Porcelain imported from China was the most highly coveted new medium in sixteenth- and early seventeenth-century Europe. Its pure white color, translucency, and durability, as well as the delicacy of decoration, were impossible to achieve in European earthenware and stoneware. In response, European ceramic factories set out to discover the process of producing porcelains in the Chinese manner, with significant artistic, technical, and commercial ramifications for Britain and the Continent. Indeed, not only artisans, but kings, noble patrons, and entrepreneurs all joined in the quest, hoping to gain both prestige and profit from the enterprises they established.

This beautifully illustrated volume showcases ninety works that span the late sixteenth to the mid-nineteenth century and reflect the major currents of European porcelain production. Each work is illustrated with gorgeous new photography, accompanied by analysis and interpretation by one of the leading experts in European decorative arts. Among the wide range of porcelains selected are rare blue-and-white wares and figures from Italy, superb examples from the Meissen factory in Germany and the Sèvres factory in France, and ceramics produced by leading British eighteenth-century artisans. Taken together, they reveal why the Metropolitan Museum’s holdings in this field are among the finest in the world.
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Foreword

The Metropolitan Museum of Art’s holdings of European porcelain number close to 4,000 works, the first of which entered the permanent collection in 1879. Since the first decade of the Museum’s founding, European porcelain produced in the years between 1575 and 1900 has occupied a prominent position in the Department of European Sculpture and Decorative Arts, and the generosity of numerous ceramic collectors has made the Museum’s collection in this area without parallel in the United States. Surprisingly, only a small percentage of our porcelain works has been published, primarily in the catalogues of the collections from which the works were donated. This volume, the fourth in a series celebrating European sculpture and decorative arts, is the first publication to reflect the breadth and the depth of European porcelain within the Museum.

In the twenty-first century, it is easy to lose sight of the fact that porcelain was the most highly coveted new medium in Europe for a period of almost a hundred years, during which most of the works in this volume were produced. The technical challenges of making porcelain in the manner of Chinese artists was the obsessive focus for numerous noble patrons and artisans for much of the eighteenth century. When success was finally achieved at a variety of European factories, the resulting production transformed European social customs and interior decoration.

Jeffrey Munger, former Curator in the Department of European Sculpture and Decorative Arts specializing in ceramics, has selected ninety pieces of European porcelain that reflect the quality and character of the Museum’s holdings in this field. His authoritative study examines the ways in which porcelain was perceived, appreciated, and employed in Europe from the sixteenth to the nineteenth century and attests to the diversity and originality of the porcelain made during this period. While important purchases of European porcelain have been made by generations of curators at the Museum, the department’s holdings of this material have been primarily shaped by the donations of numerous collectors, many of whom are the focus of Elizabeth Sullivan’s essay concerning the history of the collection. I am indebted to these two authors for bringing to life an area of the Museum’s collection that continues to surprise and delight with its inherent beauty and the artistry and originality of its decoration.

Finally, I join my colleagues in extending our gratitude to Marilyn and Lawrence Friedland, The Arnhold Foundation, Michele Beiny and Michael Harkins, Ceramica-Stiftung Basel, and Adrian Sassoon for their important support of this outstanding publication.

Daniel H. Weiss
President and CEO
THE METROPOLITAN MUSEUM OF ART
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In general, the entries in this book are organized by country of origin, by founding date of the factory within each country, and by date of production of the work under discussion. In the List of Manufactories (see page 282), the factories are grouped according to culture, which reflects present-day geography rather than the more complex territorial identities of the periods in question. The brief descriptions of each object’s construction are based upon visual examination and interpretation by the author and his colleagues, and they do not purport to be unfailingly accurate. When the terms “left” and “right” are used, the viewpoint is that of the observer unless otherwise indicated. In the section concerning Vincennes and Sèvres porcelain, the factory name for the model appears in parentheses following the English title. In addition, the interpretation of the date letter mark is based on David Peters’s *An Examination of Vincennes and Early Sèvres Date Letters* (2014) (see Bibliography, page 284). In the interest of brevity, archival citations regarding the Sèvres factory omit the full title of the manufacturer, which includes “Cité de la Céramique, Sèvres & Limoges.” In instances where the same mark occurs on more than one object in a set, the mark is illustrated only once. The use of square brackets in the Provenances denotes a period of ownership by an art dealer. References are cited in abbreviated format in the endnotes and in the literature section of the entries, with the corresponding full citations provided in the Bibliography.
European Porcelain IN THE METROPOLITAN MUSEUM OF ART
In an age when porcelain is ubiquitous as a medium for the wares that we use in our daily lives, including a wide range of commercial products, and for decorative objects, such as vases, it is almost impossible to imagine its allure and exotic appeal to sixteenth-century Europeans when porcelain from China first began to arrive in any quantity. The whiteness, translucency, and delicacy of Chinese porcelains were startling in a context in which heavily potted brown or gray stonewares were the most refined ceramics available, and the detailed scenes and designs painted in cobalt blue had no parallels in ceramics used by Europeans prior to the arrival of imported porcelains. The decoration on Chinese porcelain depicted unfamiliar people, landscapes, and motifs, and the foreign quality of the worlds evoked their own fascination and desirability. Porcelain was a new medium in sixteenth- and early seventeenth-century Europe and avidly embraced by those who could afford this imported luxury good. When commerce between Europe and China grew to meet the ever-growing demand for Chinese porcelain, these blue-and-white wares became increasingly available to affluent Europeans and ultimately served as the impetus for the production of porcelain in the West. This quest to discover the process of making porcelain similar to that imported from China was one of the defining aspects of eighteenth-century Europe with significant artistic, technical, and commercial ramifications.

The early history of porcelain exports from China, and later Japan, to Europe has been the focus of much scholarly attention, and the multiple narratives that emerge from this history document the extent and sophistication of trade during the seventeenth century and into the following century. Many specifics of this trade have been fully explored, but the overarching history can be reduced to the most basic concept of supply and demand and the increasing customization of the product—in this case, porcelain—to meet Western tastes and customs. One of the most fascinating currents in the evolving trade in Chinese porcelain was the Europeans’ simultaneous attraction to the new medium because of its perceived exotic nature and the desire for these precious wares to serve European utilitarian purposes, often very distinct from those in China (fig. 1). This tension was one of many factors lending impetus to the experimentation in Europe to manufacture porcelain domestically and to produce porcelain wholly suited to a wide variety of European habits. However, it was primarily the prestige associated with Chinese and Japanese porcelain in Continental Europe that provided the strongest motivation to discover the process to make these white, thinly potted, durable wares, which allowed for a level and quality of decoration hitherto not possible. Chinese porcelains served as rare, treasured objects in European noble collections in the sixteenth century (fig. 2), and as the flow of imported porcelains increased during the following century, they were often displayed in quantity in aristocratic houses, arranged on mantelpieces or on brackets on walls. This fashion culminated in what came to be known as porcelain rooms in which hundreds of pieces of porcelain were mounted on the walls, and occasionally the ceiling, in decorative patterns. Increased availability meant that imported porcelains were no longer regarded as individual precious objects but rather as vehicles for display and reflections of one’s social and economic status. Some royal and aristocratic collectors pursued Asian porcelains with a ferocity of intent that has never been surpassed, the most extreme example being August II (1670–1733), commonly known as Augustus the Strong, elector of Saxony, king of Poland, who famously amassed approximately 24,000 pieces of Chinese and Japanese porcelain before his death.

The overwhelming challenge for Europeans intent on producing porcelain was not only determining the ingredients required but also developing kilns that permitted the very high temperatures required to fire...
porcelain. The ceramic bodies used by European potters prior to the discovery of porcelain were either earthenware or stoneware, and the clays employed for them were fired at temperatures lower than those at which porcelain would vitrify or become nonporous. The endeavors to make porcelain in Europe beginning in the sixteenth century were rooted in the search for the necessary ingredients, and the experimentation with different clays and the additional components were the threads that tied together the efforts to produce this entirely new type of ceramic body. Among the earliest attempts were those undertaken at the Medici workshops in Florence during the late sixteenth century (fig. 3), which resulted in the creation of a type of artificial porcelain that is commonly known as “soft-paste porcelain” (entry 1). While many variants of soft-paste porcelain were developed in Europe over the next two centuries, these artificial porcelains approximated the appearance of true porcelain but did so without the ingredients essential to Chinese porcelain. The most critical component of true porcelain is a white china clay known as “kaolin”; when combined with a feldspathic rock called “petuntse” and fired at high temperatures, it produces the very white, nonporous, and often translucent ceramic body that distinguishes porcelain from other types of ceramics. During the long process of experimentation in Europe and before it was widely known how to make true porcelain, frequently termed “hard-paste,” the artificial or soft-paste body was the most common type of porcelain produced.

The recipes for soft-paste porcelain varied from factory to factory and were typically inconsistent over time even within a factory, and the attributes of the soft-paste body resist easy characterization. Nonetheless, objects made in soft paste are usually warmer in tone than those produced in hard paste, and they are commonly more thickly potted and
generally more prone to problems in the kiln, although the firing temperature was lower than that required for hard paste. Soft paste can be translucent, but often the thickness of the body does not allow light to transmit. It has been frequently observed that the enamel decoration “sits” differently on the surface of a piece of soft-paste porcelain, sinking slightly into the transparent lead-based glaze (fig. 4). Despite these differences, it is not always immediately apparent if an object is made of soft paste or hard paste.

Many early experiments in making porcelain were conducted at ceramic factories producing faience, or tin-glazed earthenware, where the fundamentals of making, decorating, and firing ceramics were well established. The tradition of adding tin to the glaze to achieve a white surface on a pinkish earthenware body had a long history, and the general approximation of the tin-glazed pottery to porcelain was increasingly exploited in the late seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries. In France the earliest experiments in making porcelain took place in Rouen, which had a thriving faience industry in the late seventeenth century when the Poterat family of faience makers successfully produced a small body of remarkably sophisticated pieces of soft-paste porcelain (entry 41). While their enterprise did not beget immediate followers, the production of soft paste flourished in France well into the second half of the eighteenth century. The Saint-Cloud factory was the first to achieve success on a commercial scale by the late 1690s (entry 42), and it was followed by numerous other small enterprises, notably those established at Chantilly and Mennecy. However, none of the French factories were able to withstand the competition offered first by Vincennes and then by its successor factory at Sèvres, which flourished due to the patronage and financial backing provided by the king, Louis XV (1710–1774) (fig. 5). Not only did the Sèvres factory benefit enormously from the prestige conferred by the monarch’s interest, but its products were offered at a year-end annual sale held at Versailles at which purchases were expected by those in the king’s circle (entry 60).

The majority of the porcelain enterprises established on the Continent in the eighteenth century...
were generally founded and supported by royal or noble patrons, and the funding that they provided was critical to the survival of the factories, which rarely if ever operated at a profit. This financial support also meant that the production of the factories often reflected the taste of the patron rather than the taste of a market to which it had to cater. The passion for the medium itself was the motivation for many of those who founded factories, as well as the prestige accrued from owning such an operation, making the financial return very much a secondary concern. In no instance was this more the case than with Augustus the Strong, whose obsessive interest in porcelain led to the founding of the Meissen factory in 1710 (entry 10). The early history of Meissen has been thoroughly researched and studied thanks to the factory’s distinction of being the first in Europe to discover the formula for hard-paste porcelain.6 With the backing and active interest of Augustus the Strong and later from his son August III (1696–1763), Meissen became the preeminent factory in Europe during the first half of the eighteenth century. Its artistic success, coupled with its remarkable technical accomplishments, contributed enormously to the prestige of porcelain and to the benefits of factory ownership (fig. 6). Numerous factories were established in Germany in the mid-eighteenth century by royal and noble patrons, and Karl Eugen (1728–1793), Duke of Württemberg, remarked that a porcelain factory was “a necessary attribute of the glory and dignity of a prince.”7 In contrast to France, all of the enterprises on German soil produced only hard-paste porcelain, which was indirectly due to the influence of Meissen. Because the formula for hard-paste porcelain was avidly sought by people intent on establishing factories, Meissen zealously attempted to guard its recipe...
from competing enterprises, but departing workers took their technical knowledge with them. The second porcelain factory in Europe to make hard-paste porcelain was founded in 1718 by Claudius Innocentius Du Paquier (d. 1751) in Vienna, and his success was largely based on the assistance provided by workers formerly employed at Meissen (entry 28). By the 1750s, it was not uncommon for potters to travel from one factory to another, which resulted in new factories being founded with the expertise gained elsewhere.

The large number of porcelain factories founded in Europe during the eighteenth century coincided with changes in dining customs and in the consumption of hot beverages, and the increasing availability of porcelain played a significant role in effecting these changes, while at the same time the new customs proved an enormous boon to the porcelain industry. The concept of producing dining wares in which all the decoration was coordinated did not emerge until the 1730s. Prior to this time, those who could afford ceramics used either faience, Chinese export porcelain, or individual pieces of soft or hard paste that were combined with wares in other media; the notion that a wide range of dinner wares could be decorated with the same or similar designs to create a unified service was entirely new when it was initiated at Meissen in the early 1730s. Dinner services made of porcelain quickly became popular, despite their huge cost (fig. 7), and they were offered as diplomatic gifts by the Saxon court and later by the French Kings Louis XV and Louis XVI (1754–1793) to other monarchs and foreign dignitaries (entry 66). An added attraction to porcelain as a medium for services was the ability to portray coats of arms. Armorials had long been engraved on pieces of silver, but these renderings...
were constrained by the dependence on line rather than color. The use of color allowed arms not only to be more detailed and specific but also to serve as prominent decorative elements in their own right (entry 14). Coats of arms were not restricted to dining wares but also were used to decorate tea and coffee services, which were produced in sizable quantities at most European porcelain factories (fig. 8). The beverages of coffee, tea, and hot chocolate had been introduced to Europe in the mid-seventeenth century, yet the costs of the ingredients restricted their use to the upper strata of society. However, increased trade made these imported luxuries available to ever-larger markets, and the demand for wares with which to consume them was a major factor in establishing the importance of porcelain in the daily lives of the affluent classes in Europe. Low-fired earthenware that became nonporous only when glazed was ill-suited to the consumption of hot beverages because of the fragility of the low-fired earthenware body, and while stoneware was more durable, it did not have the strength of porcelain to always withstand the high temperatures at which the beverages were served. The manner in which Europeans consumed tea and coffee, in particular, encouraged the development of new forms for which porcelain was the ideal medium. Whereas Chinese ceramics offered models for teapots and tea bowls, prototypes for milk jugs or sugar bowls were nonexistent for these purely European customs, and as the serving of coffee and tea developed into social rituals, forms became both more specific and elaborate (fig. 9). Coffee cups were differentiated from those used to serve tea, chocolate cups were often accompanied by specially designed saucers, and chocolate pots were furnished with a hole in the lid so that a stirrer could be inserted to mix the hot drink.

Porcelain tea and coffee services became staples of affluent households, and they were increasingly available to the middle classes as the eighteenth century progressed due to both the growth in trade in these commodities and the establishment of porcelain factories specifically catering to broader markets.

The enthusiastic embrace of tea drinking in England during the eighteenth century was particularly significant to the English porcelain industry, because those factories were not backed by royal or noble patrons, as were their peer factories on the Continent. All of the English factories were founded as commercial enterprises and thus needed to become financially viable as quickly as possible. Rather than simply please the tastes of the founding patron, they had to develop a range of useful wares and decorative objects that would find a market large enough to support the operation. While some of the English factories focused on the luxury market either exclusively or primarily, others sought to supply products to the growing middle classes in addition to the upper classes who had traditionally been the consumers of porcelain (fig. 10). The desire to improve the product and expand the client base led to numerous technical innovations, such as the addition of soapstone to the soft-paste porcelain body for increased durability, but it also culminated in the development of other nonporcelaneous ceramic bodies, including creamware, that posed significant competition to the hegemony of porcelain by the end of the eighteenth century.

Despite the considerable breadth and depth of the Museum’s holdings of European porcelain, the development of porcelain in Europe and its multifaceted significance can only be touched upon by a selection of ninety works spanning the sixteenth century to the

---

**fig. 7** Liqueur Bottle Cooler (Seau à liqueur ovale), 1771. Sévres factory, French, 1756–present. Soft-paste porcelain decorated in polychrome enamels and gold, 4 1/4 × 12 1/2 in. (11.4 × 31.8 cm). The Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York, Gift of Mr. and Mrs. Charles Wrightsman, 1976 (1976.240.2a, b)

mid-nineteenth century. The works chosen for this volume necessarily reflect the strengths of the collection, as well as its defining characteristics, but inevitably many currents of porcelain production—particularly in the nineteenth century—remain unexplored due to the specific nature of the holdings. The history of the Metropolitan Museum’s collection is addressed in a separate chapter, and its character can be summed up as being a collection of collections that arrived at the Museum either as gifts or as bequests. Hence, it is not a collection of European porcelain formed strategically with specific aims in mind, rather it is a collection that reflects the interests of numerous donors, most of whom, happily, were exceptionally intelligent and informed in the acquisitions that they made. The holdings have been augmented by purchases made since the founding of the institution with the intention to enhance areas of strength and to represent new areas, however, the porcelain collection remains largely determined by the remarkable generosity of many donors. Their desire to place their collections in this institution allows the Museum to present to its visitors innumerable glories of European porcelain, of which only a taste is offered here.

1 Sargent 2012, pp. 1–32.
2 For example, see Leidy 2016, pp. 15–32.
3 Ibid., p. 31, fig. 16.
4 Ströber 2001, p. 10.
5 For the dates of operation of the porcelain factories represented in this book, please consult the List of Manufactories on p. 282 of this volume.
6 For a history of the factory, see Nelson 2013, pp. 117–83.
7 Coutts 2001, p. 124.
8 For general information on Meissen services, see Pietsch 2010a.
9 For the subject of Meissen porcelain including dinner services as diplomatic gifts, see Cassidy-Geiger 2007a.
The collection of European porcelain in The Metropolitan Museum of Art is the finest, most comprehensive in the United States. Extraordinary in depth and quality, it tells the story of porcelain production in Europe with representative works from major factories, as well as important rarities. Although the collection is a reflection of the taste and generosity of donors and collectors throughout the Museum's history, it is especially indebted to those collectors who were active during the mid-twentieth century, in particular from the 1940s to the 1970s when porcelain collecting reached a zenith in America. Numerous collections assembled during this period, but primarily those of Jack Linsky (1897–1980) and Belle Linsky (1904–1987), Lesley G. Sheafer (ca. 1890–1956) and Emma A. Sheafer (1891–1973), Judge Irwin Untermyer (1886–1973), R. Thornton Wilson (1886–1977), and Charles B. Wrightsman (1895–1986) and Jayne Wrightsman, now enable the Museum to present one of the most important collections of European porcelain in the world.

Founded in 1870, The Metropolitan Museum of Art had few European porcelain objects in its early collection. Two Sèvres vases des âges (entry 67), bequeathed in 1886, were among the first important accessions. These vases, still among the Museum’s most significant, have ties both to American history and to the French Revolution (1789–99) and are presumed to have passed directly from Louis XVI (1754–1793), king of France, to Gouverneur Morris (1752–1816) to the donor’s father-in-law, David Hosack (1769–1835), a prominent New Yorker. In essence, the presence of the vases in the early collection of the Museum speaks more to their provenance than to the collecting of European porcelain in the United States at the time.

In fact, the collecting of European porcelain in late nineteenth-century and early twentieth-century America occurred at only a modest level. In contrast to Italian Renaissance maiolica, which had become fashionable among wealthy Americans at the turn of the century, 1 European porcelain was not generally considered a serious pursuit. Furthermore, access to porcelain was limited largely to what could be seen and purchased on trips to Europe, with the best objects often already held in illustrious old European collections. Hence, it is not surprising that, in the 1900s, the Museum’s holdings were weak. In the Metropolitan Museum’s 1911 Catalogue of the Collection of Pottery, Porcelain, and Faience, curator Garrett Chatfield Pier acknowledged, “At the present moment many of the best known English, German, French, Austrian and Spanish fabriques are most inadequately represented.” At the time, the Museum’s European collection was made up almost entirely of gifts from only two collectors: Henry G. Marquand (1819–1902) and the Reverend Alfred Duane Pell (1860–1924). Marquand was an initial benefactor of the Museum, who also served as a trustee and president. His gifts, particularly of European paintings, helped to establish the Museum’s prominence in its preliminary years. In 1894, he donated his collection of European ceramics, which included Italian maiolica, Dutch Delftware, and other varieties of European pottery, as well as some eighteenth- and nineteenth-century porcelain.

Marquand seems to have viewed the ceramics collection as a teaching model for promoting the industrial arts, a prevailing Victorian idea exemplified by London’s South Kensington Museum, later renamed the Victoria and Albert Museum. 3 Though the porcelain from the Marquand ceramic gift consisted of English, French, and German tablewares of relatively little importance, one standout is a unique goblet and saucer made in Vienna in 1804, illustrating the principal colors used by the factory. 4

Reverend Pell was another early collector, who donated approximately 280 objects to the Museum in 1902, at a time when scholarship of European porcelain was in its infancy. He was a thoughtful and intelligent ceramics collector, preferring not only to donate his pieces to the Museum but also to exhibit them and
to write the labels himself. Pell collected Meissen, Sèvres, and Worcester porcelain, among other factories, and he made donations to several museums, including the Brooklyn Museum in New York, the Wadsworth Atheneum Museum of Art in Hartford, Connecticut, and the Smithsonian Institution in Washington, D.C., which received the largest portion of his collection.

