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François Dieussart, Constantijn Huygens, and the classical ideal in funerary sculpture

When the sculptor François Dieussart left The Hague in 1651 he could look back on a successful and productive period of nearly ten years during which he had worked chiefly for the stadholder and his circle. In addition to several major commissions from the court he had also completed two monuments for private individuals: the tomb of Charles Morgan in Bergen op Zoom (fig. 106) and the more modest memorial for Arend and Josina van Dorp (fig. 127). These are the only two sepulchral monuments in his oeuvre, and in each case the stadholder’s secretary, Constantijn Huygens (fig. 107), played a key part in their realisation. This collaboration between Huygens and Dieussart resulted in two sculpted ensembles with unusual iconographies. This chapter examines the origins and meanings of the two monuments. The tomb for Charles Morgan is regarded as the outcome of Huygens’s attempts, beginning in 1636, to invest Dutch sculpture with a new ideal based on a classical model. The wishes of Charles Morgan’s family to honour his memory with a monument, together with the availability of the experienced Dieussart, presented Huygens with the perfect opportunity to put his plan into effect. In a sense, the tomb can be seen as the fruit of artistic rivalry with antiquity through the direct imitation of classical models coupled with contemporary views on the depiction of emotions. The inspiration for the latter came from contemporary theatre.
François Dieussart, Portrait of Constantijn Huygens, 1651, white Carrara marble, Haags Gemeentemuseum, The Hague

François Dieussart, Monument of Charles Morgan, as it was around 1900, c. 1645, white Carrara marble and black Belgian marble, Grote Kerk, Bergen op Zoom
The point of departure for the Van Dorp memorial, on the other hand, which seems to have marked the conclusion of the collaboration between Huygens and Dieussart, was the emulation of a celebrated, contemporary model, which Dieussart gave a more classical form and an entirely new, eschatological meaning.

The Morgan monument in Bergen op Zoom

Although severely damaged by fighting in 1747, the tomb of Charles Morgan, the English governor of Bergen op Zoom, is still one of the most impressive funerary monuments in the Netherlands. It was in pristine condition when described in a travel journal in 1668, but by 1752 was “more than half destroyed” and the marble statues had been “sorely maltreated.” It was only with the most recent restoration programme in 1982 that the tomb regained something of its former glory (figs. 106, 108).

The Morgan monument is a wall tomb in the form of a white marble niche with a round-headed arch set within composite pilasters supporting a pediment in the same material. The overall look is that of a classical temple front. One striking feature is the ornate decoration of the capitals, which are fittingly adorned with skulls, crossed bones and draperies. There are two figures in the niche, although originally there were three: in the centre Anna Morgan, the governor’s daughter and the person who commissioned the monument, flanked on the right by her small daughter Elizabeth and on the left by her son Thomas, his being the statue that is lost (figs. 123-125). They gaze silently down on the body of Charles Morgan, which lies on a black marble tomb in front of the niche. The tomb itself serves as the pedestal for the architecture of the niche. Following funerary decorum, the governor is represented as vir militaris in ceremonial armour and with his commander’s baton (fig. 109). He lies on a straw mattress, a predominantly Netherlands funerary motif that dates from the Middle Ages. On either side of the niche are classical trophies, symbols of victory, which were de rigueur on the tomb of a successful general (figs. 110, 111). The architecture of the niche is also furnished with heraldic accessories and there is a lengthy epitaph on the front of the tomb (fig. 112). The monument is neither signed nor dated, but since 1939 it has been convincingly attributed to the sculptor François Dieussart. It must have been made after 1642, the year of Morgan’s death.
The most original part of the monument is the imposing, life-size group of Anna and her child, who bring a rare liveliness to the rigid structure. They, not Charles Morgan, are the true focal point of the tomb. Anna and her children were an unusually monumental version of an old motif in western tomb sculpture, that of the mourning relatives. One finds numerous examples of it on seventeenth-century English and German tombs, echoing the pleurants that had been such a prominent feature of the Burgundian funerary tradition (fig. 113).

The unusual form, style and iconography of the Bergen op Zoom tomb have attracted the notice of several scholars, although as yet this has not led to a convincing interpretation. While one author stressed the English influences in the dress of the mourners, another suspected that the tomb stemmed from a Netherlandish tradition, although without giving any detailed reasons for doing so. However, the close involvement of Constantijn Huygens in the realisation of the Morgan tomb, and the English antecedents of the sculptor Dieussart, open up fresh avenues for interpreting the work.

Charles Morgan

The tomb that Dieussart made for the Great Church (St Gertrude's) in Bergen op Zoom honoured the memory of Charles Morgan, the
François Dieussart, Monument of Charles Morgan, detail showing trophies before restoration, c. 1645, white Carrara marble, Grote Kerk, Bergen op Zoom
governor of the town, who died on 12 December 1642. Morgan, who was born around 1575, had gained a great military reputation as commander of the English troops fighting on the side of the States-General in the Eighty Years' War. He served under Prince Maurits at the Battle of Nieuwpoort in 1600, and put up a heroic defence against Spinola's troops at the sieges of Bergen op Zoom (1622) and Breda. The retention of the strategically vital town of Bergen op Zoom was particularly important, and was a great relief to the Republic, for it controlled the routes from the Spanish Netherlands to the northern provinces of Zeeland and Holland. After a brief period of service fighting for the King of Denmark in Germany, Morgan returned to the Republic around 1630, where Stadholder Frederik Hendrik appointed him military governor of Bergen op Zoom, in which post he served until his death. He allied himself closely with the republican cause, not only through his military exploits but also through his marriage to
Elisabeth van Marnix, daughter of Philip van Marnix, Lord of St Aldegonde and a confidant of William the Silent. When she died in childbirth in 1608, Morgan had an ornate tomb built for her in Delft’s Oude Kerk – one of the first sepulchral monuments to be erected in the fledgling Republic (fig. 114). He was left to bring up his daughter Anna.

