman, Peters, and Selys probably still exist in their institutions.

Reconsidering the results of this first auction of Van Lidth de Jeude's collections, especially observing the limited number of specimens actually sold and the low prices, one can understand that Van Lidth de Jeude became quite depressed. In a letter to Schlegel of June 1, 1862 (Leiden Museum archives) he states (in translation): “From Arnhem I received back my stuff, in 124 1) boxes! — and these specimens now must all be cleaned and put in order. And, as I, having retired, am almost without help, everything falls to me. I have never objected to work; but the disappointment I suffered in Rotterdam and Arnhem depresses me!” (The disappointment in Rotterdam is still a mystery). And he even considered selling his anatomical collection to Japan. But, though Schlegel provided some advice to this end, nothing came off, presumably because Van Lidth de Jeude died in December 1863.

After this, nothing appears to have happened with Van Lidth de Jeude's collections until 1866. Actually, the idea to sell the large remainder of the Museum never appears to have left the inheritor(s), but such plans seem to have taken shape only in the course of 1864. Schlegel’s letter of February 6, 1865, extensively quoted on previous pages, indicates that he received from the board of Trustees of Leiden University a letter, dated January 20, 1865, requesting information on the Van Lidth de Jeude Museum, offered for sale to this institution. Schlegel answered by stressing the importance of the collection (relating the story about the hidden part of the Stadholder's Cabinet, Van Klinkenberg's Museum, etc.), by presenting his ideas about a future distribution of its contents, and by adding an inventory with its presumed value. Again it seems worth while to quote from this letter.

About the distribution, Schlegel states (in translation): “Considering the character of the Leiden Museum, it is evident that, as the Central Museum,
it will after the acquisition have the first and free choice of all items which either are lacking there or may serve to complete or replace damaged or less well preserved specimens, necessary for research. Roughly estimated, about half the Museum V. L. d. J. would be of value to the Leiden Museum...". He adds that the collection of human skulls could be given to the Leiden Academy (—University—), and that most of the remaining specimens or objects could be divided between the Universities of Utrecht and Groningen. The final remainder he suggested to use for distribution to high schools.

In an additional list, Schlegel enumerates the available material and estimates its value: mammals (stuffed) 420, 1900 D.fl.; birds (stuffed) 2437, 2800 D.fl.; mammals (in spirits) 270, 1900 D.fl.; vertebrate skeletons (mammals 310, birds 286, reptiles and amphibians 100, fishes 70) together 766, 5900 D.fl.; horns and antlers 166 (pairs), 450 D.fl.; skulls (mammals 444, birds 286, reptiles and amphibians 34, fishes 13) together 777, 1900 D.fl.; human skulls more than 100, 1000 D.fl.; anatomical objects about 1300, 2500 D.fl.; reptiles and amphibians (in spirits 1400, stuffed 129, carapaces 94) together 2000 D.fl.; fishes (in spirits 910, stuffed 426) together 1336, 800 D.fl.; insects (apparently more than 10,000) together 4500 D.fl.; crustaceans (stuffed 250, in spirits 383) together 633, 1100 D.fl.; spiders and millipedes (in spirits 257, stuffed 220) together 477, 300 D.fl.; worms (in spirits 251, glass tubes 100) together 351, 300 D.fl.; molluscs, "Cirrhopods", etc. 386 (in spirits), 400 D.fl.; shells several thousands of species, 8500 D.fl.; and lower invertebrates 1750 D.fl., the total value of the Van Lidth de Jeude Museum thus being estimated at 38,000 D.fl.

For some of these lots, his added remarks about the contents provide interesting information, of which a few items may be reproduced here. About the mammals in spirits he states (in translation): "This collection contains a very remarkable number of curious specimens, of which the most rare were procured from the Cabinet of H. H. W. (—William—) V. Several of these distinguish themselves an elephant embryo 1) measuring about two feet...".

