

## Schlüteriana III

A. P. ...

Kevin E. Kandt

# **Schlüteriana III**

**Studies in the Art, Life, and Milieu of Andreas Schlüter  
(c. 1659 – 1714)**

**Lukas Verlag**

Cover: Andreas Schlüter and Johann Jacobi. *Sarcophagus for King Friedrich I of Prussia* – Detail of the Emblematic Figural Group (1713). Berlin Cathedral.

I would like to thank my father, Glenn J. Kandt, for his most generous financial assistance during the preparation of this book. Without his steadfast support, it might have never come to fruition.

© by Lukas Verlag  
Erstausgabe, 1. Auflage 2015  
Redaktionsschluss: 31. März 2014  
Alle Rechte vorbehalten

Lukas Verlag für Kunst- und Geistesgeschichte  
Kollwitzstraße 57  
D-10405 Berlin  
[www.lukasverlag.com](http://www.lukasverlag.com)

Umschlag: Verlag  
Reprographie und Satz: Susanne Werner, Frank Böttcher  
Druck: Elbe Druckerei Wittenberg

Printed in Germany  
ISBN 978-3-86732-183-9

# Table of Contents

Forward	7
<b>Quis Evadet? Nemo</b>	15
A Study of the Funerary Monuments by Andreas Schlüter in Poland and Germany	
<b>Part Two: Germany (1694–1713)</b>	
I The Berlin Years: A New Beginning in Brandenburg-Prussia	17
II Schlüter, Döbel, or Weyhenmeyer? The Derfflinger Epitaph	31
III A Questionable Schlüter Attribution: The Barfus Epitaph	73
IV Vera Philosophia Mortis est Meditatio: The Männlich Tomb Portal	79
V Excursus: A Commemorative Print for M. D. Marschall von Bieberstein	99
VI Schlüter's Palace and its Influence	104
VII A Fitting Memorial to a Departed Husband: The Marwitz Epitaph (Groß Rietz)	109
VIII Cunctus Mors Una Manet: The Sarcophagus for Queen Sophie Charlotte	129
IX A Second Tribute to a Deceased Spouse: The Marwitz Epitaph (Friedersdorf)	173
X Hodie Mihi, Cras Tibi: The Sarcophagus for Prince Friedrich Ludwig	184
XI Quis Evadet? Nemo: The Sarcophagus for King Friedrich I of Prussia	207
XII Schlüter or Glume? The Sarcophagus for Margrave Philipp Wilhelm of Brandenburg-Schwedt	235
XIII Schlüter's Legacy as a Designer of Sepulchral Monuments	259
XIV Schlüter's End	279
<b>Catalogue of Monuments Documented or Attributed to Andreas Schlüter and His Circle</b>	283
<b>Appendices I–V: Sources and Documents</b>	295
<b>Bibliography</b>	447
<b>Illustrations</b>	481
Color Plates	760
Picture Credits	812

## List of Archives and their Abbreviations

APGD	Archiwum Państwowe w Gdańsku [State Archive in Gdańsk], Poland
BBAW-PAW	Berlin-Brandenburgische Akademie der Wissenschaften – Preußische Akademie der Wissenschaften
BDA	Berliner Domarchiv
BLDAM	Brandenburgisches Landesamt für Denkmalpflege und Archäologisches Museum, Wünsdorf-Waldstadt
BLHA	Brandenburgisches Landeshauptarchiv, Potsdam-Bornim
ELAB	Evangelisches Landeskirchliches Archiv, Berlin
GStA-PK	Geheimes Staatsarchiv – Preußischer Kulturbesitz, Berlin-Dahlem
LAB	Landesarchiv, Berlin
LDB	Landesdenkmalamt, Berlin
LMOK	Landkreis Märkisch-Oderland Kreisarchiv, Seelow
LVGA	Landesgeschichtliche Vereinigung für die Mark Brandenburg – Archiv, Berlin
SBB-PK, HA	Staatsbibliothek zu Berlin – Preußischer Kulturbesitz, Handschriftenabteilung
SMB-PK, KB	Staatliche Museen zu Berlin – Preußischer Kulturbesitz, Kunstbibliothek
SMB-PK, ZA	Staatliche Museen zu Berlin – Preußischer Kulturbesitz, Zentralarchiv
SSMB	Stiftung Stadtmuseum Berlin
SOAP	Státní oblastní archiv v Plzni [State Regional Archive in Pilsen], Czech Republic
ZLB	Zentral- und Landesbibliothek, Berlin

### \* A Word of Explanation from the Author

It was my original intention – as planned with the second volume of *Schlüteriana* – to co-ordinate the scheduled publication of *Schlüteriana III* in conjunction with the opening and/or duration of the Schlüter exhibition at the Bode Museum in Berlin so that both volumes would be available during this period (4 April – 24 August 2014). Unfortunately, due to the publisher's other projects, the manuscript's graphic layout was delayed so that printing of the book was postponed and it could not be brought out until now. The main text and appendices, which had already been completed by March 2014, were made available to Prof. Goerd Peschken and PD Dr. Gerd-Helge Vogel, both of Berlin, for their reading and commentary. Many thanks go to them for their thoughtful suggestions and helpful contributions. Finally, owing to the initial publication deadline, there no longer remained sufficient time to integrate any material from the Bode Museum exhibition catalogue into the main text and bibliography. This task shall remain an obligation for future editions of *Schlüteriana*.

Berlin, September 2015

## Forward

This third volume of the new serial publication *Schlüteriana: Studies in the Art, Life and Milieu of Andreas Schlüter (c. 1659–1714)* continues the observation of the 300<sup>th</sup> anniversary of Schlüter's death and is dedicated solely to the funerary monuments created by the sculptor, his school, and followers in Berlin and the Brandenburg region of northeastern Germany. The single text presented here is subtitled "Part Two: Germany" and serves as the second installment of a comprehensive, in-depth survey focused on this highly important genre in the sculptor's *œuvre*. It completes the examination initiated by "Part One: Poland" published in *Schlüteriana II* which dealt with Schlüter's tomb art created during his earlier sojourn in Polish territories.

The primary aim of this current publishing project is to bring about a more complete, overall understanding of the artist's production from his Polish and German years. In the text, we concentrate on his funerary sculpture by providing a fundamental description, comparative analysis (using appropriate, contemporary Baroque-period examples) presented in an essay/catalogue/appendices format including an exhaustive archival and photographic documentation for each work closely associated with Andreas Schlüter and his circle. Selected sepulchral monuments created by the sculptor and his assistants in Berlin may already be somewhat better known to art historians or the lay public in general, however, those from his Polish years have been, thus far, still unfairly neglected and inadequately received within the context of the artist's total output. Presenting all the works together – along with commentary on the historical, artistic, and iconographic inter-relationships they share – will hopefully begin to enrich our fuller understanding of Schlüter's art. For the interested reader's further information regarding a more thorough insight into the subject's art historical background, context, and motivations for this author's research project, it is suggested to consult the "Forward" in the last issue – *Schlüteriana II*.

*Schlüteriana III* is being published in remembrance not only of Schlüter's death in 1714, but also as tribute to a Berlin scholar Liselotte Wiesinger, née Horn (1917–2002),<sup>1</sup> who spent many years of her career deeply involved with research into the master's

---

1 Reported in Wiesinger's type-written *curriculum vitae* dated 6 November 1947. She was born in Posen (now Poznań, Poland) as the daughter of Protestant minister Dr. Curt Horn, but her parents moved to Berlin in 1918. The surname came from her deceased husband the art historian Edzard Wiesinger (1907–44) whom she married in August 1944. He had apparently studied Gothic architecture according to the evidence provided by his research notes taken in the 1930's now preserved in his wife's papers (see: *Nachlass des Ehemannes Dr. Edzard Wiesinger*). Edzard Wiesinger is seen in a photograph at Reims Cathedral owing to his participation in Richard Hamann's Foto Marburg photo-documentation project undertaken in occupied France during 1940–42. Edzard Wiesinger fell on the Western Front in 1944. Consult: Landesgeschichtliche Vereinigung für die Mark Brandenburg in Berlin – Archiv (hereafter LGVA) B 52. Wiesinger Nachlass, unpaginated. – MATYSSEK 2009, p. 200, fig. 26.

greatest work of architecture – the Berlin *Stadtschloss* (Town Palace). Her kindness and generosity in the free-exchange of information led to many stimulating discussions about the artist which still inspire this author until today. Wiesinger's role in creating the foundation for the high standard of present-day state of research on Andreas Schlüter's artistic production will, I believe, only be fully perceived at some time in the hopefully not too distant future for its inestimably significant contributions.

According to her *curriculum vitae*, Wiesinger's first university studies in art history were at Berlin (1935–37) under Wilhelm Pinder and Gerhard Rodenwald, but her doctoral dissertation was later supervised by professors including, among others, Richard Hamann (1879–1961),<sup>2</sup> from the Philipps-Universität, Marburg an der Lahn, where she received her doctoral degree in 1942.<sup>3</sup> From February 1943 to October 1950, she was employed to work on the catalogue established for the Foto Marburg photographic documentation center at the Art History Institute of the same university and in a scholarly capacity as well for the *Preußisches Forschungsinstitut für Kunstgeschichte* (Prussian Research Institute for Art History).<sup>4</sup> During this time, in 1945–46, there was also a period when she was part of the staff at the “Collecting Point” in Marburg an der Lahn for artwork being restituted after World War II.<sup>5</sup> In 1946–48, she worked for Professor Hamann as an assistant at the Humboldt University.<sup>6</sup> Wiesinger's close contact with Hamann could have brought about the origins for her strong inclination to engage in research on the history of the Berlin *Stadtschloss*, since he had been one of the most active voices of expert scholarly dissent against its politically and ideologically-motivated demolition by the GDR government in the year 1950.<sup>7</sup> After the war, in order to survive financially, Wiesinger was compelled to branch out into another field of specialization, namely, French philology and literature. She successfully completed her studies with exams at Paris' Sorbonne University and a German state exam for French and History at the Free University in Berlin, which was followed by a brief period of teaching.<sup>8</sup> Fortunately, she was able to return to art history and experience some further impetus for her scholarly career. This opportunity no doubt came during her employment in 1959 cataloguing the surviving tapestries from former Prussian royal palaces preserved in the collections of the *Verwaltung der Staatlichen Schlösser und Gärten – Berlin* (Berlin State Palaces and Gardens Administration) and

---

2 For Hamann, see: MAETHER 2000, p. 70 (note 137). – MATYSSEK 2009, p. 21ff. Her dissertation title was *Berliner Porträtplastik der Göthezeit* – supervised by Dr. Paul Ortwin Rave along with Prof. Dr. Richard Hamann (art history), Dr. Friedrich Matz (archaeology), and Dr. Wilhelm Mommsen (early modern history). See the file folder *Lebensläufe (1965–1969, o.D.)*. LGVA B 52, unpaginated.