Charles Morgan was a familiar figure in the circles around the stadholder and the Winter Queen in The Hague. In an anonymous letter written in 1625 by a member of the entourage of Elizabeth of Bohemia he is mentioned in the same breath as the English ambassador, Dudley Carleton: “Reaching there on the evening of the first of July we found Ambassador Carleton and Colonel Morgan awaiting our arrival.” Huygens and Morgan may have become acquainted through Carleton, although of course other connections...

112 François Dieussart, Monument of Charles Morgan, detail showing coat of arms in the central niche, c. 1645, white Carrara marble, Grote Kerk, Bergen op Zoom

113 Claus Sluter, Mourner ("pleurant") from the tomb of Philip the Bold, 1404, marble, Musée de la Ville, Dijon
within this circle are perfectly possible.\textsuperscript{19} What is indisputable is that the court secretary knew Morgan well. His name crops up regularly in Huygens’s correspondence, who also mentions him once or twice in his poems and wrote two Latin elegies on his death.\textsuperscript{14} Huygens had a more intimate relationship with Morgan’s daughter, Anna, and it was probably through her, as will be seen below, that he became directly involved with the tomb in Bergen op Zoom.

\textsuperscript{114} Nicholas Stone (?), \textit{Monument of Elisabeth Morgan}, white Carrara marble, English alabaster and touchstone, 1611, Oude Kerk, Delft
François Dieussart

Dieussart arrived in The Hague in July 1641 bearing a letter of recommendation from the painter Gerrit van Honthorst. He had come straight from London, where he had been working since 1636 for the Earl of Arundel and for the English court. He called on Constantijn Huygens, undoubtedly in the hope of being appointed court sculptor. In his capacity as the stadholder’s secretary Huygens was an important intermediary, or ‘broker,’ for princely commissions. In his letter, Van Honthorst reported that Dieussart had started work on a bust of Frederik Hendrik on his own account, but would be unable to finish it unless he could model the prince’s head from life (fig. 115). He accordingly requested the honour of a short posing session.

Dieussart arrived at an opportune moment, undoubtedly thanks to Van Honthorst’s good advice. The two artists probably knew each other from their days in Rome. On that occasion the painter may have advised the sculptor to move to The Hague, where there was a prospect of major commissions.

In the first place there was the possibility of orders from the stadholder’s court, which was going through a period of cultural revival. Stadholder Frederik Hendrik and his wife Amalia van Solms
were well aware of the importance of a flourishing court culture that would redound to the honour of the House of Orange and underpin their political ambitions. Two new palaces, Honselaarsdijk and Ter Nieuburgh, had been built outside The Hague, the furnishing of which would require the employment of numerous artists and the purchase of works of art of every kind.\textsuperscript{19} Although the stadholder had a wide choice of architects, painters and practitioners of the applied arts in his own country, qualified sculptors were very thin on the ground.\textsuperscript{20}

Besides this, The Hague offered Dieussart the potential patronage of the Winter Queen and her entourage, who had been living in exile in the Republic since 1621, and who conducted themselves in grand style.\textsuperscript{21} Finally, he could expect commissions from the representatives of foreign courts and governments in The Hague, and from prominent families in the circles around the stadholder.

Dieussart, for his part, had a great deal to offer. He had wide international experience and had developed into a leading portrait sculptor employing the latest ideas of the Italian Baroque. He must have been in Rome before 1620, and certainly worked there between 1622 and 1636. One of the projects in which he was involved was the decoration of the magnificent catafalque for Cardinal Carlo Barberini, on which many sculptors worked under the supervision of Bernini.\textsuperscript{22} In 1633, Dieussart approached the English collector and connoisseur, Thomas Howard, Earl of Arundel, and asked if he could enter his service. This led initially to several commissions, including the restoration of classical sculptures, which he completed while in Rome. Arundel was evidently pleased with the results, for in 1636 Dieussart left Italy for England.\textsuperscript{23} He remained there until his move to The Hague in 1641, working partly for the earl at Arundel House and partly at the court of Charles I. The portraits he made of Arundel and members of the English royal family testify to his success in these years. His most monumental commission, and probably the first test of his skills for the English court, was the splendid high altar of 1636 for the chapel in Somerset House. That work, in which Dieussart showed himself to be a modern artist capable of applying the theatrical and illusionistic effect of Roman Baroque, has unfortunately been lost. It seems from a contemporary description that it must have been about 40 feet high. The sculptures included almost 200 angels worshipping the Holy Sacrament, as well as two standing prophets, probably life-size.\textsuperscript{24} The experience he gained while making such a monumental complex would undoubtedly have stood him in good stead when he came to execute the tomb for Charles Morgan.
Dieussart gave proof of his abilities in The Hague with a number of modern portraits conceived in the Classicist style. Typical of his work is the bust of Queen Elizabeth of Bohemia that he made in 1641, the year of his arrival in the Republic (fig. 116). The Winter Queen is shown in classical attire and is rendered in a sober, dry style. In addition, the bust is in white Italian marble, a material that was little used by sculptors in the Republic and one that gives the sculpture a decidedly classical look. From 1644 Dieussart could also count Johan Maurits van Nassau-Siegen among his clients, for whom he made marble busts of the four stadholders of the House of Orange for the large reception room in the newly built Mauritshuis, and a bust of the Elector of Brandenburg for an overdoor niche in the bedchamber. Johan Maurits himself was portrayed as a Roman general shortly after his return from Brazil in 1644. In 1646, Dieussart received his largest commission from the court: a dynastic series of full-length portraits of the four princes of Orange for the vestibule of the newly finished Huis Ten Bosch. Constantijn Huygens’s involvement was limited to acting for Amalia van Solms in the usual negotiations on the conditions of delivery, as well as keeping an eye on the sculptor’s progress. He wrote to Frederik Hendrik saying that he expected to persuade Dieussart to reduce his high asking price for the statues. He was probably basing this expectation on his position as Dieussart’s ‘broker,’ for it was thanks to him that the sculptor had received the commission for Morgan’s tomb in Bergen op Zoom, completed shortly before. In the event, he failed, which is an indication of the strength of Dieussart’s position in The Hague at that time.