One of the most powerful men of the Gilded Age of the late nineteenth century, financier J. Pierpont Morgan (1837–1913), was an early collector of European porcelain and pottery, in addition to the many other diverse areas in which he collected. In 1914, when the Museum opened a loan exhibition of the expansive Morgan collection, there was a gallery devoted to French porcelain, and another gallery installed with German porcelain. These galleries, actually long corridors separated by a small gallery displaying the Morgan watches, were not given the prominence of other spheres of Morgan’s collection, such as his paintings and Renaissance art, which was a reflection of the lower status afforded to decorative arts at the time. Following Morgan’s death and in accordance with his wishes, his various collections were divided and donated to three main recipients: The Metropolitan Museum of Art, the Morgan Library in New York, and the Wadsworth Atheneum in Morgan’s hometown of Hartford. Morgan’s son Jack donated a large portion of his late father’s collection to the Museum in 1917, including most of the works that had been on loan. This included important early European pottery and porcelain, notably two examples of rare Medici porcelain (entry 1), and early French soft-paste porcelain (entries 42, 43, 46). However, much of the eighteenth-century French and German porcelain displayed in the Morgan loan exhibition, including Meissen and Sèvres porcelain, did not end up coming to the Museum but instead went to the Wadsworth Atheneum. 6

The reasons why Morgan’s collections were divided could relate to the hierarchy of value associated with different types of ceramic art at the turn of the twentieth century. Morgan’s early European pottery and porcelain—the Medici porcelain and early French porcelain and pottery—were important to the telling of the history of ceramics, and like Italian Renaissance maiolica, generally considered more significant than “decorative” Meissen porcelain figures. Hence, they would be fitting for the Museum, which Morgan considered to be America’s great encyclopedic museum. In contrast, Morgan foresaw his collection at the Wadsworth to be of a more personal nature, composed of the objects he collected for his residences, which included his Sèvres and Meissen porcelain. 7 Furthermore, Morgan seemed to attach greater importance to French porcelain than to German porcelain. This has been inferred by the fact that he kept his German porcelains at his country house outside of London rather than at his London residence, where he kept his Sèvres. 8 Morgan showed a genuine interest and appreciation for Sèvres porcelain, which he purchased from dealers in London and Paris. In England, where Morgan spent much of his time, the preference for Sèvres porcelain was paramount, evident in great English collections, such as the Wallace Collection in London and the Rothschild Collection at Waddesdon Manor in Aylesbury.

George B. McClellan Jr. (1865–1940), one of the most knowledgeable early collectors of German porcelain in the United States, assembled an important collection with his wife, Georgiana Heckscher (1863–1952). McClellan was the son of the American Civil War Union Army general George B. McClellan Sr. (1826–1885), who had been one of the first prominent American collectors of German porcelain. The elder McClellan had acquired objects during his extensive travels to Europe (his son was born in Germany on one such occasion), though his collection was largely destroyed in a warehouse fire in 1881. 9 The younger McClellan inherited his father’s love of German porcelain, which he studied and also acquired during his travels through Europe. He and his wife chose to focus on tablewares rather than sculptural porcelain or figures that were more expensive. “For financial reasons,” McClellan wrote, “collecting figures was quite out of our reach, for before the Depression a good example of Bustelli or Kändler would bring anywhere from $2,000 to $5,000.” 10 The McClellans’ collection of 287 examples of German and Austrian porcelain (entry 12) was presented to the Museum by Mrs. McClellan a year after her husband’s death (the gift was accessioned in 1942). 11

The late 1940s marked the beginning of a period of intense activity and opportunity for collecting European porcelain in the United States—something that would have a dramatic impact on the Metropolitan Museum’s collection. The causes for this shift can be traced to World War II, and the upheaval in Europe during the years surrounding the war that brought both European objects and dealers to the United States in
an unprecedented wave. The rise of American collectors, and the importance of their collections, was demonstrated by the special exhibition "Masterpieces of European Porcelain," held at the Museum in 1949 (fig. 11). The show presented the public with over 500 objects, and in the accompanying exhibition catalogue, curator C. Louise Avery (1891–1986) describes the collecting phenomenon: "During the past ten or fifteen years a steadily increasing interest in European, and especially in Continental, porcelain has brought many pieces of first rank into American collections . . . some of the choicest pieces in public and private collections in New York City and its vicinity." The exhibition featured a high ratio of figures, which Avery explained was due to an American preference for them: "If in the exhibition there is a preponderance of figures, it is in part because these have appealed more to the American collector than have tablewares and ornamental vases, and in part because in the eighteenth century the insistent demand for figures and groups in porcelain enlisted the talents of many of the most gifted sculptors of the time." Among the private lenders to the exhibition were R. Thornton Wilson (fig. 12), Mr. and Mrs. Jack Linsky, and Judge Irwin Untermyer.

The most consequential donor to the Museum’s collection of European porcelain was Wilson, who made it his mission to build a world-class collection at the institution. Unlike some donors who acquire pieces for their private collections first and bequeath later, he collected specifically for the Museum. As Avery writes,

Museums benefit richly by the generosity of private collectors. In many instances the donors contribute things which they have previously acquired for their own enjoyment; in other words, they are private collectors first and museum donors later. R. Thornton Wilson has been exceptional in that he quickly dropped the former role and turned all his energy and enthusiasm to studying the needs of a particular museum and seeking specifically to meet them. As a New Yorker, he chose to devote himself to the Metropolitan Museum, selecting the field of European ceramic art as his immediate concern.
Wilson came from a prominent New York family: his mother, Caroline Astor Wilson (1861–1948), was the daughter of William Backhouse Astor (1830–1892) and Caroline Schermerhorn Astor (1830–1908) or “The” Mrs. Astor. His involvement with the Museum began in the 1930s when he made his first gifts of English ceramics. In 1936, he wrote of his long-term intentions, “As an old and very loyal New Yorker, I like to think that my hobby will eventually be a source of pleasure and interest to my fellow townsmen.” His offer of support was enthusiastically accepted by the Museum, because at the time the holdings of European porcelain were ill-balanced. Bequests from earlier collectors, such as J. Pierpont Morgan and George Blumenthal (1858–1941), had been largely to the benefit of the collection of early pottery: Italian maiolica, French faience, and Saint-Porchaire and Palissy ware. Yet in the field of eighteenth-century European porcelain, the Museum had substantial gaps to fill. A 1950 “Report to the Trustees” on the growth of the collections found that Italian porcelain was “meagerly represented,” as was English porcelain, and the Museum owned “little of actual significance” in French porcelain. In the area of German porcelain, despite gifts from Pell and McClellan, there was still need of development.

Wilson sought to fill these gaps, gaining the nickname “One-a-Day Wilson,” because he would often find something at a dealer and bring it directly to the Museum in a taxi. Pieces would typically be put on view as loans, and later they would be converted to gifts, the bulk coming in two major donations in 1950 and 1954. According to the press release, “His gift makes the Museum’s collection one of the most representative to be found in any public institution in this country or abroad.”

Francis Henry Taylor (1903–1957), the Museum’s director from 1940 to 1955, went on to state, “It is an interesting commentary on post-war conditions in Europe that it was possible for Mr. Wilson to assemble his entire collection in New York City. . . . Rarely, if ever, before has a collection of European ceramics of such high quality been purchased entirely within the confines of the United States. And it would indeed be difficult to duplicate the collection in any European capital.”

Like many Americans, Wilson began his collecting with English ceramics, available in the 1920s and 1930s through English dealers like Arthur Vernay (1877–1960), who had established shops in New York during the first half of the twentieth century. By the end of the 1930s, however, Wilson had “gotten tired” of English ceramics and turned his attention to French, German, and other Continental wares. His aim was “to obtain objects of fine quality not already represented in the Museum’s collection and not owned by other collectors who have expressed an intention of bequeathing their collections to the Museum.” For this reason Wilson “tried not to get Meissen figures and groups and English porcelains, of which Judge Untermyer has so many fine examples.” In total, Wilson gave the Museum over 500 European ceramics—over 330 of those are porcelain—primarily of eighteenth-century manufacture. Of this number, there are 123 pieces of German porcelain (entries 33, 35), and 106 French porcelains (entry 47), including 55 from Vincennes-Sèvres (entries 63, 64). His acquisitions of other European porcelain factories, including Italian (entry 8) and Austrian (entry 28), were also significant. In his later years, Wilson also donated generously to the Museum of Fine Arts, Boston, where his collection of over 160 objects features important early Northern European stoneware and earthenware.

In 1969, the Metropolitan elected Wilson an honorary trustee: “Some thirty-odd years ago Mr. Wilson

fig. 13 Vase (Vase urne antique), ca. 1755–57. Sèvres factory, French, 1756–present. Soft-paste porcelain, 11 15/16 × 7 9/16 × 5 3/4 in. (30.3 × 19.2 × 14.6 cm). The Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York, Gift of Samuel L. Kress Foundation, 1958 (58.75.112a, b)
voluntarily became the architect of the Museum’s ceramic collection. Extraordinary in scope, containing not only unusual but classic pieces of the ceramic art, it fulfills the donor’s dream of creating a model collection for a museum of this size.”23 The many exceptional objects featured in this volume speak to Wilson’s legacy.

The large gifts from the Wilson collection in the early 1950s were followed by other important developments in the decorative arts and porcelain. In 1955, James Rorimer (1905–1966), who began his career as an assistant in the Department of Decorative Arts, was appointed director. It was said that under Rorimer, the decorative arts “flourished as they had in the old days under Morgan.”24 In 1958, the Museum received an extraordinary gift of French decorative arts from the Samuel H. Kress Foundation, which included 53 Sévres porcelain vases and objects and 17 pieces of Sévres porcelain-mounted furniture from the Hillingdon Collection in England (fig. 13, entries 59, 60).25 This windfall gave the Museum the best collections of Sévres porcelain outside of Europe.

Judge Irwin Untermyer collected in a variety of fields, including English furniture and silver, embroidery and needlework, enamels, and medieval and Renaissance bronzes. His superb ceramic collection was primarily made up of eighteenth-century English and German porcelain, with important figures and large vases made at Chelsea (entry 84) and Meissen (entry 18). Indeed, the Museum’s collection of English porcelain is indebted to Untermyer above all others. Upon visiting his Fifth Avenue apartment in 1955, Meissen collector Ralph H. Wark (1902–1987) described the judge’s collection:

His porcelains, needless to say are out of this world. The Morgan Collection at Hartford is unimportant compared to what the Judge owns. His Kaendler Crinolines are complete except for one known piece. And the quality is unequalled anywhere, since he has exchanged each group or harlequin at least 3 or 4 times, a[ll]ways getting a finer specimen in colors and condition. He owns some 50 Meissen birds, but also an unsurpassed 50 Chelsea birds. His AR-Vases in sets up to Garnitures of 5 pieces were only to be seen in the former Dresden collection.26

Untermyer, who was a former justice of the New York State Supreme Court, bequeathed to the Museum his entire collection, which consisted of over 2,129 objects, including 859 examples of porcelain and pottery (fig. 14).

Jack and Belle Linsky also formed an expansive collection that embraced a range of subjects and media: Renaissance and Baroque bronzes, goldsmiths’ work, jewelry, enamels, furniture, and Dutch, Flemish, French, German, and Italian paintings. It was in

fig. 14 View of Irwin Untermyer’s apartment at 960 Fifth Avenue, New York, 1970, showing porcelain on display
the field of European porcelain that the Linskys were first recognized as "serious collectors" (fig. 15).27 Their collection of Austrian, French, German, and Italian porcelain contained over 200 figures, many illustrating subjects from commedia dell'arte (entries 22, 23, 32). The Linskys also collected Danish and Russian porcelain figures of peasants and tradesmen—an area unique to their collection. Unlike museum-minded collectors like Wilson and Untermyer, the Linskys rarely consulted experts and acquired pieces based solely on personal preference. In 1982, Mrs. Linsky bequeathed the entire collection to the Museum with the stipulation that it would be kept together in perpetuity in the Jack and Belle Linsky Galleries.

Lesley G. and Emma A. Sheafer made no indication that their collection of European paintings and decorative arts, including nearly 400 ceramics, would one day be given to the Museum (fig. 16). The Museum only learned of the generous bequest through a notice of probate sent in the mail after Mrs. Sheafer’s death in 1973.28 The Sheafers started collecting in the 1920s, buying American paintings and drawings and eighteenth-century British and French furniture, and after World War II, they focused on French and German decorative arts and furniture. Mrs. Sheafer continued to grow the collection following her husband’s death in 1956, acquiring additional important examples of porcelain from dealers in New York and Munich.29 A particular strength of the
One of the outstanding events was one visit to the G. Leslie [sic] Sheafer’s. This is a collection hardly anybody ever gets to see, since the Sheafer’s [sic] are very reticent and will not let anybody in New York into their home. They have unique things. . . . Their porcelains are in quality as fine as Untermyer’s but not as numerous. They were most gracious to us . . . although it is said that they criticize [sic] everyone who has been to see them.30

A description of Mrs. Sheafer’s apartment in 1960 also offers insight into the porcelain collection and the manner in which it was displayed: “Her porcelain collection includes pieces from the leading German and French factories. Of the more than fifty birds, most were modeled by Kändler of Meissen. The wall brackets on which these are displayed and the numerous sconces in carved wood, porcelain, and ormolu show interesting variety of design in the asymmetrical scroll.”31 Porcelain birds, displayed on Rococo wall brackets, featured prominently in the residences of many twentieth-century American collectors, including Untermyer and the Wrightsmans.

The most important and generous donors to French decorative arts at the Museum have been Charles B. Wrightsman and his wife, Jayne, who began to collect in 1952 (fig. 17). Their collection, one of the finest in the country, includes furniture and paintings, as well as a significant group of Sévres and Meissen porcelain. Many objects on view in the Wrightsman Galleries and period rooms were given from the Wrightsmans’ private collection (entries 58, 70). Many other objects have been acquired for the Museum through the Wrightsman Fund (entries 21, 73, 77).

Opulent garnitures of large vases with prominent gilt decoration, like those made at Sévres or at Chelsea during the Gold Anchor period (1758–69), appealed to many collectors, and due to their gifts and bequests, the Museum is now strong in these styles. From a quieter aesthetic, however, is the well-informed collection of early Worcester porcelain assembled by New York stockbroker Marcel H. Stieglitz (ca. 1900?–1962). Stieglitz began to collect Worcester in the 1930s, focusing on the factory’s early production. In 1947 his collection was loaned to the Art Institute of Chicago for a special exhibition, and the accompanying catalogue featured an introduction by renowned porcelain expert W. B. Honey, who was then Keeper of the Department of Ceramics at the Victoria and Albert

fig. 16 View of Emma A. Sheafer’s apartment at 45 East 66th Street, New York, ca. 1973, showing cabinet with ceramics

fig. 17 Portrait of Jayne Wrightsman at home, 1963
Museum.32 After Mr. Stieglitz’s death, the collection was donated to the Museum in 1964 by his wife, Constance D. Stieglitz (1901–1994), providing the Museum with an impressive holding of early Worcester porcelain (entry 87).

Another collection with a very defined focus entered the Museum’s holdings in 1995 when it received a gift of nearly 300 examples of comparative European and Asian ceramics acquired by the Swiss-born collector Hans Syz (1894–1991). Dr. Syz, a psychiatrist living in Connecticut, was interested in Asian prototypes for European models and patterns. His gift also included important additions to the Museum’s collection of Du Paquier porcelain (fig. 18). Syz donated his large collection of Meissen porcelain to the Smithsonian Institution.33 Douglas Dillon (1909–2003), an investment banker and distinguished government official, served the Museum in an executive capacity for more than fifty years, including a term as president and as chairman of the board of trustees. He and his wife were collectors of French eighteenth-century and Impressionist art, as well as Asian art, which they supported generously at the Museum. Dillon also contributed to the collection of European porcelain, according the Museum a highly important group of Capodimonte figures (entries 6, 7A).

Since the 1980s, the Museum has made significant strides in the field of nineteenth-century porcelain (entries 74–78). These acquisitions, most of which were made by purchase, were spearheaded by Clare
Le Corbeiller (1931–2003), one of the first curators in this country to systematically collect nineteenth-century ceramics that had been commonly regarded in recent history as merely derivative or even in bad taste. Increasing the nineteenth-century holdings remains a priority for the department, and the acquisition in 2013 of the Robert A. Ellison Jr. collection of European Art Pottery from 1880 to 1930 has transformed the Museum’s ceramic collection. Though primarily composed of stoneware—the preferred medium of art potters—the Ellison collection includes several significant works in porcelain, such as five monumental vases by Ernest Chaplet (1835–1909) (fig. 19). Currently, as the Museum embarks on a major renovation of the British Galleries, there has been particular interest in British ceramics, with important acquisitions of Chelsea and Bow porcelain (entries 79, 80, 82, 86).

The history of the collection of European porcelain at The Metropolitan Museum of Art echoes global trends in porcelain collecting at the highest level. Due to the generosity of a handful of important collectors who were equipped with opportunity, means, and discrimination, the Museum is now able to present the public with the incredible story of porcelain in Europe, as shown through its finest examples.

4. MMA 94.4.290, .291.
6. Some were also later sold by Jack Morgan in the 1940s.
10. McClellan 1946, p. 3.
11. A guidebook written by Mr. McClellan was published posthumously, see McClellan 1946.
14. Ibid.
15. C. L. Avery 1957, p. 189.
18. See Le Corbeiller, interview by Zane, May 9, 2000 (see note 5 above), pp. 25–26, for Wilson’s visits to the Museum by taxi after making a purchase from a dealer.
20. Francis Henry Taylor, quoted in ibid.
26. Ralph H. Wark to Ryland Scott, March 30, 1955, Stout Archives, Dixon Gallery and Gardens, Memphis, Tenn., box 4, folder 1 (copy in the curatorial files, Department of European Sculpture and Decorative Arts, The Metropolitan Museum of Art). ”AR-Vases” refers to Meissen vases marked with the monogram AR (Augustus Rex), which often appears on pieces made for Augustus the Strong, elector of Saxony, king of Poland.
30. Wark to Scott, March 30, 1955 (see note 26 above).
33. For more on the Syz Collection, see Richards 2017.
1. Ewer

**MEDICI PORCELAIN WORKSHOP, ITALIAN (FLORENCE), CA. 1575–87**

ca. 1575–87

Soft-paste porcelain decorated in underglaze blue

8 × 4 ¼ × 4 ⁷⁄₈ in. (20.3 × 10.8 × 12.4 cm)

Gift of J. Pierpont Morgan, 1917 17.190.2045

**MARKS:** painted on underside: dome of Florence Cathedral, letter F below, flanked by dots (possibly for Francesco I de’ Medici), both in underglaze blue

**CONSTRUCTION/CONDITION:** wheel-thrown with modeled and applied spout and handles; repair to rim

**PROVENANCE:** Sir William Richard Drake, London (by 1873–d. 1890); heirs of Sir William Richard Drake (1890–96; sale, Christie’s, London, July 17, 1896, no. 433; [Durlacher Brothers, London]; John Edward Taylor, London (until d. 1905; to his widow, Martha), Martha Taylor (1905–d. 1912, sale, Christie’s, London, July 1–4, 9–10, 1912, no. 136); [Durlacher Brothers, London, 1912], perhaps on commission from Morgan; J. Pierpont Morgan, London and New York (1912–d. 1913; to his son, J. P. Morgan); J. P. Morgan Jr., New York (1913–17; on loan to MMA 1913–16; given in his father’s name to MMA)


This small ewer reflects both the ambition and sophistication of the Medici porcelain workshop established during the late 1560s within the Casino di San Marco in Florence. The Casino was constructed between 1568 and 1574 as a residence for Francesco I de’ Medici (1541–1587), and the building housed numerous workshops that produced luxury goods made from precious metals, rock crystal, richly colored hardstones, and glass for the Medici. Decorative objects, such as vases, ewers, and standing cups made from exotic materials, were standard components of princely collections as well as gold mounts manufactured to enhance the luxurious aspect of these pieces.

Porcelains imported from China were avidly acquired by royal and aristocratic collectors, and the Florentine workshop were the first to attempt production of this highly valued material in Europe. Documents indicate artificial porcelain was in production in the Casino workshops by 1575, and while technical challenges persisted throughout the small factory’s existence, the surviving examples of Medici porcelain demonstrate that the workshop’s potters produced both forms and types of decoration that consistently tested the limits of new technology.

The potters worked in the Casino alongside other court artisans who produced objects in a variety of media, and documents from that period record Francesco’s keen interest in these various techniques and enterprises. The Italian court designer and architect Bernardo Buontalenti (Italian, 1536–1608) appears to have guided Francesco’s taste and exerted both direct and indirect influence on the various court workshops, although his precise role in the production of Medici porcelain has not yet been determined. While Buontalenti was responsible for the initial experiments to discover a formula for porcelain, his involvement with specific designs for pieces is uncertain. However, he supplied drawings for objects to be made in other media, and the vessels made from rock crystal with colored hardstones in silver or gold in the Casino workshops must have served as prototypes for the forms of many of the pieces of Medici porcelain. The shapes of the porcelain ewers, in particular, echo the ones made from rock crystal and lapis lazuli produced or mounted in the Casino workshops. While exact parallels between the form of the Museum’s ewer and those contemporary examples made in other materials have not been found, some of the hardstone ewers from the Medici collections suggest that similar objects must have provided models for the Casino potters. The distinctive arched handle created from the two scrolls at the top of the ewer as well as the faceted spout are derived from metalwork examples, while the handle also recalls some of the mounts made in gold that were applied to hardstone vessels.
The Museum’s ewer is painted in cobalt blue with meandering leafy branches that terminate in prominent stylized flowers, and a standing male figure in classical dress appears directly below the spout. The cobalt-blue decoration inspired by Chinese blue-and-white porcelains is found in abundance in the Medici collections from the late sixteenth century. The scrolling, flowering branches are also derived from Chinese porcelain, and similar leafy vines with blossoms are among the most common motifs on the blue-and-white, Ming dynasty porcelains from the Xuande (1426–35) and Zhengde (1506–21) periods. It has been suggested by Clare Le Corbeiller that Iznik pottery from Turkey may have provided a stylistic influence as well, and a Medici inventory from 1592 to 1595 records “Levantine and domestic porcelain,” presumably alluding in part to wares imported from the Near East. The extent of the influence of Iznik pottery on the decoration of some Medici porcelain has been debated, but it is clear that a variety of sources inspired the painters in the Casino workshops. The incorporation of the male figure in classical dress on the Museum’s ewer indicates that slavish copying of specific decorative schemes was not the intended goal but suggests instead that a new decorative vocabulary was being developed, which allowed for the intermingling of motifs based on varied sources. The creativity of the Medici potters, and of all those who supplied designs to them, is evident in their embrace of both forms and decoration taken from different media and later combined in novel ways. The resulting wares, while strongly indebted to Chinese porcelain, were entirely European in spirit and reflect a remarkable artistic accomplishment due in large part to the enlightened patronage of Francesco I de’ Medici.