3 MATYSSEK 2009, p. 28–35. See also *Lebensläufe (1965–1969, o.D.)*. LGVA B52, unpaginated.

4 See the file folder *Ausstellungen, Werkverträge (1945–1975)*. LGVA B 52, unpaginated.

5 Compare: *Ausstellungen, Werkverträge (1945–1975)*. LGVA B 52, unpaginated.

6 WIESINGER 1989, p. VIII. Noted in: *Lebensläufe (1965–1969, o.D.)*. LGVA B52, unpaginated.

7 WIESINGER 1989, p. VIII. – PETRAS 1992, p. 137. – MAETHER 2000, p. 67, 70, 71, 72, 78, 79, 90, 93–94, 95–96, 100, 101–102, 105. For a brief history of the palace, its damage, and destruction, see: RODEMANN 1951, p. 7–19. – PESCHKEN/KLÜNNER 1982, p. 128–136. – PESCHKEN/KLÜNNER 1991, p. 128–136. – MAETHER 2000, p. 9–133.

8 See the file folder: *Lebensläufe (1965–1969, o.D.)*. LGVA B 52, unpaginated.



in the preparation of exhibitions under the aegis of its long-term director Margarete Kühn (1904–1995) another prominent Berlin art historian who had also been a very outspoken critic of the demolition of Schlüter's architectural masterpiece.<sup>9</sup>

Wiesinger's career in art history continued during the early to mid-1960's when she was employed by the *Staatliche Museen zu Berlin* (Berlin State Museums) in the branches of the *Kunstgewerbemuseum* (Museum of Decorative Arts) and *Kupferstichkabinett* (Department of Prints and Drawings).<sup>10</sup> At this time, she expressed her deep interest in researching the outstanding graphic prints preserved in the *Ornamentstichsammlung* (ornament print collection) and this would serve her well in future publications.<sup>11</sup> In early 1970 until 1973, she was contracted to work by the Berlin State Palaces and Gardens Administration in preparation for an exhibition and catalogue on the fashionable *chinoiserie* style popular in Europe during the 17<sup>th</sup> and 18<sup>th</sup> centuries,<sup>12</sup> which reinforced her engagement in the realm of the decorative arts and historic prints so necessary for her later efforts. Thereafter, she became involved as a scholarly assistant in the so-called *Berliner Schloßmonographie* (Berlin Palace monograph) publication project funded by the *Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft* (German Research Association), which began around 1975–1976 until 1980,<sup>13</sup> and was initiated by Margarete Kühn of the State Palaces and Gardens then headquartered at Schloss Charlottenburg,<sup>14</sup> but under whom this publication goal was never fully realized. Toward this end, however, the architect and archaeologist Goerd Peschken (b. 1931), who taught at the *Hochschule für bildende Künste* (College of Fine Arts) in Hamburg, also became associated with Kühn's project beginning around the years 1963–65 as a scholarly assistant through funds provided by the German Research Association.<sup>15</sup> He published, together with Hans-Werner Klünner (1928–1991), a pioneering photographic documentary monograph dedicated to the Berlin Palace in 1982.<sup>16</sup> Presumably due to the co-operation and influence from all these colleagues – and because the Schloss monograph had not manifested in its originally intended form – Wiesinger then published her own book concerning the art history of the Berlin Palace as part of a first-step in continuing this process.<sup>17</sup>

As a supplemental, explanatory background, it should be said that research on Andreas Schlüter and his Schloss was never a simple matter. Wiesinger's predecessor, Heinz Ladendorf, had complained in 1935 about the incompleteness of the archival

---

9 For Kühn's career and her engagement in this issue, see: MAETHER 2000, p. 53, 71, 100–101, 103, 109, 110. – BÖRSCH-SUPAN 2004, p. 16–17.

10 Compare: *Lebensläufe* (1965–1969, o.D.). LGVA B 52, unpaginated.

11 Refer to the letter dated 26 July 1962 addressed to the *Generaldirektion der ehem. Staatliche Museen* in: *Ausstellung, Werkverträge* (1945–1975). LGVA B 52, unpaginated.

12 Reported in: *Lebensläufe* (1965–1969, o.D.). LGVA B 52, unpaginated. See also: WIESINGER 1973A, p. 12–17. – WIESINGER 1973B, p. 125–144, 146, 153–159, 161–164, 195. – WIESINGER/KRAFT 1973, p. 166–173.

13 Consult the file folder: *Ausstellungen, Werkverträge* (1945–1975). LGVA B 52, unpaginated.

14 For Kühn and the Schösser Verwaltung, see: BÖRSCH-SUPAN 2004, p. 16–17.

15 Thanks go to Prof. Goerd Peschken for this information.

16 For the first edition of this title: PESCHKEN/KLÜNNER 1982.

17 WIESINGER 1989.

documentation in Berlin facing a scholar researching Andreas Schlüter's art, life, and career.<sup>18</sup> Yet Ladendorf had indeed benefitted from an infinitely richer selection of historical resource material from which to examine than, for example, those scholars studying the artist's Warsaw years and these challenges and obstacles were only compounded later by World War II and its aftermath.<sup>19</sup> The attentive reader will notice a great discrepancy between the obviously poorly-represented archival sources from Schlüter's early years and those much more extensive ones still extant even today for his years in Berlin.<sup>20</sup> Despite these obstacles in researching original, primary archival materials, Wiesinger was nevertheless acutely aware of the need for dealing with them, however, the practicality of engaging in this fundamental task (required of any serious scholar) was not easily undertaken. Indeed, she had even greater challenges to confront regarding archival research than her predecessor Ladendorf.<sup>21</sup> Wiesinger did take care to consult original, archival documents as much as possible. However, at that time, most of them which had somehow survived the destruction and chaos of World War II,<sup>22</sup> were extremely difficult to access for consultation by most scholars from the east and largely inaccessible to those from the west until after 1989.<sup>23</sup> As Renate Petras, a Wiesinger colleague formerly active as a free-lance scholar in East Berlin's *Denkmalpflegeamt* (monuments protection office) wrote in the introduction to her 1992 book on the Berlin Palace: "I had to wait a long time to write this book [...] Before the political events of the autumn of 1989, I had no opportunity to publish on this explosive topic. Up until then, in the GDR, everything concerning the Berlin Palace was taboo: the documents were locked up [...]"<sup>24</sup> Likewise, to her great credit, in 1984–87, Wiesinger was able to network with colleagues on the other side of the Berlin Wall and made

---

18 Reference to earlier hardships with regard to dealing with the then missing and no-longer extant archivalia dating from Schlüter's period was expressed by: LADENDORF 1935, p. 1–4.

19 See the "Forward" in *Schlüteriana II*, p. 8–9.

20 A comparison of the appendices listing archival sources and documents for the works presented in Part One: Poland (*Schlüteriana II*) and those found in the present publication (*Schlüteriana III*) make this fact quite evident.

21 LADENDORF 1935, p. 1–4. – PESCHKEN/WIESINGER 2001A, p. 235–236.

22 Information on the history of the Berlin Stadtarchiv (Berlin Civic Archive), Preußische Geheime Staatsarchiv (Prussian Privy State Archive) and the Brandenburg-Preußische Hausarchiv (Brandenburg-Prussia House Archive) along with accounts of the massive destruction and numerous losses suffered by these archives and their library holdings containing historic papers, documents, and manuscript from civic and electoral/royal collections during these tragic events are dealt with in: GROSSMANN 1896, p. 1–19. – NISSEN 1954, p. 139–150. – KAEBER 1961, p. 23–31, 35, 44–46, 49–51. – DRÄGER/LEHMANN 1969, p. 230–237. – WETZEL 1977, p. 302, 304, 306. – LEHMANN 1996, p. 131–154. – HENNING 2000, p. 441–471. – SCHROLL 2000, p. 15–205, especially 183–205. – STRECKE 2000, p. 27–45. Many thanks go to Marie-Luise Adlung and Thomas Breitfeld at the Geheime Staatsarchiv – Preußischer Kulturbesitz, Berlin-Dahlem, for their generous assistance in providing the author with bibliographic information on the history and fate of documents now in the Dahlem archive.

23 LEHMANN 1996, p. 131–154. – KLOOSTERHUIS 2000, p. 52.

24 "Ich habe sehr lange warten müssen, ehe ich dieses Buch schreiben konnte [...] hatte ich vor den politischen Ereignissen im Herbst 1989 keine Möglichkeit, zu diesem brisanten Thema zu veröffentlichen. Bis zu diesem Zeitpunkt galt in der DDR alles, was das Berliner Stadtschloß betraf, als tabu: Die Akten waren unter Verschuß [...]" PETRAS 1992, p. 6. See also: LEHMANN 1996, p. 131–154.

the effort to risk crossing the literal and figurative political/ideological border then separating West and East Germany by travelling several times in those years to East Berlin, Potsdam, and Belzig so that she might examine and study long-inaccessible collections and/or archives located there vitally necessary for her research.<sup>25</sup>

Wiesinger's scholarly maturity and specialized knowledge in the field, her presence within the circle of art historians, scholars, as well as other experts engaged with the history and fate of the Berlin Palace, and her membership in the association of the *Freunde der Preußischen Schlösser und Gärten* (Friends of the Prussian Palaces and Gardens),<sup>26</sup> was vital for her continued research into the palace's art history. The association's treasurer was Wilhelm von Boddien of Hamburg – an individual with an involvement and foresight regarding Schlüter's lost architectural masterpiece. He financially supported and promoted Wiesinger's next publication from 1992 focusing on the palace's interiors, namely, a description and iconographic analysis of its ceiling *plafonds* featuring high-quality color illustrations reproduced from surviving photographic slides taken by Peter Cürliis (1924–1997) shortly before the building was bombed in World War II.<sup>27</sup> This publication also brought with it a seminal co-operation with her colleague Goerd Peschken which would bear fruit in the coming years.<sup>28</sup> Already in 1982, as we pointed out, Peschken had co-authored a richly-illustrated book on the Berlin Palace with Klünner documenting the palace's historic interiors and it would appear again in a slightly revised edition in 1991.<sup>29</sup> Also in 1982, Wiesinger published an excellent and important article on one of the Berlin Palace's most magnificent interiors, the so-called *Elisabethsaal* (Elisabeth's Hall), tracing Schlüter's marked reception to antique art conveyed via printed graphic prototypes.<sup>30</sup> Further Wiesinger essays for the 1995 exhibition catalogue featuring the Prussian court painter Augustin Terwesten concerning his contribution to the founding of Berlin's Academy of Fine Arts in 1694 as well as his impressive ceiling *plafonds* created for the royal palaces in Berlin and Charlottenburg added greatly to her range of expertise in the art of Andreas Schlüter and his milieu.<sup>31</sup>

---

25 See the official letter of invitation written (29 March 1984) by former director of the Staatliche Schlösser und Gärten Potsdam-Sanssouci, Hans-Joachim Giersberg, authorizing Wiesinger's visit as a scholar to do research in his institution's collections. See the file folder: *DDR-Reisen (1984–87)*. LGVA B 52, unpaginated. – WIESINGER 1992, p. VIII.