Huygens and classicism in sculpture

Although Dieussart’s arrival was important to the stadholder and his circle, Huygens must privately have been delighted with the opportunity that presented itself. This was due to his growing interest in sculpture, and to the efforts that he and Jacob van Campen had been making since 1636 to give it a more classical form.

Huygens belonged to a wide circle of intellectual writers who studied classical antiquity, and classical architecture in particular. He corresponded with and sought the company of many leading antiquaries, “virtuosi” and dilettantes. His correspondents and acquaintances included such diverse personalities as the philologist Johannes Fredericus Gronovius, Daniël and Nicolaas Heinsius, the
François Dieussart, *Portrait of Queen Elizabeth of Bohemia*, 1641, white Carrara marble, Victoria & Albert Museum, London

diplomat Joachim de Wicquevoort, the Leiden historian Marcus Zuerius Boxhorn, Jan de Bisschop, the Nijmegen antiquary Johannes Smetius, the art dealer and collector Daniël Nijs in Venice, the merchant and collector Gerard Reynst, the antiquary Gisbert Cuper of Deventer, Rubens in Antwerp, Nicolas-Claude Fabri de Peiresc in Aix-en-Provence, the collector and maecenas Thomas Howard, Earl of Arundel, and the philologist Claude Saumaise (Salmasius) in Leiden.

Huygens and Van Campen also played a key role in the development of Classicism in Dutch architecture, chiefly by introducing architectural principles based on a critical study of Vitruvius and the Italian treatises, and by building his own house. The latter project, along with the construction of the Mauritshuis next door and the stadholders’ palaces, were among the first essays in pure Classicist architecture in the Republic. Huygens’s mansion was built between 1634 and 1637 on what later became the Plein in The Hague, and was the proud embodiment of the architectural principles he had derived from Vitruvius. A few years later the same ideas informed the design of the garden at his country estate, Hofwijck near Voorburg. In addition to being an exercise in pure architecture, his town house also served higher, less personal ideals. Huygens aimed to improve the Hague townscape with his creation. It was above all intended as an incentive and model for future patrons and architects. Its owner presented himself as a conscious innovator in Dutch architecture, impelled by the desire to revive the architectural principles of antiquity.

Needless to say, the development of this new architecture also created a demand for suitable sculptures that reflected the ideas of classical antiquity. The facades of the first Classicist buildings were embellished with tympanum reliefs and free-standing statues on the cornices of the pediments, in accordance with the precepts laid down by Vitruvius and the writers of the Italian treatises. The sculptor
Pieter Adriaensz 't Hooft,
Household management,
c. 1638, sandstone,
Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam
entrusted with this work was Pieter 't Hooft (1610-1649/50), an artist from Dordrecht who had settled in The Hague as early as 1631.47 Nothing is known about 't Hooft's training or his work prior to teaming up with Huygens. The latter employed his services for the sculptural decoration of his new house. Around 1636-1637, 't Hooft delivered two bronzed, sandstone figures for the hall of the house that together formed an allegory of Good Fortune (figs. 117, 118).49 The sculptor may also have been responsible for the statues, now lost, on the main front: the Vitruvian trio of Venustas, Utilitas and Firmitas.49 Pieter 't Hooft was also employed on several of Jacob van Campen's building projects, with which Huygens was also indirectly involved. He supplied several statues for the bridge at Honselaarsdijk in 1638, and made the facade decorations for the Mauritshuis (before 1644) and Noordeinde Palace (Het Oude Hof) in 1645.50 Here the tympana were filled with battle reliefs, the form and location of which made them the most prominent examples of Classicist sculpture in the Republic at that moment.51

Given the outspokenly classical nature of 't Hooft's sculptures, it is fair to assume that Huygens and Van Campen were the sculptor's joint sources of inspiration. However, in the light of the train of events outlined above, it seems that Huygens had the honour of being 't Hooft's 'discoverer.'52 Through his wide range of contacts with antiquaries, classical scholars and collectors throughout Europe, he had even better access to knowledge about classical sculpture than Van Campen. He had also, of course, seen major collections of antiquities with his own eyes, such as those of his former neighbour, the English ambassador Sir Dudley Carleton, the Earl of Arundel in London, the Reynst brothers in Amsterdam, and of Johannes Smetius in Nijmegen.53 In addition, he had visited Italy in 1620, where he had ample opportunity to study the remains of Roman culture.54