4. See note 1.
5. Hayward 1976, pl. 91 and p. 347.
6. See, for example, ibid., pl. 334; Martha McCrory in Medici, Michelangelo 2002, p. 256, no. 113, ill. p. 257; Mosco 2004, pp. 72, 76–77, 78, figs. 12, 16, 18.
8. More than a thousand pieces of Chinese porcelain were in the Medici collections by 1590; Thornton and T. Wilson 2009, vol. 2, p. 694. Imported porcelains were already in Medici collections by the fifteenth century and recorded in inventories made between 1456 and 1555; Le Corbeiller 1988, p. 122.
9. For example, see Harrison-Hall 2001, nos. 4.25, 8.12, 9.46; Ströber 2011, p. 52, no. 12, ill. p. 51.
11. Ibid., p. 124.
2. Dish

**MEDICI PORCELAIN WORKSHOP, ITALIAN (FLORENCE), CA. 1575–87**

c. 1575–80
Soft-paste porcelain decorated in underglaze blue
Irregular diameter: 2 1/4 × 13 ¾ × 13 ¼ in. (5.7 × 33.5 × 33.3 cm)
Samuel D. Lee Fund, 1941 41.49.6

**MARKS:** painted on underside: coronet and six balls of the Medici arms, *F M M* on three topmost balls, illegible initials (perhaps *E D II*) on remaining three balls (probably *F M M E D I I* for Franciscus Medici Magnus Dux Etruriae Dux II, Francesco I de’ Medici Second Grand Duke of Tuscany), all in underglaze blue

**CONSTRUCTION/CONDITION:** molded; chips at 3:00, 4:00, 5:30, glaze crizzled at 12 o’clock

**PROVENANCE:** [art market, Florence; to Foresi]; Alessandro Foresi, Florence; Eugène Piot, Paris (until 1860; his sale, Hôtel des Commissaires-Priseurs, Paris, March 19, 1860, no. 83); Baron Gustave de Rothschild, Paris (in 1882–d. 1911); by descent, Baron Henri Lambert, Brussels (until d. 1933; to his widow, Johanna); Baroness Rothschild-Lambert, New York (1933–41; sale, Parke-Bernet, New York, March 7, 1941, no. 110; sold to MMA)


**LITERATURE:** Foresi 1859/1869, pp. 19, 29, no. 2; Hôtel des Commissaires-Priseurs 1860, no. 83; Fortnum 1873, p. lxvi; Davillier 1882, p. 115, no. 30; Grollier 1914, p. 358, no. 2308 (30); Hannover 1925, vol. 3, p. 13; Liverani 1936, pp. 25–26, no. 10, ill.; C. L. Avery 1941, p. 232; Parke-Bernet 1941, no. 110; C. L. Avery 1949b, no. 371; Lane 1954, pp. 4–5.

The soft-paste porcelain objects produced by the Medici workshops in Florence during the last quarter of the sixteenth century represent the first successful attempts at fabricating porcelain in Europe.¹ The ceramic body made by the Medici potters was an artificial porcelain, lacking the essential ingredients of true porcelain, as found in the Chinese porcelains prized in fifteenth- and sixteenth-century Europe. However, the hard, white Medici porcelain simulated Chinese porcelain, even if the former was composed of elements that were more closely related to the composition of early twelfth-century fritware ceramics produced in the Near East.² Chinese porcelains were valued for the whiteness of the clay body, the intense blues of the cobalt decoration, their translucency, as well as their durability, and the Medici collections were particularly rich in porcelains imported from Asia.³ Cosimo I de’ Medici (1519–1574) must have had the goal of imitating Chinese porcelain when he established a ceramic workshop in the Casino di San Marco in Florence in the late 1560s; however, porcelain was not successfully produced until shortly after his death in 1574.⁴ The oft-quoted observation of a Venetian ambassador to Florence in 1575 indicates that porcelain was being manufactured by that date: "Grand-Duke Francesco de’ Medici has found the way of making Indian [i.e., Asian] porcelain, and in his experiments has succeeded in equaling its quality—its transparency, hardness, lightness, and delicacy; it has taken him ten years to discover the secret, but a Levantine showed him the way to success."⁵ The reference to the role played by a potter from the Levant or Eastern Mediterranean may explain the similarity of the...
composition of the Medici porcelain to other ceramic bodies produced in this region, which were also intended to imitate Chinese porcelain.

Soft-paste porcelain was produced in the Medici porcelain workshops from 1575 to about 1587, the same year Francesco I de’ Medici died, though it is possible that production continued on a much-reduced basis until around 1620. While documents indicate Medici porcelain was made in sufficient quantity to allow approximately 300 pieces to be recorded in the Medici collection in the early eighteenth century, there are only around sixty to seventy pieces known to have survived today. As writers have indicated, the experimental nature of the Medici enterprise is apparent in the surviving pieces. Technical flaws, from slightly warped forms caused by the high heat
King Saul was intended to offer a parallel to the life of Cosimo, who died shortly before the dish was made, as both rulers were distinguished by their military and political successes, as well as their bravery.\(^\text{12}\)

The technical challenges inherent in firing Medici porcelain, and especially an object of this scale, are evident in the faint slope to the rim, in the slight warping seen throughout, in the blurring of some of the cobalt decoration, and in the areas where the glaze has bubbled to a certain extent, but this dish nevertheless is a remarkable artistic achievement, realized in the new medium of porcelain. Further developments in the production of porcelain in Europe were not to take place for around another one hundred years, nor was Medici porcelain an influence on those potters working in France during the late seventeenth century. Without the patronage of Francesco, production of Medici porcelain ceased and escaped artistic and collecting attention until the late 1850s, when the art dealer Alessandro Foresi recognized a ceramic flask as a piece of Medici porcelain.\(^\text{13}\) Foresi’s publication in 1859 regarding his discovery ignited a keen interest in Europe’s first porcelain, which has persisted to this day.\(^\text{14}\)

1 Documentation evidence reveals there were experiments to make porcelain undertaken elsewhere in Italy earlier in the sixteenth century, but no surviving objects can be linked to these efforts; Thornton and T. Wilson 2009, vol. 2, p. 694.
2 The composition of the Medici porcelain body has been described as “white clay from Vicenza, fine white sand, powdered rock crystal and marzacotto (sand, salt, and calcinated wine dregs)”; Alan P. Darr in Darr, Barnet, and Boström 2002, vol. 1, p. 226.
8 Differing numbers of surviving pieces of Medici porcelain have been published, and a definitive list does not exist to the author’s knowledge.
9 See, for example, Darr in Darr, Barnet, and Boström 2002, vol. 1, p. 226.
10 Le Corbeiller 1988, p. 125.
12 Ibid.
13 See Le Corbeiller 1988, p. 119.
14 Foresi 1859/1869.
3. Tray (one of a set)

CARLO GINORI FACTORY, ITALIAN (DOCCIA), 1737–PRESENT

Decoration attributed to Carl Wendelin Anreiter von Ziernfeld (Slovakian, 1702–1747)

1745–47

Hard-paste porcelain decorated in polychrome enamels and gold

1 ³⁄₈ × 12 ¹⁄₈ × 9 ¹⁄₂ in. (3.5 × 30.8 × 23.5 cm)

Rogers Fund, 1906 06.372b

MARKS: unmarked

INSCRIPTIONS: incised on underside: s v v

CONSTRUCTION/CONDITION: molded; firing flaw on underside

PROVENANCE: [Harding, 1906; sold to MMA]


THE FIRST FACTORY IN ITALY TO PRODUCE HARD-PASTE PORCELAIN was founded in Venice in 1720 by Francesco Vezzi (Italian, 1651–1740), but this enterprise was short-lived and closed in 1727. A far more ambitious and successful hard-paste porcelain factory was established ten years later outside of Florence at Doccia by Carlo Ginori (Italian, 1702–1757), and it became one of the most significant European factories during the eighteenth century. The Doccia factory, as it is commonly known, continued after Ginori’s death and remained under family control until merging with a Milanese firm at the end of the nineteenth century, but Doccia’s period of greatest artistic innovation took place under Carlo Ginori’s directorship from 1737 to 1757.1

Considerable recent scholarship on the Ginori factory has underscored both the political circumstances in Florence at the time the factory was established and the importance of Ginori’s role in the factory’s founding and early growth.2 The death in 1737 of the last Medici to rule Florence, Grand Duke Gian Gastone (1671–1737), shifted control of the region to the House of Habsburg-Lorraine in Vienna.

fig. 20 Jacopo Ligozzi, Donna di Caramania (Woman from Caramania), ca. 1615. Tempera on paper, 20 ½ × 15 ¾ in. (52 × 39 cm). Galleria degli Uffizi (Polo Museale Fiorentino), Florence (inv. no. 2950 F)
Ginori’s keen interest and active involvement in the factory’s production are well documented. Trained as a chemist, he provided the technological expertise in the area of pastes, glazes, and enamels. It appears that Ginori began experimenting with ceramics as early as 1734, but it was during a trip to Vienna to acknowledge the new rulers of Florence in 1737 that he met two workers at the Claudius Innocentius Du Paquier factory, who would become instrumental to the new factory’s success. Ginori was able to entice the painter Carl Wendelin Anreiter von Ziernefeld (Slovakian, 1702–1747) and kiln master Giorgio delle Torri (culture unknown, active at Doccia 1737–43) to Florence to assist with Ginori’s experiments. In addition, he hired sculptor Gaspero Bruschi (Italian, 1710–1780) and chemist Jacopo Fanciullacci (Italian, 1705–1793), and soon the Ginori factory was in a position to secure patents in 1741, by which time its first porcelains were in production.

This tray dates from 1745 to 1747, the years in which the factory began producing on a commercial scale. An inventory taken after the death of Ginori in 1757 indicates that it was one of twenty oval trays that, along with two round plates, were decorated with “Turkish figures.” In addition, the inventory notes that these figures derived from a painted manuscript housed in the Gaddi library, a scholarly library in Florence founded in the sixteenth century. The figures in the manuscript were painted by Jacopo Ligozzi (Italian, 1547–1627), a prolific artist who became a court painter to the Medicis. The majority of Ligozzi’s figures depict men and women from the Ottoman Empire, and their costumes and hats are as much his focus as are their facial features. Ligozzi appears to have based many of his depictions on those found in the manuscript housed in the Gaddi library.
in Nicolas de Nicolay’s (French, 1517–1583) *Les navigations, peregrinations et voyages, faicts en la Turquie* (1576), although Ligozzi has added animals that figure prominently in each of his compositions. Both the manuscript with Ligozzi’s figures and the book by de Nicolay reflect the deep interest in publications that recorded figures and customs from foreign lands, especially those deemed to be “exotic” by western Europeans in the late sixteenth and seventeenth centuries.

Three of the eleven surviving trays and plates are now in the Museum (figs. 21, 22). One tray depicts a woman from Caramania (referring to a part of Asia Minor) as identified in Ligozzi’s painting (fig. 20); a second illustrates a man whose origin is not cited by Ligozzi but identified in *Les navigations* as “Sacquaz from a Moorish country, a porter of water and pilgrim of Mecca”; and the third portrays a Turkish youth whom Ligozzi titles “a page of the grand Turk.” The figures on the Museum’s trays and the animals that accompany them closely copy those painted by Ligozzi, and even the palette used by the Doccia painter reflects the same employed by Ligozzi, suggesting that the manuscript was made available to the factory for copying. The quality of the decoration on the porcelain is extremely high, and it has been traditionally attributed to Anreiter, the painter from Vienna cited above, who may have been aided by his son Anton Anreiter van Ziernfeld (1727–1801). The borders of the New York trays and other surviving examples are decorated with large-scale sprays of naturalistic flowers that are similar stylistically to those frequently found on Du Paquier porcelain, reflecting both Anreiter’s prior employment by the Viennese factory and the role that factory played in the formation of Ginori’s enterprise. In contrast to Du Paquier porcelain, however, the hard-paste body made by Doccia was noticeably gray in tone. While the pastes employed by the factory varied considerably over a period of several decades, the development of a porcelain paste deemed to be sufficiently white remained a technical challenge through the end of the eighteenth century. The gray bodies of the Museum’s trays in addition to a certain coarseness to the paste points to a relatively early date of manufacture, and this supposition is reinforced by the incised numbers or letters on the back of one of the trays.

1 For a history of the factory, see Agliano 2005a; Biancalana 2005; Biancalana 2009; Agliano 2010; Biancalana 2011; Agliano 2013; Agliano 2014, pp. 272–74.
2 Agliano 2010.
3 Ibid., p. 79.
4 Biancalana 2005, p. 16.
5 There are variants to the way delle Torri’s name is spelled, including Georg Deledori and Giorgio Delle Dori.
6 Biancalana 2005, p. 73.
7 Agliano 2010, p. 80.
8 Andreina d’Agliano in Kräftner 2005, pp. 380–81, no. 239. When known, the locations of the other eight are cited.
9 See Kräftner 2005, p. 384.
10 The inscription on the tempera reads: ADICCI OGLANI/ SONO GLI PAGGI DEL GRÁ TURCHO; see Forlani 1982, p. 95.
11 Agliano 2010, p. 80.
12 See, for example, Zelleke 2009a, p. 400, fig. 4:129.
13 Agliano 2010, p. 79.
14 Agliano 2005a; Biancalana 2005.

**fig. 21** Tray, 1745–47. Carlo Ginori factory, Italian (Doccia), 1737–present. Decoration attributed to Carl Wendelin Anreiter von Ziernfeld (Slovakian, 1702–1747). Hard-paste porcelain decorated in polychrome enamels and gold, 1 3/8 × 12 1/8 × 9 1/4 in. (3.5 × 30.8 × 23.5 cm). The Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York, Rogers Fund, 1906 (06.372a)

**fig. 22** Tray, 1745–47. Carlo Ginori factory, Italian (Doccia), 1737–present. Decoration attributed to Carl Wendelin Anreiter von Ziernfeld (Slovakian, 1702–1747). Hard-paste porcelain decorated in polychrome enamels and gold, 1 3/8 × 12 1/8 × 9 1/4 in. (3.5 × 30.8 × 23.5 cm). The Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York, Rogers Fund, 1906 (06.372c)
4. Dish with stenciled decoration

CARLO GINORI FACTORY, ITALIAN (DOCCIA), 1737–PRESENT
Ca. 1745
Hard-paste porcelain decorated in underglaze blue
Irregular diameter: 1¾ × 13 × 13¼ in. (4.4 × 33 × 33.7 cm)
The Charles E. Sampson Memorial Fund, 1990 1990.312

MARKS: painted on underside: dome of Florence Cathedral in underglaze blue

CONSTRUCTION/CONDITION: molded; discoloration from firing on underside and crawling of glaze

PROVENANCE: Robert L. Michael, Millwood, Virginia (by 1980–90; sold to MMA)

LITERATURE: Munger 2007a, p. 23, fig. 4

The Carlo Ginori Factory, founded at Doccia outside of Florence in 1737, developed a notably wide repertoire of decorative techniques for its wares. Unusually, many of these techniques not only were distinct from one another but were in use more or less simultaneously, which speaks to the factory’s artistic ambitions. A number of these styles practiced at Doccia were unique to the factory, and the most extraordinary involved the use of stencils by which the decoration was applied. This technique became known as a stampino, though the term was not used in the eighteenth century, and the stenciled designs were always executed in cobalt blue, as seen on this dish. Due to the high-firing temperature of cobalt oxide, it could be applied to the biscuit porcelain (fired but not glazed) and then fired at the same time as the transparent lead glaze that covered it, which reduced the total number of firings per object. Furthermore, the use of stencils meant that a relatively unskilled painter could apply the decoration, which was particularly useful at the Ginori factory during its early years when it was establishing its labor force.

The stencils employed for the decoration were made from either paper, parchment, or a thin sheet of copper with the form of the object dictating the material of the stencil. Dishes and plates decorated a stampino commonly follow a standard formula that included a spray of flowers in the center with a surrounding border decoration composed of floral motifs usually linked by C-scrolls. Documents from that time period indicate stenciled motifs were inspired by real flowers, as a letter dated to 1755 identifies a book with flowers that could be copied for copper stencils. The complexity of the stenciled designs varied, and numerous small dishes were produced in which both the borders and central decoration consisted of simple floral motifs assembled in spare compositions. In contrast, the Museum's dish is one of the most elaborate of the stenciled works produced at the Ginori factory, with an unusually dense border design and a more complex central composition. The components of the border pattern are very similar to those found on several Ginori dishes but do not appear to be identical, suggesting that as stencils wore out new ones were made based upon the earlier models, however, with inevitable slight variations occurring. It is easy to imagine that the use of a simple decorative technique at Doccia might have been confined to objects to which stencils could be easily applied, such as dishes or plates, or to modest works for which the cost of polychrome decoration could not be justified. Clearly, however, the Ginori factory did not regard a stampino decoration as artistically inferior, and a variety of ambitious objects, including large, two-handled covered pots, coffeepots, baskets, and tureens with stands, were decorated in this manner and attest to the perceived desirability of this particular style.
The underside of the Museum’s dish is marked with the dome of the Florence Cathedral, also in underglaze blue, which is the same mark often found on the Medici porcelain produced in Florence approximately 170 years earlier (entry 1). While the soft-paste porcelain made in the Medici workshops during the late sixteenth century was a short-lived venture, it was one of the most technically and artistically challenging undertakings of the court under Francesco I de’ Medici (1541–1587), and Carlo Ginori’s (Italian, 1702–1757) choice of this same mark can only be interpreted as his affirmation of the significance of his own ceramic accomplishments at Doccia. The blue-and-white color scheme of a stampino decoration recalls that of Medici porcelain, which is rooted directly in the Chinese porcelain that defined ceramics of the highest refinement in the European mind during this period. While the motifs chosen for both the Medici porcelain and Ginori’s a stampino wares were European in character rather than Chinese, the choice of cobalt-blue decoration at Doccia can be read as a deliberate link to Chinese porcelain and to the Medici’s attempts to re-create it. It is likely that Ginori regarded the dome mark as conferring a kind of legitimacy to his young ceramic enterprise, while simultaneously suggesting a continuity of inventiveness within Florence’s long-established and rich artistic tradition.

1 One of the terms for this technique that appears to have been used at the time of manufacture is a stampa (Biancalana 2009, p. 146), but the style may have been known simply as blau a fiori (with blue flowers; see Alessandro Biancalana in “Victoria and Albert Museum Collection” 2013, pp. 50–51, nos. 25, 26).
2 Biancalana in “Victoria and Albert Museum Collection” 2013, pp. 50–51.
4 Biancalana 2009, p. 147.
5 For example, see Biancalana in “Victoria and Albert Museum Collection” 2013, pp. 50–51, nos. 25, 26.
6 See the dish illustrated in Biancalana 2009, p. 147.
7 Agliano 1999, p. 22, fig. 2; Christie’s, Genoa, sale cat., June 19–20, 2000, no. 377 (sale held at Proprietà Galletto, Genoa).
10 Collezione Cagnola 1999, p. 296, no. 317.
5. Rape of Proserpina

CARLO GINORI FACTORY, ITALIAN (DOCCIA), 1737–PRESENT
Gaspero Bruschi (Italian, ca. 1710–1780, active 1737–80)
After a model by Giovanni Battista Foggini (Italian, 1652–1725)
ca. 1750
Hard-paste porcelain
19 1/2 × 13 ⁷⁄₈ × 9 ³⁄₈ in. (49.5 × 35.2 × 23.8 cm)
Purchase, Gift of Irwin Untermyer, by exchange, 1997 1997.377

MARKS: unmarked

CONSTRUCTION/CONDITION: press-molded, currently with metal dowel connecting figure to modern wood base; flames of base heavily restored, restoration to proper right leg of Pluto, replacement fingers on Proserpina’s proper right hand, prominent firing cracks on backs of figures, discoloration of glaze in areas

PROVENANCE: possibly Paul Ayshford, 4th Baron Methuen by 1951; then by descent to Anthony John Methuen, 6th Baron Methuen (d. ca. 1996); [William Agnew, London, until 1997; sold to MMA]

LITERATURE: Clare Le Corbeiller in “Recent Acquisitions” 1998, p. 35, ill.; Winter 2003, p. 23, fig. 17; Munger 2007a, p. 23, fig. 8

CARLO GINORI’S (ITALIAN, 1702–1757) AMBITIONS FOR HIS NEWLY formed porcelain factory in the small town of Doccia, Italy, are best reflected by an extraordinary sculptural program that he initiated in the early 1740s.7 He began actively acquiring sculptural molds and models in order to reproduce ancient, Renaissance, and Baroque sculptures in porcelain, which was an unprecedented undertaking for any eighteenth-century European manufactory. Approximately ten years earlier, the Meissen factory in Germany inaugurated the production of its porcelain menagerie (entry 21), which was an equally ambitious project, but its aims were different in that they involved creating new models for which there were no points of comparison. In contrast, Ginori was intent on reproducing many of the most famous sculptural works housed in Italian collections and by which the new medium of porcelain would be judged against bronzes and marbles of exceptional quality.

