Introduction:
Dutch post-Reformation tombs

In 1752 the Nederlandsche Spectator published a critical article titled “Over het opregten van pragtige Tombes en gedenktekenen in de kerken” (“On the erection of ornate tombs and memorials in the churches”) in which the anonymous author railed against the tombs built for “stout-hearted and meritorious men with a grandiose display of worldly pomp and circumstance.” He acknowledged the importance of commemorating their great deeds as an example and inspiration for future generations, but felt that the church was not the right place to do so. It would be better to honour them on market squares or in town halls. The ‘spectator’s’ ire had been aroused by the fact that many rich people awarded themselves memorials of this kind without the slightest reason. “I am sorely vexed that an earthworm whose only service is that his coffers are stuffed with money dares aspire to such a proud display of grandeur, wishing the lesser folk to believe that his folly is an uncommon goodness [...]. Are those marble statues, they may portray what they will, not mummeries and masks of vain pride and overweening arrogance?”

It was old wine in new casks, for tombs and other kinds of public sculpture had long attracted criticism. Statuary in general had been seen in a bad light in the Netherlands since the Reformation, although the objections to it came mainly from a Calvinist minority and chiefly concerned sculpture which encouraged superstition, or even idolatry. Calvin himself utterly rejected its use in a religious context, although he tolerated profane images, of historical events, for example, or of people. According to him, paintings or statues of people were futile, serving at best for the viewer’s enjoyment. A relatively small number of orthodox Calvinists, however, adopted an extreme, purist stance and
utterly rejected any form of sculpture, citing the second of the Ten Commandments, “Thou shalt not make unto thee any graven image,” which they coupled with the following verse in Exodus 20: “Thou shalt not bow down thyself to them.” Examples of contempt for sculpture can be found in the writings of Philip van Marnix, Lord of St Aldegonde (1569), Jacobus Revius (1630), Willem Teellinck, and Jacob Cats, among others. The general attitude, though, was less intolerant, the main aim being to banish statues from churches gradually. Nor were all statues considered equally offensive. The degree to which they were tolerated in practice depended on various factors, such as whether or not they were idolatrous, and their location in a church.

The oeuvre of Hendrick de Keyser offers some striking examples of the variable attitudes to sculpture at the beginning of the seventeenth century. In 1601, the orthodox congregation in Hoorn had forced him to remove the figurative framework around his memorial for the city physician Petrus Hoogerbeets. The Hoorn chronicler, Theodorus Velius, described the incident as follows. “But because the sculpture was used in the ambulatory to adorn the frames, a mass of foolish people gathered together and would not permit it to be placed in the church, threatening that if it were done they would immediately shatter it into pieces, and they urged this so forcefully that the matter almost came to a riot. It was therefore considered best to omit the figures and to alter the work to the satisfaction of those people.” Figurative sculpture in church was clearly not yet fully accepted at the beginning of the seventeenth century, even if Velius did dismiss the Hoorn churchgoers as foolish. Their vehement reaction was perhaps partly due to the fact that the memorial was a municipal commission paid for out of public funds. The city authorities regarded peace on the streets as more important than the quality of De Keyser’s work, leading to the compromise of eliminating the most offensive part of the memorial.

Twelve years later, the Amsterdam church council expressly forbade De Keyser, on pain of exclusion from the Lord’s Supper, to make an alabaster statue of St John the Evangelist for the rood loft in St Jan’s Cathedral in Den Bosch, “to be used in the church there for idolatrous purposes.” De Keyser made it clear in his reaction that “no idolatry would be committed with the same [the statue], but that it would stand under the rood loft by the portal.” The council was probably unimpressed by this fine distinction that the location of a statue in the church determined its function (and hence its idolatrous nature). Although one suspects that De Keyser felt that discretion would be the better part of valour, partly because of his prominent position in the
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service of Amsterdam, he nevertheless allowed his business interests to prevail over religious considerations, because the statue was indeed finished and delivered to the cathedral (fig. 1).

Finally, in 1618 there was the hypocritical brouhaha over the statue of Erasmus in Rotterdam, with the Calvinist objections to Erasmus the person (as a Catholic freethinker) being wrapped up in allegations that the statue had given rise to devotion (fig. 2). Its opponents based their arguments on the traditional Protestant criticism of statues of saints. They alleged that people had knelt before the statue, an act which implicitly elevated Erasmus to the status of a popish idol, and said that the public funds used to pay for it would have been better spent on the “living images of God,” their fellow men. Tellingly, those who opposed the statue had no objections to the magnificent tomb for William the Silent which was erected that same year in the Nieuwe Kerk in Delft. One of the champions of the Rotterdam statue neatly drew attention to this inconsistent behaviour on the part of the Calvinist quibblers. It was also clear to contemporaries that the row around Erasmus was above all politically coloured, and was part and parcel of the power struggle between the moderate and strict groupings among the Protestants.

The climate did improve later, although the diehards did not abandon their stubborn attitude towards statues in churches. Around the middle of the century, the Amsterdam church council had the greatest difficulty in accepting the city council’s gift of Albert Vinckenbrinck’s ornate pulpit for the Nieuwe Kerk. Fifty years later, in Leiden, there was more wrangling over the sculpted portrait of the theologian Johannes Coccejus on his memorial in the Pieterskerk (fig. 3). On this occasion the objections were twofold. On the one hand there was horror at a theologian receiving so much honour, which was considered most unorthodox (and unbecoming). On the other hand it was said that “it looks somewhat offensive in the body of the church, and seen from afar resembles the statues of the saints in the Romish temples; which improper usage (it is further said) has gradually crept in from such small beginnings to honour the memory of the highly gifted forefathers and has grown to become the pinnacle of superstition, as is seen in the Roman
church.” As with Erasmus, Coccejus’s controversial reputation was undoubtedly the true reason for all the fuss. The hostility, and the suggestion of Roman Catholic sanctity, was used as a front to imply that commemoration could easily descend into idolatry. Supporters of the portrait brushed this argument aside by pointing out that “the sumptuous tombs of naval heroes, far prouder and ornate than this tablet and bust, and tolerated everywhere in our churches, have never given occasion for the menace that is feared.”

Although not a real piece of sculpture, a political broadsheet of 1674 with an imaginary statue of Stadholder Willem III on the Buitenhof in The Hague is significant in this context (fig. 4). The text on the print refers both to the stadholder’s haughtiness and to the dangers of idolatry. Willem is described as “The great idol of Holland,” and the print shows several people kneeling before the statue as an illustration of the potential dangers of the public veneration of an individual. This is clearly an echo on paper of the story of the statue of Erasmus, and yet another indication that public statues of people could easily be
mobilised as symbols of idolatry if the political situation demanded.

Ecclesiastical protests against the building of tombs were rarer, because the commissioning and erection of a monument were generally less politically charged and did not fall under the church’s purview. In the large city churches, where most of the tombs stood, a distinction had been made even before the Reformation between the ‘preaching church’ (preekkerk) and the ‘strolling church’ (wandelkerk). The latter usually embraced part of the nave, ambulatory and side aisles. Anyone could come here from early in the morning until late at night and stroll around, conduct trade, play, lounge about or listen to music (fig. 5), while in the preaching church, which was often situated in the nave, services were held at set times (fig. 6). The strolling church was a neutral public area, a sort of indoor city square, and the ideal place to erect tombs and other memorials for national and local heroes, as well as for wealthy citizens who wished to perpetuate their own memory in an eye-catching way.²¹

This division of the church into strolling and preaching areas became even more pronounced after the Iconoclasm and the Alteration, the transfer of power in the cities from the Catholics to the Protestants. Strict Calvinists inveighed against popish idolatry, and against statues of saints in particular. Tombs and other secular scenes in churches were rarely criticised on theological grounds. Beginning in the seventeenth century, however, there were growing moral objections to the posthumous love of display in tombs, hatchments and the like, and it is here that one finds clear expression of the typical seventeenth and eighteenth-century dilemma concerning wealth and conscience. The ostentatious, posthumous flaunting of rank and riches in the form of tombs, memorials or hatchments was regarded as vain pride, and did not fit in with a society which had the greatest difficulty accepting the cult of personality and displays of status. Jacob Cats spoke of tombs in this context as “trifles, mere foolish pomp.” Jacob de Hennin gave a striking picture of this worldly exhibitionism in his 1681 description of the Grote Kerk in The Hague. “There one also sees many burials with counts, princes, dukes, crowns. What a mass of standards, banners, ensigns, flags and banderoles hang there. O Lord, if all these dead might only shelter under your banner and flag of peace upon their resurrection, then it would be well! Oh, the poor treasures and pompous glory of the world! Is it not all a great vanity?” Cats, De Hennin and the ‘spectator’ we met at the beginning of this chapter are typical exponents of such Dutch arguments for soberness.
and against vain pomp, the roots of which actually stretch back to before the Reformation. In the section addressed to widows in Die Institutie ende leeringe van den Christelijcke vrouwe of 1554, the Dutch translation of Juan Luis Vives’s De institutione feminae christianae, there is already a clear condemnation of tombs and statues. “The vainglory of the burials, the tombs and golden statues which are made for no other purpose than to glorify and praise the living in order to display the great magnificence and splendour of their parents and forefathers.”

This view that tombs honoured the surviving family rather than the deceased was regularly echoed in people’s wills, with the testator asking that his body be placed in a sober tomb. The family, though, seldom respected those wishes.

**Memoria and exemplum**

One important argument used to parry the criticism of posthumous ostentation in the form of tombs, hatchments and the like was the doctrine of memoria. Monuments kept the memory of the deceased alive, and thus legitimised their presence in public areas like churches, which had long been the place where the ties with ancestors had been maintained. In 1623, for example, the supporters of the statue of
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Erasmus pointed out the innocence of “political monuments, statues, images, trophies and the like, which are simply erected for the adornment of cities and countries and for the preservation of the good memory of some memorable events and persons.” Although that does not explicitly cover funerary sculpture, the preservation of memoria was presented as one of the three universal motives for building a tomb in Den Nederlantschen herald of 1645 by Thomas de Rouck, an antiquary of Bergen op Zoom. His treatise is one of the few contemporary sources on Dutch funerary culture in the seventeenth century. It is devoted mainly to heraldry, but ends with a valuable chapter on tombs. In addition to the love of the deceased as the reason for erecting a tomb, De Rouck mentions keeping alive the memory of the outstanding deeds and character of the departed. “So that such works would be memorials to the heroic deeds and excellent qualities of the departed, by means of which works they would live on in the memory of their friends and others who came afterwards.” As a historical buttress for his argument De Rouck refers to the Old Testament, where Simon the Maccabee erected a tomb to the eternal memory of his father and brothers. De Rouck’s views were repeated almost word for word in another important source for Dutch funerary culture, the Inleidinge tot het Ceremonieel en de Plegtigheden der Begraevenissen, En der Wapenkunde by the Rotterdam tax official Cornelis van Alkemade.