Huygens's interest in classical sculpture is apparent from other sources as well. On 5 November 1638, Count Hendrik van Nassau, a brother of Johan Maurits, wrote to Huygens from Paris: "Regarding the statues that you want from here, I will see to it. I shall go to Fontainebleau to have copies made of all that they have, and will send you a list, complete with the sizes, so that you can make your selection."55 Fontainebleau was the only place outside Rome where many of the most important antique sculptures could be seen, albeit in the form of bronze and plaster copies. They consisted of a series of statues and reliefs that Primaticcio had had made in Rome around 1540 on the orders of François I, and copies had subsequently been
made for use elsewhere.\textsuperscript{56} Huygens’s interest in these Paris statues is explained by the timing of the letter, for in 1638 his house had just been completed, and he undoubtedly needed sculptures to decorate the garden. In addition, the Paris copies would come in useful for the gardens of the stadholder’s palaces, and possibly even for that of the Mauritshuis, which was half-built at the time.\textsuperscript{57} It is not clear whether the copies from Fontainebleau ever arrived in The Hague, for nothing more is said about them in Huygens’s correspondence. In 1664, however, he wrote a poem about a statue of Venus in his garden, which may have had something to do with the Paris order.\textsuperscript{58} Be that as it may, the letter of 1638 demonstrates that Huygens made a serious attempt to have examples of antique sculpture sent to the Republic.

The Classicist works that ‘t Hooft made for Huygens and Van Campen would have been inconceivable without a thorough grounding in classical sculpture. The sculptor himself probably lacked such knowledge, given his restricted sphere of action, nor were Van Campen’s small sketches for comparable sculpture of much help.\textsuperscript{59} Original statues, casts or accurate drawings must have offered a solution. This is demonstrated by one of the two statues from the hall of Huygens’s house, a figure holding a ship’s rudder (fig. 117). It is a meticulous reworking (note the bared breast and the distinctive, ‘Hellenistic’ folds of the chiton) of a classical statue of an amazon, as can be seen from a comparison with the torso of an amazon from the Arundel Collection (figs. 119, 120).\textsuperscript{60} It is even possible that this torso was the literal model, for as far as is known it was the only one of its kind north of the Alps in the seventeenth century.\textsuperscript{51} The choice of an amazon may have been prompted by Pliny, who described a famous contest at Ephesus where five classical sculptors vied with each other to produce the best bronze amazon. Was Huygens trying to involve ‘t Hooft, ‘his’ sculptor, symbolically in this ancient “agoon,” thus setting up an artistic rivalry with the antique artists?\textsuperscript{62} 

It is clear from the collaboration between Huygens, Van Campen and ‘t Hooft that there was an active endeavour in The Hague to revitalise sculpture from the second half of the 1630s. Up to this point innovation was limited to sculptural applications within architecture. Before 1640 there was insufficient talent in the Republic for a truly Classicist sculpture based on a thorough study of classical art. That changed with the arrival of Dieussart.
Torso of an amazon, *Roman copy after a Greek bronze of c. 430 B.C.*, marble, Ashmolean Museum, Oxford

Antique statue of an amazon, drawing from the Cassiano dal Pozzo-collection, c. 1630, The Royal Collection, H.M. Queen Elizabeth II, Windsor Castle
Huygens as adviser

Huygens’s involvement with the preparations for the tomb for Charles Morgan is clearly documented in his correspondence. In a letter to Huygens of 29 September 1644, the painter Thomas Willeboirts first commended his colleague Gonzales Coques to the stadholder’s secretary, and continued: “I have not heard whether anything further has been done about the tomb for Mr Morgan. The two sculptors who made the drawings occasionally ask what happened to them. Should there be any other matter in which I can serve Your Excellency you will always find me ready to oblige [...] Antwerp, 29 September 1644.”

Huygens had probably been in regular touch with Willeboirts since 1641. He was the court’s contact in Antwerp for artistic matters, but Huygens also used him in a private capacity. Their relationship eventually led to Willeboirts’s involvement in the decoration of the Oranjezaal in Huis Ten Bosch. It is clear from the passage just cited that Willeboirts was acting for Huygens when he asked the two Antwerp sculptors to produce a design for Morgan’s tomb. Their names are not known, nor what form their design took. There were various reasons for making an approach to sculptors from Antwerp. In the first place, it was close to Bergen op Zoom, and unlike the cities of the northern Netherlands it had plenty of talented sculptors with large studios who were experienced in making funerary monuments. Another possible factor in the equation is that Willeboirts himself came from Bergen op Zoom and would have been familiar with the situation there.

One obvious reason why Huygens did not ultimately make use of the services of the unknown Antwerp sculptors is that François Dieussart returned to The Hague in the summer of 1644 after a two-year interlude in Italy and Denmark. An added advantage was that by obtaining the commission for the Morgan tomb for ‘his’ trusty sculptor, Huygens would be able to assess his talent for monumental work. That would not be illogical, given the pending major commission for Huis Ten Bosch: the four standing portraits of the princes of Orange.

The actual client for the monument, however, was Morgan’s daughter Anna, not Huygens. Anna Morgan undoubtedly consulted the court secretary as artistic adviser because of his excellent contacts in the art world, and because of his taste. The main consideration, though, was that they were very close friends. In a poem that Huygens wrote at this time to mark the gift of a mosquito net, which
he dedicated to Anna, he unabashedly declared his love for the daughter of the English governor. It is titled “A lover to a widow concerning a mosquito net with which she has honoured him,” and was written in the summer of 1645 in Zelzate, when Huygens was accompanying the prince on a campaign. In a letter to Huygens from D. de Wilhelm there is even mention of “your alleged mistress, Madame Morgan.” It was during these amorous exchanges that the preparations were going ahead for Morgan’s tomb.