26 Consult the file folder: *Mitgliedschaft in Vereinen (1968–1996)*. LGVA B 52, unpaginated.

27 Read the "Zum Geleit" and p. 155–156 in: WIESINGER 1992. The illustrations published in this book were taken from 150 original color slides photographed by Cürliis during 1943 under Adolf Hitler's command in anticipation of the possible destruction of historic monuments during bombing air-raids being carried out at that time on Germany's towns and cities. See: REDSLOB 1954, p. 5–6. – JULIER 1993, p. 17, 27 (note 10). These slides are now preserved in the Stiftung Preußische Schlösser und Gärten – Berlin/Brandenburg, while duplicates are at the Zentralinstitut für Kunstgeschichte – Fotothek, in Munich, and currently available for on-line viewing at: [www.zi.fotothek.org](http://www.zi.fotothek.org) and [www.bildindex.de](http://www.bildindex.de) (last accessed March 2014).

28 Read Peschken's essay in: WIESINGER 1992, p. 11–25.

29 PESCHKEN/KLÜNNER 1991.

30 WIESINGER 1982.

31 WIESINGER 1995A, p. 62–68. – WIESINGER 1995B, p. 69–92.

A major occurrence which ultimately led to the culmination of Wiesinger's Schlüter research emerged from the publication of Goerd Peschken's first, detailed monograph dealing with a physical description and documentation of the Berlin Palace's pre-Schlüterian phases and those first years of Andreas Schlüter's renovation program (1688–1701).<sup>32</sup> In the interim, in 1997–98, Wiesinger would herself publish yet another article on a principal interior from the Berlin Palace, i.e. the *Alte Kapelle* (old chapel).<sup>33</sup> Thereafter, Peschken would follow in 1998 with his second volume dealing with the building at the height of its re-creation under Schlüter until his dismissal from the project (1701–06).<sup>34</sup> Both of Peschken's volumes would serve as an unquestionable foundation for the culmination of Wiesinger's endeavors. Here, evident in what would be her very last publication, was her expertise contribution to the text of the third volume in the *Schloß* monograph series now co-authored with Peschken. She provided an exhaustive, iconographic analysis of the Berlin Palace's magnificent Baroque-period interiors created by Schlüter.<sup>35</sup>

My first encounter with Liselotte Wiesinger occurred in 1995, nearly three years after my arrival in Poland to begin research on a doctoral dissertation about the art of Andreas Schlüter. During my visit, Wiesinger personally conducted me through the exhibition of *Götter und Helden in Berlin* at Schloss Charlottenburg.<sup>36</sup> This meeting began a series of discussions we held together periodically over the next years whenever I travelled to Berlin in order to consult libraries and archives necessary for my work. Her long years of experience, positive attitude, and humorous anecdotes related over cups of hot tea about the trials and tribulations in researching our commonly-held hero Schlüter (“Ja, Kind, bei uns dauert's für Fotos immer ewig und drei Tage!”) always encouraged, re-assured, and enlightened me in my own efforts which have now continued for well over twenty-two years. Yet the origins of this present book go back to the year 1998 when my initial search for a definitive dissertation topic in the field of art history finally became clear to me: the tomb sculpture of Andreas Schlüter. The decision was, however, sadly precipitated by the tragic, premature death of the Polish art historian Katarzyna Cieślak of Gdańsk, Poland, in 1997, but which was nevertheless generously encouraged and supported by Prof. Konstanty Kalinowski of Poznań, Poland, until he himself suddenly passed away in December 2002. My tribute to these two scholars was made in the last issue of *Schlüteriana*. Liselotte Wiesinger departed this life in November 2002, shortly after I had permanently re-located to Berlin. I realized then that the opportunity to relish her good-natured personality and profound knowledge derived from many years' experience was gone forever. What remained were the memories, inspiration, and her publications to enhance my research work. Now, finally, the time has come with this book to somehow say my own word of thanks to her.

---

32 PESCHKEN 1992.

33 WIESINGER 1997–98.

34 PESCHKEN 1998.

35 PESCHKEN/WIESINGER 2000A–B.

36 See: COLELLA 1995.

## Bibliography

- BÖRSCH-SUPAN 2004: Börsch-Supan, Helmut: "Sie streitet gern, kann aber niemandem böse sein. Margarete Kühn zum 100. Geburtstag," *Porticus – Besuchermagazin der Stiftung Preussische Schlösser und Gärten – Berlin-Brandenburg*, 10(2004), nr. 1, p. 16–17.
- CHINA UND EUROPA 1973: Verwaltung der Staatlichen Schlösser und Gärten – Schloß Charlottenburg (ed.): *China und Europa. Chinaverständnis und Chinamode im 17. und 18. Jahrhundert*, exhibition catalogue, Berlin 1973.
- COLELLA 1995: Colella, Renate (ed.): *Götter und Helden für Berlin. Gemälde und Zeichnungen von Augustin (1649–1711) und Mathäus (1670–1757) Terwesten. Zwei niederländische Künstler am Hofe Friedrichs I. und Sophie Charlottes*, exhibition catalogue, Berlin 1995.
- DRÄGER/LEHMANN 1969: Dräger, Udo; Lehmann, Joachim: "Zur Geschichte und Auflösung des Brandenburg-Preussischen Hausarchivs," *Archivmitteilungen. Zeitschrift für Theorie und Praxis des Archivwesens*, 19(1969), nr. 6, p. 230–237.
- GROSSMANN 1896: Grossmann, Julius: "Das Königlich Preussische Haus-Archiv zu Charlottenburg," *Archivalische Zeitschrift*, N.F. 6(1896), p. 1–19.
- HENNING 2000: Henning, Eckart: "Das Preussische Geheime Staatsarchiv zwischen Krieg und Frieden, April – Mai 1945. Augenzeugenberichte von Joachim Lachmann und Paul Freudenberg," in: Kloosterhuis, Jürgen (ed.): *Archivarbeit für Preußen. Symposion der Preussischen Historischen Kommission und des Geheimen Staatsarchivs Preussischer Kulturbesitz aus Anlass der 400. Wiederkehr der Begründung seiner archivischen Tradition*, Berlin 2000, p. 440–471.
- JULIER 1993: Julier, Jürgen: "Zerstörung und erste Sicherung des Schlosses Charlottenburg. Schloß Charlottenburg im Zweiten Weltkrieg," in: Eggeling, Tilo; Hanemann, Regina; Julier, Jürgen: *Ein Schloß in Trümmern – Charlottenburg im November 1943*, Berlin 1993
- KAEBER 1961: Kaeber, Ernst: "Erinnerungen an das Stadtarchiv Berlin. Zugleich eine Skizze der Geschichte des Archivs," *Der Bär von Berlin. Jahrbuch des Vereins für die Geschichte Berlins*, 10(1961), p. 7–51.
- KLOOSTERHUIS 2000: Kloosterhuis, Jürgen: "Von der Repositorenvielfalt zur Archiveinheit. Die Etappen der Tektonierung des Geheimen Staatsarchiv," in: Kloosterhuis, Jürgen (ed.): *Archivarbeit für Preußen. Symposion der Preussischen Historischen Kommission und des Geheimen Staatsarchivs Preussischer Kulturbesitz aus Anlass der 400. Wiederkehr der Begründung seiner archivischen Tradition*, Berlin 2000, p. 47–257.
- LEHMANN 1996: Lehmann, Joachim: "Von Staßfurt und Schönebeck nach Merseburg. Nachkriegsschicksale eines deutschen Archivs," in: Kloosterhuis, Jürgen (ed.): *Archivarbeit für Preußen. Symposion der Preussischen Historischen Kommission und des Geheimen Staatsarchivs Preussischer Kulturbesitz aus Anlass der 400. Wiederkehr der Begründung seiner archivischen Tradition – Arbeitsberichte 1*, Berlin 1996, p. 131–154.
- MAETHER 2000: Maether, Bernd: *Die Vernichtung des Berliner Stadtschlösses. Eine Dokumentation*, Berlin 2000.
- MATYSSEK 2009: Matyssek, Angela: *Kunstgeschichte als fotografische Praxis. Richard Hamann und Foto Marburg*, Berlin 2009.
- NISSEN 1954: Nissen, Walter: "Das Schicksal der ausgelagerten Bestände des Preussischen Geheimen Staats- Archivs und ihr heutiger Zustand," *Archivalische Zeitschrift*, 49(1954), p. 139–154.
- PESCHKEN/KLÜNNER 1982: Peschken, Goerd; Klünner, Hans-Werner: *Das Berliner Schloß*, 1st. ed, Frankfurt am Main/Berlin 1982.
- PESCHKEN/KLÜNNER 1991: Peschken, Goerd; Klünner, Hans-Werner: *Das Berliner Schloß*, 2nd. ed, Frankfurt am Main/Berlin 1991.