John Weever, an English contemporary of De Rouck’s, regarded the desire for the posthumous preservation of the memoria as the most fundamental reason for building a tomb, “most especially because thereby they thought to preserve their memories from oblivion.” He cited the example of the biblical King Absalom who, in order to keep his name from oblivion, erected a pillar on the spot where he wished to be buried. In contrast to the Dutchman, Weever wrote from the perspective of the deceased, which may well reflect the far more highly developed funerary culture in England, which was not hamstrung by a Protestant morality towards the dead.

The universal concern for preserving the memoria after death was indeed a fundamental motive, and it also applied to painted portraits. This culture of commemoration may have had its roots in classical times, but it enjoyed a great flowering in the late Middle Ages, when there was a true “cult of memory.” The medieval commemoration of the dead comprised a complex of agreements and measures which went far beyond activating the memory in a strict sense. Because the deceased had entered into a large number of social and religious
obligations during his life which had to be maintained posthumously, by making an endowment, for example, or having Masses said for the dead, he ensured himself of a continuing tie to earthly existence. In a sense, this made him still part of the world of the living. Visible manifestations of this memoria culture were the numerous private epitaphs, memorials, guild and fraternity paintings which filled the churches before the Reformation. In conjunction with epitaphs and memorials, gravestones and tombs also had a function within this complex of medieval expressions of memoria. One illustrative example is provided by the fifteenth-century inscription on the screen of the Eggert Chapel in Amsterdam’s Nieuwe Kerk: “Anno MCCCC ende XVII den XV dag in julio starff den eerbaeren heer Willem Eggerta, heer tot Purmereynde, gedoyteerd met twee vicariën, meede fundateur van dese kerk, die begraven is onder dese blauwe serk” (“In the year 1617, on the 15th day of July, died the honourable lord, Willem Eggert, Lord of Purmerend, one of the founders of this church, who is buried beneath this ashlar slab, with two endowments”). In memory of Willem Eggert, his son Jan made two endowments for the altar of the funerary chapel.

In the course of the sixteenth century, partly under the influence of humanist and Reformational thinking, the medieval commemoration of the dead broke free of its ecclesiastical bedrock. In Erasmus’s writings, for instance, one detects a critical attitude towards the system of pious foundations, indulgences and veneration of the saints with a view to the salvation of one’s soul in such works as his Enchiridion (1501), Praise of folly (1509) and De praeparatione ad mortem (1533). He did, however, reject Luther’s doctrine of sola fide, according to which man could rely on his faith alone in order to attain salvation, and argued that a virtuous, Christian mode of life was essential for a good death. Another example of this more humanistic and ethical approach is found in Vives’s instructions for Christian women. In the 1554, Dutch edition of the book there is a brief chapter titled “Van dye memorie ende ghedachtenisse des mans” (“On the memory and remembrance of the husband”), in which widows are told that it is virtuous to honour the memory of their dead spouses. The concern for the salvation of the deceased’s soul made way for the virtuousness of those left behind.

After the Reformation, when there was a separation between the church and the care for the dead, memoria was abruptly and completely divested of its ecclesiastical ties. In addition, the reformers dismissed the existence of Purgatory, where the souls of the dead supposedly
waited for the Day of Judgement. The doctrine of Purgatory underpinned the practice of praying for the dead, which the reformers abominated along with the associated system of indulgences. The abolition of Purgatory not only meant an end to these “papist superstitions” but also broke the symbolic bond between the living and the dead which had been maintained by Masses for the dead and intercessory prayers.42

The existing concept of memoria, which was based on classical practice, filled the gap to some extent.43 In a study of the significance of memorials and private epitaphs in Lutheran countries, the growing interest in these funerary elements in the sixteenth century has actually been associated directly with the abolition of the many Roman Catholic side altars founded to perpetuate the memory of the dead. Those places, where the dead were commemorated with great pomp during special Masses, were replaced by painted or sculpted memorials and epitaphs on which the dead made a posthumous profession of faith and of their hope of resurrection. Their very visibility kept them in the minds of later generations.44

This simplified form of memoria was retained by the Protestants, and because funeral arrangements were not the task of the ecclesiastical authorities it became more closely intertwined with tomb culture. The aspect of remembrance had long played an important part in the erection of tombs, as the portrait of the deceased and the inscription with his name and dates of birth and death kept his memoria alive. The durability of the materials used in tombs greatly heightened the significance of remembrance.45 Bronze and stone were traditional metaphors of durability and immortality, and were thus ideal for preserving memoria. Or as Crispin de Passe put it around 1645: “Because man’s memory is fleeting, and other occurrences make people forget as if in a dream things that they actually saw, the ancient famous men ordered images to be erected in stone and marble, which they wished to preserve for posterity, aye even made for their holy memory a temple and altar.”46

Implicit in the Protestant rejection of the Catholics’ extensive system of remembrance was a growing concern for the individual, his life, and commemoration of it. To put it another way, the Reformation altered the nature of the culture of remembrance from the prospectively to the retrospectively eschatological.47 Under Protestant theology, for Lutherans with their belief in God’s grace for their assurance of salvation, and for Calvinists with their doctrine of predestination, the prime concern was no longer the dead person’s destination in the next
world, but far more his faith, and his exemplary, virtuous and Christian way of life on earth.\(^4^8\) Moreover, the funerary ritual and concern for the dead were stripped down to their essentials. Calvin admittedly regarded the funeral as a “memorial of the Resurrection,” a mirror for those left behind to remind them of the new life after the one on earth, but all attendant rituals were taboo. Funeral sermons were banned, as were mourning dress and the ringing of church bells to mark a death.\(^4^9\)

This liturgical and ritual dismantlement freed the way for a classical and humanist notion which could make sense of and justify the erection of tombs, namely the exemplum virtutis. The earliest instances of such exempla are found in classical Rome, where it was customary to put up statues honouring citizens who had made an important contribution to the public good, thus holding them up as examples to the populace.\(^5^0\) This tradition took on a new lease of life in north Italian cities in the later Middle Ages and the Renaissance.\(^5^1\) Boccaccio, for example, called on the Florentine authorities to erect a statue or a tomb for Dante.\(^5^2\) Alberti recommended making statues and tombs for deserving citizens in his treatise on architecture of 1485, expressing a preference for tombs because they were less susceptible to damage. According to him, Roman sepulchres erected at public expense were reserved for very few people, but statues were far more common. He felt that the point of building tombs with public money was twofold. In the first place, the tomb embodied the gloria for both the immediate family of the deceased and for his city. Secondly, it should encourage other citizens to imitate the virtus of the person so honoured.\(^5^3\) Alberti gave virtus the specific connotation of amor patriae, as manifested in glorious death for the fatherland.\(^5^4\) This was a revival of the classical cult of glory and virtue, which recalled the civic ideals of republican Rome. Moreover, it had been codified.\(^5^5\)

It is not surprising that the exemplum virtutis, particularly in the special form of amor patriae, took on a new significance in the seventeenth-century Dutch Republic. Patriotism, which had been aroused by the young state's struggle against Habsburg rule, swiftly sought its expression in a 'pantheon' of heroes.\(^5^6\) At the beginning of the Twelve Years' Truce in 1609, even before the magnificent tomb for the Father of the Fatherland had been commissioned, the States-General had ordered that the naval hero Jacob van Heemskerck be honoured with an epitaph (fig. 7). It was the start of a deliberately conceived cult of the naval hero, and would result in the erection of
a series of splendid tombs for them throughout the seventeenth century. 
Honouring these popular heroes, who had given their lives while protecting the country's interests at sea, assumed forms which have been described as the veneration of secular saints. Those 'saints' did not embody religious virtues but a new, proto-national one: patriotic self-sacrifice prompted by *amor patriae*.

 Shortly before the cult of the naval hero took on real form in the third quarter of the seventeenth century, Thomas de Rouck spoke of the importance of a tomb as an instrument for encouraging virtuous behaviour: "So that those who come after, beholding tombs of honour and epitaphs, should see examples of virtues and incentives to piety." It can be deduced from his subsequent reference to the tomb of Alexander the Great, which Julius Caesar and Emperor Augustus visited to seek inspiration, that De Rouck was thinking of heroes' tombs in particular (fig. 8). His predisposition towards Roman examples was of a piece with the Classicist spirit of the veneration of naval heroes in a broad sense, with classical inspiration dominating
both the content and composition of the Latin funerary inscriptions and the design of the monuments. The Dutch regents loved to identify with the glory of republican Rome, as demonstrated so eloquently in the decorative programme of Amsterdam’s new Town Hall (now the Royal Palace on Dam Square). Seen against the background of such a revival of interest in classical ideals, the significance of the tombs of national heroes as exempla virtutis along Roman lines is perfectly understandable. In the case of the Van Heemskerck epitaph, the States-General stated explicitly on 2 June 1607 that a depiction of his victorious battle at sea was to be added, “that it may inspire future generations to serve their country with the same courage and devotion to duty.” The inscription on a later tomb of a naval hero was an explicit exhortation to imitation. “Patriae victoriam, civibus sui desiderium, exemplar posteris imitandum reliquit” (“To the fatherland the victory, to the citizenry the sadness at his loss, and to posterity a model for emulation”) is what one reads on the epitaph of 1674 for Vice Admiral Isaac Sweers in Amsterdam’s Oude Kerk. In the discussions leading up to the building of a tomb for the Evertsen brothers in 1666 the States-General also specifically stated that “in this manner their memory and deeds might be left to posterity for inducement and emulation.” In 1713, Cornelis van Alkemade took a look back at the seventeenth century and also concluded that the erection of tombs for naval heroes was inspired by the exhortations to valour that they embodied.

Before the Reformation, private memorials, altars and tombs inspired prayers for the dead, devotion and service to God, whereas the tombs for heroes in the new Protestant order were exhortations to virtuous behaviour and stirred up feelings of admiration and the desire for emulation. A well-known painting of 1832 demonstrates that this idea of exemplum virtutis had once again become topical in the nineteenth century, shortly after the outbreak of the Belgian Revolution, which had made the Dutch reassess their national identity. It shows the young orphan Jan van Speyk musing before the tomb of his role model Admiral Michiel de Ruyter (fig. 9). Van Speyk had acquired immortality in 1831 by blowing up the ship he commanded rather than let it fall into the hands of the Belgians. A contemporary commentary on the small painting praises it for “the lively, impassioned face” of Van Speyk, who “stares at the marble likeness of De Ruyter with visible emotion.” The work not only expresses a “love of the fatherland” but has a certain religious force, with the devout Van Speyk before the ‘altarpiece’ dedicated to the hero De Ruyter. If the
painter consciously sought to give the scene such a religious dimension, then he accentuated the topical contrast between the northern and southern Netherlands in the form of the Protestant veneration of heroes as against the Catholic veneration of saints in an extremely subtle way.

**Rank, decorum and typology**

Writing in 1631, John Weever devoted an entire chapter to the relationship between the rank of the deceased and the form of his tomb. **Decorum** demanded that “Sepulchres should bee made according to the quality and degree of the person deceased, that by the Tombe every one might bee discerned of what ranke hee was liuing: for monuments answerable to men’s worth, states and places, haue alwayes beeene allowed, and stately sepulchres for base fellows haue alwayes lien open to bitter iests.”