The monument was actually made in 1645-1646. Neurdenburg assumed that it had been built in 1642, but she was unaware of the letter from Willeboirts to Huygens of September 1644, which can be taken as the datum post quem. Morgan’s tomb is not mentioned in Den Nederlandtschen herauld, a heraldic work of 1645 by De Rouck, although the author does discuss several other tombs in the Great Church at Bergen op Zoom, and since he actually lived in the town it can be assumed that it was not completed when his book was published in 1645. In April 1646, Dieussart accepted the commission for the four life-size statues of the princes of Orange, and it is fair to assume that the tomb was then finished, or nearly so.

**Iconography**

The Morgan tomb is the only one of its kind in European sepulchral art. There are no obvious iconographic roots for the theatrical structure of mourning relatives combined with a classical, architectural framework and a traditional gisant of the dead man. This is clearly a new type of tomb, although parts of it are related to existing visual traditions. It stands to reason that the client, Anna Morgan, had a hand in the design, were it only because she and her children were given such a prominent place in the composition. Dieussart very probably used an intriguing source of inspiration in his search for a form that would satisfy both Anna’s list of requirements (at which we can only guess) and his own artistic ambitions. His formal point of departure was a Hellenistic tomb stele with a uniform structure of a simple, classical front with a niche containing several figures. The striking similarity (leaving aside the size) between this type of antique tomb relief and the monument for Charles Morgan is due to their identical compositional programmes. Both employ an austere architectural form of two pillars that flank a niche and support a pediment and tympanum. Many of the niches in the stelae contain one or more adult
figures with their slaves or servants, who are shown on a smaller scale. It very much seems that Dieussart translated this small classical image into a life-size monument, and that he followed his model by peopling the niche with a grown woman and her two children. The classical slaves or servants, whose smaller size was dictated by the social hierarchy in antique times, became the deceased’s grandchildren in Dieussart’s creation.

Although people knew far less about classical sculpture in the seventeenth century than we do today, there is every reason to believe that François Dieussart, and Constantijn Huygens as well, were familiar with the antique stele form. He may have seen it during his stay in Italy, but he was quite definitely able to study the type in the Earl of Arundel’s collection. The Arundel provenance is documented for at least four different stelae. Three were reproduced in Richard Chandler’s *Marmora Oxoniensa* of 1763, together with another that came from John Selden, the antiquary who published the inscriptions on Arundel’s marbles in 1628. Of the specimens reproduced by Chandler, the late-Hellenistic stele for Philista from Arundel’s collection, which is now in the Ashmolean Museum in Oxford, is the best candidate as the source for the Morgan monument (fig. 121). The relief shows a structure almost identical to the one used by Dieussart in Bergen op Zoom only a few years after leaving Arundel’s service. The only essential difference in a formal sense is the round head to the niche, which is lacking in this particular stele but is found in others.

The idea of using a classical funerary relief for the design of a modern tomb, assuming it was Dieussart’s, was new in the Netherlands. Experiments incorporating classical motifs in funerary art had been made in the first half of the seventeenth century, chiefly in England (of which both Dieussart and Huygens were undoubtedly aware), but never before had an example of classical funerary art been so manifestly transformed into a modern tomb. This ambitious enterprise must have greatly appealed to Huygens. The Morgan monument was the next logical step after his earlier efforts to give shape to a Classicist form of sculpture with the aid of Jacob van Campen and Pieter ‘t Hooft. This audacious tomb, which was moreover largely executed in white Italian marble, marked the birth of a new Classicism in tomb sculpture, for the first time based directly on the reworking of an antique model.

The sculptor’s greatest challenge lay in the large group of Anna and her children in the niche, which is the visual and iconographic core of the monument. It was his best opportunity for vying successfully with
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*Stele of Philista with maidservants*, Greece (Late Hellenistic), 2nd century B.C., marble, Ashmolean Museum, Oxford
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Hubert le Sueur,
*Queen Henrietta Maria*,
1634, bronze,
St. John's College, Oxford
the ancients. He was faced with the task of working within the formal constraints imposed by the scene on the stele while creating a monumental ensemble that would both present the Morgan family as a dynastic entity (which was probably one of his client’s demands) and express the relatives’ sorrow at the loss of a father and grandfather.

Dieussart gave the group monumentality by making it life-size and freestanding, whereas the pendant in the classical relief is much shallower and moreover only a few decimeters high. Since Dieussart is not known to have attempted a standing, life-size group before, this would also have been a technical challenge. It is possible that he drew on his knowledge of a statue that he must have seen in England, namely the bronze, full-length portrait of Queen Henrietta Maria executed between 1634 and 1636 by Hubert le Sueur, the French court sculptor to Charles I (fig. 122). Dieussart himself made a portrait of
the queen in 1640, a year before his arrival in The Hague, but in 1636 he had already executed a colossal high altar for her chapel. It is almost inconceivable, therefore, that he did know of Le Sueur’s bronze statue. The latter’s stiff portrait of the queen may lack the emotion that imbues the statue of Anna Morgan, but the pose provided Dieussart with a good starting point for his own composition. He was particularly successful in adopting and reworking the position of the figure’s right hand, which was elegantly lifting a veil beside the body. It is a gesture that is quite often found in English tomb sculpture, but only with recumbent figures.