- PESCHKEN 1992: Peschken, Goerd: *Das königliche Schloß zu Berlin. Erster Band – Die Baugeschichte von 1688 bis 1701*, Munich 1992.
- PESCHKEN 1998: Peschken, Goerd: *Das königliche Schloß zu Berlin. Zweiter Band – Die Baugeschichte von 1701 bis 1706*, Munich/Berlin 1998.
- PESCHKEN/WIESINGER 2001A–B: Peschken, Goerd; Wiesinger, Liselotte: *Das königliche Schloß zu Berlin. Dritter Band – Die barocken Innenräume*, text and illustrations vols., Munich/Berlin 2001.
- PETRAS 1992: Petras, Renate: *Das Schloss in Berlin. Von der Revolution 1918 bis zur Vernichtung 1950*, Munich/Berlin 1992.
- REDSLOB 1954: Redtslob, Edwin: *Barock und Rokoko in den Schlössern von Berlin und Potsdam*, Berlin 1954.
- SCHROLL 2000: Schroll, Heike: *Spurensicherung. Die Bestände des Stadtarchiv Berlin und ihr Schicksal durch den Zweiten Weltkrieg* [Schriftenreihe des Landesarchiv Berlin, Wetzel, Jürgen (ed.)], Berlin 2000.
- STRECKE 2000: Strecke, Reinhart: “Der lange Weg nach Dahlem. Baugeschichte und -probleme des Geheimen Staatsarchivs,” in: Kloosterhus, Jürgen (ed.): *Archivarbeit für Preußen. Symposium der Preussischen Historischen Kommission und des Geheimen Staatsarchivs Preussischer Kulturbesitz aus Anlass der 400. Wiederkehr der Begründung seiner archivischen Tradition – Arbeitsberichte 2*, Berlin 2000, p. 27–45.
- WETZEL 1977: Wetzel, Jürgen: “Das Landesarchiv Berlin,” *Mitteilungen des Vereins für die Geschichte Berlins*, 73(1977), p. 302–308.
- WIESINGER 1973A: Wiesinger, Liselotte: “Die Anfänge der Jesuitenmission und die Anpassungsmethode des Matteo Ricci,” in: CHINA UND EUROPA 1973, p. 12–17.
- WIESINGER 1973B: Wiesinger, Liselotte: “Geografie,” “Jesuiten in China,” “Reiseberichte,” “Die Diskussion über China im 18. Jahrhundert,” in: CHINA UND EUROPA 1973, p. 125–144, 146, 153–159, 161–164, 195.
- WIESINGER/KRAFT 1973: Wiesinger, Liselotte; Kraft, Eva: “Die chinesische Bibliothek des Großen Kurfürsten und ihre Bibliothekare,” in: CHINA UND EUROPA 1973, p. 166–173.
- WIESINGER 1979: Wiesinger, Liselotte: “Berliner Maler um 1700 und die Gründung der Akademie der Künste und mechanischen Wissenschaften,” in: Arenhövel, Willmuth (ed.): *Berlin und die Antike. Architektur – Kunstgewerbe – Malerei – Skulptur – Theater und Wissenschaft vom 16. Jahrhundert bis heute*, exhibition catalogue, Berlin 1979, p. 80–92.
- WIESINGER 1982: Wiesinger, Liselotte: “Der Elisabethsaal des Berliner Schlosses – Ein Beitrag zur Antikenrezeption um 1700,” *Jahrbuch der Berliner Museen*, 24(1982), p. 189–225.
- WIESINGER 1989: Wiesinger, Liselotte: *Das Berliner Schloss. Von der kurfürstlichen Residenz zum Königsschloß*, Darmstadt 1989.
- WIESINGER 1992: Wiesinger, Liselotte: *Deckengemälde im Berliner Schloß*, Frankfurt am Main 1992.
- WIESINGER 1995A: Wiesinger, Liselotte: “Augustin Terwesten und die Gründung der Königlichen Akademie der Künste – Zu Neuerwerbungen von Akademiezeichnungen Terwestens,” in: COLELLA 1995, p. 62–68.
- WIESINGER 1995B: Wiesinger, Liselotte: “Die Deckenmalerei Augustin Terwestens im Schloß Charlottenburg und im Berliner Schloß,” in: COLELLA 1995, p. 69–92.
- WIESINGER 1997–98: Wiesinger, Liselotte: “Zu dem verschollenen Bilderzyklus von Christian Bernhard Rode in der Alten Kapelle im Berliner Schloss,” *Jahrbuch der Stiftung Preussische Schlösser und Gärten Berlin-Brandenburg*, 2(1997–1998), p. 119–132.

# QUIS EVADET? NEMO

**A Study of the Funerary Monuments by Andreas Schlüter in Poland and Germany**

**Part Two: Germany (1694–1713)\***

In memory of Liselotte Wiesinger

---

\* Author's note: All the illustrations designated with a Roman numeral "I" refer to the article Part One – Poland published in the previous issue of this series, *Schlüteriana II*.





## I The Berlin Years: A New Beginning in Brandenburg-Prussia

In 1694, the Warsaw royal court sculptor Andreas Schlüter began negotiations with a new patron, the Elector of Brandenburg – Friedrich III, who would be crowned only a few years later on 18 January 1701 as the first King in Prussia – Friedrich I of the House of Hohenzollern.<sup>1</sup> In an undated letter probably written to the Elector in the spring months of 1694, the artist requested an official appointment as sculptor with an annual salary of 1,200 thalers.<sup>2</sup> By summer of the same year, the matter had advanced to the stage that a second document, a draft text for the artist's appointment dated 25 July/4 August, described what Schlüter's position as *Hofbildhauer* or court sculptor would entail and stipulated, among other points, his duties and responsibilities as a court servitor:

We, Friedrich III, by the grace of God, Margrave and Elector of Brandenburg [...] herewith document and acknowledge; as Andreas Schlüter's capable knowledge and experience in the art of sculpture were most humbly commended to Us, thence, We were prevailed upon to graciously accept and engage the said man for Our court sculptor, [...] what We shall wish from him in sculpture: to produce – be it from stone, marble, ivory, alabaster or wood – to the best of his ability; and thereby initiate and perfect the young in this art as much as possible in the soon-to-be established Academy of Sculptors. [He] should employ all conceivable industry and conduct himself at every place in such a manner and attendance to manifest loyalty, diligence, duly and accordingly, as an honorable and experienced court sculptor and also as is required by his oath of duty to Us [...]<sup>3</sup>

- 1 For Friedrich and the history of Brandenburg-Prussia during this period, refer to PREUSSEN 1701 – CATALOGUE AND ESSAYS 2001. – FRIEDRICH/SMART 2010, p. 1–51, 175–260, 377–395. More on the designation “King in (versus) of Prussia” is dealt with by: KAUER 1999, p. 25 (note 55).
- 2 Alte und Neue Repositoren. Geheimer Rat. Hof- und Güterverwaltung, *Acta der Geheimen Kanzlei betr. Bildhauer und Architekten, Bildgießer – vornehmlich Bestellungen von Hofbildhauern (1667–1716)*. Geheimes Staatsarchiv – Preussischer Kulturbesitz (hereafter GStA-PK) I. HA, Rep. 36, Nr. 2743, fols. 32r–32v. First published by: KLÖDEN 1855, p. 12–14. – GURLITT 1891, p. 47. Mentioned in: LADENDORF 1935, p. 113 (note 38), 116 (note 67). Published in: GEYER/GRÖSCHEL 2001 I, p. 5. The source was once published again in full (HINTERKEUSER 2003, p. 401) but omitting one line of the text found in the original document. “[...] auch weil ich hier bin aus meinen eigenen Leben und ein merckliches zusetzen müssen [...]” This error repeats exactly the same ones published long ago by Klöden and Geyer which a careful examination of the document proves and therefore could have easily been corrected.
- 3 “Wir Friderich der III:<sup>te</sup> von Gottes gnaden, Marggraff und Churfürst zu Brandenburg [...] Urkunden und bekennen hiermit; Nachdem Unß *Andreas Schlüters* gute Wißenschaafft und erfahrungheit in der Bildhauer= Kunst un[ter]th[änig]st gerühmet, daß Wir dannenhero bewogen worden, denselben zu Unserem Hoff= Bildhauer gn[ädig]st zu bestellen und anzunehmen [...] waß Wir von Bildhauer= Arbeit, es seÿe von Stein, Marmor, Elfenbein, Alabaster oder Holtz von Ihm verlangen werden, seiner besten Wißenschaafft nach verfertigen, in der anzurichtenden *Academie* von Bildhauern, damit die Jungen in dieser Kunst soviel möglich angeführt und *perfectioniret* werden möge, allen möglichen fleiß anwenden, und sich überall dergestalt treü, fleißig und aufwartsam bezeigen und verhalten solle, wie es einem ehrliebenden und erfahren Hoff= Bildhauer eignet und gebühret, auch seines Unß geleistete Eÿdes= Pfichte erfordern [...]” For the complete text: GStA-PK I. HA, Rep. 36, Nr. 2743, fol. 31r–31v. Long-ago published and/or mentioned in: KLÖDEN 1855, p. 13–14. – GURLITT

Schlüter ultimately left the Polish capital to enter the service of Friedrich III and a new period in the sculptor's artistic production began in the burgeoning state of Brandenburg-Prussia. This new post brought Schlüter many commissions for work including ones for funerary art, as we shall see. Yet before continuing the story of our sculptor's sojourn in his new home, let us take a moment to look at the milieu with which he would be confronted. Some notable artists had already been active in Berlin before and, in order to provide more background, we shall present a brief overview of the most significant tomb monuments existing in the town at the time when Schlüter first arrived. Fortunately, despite the passage of the years and massive war-time destruction, we can still admire quite a number of these creations even today.

Berlin was the primary residence of the Electors of Brandenburg from the House of Hohenzollern and would later serve as *Residentzstadt* for the first Prussian King Friedrich I.<sup>4</sup> Once his leadership position was established, the power-intrigues of his own family suppressed, the opposition of the local aristocracy against his rule quelled, and his plan to obtain a monarch's crown set into motion, he could begin to concentrate more fully on the embellishment of his residence as a center for government with administrative, religious, and cultural institutions reflecting his ambitions as an up-and-coming monarch fully present on the European political scene.<sup>5</sup> Friedrich's efforts were an attempt to aggrandize and modernize a somewhat provincial town whose cultural life was still suffering from the results of devastation brought about by the Thirty Years' War.<sup>6</sup>

Of course, the Berlin tradition of sculpture and its existing arts milieu was certainly far from being an exhaustively rich one compared with other centers like Paris or Rome,<sup>7</sup> and even perhaps in some respects rather modest in contrast to that of Danzig – Schlüter's hometown. When one looks closely, however, it did not entirely lack in having some first-rate examples from the Netherlandish schools in both large and small-scale sculpture. They were either specially produced on commission by foreign and domestic artists working in the style, from masters resident abroad in other art centers, or simply purchased for the electoral and later royal *Kunstkammer* – chamber of curiosities, as a number of scholarly publications on the subject have already shown.<sup>8</sup>

---

189I, p. 47. – GEYER/GRÖSCHEL 2001, p. 5. This source was published again recently with an error in the pagination, as “Bl. 32” and not 31r–31v as is found on the document by: HINTERKEUSER 2003, p. 401.

4 Overviews of the city's history and development previous to and during Schlüter's years there are given in: SCHNEIDER 1980, p. 123–158. – PESCHKEN 1987, p. 4–50. – PREUSSEN 1701 – ESSAYS 2001. – ESCHER 2002, p. 341–403.

5 PESCHKEN 1987, p. 50–60. – MERTENS 2001, p. 269–278. – FRIEDRICH/SMART 2010, p. 53–87. – GÖSE 2012, p. 104–169, 202–257.

6 Some historical/cultural/artistic background is given in: BORRMANN 1893, p. 55–79, 109–115. – ESCHER 2002, p. 341ff. – KANDT 2011A, p. 327–238.

7 More on sculpture in Berlin and at the court from c. 1650–1720 is dealt with in: BOECK 1933D, p. 104–116. – PETRAS 1954, p. 5–43. – PETRAS 1972 I–III. – HÜNEKE 1988, p. 118–133. – THEUERKAUFF 1990, p. 13–25. – GRÖSCHEL 1999, p. 118–131.