Weever’s view of a grave typology dictated by rank and born of decorum was rooted in age-old traditions, as he himself noted. “Persons of the rusticke or plebeian sort” were buried in unmarked graves, while simple tombstones were reserved for “persons of the meaner sort of gentry.” “Gentlemen, which were of more eminencie” could lay claim to a portrait of themselves on a plinth on the grave but could not display their coats of arms. Lofty tombs were reserved for the nobility, princes and kings, and were elevated above the ground “to note the excellencie of their state and dignitie” and adorned with a complete portrait figure on the grave and made from costly materials like alabaster, marble, touchstone, porphyr and polished bronze or copper.

This funerary decorum persisted into the eighteenth century in class-conscious England, and those who breached it were regularly mocked. The idea that the grandeur of a tomb was inversely proportional to the merits of the deceased was a commonplace, particularly during the eighteenth-century sumptuary debates.

Elsewhere in Europe, too, the social hierarchy governed the dignity of both the funeral and the tomb. The Saxon scholar Cyriakus Spangenberg pointed out in his *Adelspiegel* that ownership of a stately tomb, a mortuary chapel or similar funerary monument was a privilege reserved for the nobility, for they have “their own graves, chapels and similar places [...] in which they are committed to the earth and not laid among the common folk.” The Danish King Frederik II went so far as
to issue a decree in 1576 ordaining that monumental, freestanding tombs were only to be built for kings and rulers.⁷²

A general form of tomb classification had begun emerging in Italy in the early thirteenth century, just as the grave clothes of the deceased were dictated by his status. According to a Bolognese source of around 1215, depictions of the deceased were traditionally placed on the tombs of prominent individuals.⁷³ Two centuries later, a similar system of tomb classification had developed in the city-state of Florence to a point where one can speak of a clear-cut funerary decorum. Grave types correlated closely with the different estates within the city walls, with certain types being the exclusive privilege of specific classes.⁷⁴ The social significance of Florentine tombs before 1500 was governed by the following factors: the presence of a tomb sculpture of the deceased, whether or not there was a canopy, and the location in the floor or the wall. A limited number of combinations of these factors (canopies, for instance, were not combined with tombstones) resulted in a variety of types reflecting the status and privileges of the different classes in Florence.

Almost 100 funerary monuments were built in the Dutch Republic in the seventeenth century, ranging from wall memorials to completely freestanding, monumental tombs.⁷⁵ That there were rules of decorum and a system of burial according to rank is suggested by a few contemporary sources. A socio-typological analysis of the tombs themselves confirms the existence of unwritten rules in Dutch funerary art.

An indication that there was a certain typological arrangement, albeit one governed by very local circumstances, is found in an architectural treatise written in 1599 in the southern Netherlands. In this work by the Bruges architect Charles de Beste, under the heading “Van diversche figuren dienende tot cieraet binnen de tempel” (“On divers designs serving as adornments within the church”), there is a
paragraph devoted to church furnishings and tombs. De Beste commented on a print by Jacques Ducerceau with a design for a tomb, giving his views on the appropriate iconography. "And if such a tomb be made for a religious like an abbot, bishop, cardinal or some other, then the figure shall be rounded, resting on its side, with the hand under the head. If it is a lord baron, duke, count or the like, then the figure shall lie on its back." 26 Although written in the southern Netherlands from a markedly sixteenth-century viewpoint, this is an interesting passage, for the categorical tone suggests that around 1600 in the Low Countries there was a certain codification of representations of the deceased on his tomb. De Beste's contention that ecclesiastics had to be depicted as "rounded" (that is to say sculpted fully in the round) demi-gisants-lying on their sides—was based on an early sixteenth-century Roman visual tradition of tombs for popes and cardinals. 27 It was possibly by way of Ducerceau's print, or under direct influences from Rome, that a small number of tombs for princes of the church were erected in the Netherlands and Germany which were clearly differentiated from the customary type of the figure lying on its back. 28 For De Beste, whose knowledge of funerary sculpture probably extended little further than the walls of Bruges, this still young visual tradition was the reason for his modest typological characterisation. Just how parochial his observations were becomes immediately apparent when one looks beyond the borders of the Low Countries. The demi-gisant was definitely not reserved exclusively for prelates in England or in southern Europe, for it was widely used for the nobility,
although with various meanings attached. In the Netherlands there are a few surviving tombs with a demi-gisant, such as that of Gilles van der Nisse, Lord of Waarde, of c. 1660 (figs. 10, 202). Moreover, De Beste overlooked the fact that ecclesiastics also had themselves portrayed in other ways, as demonstrated by a suite of prints by Hans Vredeman de Vries.

His series of 1563 seems to confirm the existence of general ideas of a tomb typology determined by social factors. It opens with a design for a nobleman’s tomb, and there are others for a faithful wife, a ruler, a general, a priest, and for various famous people like Emperor Charles V and Admiral Andrea Doria. The suite closes with a few simpler epitaphs which are not allocated to any one group. A series by Cornelis Floris published six years earlier already indicated that there were broad connections between typology and social hierarchy.

Did this general awareness of ranks and classes persist in the funerary culture of the northern Netherlands after the Reformation? Surveying the surviving monuments, one is forced to conclude that there was indeed some sort of classification, although there are hardly any written sources to back this up. In his book on Dutch funerary customs, Cornelis van Alkemade focuses mainly on precedence in the funeral cortège. However, this amateur historian does devote a modest
passage to “Tombs and their variety” (“Tomben en verscheidenheid van dien”), in which he distinguishes between three types of monument, namely for “kings and princes,” for “knights and nobles,” and for ecclesiastics ranging from popes to “common clerks and monks.” However, Van Alkemade does not really establish a connection between this classification and the form and type of tomb. Moreover, it is clear from his account that he is not speaking of contemporary monuments but of those erected before the Reformation.

The official lack of a class of high-ranking churchmen after the Reformation automatically brought an end to an honourable clerical tradition of monumental funerary art. No more tombs were built in the Republic for the Catholic clergy. A new, much more modest genre evolved to take their place, that of fictitious tombs in prints. An early
example of this is Bloemaert’s engraving after Pieter de Grebber’s design for a tomb for Father Nicolaes Nomius of 1626. According to the inscription, the engraving was ‘erected’ as a memorial (fig. 11). Fantasised bishop’s tombs feature in some of Pieter Saenredam’s painted ‘Protestant’ church interiors. Just what the north lacked in the way of ecclesiastical funerary art after the Reformation, or knew at most in painted or engraved form, becomes clear if one takes a look at the Spanish Netherlands. In the course of the seventeenth century a new type of episcopal tomb was erected in the choirs of several Flemish cathedrals. It was a freestanding edifice with a triumphal arch. The dead bishop appeared in his full earthly glory, often as an

13 Lucas Fayd’herbe, Tomb for archbishop Andreas Cruesen, 1665, white Carrara marble and touchstone (Noir de Mazy), St Rombouts Cathedral, Mechelen
actor in a theatrical, funerary allegory. Even in the most lavish tombs, Protestant sepulchral art in the Dutch Republic restricted itself to more realistic visual forms sparingly decorated with symbolic motifs.

This difference between north and south is well illustrated by a comparison of the ornate (by northern standards) tomb of Anna van Ewsum and her husband (1664–1669) by Rombout Verhulst in Midwolde, and a tomb by Lucas Fayd’herbe erected in Verhulst’s native Mechelen in 1665 for Bishop Andreas Cruesen (figs. 12, 13). The dead bishop has been brought to life in a devout pose facing the life-size risen Christ. Behind the kneeling bishop a personification of Time (Chronos) – a bearded and winged old man with a scythe – watches Christ vanquishing mortality by his resurrection. Upon beholding the triumphant Christ, a putto flies off towards Time. Three life-size protagonists here narrate the essence of the story of salvation in a symbolic and visionary way, making the monument one single allegory of the hope of resurrection through faith in Christ’s triumph over death. Verhulst’s tomb also expresses the hope of resurrection, but without the use of such theatrical effects. His sculptures form an

14 Pieter van de Plas (?) after a design by Daniel Marot, Tomb for Willem Bentinck, 1708–10, white Carrara marble, red-grey Belgian marble and touchstone, N.H. Kerk, Rhoon

15 Daniel Marot, Pensée du Tombeaux du Comte de Portland, design of a tomb for Willem Bentinck, 1706, engraving from his Second Livre de Tombeaux et d’Epitaphes
intimate and realistic scene, with the symbols of death and transience being restricted to the ancillary work.

After 1650, Verhulst played an important part in the development of large wall tombs with full-length portraits of the deceased. It was a type reserved solely for the nobility, although there are a few for naval heroes. Leaving aside the ornate use of sculpture, this category is marked by great heraldic display as public evidence of nobility. It was only around 1700, when the French court style of Daniel Marot became fashionable in the Republic, that these aristocratic tombs were toned down. The full-length portrait of the deceased increasingly made way for portrait medallions or busts, and less emphasis was placed on the heraldic aspects. A good illustration of this development is provided by the monument for Hans Willem Bentinck in Rhoon (1708-1710), for which portraits of the dead man were envisaged in the design stage but were eventually omitted in favour of two coats of arms (figs. 14, 15). This stylistic development evolved further in the first half of the eighteenth century, most notably in the work of the sculptor J.B. Xavery (1697-1742).

In a few cases the unwritten funerary rules were interpreted rather loosely, as in the tomb for the Englishman Charles Morgan, who was accustomed to the different, more liberal funerary culture of his native country (fig. 106). Despite not being a nobleman he nevertheless awarded himself the dignity of an aristocratic tomb. Johan Polyander van Kerckhoven, who came from a patrician family of Ghent, also permitted himself a tomb which was grandiose by Dutch standards. Thanks to his marriage to a member of the highest English nobility and his posts at the stadholder’s court, he had manoeuvred himself into a position which accounts for his temerity (fig. 62).

Simpler graves and monuments were reserved for the remaining classes after the Reformation. The well-to-do middle class safeguarded itself from an anonymous, uncommemorated burial by placing simple slabs over their graves which generally bore no more than their names (portraits were unacceptable), dates of birth and death and the standard funerary symbols. Family coats of arms were also added, if possible, thus contributing to the social gravitas of the deceased. One major exception were
the black marble and sandstone slabs made for the local gentry and nobility in the northern and eastern provinces. The production of those slabs flourished until late in the seventeenth century, and they often did have portraits of the deceased (fig. 16). Also exceptional are a few luxuriously carved slabs for aristocratic families, such as the one for a member of the Van Randenrode van der Aa family ordered in 1614 from the sculptor Gregorius Cool of Gouda (fig. 17), that for Justinus van Nassau and Anna van Merode in Leiden (Hooglandse Kerk, 1634), or the white marble slab of 1684 in Geldermalsen for Jacob van Borssele and his wife (fig. 18). It is not impossible that such departures from tradition should be interpreted as a topos of modesty.