Dieussart could also emulate the antique model by portraying the sorrow of Anna and her children and by presenting the three generations of the Morgan family as a dynastic unit. The importance of family ties, which continued even after the death of a member of the family, was a particularly popular theme in English tomb sculpture at this time. It is only after 1660 that traces of it are found in a few other Dutch tombs. Its introduction here is not strange, given Anna Morgan’s English descent and Dieussart’s knowledge of the latest developments in English tomb sculpture. As will be shown below, Dieussart and Huygens sought their inspiration for the mourning of Charles Morgan’s family in the theatre of the day.
Display of grief

With the subtle depiction of the sorrow of Anna and her children, Dieussart gave his figure group an emotional power that far transcends that of his model (figs. 123-125). Anna and her children appear to have come straight from a funeral procession. However, situated as it is within the high, monumental frame of the tomb, the scene, although realistic in itself, would initially have conjured up associations with a stage play in the beholder's mind. One gets the impression of being a spectator at a numbed, intimate display of grief enacted on a theatre stage. The leading players in this marble tableau vivant are the close relatives; The laid-out body of Charles Morgan is almost reduced to a non-speaking extra, the tomb itself to a proscenium. Anna's pose and expression bespeak pent-up sorrow — her head bowed and arms hanging, the corners of her mouth and eyelids turned down. The association with the stage would have struck the seventeenth-century viewer even more forcibly if he was aware of the subject matter and performance of classical and contemporary tragedies. There is even good reason to believe that contemporary stagecraft influenced the execution of the tomb, with Constantijn Huygens, once again, as the logical link.

In order to accentuate dramatic climaxes in their plays, writers liked to use so-called "stomme vertoningen" — "dumb shows," "pageants" or tableaux vivants. These were interposed as separate, small scenes with action that was entirely or largely frozen. The silent players in these 'shows' usually depicted terrifying, barbaric or solemn events. In the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries they were often part of the stage plays performed by rhetoricians' societies, or during civic processions and the joyous entries of royalty. The plays were usually performed on simple stages specially erected for the occasion, and were sometimes set within ephemeral, painted architecture (fig. 126). In a simpler form these late-medieval pageants probably lived on as entr'actes in seventeenth-century stage plays.

The notes for Vondel's Gebroeders, his first drama to follow the Greek model, which had its premiere in the Amsterdam Playhouse in 1641, give directions for the performance, including the associated dumb shows. In the fifth act of this biblical drama one even finds a description of a tableau vivant that bears a resemblance to Morgan's tomb both as regards the scene itself and the form of words used. It is the one where Rizpah, Saul's widow, accompanied by her maidservants, finds the bodies of her dead sons and mourns them.
"And, supported beneath the arms, she came to the stake
And grasped the wicked wood to which the sons were bound,
Their still dumbstruck mother. Mouths speechless,
Without answering, and she like a marble statue,
Save when she swooned, so often did her heart break;
And without our seeing a tear roll down her face,
From sighs to groans, from groans to lamentation." 87

The speechless mother, overcome with grief for her dead sons, is presented by Vondel as if she were a marble statue, which establishes a very direct connection with Dieussart's group of Anna and her children beside Charles Morgan's body.88 In both cases there is deep sorrow that is borne stoically, without tears.89 For Vondel, this dumb show had an exemplary purpose, which was to make the audience feel and reflect on Rizpah's suffering. The spectator at Morgan's tomb is invited to experience the same emotional involvement. One cannot, of course, say that Vondel's scene had a direct influence on the conception of the tomb, despite the coincidence of content and date.90 What can be said is that both scenes, in marble and life, sprang from the same interest in the representation of one of the traditional emotions – mourning the dead.91

There was a great interest in classical theatre, and in tragedy in particular, in this period of the Republic's history. The flourishing focus of this revival was the Amsterdam Playhouse, which had been built in 1638 to a design by Jacob van Campen, "after the manner of the old Roman theatres."92 Although Constantijn Huygens never made a name as a playwright, producing but a single comedy, he was certainly well-informed about developments in Dutch theatre. It can be assumed that he took a keen interest in the building of Van Campen's Classicist playhouse, for the two were in close touch at the time, and when he was not in the audience himself he was told about the performances by his friends in Amsterdam. Barlaeus, for instance, wrote to him enthusiastically in 1641 about the tragedy Aran en Titus by Jan Vos, and particularly praised the
depiction of the passions. Huygens would certainly not have failed to see that the subjects and decorum of classical tragedy bore a great resemblance to those of many funerary monuments. Both have a seemly and stately character, eminent personages and a sad end. Huygens could therefore have realised that the depiction of emotions on the stage in the form of dumb shows could very easily be applied to tombs, above all as a way of emulating a classical model.

He had shown his awareness of the importance of depicting emotions convincingly back in 1630 in his well-known description of the work of the young Rembrandt. He wrote of the artist's emotionally charged depiction of the penitent Judas: “I maintain that no Protogenes, Apelles or Parrhasius achieved, or ever could achieve were they to return to earth, what has been brought together in a single figure and shown in its entirety by a youth, by a Dutchman, by a miller yet beardless. Amazement seizes me when I say: bravo Rembrandt! To bring Troy, yea Asia entire, to Italy is a lesser achievement than bearing the crown away from Greece and Italy and bringing it to the Dutch.” In common with several of his epigrams on paintings and
statues, this passage demonstrates the high value he put upon such emotive aspects in art. Moreover, what is even more significant in this context is that he believed that Rembrandt had actually excelled the ancients with his depiction of emotions. So perhaps, partly in this light, one can detect Huygens’s involvement in the display of mourning on Morgan’s tomb.

The Van Dorp memorial

Shortly after the completion of the Morgan tomb a more modest monument was made that has so far not been associated with Dieussart. It is the marble memorial for Arend and Josina van Dorp, father and daughter, in the north wall of the Cloister Church in The Hague (fig. 127).