The work of these sculptors active mostly for or favored by the Hohenzollern court in the second half of the 17<sup>th</sup> century primarily typified the style in art from the Low Countries. Among them included those of international renown like François Dieussart (1600–1661), Artus Quellinus I – known as the Elder (1609–1668), Bartholomäus Eggers (1637–1692), Leonhard Kern (1588–1662), François Duquesnoy (1597–1643), or Gabriel Grupello (1644–1730); in addition to talented local masters like Gottfried Christian Leygebe (1630–1683), Jeremias Süßner (d. 1690), and Johann Michael Döbel the Younger (1635–1702).<sup>9</sup> These masters’ contributions are very necessary to take into account if one wishes to fully comprehend the stylistic development of the Berlin school of sculpture and the artistic taste and patronage of the town’s rulers and its citizens.

General overviews written about the art of Prussia and/or Berlin have included commentary on the local school of sculpture highlighting some Baroque-era funerary monuments found mainly in the churches of St. Mary and St. Nicholas in existence when Schlüter arrived there.<sup>10</sup> In addition, further references have also been made to lesser-known tombs and epitaphs dating from the 17<sup>th</sup> to 18<sup>th</sup> centuries located in village churches from the surrounding areas of the province of Brandenburg which were most probably executed in or much indebted to the production from workshops located in the *Residenzstadt*.<sup>11</sup> Admittedly, much of the then most “modern” Berlin tomb art (and this term purposefully excludes the “old-fashioned” Renaissance work still surviving in the town) exhibited a great deal of the standard acanthus-leaf style

- 
- 8 For the presence of Netherlandish-influenced sculpture in Berlin: PETRAS 1972 I–III, p. 137–220 and plates. – HÜNEKE 1988, p. 118–126. – THEUERKAUFF 1990, p. 13–19. – HÜNEKE 1991, p. 57–59. – GRÖSCHEL 1999, p. 118–121. – HÜNEKE 1999, p. 57–59. – ONDER DEN ORANJE BOOM – CATALOGUE 1999, p. 127–128, 148–150, 193–194, 218–220, 223–224, 230–231, 244–245, 275–279. – KANDT 2011A, p. 327–329. It is inconceivable why Berlin’s Humboldt University – Institute of Art History Library made the highly questionable decision to discard Petras’ work (formerly call number Dp 4733, I–III) from their collection. Comparable master’s thesis papers from the same era written at the Free University of Berlin have remained in that library’s collection without being subject to such a fate. Furthermore, published dissertations from German universities submitted in the early 20<sup>th</sup> century, for example, which are considered nowadays to be lacking the necessary academic standards currently demanded by modern institutions, have likewise remained in many library collections and never been removed from them.
- 9 See note 8 above. Some court documents which record the names at the onset of their appointments and give an idea of their activities thereafter are found in: Alte und Neue Reposituren. Geheimer Rat. Allgemeine Verwaltung. Bildhauer, Bildgießer, Gipser, Stukkateure (1600–1800). Geheimer Rat. Allgemeine Verwaltung, *Acta betr. Stein- und Bildhauer, Gießer, Marmor und Gips (1600–1715)*. GStA-PK I. HA, Rep. 9, AV, E 16<sup>l</sup> – Fasc. 1. – GStA-PK I. HA, Rep. 36, Nr. 2743.
- 10 BORMANN 1893, p. 169, 215–221, 234–236. – PETRAS 1972 I, p. 122–128. – THEUERKAUFF 1990, p. 13–19. – BREHM/KLEBER/VEIGEL/WINKLER 1994, p. 45–65. – NEUHÄUSER 2008 I–II, p. 31–37, 40–42, figs. 79–87, 89, 94.
- 11 FASTENAU 1926, p. 31–52. – FRÜNDT 1987, p. 147–156. – NEUHÄUSER 2008 I, p. 31–58. – NEUHÄUSER 2008 II, figs. 77–89, 94–101. – NEUHÄUSER 2008A, p. 149–165. In the latter study, although the un-chronological arrangement of the works discussed is rather confusing, the general usefulness of this overview is mostly very positive. However, it appears Ms. Neuhäuser’s dissertation may be part of a new trend involving scholarly projects to research, study, and restore these often neglected art treasures which in many cases are truly the hidden masterpieces of rural Brandenburg. DEITERS 2013, p. 141. – NEUHÄUSER 2013, p. 159–160.

decoration quite popular in the 1680's. As we shall see, the town's artworks really did not offer an over-abundance of resource material from which Schlüter could derive that much fresh inspiration. What follows now is a very cursory, but stylistically representative, overview of key sepulchral monuments extant in Berlin dating from circa 1660–1692.

Of the few exceptionally good works of funerary art to be found in Berlin during Andreas Schlüter's years was undoubtedly a most extraordinary piece of Netherlandish sculpture the *Tomb of Otto Christoph Baron von Sparr* (c. 1660–63) in St. Mary's Church.<sup>12</sup> It originated in the studio of the foremost master of the period, namely, Artus Quellinus I.<sup>13</sup> [Fig. II 1a] This monumental marble tomb is still located miraculously undamaged by time or social-tumult destruction in the presbytery to the left of the main altar. It consists of an architectonically constructed frame with a massive entablature supported by two Corinthian columns each resting upon a tall plinth decorated with a panoply-relief panel. The deceased Baron Sparr is depicted as an almost life-size, three-dimensional figure in an interior scene enframed by the columns and set upon a ledge above the door to the crypt. [Fig. II 1a-1] Sparr kneels in prayer as a *priant* on a cushion before a sculpted altar.<sup>14</sup> A crucifix, skull, and bones have been placed upon the altar-table as objects of devotional contemplation. Behind him stands a young page holding a plumed helmet with visor. A small dog emerges from beneath the heavy cloth drapery covering the altar. In the background, an illusionistic triumphal arch flanked by pilasters and a pair of Fame figures in relief fill the spandrels. The perspectival coffered vault visually leads the eye of the beholder to notice the commemorative inscription carved in the panel behind Baron Sparr. Above, a most impressive sculptural group of the goddesses Minerva and Bellona standing to either side of the large Sparr family coat of arms with pairs of fettered Turkish slaves cowering at the left and right recall earlier works from the artist's chisel.<sup>15</sup> [Fig. II 1a-2] The stylistically characteristic traits of Netherlandish Baroque Classicism, a trademark for which Quellinus' school is well-known, are revealed here to great advantage.<sup>16</sup>

---

12 Some interesting incidental information on the monument's history can be inserted here. Baron Sparr's intention to establish this burial place in the church was noted in a document (4 August 1658). A written extract (4 September 1667), copied from his last testament gives a note about 200 reichsthalers for his and his successors use of this burial crypt. Maintenance of the crypt was also mentioned (14 July 1669). Payments for the rights to the site were noted between Pfingsten 1668 and Michaelis 1670. A century later (29 May and 15 July 1766) notifications of the Sparr family crypt's poor condition was reported. Cleaning of the Sparr monument was contemplated (30 April and 19 May 1858) but funding may have been lacking. Consult: Berlin Stadtmitte – St. Marien/St. Nikolai Depositum. *Acta des Vorstandes der St. Nicolai und Marien= Kirche betreffend das gräflich. von Sparrsche Begräbniß= Gewölbe in der Marien Kirche von 1658[–1917]*. Evangelisches Landeskirchliches Archiv Berlin (hereafter ELAB) 101 09/11, Rep. I, Nr. 6, fols. 1r, 2r, 3r, 4r, 15r–16r, 17r–18r, 78r–78v, 91r. For Sparr, see: GÖSE 2006.

13 BARTSCH-MOLDEN 1993, p. 15–19.

14 S'JACOBS 1954, p. 215. – BARTSCH-MOLDEN 1993, p. 31–52.

15 BARTSCH-MOLDEN 1993, p. 52–61.

16 Vlieghe 1998, p. 245.

From the next decade of the 1670's, we have funerary monuments which include those like the *Epitaph for Johann Korn* (d. 1671) also in St. Mary's.<sup>17</sup> [Fig. II 1b] It is made of stucco and exceedingly modest in terms of composition, style, and effect when compared to the Sparr monument only a few footsteps away in the same church. Much smaller in scale and at a height directly on eye-level with the observer, its base is a plain, solid rectangular casket-like shape with a commemorative inscription below and a smaller pedestal-like structure above. Upon it is to be found the half-length portrait bust of the deceased looking upward piously into the heavens with his hands folded in prayer and resting on a skull. This compositional configuration demonstrates a popular tomb-genre of Italian origin, namely, a combination of the *priant* and portrait bust types.<sup>18</sup> Adorning the epitaph's base is a relief featuring the Zorn family's coat of arms surrounded by olive branches. To the left and right of Zorn's portrait bust, there are large putti grasping a sizeable acanthus-leaf garland which forms a kind of arch over the deceased's effigy. Also on both sides, a large hourglass stands just in front of each putto. At the top is yet another putto figure holding a flaming torch and sheaves of wheat; while heavy, old-fashioned, auricular-inspired vestiges of *Knorpelwerk* or *Ohrmuschel* ornaments (clear forerunners of the distinctive, soon-to-become fashionable acanthus-leaf motifs) expand farther outwards to the left and right.<sup>19</sup> In terms of style and artistic competence, the monument is a good, but still provincial, work of sculpture from a second-rate local master probably influenced by Netherlandish prototypes,<sup>20</sup> but limited only by the creator's lack of skill necessary in designing a more imaginative composition and producing a sufficiently credible differentiation of forms and textures found in real flesh, hair, clothing, and organic plant materials.

Another category of sepulchral monument having some distinguishing artistic merit in Berlin during that pre-Schlüterian era (before c. 1694) can be viewed and it might even be reasonably categorized as having been done by one particularly prominent artistic personality, his studio, or other followers most likely working under his strong stylistic influence. He was among the foremost court artists employed by the Great Elector of Brandenburg, Friedrich Wilhelm of Hohenzollern (1620–1688),<sup>21</sup> and someone we have already mentioned by name – Johann Michael Döbel the Younger (1635–1702).<sup>22</sup> He is a personality we should now take time to properly introduce into our study. Originally from Schweidnitz in Silesia (now Poland), he first entered

17 SCHWEBEL 1891, p. 198. – BORRMANN 1893, p. 218. – PETRAS 1972 I, p. 123–124. – NEUHÄUSER 2008 I–II, p. 37, fig. 89.

18 NEUHÄUSER 2008 I, p. 37.

19 For the auricular style, its Netherlandish origins and stylistic development in relation to the Roman Baroque acanthus-leaf decoration as it manifested north of the Alps: ZÜLCH 1932. – ROTHE 1938, p. 39–81. – THORNTON 1998, p. 92–98, 102–110. – SNOWDIN/LEWELLEN 2009, p. 106–110.