1) It is interesting to note that young elephants or embryos seem to have been in the possession of Seba, Vosmaer, the Stadholder's Cabinet, and Van Lidth de Jeude. If Lönnberg's (1904: 323) claim is correct, the Seba specimen was bought (via Gelt) by King Adolf Frederik for the Stockholm Museum; about the Vosmaer specimen (Engel, 1937: 94) nothing seems to be known, but specimens from the Stadholder's Cabinet were claimed both by the Paris Museum (see list by Thomas, 1892: 317) and by Van Lidth de Jeude (judging by Schlegel's remarks as quoted in this paper). Possibly the example Leiden probably obtained from Van Lidth de Jeude (Jentink, 1892: 199, "c") actually is the Vosmaer specimen.
This may again be Vosmaer's elephant embryo already referred to on a previous page. About the vertebrate skeletons he states that this was the best collection of its kind in the world, adding that the Leiden Museum collection came next. As an example he mentions (translation) “the skeleton of a finned whale measuring 62 feet, according to the Director of the British Museum belonging to a new species, and for which that institution offered an amount of 1000 D.fl.”. About the reptiles and amphibians he states (in translation): “This collection mostly comes from the Cabinet of H. H. W. (—William—) V.” and “Reptiles (—and amphibians—) are bought in any number and without selecting by the British Museum for 3 British shillings each.” About the fishes he was less enthusiastic as the collection contained few specimens of interest. About the insect collection he states that it consisted of 370 big drawers and 416 jars respectively containing the dry specimens and those on spirits. Finally, about the shells he remarks to have estimated their value by considering “a bid made for it by various persons and recently by a British trader, all of which had come to Utrecht for the purpose to consider this collection”. Possibly this remark refers to Mr. Damon, who is discussed further on.

In a final paragraph Schlegel writes that Mrs. Van Lidth de Jeude would be compliant with regards to arrangements facilitating payment.

In spite of Schlegel’s extensive efforts, the Trustees of Leiden University had to inform him, in a letter of April 18, 1865 (Leiden Museum archives) that the Minister of the Interior had not considered it opportune to spend about 40.000 D.fl. to enrich collections already invaluable. Schlegel reacted to this disappointing information by directing to the Trustees of Leiden University a more limited proposal (May 1, 1865, Leiden Museum Archives), suggesting the acquirement of the really important desiderata only. Schlegel did not think that for this limited purpose the expenses would surpass 4000 D.fl.

With this letter is a list of desiderata compiled by Schlegel (in translation): “1) A choice from the collection of mammals on spirits, e.g., young elephant, hippopotamus, sperm whale, dolphins, aard-vark, and a considerable number of other rare species, all derived from the famous Cabinet of the Stadholder prince William V, and mostly unique in the Museum Lidth de Jeude. 2) Some stuffed mammals. 3) A choice from the stuffed birds, including objects of importance for research or recorded in scientific literature. 4) A similar choice from the Classes of reptiles and other lower animals. 5) A choice from the skeletons, including specimens which the Museum does not at all or very incompletely possess, or such which on account of their excep-
tional condition do not have their likes. 6) The same from the animal skulls.” There is no answer to this request in the Leiden Museum archives, but it is known that during 1866 and 1867, before the second Van Lidth de Jeude auction took place, numerous specimens of all vertebrate groups were acquired by the Leiden Museum.

But, as is shown by Schlegel’s remark on the Van Lidth de Jeude shells (see above), more persons (or institutions?) were interested in obtaining specimens from this collection. Among these, the principal may have been R. Damon, judging by the numerous specimens from Damon’s collections now in the British Museum.

From the consulted literature and other sources of information it was not clear if Damon was merely a trader in natural history objects, or if he (also) possessed a collection. According to Thomas (1892: 309), who (April, 5, 1892) writes about the late Mr. R. Damon, the British Museum specimens from Damon were all purchased. Also, Van Benthem Jutting (1939: 169, 174) only writes about purchases from Damon, the last evidently being in 1872. Fortunately, Mr. P. J. P. Whitehead was able to provide the information (in lit., October 6, 1969) that “Robert Damon (1814-1889) of Weymouth (was) a well known collector and dealer, as well as a conchologist and geologist”.

About the specimens from the Van Lidth de Jeude Museum the British Museum acquired through Damon, the following information may be given. In August 1866, the British Museum bought 210 fishes and 145 reptiles and amphibians, all in spirits (B.M. 1866.8.14.1-206 and 352-355; B.M. 1866.8.14.207-351). This was followed in April-October 1867 by the purchase of 290 mammals in spirits (B.M. 1867.4.12.324-613), 323 mammal skulls (B.M. 1867.4.12.1-323), 123 reptile and amphibian skulls and skeletons (B.M. 1867.4.2.66-188), 80 fish skulls and skeletons (B.M. 1867.4.2.1-65 and 189-203), 3 reptile skeletons (B.M. 1867.5.14.1-3), and 20 stuffed fishes and reptiles (B.M. 1867.10.16.1-20). In 1868 and 1869 three additional collections of fishes and reptiles from Damon were acquired (B.M. 1868.2.12.1-2, B.M. 1868.11.17.1-45, and B.M. 1869.4.22.1-6). It must be added that at present part of these specimens are not indicated as derived from the Van Lidth de Jeude Museum, but several bear the indications “Utrecht”, or “Jeude”, or even more complete data. Therefore, it seems obvious that at least most of these specimens came from that source, considering the time and the circumstances.