Like the tomb in Bergen op Zoom it consists of classical portico, but now with a rounded, broken-apex pediment. The architecture on the Morgan tomb encloses a niche, but here there is an archway shown in perspective. However, it is blocked by two putti holding up a cloth with the funerary inscription. Below their pedestals are stylised wave scrolls. The memorial terminates with two mermaids holding up a coat of arms. Other escutcheons hang above and below the putti. The monument was erected in or shortly after 1646, after the death of Josina van Dorp. She was from an old noble family of the province of Holland that had fallen on hard times in the sixteenth century but had recovered much of its lost wealth through the daring financial transactions of her father Arend. He had purchased the seigniories of Theemsche, Maasdam and Middelharnis, had the bailiwick of Zevenbergen, was steward of the Marquis of Veere and Vlissingen, and governor of Zierikzee. The Zeeland connections may explain the maritime motifs on the memorial: the mermaids and wave scrolls. Van Dorp passed the last years of his life with Josina, a daughter from his second marriage, on Noordeinde in The Hague. He died on 2 August 1600, naming his daughter as executrix of his will. Josina continued living in The Hague, and in 1634 moved to a house on the corner of Heulstraat. Although her father had converted to Protestantism, Josina remained a staunch Catholic all her life - in part, no doubt, because of the family’s many connections with the southern Netherlands.

The memorial can be attributed to Dieussart on the evidence of the characteristically ‘dry’ style, and this is supported by circumstantial evidence. Around 1646, Dieussart was the only sculptor in The Hague
capable of producing such an innovative design. He was also one of the Republic’s few sculptors to work in Italian marble before 1650. Moreover, the unusual design of the memorial would have been inconceivable without a knowledge of recent developments in Roman Baroque sculpture, which Dieussart certainly had.

The obvious source of inspiration for the Van Dorp memorial is François Duquesnoy’s tomb for the Dutchman Adriaen Vryburgh in Santa Maria dell’Anima in Rome (fig. 128). Although there has been speculation about contacts between Dieussart and his far more famous fellow-countryman (both arrived in Rome at about the same time), no concrete evidence has so far been found to substantiate it. Yet Dieussart must almost certainly have witnessed the making of this well-known tomb of 1629, which was erected while he was in Rome. Nor could it really have escaped his notice during his brief return to that city in 1643, for it stood in the church of the German-Dutch congregation in Rome. Together with its pendant, the even better-known monument for Ferdinand van den Eynde of c. 1630-1631, the Vryburgh tomb was celebrated among artists for the sensitive rendering of the putti, which presented a challenge to other sculptors. Rubens and Bellori praised Duquesnoy’s figures of children at length. The latter wrote in 1672: “In Rome, in the Church of Santa Maria dell’Anima, he [Duquesnoy] made two tombs which are built up against columns on either side. The one is of Ferdinand van den [Eynde], a gentleman from Antwerp, and the other of Adriaen of the Vryburgh family of Alkmaar. On the first are two putti which raise a cloth to reveal the inscription. One of them covers part of its head with a cloth as a token of sorrow, and it holds the hourglass of death in its hand. This is without doubt the most beautiful little putto to which Francesco’s chisel gave life, and sculptors and painters consider it exemplary, together with its companion, who is turned towards him and bows with him as he raises the cloth.”

Duquesnoy’s putti on the Vryburgh tomb, who hold up the cloth with the funerary inscription, stand against a large lobate cartouche that flows around the base of one of the pillars of the church. Dieussart transformed this flowing, organic and elegant design into a much more austere composition which serves chiefly to emphasise the sober architecture. His rendering of the putti lacks the famed sensitivity of Duquesnoy’s versions, even though the faces, in particular, betray the influence of the two monuments in Rome. The difference between both works, although largely due to dissimilar artistic approaches, also has an iconographic basis.
By choosing the rigid shape of a classical portico with a barrel vault seen in perspective, Dieussart was using the old funerary motif of the gateway or door separating earthly existence from the hereafter. In the Christian tradition it has acquired a predominantly eschatological significance as the portal to eternity.\textsuperscript{105} The precise meaning of the gateway motif, which is extremely rare in Dutch funerary art, is unclear in this particular case. Does this \textit{porta coeli} lead to a view of eternal life, or to the dark burial chamber of a mausoleum, where the sarcophagus was placed in classical times? Should it be associated with a classical triumphal arch honouring conquest over death, or with Christ himself?\textsuperscript{106} The lack of specific clues makes it impossible to give a firm answer.

Gateways with doors or curtains hanging before them have been common in western sepulchral art since classical times.\textsuperscript{107} The motif of double doors, sometimes half-open, was quite widespread, above all on Roman sarcophagi, and reappeared in Italian tomb sculpture in the fifteenth century.\textsuperscript{108} Donatello’s use of it on the pedestal of the equestrian statue of Gattamelata in Padua is the best-known example of its revival, followed by Michelangelo in his first design for the tomb of Julius II.\textsuperscript{109}

In the Low Countries, Rubens applied the classical sarcophagus motif in an unexecuted design for a large wall tomb (fig. 129) intended for Jan Grusset, also known as Richardot (1540-1609), President of the Privy Council in the Spanish Netherlands and close adviser to Archdukes Albert and Isabella. Rubens designed a Classicist structure with a tomb in front of it, all situated in a niche. Within the architectural surround stand two angels or genii who are starting to open a double door. They are the centrepiece of the monument, and as such lie at the heart of its iconography, alluding to the triumph of eternal life that awaits beyond the doors.\textsuperscript{110} Another occurrence of this motif is, on the tomb of Elisabeth Morgan in Delft (fig. 114). The inscription “R 1655” on the rear wall shows that the monument was restored in 1655, probably on the instructions of her daughter Anna,\textsuperscript{111} and it seems likely that that was when the illusionistic painted background was added, showing the two opened doors of a gateway. Beyond them is a light, undefined space.