Members of the urban patriciate and of regent families with interests in the countryside usually commissioned sculpted epitaphs in stone or wood. Good examples of such restrained monuments can be found in most Dutch city churches. In Delft, members of the leading regent families like Jacob van der Dussen (1614), Adriaen Teding van Berkhout (1620) and Paulus van Beresteyn (1625) had themselves honoured with wall memorials in prominent positions in the local churches (figs. 100, 101). The same phenomenon can be seen in The Hague, Leiden and Purmerend (fig. 19), as well as in the village.
churches of Spanbroek (fig. 170), Aagtekerke (fig. 33), Oudshoorn (fig. 20), Ee (fig. 102) and Heemstede, where patricians filled the office of district governor. An intermediate form, a wall memorial that can be regarded as a modest wall tomb, is the monument for Adriaen Pauw in Heemstede. Not himself a nobleman, Pauw lived in a grand style aped from the aristocracy, which included ownership of a medieval castle, and in 1653 chose a funerary monument which very clearly reflected his social ambitions although while nevertheless observing the rules of decorum, for instead of portraits the arms of him and his wife were set in frames in very central positions. The use of epitaphs also characterises monuments for two city doctors in Gouda (figs. 21, 22) and the monument honouring the legendary Leiden burgomaster Van der Werff, a typical 'civic hero' (fig. 23).

A very separate category, virtually unknown abroad, is formed by the 18 monuments for naval heroes who died “on the bed of honour.” The typological variations within this group are striking, ranging from wall memorials to completely freestanding, monumental tombs, and appear
to be a measure of the fame and valour of the dead men. Personal and political considerations also played a part, of course. In addition to commanding a fleet, Van Wassenaer Obdam was a member of one of the country’s oldest noble families, and was the only naval hero to be honoured with a freestanding canopied tomb situated in the choir of a church. The four virtues at the corners also contributed to the grandeur accorded him. The choice of this sort of tomb is made all the more remarkable by the fact that Obdam’s career was anything but glorious. De Ruyter, a far more important commander and a more popular naval hero, was only honoured with two virtues, although his importance is reflected by the location of his tomb in the choir of the Nieuwe Kerk in Amsterdam. The only other naval hero to be given such a prominent position was Van Gendt with his semi-freestanding tomb, which was undoubtedly due in part to the fact that he was a

---

21 Gregorius Cool (?), Epitaph of city doctor Joost Balbian, after 1616, painted sandstone, St. Janskerk, Gouda

22 Epitaph of city doctor Martinus Herculanus Bloncq, 1651, painted sandstone, St. Janskerk, Gouda
member of the nobility. Epitaphs were reserved for naval heroes of lesser distinction, like Vice Admiral Sweers and Rear Admiral Willem van der Zaan, who thus in a certain sense became the counterparts of the patriciate in civilian life. Even simpler was the grave marker which the Admiralty of the Maas ordered for its hero Johan de Liefe. In typological ranking, his upright tombstone in Rotterdam’s Laurenskerk is barely above that of the numerous gravestones ordered by Dutch civilians in the seventeenth century, which covered the floors of churches in large numbers.

The existence of some form of funerary décorum is also detectable in a negative sense in the criticism of funerary practices, which was often a reaction to breaches of décorum. Much of the criticism was directed at the excessive and improper display of coats of arms during funerals and near graves. One civilian funeral astonished Aernout van Buchel at the way Dutch merchants seized the opportunity to award themselves the privilégis nobilium. In 1614 Roemer Visscher devoted one of his

23 Rombout Verhulst, Epitaph for Pieter Adriaensz van der Werff, 1661, white Carrara marble and touchstone, Hooglandse Kerk, Leiden

24 Pracht, voor ‘t gheslacht (“pomp for the clan”), 1614, etching from Roemer Visscher’s Sinnepoppen
J. van de Velde after D. Vinckboons, The “kin-sick” younker, 1622, etching from Gerbrand A. Brederode’s Groot lied-boeck

Hendrick Goltzius, Temporary tomb for William of Orange at the Nieuwe Kerk in Delft, detail from an engraving of the funeral procession of William of Orange, 1584, Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam
Sinnepoppen to this abuse under the title “Pracht, voor ‘t gheslacht” (“Pomp for the clan”; (fig. 24)).98 Eight years later, the poet Gerbrand Brederode aimed his satire at the excessive concern for one’s descent, describing the younkers who flaunted their ancestry as “kin-sick” and “sham wise” in his Groot lied-boeck.99 He even had one such coxcomb portrayed with an escutcheon in the shape of a gravestone (fig. 25).

Satirical or ironic poetry of this kind had practical repercussions, for in 1616 the Amsterdam college of burgomasters, led by Reinier Pauw, decided to curb the display of armorial bearing in the churches. From then on it was forbidden “to hang in the churches the arms of the deceased who are buried there.”100 However, the ordinance had little effect, the main reason probably being that the city earned money from the practice. The following generation of Amsterdam regents and patricians simply ignored the prohibition. Around the middle of the century they actually displayed a great desire to flaunt their descent, titles and possessions, both during their lifetimes and posthumously. That arriviste display of a pseudo-aristocratic status prompted the true nobility to indulge in ostentatious references to their own aristocratic forebears on monumental tombs in the second half of the century.101 Such tombs, after all, were a traditional privilege of the nobility.

The ‘spectator’ of 1752 encountered at the beginning of this chapter criticised the very fact that people were buried in church at all, not only because it was unhygienic but above all because it was due to the “rapacity” of the ministers.102 The clergy offered graves suited to every purse, in “different degrees of holiness, thus charging different prices for them, to suit small and great according to the worth of each.”103 It is clear that funerary monuments, although freed from ecclesiastical censure, could become the target of social criticism. Decorum in the ‘strolling church’ was a sensitive issue in the court of public opinion.

Dignitas

An English visitor to Delft’s Nieuwe Kerk in 1592 was amazed at the modest and unworthy canopy over the grave of William the Silent, which was in fact a temporary monument (fig. 26). He described it as follows in his travel journal: “[...] the poorest that I ever saw for such a person, being only of rough stones and mortar with postes of wood, coloured over with black, and very little erected from the ground.”104 What is important in this context is the final remark, which makes a connection between a person’s status (“such a person”) and the
loftiness of his tomb ("very little erected"). That link is made even more explicit in John Weever’s description of the highest category of tomb: “Noble men, princes and kings had (as it befitteth them and as some of them haue at this day) their Tombes or Sepulchres raised aloft aboue the ground, to note the excellencie of their state and dignitie.” The extent to which the tomb rose above ground level was evidently an expression of the excellence and dignity of the deceased.

That the connection between excellence and dignity on the one hand and elevation on the other was also known in the Netherlands around the same time is demonstrated by a remark of Rubens in his comments on the architecture of Constantijn Huygens’s newly built house in The Hague. He said that the facade arrangement with pilasters was too simple. The addition of extra pilasters and a protruding cornice would give the facade more dignity and three-dimensionality (“maggior dignità e rilievo a tutta la facciata”). Rubens evidently felt that there was a connection between “rilievo” (elevation) and “dignità.” It should be noted that he was commenting on domestic not funerary architecture, and that the elevation he was speaking of was horizontal, not vertical.

The use of the concept of dignity or dignitas in architecture was introduced by Alberti, being part of the triad venustas, utilitas and dignitas in his De re aedificatoria. Dignity is there the outcome of the perfect, unequivocal correlation between the beautiful form (venustas) and the function (utilitas) of a building. The more unequivocally and beautifully the form gives expression to the function, the more dignified the architecture and the higher the building’s place in the architectural hierarchy. Alberti also points to the role of dignitas in the arrangement of an element like a portico. The dignity of a building is determined in part by the relationship between the decorative elements of its entrance and the function and position of the builder or occupant of the house.

This clarifies Rubens’s remarks to Huygens. The use of decorative, plastic means for the entrance raises the dignity of the building and with it that of its occupants. However, Huygens’s reply is equally clear in the light of Alberti’s theory. In order to rebut Rubens’s criticism he pleaded his modest social position, citing the location of his house, right beside the stadholder’s residence, his limited financial means and his (befitting) modesty as arguments for the lack of an excessive display of relief and dignity. To put it another way, Huygens knew his place, and had no wish to breach decorum, which would have threatened his dignitas.
That concept had been associated with the aristocracy and the authority of the state since classical times.\textsuperscript{109} As early as the Middle Ages it was directly linked to sovereignty. In a certain sense it formed the enduring power behind the ruler, supported by the doctrine of “dignitas non moritur.” Dignitas conferred immortality on the ruler’s social or body politic (“corpus politicum”), although his body natural (“corpus naturale”) was mortal. It is this concept which underlies the expression “The king is dead, long live the king!”, which equally pithily characterises the continuity of the monarchy notwithstanding the death of an individual king. Dignitas thus forms the foundation of the monarchy.\textsuperscript{110} In the royal funeral rituals in France and England this distinction between the king’s natural and political bodies was visualised by burying the natural body while at the same time presenting a visible effigies in wax or wood adorned with all the regalia, thus depicting the continuity of the monarchy, or rather of its dignitas (fig. 27). This dualism was explicitly represented in royal sepulchral sculpture from the late Middle Ages on. As a result, the tomb itself became an embodiment of the immortal royal dignity.\textsuperscript{111}

That the situation was different in the Dutch Republic was well expressed by the diplomat Sir William Temple, England’s ambassador to the States-General from 1667 to 1679 (with a break of three years). He described the political situation in the Republic as follows: “As the States-General represented the Sovereignty, so did the Prince of Orange the Dignity of this State, by publique Guards, and the attendance of all Military Officers; By the splendour of his court, and magnificence of his Expence.”\textsuperscript{112} In other words, the dignitas of the Republic was not invested in the sovereign power (the States-General), as it was elsewhere, but was represented by the individual stadholder in his capacity as commander of the army and the head of a court with all its attendant pomp.

Seen in this light, the erection of tombs by the States-General, for naval heroes for example, takes on an added dimension, because the height of those tombs together with their dazzling display must be understood as expressions of dignity, both of the state and of the deceased. An aspiration
to dignitas, which in the highest level of state was exemplified mainly by the stadholders and their court, thus forms a latent driving force behind the exceptional patronage of the States-General. The link between dignitas and the height of tombs also explains the aristocratic privilege of being allowed to erect tombs. The nobility, the sovereign rank par excellence, possessed dignity by its very nature, and could express it through a glittering, lofty tomb.