Also at this time, the Zoological Garden of Amsterdam purchased part of the Van Lidth de Jeude shell collection. It is stated (Van Benthem Jutting, 1939: 212) that this cabinet was “not so important”, but at the time the
facts related here were not known. However, it seems unlikely that this shell collection contains any indications allowing recognition of specimens derived from the Cabinet of the Stadholder or even from Seba.

Other private transactions may have taken place during this period, but it seems improbable that these were of much importance. Schlegel\(^1\) apparently had first choice and he was well aware of the importance of various specimens, as is shown in his letters as quoted above. Also Damon seems to have been acquainted with their value, as his purchases show by including numerous Stadholder or even Seba specimens (Thomas, 1892).

It seems obvious that, when the second auction was to take place in Utrecht, September 30, 1867 and following days, the collection to be sold was already mostly depleted of important objects. In fact, reptiles, amphibians and fishes were almost completely lacking. But the whole of the anatomical cabinet was still available. In a letter of July 31, 1867 (Leiden Museum archives), Schlegel proposed to the Trustees of Leiden University to buy this cabinet for the University, pressing them by adding that the University of Berlin had the same intention and that any day this purchase could take place. To this request Schlegel added a detailed list of contents and a copy of a letter by W. H. Flower, Director of the Royal College of Surgeons at London (both Leiden Museum archives), stressing the importance of the cabinet. There is no answer to this in the Leiden Museum archives, but it must have been favourable as in a subsequent letter (February 7, 1868, Leiden Museum archives) Schlegel states to have received the anatomical cabinet, and to send to the Trustees of Leiden University two catalogues concerning its contents. With the letter is also a detailed handwritten inventory of the cabinet. The zoological objects were already exhibited in the Leiden Museum, but the human anatomical objects were kept separate with the intention to have them presented to the “Museum anatomicum der L(eidsche) Academie”.

In a letter of March 26, 1868 (Leiden Museum archives), the Trustees of

\(^1\) For example, there are records that Schlegel already in 1866 obtained for the Leiden Museum at least 64 stuffed mammals, 65 mammal skeletons (or parts thereof), 64 bird skeletons (stuffed birds not counted), 48 reptiles and amphibians in spirits, 30 reptile skeletons, 4 fishes in spirits, and 12 fish skeletons, while the actual number may have been considerably higher. As some authors have doubted the accuracy of Van Lidth de Jeude’s localities, it is interesting to note that among a number of 323 of his specimens in the Leiden Museum, 178 had no locality data, while 52 were from Surinam, 25 from Holland, 18 (or 17) from South America, 16 from Europe, 16 from Asia, 13 from Africa, 5 (or 4) from North America, and one from Australia. This appears to show that Van Lidth de Jeude, when in doubt, did not attach a fictitious locality and, as a consequence, that there are no reasons to doubt his localities whenever given. A similarity with Seba’s collections is the considerable number of Surinam specimens.
Leiden University agreed to this, while in a letter of April 1, 1868 (Leiden Museum archives) Schlegel informs the Director of the Anatomical Cabinet of Leiden University (J. A. Bogaard) about this decision. These human objects still should be there, but part of the animal items, at first exhibited in the Leiden Museum, eventually probably went to the Zoological Laboratory of Leiden University.