20 PETRAS 1972 I, p. 124.

21 A very useful source for the Great Elector's court is BAHL 2001.

22 For Döbel: THIEME/BECKER 1907–50, vol. 9, p. 362. – AKL 1992–, vol. 220–221. – STRAUBE 1916. – ULBRICH 1926–29 I, p. 248. – LADENDORF 1935, p. 9–11. – PETRAS 1972, p. 190–202. – THEUERKAUFF 1990, p. 17.

electoral service as a *Landbaumeister* at Königsberg, East Prussia, in 1667 and eventually, by the year 1673, he was engaged as both electoral-court *Baumeister und Bildhauer* or master-builder and sculptor.<sup>23</sup> directing architectural projects for the Elector in Berlin, Potsdam, Bornim, and Caput.<sup>24</sup> Indeed, in 1674–78, one major commission Döbel received was for the design and construction of the *Lustschloss* or pleasure palace at Bornim near Potsdam,<sup>25</sup> which brought with it the need for a great deal of sculptural decoration and the assistance of many additional sculpture journeymen or *Bildhauer Gesellen* to be obtained as necessary from other local masters. It was an extraordinary privilege granted to Döbel by Friedrich Wilhelm on 29 June/8 July 1679,<sup>26</sup> and a right the court sculptor may have again exercised in 1687.<sup>27</sup> From among his other building contracts there were the interior decoration for palatial residences like the Berlin Stadtschloss, Schloss Charlottenburg, and Schloss Oranienburg, for which he and his workshop are believed to have provided richly ornamented stucco ceilings.<sup>28</sup> [Figs. II 15a–15c] It is to these works – along with other pertinent statuary – that we shall turn as comparative stylistic examples during our next discussion about the *Epitaph for Georg Freiherr von Derfflinger*. After the death of the Great Elector, Döbel’s position as court sculptor under Friedrich III was again confirmed as documents prove on 2 December 1689.<sup>29</sup> Döbel’s style has also been generally associated with the sort of acanthus-leaf-with-putti ornamental motifs which were so popular in the arts during the last quarter of the 17<sup>th</sup> century and truly omnipresent throughout the town and its outlying hinterlands.<sup>30</sup>

Indeed, when we look at Berlin sepulchral art from the 1680’s, it is clear that sculptors like Johann Michael Döbel and his circle promoted this trend in ornamental decoration which had by this time eventually taken full root in the local milieu.

23 The document is found in GStA-PK I. HA, Rep. 36, Nr. 2743, fols. 1r–4r. On 22 December 1673, an electoral decree was made concerning the presentation of a plot of land on the so-called *Freiheit* along the Spree River opposite the Berlin *Residenzschloss* with specific reference to “...Unsern Baumeister und Bildhauer Michel Döbeln...” Other references to his position as court sculptor were noted on 14 June 1676 and 15 January 1681. Alte und Neue Reposituren. Brandenburgische Städte, Ämter und Kreise [...] nebst einigen Materien betr. die innere Verwaltung der Mark. Berlin – Magistrat zu Friedrichswerder. *Bausachen (1673–1695)*. GStA-PK I. HA, Rep. 21, Nr. 191b – Fasc. 3, fols. 2r–3r, 24r–24v. For published references and citations of these documents: GALLAND 1911, p. 238–240. – STRAUBE 1916, p. 26–29.

24 GALLAND 1893, p. 198. – THIEME/BECKER 1907–50, vol. 9, p. 362. – AKL 1992–, vol. 28, p. 220.

25 BACKSCHAT 1912, p. 102–127. – STRAUBE 1916, p. 30–35. – PETRAS 1972, p. 78–82.

26 NICOLAI 1786B, p. 44. – STRAUBE 1916, p. 35–37. For the document cited by Straube, see: Alte und Neue Reposituren. Geheimer Rat. Allgemeine Verwaltung. Bildhauer, Bildgießer, Gipser, Stukkateure (1600–1800), *Acta betr. Stein= u. Bildhauer, Gipfser, Marmor und Gips (1600–1715)*. GStA-PK I. HA, Rep. 9, AV, E 16<sup>1</sup> – Fasc. 1, fols. 19–20.

27 GALLAND 1893, p. 234. – JOSEPH 1896, p. 44. – STRAUBE 1916, p. 39. This document, whose pagination was not cited by Galland and Straube, is found in: GStA-PK I. HA, Rep. 9, AV, E 16<sup>1</sup> – Fasc. 1, fols. 19r, 20r, 24r, 52r–53r.

28 For the literature on this activity at the electoral palaces, see: note 209 below.

29 STRAUBE 1916, p. 43 and note 6. Noted with an incorrect archival call number in: HÜNECKE 1997, p. 89 (note 12). Also consult: GStA-PK I. HA, Rep. 36, Nr. 2743, fol. 28.

30 FASTENAU 1926, p. 39–42. – PETRAS 1972, p. 118, 190–202. – GÖRES 1988, p. 131–132. – SNODIN/LLEWELLYN 2009, p. 109–110.

Take for example the sandstone *Epitaph for Catharina Rantz, née Stuck* (d. 1682) in the Church of St. Nicholas, Berlin, which was done by an un-identified artist but unfortunately later damaged by bombing in World War II and exposed to weathering and vandalism during the early post-war period.<sup>31</sup> [Fig. II 1c] This standing monument is almost stele-like in its appearance and included a now-lost, oval portrait of the deceased above the usual inscription tablet. In comparison to the *Korn Epitaph*, it is surrounded by ever more dense, florid, acanthus-leaf vegetal forms populated by a number of chubby, slightly awkward, but still-charming putti who are either hovering above at the top, steadying the portrait painting, climbing upward on the vegetation, or seated below at the bottom displaying their grief by wiping the tears from their eyes. [Figs. II 1c, 1c-1]

The ubiquitous acanthus-leaf-with-putti ornamentation persisted as a favored motif and maintained its pre-eminence in Berlin even on into the final decade of the 17<sup>th</sup> century. We can see this style in the sandstone *Epitaph for Anna Westarph née Cramer* (d. 1691) which is again a wonderful, but war-damaged, relict also still surviving in the Church of St. Nicholas, Berlin.<sup>32</sup> [Fig. II 1d] The artist responsible for this work has not been confirmed but a more sophisticated approach to the composition is evident in the double-oval configuration for the portrait frame and inscription tablet. One can see a true skill, greater technical capability, and proficiency demonstrated in the handling of the stone material far beyond what is observed in the *Rantz Epitaph*, especially with regard to the richer, exuberant Roman-Baroque acanthus-leaf motif,<sup>33</sup> with its four large putti seated comfortably among the lush vegetation. [Figs. II 1d, 1d-1] Moreover, we notice at the top left one putto blowing soap-bubbles, which was a significant iconographic *memento mori* theme quite prevalent and universally acknowledged as a *vanitas* motif during the Renaissance and Baroque eras. [Fig. II 1d-2] It is one we shall deal with in much greater detail later on in this study.

At almost exactly the same time as the *Westarph Epitaph* came into being, however, some markedly newer, more innovative, compositional designs finally penetrated into the static, somewhat stagnating Berlin sculpture milieu. One example was probably due not to the influence of sculpture, but rather to architecture, and was represented in the now-destroyed monument erected for the foremost architect to the Great Elector Friedrich Wilhelm. The sandstone *Tomb of Michel Matthias and his Son Adrian Smids* (after July 1692) once in St. Dorothea's Church, which is thought to have been done by an anonymous Netherlandish (?) sculptor, was fortunately photo-documented before World War II.<sup>34</sup> [Fig. II 1e] It presents a rather similar, yet more ambitious

31 PETRAS 1972 I, p. 126. – BREHM/KLEBER/VEIGEL/WINKLER 1994, p. 60, 166.

32 PETRAS 1972 I, p. 125. – BREHM/KLEBER/VEIGEL/WINKLER 1994, p. 62–63, 167.

33 ROTHE 1938, p. 8–38. – THORNTON 1998, p. 103–110. – SNOWDIN/LLEWELLEN 2009, p. 109–110.

34 BORRMANN 1893, p. 169. – GEYER 1936 I–II, p. 79 and fig. 152. – PETRAS 1972 I, p. 127–128. – NEUHÄUSER 2008 I–II, p. 35–37, figs. 87–89. A brief reference to the *Smids Tomb* is also found in an 18<sup>th</sup> century manuscript: *Chronik Beckmann, Teil III – Friedrichstadt und Dorotheenstadt* (c. 1752–60), Landesarchiv Berlin (hereafter LAB) F Rep. 237, Nr. 5, fol. 205. See also a copy (1913) of Beckmann's chronicle by Emil von Siefert: Zentral- und Landesbibliothek, Berlin (hereafter

design to the *Zorn Epitaph* without being occupied by the usually ever-present putti gambolling in acanthus-leaf vegetation like the Rantz and Westarph epitaphs. The *Smids Tomb* is more advanced with its *exedra* or concave, hemicycle recess in the substructure and the inclusion of two female *pleurant* figures exhibiting a compositional solution departing from the conventional wall-background and likely owing to an earlier Italian prototype.<sup>35</sup> It also appears to have been the earliest example of reception to the taste for Italo-Flemish tomb art in Berlin, among the first examples of a “modern” portrait-bust sepulchral monument in the town, and consequently a model for many later epitaphs made for the Prussian aristocracy in the surrounding region of Brandenburg during the 18<sup>th</sup> century.<sup>36</sup>

We can briefly mention at this juncture the significance of the funerary portrait bust integrated into both the *Zorn Epitaph* and *Smids Tomb* monuments. This element, the so-called *imago clipeata*, has origins going back to Hellenistic and Roman Imperial tomb art where the deceased’s effigy became set into a niche enframing the bust so that it implied a sort of apotheosis of the person depicted being simultaneously reinforced by the addition of “genii, victories, nereids and other supernatural creatures bearing the *imago clipeata* to heaven” and thus contributing to a glorification of the subject’s eternal memory.<sup>37</sup> This visual motif never completely died out. It was taken up later by the Christians on their sarcophagae (however without the ideas of apotheosis), occurred sporadically during the Romanesque period, and then caught on again with reinforced vigor during the Renaissance ultimately becoming a standard convention employed by Baroque artists like Gian Lorenzo Bernini,<sup>38</sup> and of course widely disseminated throughout Europe by other artists who copied this sort of funerary art. A permutation of this tradition is seen in those examples where the bust has been transformed into a painted portrait like the ones found on the Rantz and Westarph epitaphs. It is also seen in Schlüter’s tomb art.

Returning to the *Smids Tomb*, we see that the massive base bears two relief panels at the far left and right with representations of architect’s instruments and the com-

---

ZLB) B118/11, fol. 428. This rare and invaluable (though not the earliest extant) hand-written account was prepared by Bernhard Ludwig Beckmann (Pötnitz bei Dessau, 8 January 1694 – Berlin, 3 December 1760) a pro-rector of the Joachimstahlschen Gymnasium and member of the Royal Academy of Sciences in Berlin. It was kept in the Berlin Städtische Archiv (Civic Archive) and its author was noted in: BORRMANN 1893, p. 103. – SIEFART 1914, p. 66. For more on the *Smids Tomb* after WWII, see: ELAB 101 09/11, Rep. II, Nr. 159, fols. 88, 99–103, 139–141.