Ritual

The form and iconography of tombs were dictated in part by decorum, the social position or descent of the deceased, and by particular considerations on the part of the patron or artist. The funeral ritual, too, left its mark on sepulchral sculpture, albeit to a more limited extent. The fact that the most important written sources on Dutch tombs, the books by De Rouck and Van Alkemade, place so much emphasis on heraldry and the funeral ceremony, may itself be indicative of the relationship between the ephemeral ritual and the
Jean Mone (?), Transis of Engelbrecht II of Nassau and Cimburga van Baden, 1531-34, alabaster, Grote Kerk, Breda

more durable monument. In some respects tombs can even be construed as petrified representations of the actual situation surrounding the person's death, or as a ritual frozen in stone. In Dutch funerary sculpture there is one example where the process of petrifying funeral rituals pervades much of the iconography of the monument, and that is the tomb of Engelbrecht II of Nassau and his wife Cimburga van Baden in Breda, which dates from 1531-1534 (fig. 28). Kneeling on the tomb are four figures supporting a large, black marble gravestone on which parts of the dead man's armour are set out on display. Lying beneath the gravestone on mats of plaited straw are the couple's lifeless bodies, partly wrapped in shrouds (fig. 29). The realistic depiction of the corpses, the care lavished on anatomical details, and the pose with the arms crossed on the breasts, show that the sculptor took his inspiration from the actual practice of lying in state.

The four supporters with the gravestone and the armour also look as if they have come straight from Engelbrecht's funeral procession, but for the fact that they are clad in old-fashioned garb and play a symbolic role as the illustrious forebears of the deceased. The custom of bearing escutcheons and pieces of armour at the funeral of a nobleman had been widespread since medieval times, and had been followed in 1538
at the ceremony for the burial of Count Hendrik III of Nassau, who had commissioned the Breda tomb. The sculptor of the Breda tomb made that aspect of the funeral procession the core of his design, and interwove it with the theme of the displayed bodies. The result was greatly admired, as demonstrated by two imitations in England and various appreciative descriptions by travellers.

Ultimately only one motif from this exceptional petrification iconography survived into the seventeenth century, and that was the straw mattress on which the body of the deceased was displayed. Laying the body on straw was a common practice in the Low Countries and in England, both as a sign of penitence and for the practical purpose of absorbing fluids from the corpse. It was regularly included in sculpted form on sixteenth and seventeenth-century tombs, such as that made by Hendrick de Keyser for William the Silent, and Verhulst's monument in Midwolde, where the deceased is even in the same classical display pose as Engelbrecht of Nassau, who had died a century earlier (fig. 30). The presence of a straw mattress in the tomb sculpture thus reinforces the suggestion of a body lying in state, which was first pointedly made on the tomb of William the Silent.
The motif of carrying armour in the funeral cortège does not recur in seventeenth-century funerary sculpture, but another took its place. The custom of displaying coats of arms around or on the bier was petrified in the form of the many marble escutcheons that were hung on sculpted garlands against the rear walls of various aristocratic tombs in the seventeenth century. This can be illustrated by comparing Salomon de Bray’s drawing of the funeral attire of the Haarlem Guild of St Luke of 1635 with the rear wall of Verhulst’s Midwolde tomb (figs. 12, 31).

Costs, materials and techniques

Because tombs expressed the status and dignity of the deceased through their lofty, sculptural design and their costly furnishings, the erection of such a monument often required the investment of large sums of money. We are reasonably well informed about the cost of tombs in the seventeenth century, thanks to the survival of a relatively large number of bills, specifications, commissions or contracts for sculpture. Rombout Verhulst, for example, the market leader in luxury tomb sculpture in the second half of the century, left quite detailed information about five commissions for tombs – one-third of his funerary output. That data even make it possible to arrive at a cautious estimate of his turnover between 1662 and 1698.

The prices for tombs were generally high in the seventeenth century, but there was a wide variation. The simple epitaph for Justus Scaliger in Leiden was made in 1609 by Hendrick de Keyser for 216 pounds, or approximately 1,300 guilders. Another fairly straightforward sculpted epitaph, for Theodorus Graswinckel (The Hague, Grote Kerk), which Rombout Verhulst supplied 60 years later, cost Graswinckel’s widow, Geertruyda van Loon, 700 guilders (fig. 32). Such a price would have been around the lower limit, particularly for a work by Verhulst. For the purposes of comparison, the now lost memorial for Nicolaà Hoof of 1676 (until 1795 in Oudshoorn, N.H. Kerk), was made by Verhulst’s main competitor, Bartholomeus Eggers, for 928 guilders. For that sum the customer, Nicolaà’s widower Cornelis de Vlamingh, received a “tomb some nine feet high and eight feet wide” made of white marble and touchstone with two
mournin gg  putt i almos t a  mete r  tall. The memorial, which disappeared after the French invaded the Republic, is still known from a nineteenth-century lithograph which is probably based on Eggers’s design drawing accompanying the specifications (fig. 20). Other memorials by Eggers and Verhulst from the same period, such as the Riccen epitaph in Purmerend (fig. 19), the Van der Werff epitaph in Leiden (fig. 23), and those in Spanbroek and Aagtekerke (figs. 33, 170) probably also cost around 1,000 guilders.

The most expensive seventeenth-century tomb was that for William the Silent in Delft, for which the States-General paid Hendrick de Keyser and his widow a total of 34,000 guilders. That huge sum reflects not only the scale and ambitious form of the monument, which was designed as a large, freestanding, canopied tomb in the spirit of monuments for foreign monarchs, but also the great variety of expensive materials which De Keyser used. White marble and the rare

32 Rombout Verhulst, Epitaph for Theodorus Graswinckel, 1669, Grote Kerk, The Hague

33 Rombout Verhulst, Epitaph for Hendrik Thibaut, Isabella Porrennaer and Jacoba Thibaut, 1669, white Carrara marble and touchstone, N.H. Kerk, Aagtekerke
Portoro had to be brought from Italy (no mean undertaking around 1620), and there were also bronze statues. Given that in the same period the cost of casting the bronze statue of Erasmus in Rotterdam came to almost 10,000 guilders, the many bronze parts of the Delft tomb, including six life-size figures, would have accounted for a considerable part of the total sum. A comparison with a large wall tomb from the same period is illustrative. The large epitaph which two sculptors from De Keyser’s circle agreed to make for the Lübeck councillor Johann Füchtling in 1633 cost 800 rix-dollars (or 2,000 guilders), not including the cost of transport from Amsterdam to
Lübeck and erection there (fig. 34). That work, though, was made entirely of readily available kinds of stone, such as red-veined marble from the southern Netherlands and white English alabaster, for which there was a regular import trade. The down payment of 200 rix-dollars made to the sculptors was probably so that they could buy the materials, as was the standard practice.

Between the simple Graswinckel memorial and the magnificent tomb for William the Silent, which represent the two extremes in form and expense, there is the larger group of ornately sculpted wall tombs for the nobility and naval heroes, the cost of which ranged from 5,000 to 12,000 guilders, depending on their nature and date. Artus Quellinus, Rombout Verhulst and Bartholomeus Eggers made most of these tombs from 1650 on, and their prices are generally well known. Verhulst's first, well-documented commission was for the tomb of Maarten Harpertsz Tromp in Delft. The contract between the sculptor and the hero's widow of 18 September 1655 shows that it cost 10,000
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Artus I Quellinus, Tomb of Engelbert van Immerseel and Helena de Montmorency, 1649-51, white Carrara marble, red Belgian marble and touchstone, Bokhoven, St Anthony's church
Artus I Quellinus, Monument for Otto Christoph Freiherr von Spar, 1660-63, white Carrara marble and touchstone, Marienkirche, Berlin

Rombout Verhulst, Monuments for Johannes and Cornelis Evertsen, 1680-82, white Carrara marble and touchstone, Nieuwe Kerk, Middelburg

guilders (fig. 156). Twelve years later, Eggers charged only 2,000 guilders more for the completely freestanding tomb for Admiral Van Wassenaer Obdam (fig. 134). The prices for four private tombs, however, were much lower. Quellinus asked a mere 1,000 patacoons (roughly 2,500 guilders) for the freestanding Van Immerseel tomb in Bokhoven (1650-1651, fig. 35). Freiherr Otto Christoph von Spar became the owner of an imposing wall tomb by Quellinus in 1650 for 6,8322 guilders (Berlin, Marienkirche, fig. 36), while Verhulst charged the widows of Willem, Baron van Liere (Katwijk-Binnen, 1663) and Carel Hieronymus van In- en Kniphuisen (Midwolde, 1664-1669) 6,315 and 7,500 Carolus guilders respectively for two double tombs (figs. 12, 163, 168). Verhulst’s double tomb for the Evertsen brothers in Middelburg (1680) was in the same price range at 6,000 guilders (fig. 37). Although it contained two sculpted figures, it was as expensive as the single tomb made more than 40 years previously for Piet Hein, although that one included far more architecture.

Leaving aside the much cheaper Van Immerseel tomb of 1650, there are no startling differences in the prices for these monuments, which are comparable in their form, size and sculpture. That the tombs for Tromp and Van Wassenaer Obdam were far more expensive was
mainly due to their richer furnishings and size. They contained more architectural work, and above all more sculpture. What these sums mean is that ordering a tomb was a very considerable investment which only government bodies or the members of a very small upper class could afford. The price of a richly sculpted wall tomb in the mid-seventeenth century was the equivalent of more than 17 annual salaries of a skilled Dutch labourer, or the cost of building two modest houses in a Dutch city.\textsuperscript{135}

Marble

The specifications for the memorial in Oudshoorn give us some idea of the relationship between the costs of labour and materials. Eggers estimated the labour costs at around 700 guilders out of the total of 928 guilders, which means that the marble accounted for roughly a quarter of the total.\textsuperscript{136} The same ratio is found with the four life-size, standing portrait statues of the stadholders which François Dieussart made in 1646 for Huis Ten Bosch (fig. 149). The contract speaks of a sum of 4,000 guilders for the entire work, while the bill for the four blocks of marble came to a little over 940 guilders.\textsuperscript{137} Eggers invested a virtually identical sum, 960 guilders, in 1674 in the marble for 12 busts of emperors, approximately one-third of the 2,850 guilders which he eventually received for the commission.\textsuperscript{138} When Eggers was in severe financial trouble in the years 1682-1685 he had to find backers prepared to lend him the capital he needed for a major commission for 11 statues involving a total sum of 7,700 rix-dollars, or 19,250 guilders. He borrowed 4,323 rix-dollars for the marble he needed, more than half of the total cost.\textsuperscript{139} An example from Rome shows that around 1630 the ratio of material to labour costs there was very much the same as in the Netherlands.