To finish the story, we now have to return to the second auction of the Museum Van Lidth de Jeude in 1867. For this auction a catalogue (Leiden Museum archives) was prepared including the following items: stuffed mammals (169), stuffed birds (1856), mammal skeletons (148), bird skeletons (195), bird skulls (152), bird nests and eggs (5 lots), bird skins, mostly from Java (1 lot of 135 specimens), worms (1 lot), insects (more than 300 jars, in spirits, 1 lot), shells (more than 2200 specimens, 1 lot divided into 12 groups), skins of reptiles and carapaces (6), non-avian vertebrates on spirits (14 jars, 1 lot), and the skull of a narwal. This time, Schlegel was by far the most important buyer, acquiring 209 mammals 1), about 325 birds, 78 mammal skeletons, 174 bird skeletons, 137 bird skulls, 4 lots of the bird nests and eggs, the whole shell collection, and 5 items of the reptile skins and carapaces (information taken from a xerox copy of the official auction act now in the Leiden Museum archives, kindly provided by F. H. Ebell, notary at Utrecht). The numerous other bidders, with only two exceptions all from Utrecht, mostly bought small numbers of specimens and obviously just for private purposes. Only when purchasing the birds, Schlegel met with considerable resistance by the buyers Coté (ca. 172 specimens), Van Laer (100), Verloren (a known cabinet owner at Utrecht, 86), Bal (57), Beudeker (53), another Beudeker (53), Gijsels (56), Lebbe (53), etc., but none seem important and they probably only obtained the spoils of the Van Lidth de Jeude Museum.

From all this it may be clear that Engel made a mistake when stating (1939: 290) that Van Lidth de Jeude's collection was “for the greatest part bought for the British Museum, even if he meant this only for the 1858 auction. It seems clear that the most important items were about equally divided between the British and the Leiden Museum, and must still be in their custody.

1) Possibly including the young elephant, if such an interpretation of Jentink's statement (1892: 199, “c. (alc.) Très jeune individu”) is correct, though mammals in spirits are not listed in the catalogue and this purchase may have taken place at an earlier date.
The recognition of Seba's specimens

An interesting review of the methods which may be employed to establish with reasonable certainty whether specimens originally have been derived from Seba's Cabinet, has already been given by Thomas (1892). Though his remarks primarily concern mammals in spirits, at least part of the same methods may be used for stuffed mammals as well as for specimens of other vertebrate groups, while for stuffed specimens moreover the attitude figured in the "Thesaurus" seems of importance, considering that most drawings were made in a very meticulous way. However, Pallas (1767 (1): 9, 13, 16; or Boddaert's translation, 1767 (1): 6, 11, 14) indicates some of Seba's plates to have been made after drawings in the collection of Burman, one of the buyers at the Seba auction.

It seems of interest that Thomas recorded the British Museum specimens to have arrived in old-fashioned glass jars with red tops, as the same may be seen on the portrait of Seba in his "Thesaurus" (1734, see pl. 3). Unfortunately, both this kind of jars and the red tops were not restricted to Seba's collection or to his time, and the jars apparently even continued to be used by Van Lidth de Jeude well into the nineteenth century (Thomas, 1892: 309).

An important indication appears to be the size of the specimens. Not only gives Seba in his text the (approximate?) size for many of his specimens, but in his Preface (1734: 5, 6) he also states that, as far as the size of the pages in his "Thesaurus" allowed, his specimens were figured at natural size.

Finally, by consulting the Seba auction catalogue, in which the Dutch names usually may be interpreted by comparison with the Dutch version of Seba's "Thesaurus", and taking into account the present story, it may be possible to verify any likelihood of occurrence of certain Seba specimens in the collections referred to on the previous pages, and indicated in figure 1. Photostat copies of Seba's catalogue, though restricted to the second group (including all vertebrates, see p. 2), are now in the British and Leiden Museums.

---

1) "Omnem, quoad potui, operam navavi, ut singulorum Animantium, Avium, Plantarum, &c. icones, aequè ac subjunctae descriptiones, veram Lectoribus exhiberent ideam, Naturae, quæ eorum quodlibet gaudeat, conformem. Hunc verò in finem nativam Exempli cujusvis magnitudinem in imaginibus, quantum chartae permettbat spatum, exactusimè exprimi curavi: unde in hasce defixus Tabellas oculus nonnisi vivam conspicit formam omnium illorum, quaè boni publici gratiâ, prout editio haecce testatur, ex omnibus mundi plagis collegi, Nominis Divini gloriæ pro virili amplificatus: is enim unicus est, quem hoc in Opere mihi praefixi, scopus."
Fig. 1. Scheme of the principal lines of dispersal of Seba's zoological specimens. Especially for the extremely wide dispersals during the auctions of 1752, 1858, and, to a lesser degree, 1867, only the principal purchasers are indicated.
Summary

An attempt is made to detect what became of Seba's extensive zoological collections. The principal results are shown in the accompanying scheme (fig. 1).
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