From necessity, Ginori’s task involved the production of porcelain sculptures on a scale that would test the limits of the medium. While the scale of each work to be reproduced was determined by the chosen model, the range of sculptures selected were of a size that ensured Ginori’s reproductions would have few precedents in porcelain. His goal was to produce serious works of sculpture entirely independent of the decorative role customarily assigned to most porcelain sculpture made elsewhere in Europe at the time and largely confined to the dessert table. It is notable this project was undertaken while the factory was engaged in producing a wide range of useful and decorative wares that had few, if any, points of intersection with the sculptural program.

Based on surviving contemporary documents, the best-known aspect of Ginori’s sculptural ambitions was his acquisition of molds and models of works made by the leading masters of the Florentine Baroque. Ginori’s first efforts focused on acquiring molds produced by the prolific Massimiliano Soldani Benzi (Italian, 1656–1740), who had retired in 1737 without leaving a practicing workshop. Through one of Soldani Benzi’s pupils, Ginori began purchasing plaster molds in 1743, eventually acquiring all of the molds inherited by the sculptor’s eldest son.2 Ginori also wished to reproduce works made by Soldani Benzi’s primary rival, Giovanni Battista Foggini (Italian, 1652–1725), who, in contrast to Soldani Benzi, left an active workshop upon his death. Thus, the molds were not made available for purchase to Ginori, but Foggini’s eldest son, Vincenzo Foggini (Italian, 1692–active until 1755), created wax models from his father’s molds for Ginori’s use. The workers at Doccia were able to create new molds from the wax models, which could then be used to produce the porcelain versions.3

The most technically challenging of Foggini’s bronzes to re-create in porcelain must have been the Rape of Proserpina. In Foggini’s composition, Pluto is depicted in full stride with his weight carried entirely on his right leg and his left leg extended behind. He holds Proserpina aloft,
clutching her torso while her outstretched arms and legs communicate her forced abduction. The strong sense of movement conveyed through the poses of the figures is reinforced by the billowing drapery worn and the flames on which Pluto stands, symbolizing their descent to the underworld. The Doccia group closely follows Foggini’s bronze dated to around 1690. The porcelain version varies only in minor aspects, which include a slightly different orientation to Pluto’s head and more extensive drapery to obscure his nudity. The most remarkable difference between the two works is not visible but concerns the extraordinary balance that is a defining characteristic of the porcelain group. The thrusting forward motion of Foggini’s composition is all the more dramatic when seen in porcelain, because there is an intuitive understanding on the part of the viewer that this has been accomplished in spite of the medium’s inherent fragility. Given the strength of bronze, the balance achieved by Foggini’s figures in this composition is impressive, but to have depicted this balance in a medium defined in part by its brittleness lends the porcelain version a truly startling impact.

It is almost certain that metal pins were used to strengthen the various components of the porcelain group at the time of manufacture, and a metal pin secured that entire group to whatever base originally supported it. The group was constructed from seven separately fabricated sections; however, repairs made at various instances in the object’s history have introduced new metal pins that make it very difficult—even with the aid of X-rays—to determine the original internal metal reinforcement. With the addition of metal supports the group pushed the limits and capabilities of porcelain, which the prominent firing cracks running through the backs of each figure attest.

The factory at Doccia produced a substantial number of sculptures from the late 1740s until the time of Ginori’s death in 1757. The stylistic breadth of the works chosen for reproduction was vast and ranges from compositions relatively modest in both scale and design to works of extraordinary size and complexity. Many of the porcelain sculptures were left undecorated, perhaps in emulation of their marble originals or to reflect the uniform coloration of the bronze surfaces that they copied. Similar to the bronzes, the play of light over the glazed porcelain enlivened the surface and differentiated smooth flesh from complex drapery. Other sculptures were decorated with polychrome enamels, which resulted in an entirely different aesthetic impact. Despite Ginori’s obvious commitment to his program to reproduce a broad array of some of the most significant historic and modern sculpture in the medium of porcelain, this aspect of his enterprise was not a commercial success. The technical challenges were impossible to overcome entirely, and many of his most accomplished sculptures embody the ultimately awkward marriage of the new medium of porcelain with the demands of large-scale, complex sculptural compositions. The Rape of Proserpina reflects one of Ginori’s most successful attempts to employ porcelain as a serious medium for sculptural expression.
6. The Mourning Virgin and Saint John the Evangelist

CAPODIMONTE FACTORY, ITALIAN (NAPLES), 1740/43–59
Giuseppe Gricci (Italian, ca. 1700–1770)
ca. 1744
Soft-paste porcelain
.1: 15 ⁵⁄₈ × 9 × 7 ⁷⁄₈ in. (39.7 × 22.9 × 18.7 cm)
.2: 18 ¹/₁₄ × 8 × 8 in. (46.4 × 20.3 × 20.3 cm)
Gift of Douglas Dillon, 1971 1971.92.1, .2

MARKS: .1 incised on underside: g.gricc; .2 unmarked

CONSTRUCTION/CONDITION: .1 press-molded; firing cracks in back, on side, and through base (crack on proper left base filled with ground porcelain and refired); .2 press-molded; slumped forward in firing, firing cracks in base and proper left knee, yellowish cast to glaze especially on base and back


THE SOFT-PASTE PORCELAIN FACTORY AT CAPODIMONTE WAS established in 1743, but experiments to produce porcelain in Naples may have begun three to six years earlier.¹ Due to the king of Naples, Charles III’s (1716–1788) interest in porcelain, initial attempts were made to produce the ceramic ware, but at the same time it remains unclear the degree to which his wife, Maria Amalia of Saxony (1724–1760), encouraged his involvement. The granddaughter of August II (1670–1733), commonly known as Augustus the Strong, elector of Saxony, king of Poland, and founder of the Meissen factory, Maria Amalia brought Meissen porcelain to Naples as part of her dowry in 1738,² but perhaps equally important, Charles III would have been well aware of the prestige conferred on her family as a result of Meissen’s success. The fact that he also founded royal workshops for tapestries and for pietre dure (hardstones) indicates Charles III’s recognition of both the political and economic advantages of an active royal patronage. By the early 1740s, a number of skilled artists and technicians had been engaged to further the king’s pursuit of porcelain, and sufficient progress was made by 1743 to warrant renovating a building on the grounds of the Royal Palace of Capodimonte, just outside of Naples, for the new porcelain factory. While the initial attempts to assemble a skilled workforce had presented obstacles,³ those ultimately hired for the most important positions established Capodimonte as one of the most artistically successful factories in Europe. With Gaetano Schepers (Italian, d. after 1764) in charge of the porcelain paste, Giovanni Caselli (Italian, 1698–1752) directing the painting workshop, and Giuseppe Gricci (Italian, ca. 1700–1770) in charge of the modelers, the factory produced works of remarkable distinction and variety.

The figures of The Mourning Virgin and Saint John the Evangelist are among the earliest sculptures made at Capodimonte and almost certainly date to 1744, a year after the factory moved into its official quarters. The base of the Virgin bears an incised g.gricc, and it is one of only two works known to have Gricci’s signature.⁴ The Mourning Virgin and Saint John are ascribed the date based on a documentary reference to a figure of the Pietà modeled by Gricci in March 1744 and to a Madonna that he modeled several months later, either of which might refer to the Museum’s Mourning Virgin.⁵ The two figures now at the Museum belong to a very small group of works made by Gricci in the years around 1744, and they are remarkable for their scale, their reductive but expressive modeling, and their emotive power.⁶ As has been noted by Angela Carola-Perrotti, the soft-paste body produced at Capodimonte was not conducive to modeling in fine detail,⁷ and Gricci seems to have recognized this constraint and responded with
a sculptural style in which simplified forms and gestures could be used to convey emotion and meaning to great effect.

The Mourning Virgin is depicted seated with her hands clasped, her neck extended back, and her head turned as she looks upward. Her anguish is conveyed by an open mouth and visible tears below her left eye. It is probable that The Mourning Virgin was originally part of a Crucifixion group, and her upward glance would have been directed at the figure of Christ on the Cross, now missing. The standing figure of Saint John is composed with his head in profile, looking down and supporting his chin with his hand in a pose traditionally associated with contemplation. Both figures are supported on bases suggestive of rockwork with irregular profiles. One side of each base is indented, suggesting they were intended to be joined with another base to support a figure now missing. While it is very likely that both figures now in New York were produced to be part of the same Crucifixion group, it is also possible that they were intended for ensembles of different compositions. It is difficult to imagine The Mourning Virgin in a composition
other than a Crucifixion group given her pose, but conceivable the Saint John was originally part of a Lamentation or Pietà group, which would make his downward glance more understandable.

Both figures reflect the early technical challenges encountered by the factory. The glaze on The Mourning Virgin is pitted in some areas and has bubbled in others, while the glaze of the Saint John has a slight but noticeable yellowish hue. There are small firing cracks in each figure, and the Saint John lists slightly to one side. However, these minor flaws do not diminish the artistic and emotional impact of the two figures. Gricci has created two porcelain sculptures that rival in their expressiveness the finest of Johann Joachim Kändler’s (German, 1706–1775) works at Meissen as well as the sculptures that would be produced at the Ginori factory in the town of Doccia within a few years (entry 5). It is all the more remarkable that Gricci could create these works with Capodimonte’s soft-paste body, which precluded the sculptural definition allowed by hard paste. Gricci has maximized the notably glassy glaze of the two figures to create a play of light that enlivens the surfaces, and the warm, creamy quality of the ceramic body, deliberately left undecorated, underscores the particular appeal of soft-paste porcelain.

1 For more information on the factory, see Stazzi 1972; Caròla-Perrotti 1986b; Caròla-Perrotti 2010, pp. 272–74.
2 Caròla-Perrotti 2013, p. 207.
3 Ibid.
4 In the literature on Capodimonte porcelain, The Mourning Virgin is commonly published as the only work signed by Gricci, but there is a figure of Saint John of the same model as that in the Museum that also bears Gricci’s signature, which appears as g_gricc. This figure was in a private collection in Italy when it was brought to the attention of the Museum in 1999. Information and photographs in the curatorial files, Department of European Sculpture and Decorative Arts, The Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York.
5 Stazzi 1972, p. 318. According to Stazzi, the reference to the Pietà is not to a group but rather to a single figure, which he suggests might be the Museum’s Mourning Virgin.
6 The group includes a Pietà group in the Museo Duca di Martina, Naples (Silvana Musella Guida in Porcellane di Capodimonte 1993, pp. 154–56, no. 86); a figure of Saint John of the same model as that in the Museum in a private collection, Italy; a figure of Saint John of a different model in the Museo Correale, Sorrento (Buccino Grimaldi and Cariello 1978, p. 113, no. 4, pl. lxxii); a Virgin of the Immaculate Conception, Museo di Capodimonte, Naples (Patrizia Piscitello in Sovrane fragilità 2007, p. 39, no. 14a, ill. p. 38); and a Corpus on the New York art market in 2011 (Caròla-Perrotti 1986a, p. 27, ill. nos. a–c).
7 Caròla-Perrotti 2010, p. 90.
GIUSEPPE GRICCI (ITALIAN, CA. 1700–1770) WAS ONE OF the most accomplished and prolific porcelain modelers of the eighteenth century and often compared to his contemporaries Johann Joachim Kändler (German, 1706–1775) at the Meissen porcelain factory in Germany (entry 22) and Franz Anton Bustelli (Swiss, d. 1763) at the Nymphenburg porcelain manufactory in Munich (entry 35) in terms of stature in the field of porcelain sculpture. Gricci’s work is remarkable for being executed in soft-paste porcelain, which did not permit the degree of detail or crispness that Kändler or Bustelli could achieve in working with the hard-paste porcelain.

Very little is known about Gricci’s career before he joined the Capodimonte factory; nonetheless, his name appears in the factory’s first personnel list dated November 1743.¹ Gricci arrived in Naples from Florence, where he presumably received his training, and some of his earliest work at Capodimonte reflects an influence of Florentine Baroque sculpture.² It is clear that Gricci was a skilled sculptor by the time of his employment, and he was soon appointed head modeler.

Giuseppe Gricci’s talents as a sculptor in the medium of porcelain were made apparent when a group of large religious figures (entry 6) were among the first works produced at Capodimonte during the mid-1740s. Shortly after these works appeared Gricci changed his focus and began producing a series of smaller figures that depict a wide range of secular subjects, including those drawn from daily life or from the commedia dell’arte. Gricci appears to have been influenced by numerous sources, but the majority of these figures produced during the second half of the 1740s to the mid-1750s share a number of characteristics. While the figures often have small heads, stocky or thickset limbs, and are simply defined, they nevertheless convey an expressiveness and sense of immediacy that distinguish them from figures made at

---

**7A. The Pottery Seller**

**CAPODIMONTE FACTORY, ITALIAN (NAPLES), 1740/43–59**

Model attributed to Giuseppe Gricci (Italian, ca. 1700–1770)

ca. 1745

Soft-paste porcelain decorated in polychrome enamels and gold

7 ⁷⁄₈ × 3 ⁵⁄₈ × 4 ¹⁄₈ in. (20 × 9.2 × 10.5 cm)

Gift of Douglas Dillon, 1982 1982.450.4

**MARKS:** painted on underside: fleur-de-lis in blue enamel

**CONSTRUCTION/CONDITION:** press-molded; numerous hairline cracks in back of figure, basket, and rock support

**PROVENANCE:** (sale, Christie’s, London, November 28, 1975, no. 34); Douglas Dillon (until 1982; to MMA)

**LITERATURE:** Christie’s 1975, no. 34, ill. (frontispiece); Clare Le Corbeiller in Metropolitan Museum 1983b, p. 31, ill.; Le Corbeiller 1985, pp. 29, 32, no. 19, ill.

---

**7B. The Spaghetti Eaters (Columbina and Pulcinella)**

**CAPODIMONTE FACTORY, ITALIAN (NAPLES), 1740/43–59**

Model attributed to Giuseppe Gricci (Italian, ca. 1700–1770)

ca. 1750

Soft-paste porcelain decorated in polychrome enamels and gold

5 ⁵⁄₈ × 4 ⁷⁄₈ × 3 ¹/₄ in. (14.3 × 12.4 × 8.3 cm)

Gift of Irwin Untermyer, 1964 64.101.350

**MARKS:** painted on underside: fleur-de-lis in blue enamel

**CONSTRUCTION/CONDITION:** press-molded; numerous hairline cracks in back of figure, loss of handle to cauldron, losses to spaghetti

**PROVENANCE:** Irwin Untermyer (by 1949–64; to MMA)


**LITERATURE:** C. L. Avery 1949b, no. 361; Early European Porcelain 1953, p. 279, under no. 406; Hackenbroch 1956, p. 224, fig. 211, pl. 142; Yvonne Hackenbroch in Metropolitan Museum 1977, p. 130, no. 247; Luciano 1990, pp. 43, 80, no. 26, ill.; Chilton 2002, pp. 223–28, fig. 5, colorpl. 7
other porcelain factories. The technical limitations imposed by soft-paste porcelain constrained Gricci in terms of detailed modeling, yet he was able to employ pose and gesture to create a dramatic tension that transcends the seemingly naive modeling. Gricci’s figures depicting activities of daily life reflect the reality of the occupations, or the encounters in which they are engaged, rather than conveying a stylized or abstract representation. His groups involving two or more figures are distinguished by the sense of rapport that he creates between the figures, which display a degree of emotional engagement not often found in the technically more sophisticated work of his contemporaries at other factories.

The Pottery Seller is one of Gricci’s most ambitious works belonging to a category known in the eighteenth century as la voci di Napoli (the criers of Naples). These figures represented the street merchants who sold wares that they carried and advertised them by their “cries” from the street throughout the city. In this figure, a barefoot male sells a wide variety of pots, cups, and dishes from the large basket that he carries on his back and from the bowl he clasps to his chest. Gricci has derived his composition from an engraving executed by Simon Guillain (French, b. 1618) in 1646 after a drawing by Annibale Carracci (1560–1609) (fig. 23), one of the most important Italian artists of the Baroque period.

Gricci closely copied Carracci’s depiction of a pottery seller, who is called Pignattaro in the engraving. As Hugo Morley-Fletcher has observed, Gricci’s talent as a sculptor is evident in his skillful translation of two-dimensional images into
three dimensions and in his ability to compose a back view for objects when there was no image to follow. In addition, Gricci has animated the figure conceived by Carracci by raising the pottery seller’s head so that he engages with the viewer and by giving him a more energetic stance, which creates the impression that he is actively hawking his wares. While it appears that Gricci looked to a variety of sources for the figures that he created to represent la voci di Napoli, the numerous vendors that he modeled are linked stylistically by their animated poses, the schematic but effective depiction of their wares, and by the sense of personality that Gricci effectively conveys.

Gricci’s keen observation of human behavior and emotion also informs the figures that he modeled depicting characters from the commedia dell’arte. Gricci created a sizable number of figures drawn from the Italian comedy at the same time he was producing his voci di Napoli series, but it is likely that these theatrical figures were not made as part of a series but rather as independent works. Similar to the street criers, Gricci looked to a variety of sources for inspiration, and it has been suggested by Meredith Chilton that paintings by the Florentine artist Giovanni Domenico Ferretti (Italian, 1692–1768) may have influenced Gricci’s composition The Spaghetti Eaters. In this group, Pulcinella sits gazing at a cauldron of spaghetti, while a standing Columbina leans toward the cauldron with her arm resting around Pulcinella’s shoulders. Pulcinella, identifiable from his distinctive mask and conical hat that lies on the rocky base, grabs a handful of spaghetti to
eat, although strands of spaghetti already in his mouth reflect his gluttonous nature. Columbina holds a pasta strainer in her right hand, and her tender embrace suggests encouragement to continue eating. Ferretti executed a number of paintings that depict Harlequin engaged in a variety of activities, and in at least two of them, the subject is Harlequin’s love of food.9 However, none of Ferretti’s compositions have been copied by Gricci for this group, but it is plausible that Gricci was influenced by them or, more likely, by prints made after them, as Harlequin has been transformed into Pulcinella in this instance. Regardless of his source of inspiration, Gricci created a composition in which simple but nuanced pose and gesture communicate a sympathy between the two figures that is just as apparent from the back as it is from the front.

In both The Pottery Seller and The Spaghetti Eaters, polychrome decoration is used very sparingly and employed primarily to define the rims of the pots and plates or the edges of the garments. Gricci’s figures produced from the mid-1740s through the early 1750s often have minimally painted decoration, which suggests that Gricci must have worked in concert with Giovanni Caselli (Italian, 1698–1752), director of the factory, to create this unusual balance between the white porcelain and its enamel decoration. Although the factory decorated some of its figures from this time period in a more conventional and fuller manner, the harmony between the undecorated and decorated porcelain is one of the distinguishing features of these early Capodimonte figures.10

1 Martini 1981.
2 Carola-Perrotti 2010, p. 90. For example, Gricci’s Pietà group in the Museo Duca di Martina, Naples (Silvana Musella Guida in Porcellane di Capodimonte 1993, pp. 154–56, no. 86), recalls the work of Massimiliano Soldani Benzi (Italian, 1656–1740).
3 Angela Carola-Perrotti in Carola-Perrotti 1986b, p. 190, no. 125, ill.
5 Carola-Perrotti 1993.
7 Carola-Perrotti 2001, pp. 67–68.
9 Baldassari 2002, p. 121.
10 Le Corbeiller 1985, p. 26. Clare Le Corbeiller’s brief discussion of the qualities of Capodimonte figural decoration is so eloquent that this author has simply paraphrased her perceptive observations.
8. Jar

**CAPODIMONTE FACTORY, ITALIAN (NAPLES), 1740/43–59**

Ca. 1750–60

Soft-paste porcelain decorated in polychrome enamels

Irregular diameter: 6 ³⁄₈ × 6 × 5 ⁵⁄₈ in. (16.2 × 15.2 × 14.3 cm)

Gift of R. Thornton Wilson, in memory of Florence Ellsworth Wilson, 1950 50.211.266

MARKS: painted on underside: fleur-de-lis in blue enamel

CONSTRUCTION/CONDITION: wheel-thrown and trimmed; large chip in foot rim

PROVENANCE: Dr. G. Kuss (until 1949; sale, Hôtel Drouot, Paris, February 21–22, 1949, no. 9); R. Thornton Wilson (until 1950; to MMA)


**THIS JAR OR VASE IS ONE OF THE MOST ENIGMATIC WORKS PRODUCED AT THE CAPODIMONTE FACTORY IN NAPLES. UNUSUALLY, ITS INTENDED FUNCTION IS NOT CLEAR. THE PROJECTING RIM AT THE TOP INDICATES THAT ORIGINALLY IT ALMOST CERTAINLY HAD A COVER, AND THE ONLY OTHER KNOWN EXAMPLE OF THIS FORM HAS A SIMILAR RIM BUT WITH A COVER MISSING AS WELL. THE SOMewhat SQUAT FORM OF THE JAR, COUPLED WITH THE EVIDENCE OF A COVER, MIGHT INDICATE THAT IT WAS INTENDED TO SERVE AS A TOBACCO JAR, BUT IT WOULD BE AN UNUSUALLY LARGE CONTAINER FOR TOBACCO. ALTERNATIVELY, THE FORM MIGHT HAVE SERVED AS A VASE WITH AN ENTIRELY DECORATIVE FUNCTION; HOWEVER, THE SHAPE IS UNLIKE ANY OF THE VASES PRODUCED AT CAPODIMONTE OR IDEED ELSEWHERE IN ITALY AT THAT TIME.**

The enigmatic quality of this object extends to the significance, if any, of its painted decoration as well. While the jar is decorated with what constitutes, more or less, a continuous landscape, there are clearly a primary and a secondary scene. The former consists of three figures, each depicting the character of Pulcinella from the commedia dell’arte. Pulcinella was a wily and licentious Neapolitan servant, and his frequent role was to serve as a companion to Harlequin, one of the primary characters in this form of popular street theater. Pulcinella’s traditional outfit of a loose tunic worn over ample trousers, a tall conical hat, and a mask with a prominent nose made him immediately recognizable to viewers familiar with the commedia dell’arte. In the principal scene on the jar, the three figures dressed as Pulcinella move through a semi-desolate landscape. The lead figure plays a trumpet, the bare-chested Pulcinella in the center rides a donkey, and the third figure carries a short branch that may represent a switch with which to prod the animal. The three figures inhabit a landscape defined by sparse vegetation, a stunted tree, and the absence of strong color. The landscape depicted on the other side of the jar is equally stark and dominated by a prominent tree that has lost most of its leaves set against a cloudy sky with small flying birds. The painter of the jar has skillfully created an environment that feels both abnormally still and vaguely disquieting. This has been achieved, in part, by the use of an unusually subdued palette dominated by pale browns, muted greens, off-whites, and a pale violet.