A commission for six statues in Santa Maria del Loreto was awarded to various sculptors, among them Finelli, Duquesnay and Maderno. The price of each statue was 150 scudi, excluding the cost of materials. The purchase price for
the marble for each statue varied from 30 to 60 scudi, or approximately one-sixth to one-third of the total sum.\textsuperscript{140}

The obvious conclusion is that the increasing use of white marble from Carrara, which had gradually been displacing English alabaster on the Dutch market as the most luxurious sculptor’s material, required higher and higher investments on the part of the sculptors (and their patrons). Around 1690, for instance, the sculptor Johannes Blommendael had “a very large quantity of marble blocks and Bentheim stones [...] having the same lying before his house, on the pavement as far as the large paving-stones of the street, which they, the deponents, judge to have been worth at least 1,000 guilders.”\textsuperscript{141}

At the same time, the greater availability of Carrara marble led to a more restrained use of materials and colour. As alabaster was gradually abandoned due to the Classicist love of white marble, so the sixteenth-century custom of partly painting the material fell into disuse. Polychromed tombs and epitaphs made way for austere black-and-white monuments in the early decades of the seventeenth century. The tomb of William the Silent clearly displays this fancy for white marble, although not yet at the expense of other, more colourful materials.\textsuperscript{142} Colouristic restraint only made its appearance in the wall tomb for Piet Hein, which was made almost 20 years later. The selfsame trend towards a simpler colour scheme was also taking place in England.\textsuperscript{143}

By his own account, Hendrick de Keyser was the pioneer in the use of marble. In a petition to the States-General in 1612, in which he requested a patent for an artificial marble he had developed, he declared in passing that “[...] since no one in these parts has so far done work in marble of any merit, save he, the petitioner, alone.”\textsuperscript{144} His bust of the Amsterdam vintner Vincent Coster is probably the first major piece of sculpture made in the Netherlands in Italian marble (fig. 38), closely followed by the tomb of William the Silent.

Initially marble was scarce, being difficult to import during the war with Spain, and thus expensive. During the Twelve Years’ Truce (1609-1621) Dutch ships had better access to the Mediterranean, leading to a modest direct trade in marble and other wares from Italy. However, it was not until the third quarter of the century that the Dutch trade in marble from Livorno took on substantial form, stimulated by the ambitious plans for Amsterdam’s new Town Hall from 1648 on (fig. 39). An Amsterdam trade consortium headed by Samuel Sautijn even acquired the monopoly of the export of marble from Carrara.\textsuperscript{145} At that time the price of marble fluctuated around 2 guilders per cubic foot.\textsuperscript{146}
When Quellinus wanted to buy some for the Von Sparr tomb from the stocks held by the city of Amsterdam he was quoted a price of 1 rix-dollar (2½ guilders) per cubic foot. The price was obviously governed by the size of the blocks and the quality of the marble.

Far less is known about the price of black, grey or red-veined marble from the Spanish Netherlands. There was clearly a lively trade in these types of stone, which was dominated by a small number of families in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. In the Republic it was mainly members of the De Keyser, Van Noremberg, Misson and Van Delft families who controlled the marble trade from Flanders, but in constantly changing roles. Sometimes they acted as stone
merchants, then as intermediaries, or as stonemasons. Moreover, the families were closely intertwined by marriage, so it is often difficult to unravel the transactions and trading interest of each one. In the event it seems that the use of veined marble from the southern Netherlands fell off slightly after 1650, at least judging by the surviving tombs and sources.

On the question of the efficient use of marble, a passage in a letter by Artus Quellinus the Younger concerning the order for the tomb of the Danish general, Hans Schack, gives us a brief glimpse of everyday practice in a sculptor’s workshop. In this letter of 29 November 1686, the sculptor makes the following comments about his customer’s requirements. “First, know that the contract requires that the figure or statue be made from a single piece, which can be done apart from the cape with the rapier hanging on the front of the tomb. This has to be made separately but attached so neatly that the join cannot be seen. The reason why it cannot be made in one piece is that I am unable to obtain a block of such width.”

It was undoubtedly true that marble blocks of a non-standard size were difficult to come by, but Quellinus the Younger is also sketching the usual sculptor’s practice of avoiding waste of materials and labour. The rule was that it was better to attach a small piece rather than carving out a lot of excess marble from a block that was otherwise too large. In his estimate for the Von Sparr
tomb, Quellinus set aside 70 guilders (out of a total of 6,832 guilders) "for the wasting of stone."

Another example of a thrifty use of marble is Quellinus's bust of the Amsterdam burgomaster Joan Huydecoper, executed in 1654. The face is made of pure white Carrara marble, which was inlaid in a bust of a veinier, more inferior coloured marble. Although Quellinus may have sought this contrasting effect deliberately, it is not found in any of his other busts, so the most likely explanation is that he wanted to use top-quality marble efficiently.

It stands to reason that Carrara marble was imported in or cut to standard sizes. In Amsterdam, which had grown to become the largest staple market for Italian marble outside Italy in the second half of the seventeenth century, there was even a professional stone-gauger who checked the size and quality of marble. He was employed by the city, and charged different rates according to the type of stone. A drawing of 1652 by Barent Graat shows the city stoneyard with a number of flat-decked boats on which blocks of stone of more or less the same size are being delivered (fig. 40). Because the dimensions of most of the
reclining sculptures on a tomb are so very similar, one suspects that there was a certain standardisation in the size of the basic marble blocks, as suggested in a seventeenth-century engraving of workers in the stoneyard (fig. 41). In the case of Bentheim sandstone, too, the quarrying of which was entirely controlled by a Dutch consortium from the middle of the seventeenth century, there were rough, fixed categories: maatsteen (the large blocks of various sizes as they came from the quarry), blocksteen (square blocks of a size of four feet or more), and a variety of smaller sizes.

There was another restriction that applied in the case of the best quality of black marble from the southern Netherlands, Noir de Mazy, which was used in seventeenth-century tombs. The bed from which it was (and still is) quarried has a maximum thickness of 45 to 50 centimetres. Hendrick de Keyser was well aware of this when he used one block of Mazy for the tomb of William the Silent, for the height of the tomb (47 centimetres) corresponds almost exactly with the maximum thickness in which the stone could be bought. An all-too efficient use of materials probably resulted in makeshift solutions in certain cases, and even to the making of statues from all sorts of leftovers. In order to put his patron’s mind at rest, Rombout Verhulst guaranteed in the contract for Tromp’s tomb that: “Finally, it is agreed that all the aforesaid work of black, red and white marble shall be made without joins wherever possible, and in all cases without fragments.” Gerard de Lairesse told his readers shortly after 1700 that it was important for a sculptor to select his stone carefully. “It is certain, that they must be very neat and white, because such Works, in Stone, being both hazardous, troublesome, and costly, were never undertaken before the Artists had chosen fine Blocks of Marble for that purpose. Wherefore, we ought to take Notice of the Stones, and their Kinds.”

In order to cushion the effects of a large and risky investment in materials, the sculptors had contracts for tombs which usually included a clause requiring advances and payment by instalment. Von Sparr agreed to pay Quellinus an advance of 2,500 guilders in 1660, rather more than one-third of the total sum for the tomb. Verhulst stipulated a down payment of 1,000 guilders for the Midwolde tomb, with a further 3,250 guilders to be paid within six months. The length of time it took to deliver this particular tomb, five years instead of the contractual two, suggests that those advances were not paid at first, with the result that Verhulst either could not or would not buy the marble. Other contracts contain similar clauses covering advances and payments, generally in three instalments.
The workshop

The high cost of sculpture was due in part to the labour-intensive nature of the work, carving the stone entirely by hand, and in the case of marble a time-consuming finishing phase. This forced the sculptor to divide the work up efficiently, certainly when it involved a large project like a tomb. Large shops with many apprentices and assistants, like those of Hendrick de Keyser and Quellinus in Amsterdam, had to be run on very taut lines. Apprentices and assistants each had a share in the finished product, ranging from the heavy drilling and roughing out to polishing the surface. Unfortunately, it is no longer really possible to say how many people worked in a large Dutch workshop. There are indications that a large commission like a tomb involved at least two or three fully trained assistants—sculptors and masons. In The Hague, the master stonemason Joris Mijne (or Minne) and the master mason Abraham Domburgh declared in 1683 that they had helped Rombout Verhulst "finish" the tomb for Michiel de Ruyter (fig. 157). The four monograms found on a slate recovered from a hollow in the vault of the tomb of William the Silent in Delft when it was restored in 1998 also point to the involvement of only a small number of people on each commission. Although they were De Keyser’s immediate assistants, for their monograms, complete with mason’s trowel and sculptor’s hammer, are directly below his signature, none of the initials can be associated with the names of sculptors known to have worked in his shop or his circle. That suggests that the true number of apprentices was considerably higher than the 12 known names. In smaller workshops, large projects were obviously carried out in association with others, or some of the work was subcontracted out. Those small sculpture operations were often connected by family ties, as was the case in Amsterdam in the early decades of the seventeenth century, so that the work could be carried out by several relatives. Assistants and pupils, of course, were employed on the heavy drilling and roughing out.

Unfortunately, there are no written sources giving a detailed picture of daily practice in a seventeenth-century sculptor’s workshop, nor are we granted a proper look at a seventeenth-century sculptor in action, as we are with Bernini, for example. Only now and then is the veil lifted for a moment, as in a deposition made against the sculptor Eggers concerning the tomb for Van Wassenaer Obdam. The witness stated that "when the said Eggers was fashioning the model at Prince Maurits’s house, the aforesaid Moninx, now lately departed, removed
several pieces of clay from some figures and placed them on others, and fashioned them in the presence of the aforesaid Eggers. An anonymous Dutch drawing illustrates the kind of modelling described here, showing a sculptor shaping a small female figure (fig. 42). A less spontaneous but much clearer work is Gonzales Coques's painting of Sight from a series of personifications of the five senses, which shows how an Antwerp sculptor (possibly Artus Quellinus himself) modelled a statuette in wax (fig. 43).

In these cases only a single sculptor is seen, but in reality many hands must have been at work, particularly for drilling and hewing. Needless to say, with such a division of labour it was essential to have models in clay, wood, wax and plaster in order to instruct the apprentices and assistants, and many such models are mentioned in the probate inventories of sculptors.