35 PETRAS 1972 I, p. 128. The *Tomb of Agostino Favoriti* (1683–84) in S. M. Maggiore, Rome, by Ludovico Gimignani and Filippo Carcani was noted as a source in: NEUHÄUSER 2008 I–II, p. 37, fig. 88.

36 FASTENAU 1926, figs. 37–39. – NEUHÄUSER 2008 I, p. 36. A fascinating socio-historical essay was published on the Prussian nobility and their uneasy, albeit non-committal, attachment to Berlin as a center and/or artistic source for representing their socio-political rank and status, e.g. the erection of commemorative funerary monuments in the *Residenzstadt*, is found in: FRIE 2005, p. 291–315. Further research into this topic could provide extremely interesting contributions to the study, analysis, and interpretation of Baroque-period tomb art in both Berlin and Brandenburg.

37 S’JACOB 1954, p. 190–191. – PANOFKY 1992, p. 31–32.

38 S’JACOB 1954, p. 192–193. – PANOFKY 1992, p. 35–36, 41–42, 44, 59, 69–70, 93–94.



memorative inscription is placed in the center. Directly above, an upward-curving pedestal has a relief of the family's coat of arms enframed by palm-fronds bound with a ribbon serving as a decorative base for a realistic portrait bust strikingly enhanced by impressively twisted, writhing, Berniniesque-like drapery. The weeping, female figures of the mourning *pleurant* type who wear long, flowing garments and are seated on either side drying their tears do look to have been less masterfully carved in their technique as is revealed by their stiff, awkward poses, ungainly gestures, and the curious, nearly Manneristic, treatment of their hair and dresses. Again, both the Zorn and Smids sepulchral monuments portray the vestigial, allegorical accoutrements (like putti or personifications) derived from antique tomb art and their more modernized contemporary equivalents used during the Baroque. However, of the two works – and despite its minor technical drawbacks – the *Smids Tomb* demonstrates a distinctly more progressive, stylistically sophisticated phase in the art of tomb sculpture in Berlin from the latter half of the 17<sup>th</sup> century.

Now let us deal with Johann Michael Döbel the Younger's most well-known contributions to the art of the funerary monument in Berlin since, chronologically speaking, he was Schlüter's immediate forerunner. One important aspect of Döbel's activity was the creation of metal sarcophagae which extended for over a period of a decade and a half from about 1683 to 1699. The majority of them survive today in the Hohenzollern-family crypt of the Berlin Cathedral. An intriguing piece of archival evidence refers to what must have been Döbel's intimate knowledge of – if not the direct participation in – the creation of these works (a number of which we shall look at below), and also his involvement in the repair work on damaged parts most probably from the *Sarcophagus for Prince Friedrich August* (d. 1686), the deceased child of Friedrich III and Sophie Charlotte.<sup>39</sup> [Fig. II 1g] This proof is revealed in a testimonial written on 26 October 1695 by Heinrich Otto, sexton at the Berlin Cathedral.<sup>40</sup> More fortuitously, however, is that Heinz Ladendorf long-ago discovered

39 For this monument: BECKER/HOTH/SCHULZ 2005, p. 246.

40 The sexton of the Church of the Holy Trinity (Berlin Cathedral), Heinrich Otto, reported that a metal-founder allegedly caused damaged to many electoral sarcophagae while attempting to do corrective-work on the inscription of one of them. Döbel was involved in the repair work on a certain piece of the sarcophagus which accidentally broke off: “[...] Einen Flügel, vor das Ersten Printzen, dieses jetzt Regierenden Churfürsten Sohn von dero annoch lebende Gemahlin, Sarg in Verwahrung gehabt [...]” It had been among those damaged during the metal-founder's work: “[...] daß der Kanen Gießer an den Seel. Chur *princessin* Sarg die Buchstaben außgraben solte, *Spoliret* Er beÿ dieser gelegenheit alle die Fürstl. Särge, solches wird der Herrschafft *notificiret*, wird befohlen, alles genau zu *Specificiren* was davon genom[m]en. Da nun Döbell der Bildhauer alles besichtigt und die Flügel zehlte wie viel derselben weg wären [...]” Döbel is said to have spoken not only of the metal-founder as being mistakenly known as “[...] einem Ehrl. Meister der schon viele Fürstl. Särge gemacht [...]” but also “[...] daß der Kannen Gießer hette beÿ wehrender Arbeit an der Seel. Churfürstin Dorotheas Sarg, viel Zinn entwandt und beÿ den Juden Versezt, da er dann wieder von den Juden außgelöset [...]” Other details regarding a conflict between Döbel, the metal founder, and his wife are also given in this document. Consult: Alte und Neue Reposituren. Geheimer Rat. Angelegenheit der Heilige Kirche zur Dreifaltigkeit zu Cölln an der Spree (Berliner Dom), *Bau der Kirche, Schutt vor der Kirche, Reparaturen an und innerhalb der Kirche... (1608–1747)*. GStA-PK I. HA, Rep. 2, Nr. 24, fols. 60r–64v, here 61v, 62r.

yet another crucial archival document securely confirming Döbel's work (perhaps if only to a limited degree?) on the decorative details for the *Sarcophagus for Margrave Carl Philipp of Brandenburg-Schwedt* (c. 1698–99) a close family member from the house of Hohenzollern, [Fig. II 1l] and to which the scholar expressed astonishment at the longevity in Berlin of Döbel's old-fashioned ornamental style, i.e. the acanthus-leaf-with-putti motifs, and pondered how it could have survived so long into Schlüter's time.<sup>41</sup> Indeed, the younger master soon infused the stagnation of Berlin's existing art milieu with truly dynamic and forward-looking artworks and quite fully replaced the previous stylistic hegemony of the Döbel-generation school of sculpture. As a result of Ladendorf's proof concerning Döbel's work on Margrave Carl Philipp's sarcophagus, the scholar simultaneously brought the artist's name into closer stylistic connection with further attributions for a whole series of similar metal sarcophagai characterizing a distinctive type of funeral casket which had been done earlier for this ruling dynasty.<sup>42</sup> Thus, the works eventually attributed to Döbel came to include those done for Hohenzollern family members like Elisabeth Henriette (1683), Friedrich August (1685–86), Ludwig (1687), Friedrich Wilhelm – the Great Elector (1688), and his second wife Dorothea of Holstein-Glücksburg (1689).<sup>43</sup> [Figs. II 1f–1l]

For a better understanding of these sarcophagai, we shall look briefly at some of the more noteworthy examples typical of Döbel's production in chronological order. The first was made for the prematurely deceased first wife of Elector and later King Friedrich III/I. It is the *Sarcophagus for Princess Elisabeth Henriette of Hessen-Kassel* (1683) in the Berlin Cathedral, which established the fundamental design and ornamentation typical for the future appearance of all these monuments.<sup>44</sup> [Fig. II 1f] The long, rectangular, box-like shape with a tall, massive, concave cover above and supported at the bottom by lions on the corners and longer sides is basically an architectonic construction covered with a multiplicity of regularized, schematically formed, yet very florid, acanthus-leaf decoration applied over the entire surface in a very symmetrical manner. Accents are provided by pairs of putti either attached to the two larger inscription cartouches or those on the sides holding emblematic discs surmounted by banderoles bearing Latin mottos. Similiar in appearance is the *Sar-*

41 This archival source and opinion is given in: LADENDORF 1935, p. 9–10, 115 (note 59).

42 These earlier and later sarcophagai were organized into stylistically similar categories by: PETRAS 1972 I, p. 113–121, here p. 116–118.

43 For some earlier attributions of Elisabeth Henriette's sarcophagus to Döbel: GALLAND 1893, p. 198. – BORRMANN 1893, p. 166. – STRAUBE 1916, p. 60. The idea that all these monuments belonged to Döbel's hand is given in: LADENDORF 1935, p. 10. More on all these sarcophagai in: BECKER/HOTH/SCHULZ 2005, p. 244–246, 258.

44 BORRMANN 1893, p. 166. Borrmann noted the existence of two prints done after Elisabeth Henriette's sarcophagus. However, we can report here that there were three, not just two, original copper-plates for it found in the attic above the library and laboratory of Berlin's Academy of Sciences' old observatory identified as numbers 28–30 in an inventory list prepared in August 1800 still preserved today. Consult: Die Königlichen Kabinette unter der Verwaltung der Akademie, *Acta betr. die auf der Kunstkammer gefundenen 311 alten Kupferplatten aus dem 17. Jahrhundert (1800–1804)*. Berlin-Brandenburg Akademie der Wissenschaften – Preußische Akademie der Wissenschaften (hereafter BBAW PAW) I–XV, 6, fol. 10r.

*cophagus for Electress Dorothea of Holstein-Glücksburg* (1689) though, in this instance, with an increased number of putti, swans, and eagles. [Figs. II 1j, 1j-1] In keeping stylistically with these two monuments are the ones done for Friedrich August (1686) and Ludwig (1687) who were the sons, respectively, of Friedrich III/I and his father the Great Elector Friedrich Wilhelm.<sup>45</sup> [Figs. II 1g–1h] The impressive *Sarcophagus for Friedrich Wilhelm – the Great Elector Brandenburg* (d. 1688), was said to have been designed by Berlin court architect Johann Arnold Nering (1659–1695),<sup>46</sup> and the model probably executed by Johann Michael Döbel,<sup>47</sup> during a relatively mature, indeed, even late period of the sculptor’s career. [Figs. II 1i, 1i-1] Furthermore, the compositional and stylistic verisimilitude among all these and the other aforementioned works is generally quite plausible in this regard.<sup>48</sup> However, it may be that Döbel was really less original and independent in the creation of his decorative designs since Ladendorf also found evidence that in 1689 it was Nering – not Döbel – who was requested to deliver preliminary designs for a new sarcophagus intended for Friedrich III’s deceased mother Louise Henriette of Nassau-Orange (d. 1667).<sup>49</sup>

The next in this series of Döbel’s metal sepulchral monuments was done for someone outside the Hohenzollern dynasty but a ruler who had spent much of his time in Berlin, i.e. the *Sarcophagus for Johann Georg II of Anhalt-Dessau* (1693), at St. Mary’s in Dessau, (destroyed by bombing in 1945) and although there is a lack of sufficiently good photographic documentation,<sup>50</sup> its visual appearance can be best presented here in

45 See also the illustrations of these works in: BECKER/HOTH/SCHULZ 2005, p. 244, 246.

46 LADENDORF 1935, p. 10–11, 115 (note 62). For Nering’s life and work: THIEME/BECKER 1907–50, vol. 25, p. 390–391. – ENGEL 1987, p. 35–46. – HECKMANN 1998, p. 116–136.