The meaning of the actions in which the three Pulcinellas are engaged is unclear, either individually or as a group. While it may seem surprising to include three figures who each represent Pulcinella in one composition, it was not uncommon in the mid-eighteenth century to depict more than one Pulcinella both in painting and in porcelain sculpture groups. In this instance, the three figures are not truly engaged with one another but rather seem to form a procession, the significance of which is not made explicit. The almost haunting aspect of the painted decoration is due not only to the skill with which it is
painted but also to the stippling technique employed by the painter, which lends itself very effectively to atmospheric effects. This style of painting at Capodimonte is commonly associated with Giovanni Caselli (Italian, 1698–1752), the director of the factory. Much of the best painting executed at Capodimonte has been attributed traditionally to Caselli’s hand, but recent scholarship suggests that Caselli, who also served as the head of the painting workshop, established the factory’s signature style, yet within that style it is difficult to attribute specific works with any certainty. Nevertheless, it appears almost certain it was due to Caselli that the Capodimonte factory developed a style in which stippling was exploited in order to achieve decoration of uncommon delicacy with a sense of heightened atmosphere.

On this particular jar, both the delicacy of the painting and the palette of enamels are enhanced by the pronounced warm, off-white color of the soft-paste body. While the paste produced at Capodimonte was typically warm in tone, the body used for this jar is notably off-white, and the jar is further distinguished by the satiny finish of the glaze. It is unlikely that the slightly more matte quality to the glaze was deliberate, but the less glassy surface in combination with the warm tone of the paste make the jar uncommon among Capodimonte porcelains and provide an appeal that aligns with a present-day appreciation of the imperfect in a factory’s early production.

1 Emerson, Chen, and Gates 2000, p. 146, pl. 118.
4 Carola-Perrotti 2013, p. 209.
9. Snuffbox

CAPODIMONTE FACTORY, ITALIAN (NAPLES), 1740/43–59
Model attributed to Giuseppe Gricci (Italian, ca. 1700–1770)
Miniature attributed to Giovanni Caselli (Italian, 1698–1752)
Mounts engraved by Francesco Pignataro (Italian?, dates unknown)
ca. 1745–50
Soft-paste porcelain decorated in polychrome enamels and gold mounts
2 1/4 × 3 ⅝ × 3 in. (5.7 × 9.2 × 7.6 cm)
Gift of R. Thornton Wilson, in memory of Florence Ellsworth Wilson, 1955 55.216.4

MARKS: unmarked

INSCRIPTIONS: engraved on bezel: FRAN. PIGNATARO PANORMIUS F. NEAPOLI

CONSTRUCTION/CONDITION: molded; bottom half of box broken in several pieces and repaired


The Capodimonte factory in Naples produced a variety of forms of snuffboxes, presumably in recognition of both the widespread popularity of snuff taking and the demand for boxes made of materials less expensive than gold. While gold boxes were considered the most desirable of containers made to transport snuff, the popularity of porcelain made it a fashionable medium for boxes despite its lack of intrinsic value. In addition, porcelain's ability to be both modeled in low relief and painted in polychrome enamels offered a range of decorative possibilities that exceeded those available to goldsmiths.

Capodimonte factory records indicate that this model of snuffbox, formed as if from a series of overlapping shells, was first produced in December 1743. The large, overlapping shell motifs that compose the box are encrusted with tiny shells and pieces of coral, also in porcelain, and the use of low relief for all of these motifs enhances their realism. The exaggerated organic quality of this design was unprecedented in European porcelain during this time, and it is one of the most innovative models produced at Capodimonte, a factory distinguished by the originality of its production. The most elaborate and ambitious works made at the factory in this stylistic genre are an ewer and basin, now in the collection of the Art Institute of Chicago, and a basin from a different model now in the Museo di Capodimonte, Naples. Each of these objects appears to have been formed by shell and other marine motifs, which are so skillfully realized that the intended function is clearly secondary to the object's evocation of the natural world through the medium of porcelain. No other eighteenth-century European porcelain factory produced works in a comparably organic style, and the snuffboxes, ewer, and basins reflect the unsurpassed originality and creativity of Giuseppe Gricci (Italian, ca. 1700–1770), the head modeler at the factory. Factory records credit Gricci with the creation of the Capodimonte snuffbox model, and consequently, the larger objects produced at this time are also attributed to him on the basis of their similarity in concept to the snuffbox design.

Both the Museum's snuffbox and the Chicago ewer and basin have polychrome decoration that heightens the realism of the various marine motifs. Shells are delineated in a variety of colors, textures are emphasized through subtle shading, and the surfaces are enlivened by the painted marine vegetation that appears attached to some of the shells. The choice of enamel colors for the snuffbox was not driven by concern for fidelity to nature, although the painting was executed with considerable detail and delicacy. Interestingly, the vigor and realism of Gricci's modeling are not dependent on the enamel decoration, as evidenced by another snuffbox from the same model in the Metropolitan's collection (fig. 24), and by the basin now at the Museo di Capodimonte, both of
which have been glazed but not polychromed. In both instances, the modeling is so successful that the individual components are easily discerned, and the composition is fully legible without the distinctions created by the application of enamel colors.

The interior covers of the known snuffboxes of this model are decorated with enameled compositions that vary widely in their subject matter. On this example, a turbaned woman holding a mahl stick or brush looks out at the viewer. In her left hand she holds both a Mannerist tankard that appears to be made of silver and a crumpled sheet of diagrams. In the back, a book and a brazier rest on a stone wall. It is possible that the figure is intended to be a personification of the arts with the objects that accompany her representing painting, sculpture, design, and literature. Figures representing an allegory of the arts were sometimes depicted with masks to symbolize illusion; in this instance, the box made of shells provided the sense of illusion that served as a complement to the personification of the arts depicted inside.

It is very likely that the artist who painted this scene was also responsible for the interior of the cover of the second box from this model at the Museum, which depicts a nursing mother with three children. Both scenes employ an extremely delicate stippled technique, and the contours of the faces, the treatment of the hair, and the rendering of the drapery are handled in a very similar manner. A factory document dated 1743 records Giovanni Caselli (Italian, 1698–1754) gilding two snuffboxes “with small seashells on the cover.” The indication that Caselli decorated boxes from this model, coupled with the quality of the painting, makes an attribution to Caselli for both boxes plausible, and indeed, Caselli’s name has been suggested for two boxes from the same model in the Victoria and Albert Museum, London, and a similar box at San Martino, Naples, which have covers painted in very much the same style. While the sources of some of the scenes attributed to Caselli have been identified, most have not, including those on the Museum’s two boxes discussed here, which suggests a wide and varied range of images was made available at the factory for artists to copy.

The gold mounts attaching the cover to the body of the box are unusual in quality and design. A continuous band of tiny shells and sea creatures has been applied to the upper rim, and they are made from a variety of colors, including gold, as well as silver, to enhance the decorative effect and presumably to differentiate them from one another. It is rare to find gold mounts on snuffboxes in which the design of the mounts relates so closely to that of the box itself. The goldsmith appears to have taken pride with his work; Francesco Pignataro was from Palermo, and he made the mounts in Naples; nothing more is known about this clearly accomplished goldsmith.

3 Gonzalez-Palacios in ibid., pp. 388–89, no. 135b.
4 Andreina d’Agliano in Pietsch and Witting 2010, p. 92, no. 94.
6 Agliano in Pietsch and Witting 2010, p. 92, no. 94.
7 For example, see Frans van Mieris the Elder (Dutch, 1635–1681), Pictura (An Allegory of Painting), 1661, in the J. Paul Getty Museum, Los Angeles (82.PC.136).
8 I thank Denise Allen, Curator, Department of European Sculpture and Decorative Arts, The Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York, for sharing her thoughts regarding this snuffbox and bringing the van Mieris painting at the Getty to my attention.
11 Agliano in Pietsch and Witting 2010, p. 97, no. 105.
10. Guanyin

MEISSEN FACTORY, GERMAN, 1710–PRESENT
1710–13
Red stoneware with gilding
14 3/4 × 4 × 4 ¹⁄₈ in. (37.5 × 10.2 × 10.5 cm)
The Lesley and Emma Sheafer Collection, Bequest of Emma A. Sheafer, 1973
1974.356.319

MARKS: unmarked

CONSTRUCTION/CONDITION: press-molded; gilding partially abraded

PROVENANCE: possibly Count de Luckner; [A. & R. Ball, New York, until 1947; sold to Mrs. Sheafer]; Lesley and Emma Sheafer, New York (1947–73; bequeathed to MMA)

LITERATURE: unpublished

THE EARLY HISTORY OF THE GERMAN PORCELAIN FACTORY AT Meissen, which was the first in Europe to produce true or hard-paste porcelain, has been extensively published.¹ The European quest to manufacture porcelain in the manner of the Chinese was long and complex, and it had been attempted at several ceramic factories throughout the Continent, but it was the experiments conducted in Dresden and in nearby Meissen during the first decade of the eighteenth century that led to the realization of this goal. After several years of experimentation to discover the necessary ingredients to make the white, translucent, and nonporous ceramic body, as well as to develop the kiln technology to fire it, the workers who were to establish the Meissen factory successfully produced a true porcelain in 1708—however, without glaze.² Ongoing experimentation resolved some of the technical challenges, and August II (1670–1733), commonly known as Augustus the Strong, elector of Saxony, king of Poland, was able to proclaim the founding of a porcelain factory in Dresden in January 1710. The equipment for the factory was transferred to Meissen, located approximately eighteen miles northwest of Dresden, in June of that year, and the factory that came to dominate the production of porcelain in Europe for the first half of the century was created.

The person most closely identified with discovering the formula for the hard-paste porcelain that Meissen would produce is Johann Friedrich Böttger (German, 1682–1719). Böttger’s life has been well documented,³ but the salient facts of his role in the development of porcelain are as follows: Böttger was apprenticed to an apothecary in Berlin at an early age but soon became fascinated with alchemy, a nascent form of chemistry that attempted the transformation of matter. After reports circulated that he had successfully transformed silver into gold in Berlin, Böttger fled to Saxony, presumably to avoid demonstration of this skill by request of the king of Prussia, Frederick I (1657–1713). His flight brought him to the attention of Augustus the Strong, who was eager to support Böttger’s efforts to transform base metals into gold. Böttger’s experiments to produce gold were conducted in collaboration with German physicist and mathematician Ehrenfried Walther von Tschirnhaus (1651–1708). In the process of developing materials to enable the transformation, Böttger and his collaborators fabricated a dense red stoneware. This stoneware body could withstand very high temperatures believed necessary for the alchemy to occur, and this discovery proved to be a critical step in the eventual production of porcelain, which required higher firing temperatures than other ceramic bodies.

With the eventual realization that Böttger’s attempts at alchemy were not going to prove successful, his efforts were redirected, assisted
by Tschirnhaus, toward the production of porcelain. Böttger’s experiments with red stoneware were critical to his eventual discovery of porcelain, which led to an understanding of how to make clays fusible, as well as to the development of high-temperature kilns. Efforts were made to refine the red stoneware, and it must have been quickly realized that their properties were similar to those of Chinese Yixing stonewares that were much appreciated by Augustus. The density of the stoneware body developed by Böttger allowed for a variety of decorative treatments, and along with the employment of specialist craftsmen, such as modelers, engravers, and polishers, the Meissen factory was able to present a variety of stonewares for sale at the annual Easter Fair in Leipzig in 1710.

While the factory soon developed a sophisticated repertoire of Baroque forms in red stoneware, many of which were derived from contemporary silver shapes, some of the earliest works produced in the new material were copies of Chinese ceramics in Augustus’s collection. Among the first objects made at Meissen in red stoneware is the figure of Guanyin, the Chinese goddess of mercy and compassion. The Meissen figure derives directly from a Chinese, white-porcelain figure of Guanyin that was in the Saxon royal collections, an example of which must have been among the eight Chinese porcelains sent by Augustus to Böttger for copying on November 28, 1709. The Chinese figures of Guanyin were produced in Dehua, a village in Fujian province, and the white-porcelain sculptures and wares made for export became known in Europe as blanc de chine (white from China). Along with Chinese blue-and-white porcelain, so-called blanc de chine was produced in enormous quantities and avidly purchased by those able to afford it. Representations of Chinese deities were especially popular, and figures of Guanyin could be found in many of the European princely houses. It is likely that plaster molds were taken from Augustus’s Chinese original from which the red stoneware version was cast. The resulting figure was thus a very close copy of the Chinese example, albeit reduced in scale. The stoneware body shrunk during the drying process before firing and again in the kiln, making the Meissen copies smaller in all dimensions. The Porzellanammlung, Staatliche Kunstsammlungen Dresden retains an original Chinese porcelain Guanyin, a Meissen red-stoneware version, and a Meissen hard-paste porcelain example made several years after the red-stoneware figure, and a photograph of the three pieces together illustrates the difference in dimensions.

The red-stoneware versions of Guanyin and other Chinese deities produced at Meissen are highly accomplished, especially as they are among the earliest products of the young factory. While the majority of the detail derives from the cast taken from the Chinese original, small differences in detail in the stoneware versions must be due to the finish work executed when the damp clay was in the so-called leather hard state. Many if not all of the red-stoneware Guanyins are polished, lending a glossy surface to the figure. One of the many desirable characteristics of the stoneware body developed by Böttger was its ability to be polished, or indeed faceted or engraved, due to the extreme hardness of the fired body. The factory produced a wide range of objects, both decorative and useful, during the approximately three-year period when the red stoneware was produced in significant quantities. However, Meissen’s successful commercial introduction of hard-paste porcelain at the Leipzig Easter Fair in 1713 presaged the decline of stoneware production at the factory. Even though red stoneware had been developed as a by-product of Böttger’s search for a true porcelain body, it proved to be a medium that not only reflected a major technological advance but also one in which objects of remarkable sophistication were produced.

1 Some of the most significant or helpful literature includes Rückert 1966, Bursche 1980: I. Menzhausen 1990, Blaauwen 2000; Däberitz and Eberle 2011; Eberle 2011b; Pietsch 2011.
2 Eberle 2011b, p. 16.
7 Anette Loesch in Pietsch, Loesch, and Ströber 2006, pp. 76-77. As the Chinese porcelain figure in the photograph is significantly larger than the two Meissen versions, it is possible that a slightly smaller Chinese original served as the prototype.
8 There are also traces of gilding on this figure of Guanyin, indicating that the edges of the robe, the rosette on her breast, and the base were decorated with decorative bands of gilding.
9 According to Meredith Chilton, Meissen stoneware, sometimes known as Böttger stoneware, was produced for approximately a ten-year period, and examples appear on the factory’s 1731 price list; Chilton 1988, p. 14.
11. Brighella on a pedestal

**MEISSEN FACTORY, GERMAN, 1710–PRESENT**
Model attributed to Benjamin Thomae (1682–1751)
1710–13
Red stoneware decorated in unfired polychrome enamels, gilding
9 ¹⁵⁄₁₆ × 4 ¹¹⁄₁₆ × 4 ¹/₂ in. (25.2 × 11.9 × 11.4 cm); base: H. 3 in. (7.6 cm)
Gift of R. Thornton Wilson, in memory of Florence Ellsworth Wilson, 1954 54.147.66

**MARKS:** unmarked

**INSCRIPTIONS:** underside of pedestal: conjoined jtr. 614 b in black enamel

**CONSTRUCTION/CONDITION:** molded; on figure unfired enamel and gilding abraded

**PROVENANCE:** Princess Margaret, Landgravine of Hesse-Cassel (by 1896); Tornov; Empress Frederick (until d. 1901); Robert von Hirsch (to R. Thornton Wilson, through Rosenberg and Stiebel, New York); R. Thornton Wilson (until 1954; to MMA)


The first product made at the Meissen factory in Germany was a dense red stoneware created during the factory’s inception from 1710 to 1713, after which the ability to manufacture porcelain was realized, and stoneware production was phased out. Most of the stoneware made at Meissen during these three years was in the form of wares, including numerous models of teapots, in particular, as well as coffee-pots, tankards, cups and saucers, tea caddies, and other useful objects. Large-scale, more ambitious objects, such as vases, were also made, but the majority of works in red stoneware were functional rather than purely decorative.

At this same time a small quantity of sculpture was made in the form of low-relief plaques, portrait heads, and figures derived from Chinese deities, but figures depicting European subjects were relatively rare. A small-scale figure of Augustus II (1670–1733), commonly known as Augustus the Strong, elector of Saxony, king of Poland, is among the best known of these European figures, and there is a male figure very much in the tradition of Baroque bozzetti, or preliminary models, that is notable for the freedom of its sculpting. However, there are six figures in red stoneware depicting commedia dell’arte characters, which must rank as the most expressive and compositionally daring of Meissen’s production from this period. All six figures were acquired by Frederick II (1676–1732), Duke of Saxe-Gotha-Altenburg, prior to 1721, at which time they appear in the Friedenstein Castle inventories in Gotha, where they remain today. The figures now in the Friedenstein collections represent five of the male characters from the commedia dell’arte, including Brighella, Il Capitano, Harlequin, Pantalone, and Pulcinella; and one female character, Cantarina, who was a secondary figure in the troupe. The commedia dell’arte, often referred to as the Italian comedy, was a form of popular theater that originated in Italy during the late sixteenth century. This form of comedic theater featured stock characters who embodied the range of human foibles, and its loosely drawn plots usually centered around themes of love, seduction, intrigue, vanity, greed, and miscommunication. The principal characters were identified by their costumes, as well as by the masks that several wore. Their personalities were well-established and generally known to the audience, and the bawdy humor and spontaneity of the dialogue made the commedia dell’arte a highly popular theatrical form available to all classes of society.

By the mid-eighteenth century in Europe the commedia dell’arte was a popular source for modelers at porcelain factories throughout the Continent, and this genre was first fully explored at the Meissen factory beginning in the 1730s. In addition, the red-stoneware figures produced at Meissen are among the earliest, if not the very earliest, representations of
commedia dell’arte characters in the medium of ceramics. These figures are remarkably ambitious in terms of their modeling, and their dynamic poses skilfully express the theatrical nature of the subject matter (fig. 25). It is not known how many figures were produced, but based upon surviving examples, it appears that they were made in very small numbers.

The Brighella figure in the Museum’s collection is highly unusual with its polychrome decoration. Since the Meissen factory did not have the technical expertise to fire enamel colors until the early 1720s, the figure is decorated with “cold colors,” the term used to denote painted decoration that has not been fired. The matte quality of the polychromy is typical of unfired decoration, and these colors are often in a poor state of preservation. They have survived relatively well on the Museum’s figure, however, but slightly less successfully on the only other polychromed figure from this group known to the author, which is now in the Museum für Angewandte Kunst, Frankfurt. The traces of gilding on the Metropolitan’s figure, particularly along the edges of the robe and on the tasseled belt, indicate that its decoration was especially luxurious. All of the known Meissen red-stoneware commedia dell’arte figures are partially polished, including the two polychromed examples, resulting in a contrast of matte and glossy surfaces that lends a heightened degree of legibility and visual interest to the compositions.

The model represented by the Museum’s figure is customarily identified as a depiction of Brighella, who was one of the principal servant characters, known as zanni, in the Italian comedy. The example in Gotha has been published as Brighella in the most recent literature; however, it has been suggested by Clare Le Corbeiller that the Museum’s figure, and by extension the one in Gotha, may be an atypical representation of Pantalone instead. The figure’s clothing, irrespective of coloring, does not correspond to the standard outfit worn by Brighella, but neither does it correspond to Pantalone’s typical attire, which leaves its intended identity unresolved. Regardless, there is no doubt that the model depicts a commedia dell’arte figure, as indicated by its mask and its obviously theatrical pose.

The Museum’s figure stands on a red-stoneware pedestal that appears to be contemporary in date with the figure but probably not original to it. The stoneware body is consistent with Meissen’s production at this time, yet the integral base of the figure itself extends slightly beyond the top of the pedestal. None of the other red-stoneware commedia dell’arte figures are supported by similar pedestals, and it is not known if separate pedestals were produced at the time that the figures were made and are now lost, or if the figure and pedestal were united at some later date. The interior of the pedestal bears a painted mark that has not yet been interpreted but may someday shed light on its history.