It is important to remember that the majority of the surviving models and drawings for sculpture were intended for presentation. They were given to the patron or added to the contract as annexes, and owe their existence to their careful preservation by the customer and
his descendants. Workshop models led a less cosseted existence and will have been more easily lost. That is why most of the surviving models only give us an indirect picture of the sculptor’s working process, and cannot be used on their own to reconstruct the genesis of a particular sculpture. They must be seen first and foremost as stages in the negotiations between the sculptor and the customer, as a *vidimus*, as evidence and a guarantee for the patron regarding the form of the finished work.\(^7\)

The sculptor Bernard Jansen, a Dutchman who worked in England, returned briefly to his native country in 1617, when he made a model for the tomb of Marcelis Bacx in the church at Bergen op Zoom which served as the basis for his negotiations with Bacx’s widow.\(^73\) Almost 50 years later, Rombout Verhulst left a similar scale model for the Midwolde tomb with his patron, Anna van Ewsum, at her country house, Nienoord, near Groningen. Reference is made to it in the contract of 1664, after a description of the work he had undertaken. “And this all in proportion and to the specifications in accordance with the finished model in little in Nienoord, which I will follow in large.”\(^73\) The presentation model which Verhulst made for the very similar tomb for Willem van Liere in Katwijk is also presumed lost, but in the eighteenth century it was in the collections of two burgomasters of Leiden, Johan van der Marck and Hendrik Twent.\(^74\) The description in the latter’s auction catalogue indicates that the model was not of the entire tomb but only of the two recumbent statues. “The original model of the monument in the church of Katwijk Binnen, depicting Mr. Wilhelmus a Lyere and Lady Maria Rygersberg lying upon a tomb, modelled by the celebrated Verhulst, on a plinth.”\(^75\)

Small models were used in sculptors’ workshops in combination with full-scale pointing models in plaster, which were needed to transfer the small design to the large scale of the stone. This combined use of small models and pointing models evolved in Italy in the course of the fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries. On the evidence of statements by Leonardo da Vinci, Vasari and Cellini, it is know that working with models was standard practice in Florence by around 1550.\(^76\) Its spread to the north must have been largely due to the first generation of ‘fiamminghi.’\(^77\) It can hardly be coincidental, for instance, that the two earliest known mentions of modelling and clay models are associated with the workshop of Cornelis Floris in Antwerp. In a letter of 1553 discussing the tomb for Count Jan van Merode (Geel, St-Dymphnakerk) the sculptor says that the alabaster statue of the count had been “modelled and hewn out.”\(^78\) Five years
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Hendrick de Keyser, *Model of the effigy of William of Orange*, 1613-14, terracotta, Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam
later, a painter was paid for making drawings of two designs after clay models by Floris: “[...] traced from two models in clay made by Master Corneliis Floris.” For Floris, who ran a large, modern sculpture workshop after his return from Italy around 1538, models, together with drawn designs, were an important instrument for conveying his ideas to his apprentices and assistants. Karel van Mander also mentions the use of models on several occasions. He says that one sculptor had acquired a great reputation because he had made a marble group of five or six figures “without any model or preparatory figure of clay or wax.” This ‘taille directe’ avant la lettre was evidently regarded as a notable feat around 1600. Elsewhere Van Mander speaks of “some models in wax and clay.”

Several scale models of tombs have survived from the seventeenth century, along with a number of mentions in probate inventories and the fascinating group of terracottas by Artus Quellinus preparatory for the sculptural decoration of Amsterdam’s Town Hall. There are also a few drawn designs for funerary sculpture. However scanty this material, it does enable us to make a fairly good reconstruction of the general working practices of sculptors in the seventeenth century.

It can be deduced from the estate left by Hendrick de Keyser that there was no longer any clear division between the old-fashioned, drawn design and the newer Italian method using models. Examples of both are found alongside each other. In 1621 De Keyser’s widow left to their son Pieter “[...] all the models, designs, papers, drawings and clay figures.” The only model which survives today that can be securely attributed to De
Keyser is the terracotta of the recumbent William the Silent for his tomb in Delft (fig. 44). Its Amsterdam provenance suggests that it came from De Keyser’s estate, which would make it identical to “the likeness of His Excellency the Prince of Orange, of most laudable memory” (“... het conterfeytsele van zyn Excie. den prince van Oraignem h m”) which was in his house when he died. De Keyser may also have known of the practice of using full-scale pointing models, although none from his shop have survived. There are a few terracotta casts of the portrait of William the Silent which are so similar to the prince’s face on the bronze statue that they must have been cast from such a full-scale model (which was lost when the bronze was cast).

There is no reason to assume that he did not use similar, plaster pointing models for his sculpture in stone.

However, it emerges from two Amsterdam probate inventories from De Keyser’s day that wooden models were also used occasionally. In the estate of Karel Cree (1621) there were “wooden designs” (“houte patroonges”), as there were in that of his colleague Cornelis van den

45 Simon van Campfoort, Model of the tomb for Pieter Florisz, 1658-60, wood, West-Fries Museum, Hoorn

46 After Simon van Campfoort, Monument for Pieter Florisz in the Grote Kerk of Hoorn, drawing in pen and ink from the ms. Van der Lelij, 1744, Koninklijke Bibliotheek, The Hague
What they were exactly is not clear, but the lack of similar descriptions in later sculptors’ inventories shows that they must have been the remnants of an old-fashioned method which the following generation of sculptors discarded. There is a surviving wooden model of the tomb of the naval hero Pieter Florisz in Hoorn, which was destroyed in 1878 (figs. 45, 46). If it was not made after the tomb itself it has to be the presentation model made by the sculptor Simon van Campfoort. It is unique of its kind, and is closer to the scale models of cabinetmakers and architects than of sculptors. At the time it was made, though (1658-1660), it was a completely outmoded type, so it is hardly surprising to learn that Van Campfoort also made a separate terracotta model of the recumbent hero (fig. 47) which would have borne more resemblance to the model which he used when scaling up for the tomb itself.

None of the drawn designs for sculpture mentioned in Hendrick de Keyser’s inventory have survived. The one for the tomb of Willem Lodewijk in Leeuwarden made by his son Pieter would correspond technically to the kind of designs produced by his father (fig. 93). Most such drawings, if used in the workshop, would naturally have been lost. The few surviving examples escaped that fate because they were made as annexes to contracts. A good example of this is Quellinus’s contract for the Bokhoven tomb of 1649, in which the text of the contract and the associated drawing are on the same sheet of paper. Several other drawings by Quellinus are mentioned in contracts, but they have not been found. In the settlement of his bill for the ducal mausoleum in Schleswig Cathedral one comes across the formulation “dem abrisze nach” (“after the drawing”), which points
to the use of a drawing. \textsuperscript{189} There was probably also a similar design for the tomb for General Von Sparr of 1660: “The model sent to Berlin, made by the aforesaid Quellinus.” \textsuperscript{190} His pupil Rombout Verhulst also signed a contract for the Graswinckel memorial based on a drawing: “a tomb [...] in accordance with a drawing of it, being signed on the back by both parties.” \textsuperscript{191} That drawing, too, has been lost. It is possible that the drawing for epitaphs made in 1647 by the Dordrecht sculptor Samuel Huppe is representative of designs of this kind (figs. 48, 49). \textsuperscript{192}

It is very doubtful that the drawing of part of the tomb of Admiral Maarten Tromp was made by the sculptor himself (fig. 50). The States-General commissioned the design from Pieter Post, who probably worked on the tomb together with Jacob van Campen, as several
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48 Samuel Huppe, *Design for an epitaph*, 1647, pen and ink, Koninklijk Museum voor Schone Kunsten, Brussels

49 Samuel Huppe, *Design for an epitaph*, 1647, pen and ink, Koninklijk Museum voor Schone Kunsten, Brussels
contemporary sources suggest. It is therefore logical to assume that the
drawing was a collaborative effort by Van Campen and Post, with the
former being primarily responsible for the overall design and the latter
for the actual drawing and possibly for some additions.\textsuperscript{93} Differences
between the drawing and the finished tomb indicate that the drawing
represents an early stage in the design process. One noteworthy and
politically piquant element is the insertion on the tomb of the two coats
of arms of the States-General and the States of Holland and West
Friesland, indicating that the patrons felt that they were not properly
represented in the drawing. The sheet is therefore probably a rejected
version of the "model" which, according to a resolution of the States-
General of 16 August 1653, Post had contracted to deliver.

Working from a drawing of this kind, Rombout Verhulst then
modelled his design for the tomb in clay. This method is explicitly
described in connection with his monument for Hugo Grotius in Delft
(never executed), for which "a design [was] drawn and modelled in clay
by the celebrated artist and sculptor Rombout Verhulst."\textsuperscript{94}
Exceptionally, two models of the Tromp tomb have survived. One is a
terracotta of the effigy of Tromp, the other a model of the background
relief, both of them set in a single, seventeenth-century wooden frame
(fig. 51). This large ensemble very probably comes from the estate of one of Tromp’s daughters, being the “One old model of wood and plaster of Admiral Maarten Harpertsz Tromp” mentioned in her inventory of 1717. The other is a terracotta of the recumbent Tromp alone, and is on a wooden base of a later date (fig. 52).

The differences between the drawing and the models suggests that they were made in a particular order. The effigy in the wooden frame is the closest to the drawing, as shown by the similarities in details like the type of boot and the sash around the admiral’s upper arm. However, the traditional straw mattress in the drawing was replaced in the terracotta with a piece of canvas. The mounted terracotta of Tromp, on the other hand, is very close indeed to the finished marble. The terracotta background relief is identical to it, so both must have been made around the same time. The difference in colour between the framed terracotta of Tromp and that of the relief also indicates that they were made at different times and were only united in the wooden frame at a later date. This gave the ensemble the look of a presentation piece suitable as a memento for the admiral’s family. The frame recalls that separate terracotta fragments of this kind, intended for showing to the patron, were probably also set in a wooden framework depicting the architecture of the tomb as a whole. There are various foreign
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Rombout Verhulst, Model for the effigy of Admiral Maarten Harpertsz Tromp, 1654-55, terracotta, Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam
examples of maquettes of tombs in which terracotta or wax models were combined with a wooden model of the architecture. The fact that most Flemish and Dutch sculptors left only figure studies in clay (or wax), and that only drawings show the overall design of the tombs, suggests that it was not usual for them to work out the entire design in three dimensions. Given the Flemish origins of Quellinus, Verhulst, Eggers and various other sculptors who worked in the Republic, it is likely that they too preferred to work in this 'fragmented' way.

In some cases architects were called in to design the architectonic elements of these monumental ensembles, which inevitably led to a separation of the designs for the sculptural and architectural parts of the composition. That was the case with Tromp’s tomb, as it was for that of Witte Cornelisz de With in Rotterdam (1669). The designer here was the architect Jacob Lois, while the execution was entrusted to Pieter Rijcx. Two virtually identical terracottas of the recumbent effigy of the admiral have survived, but their status is not known. One is on a seventeenth-century socle, and may have been the presentation model (fig. 53), while the other is possibly the sculptor’s workshop model (fig. 54). Lois’s complete, drawn design has been lost.

Finally, sculptors could divide a project up between them or
subcontract parts of it. Bernard Jansen and Nicholas Stone, Hendrick de Keyser’s English son-in-law, collaborated on the tomb for Sir Nicholas and Lady Bacon in 1620 (St Mary’s Church, Redgrave, Suffolk). Jansen worked on the simpler architectural sculpting work while Stone supplied the two effigies. 199

Once the presentation models had been approved the sculptor could make a full-scale pointing model in plaster for each part of the design. 200 That, though, was not always done. Some sculptors, such as the Fleming Michael Rysbrack, who worked in England, preferred to carve directly in the stone while referring to a scale model. 201 The advantage was the elimination of the laborious stage of making a full-scale model in plaster (fig. 55), but the drawback was that transferring the proportions of the small clay model to the stone required far more measuring and calculation. Making full-scale pointing models was also extremely important for compositions consisting of different parts, and was in fact essential for the seamless assembly of the three-dimensional puzzle. 202

It has been assumed, wrongly, that seventeenth-century Flemish and Dutch sculptors never used large-scale pointing models but worked directly in the stone from small clay models, as Rysbrack did. This misconception is based mainly on the fact that no pointing models have come down to us, and that contemporary sources make no explicit mention of them. 203 As supporting evidence, authors cite a print by Jan Luyken from his Het menselyk bedryf of 1694 (fig. 56). 204 It shows a sculptor working on a life-size statue with a small model of the sculpture on the modelling stool beside him. The print is first and foremost an illustration for a moralistic rhyme, so the reliability of the scene is questionable. The compact depiction of a sculptor at work forced Luyken to reduce the scene to its basic essentials, which is why he made no attempt to portray the complex process of carving from a pointing model. The lack of any full-scale plaster models from the seventeenth century is 54

Pieter Rijcx, Model of the effigy of Admiral Witte de With, c. 1668, terracotta, Rotterdams Historisch Museum, Rotterdam
hardly surprising, given their fragility and size. In general, too, they were not preserved or sold, for their value was slight. Some, though, have survived, although they were made in preparation for the casting of bronzes rather than for the carving of marble statues. They are the *Atlas, Justice* and *Temperance* by Quellinus high up in the Civic Hall in Amsterdam's Royal Palace, the bronze versions of which crown the east and west fronts of the building (fig. 57).