The doors in this monument and the Rubens drawing are completely open, leaving the spectator wondering what will be revealed beyond, but a scene of a stairway of life painted in Haarlem leaves no room for doubt. In this mid-seventeenth century canvas, a gateway opened by angels blowing trumpets reveals a scene of the Day of Judgement, the
Peter Paul Rubens, Design for a tomb for Jean Grusset, known as Richardot, c. 1609, drawing in pen and ink, Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam

Stairway of life, Haarlem (?), c. 1650-60, canvas, Museum Kurhaus, Kleve
resurrection of the dead (fig. 130). The motif of a gateway and the same hope of salvation are also found in an elegy that Constantijn Huygens wrote for his deceased wife Susanna van Baerle. In it the widower speaks of death as a passing moment, as the "passageway of stone, of a groaning, towards life, thin partition." Death is here intended merely as the transition to the true life. In Romeyn de Hooghe's print cycle, Mirror of a blessed death of 1694, man is led through a gateway on his rose-strewn road to eternal life. The crucifix signifying victory over death gives the gateway the nature of a triumphal arch.

In the light of these specific applications of the gateway motif, the most obvious association of the form of the Van Dorp memorial is with the triumphal arch that leads to eternal life. Although half-raised curtains and cloths regularly feature on Italian tombs from the Middle Ages on, where they depict in petrified form the remains of the burial chamber in which the deceased was laid out, Dieussart's decision to replace the traditional doors with a raised cloth with an inscription would have been influenced above all by Duquesnoy's example.

The commission

There are no surviving documents that could shed light on the origins of the Van Dorp memorial. Arend van Dorp's last will merely expresses his wish for a modest funeral: "[...] and my body desiring a Christian burial that the same shall be as plain as possible, without ostentatious worldly pomp." The settlement of debts after the funeral, which was done by his daughter Josina, shows that his wish for sobriety was observed. There are no excessive expenses, apart for the fee for painting the dead man's portrait. This makes it likely that it was Josina who commissioned the memorial.

There are indications, however, that Constantijn Huygens acted as the intermediary with Dieussart, either on behalf of Josina or her surviving relatives. Huygens had been well acquainted with the Van Dorps since his youth. His parents lived from 1613 on Voorhout, close to the house of the widow of Frederik van Dorp. In 1616 Constantijn had a brief romance with one of the daughters, Dorothea, which matured into a lasting friendship. Later, moreover, he became related to the Van Dorps through his wife, Susanna van Baerle. Josina and Constantijn were also in touch with each other. As early as 1614 he dedicated a poem to her, as is clear from the title, "A madame de Villebon," and he
followed this in 1624 with “Par le Sr. Ambr. de Venise sur une dame d’autre religion,” the lady in question being once again Josina.  

That the prince’s secretary was also involved in the making of this monument is shown conclusively by his literary estate. It contains two drafts of Latin funerary inscriptions for Arend and Josina van Dorp, one of which is very close to that on the memorial, so he can now be identified as the author.

Given his relationship with Dieussart, one would imagine that Huygens’s role was not limited to supplying the inscription, but the part that he may have had in the design remains an open question. One can certainly note, though, that Dieussart’s composition of the two putti coincided with Huygens’s own preference. In 1644 he sketched several designs for the title page of his *Momenta desultoria*, and all have the same composition: two putti on a pedestal holding up an open book in which the title was to appear (fig. 131).  

---


132 Daniel Marot, *Design for a tomb for King-Stadholder William III*, 1705, engraving, Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam
Conclusion

As isolated as François Dieussart stands in the history of Dutch sculpture, so the two funerary monuments that he left behind in the Republic prompted little in the way of direct imitation or reaction. The Van Dorp memorial seems to have spawned no imitation at all, unless it is the rather clumsy facade sculpture of the Hofje van Nieuwkoop in The Hague.124 The theatricality of the Morgan tomb does find some echo in Daniel Marot's unexecuted design for the tomb of King-Stadholder William III (fig. 132). It has the same *mise-en-scène* of two standing, allegorical mourners in a niche behind the image of the stadholder.125 Marot's design, made some 50 years after the Morgan tomb, demonstrates how early and original was Dieussart's presentation of the mourning family. The use of such theatrical devices only became common in Baroque tomb sculpture north of the Alps in the closing decades of the seventeenth century.126

The collaboration between Huygens and Dieussart came to an end around 1647, after the completion of the Van Dorp memorial. There are, at least, no further indications of the involvement of the first in the sculptor's work. The relationship between the two men nevertheless remained extremely cordial until around 1651. Shortly before leaving The Hague that year, Dieussart completed a medallion portrait of Huygens *en profil* (fig. 107).127 On the evidence of the date it would seem that it was a parting present for the man who had contributed so much to Dieussart's success in The Hague.

The sculptor must have realised after 1650 that there were no more major commissions to be had there, notwithstanding Huygens's efforts on his behalf. With the death of princes Frederik Hendrik in 1647 and Willem II in 1650, the prospects of a lasting, vibrant court culture in The Hague seemed remote. The cultural focus shifted to Amsterdam, where a modern, talented sculptor, Artus Quellinus, was employed to provide the sculptural decoration for the new town hall. These developments would have weighed heavily in Dieussart's decision to seek new patrons outside the Republic. However, he was never again to experience the kind of creative and artistic flowering he had known in The Hague.

Constantijn Huygens's involvement with sculpture also seems to have ended with Dieussart's departure. There is nothing, at any rate, to suggest a continuing, intense preoccupation. In a sense, the completion of the Morgan tomb was the crowning, and culminating, touch to his years of effort to bring about a revival of the classical ideal in Dutch sculpture.