2 Ibid., pp. 49–56, nos. 18–28.
4 See, for example, I. Menzhausen 1990, p. 196, pl. 23.
5 Meissen 1984, ill. nos. 152, 156, 157.
6 Ibid., ill. nos. 142–44, 147.
7 MMA 1982.60.318; Clare Le Corbeiller in Metropolitan Museum 1984a, pp. 250–51, no. 156.
8 Bursche 1980, pp. 56–57, no. 29.
9 Eberle 2011b, p. 29.
10 Ibid., pp. 39–45, nos. 2–7.
11 For a history of the commedia dell’arte, see Pietropaolo 2001.
12 At least two red-earthenware figures, one of which depicts Harlequin, were made in Delft in the years around 1700, and interestingly an example of Harlequin appears in a 1721 inventory of Augustus the Strong’s Japanese Palace, where his ceramic collection was displayed; Chilton 2001, p. 322, no. 139. It has been suggested that this figure may have inspired the modelers at Meissen to make the red-stoneware commedia dell’arte figures; Chilton 1998.
13 Meissen 1984, ill. no. 167.
15 Le Corbeiller 1990, p. 10.
16 For descriptions of costumes typically worn by Pantalone and Brighella, see Chilton 2001, pp. 50–55, 90.
12. Beaker vase

**MEISSEN FACTORY, GERMAN, 1710–PRESENT**

ca. 1713–20

Hard-paste porcelain

$5\frac{3}{4} \times 4\frac{3}{4} \times 4\frac{3}{4}$ in. (13.8 × 11.9 × 11.9 cm)

The George B. McClellan Collection, Gift of Mrs. George B. McClellan, 1941 42.205.26

**MARKS:** unmarked

**CONSTRUCTION/CONDITION:** wheel-thrown with applied decoration; firing crack in base and crack in side

**PROVENANCE:** [art market, Dresden, 1935; sold for $84 to McClellan]; George B. McClellan Jr. (until d. 1940; to his wife); Mrs. George B. McClellan (1940–41; to MMA)

**LITERATURE:** C. L. Avery 1946, p. 60, ill. p. 58; McClellan 1946, p. 11, fig. 3


This vase, one of the first pieces of porcelain produced at Meissen, embodies the qualities that made porcelain so desirable to Europeans during the seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries, when porcelain was still an unfamiliar and exotic medium. Its whiteness and translucency distinguished the vase dramatically from the earthenwares and stonewares that were the common ceramic bodies in Europe. The only true porcelains available to Europeans prior to the discovery of porcelain at Meissen in 1708–10 were those imported from China and Japan, and the attempts in Europe prior to this time produced an artificial or soft-paste porcelain that did not possess the qualities of a true, high-fired porcelain body (entry 41).

The events leading to Meissen’s production of porcelain as a result of the experiments carried out by Johann Friedrich Böttger (German, 1682–1719) have been well documented. Böttger’s initial efforts produced a dense red stoneware that combined fusible clays fired at high temperatures, and these latter two elements were the primary requirements for the production of a true or hard-paste porcelain body (entry 10). Böttger worked simultaneously to improve the quality of the red-stoneware body and to manufacture white porcelain, and by March 1709, he was able to report success in producing porcelain, as well as a successful glaze for it. These accomplishments led to the official establishment of the Meissen factory in 1710, and its red stoneware was presented that same year for sale at the annual Leipzig Easter Fair, as well as samples of porcelain, which were available for display only. The next three years were spent improving the porcelain body, and the factory was able to sell porcelain for the first time at the Easter Fair in 1713.

Böttger’s ability to manufacture porcelain resulted from his discovery of suitable ingredients to allow china clay, known as kaolin, to become fusible. Kaolin was the critical component of hard-paste porcelain, but it was essential for kaolin to combine with other ingredients. In search of a suitable flux to accomplish this melding, Böttger chose alabaster, and chalk or quartz. The high-calcium content of these first two ingredients imparted a warm or sometimes grayish tone to the porcelain body, and this slightly off-white color is the primary distinguishing feature of what came to be termed “Böttger porcelain.” Several years after Böttger’s death in 1719, the factory began using feldspar as a flux, which produced a porcelain that is noticeably whiter and cooler in tonality than the porcelain developed by Böttger.

Many of the earliest porcelain works made at Meissen employed forms and motifs that had been used in its red-stoneware production. In several instances, the same molds were used for the porcelain examples as had been used for the stoneware (fig. 27). In other cases, the use...
of stoneware models for porcelain may have been driven by the relatively limited repertoire of forms and decorative vocabulary employed by the factory in the early years of porcelain production. This beaker vase was thrown on the wheel rather than made from a mold, and its form and applied ornament follow closely a stoneware model, of which several examples exist. On both the stoneware and porcelain examples, the ornament consists of applied decorative bands composed of bellflowers below the rim and stylized acanthus above the foot, with a female mask applied just above the waist. The mask on the Museum’s vase differs from that on the stoneware examples, but the ornament on all the vases is drawn from the vocabulary of European metalwork.

The factory had hired the Dresden goldsmith Johann Jacob Irminger (German, 1635–1724) in 1710, who was cited as providing “the inventions and new designs” for the factory’s production. Irminger determined the decorative schemes of stoneware and then porcelain, and the factory’s style during these years derives largely from him. The vases and wares produced from Irminger’s designs depend upon a varied vocabulary of applied ornament for their visual impact. This ornament was sometimes restrained, as on this beaker vase, but it was often profuse, covering much of the surface of an object. The sculptural nature of the factory’s decoration during these years was due in part to the prevailing Baroque taste that favored bold ornament and decoration in relief. But it also must have been driven by the factory’s inability at this time to fire painted decoration, a technical feat that would not be mastered until the early 1720s.

Many of the individual motifs, such as masks or bands of ornament, are used repeatedly and in varying combinations on the porcelain production from 1715 to 1719 (fig. 26). Much of the applied ornament that appears on the porcelain is more ambitious and more elaborate than what is found on the stoneware, but it often lacks the crispness of its stoneware counterpart due to the presence of glaze. The period in which the porcelain production relied upon applied ornament as the primary decoration was short-lived, but it produced some of the factory’s most remarkable works that reflect its quick mastery of the new medium of porcelain.
13. Teapot

**MEISSEN FACTORY, GERMAN, 1710–PRESENT**

1722–23

Hard-paste porcelain decorated in polychrome enamels and gold

$4\frac{3}{4} \times 6\frac{3}{4} \times 4\frac{5}{6}$ in. (11.6 × 16.7 × 11 cm)

Gift of William B. Osgood Field, 1902 02.5.39a, b

**MARKS:** painted on underside: M.P.M. in underglaze blue

**CONSTRUCTION/CONDITION:** wheel-thrown with applied handle and spout; replaced finial on lid

**PROVENANCE:** William B. Osgood Field (until 1902; to MMA)

**LITERATURE:** T. H. Clarke 1988, pp. 10–14, 20, pls. 3, 5, 7; Cassidy-Geiger 1996a, p. 107, fig. 25; Agliano 2016, p. 371, fig. 1

Remarkably, the Meissen factory was producing porcelain on a commercial basis within three years of its founding in 1710 (entry 12). The artistic quality of its wares and decorative objects was impressively high from the outset, but throughout the 1710s, Meissen lacked the ability to successfully decorate its production with enamel colors. The Chinese and Japanese porcelains avidly collected by August II (1670–1733), commonly known as Augustus the Strong, elector of Saxony, king of Poland, during these years were notable for the superlative quality of their painted decoration, making the absence of brilliant enamel colors on the factory’s porcelain perceived as a serious deficiency. While Meissen had not yet mastered this technology, the wares and vases intended for painted decoration were delivered to Georg Funcke (German, active 1713–27), an independent enameler and gilder in Dresden. The porcelains painted by Funcke are prized today, both for their rarity and for their early date of production, but the enamels that he employed were limited both in range and in saturation, and so-called Funcke decoration is always modest in ambition.¹

However, the arrival of German enameler Johann Gregorius Höroldt (1696–1775) at Meissen in May 1720 changed the factory’s capabilities in porcelain painting dramatically. Höroldt’s early years at Meissen have been extensively documented,² and his impact on every aspect of the factory’s production was far-reaching. In brief, Höroldt worked at the Du Paquier enterprise in Vienna (entry 28) prior to arriving at Meissen, and he brought a level of proficiency to enamel painting that was unknown either at Meissen or in Dresden at that time. Höroldt’s abilities were not confined to his painting expertise; he oversaw the development of a range of enamel colors at Meissen that was unprecedented, and he created a factory style that ensured Meissen’s prestige during the first half of the eighteenth century. Due to the quality of the work produced and the painters who he employed, the factory’s models shifted from those dependent on low-relief decoration to those that provided a smooth surface to facilitate the enamel painting. Höroldt was also responsible for devising the decorative scheme that defined Meissen porcelain for the next several decades: miniature scenes painted within an elaborate cartouche, an ornamental frame consisting of scrolling motifs executed in red or purple enamel, gilding, and sometimes with a distinctive pale-purple luster.

Before becoming officially employed by Meissen, Höroldt worked as an independent contractor for the factory for eleven years, and he assembled a team of painters who were paid by him rather than by the factory. Höroldt signed very few works, and it is difficult to attribute work to his hand with certainty, particularly since he was so influential.
in establishing a factory painting style. It is not known who painted the Museum’s teapot, but it is one of the earliest works with enamel decoration made at Meissen. The underside of the teapot is marked M.P.M. (Meissener Porzellan Manufaktur), a mark that appears to have been in use only for a few months in autumn 1722, although the decoration may have been applied during the course of the following year. At this time, the range of enamels was still in development, and the slightly muddy and muted colors on the teapot’s scenes attest to its early date. Höroldt is best known for the chinoiserie scenes that he both painted and promoted as a principal category of decoration in the 1720s, but some of the earliest compositions painted under his direction depict European subject matter.

The two reserves, as well as the lid of the Museum’s teapot, depict dwarfs at a riding school, and all of the figures are taken from a series of prints about a riding school for dwarfs, entitled Neu aufgerichte Zwergen-Reut-Schul eröffnet von N.E (fig. 28). The teapot is part of a group consisting of three additional teapots, four sugar boxes, and one waste bowl (for used tea leaves), all of which have similar decoration that derives, with one exception, from this series. This seemingly unlikely subject matter for porcelain decoration is less surprising than it might seem, as satirical prints depicting dwarfs were popular and widely circulated in the first quarter of the eighteenth century, and the fascination with dwarfs extends back to the sixteenth century (entry 50). One side of the Museum’s teapot portrays a pupil riding a horse and shooting at a sculpture of a Turk’s head, knocking it off its pedestal. The explosion from the pupil’s gun, a wheel-lock blunderbuss, is mirrored by an explosion from the rear of the horse that knocks over two stableboys. The teapot’s other side depicts two standing figures, who may represent the school’s owner and a prospective client, with a seated stableboy on the left. The costumes and exaggerated wigs of the figures add to the satirical quality of the subject matter, and T. H. Clarke has suggested that the series of prints from which the compositions derive may have been intended as a humorous commentary on the follies of the nouveau riche.

Rainer Rückert has observed that the bawdy and slightly vulgar nature of the painted decoration on this group is curiously at odds with the sophistication of the form, which can be attributed to Johann Jacob Irminger (German, 1635–1724), the court goldsmith who supplied designs for the factory’s models during the 1710s and early 1720s. This shape of teapot, with its bulbous body, ear-shaped handle, curved spout springing from a lower relief mask, and a high-domed cover, has its origins in a red-stoneware version made at Meissen from 1710 to 1713. This model, with slight variations, was then produced in so-called Böttger porcelain, and very early examples—produced prior to the use of enamels at the factory—remain in the Porzellansammlung, Staatliche Kunstsammlungen Dresden. Several more examples of this model exist with the same rare factory mark of M.P.M., indicating a date of production in 1722, and the form was used frequently for Höroldt-inspired chinoiserie decoration that came to prominence beginning in 1723.

1 See, for example, Cassidy-Geiger 2008, p. 342, no. 112.
5 Ibid. This article discusses the group in depth, as well as the sources of decoration, and specifies which prints served as sources for the painter at Meissen.
6 Ibid., p. 6.
7 Ibid., p. 8.
8 Rückert 1966, p. 53, no. 3, pl. 2.
10 Cassidy-Geiger 2008, p. 343, no. 113; Pietsch 2011, p. 131, no. 102; Nelson 2013, p. 441, no. 21.
11 See, for example, Pietsch 1996a, p. 82, no. 59, ill. p. 83.
14. Beaker and saucer

MEISSEN FACTORY, GERMAN, 1710–PRESENT
Painted by Johann Gregorius Höroldt (German, 1696–1775)
1724–25
Hard-paste porcelain decorated in polychrome enamels and gold
.75 (beaker): 3 × 2 1/4 × 2 1/4 in. (7.6 × 6.4 × 6.5 cm)
.76 (saucer): 3/4 × 5 × 4 3/4 in. (2.4 × 12.7 × 12.5 cm)
Gift of R. Thornton Wilson, in memory of Florence Ellsworth Wilson, 1954
54.147.75, .76

MARKS: both painted on underside: AR in underglaze blue

INSCRIPTIONS: .75 incised in footring: two dots (former’s mark for Küttel); .76 incised in footring: x (former’s mark for Rehschuck)

CONSTRUCTION/CONDITION: both .75 and .76 are wheel-thrown

PROVENANCE: Victor Amadeus II, king of Sardinia, possibly private collection, Austria; [Alex Ball, New York, before 1954; sold to R. Thornton Wilson]; R. Thornton Wilson (until 1954; to MMA)


LITERATURE: McNab 1963, pp. 11–14, fig. 3 and colorpl., p. 18 (54.147.75); Pietsch 1996a, pp. 148–49, nos. 118, 119, ill.; Cassidy-Geiger 2007b, p. 210, fig. 10.4; Ulrich Pietsch in Pietsch and Banz 2010, p. 190, no. 53, ill. p. 191

The elaborate coat of arms and monogram of Victor Amadeus II (1666–1732), king of Sardinia, serve as the primary decoration of this beaker and saucer, which belong to a tea and chocolate service presented as a gift by August II (1670–1733), commonly known as Augustus the Strong, elector of Saxony, king of Poland, in 1725. The porcelain service was part of a much larger diplomatic gift sent to Victor Amadeus II by the Saxon court, and due to its artistic and diplomatic significance, it has been well documented. The beaker and saucer belong to one of nine tea, coffee, and chocolate services produced at Meissen during the 1720s for the Saxon court and presented to the Sardinian king. As has been noted by Maureen Cassidy-Geiger, the presentation of Meissen porcelain by Augustus to another royal court indicates the status accorded to the factory’s products by 1725, when Meissen had yet to reach its maturity.

The components of this tea and chocolate service are among the earliest pieces produced at Meissen on which the armorial decoration is given such prominence. Most of the saucer well is occupied by the arms of Victor Amadeus II, which are surmounted by a crown and supported on either side by lions resting on military trophies. The beaker is painted with the king’s monogram framed by palm fronds against a shield and a crown above. Both the coat of arms and the monogram are painted with a degree of detail and painterly elaboration that indicates the armorials were valued for their decorative potential in addition to their heraldic significance.

The beaker’s secondary decoration on the side opposite the monogram consists of a scene with three Chinese men and a container of lobsters. The central figure holds up a rod from which three tied lobsters are suspended, and the two figures that are seated try unsuccessfully to capture the lobsters that are escaping from the oval container. The relatively simple and straightforward composition reflects many of the qualities of the chinoiserie style introduced by the German painter Johann Gregorius Höroldt (1696–1775) around 1723, which would dominate the factory’s decoration throughout the 1720s and into the early 1730s. In the chinoiserie scenes originated by Höroldt, the figures and landscapes evoke a fantasy vision of the Far East in which all the compositional elements are imbued with an exoticism that had little to do with real life and customs yet resonated with European tastes and expectations. Höroldt’s talent lay not only in his considerable painterly skills but also in his ability to deftly create an imagined, romanticized world through gesture, silhouette, and pattern.
In addition, many of Höroldt’s compositions, and those created under his influence, incorporate a sense of whimsy and humor that enhance the exotic character of the subject matter. In this instance, the escaping lobsters along with those tied on the rod with decorative bows provide the element of playfulness, which is a hallmark of many of Höroldt’s chinoiserie scenes.

While he is credited with introducing and promulgating the chinoiserie decoration that is closely identified with Meissen’s production during these decades, it is very difficult to attribute specific works to Höroldt’s hand with any certainty. In the case of the tea and coffee service with the arms of Victor Amadeus II, however, documentary evidence indicates that Höroldt himself was responsible for the decoration, making it one of the few instances in which his authorship is secure. When the service was delivered from Meissen to Dresden in March 1725, a document declares that it was “made by the court painter Herr Höroldt,”5 and thus, the service provides a touchstone by which other chinoiserie scenes on Meissen porcelain from the mid-1720s can be assessed.

This beaker and saucer originally belonged to a service that included six tea bowls with saucers, a teapot, a sugar box, a waste bowl (for used tea leaves), and six chocolate beakers with saucers.6 Despite the substantial number of pieces composing the service, very few are known to have survived. A beaker and saucer similar to the Museum’s examples are in the Museo Civico d’Arte Antica, Turin;7 a sugar box is in the Bayerisches Nationalmuseum, Munich;8 and two saucers are known, one in the Arnhold Collection, New York,9 the other in the Palazzo Pitti, Florence.10

3. Ibid., p. 211.
4. It is likely that the first tea service to be decorated with armorials shows the combined coats of arms of the Electorate of Hanover and the Electorate of the Palatine; see Meissener Porzellan 1999, vol. 2, pp. 470–71, no. 301, and a beaker and saucer in the British Museum (1931,0318.5.CR).
6. Cassidy-Geiger 2007a, app., p. 330. While Meissen chocolate beakers were usually made with two handles at this period, the beakers for this service were produced without them.
15. Covered tankard

**MEISSEN FACTORY, GERMAN, 1710–PRESENT**

c. 1725–30

Hard-paste porcelain decorated in polychrome enamels and gold; silver-gilt mounts

8⅞ × 7⅜ × 6¼ in. (22.5 × 18.6 × 15.7 cm); H. (without cover) 7⅞ in. (19.4 cm)

Gift of R. Thornton Wilson, in memory of Florence Ellsworth Wilson, 1954. 54.147.81

**MARKS:** porcelain is unmarked; struck on lid to right of handle: 13 over crossed swords with D below, all within a shaped shield; MS within an oval

**INSCRIPTIONS:** on obverse of marriage medallion, around edge: QUOS DEUS CONIUNXIT, HOC NON SEPARAT; on reverse: CHRISTUS MACHET WASSER Zu: WEIN IN CANA GALIL*|JOHN*|JESUS

**CONSTRUCTION/CONDITION:** wheel-thrown with molded handle

**PROVENANCE:** Ole Olsen (by about 1924 until 1943; sale, Winkel & Magnussen, Copenhagen, January 17, 1944, no. 304; [Antique Porcelain Co., London]; [John J. Klejman, New York]; R. Thornton Wilson (until 1954; to MMA)

**LITERATURE:** Schmitz 1924, vol. 2, pp. 6, 33 (English), no. 1453, pl. xlvi; Ole Olsen’s Art Collections ca. 1930, ill. (unnumbered plate); Winkel & Magnussen 1944, no. 304, ill.; Connoisseur: Antique Dealers’ Fair 1954, n.p. (advertisement, Antique Porcelain Co., London); C. L. Avery 1957, p. 192, ill. p. 190; Ulrich Pietsch in Pietsch and Banz 2010, pp. 210–11, under no. 95

The Chinese and Japanese porcelains in the collection of August II (1670–1733), commonly known as Augustus the Strong, elector of Saxony, king of Poland, provided a wealth of decorative styles and motifs for the painters at the Meissen factory to copy and reinterpret. Certain imported models were copied with great fidelity, but often the imported porcelains provided a decorative vocabulary from which motifs could be selected and combined for use in innovative ways. On this magnificent tankard, the depiction of large, sinuous lotus leaves derives directly from so-called *famille verte* porcelains made in China during the late seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries. *Famille verte,* a French term meaning “of the green family,” was first used in the late nineteenth century to describe a large group of Chinese porcelains in which a translucent green enamel dominates the palette. Other enamel colors, such as iron-red, yellow, blue, and black, were employed on *famille verte* porcelains, but the brilliant and luminous green developed by the Chinese painters is customarily the immediately distinguishing feature of these works. A broad range of compositions and motifs appear on Chinese porcelains belonging to this group, yet those decorated primarily with lotus leaves and flowers make up a small but distinctive category. Characteristically, the depictions of the lotuses employ boldly undulating lines, as well as a marked contrast between the irregularly shaped masses of the leaves and flowers and the delicacy of the sinuous stems. Birds and waterfowl are sometimes included in the compositions, but the lotus plants are always the dominant feature.

The lotus leaves and flowers on the Museum’s tankard are rendered in the conventional Chinese manner, but here they are populated with chinoiserie figures and snails that have been given equal compositional weight. One of the figures balances on a lotus leaf stem as he fans a seated figure sitting on a bended stem. One of the snails is perched on a leaf; a second snail is ridden by a child. Three additional figures occupy the fantasy landscape dominated by the oversize lotus plants, and all the figures are painted in a manner traditionally described as that associated with the Meissen painter Johann Ehrenfried Stadler (German, 1701–1741). It is not possible to attribute the decoration to a specific painter, but the chinoiserie figures are very much in the style promulgated by Johann Gregorius Höroldt (German, 1696–1775) (entry 14).

The tankard’s painting, especially that of the faces and costumes, is of the highest quality, and the richly detailed aquatic landscape is depicted with a level of skill and with a diversity of palette that marks this object as one of the factory’s exceptional works.

The complexity of the composition is particularly evident when the tankard is compared to other Meissen porcelains decorated with lotus
plants in the *famille verte* tradition. The closest comparisons are offered by a vase in the Schneider Collection at Schloss Lustheim near Munich, a tankard in Berlin, and a waste bowl (for used tea leaves) in the Arnhold Collection, New York, all of which follow the Chinese model closely, with few compositional deviations from the *famille verte* prototypes. A beaker vase with lotus decoration in Berlin includes two chinoiserie figures, yet they are subsidiary to the plant motifs, and hence the vase’s painted composition does not reflect the innovative balance of Chinese-inspired decoration and Höroldt chinoiseries that distinguish the Museum’s tankard.

The tankard is remarkable as well for the two continuous borders painted at the base and below the rim. The border at the top is not only unusually large in scale but also particularly complex in its design and palette, incorporating polychrome four-petaled flowers within a lozenge pattern, with C-scrolls and foliate motifs along the lower edge of the border. Both borders are partially painted in cobalt blue that was applied under the glaze, which indicates that the design of the borders had to have been determined before the glaze and enamel firings. The interplay between the underglaze blue and the gilding is especially elaborate, suggesting that the tankard was intended from the outset to be a particularly ambitious work. This supposition is reinforced by the tankard’s size, which is one of the largest produced by the factory.