47 LADENDORF 1935, p. 10–11. That Döbel was perhaps not responsible for the metal casting involved in creating the Great Elector’s sarcophagus is implied by references to the metal founder mentioned in note 40 above. Incidentally, an interesting and fairly detailed physical description of the sarcophagus with transcriptions of the commemorative texts was written in an 18<sup>th</sup> century manuscript: *Johann Joachim Müller, Chronicolum Berlinense. (18th century)*. Staatsbibliothek zu Berlin – Preußischer Kulturbesitz, Handschriftenabteilung [hereafter SBB-PK, HA]. Ms. Boruss. Folio. 1170, fols. 373v–376v.

48 Ink drawings showing one long side and the two narrow ends of the Great Elector’s sarcophagus said to have been done in 1819 by a copper-engraver named “Meyer” or possibly by Geheimrat Bürde (?) according to correspondence written at a time (15 April 1820 and 3 February 1821) when deliberations were being made to restore the Hohenzollern sarcophagai in the Berlin Cathedral, provide a unique opportunity to study the work’s individual ornamental decorations in a clearer and more schematic manner. The printmaker named here may refer to Friedrich Wilhelm Meyer (1777–1826) or Ludwig Meyer junior (c. 1797–1833) both local Berlin artists. For the document: Domstift Cölln/Domkirche Berlin. Dombausachen, *Acten wegen Ergänzung der Zierrathen und Inscripationen an die im Schiffe der Dom Kirchen stehenden Särgen (1819–1821)*. Brandenburgisches Landeshauptarchiv – Potsdam-Bornim (hereafter BLHA) Rep. 10A, Nr. 245, fols. 32r–33r, 37r. For the Meyer biographies: ERNST 2010 I, p. 531, 536.

49 LADENDORF 1935, p. 10–11 and accompanying notes.

50 BOECK 1937, p. 50. Published documentation includes: HÖNICKE 1833, p. 125–128. – HARKSEN 1937, p. 45. For reference to the attribution: AKL 1992–, p. 220. Many thanks go to Ms. Christine Köhler at the Landesamt für Denkmalpflege Sachsen-Anhalt in Dessau for her assistance in providing copies of the surviving photographic documentation of this and other metal sarcophagai formerly preserved in St. Mary’s crypt.

the form of a contemporary engraved print done by Samuel Blesendorff (1633–1699).<sup>51</sup> [Fig. II 1k] As Renate Petras pointed out, the work is generally very much like the previously created Berlin sarcophagai in its use of reclining animals (here eagles and bears), the foliate-decorations along the base, the garlands and reliefs, as well as the grieving Genius figures placed to each side of the inscription cartouche on the cover.<sup>52</sup>

Finally, the one work specifically documenting Döbel's authorship by name is the *Sarcophagus for Carl Philipp* (1698–99) which appears much simpler and at the same time somehow rather less artistically successful than any of the other sarcophagai listed above.<sup>53</sup> [Fig. II 1l] Whether this owed to the Margrave's less prominent status in comparison with immediate family members or reflects a marked decline in quality-standards on the part of Döbel and/or the participation of his workshop is difficult to determine.<sup>54</sup> To Döbel's credit, Ladendorf pointed out positive elements in the earlier electoral sarcophagai with their lively ornamental and figural motifs but then how these dissipated and faded almost completely in this last one for which the artist was supposedly responsible.<sup>55</sup> Petras later emphasized how Döbel's characteristic decorative ornamentation with vegetal garlands, laurel wreaths, and acanthus-leaf *rinceaux* – like the stucco ceiling at Schloss Oranienburg – lacks the opulence with which Schlüter's efforts are fully imbued; while stylistically and compositionally the overall "Döbel-effect" is one without any cohesiveness between the ornaments themselves and the object they decorate being simply attached onto the surface and having no real integration with the architectonic form of the sarcophagus.<sup>56</sup> Thus, there is a pervasive, inherent dis-association among the various parts: the inter-relationship is missing between the basic elements of the solid background and the *appliqué* decorations which are merely added on. Indeed, it must be accepted that despite Nering's designs, Döbel's contribution is often a frankly mediocre and quite purely mechanical work.<sup>57</sup> All in all, this monument is but one more convincing piece of evidence for Döbel's authorship.

For the purposes of this study, it will be a good idea to keep in mind all these earlier 17<sup>th</sup> century sarcophagai created for the house of Hohenzollern still preserved in the Berlin Cathedral. Their common stylistic forms and motifs will guide us to a deeper awareness and comprehension of the remarkable contrast and truly radical change which occurred in Berlin sepulchral art when we examine in much closer detail the

---

51 Two prints showing the long and narrow sides were once in the collections of the Prussian State Library before World War II. BOECK 1937, p. 50. – PETRAS 1972 I, p. 121. For Blesendorff: THIEME/BECKER 1907–50, vol. 4, p. 115. – BERCKENHAGEN 1964 II, p. 13–14. – AKL 1992–, vol. 11 p. 494–495.

52 PETRAS 1972 I, p. 120–121.

53 BECKER/HOTH/SCHULZ 2005, p. 245. See again Ladendorf's archival confirmation of this fact in note 41 above.

54 Döbel's workshop may have been quite large and varied especially when the master obtained the right from the Great Elector to appropriate other local masters' apprentices whenever necessary! For more on Döbels and his workshop assistants: STRAUBE 1916, p. 33, 35–40, 46.

55 LADENDORF 1935, p. 11.

56 PETRAS 1972 I, p. 118.

57 LADENDORF 1935, p. 11.

sarcophagai Andreas Schlüter created not so many more years later for this ruling dynasty.<sup>58</sup> In fact, even a brief glance at Döbel's work clearly indicates how indebted he was to the Netherlandish models favored by the Great Elector as shall be shown.<sup>59</sup> It can be safely stated that a prime example of Netherlandish Baroque Classicism like Quellinus' *Sparr Tomb* stood out as the hallmark of this trend in sculpture for the Berlin milieu and – as a readily available prototype – assisted in maintaining the style's predominance until about the turn of the century. Thereafter, the French taste in sculpture would come to the fore, standing right alongside Schlüter's style,<sup>60</sup> owing to two architects/military engineers: the Swede Johann Eosander von Göthe (1669–1728),<sup>61</sup> and French Huguenot Jean de Bodt (1670–1745),<sup>62</sup> whose building projects employed the newest sculptors on the scene: Guillaume Hulot (before 1660 – after 1722), René Charpentier (1680–1723), Charles-Claude Dubut (1687–1742), and Bartholomé Damart (died 1736).<sup>63</sup> At this juncture, we only briefly mention in passing this facet of the French Classical style and its introduction into this developmental stage of the Berlin school of sculpture, however, selected aspects concerning manifestations of this artistic style in the town shall be dealt with more fully as necessary throughout the course of our study.

In summary, it becomes clear from this overview that, in many respects, Schlüter the sculptor would not really obtain very much stimulation from the few pre-existing examples of sepulchral artworks available in Berlin, but as we shall see would rely heavily upon his own skills of creative invention when adapting styles, motifs, and iconography from sources of internationally recognized Netherlandish, Italian, and French prototypes in order to complete his numerous commissions. He would continuously stand more self-reliant in all his artistic endeavors. Let us return now to the late 17<sup>th</sup> century and learn more about the two main sculptors then active in the town during Schlüter's earliest years there while we examine and discuss the first piece of funerary sculpture brought into connection with Andreas Schlüter's *œuvre*.

---

58 More on these sarcophagai in: PETRAS 1972 I, p. 113–121. – BECKER/HOTH/SCHULZ 2005, p. 243–246.

59 HÜNEKE 1988, 118–126.

60 KÜKE 2002, p. 46.

61 MARPERGER 1711, p. 447. – THIEME/BECKER 1907–50, vol. 10, p. 573–574. – RIBBE/SCHÄCHE 1987, p. 613. – AKL 1992–, vol. 34, p. 192–194. For Eosander and his appointment as Berlin court architect 17 February 1699: Alte und Neue Reposituren. Geheimer Rat. Allgemeine Verwaltung, *Acta betr. Schiffs- und Schleusenbau, Matthiaß Schmit, Eosander; Bauwesen (1650–1708)*. GStA-PK I. HA, Rep. 9, AV, E 15 – Fasc. 3, fols. 52r–59v. Also see: HOLLAND 2002, p. 24–26, 41–47, 242–246.

62 MARPERGER 1711, p. 443. – THIEME/BECKER 1907–50, vol. 4, p. 71–72. – RIBBE/SCHÄCHE 1987, p. 602. – AKL 1992–, vol. 12, p. 98–99. For De Bodt and his appointment as Berlin court engineer on 5 June 1699: KÜKE 2002, p. 48, 93–94.

63 More on the French artists active in Berlin is treated by: BOECK 1933D, p. 104–116. – LADENDORF 1935, p. 78–79. – PETRAS 1954, p. 22, 39. – SOUCHAL 1977, p. 86–91. – SOUCHAL 1981, p. 144–150. – THEUERKAUFF 1990, p. 24–25. – KANDT 2011A, p. 326, 345–348, 358.



Plate II A Circle of Andreas Schlüter (Georg Gottfried Weyhenmeyer?) *Epitaph for Georg Baron von Derfflinger* (c. 1695–96), sandstone. Bust formerly attributed to Andreas Schlüter now given to an Anonymous Artist from the Circle of Johann Michael Döbel the Younger (before c. 1695?), alabaster. Parish Church, Gusow. Photograph c. 1920.

## ILLUSTRATIONS

I The Berlin Years



II 1a Artus Quellinus the Elder and Workshop. Tomb of Otto Christoph Baron von Sparr (c. 1660–63), marble. St. Mary's Church, Berlin.



II 1a-1  
 Artus Quellinus the Elder and Workshop.  
*Tomb of Otto Christoph Baron von Sparr* – Detail  
 showing Main Relief  
 (c. 1660–63).



II 1a-2  
 Artus Quellinus the Elder and Workshop.  
*Tomb of Otto Christoph Baron von Sparr* – Detail  
 showing Minerva and Bellona with Slaves  
 (c. 1660–63).





II 1b Anonymous. *Epitaph for Johann Korn* (d. 1671), stucco. St. Mary's Church, Berlin.



II 1c Anonymous. *Epitaph for Catharina Rantz, née Stuck* (d. 1682), sandstone. St. Nicholas, Berlin. Photograph before 1945.



II 1c-1 Anonymous. *Epitaph for Catharina Rantz, née Stuck* – Detail of Putto at Left (d. 1682). Photograph November 2013.



II 1d Anonymous. Epitaph for Anna Westarph née Cramer (d. 1691), sandstone. St. Nicholas, Berlin. Photograph before 1945.