55 Bourgeois after P. Falconet, *Atelier des Mouleurs en Plâtre*, 1762-77, engraving from L’Encyclopédie of M. Diderot and M. d’Alembert

56 *De Beeldhouwer*, 1694, engraving from Jan Luyken's *Het menselyk Bedryf*
Seventeenth-century sources, mainly probate inventories and sculptors’ wills, give several indications for the existence of pointing models in clay or plaster. Van Mander mentions “some large statues, eight or nine feet tall, first built up with hard straw, and then with clay.” Those figures were painted with glossy white oil paint to make them look like white marble statues. Strictly speaking these were not pointing models, but their existence does show that the technique of making such large, modelled figures was certainly known at the beginning of the seventeenth century.\footnote{The probate inventory of Bartholomeus Eggers, which was drawn up in 1681, lists a large number of works in plaster. Some may have been study materials, such as flayed figures or copies after classical sculpture, but most were made by Eggers himself. Moreover, the inventory lists a “cupboard with unfired plaster,” and there was a separate “casting room” in the house containing “an iron plaster pot” and “some plaster moulds.” This all confirms that Eggers cast his own plaster models.\cite{205} His colleague Rombout Verhulst also used plaster models when carving the stone, as his will of 1692 shows. In it he left “all his small clay and plaster figures of epitaphs” to his pupil Johan van der Heijden.\cite{206} The adjective “small” implies the existence of large models, but Verhulst evidently did not want to saddle his heir with those pointing models, assuming they had even been preserved, because they were not very suitable for reuse, and their size made them impractical to store. The smaller plaster figures which Verhulst left were probably scale models or full-size parts of large
tombs. The 1702 probate inventory of his pupil Johannes Blommendael lists “two plaster statues, one the Greek Venus, the other Faunus, a recumbent lion, everything as large as life.”

Several of Verhulst’s portrait studies are completely in accord with this method of using pointing models. They are carefully finished, full-scale terracotta studies of death portraits, and relate to the tombs for the naval heroes De Ruyter and Van Gendt (figs. 58, 59). The correspondences in details and size with the marble figures indicate that the terracottas played a part in the genesis of the tomb sculptures. The most likely explanation is that Verhulst modelled them as preliminary studies, and that plaster casts taken from them were used as the full-scale pointing models for the figures on the tombs. Their high finish and the sharp truncation at the bottom are indications that Verhulst intended the terracottas to be works of art in their own right, possibly intended for his patrons. Several other modelled portrait studies formed part of his estate — of Admiral Sweers, King-Stadholder Willem III (William III of England) and Michiel de Ruyter — which again means that he had kept them as study material.

The terracotta portrait of Jacob van Reygersbergh, of which there is also a version in marble, fits in the same category. Verhulst modelled it from life, probably in the same way as Quellinus captured the likeness of Pensionary Johan de Witt in a single sitting in 1665, or as the army captain Adam van Broeckhuysen had his portrait modelled by Jan Baptist Xavery in 1738. The Van Reygersbergh portrait was made in preparation for the marble, to which it corresponds down to the smallest detail. The minor differences between the two include the addition of the base to the marble and the position of the head, as was seen when the two version were brought together (figs. 60, 61). In the marble Verhulst rotated the head a little more to the front and tilted it up slightly. He evidently felt that the gaze turned so far away from the viewer was a bit too informal for an official portrait. He did not need to make a completely new model from life for such corrections, but very probably made the adjustments using a
plaster which he cast from the terracotta. It seems likely that the latter also went to the patron who, given its less formal nature, installed it in a more private setting. The marble portrait was intended for public show, and may even have been conceived as a tomb bust.

Full-scale pointed models also enabled Verhulst to repeat compositions if he so desired. He did so on the tomb for Adriaen Clant in Stedum (1672), for which he used the model of the effigy of Johan Polyander van Kerckhoven, which had been delivered to Leiden almost ten years previously (figs. 62, 180, 183). Not only is the composition of the two statues very close indeed, but the right hands are actually identical (figs. 63, 64). However, it is impossible to say whether Clant's hand was made from a separate plaster model or derived from a large pointing model of the entire sculpture. Whatever the answer, the method allowed Verhulst to leave a lot of the chiselling to his assistants. The fact that the Stedum monument is not signed, which is highly unusual, also suggests that his collaborators had a large share in the finished work. Separate models of hands and limbs are regularly mentioned in probate inventories, and can also be seen in seventeenth-century views of sculptors' workshops, such as a drawing by an anonymous Dutch artist (fig. 65).
When they transferred the proportions and forms of the pointing model to the stone it is likely that Dutch sculptors were using a forerunner of the pointing machine, such as the one illustrated in a French engraving from Diderot's *Encyclopédie*, which is in the form of a wooden frame with plumb lines hanging above the pointing model, enabling every point on it to be fixed (fig. 66). In any case, they certainly used small straight compasses and large calipers to take measurements. These tools were often depicted in scenes set inside workshops, and also feature in sculptors' inventories. A document of 1681, for instance, mentions the sale of tools belonging to Jacob
Roman to his colleague Johannes Hannaert in The Hague.\textsuperscript{218}

Once the marble had been drilled and chiselled to the desired shape with a variety of picks, chisels and hammers, the details were added with delicate pointed chisels and files in a process which differed little from practices employed elsewhere in Europe and already described at length by other authors.\textsuperscript{219} The final step was to finish the surface of the stone in varying degrees of smoothness. Sculptors like Quellinus and Verhulst were well aware of the effects of light and sheen on the
surface of marble, and they exploited the textural range to the full. Generally speaking, figurative sculpture was not very highly polished, but the architectural parts of a tomb were. That can hardly be seen today, because most tombs have lost much of their original gloss as a result of centuries of cleaning. It was a great surprise, then, when the recent restoration of William the Silent's tomb revealed very glossy surfaces of both white and black marble. Parts which had been bricked in since the tomb was made, and had thus never been cleaned, had very delicately polished areas. Those reflecting surfaces gave a rare insight into the original degree of finish of the entire monument. It is not known precisely how this high gloss was achieved, but alum and vegetable oils may have been used to get a deeper tone. In Namur, which was the centre of the trade in Flemish stone, there were specialist stone polishers or polisseurs in the seventeenth century, as is known from a document of 1620 relating to the delivery of stone for the rood loft in St Jan's Cathedral in Den Bosch.

It may be of relevance in this connection that Hendrick de Keyser worked on the tomb of William the Silent in or before 1618 with the stonemason and lens-grinder David Hermansz Nieman, also known as David Hermanni. It was in that year that Nieman applied for a patent for a sort of polishing and saw-mill for marble and touchstone, and for cutting reliefs: "[...] in order to prepare touchstone and marble so efficiently through the invention of a mill and special processes that columns, tablets and all manner of fine things can be prepared from them without any loss, with raised gilt and silver lettering, histories and memorable events [...] and so purely and cleanly that it has the gleam of a mirror." Although it is not known how that mill worked, the invention does illustrate the growing interest in working luxury stone in the Dutch Republic, as well as Hendrick de Keyser's innovative approach to his art.

When all the parts of a tomb had been finished in the sculptor's workshop they had to be taken to their final destination. The transport took the usual route: as much as possible by water, or otherwise in carts overland. The large portrait of Count Johan Maurits van Nassau-Siegen which Bartholomeus Eggers made in The Hague in 1664 was moved from the garden of the Mauritshuis four years later to the counts' crypt in Siegen (Germany). The count himself organised the transport down to the finest detail, picking the route (by ship to Wesel, and then four days overland to Siegen), appointed an overseer in the person of one Claes Janssen, and stipulating that the work was to be packed in a strong crate. The general practice with larger shipments was to have
experienced assistants of the sculptor accompany the sculpture to assemble it at its destination.225

The transport costs were not covered by the contract. Rombout Verhulst came to an agreement with Anna van Ewsum that the tomb for the church in Midwolde would be shipped at her expense, and she declared that “I [...] shall also assume the costs of having the same collected from The Hague.”226 She was also responsible for ordering an iron railing around the tomb. That was unusual, because railings were regarded as being an integral and essential part of the tomb itself. Since it largely determined the impression that the tomb made, one would have expected the sculptor to have a say in its appearance. That was the case with the tomb of William the Silent, for in 1620 Hendrick de Keyser submitted separate and very detailed specifications for the railings, which were to be made by two Hague smiths.227 The fencing
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around most other tombs is unfortunately not documented, so it is not clear just how much seventeenth-century sculptors were involved in the protection of their creations behind ironwork, which could occasionally be very obtrusive indeed. One exception is Thomas Quellinus's design for the ironwork around the tomb of Hans Schack. The only sporadic remarks about fencing are found. There is the following illuminating passage in the specifications for William the Silent's tomb: "Eleven protruding rods riveted in each pillar to prevent dogs creeping underneath and boys over the top" (fig. 67). The dogs and playing children in seventeenth-century paintings of church interiors are evidently no invention on the artists' part. The railings in Westminster Abbey were also there to keep out mischievous boys, who scratched their names on the tombs. Railings were installed in the Saxon mortuary church in Freiberg in 1595 so that "not everyone can walk on the floor in which the royal slab is laid and besmirch it, and that the reputation of the Saxon royal house must be taken into consideration, that not everyone may be admitted to the area within the railings." Here, then, the railing was intended to prevent the defacement and desecration of the tombs by disrespectful visitors and to mark off the funerary area.

The final instalment of the sculptor's bill was paid after the tomb had been delivered and erected to everyone’s satisfaction. Delivery and payment could be recorded on the contract, as was the case with the Midwolde tomb. In his own hand, the sculptor thanked his patroness for paying promptly, and gave her a lifelong guarantee on the tomb now firmly anchored in the wall:

The content of this, the first penny with the last, fully settled and paid, so this tomb described above is hereby fully discharged, with gratitude for the good payment. Be appraised that if anything of the coats of arms or anything else fastened to the wall should fall off, it shall be made good at my expense, and pledge to do the same for as long as I shall live.

In witness whereof my hand. Actum Nienoord House, the 26th of August in the year 1669.

Rombout Verhulst.