The silver-gilt lid and thumb piece are almost certainly original to the tankard, and while mounts such as these are often regilded, the gilding here appears to be original as well. Interestingly, the three-leafed motif of the thumb piece
16. Wine pot

**MEISSEN FACTORY, GERMAN, 1710–PRESENT**

ca. 1725

Hard-paste porcelain decorated in polychrome enamels and gold

5 1/2 × 7 × 3 1/2 in. (14 × 17.8 × 8.9 cm)

The Lesley and Emma Sheafer Collection, Bequest of Emma A. Sheafer, 1973 1974.356.488

**MARKS:** painted on underside: crossed swords in underglaze blue

**CONSTRUCTION/CONDITION:** molded with applied handle and spout; repairs at side of base and to tip of spout, old repair to underside of base treated in gold

**PROVENANCE:** Walter von Pannwitz, Berlin (until 1905; sale, Galerie Hugo Helbing, Munich, October 24–25, 1905, no. 377); S. Berges, New York; Lesley and Emma Sheafer, New York (until 1973; bequeathed to MMA)


**LITERATURE:** Brüning 1904, p. 27, no. 151; Galerie Hugo Helbing 1905, no. 377, pl. lxxvii; Georges Brunel in *Pagodes et dragons* 2007, pp. 195–96, no. 80, ill.

**FROM THE BEGINNING THE MEISSEN FACTORY COPIED CHINESE MODELS**

The export ceramics owned by August II (1670–1733), commonly known as Augustus the Strong, elector of Saxony, king of Poland, provided convenient prototypes for a factory that was, by necessity, more concerned with technological advances than with aesthetic innovation during its formative years. The taste for copies or interpretations of Chinese and Japanese originals continued through the 1730s, long after the factory had developed both new models and types of decoration that were entirely European in conception. Meissen made use of Chinese and Japanese prototypes in a variety of ways that ranged from appropriating both form and decoration, which resulted in close copies of the original, to employing either the form or type of decoration from the original, but not in combination, and thus producing works only distantly related to the Chinese models.

This wine pot is an example of the latter approach in which a Chinese form is decorated in a wholly European style, and the result is a work far removed from its original source. The model was a porcelain wine pot from the Kangxi period (1662–1722), which probably dates to around 1700 (fig. 29). The unusual shape of this model evokes a flattened peach that is fitted with a sloping base, an ear-shaped handle, and a slightly curved spout. Chinese wine pots of this model do not have a cover and were filled through a hole in the base. The hole serves as the opening to a porcelain funnel that extends vertically inside the pot to a height that prevents the liquid from escaping when the pot is turned right side up after filling. While Meissen and other European versions of the Chinese wine pots have often been described as teapots, the construction of this pot would not allow it to perform that function. In addition, the European examples of this form have been occasionally termed “Cadogan teapots,” due to an unsubstantiated association with William Cadogan (1675–1726), 1st Earl of Cadogan, or his wife.

The Museum’s wine pot is decorated with polychrome chinoiserie scenes on the two long sides of the pot in the manner of Johann Gregorius Höroldt (German, 1696–1775). An unusually elaborate pattern of gilt highlight with purple lustre extends from the top of the handle to the spout, and small leaves painted in iron-red, purple, and gold decorate the spout and the handle. The gilt branches that extend from the handle and spout terminate in applied, elongated leaves that recall an applied-foliate decoration often found on Meissen porcelain from the previous decade, but here they are transformed in appearance by the use of green enamel. The chinoiserie scenes are relatively small in scale in relation to the size of the pot, giving prominence
to the areas of undecorated white porcelain and allowing the green leaves to play a prominent decorative role.

Based on the number of surviving examples, it appears that wine pots were not produced in large numbers at Meissen. There are two other wine pots with decorative schemes very similar to the Museum’s example, and the similarity of these two pots, now in the collections of the J. Paul Getty Museum, Los Angeles,9 and the Gardiner Museum, Toronto,10 extends to the distinctive leaf decoration found on their spouts and handles. A wine pot of the same model that was on the market in the 1980s is also decorated with chinoiserie scenes in what appears to be a related gilt design on the top, but the spout and handles are fully gilded rather than painted with scattered leaves.11 Three other wine pots are known, all of which are decorated only with gilding. The example with the simplest gilt decoration is in the Porzellanammlung, Staatliche Kunstsammlungen Dresden, and it has been dated to around 1735,12 although an earlier date might also be proposed. A wine pot in the Cagnola Art Collection, near Varese, Italy,13 and a wine pot in the Museum’s collection are more elaborately decorated with chinoiserie scenes in gold.14 The gilding on all three pots was almost certainly executed in Augsburg, where several gilding workshops excelled in this type of decoration from the late 1720s to the early 1730s.15

The fact that only seven of these Meissen wine pots are known today is an indication that relatively few were made, and it is possible that the steps involved in their fabrication may have discouraged production on a significant scale. The peach-shaped body would have been created with molds, and the base with its vertical funnel would have been crafted separately, either by throwing or with a mold. The base would have then been joined to the two sides of the wine pot, adding an additional step to the assemblage process. It is conceivable that the process was too time-consuming in order to produce an object defined by a clever feature that was not readily apparent.
17. Temple of Venus

**MEISSEN FACTORY, GERMAN, 1710–PRESENT**

Modeled by Johann Gottlieb Kirchner (German, b. 1706)
ca. 1727–28

Hard-paste porcelain decorated in polychrome enamels and gold

11 ⁹⁄₁₆ × 8 ⁵⁄₈ × 3 ³⁄₈ in. (29.4 × 21.9 × 8.6 cm)

Gift of R. Thornton Wilson, in memory of Florence Ellsworth Wilson, 1950.50.211.229

**MARKS:** painted on back: crossed swords in underglaze blue

**CONSTRUCTION/CONDITION:** molded in three sections with the addition of modeled figures; missing elements at proper left side and at top, firing cracks in back

**PROVENANCE:** [Max Glückselig]; R. Thornton Wilson (by 1949; to MMA)

**EXHIBITION:** “Masterpieces of European Porcelain,” The Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York, March 18–May 15, 1949

**LITERATURE:** C. L. Avery 1949b, no. 220; Blaauwen 1975, pp. 71–72, fig. 2; Le Corbeiller 1990, pp. 13, 56, ill. p. 15; I. Menzhausen 1993, p. 13, ill. p. 14; Blaauwen 2000, pp. 100–102, under no. 50; Cassidy-Geiger 2002b, p. 152, fig. 44; Wittwer 2004, p. 106, fig. 86; Wittwer 2006, p. 106, fig. 86

The form of this remarkable porcelain sculpture recalls that of a triumphal arch, though the center of this object is occupied by a niche flanked by Roman Ionic columns. Standing in the niche are the figures of Venus, who holds a flaming heart, and a cupid, who reaches toward her. The structure’s tall base extends on either side, showing the figure of Jupiter with his eagle to the left, and an empty space to the right, where the figure of Juno almost certainly would have stood but clearly has been broken off. Above the niche is a double entablature with sloping roofs at both ends, and a central depressed, undecorated area in which another figure presumably would have been placed. The architectural quality of the structure has been emphasized by the decorative marbling of the base, the columns, the pilasters located behind the columns, and the sloping roofs at the top. Curiously, the decorative scheme also includes a series of reserves with chinoiserie scenes that do not appear to be related to either the mythological figures or to the strong architectural aspect of the sculpture. The contrast between the finely painted quality of the small-scale chinoiserie scenes and the loosely executed marbling creates a surprising aesthetic effect that, in combination with the relatively unsophisticated modeling of the two figures, makes the Venus Temple unlike anything else produced at Meissen during the late 1720s. It is important to view the sculpture as one of the earliest works to have been created by the first sculptor employed by the factory, and from this perspective, it must be regarded as a highly ambitious undertaking.

From contemporary factory records, it is known that Johann Gottlieb Kirchner (German, b. 1706) created the model for the sculpture, referred to in original documents as the Venus Tempel, in July 1727. Three examples of the Venus Temple were recorded in the Meissen inventory in July 1729, and two were ordered in 1733 for delivery to the Japanese Palace in Dresden. Another Venus Temple is known to survive today, and on this example, now in the collections of the Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam, the three mythological figures, including that of Juno, are intact. While the choice to create a Venus Temple in porcelain may seem unexpected for the Meissen factory, temples devoted to the Goddess of Love created in other media had both an immediacy and an elevated status in Dresden court circles. A large, two-tiered Venus Temple had served as the primary table decoration at a dinner held in Dresden in 1719 to celebrate the wedding of the Crown Prince Frederick August II (1696–1763) to Maria Josepha (1699–1757), daughter of Holy Roman Emperor Joseph I (1678–1711). The decorations and protocol established for this wedding were considered so successful that they established the model for future royal weddings in Dresden.
It is not surprising that Kirchner looked to sources close at hand for inspiration for his Venus Temple. Sculptural production of European subjects was still in its infancy at Meissen, and no repertoire of figural types had yet been established. Furthermore, there was a natural association between the court architecture created for August II (1670–1733), commonly known as Augustus the Strong, elector of Saxony, king of Poland, and the porcelain produced at Meissen to decorate one of his palaces. The strongly architectural nature, as exemplified by the Venus Temple, was not a stylistic direction that Meissen would explore in depth, but the depiction of figures in the European tradition would soon become one of the defining aspects of the factory’s production.

In modeling the Venus Temple, Kirchner drew upon sources with which he was familiar. His older brother, Johann Christian Kirchner (German, 1691–1732), worked with the court sculptor Balthasar Permoser (German, 1651–1732) on the decorative program for the Zwinger Palace in Dresden, a complex used for display and entertainment, which was constructed from 1710 to 1728. Three garden sculptures by Permoser served as models for the figures created for the Venus Temple, and two of these works by Permoser were made for the Zwinger. The third sculpture by Permoser, the figure of Venus, was produced for a garden in a manor house in Borna, a town located to the west of Dresden, which may have been accessible to the younger Kirchner through his brother. Elements of the architecture of the Venus Temple recall the Zwinger as well. Abraham L. den Blaauwen has noted the sloping roofs atop the Venus Temple are similar to those found on the Nymphenbad, an elaborate architectural fountain within the Zwinger complex. The distinctive low-relief, foliate decoration on the columns of the Venus Temple echo similar carved ornament on columns found within the Zwinger.

Even though it might seem logical to assume that the porcelain Venus Temple was created to serve as table decoration, its early date of production indicates that it would not have been displayed on the dining or dessert table. It was not until the mid-1730s that porcelain sculpture would begin to play a major role in decorating the table, gradually replacing the long-established practice of creating sugar sculptures to serve as the decorative elements. It is not known specifically how the two Venus Temples ordered for the Japanese Palace were intended to be displayed, but they were part of a very large order of vases, tea services, plates, tureens, and figures, all of which would have been installed decoratively on the walls.

18. Garniture of three vases

**MEISSEN FACTORY, GERMAN, 1710–PRESENT**

ca. 1725–30

Tinted hard-paste porcelain decorated in polychrome enamels and gold

.153a, b: 12 11⁄16 × 7 15⁄16 × 7 in. (32.9 × 18.6 × 17.8 cm)
.154a, b: 9 3/4 × 4 1/4 × 4 1/4 in. (24.8 × 12.1 × 11.7 cm)
.155a, b: 9 1/2 × 4 9/16 × 4 11/16 in. (24.1 × 11.6 × 11.9 cm)

Gift of Irwin Untermyer, 1964 64.101.153a, b–155a, b

**MARKS:** all painted on underside: crossed swords in blue enamel

**CONSTRUCTION/CONDITION:** All three vases are wheel-thrown with applied molded and modeled decoration; .153 firing crack in foot; .154 finial restuck

**PROVENANCE:** Irwin Untermyer (by 1949–64; to MMA)


**LITERATURE:** C. L. Avery 1949b, no. 334; Hackenbroch 1956, pp. 130–31, fig. 117, pl. 85; Yvonne Hackenbroch in Metropolitan Museum 1977, p. 108, no. 193, ill.; Bauer 1983, p. 36, under no. 9; Blaauwen 2000, p. 74, under no. 37

**THESE THREE VASES ARE DISTINCTIVE FOR THEIR MUTED BLUE COLOR,** which was achieved by tainting the porcelain paste rather than by applying a blue ground color after the vases had been glazed. The vases were made during the period in which the Meissen factory was experimenting with ground colors, and adding color to the paste before the objects were thrown or molded must have been one of the methods explored. Very few pieces with tinted color were produced at Meissen (fig. 30), suggesting that the results were deemed unsatisfactory. It has been observed by Ulrich Pietsch that enamel colors do not read well against the tinted ground, and it may have been for this reason that adding color to the paste was abandoned after a period of several years in favor of colored grounds applied over the glaze. The standard format that developed for the use of colored grounds left certain defined areas white, known as reserves. Applying the enamel colors within the reserves allowed the brilliant palette developed by Johann Gregorius Höroldt (German, 1696–1775) to be seen to best advantage against the bright-white Meissen paste.

The other known blue-tinted pieces of Meissen include a small cup and a small covered pot in the British Museum, London, a small beaker in the Museum für Kunsthandwerk, Frankfurt am Main, a tankard in the Porzellanammlung, Staatliche Kunstsammlungen Dresden, and a beaker vase in the Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam. While the decoration of the latter is closely related to the Museum’s vases, the set of three now in New York reflects the most ambitious works produced in this experimental technique. On each of the Museum’s vases, two polychrome chinoiserie scenes are painted just above the foot, with each scene enclosed by low-relief vines with leaves and clusters of grapes. These applied vines, formed of glazed-white porcelain, provide a stark contrast to the blue-tinted body, serving to enhance the blue color and supply a framework for the chinoiserie scenes. The vines were skillfully constructed with molds employed for the leaves and the grape clusters and with modeling by hand for the undulating branches; the crispness of the contours and the veining of the leaves reflect the proficiency of the factory’s modelers. It must have been perceived at the factory that the use of white porcelain in low relief on the blue-tinted body created a pleasing visual impact, because all of the pieces cited above employ this contrast.

The use of applied ornament, especially in the form of vines, leaves, or flowers, is commonly found on the porcelain made in the earliest years at the factory by Johann Friedrich Böttger (German, 1682–1719), approximately between 1713 and 1720. As the factory did not have the necessary technology to fire enamel colors successfully at this time, low-relief ornament provided the most effective form of decoration.
The presence of the applied vines on these vases is as an extension of the fantasy landscapes depicted in the enamel colors. The applied vines are further integrated into the overall compositional scheme by the presence of the small insects painted as if they were flying around the branches, and in some cases seeming poised to alight on one.

The six chinoiserie scenes on the three vases reflect all of the characteristics that made this type of decoration popular at Meissen in the 1720s. The figures are dressed in elaborate costumes intended to make them instantly recognizable as Chinese, with distinctive hats, in particular, that mark the figures as "exotic." The robes worn by the figures are decorated with detailed patterns painted in a palette of vibrant colors, and the abbreviated landscapes in which the figures stand are defined by bands of ornamental fencing that echo the patterning of the costumes. A vertical element
is added to each scene in the form of a parasol, an ornamental fan, or a pole with decorative streamers, and these compositional devices help define the areas bordered by the applied vines. It is not possible to attribute the decoration on these vases to a specific painter, but this type of painting is often described as being in the manner of Johann Ehrenfried Stadler (German, 1701–1741), who was employed by the factory around 1723.

All of the blue-tinted works produced at Meissen are ascribed to the years 1725–30, and it was during this period that the factory developed the technical expertise to apply ground colors successfully. By the late 1720s Meissen was able to employ a range of grounds that included yellow, blue, a pale turquoise, and purple, and as a result, the interest ceased in coloring the porcelain paste itself.

6. Similar applied floral ornament is occasionally found earlier on Meissen red stoneware as well; see Johann Friedrich Böttger 1982, no. 1/41.
7. Pietsch 2011, p. 82, no. 29.
10. See, for example, Blaauwen 2000, pp. 66–70, no. 34, pp. 82–83, no. 42, pp. 88–89, no. 45, p. 92, no. 47, p. 110, no. 57.
19. Fountain and basin

**MEISSEN FACTORY, GERMAN, 1710–PRESENT**

Modeled by Johann Gottlieb Kirchner (German, b. 1706)
ca. 1727–32

Hard-paste porcelain decorated in polychrome enamels and gold; silver spout

Assembled: 24 1/2 × 18 1/4 × 16 1/2 in. (62.2 × 46 × 41.9 cm)
.a (fountain): 13 3/4 in. (35 cm);
.b (plinth): 11 1/4 × 10 in. (28.7 × 25.4 cm);
.c (basin): 3 1/8 × 18 3/8 × 13 5/8 in. (7.9 × 46.7 × 34.6 cm)

Gift of R. Thornton Wilson, in memory of Florence Ellsworth Wilson, 1954.54.147.65a–c

**MARKS:** .a: painted on back, at base: crossed swords in underglaze blue; .b: painted on back: crossed swords in underglaze blue; .c: painted on underside: crossed swords in underglaze blue

**CONSTRUCTION/CONDITION:** all components molded; .a: repairs at base near spout, shell broken and repaired

**PROVENANCE:** R. Thornton Wilson (until 1954; to MMA)

**LITERATURE:** Blackburn 1957, p. 36, fig. 42 (54.147.65c); Dauterman 1963, p. 2, fig. 1 and frontispiece; McNab 1963, p. 16, fig. 9; Metropolitan Museum 1983a, p. 232, no. 72, ill.; Cassidy-Geiger 2002b, pp. 138, 152, fig. 10; Agliano and Jezler-Hübner 2003, p. 34, under no. 10; Agliano 2005b, pp. 137, 141, 142, fig. 5


The fountain is one of the largest, most complex works produced at Meissen in the years around 1730. The factory archives reveal a certain amount of information about its genesis, though not all of the circumstances are entirely clear. The German modeler Johann Gottlieb Kirchner (b. 1706) is recorded as having produced a model for a basin in 1728, and then a second model in 1732, at which time he also modeled a figure of Neptune with a shell and a pedestal (or plinth) with satyrs.1 The two models of basin are closely related, which makes it difficult to distinguish one from the other in the archival references. It has been suggested by Maureen Cassidy-Geiger that Kirchner was inspired by the fountains at the Zwinger Palace in Dresden,2 where the sculptural program had already provided a source of influence on his work (entry 17).

Despite the technical challenges that would have been involved in both modeling and firing this three-part fountain, it appears there may have been as many as twelve fountains created based on the number of partial or complete surviving examples.3 Of these twelve, only seven are complete, including the Museum’s example,4 while one or more of the three components are known in four other instances.5 It appears that all but one of the surviving ten basins are decorated with chinoiserie scenes in the style of Johann Gregorius Höroldt (German, 1696–1775).6 The Museum’s basin is painted with a central shaped scene that includes a group of Chinese figures gathered around a table, with an African figure appearing behind the trunk of a palm tree, and another Chinese figure in a headdress approaching the group. The palm trees and the other colorful vegetation emphasize the exotic quality of the setting, and a
harbor scene is depicted in minute detail in the far distance. The scene is framed by an unusually detailed cartouche executed in gold and purple lustre. At either side of the cartouche are two smaller chinoiserie scenes, and just below the interior rim of the basin are twelve small, monochromatic chinoiserie and harbor scenes. The size of the primary scene, the inclusion of the two secondary vignettes, and the addition of the twelve small scenes make this basin one of the most elaborately decorated works produced at Meissen during this time, and it reflects the ambition of the table fountain model.

The figural composition of the central scene can be traced to two designs in the Schulz Codex, a compilation of drawings created to serve as a design source for the painters at Meissen. Assembled from 1723 to 1724, the codex contains many sketches not only by Höroldt but also by numerous other artists, and the vast majority depict chinoiserie figures and vignettes that could be copied, often in combination with other motifs drawn from the assembled sketches, on both the functional and the decorative wares produced by the factory. The sketches in the codex provided models for the work executed by the forty-six painters working under Höroldt, and the decorative and compositional style that he promoted in this fashion defined Meissen’s production in the years from about 1722 until the early 1730s.

Cassidy-Geiger has observed that several of Meissen’s most sculptural works from this period, which are fully Baroque in style, are decorated with chinoiserie painting in the manner of Höroldt. The whimsical and elegant, linear quality of the chinoiseries seems curiously at odds with the expressive, sculptural aspect of the porcelain models themselves. The unexpected fusion of styles may be explained by the fact that the Meissen painting studio was working independently of the modelers at this time, and there was no coordination to ensure a unified artistic vision. The group of table fountains, the Temple of Venus from around 1727 to 1728 (entry 17), and several clock cases dating from around 1727 to 1730 reflect this fusing of disparate styles, and this tension between the sculptural potential of the model and the painted decoration would persist as a theme at the factory for the next two decades.

3 Despite every effort to compile a comprehensive list, identification made on the basis of old black-and-white photographs and a certain number of ownership changes has made this task very challenging, and the reader is cautioned not to regard the list as definitive. That said, the author is very indebted to the research of Maureen Cassidy-Geiger and Clare Le Corbeiller, both of whom worked exhaustively to catalogue this group of objects.
4 Hetjens-Museum, Deutsches Keramikmuseum, Düsseldorf (Alfred Ziffer in Pietsch and Banz 2010, pp. 296–97, no. 302); Ludwig Collection, Bamberg (Agliano and Jezler-Hübner 2003, p. 34, fig. 35); formerly Abingdon Collection (Christie’s, London, sale cat., July 5, 1949, no. 228; sale held at Highcliffe Castle, Highcliffe, Dorset); Porzellansammlung, Staatliche Kunstsammlungen Dresden (E. Zimmermann 1926, pl. 13); formerly Torré Collection, Zurich (Hofmann 1980, p. 268, no. 39); Mary Moody Northen, Inc., Galveston, Texas (Christie’s, London, sale cat., June 30, 1980, no. 261). The basin of this last fountain appears to be a later replacement and of a different model, and an eighteenth-century origin has been doubted; see Clare Le Corbeiller to Bradley C. Brooks, Curator, Mary Moody Northen, Inc., December 7, 1988, curatorial files, Department of European Sculpture and Decorative Arts, The Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York.
5 A figure of Neptune and a basin (but without a plinth) are in the Bayerisches Nationalmuseum, Munich (Rückert 1966, p. 78, no. 194, colorpl. iv, p. 164, no. 851, pl. 202); a figure of Neptune (bowl destroyed) and a plinth in the State Hermitage Museum, Saint Petersburg (Butler 1977, no. 3); a figure of Neptune (Sotheby’s, London, sale cat., May 5, 1970, no. 162); a basin in the Kocher Collection (Agliano and Jezler-Hübner 2003, p. 34, no. 10, fig. 36).
6 In a handwritten annotation to the Abingdon sale catalogue, Maureen Cassidy-Geiger observes that the decoration of the basin appears to include dwarfs, even though the sale catalogue description (see note 4 above) cites “Chinese figures” (annotated photocopy in the curatorial files, Department of European Sculpture and Decorative Arts, The Metropolitan Museum of Art).
7 Exotische Welten 2010, p. 78, fol. 9, p. 106, fol. 37.
9 Pietsch 2011, p. 23.
11 Ibid.
12 See, for example, Reinheckel 1964, Cassidy-Geiger 2008, pp. 232–37, no. 33.
20. Vase

**MEISSEN FACTORY, GERMAN, 1710–PRESENT**

Decoration attributed to Adam Friedrich von Löwenfinck (German, 1714–1754)

ca. 1735

Hard-paste porcelain decorated in polychrome enamels and gold

15 ⁷⁄₈ × 10 × 10 in. (40.3 × 25.4 × 25.4 cm)

The Lesley and Emma Sheafer Collection, Bequest of Emma A. Sheafer, 1973 1974.356.363

**MARKS:** painted on underside: AR in underglaze blue

**INSCRIPTIONS:** incised on underside: Maltese cross

**CONSTRUCTION/CONDITION:** wheel-thrown (body and neck thrown separately, then joined); neck warped in firing

**PROVENANCE:** [S. Berges (until 1942; to Sheafers)]; Lesley and Emma Sheafer, New York (until 1973; bequeathed to MMA)


**LITERATURE:** Wark 1967, p. 17, figs. 8, 9; Ulrich Pietsch in Pietsch and Banz 2010, p. 224, no. 128, ill. p. 225; Pietsch 2014, pp. 162–63, no. 59, p. 74, figs. 40, 41

**VERY FEW PAINTERS WORKING AT MEISSEN UNDER JOHANN**

Gregorius Höroldt (German, 1696–1775) developed a distinctive, recognizable style, in part because the type of chinoiserie decoration implemented by Höroldt in the early 1720s evolved into a factory style in which the hands of individual artists were difficult to detect. Among the few artists whose work stands out from that of his peers is Adam Friedrich von Löwenfinck (German, 1714–1754). His stay at Meissen was relatively short but nevertheless very influential in terms of creating a particular style of chinoiserie decoration. Löwenfinck joined the factory in 1727 at the age of thirteen to apprentice under Höroldt, and by 1734 he had completed his training. Löwenfinck left Meissen in October 1736, perhaps due to frustration with his compensation as determined by Höroldt. After his departure, Löwenfinck worked for a number of faience factories in Germany, beginning with one in Bayreuth, and it is the few works in faience bearing his signature that provide the basis for attributions to his hand on Meissen porcelain.

In his brief tenure at Meissen, Löwenfinck developed a manner of painting that relied strongly on line, with an emphasis on contour, as opposed to the subtle shading that was characteristic of Höroldt’s painting style. The graphic quality of Löwenfinck’s style, coupled with his use of areas of saturated color, gives his work a highly ornamental quality that is immediately distinguishable from Höroldt-style chinoiserie, where volume, a sense of pictorial depth, and atmospheric effects are emphasized. The prints of the Dutch artist Petrus Schenk (1698–1775) have often been cited as an influence on Löwenfinck, who copied some of Schenk’s compositions, and Chinese famille verte (of the green family) porcelains, with their strong sense of pattern and linearity, have been recognized as an influence as well. Stylistic elements from both of these sources can be seen in a series of watercolors attributed to Löwenfinck now in the archives at the Meissen factory.

In addition to developing a distinctive painting style, Löwenfinck created compositions within the genre of chinoiserie that departed slightly from the factory norm. He is best known for the fantastic beasts that often populate his scenes, and a service decorated with Fabeltiere (mythical creatures) is his most famous work in this genre. Each plate in the extensive service is decorated with one of these beasts in the center and a continuous landscape with Chinese figures amidst exotic vegetation on the rim. These beasts, also known as fable creatures, evidently enjoyed considerable popularity, as they continue to appear on Meissen porcelain long after Löwenfinck’s departure in late 1736. The so-called Münchhausen service, produced in 1745, is an example of the extended stylistic life of the type of fantastic creatures created by Löwenfinck approximately a decade before.
The decoration of this tall, bottlenecked vase has been attributed to Löwenfinck not only for stylistic reasons but also because two of the scenes that decorate the three reserves are repeated on a faience tankard made in Bayreuth that bears his initials, F.v.L. This tankard, which is also in the Museum (fig. 31),\textsuperscript{10} is dated from about 1736 to 1737, the period immediately following Löwenfinck’s departure from Meissen. On the tankard, one scene depicts three Chinese figures, one of whom appears to be a boy who holds a rabbit. In the second scene, one of three Chinese figures rides a fantastic beast and holds a pennant in his left hand. While these scenes are found on the Museum’s vase, they are in reverse orientation to those on the faience tankard. The understanding of why the compositions would be flipped is made more complex by the fact that the scene with the boy and the rabbit exists on another Meissen vase in the same orientation as that found on the tankard,\textsuperscript{11} and the scene of the man riding a fantastic beast as seen on the tankard appears on yet another Meissen vase.\textsuperscript{12} In other words, Löwenfinck repeated his compositions at Meissen but employed them in two different orientations, and then he reused the compositions at Bayreuth but in reverse of those found on the Museum’s vase. It is not clear why Löwenfinck inverted the compositions while he was at Meissen and again on the Bayreuth tankard. It is possible that he originated the compositions and simply decided to paint them in reverse on different objects, or that he worked from both an original sketch and from a print made of that sketch, which would have reversed the orientation.

It is almost certain that the Museum’s vase would have been part of a set of three or five vases that formed a garniture, a decorative grouping of vases often including a variety of shapes. It is not known what model or models of vases might have originally accompanied the Museum’s vase, but a document from 1737 records the delivery of “three round display bottles,” suggesting that in this particular instance, three vases of this same form might have been displayed together.\textsuperscript{13} This model of bottlenecked vase was not one of the most common produced at Meissen, and other surviving examples date from the period 1730 to 1735.\textsuperscript{14} It is interesting to note that the elongated neck on the Museum’s vase has warped in the firing, but this imperfection was not viewed as cause for rejection, and it was given subsequent firings in order to apply the painted decoration. The evident appreciation for large Meissen vases was such that a vase with obvious warping around the rim was nevertheless deemed appropriate to be included in a garniture presented by August III of Poland (1696–1763) to his mother-in-law, the Dowager Empress Wilhelmine Amalia (1673–1742) in 1737.\textsuperscript{15}

4 Pietsch 2014, p. 80, figs. 56, 58, 60.
5 Ibid., p. 77, figs. 49, 50. pp. 168–69, no. 63.
6 Ibid., pp. 108–9, nos. 1–5.
7 Cassidy-Geiger 2008, p. 432, no. 182.
11 Ibid., pp. 164–65, nos. 60, 61.
12 Ibid., pp. 166–61, nos. 57, 58.
21. Lion and lioness

MEISSEN FACTORY, GERMAN, 1710–PRESENT
Johann Gottlieb Kirchner (German, b. 1706)
ca. 1732
Hard-paste porcelain
.1 (lion): 21 × 32 ¾ × 13 ½ in. (53.3 × 83.2 × 34.3 cm)
.2 (lioness): 19 × 29 ⁷⁄₈ × 13 in. (48.3 × 75.9 × 33 cm)
Wrightsman Fund, 1988 1988.294.1, .2

MARKS: both unmarked

CONSTRUCTION/CONDITION: .1: molded; numerous firing cracks, significant discoloration of glaze, loss to glaze on proper right cheek, losses to proper right paw, loss near proper left paw,.2: molded; numerous firing cracks, numerous losses along base throughout, discoloration of glaze

PROVENANCE (.1 and .2): August II, elector of Saxony, Japanese Palace, Dresden; [Johanneum, until late 19th century]; Selina, 4th Countess of Longford (late 19th century?); Edward Pakenham, 6th Earl of Longford (probably by 1899); by descent, Thomas Pakenham, son of the 7th Earl of Longford (until 1988; [sold through Armin B. Allen, London, to MMA])


One of the most ambitious projects undertaken by any ceramic factory during the eighteenth century was the creation of a menagerie of porcelain animals by the Meissen factory in the first half of the 1730s. These figures of a lion and lioness were part of a vast commission of mammals and birds that was initiated at the factory by 1730, and all of the animals were intended for display in the Japanese Palace, which was situated on the Elbe River in Dresden. In 1717, August II (1670–1733), commonly known as Augustus the Strong, elector of Saxony, king of Poland, had purchased a much smaller building on the site, then known as the Dutch Palace. It was initially used for court festivities, but by 1725 it was decided that the Dutch Palace should be the setting for the vast holdings of porcelain amassed by Augustus the Strong and renamed the Japanese Palace. Construction commenced in 1729 to significantly remodel and expand the palace, and while plans were continually modified in the early 1730s, the intention was to display the Chinese and Japanese porcelains on the ground floor while reserving the upper floor for Meissen porcelain. A large gallery on the upper floor was to be devoted to the porcelain animals, but the Japanese Palace had not been completed by the time of Augustus’s death in 1733. Work continued after 1733 on both the palace and the production of the animals; nevertheless, the entire project was abandoned by 1740 due to a variety of political factors and despite the initial commitment shown by August III (1696–1763), the son of Augustus the Strong.

No precedent existed for a project of this scope in terms of scale of the commission and the individual figures. A factory order from late 1733 lists 296 figures of 37 different mammals, and 292 birds of 32 different varieties, which represented the commission at its maximum size. The technical challenges involved in producing these large figures were so extreme that the commission was never completed, although 159 mammals and 319 birds were inventoried in the Japanese Palace in 1736, the last year in which the figures were produced. The scale of the figures presented the most fundamental problem to the factory. Augustus the Strong had stipulated that the figures be lifesize, or as approximate to lifesize as possible, and the standard porcelain paste used by the factory was not durable enough to fabricate figures of this scale. Numerous experiments were conducted to make a paste capable of supporting the mass required by the size of the animals. The addition to the paste of ground-up pieces of fired porcelain provided one of the more successful remedies, but even with this fortified porcelain body, cracking was a common occurrence and source of constant concern. It was essential for the figure to dry thoroughly before the first firing, and both the sheer quantity of porcelain paste and the
requisite thickness of the walls of the body meant that six to eight weeks of drying time were often needed in order for all the moisture in the clay to evaporate. The first kiln firing, conducted at low temperature, was intended to stabilize the figure, which was fired a second time at a much higher temperature after the glaze was applied. Porcelain shrinks when subjected to the heat of the kiln, and this inevitable shrinkage contributed significantly to the problem of cracking.

Augustus the Strong not only wanted the porcelain animals to resemble in scale the actual animal depicted but also requested that the figures be colored naturalistically. In order to accomplish this stipulation with enamel colors, a third firing would have been necessary. It was clear the larger animals would not survive an additional firing; therefore almost all were colored with oil paints that did not need to be fired. This type of decoration, known as cold painting, did not produce satisfactory results, because the oil paints lacked the color saturation and glossy finish of fired enamel colors. The oil paints did not adhere well to the porcelain surface, and because they have darkened with time, most of these original surface treatments have been removed, because the peeling and discolored paints rendered the animals unsightly. The painting of the animals did offer the opportunity to disguise the cracks and blemishes, which were frequently numerous, and because many of the animals no longer bear their original decoration, they have come to be understood to modern eyes as "white" animals, whose musculature and coats can be more fully appreciated unobscured.

The work on the large animals almost certainly began in the second half of 1730, and it is known that modeler Johann Gottlieb Kirchner (German, b. 1706) (entry 19) and the recently hired sculptor Johann Joachim Kändler (German, 1706–1775) were creating models for various animals by September 1731. The lion and lioness are the work of Kirchner, who produced the models for the two figures before August 1732. The two recumbent lions are among the most ambitious of the animals created by him, and they are notable for having been conceived as a pair, with the lioness in the answering pose to that of the lion. In his depiction of the two animals, Kirchner has not attempted to create realistic portraits of male and female lions. Both figures lie in a docile pose with front legs crossed and their heads turned toward the viewer. Each has an expression that has been
described as contemplative, and their expressive eyes seem decidedly more human than animal. There is little sense in Kirchner’s depictions of the lions of the power and incipient danger for which they are known, despite the perception of muscular tension with which the figures are imbued. It has been suggested by Samuel Wittwer that Kirchner’s aim was to use the imagery of a lion as the king of animals to evoke the majesty of a human king, which by association would apply to Augustus the Strong, for whom the animals were created.10

While a total of twenty-four figures of both the male and female lions was ordered, it appears that a lesser number of each model were produced, despite the fact the calculation is made complex by a variety of factors. Seven of the male lions and five female lions are known to have survived, including the examples under discussion. The male lion now at the Museum is distinctive among this group for his pale-blue coloring. It is not clear why the lion’s glaze has a pale-blue tint, although it can be assumed that it was not done deliberately for aesthetic effect. It is possible that blue residue entered the glaze mixture by mistake.11 As the lion was intended to be painted with oil colors, this defect would not have caused undue concern at the factory, and today we appreciate the blue tint as evidence of the technical struggles encountered in the production of these remarkable pieces of sculpture.

1 The vast majority of the current knowledge of the commission and the porcelain animals themselves is due to the work of Samuel Wittwer, whose findings are published in Wittwer 2006.
2 Ibid., pp. 32–58.
3 Ibid., pp. 56–58.
4 Ibid., p. 67.
5 Ibid., p. 68.
6 Ibid., p. 83.
7 Ibid., p. 66.
8 Ibid., pp. 312–13. While Wittwer only attributes the lions to Kirchner, they are universally accepted as his work.
9 Ibid., indicating that the lion was conceived first.
10 Ibid., pp. 175–76.
11 Ibid, p. 86.
22. Columbine and Pantalone

**MEISSEN FACTORY, GERMAN, 1710–PRESENT**

Modeled by Johann Joachim Kändler (German, 1706–1775)

ca. 1736

Hard-paste porcelain decorated in polychrome enamels and gold

$6\frac{5}{16} \times 5\frac{11}{16} \times 3\frac{13}{16}$ in. (16 × 14.4 × 9.7 cm)

The Jack and Belle Linsky Collection, 1982 1982.60.300

**MARKS:** painted on underside: crossed swords in underglaze blue (faint)

**CONSTRUCTION/CONDITION:** press-molded; repair to feathers of female figure’s cap

**PROVENANCE:** Jack and Belle Linsky (by 1949–82; to MMA)

**EXHIBITION:** “Masterpieces of European Porcelain,” The Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York, March 18–May 15, 1949


The Meissen factory started producing small-scale sculpture shortly after its founding in 1710. These early works were made in red stoneware, as the technical mastery of porcelain had not yet been achieved (entry 11). Once porcelain was developed for commercial production, small-scale figures were made beginning around 1713, most of which were either copies of or derived from Chinese prototypes.1 The few exceptions included several figures depicting characters from the commedia dell’arte2 or figures of dwarfs that date to the mid-1720s.3

The project to produce large-scale animals for the Japanese Palace (entry 21) in the early 1730s reflected the factory’s first serious and organized commitment to the production of sculpture, and it subsequently absorbed all of the factory’s resources in this genre until the project was abandoned in 1736. By that date, the highly talented German modeler Johann Joachim Kändler (1706–1775) had elevated the status of sculpture at the factory, and his successes in modeling figures and integrating a sculptural component into tablewares were to define the factory’s production for the next two decades. After the production of animals for the Japanese Palace ceased, Kändler turned his attention to small-scale figures, many of which depicted either characters from the Italian comedy or figures from European fashionable society engaged in various pursuits.

It is logical to assume that the choice of commedia dell’arte characters as a major focus for porcelain sculpture was due to the enduring popularity of the type of theatrical entertainment that it depicted. Traveling troupes of Italian comedy actors frequently performed in Dresden during the early eighteenth century, and beginning in the early 1720s, Dresden court spectacles often included members of the court dressed in the costumes of the commedia dell’arte.4 The appeal of the commedia dell’arte remained undiminished during the reign of August III (1696–1763), elector of Saxony, king of Poland, who in 1738 enlisted a troupe of Italian comedy actors to perform in both Dresden and Warsaw. The status of the commedia dell’arte in Dresden was reinforced by the troupe’s performance at the wedding festivities of the elector’s daughter Maria Amalia (1724–1760) to Charles III (1716–1788), king of Spain.5

This figure group is one of Kändler’s earliest depictions of characters from the commedia dell’arte. The two figures are traditionally identified as Columbine and Pantalone, two of the stock characters of the Italian comedy often portrayed together. Pantalone was an elderly Venetian merchant known for his greedy and lustful nature, while Columbine was a coquettish and sharp-witted female servant.6 However, while Kändler’s description of a slightly later version of this group lists the male figure as Pantalone, the female figure is not identified by name, suggesting that it
might not have been intended to represent Columbine. It has also been noted that the dress of the female figure does not correspond to that of a servant, and thus, the figure may represent an actress or a lady in masquerade.

In Kändler’s composition, the seated female holds a mask in one hand behind her back, while she offers Pantalone a flower with the other. The standing figure of Pantalone bows in her direction, and he is depicted with his customary cap, long pointed beard, and the flowing robe of a Venetian merchant. It has been observed by Meredith Chilton that the engraving of Pantalone from 1618 to 1619 by French Baroque printmaker Jacques Callot (1592–1635) provided the model for many of the subsequent depictions of this figure, and Kändler’s Pantalone is clearly rooted in Callot’s portrayal.

In addition, Kändler may have used the German engraver and publisher Christoph Weigel’s (1654–1725) engraving Troupe of Italian Comedians (1723) as a source for the basic compositional format for this group, although it appears that he did not depend on printed sources for the majority of his commedia dell’arte figures and groups.

Kändler’s group, Pantalone with an Actress, as it is now often designated, clearly proved to be very popular, and by 1738 the molds used to produce the pieces had been compromised from overuse. Therefore, a new version was created by Kändler with changes to the female figure, in particular; she has been given a different hairstyle and a more complex costume, and she now holds the mask in front of her and plays with Pantalone’s beard with her other hand. The group was further revised in 1741 when the female’s hairstyle and costume were again modified to make them fashionably current, while the figure of Pantalone remained essentially unchanged (fig. 32). While it is not known precisely when the model represented by the Museum’s group was introduced, it is customarily dated to about 1736; thus, the model was revised twice in a five-year period, which is unusual. The plaster molds used to make figures absorbed the moisture from the raw porcelain paste and thus deteriorated with repeated use, and it has been estimated by Alfred Ziffer that the molds could be used between twenty and thirty times before needing to be remade. Consequently, the evident popularity of the group necessitated new molds, providing Kändler with opportunities to revise and update certain details. This model in its three variants reflects the appeal of figures drawn from the commedia dell’arte, which was to furnish Kändler with a wide range of subjects into the 1760s.

3 Kunze-Köllensperger in Pietsch and Banz 2010, p. 182, no. 40.
4 Chilton 2001, pp. 166–78.
5 Ibid., p. 191.
6 For a fuller description of these two characters and their attributes, see ibid., pp. 50–55, 65–69.
7 Ibid., p. 304.
8 Ibid., p. 106 and fig. 166. The print appeared in Riccoboni 1728, pl. 3 (ill. in Chilton 2001, fig. 316).
9 Chilton 2001, pp. 187–89, fig. 305.
11 Alfred Ziffer in Pietsch and Banz 2010, pp. 316–17, no. 349.
12 Ziffer 2010, p. 64.
13 For examples, see Ziffer in Celebrating Kaendler 2006, pp. 167–79, nos. 30–32.
23. Harlequin with jug

**MEISSEN FACTORY, GERMAN, 1710–PRESENT**
Modeled by Johann Joachim Kändler (German, 1706–1775)
ca. 1740
Hard-paste porcelain decorated in polychrome enamels and gold
6 ⁹⁄₁₆ × 5 ¹⁄₈ × 3 in. (16.7 × 13 × 7.6 cm)
The Jack and Belle Linsky Collection, 1982 1982.60.309

**MARKS:** unmarked

**CONSTRUCTION/CONDITION:** press-molded

**PROVENANCE:** Sir Ernest Cassel (until 1932; sale, Puttick & Simpson, London, May 25–27, 1932, no. 625); Armand Esders (until 1941; sale, Hôtel Drouot, Paris, June 19–20, 1941, no. 184); Jack and Belle Linsky (until 1982; to MMA)

**LITERATURE:** Puttick & Simpson 1932, no. 625, ill.; Hôtel Drouot 1941, no. 184, pl. xviii; Clare Le Corbeiller in Metropolitan Museum 1984a, p. 260, no. 174, ill. p. 261

Of all the characters represented in the commedia dell’arte, Harlequin is the best known and the most immediately identifiable. Actors portraying Harlequin in the eighteenth century, as well as the porcelain figures depicting him, are invariably dressed in a jacket and trousers composed of large, brightly colored lozenges. The early, painted representations of theatrical Harlequins depict him in a costume made with irregular, variously colored patches to indicate his poverty, and this manner of dress would evolve into the distinctive, multicolored lozenge outfit with which Harlequin continues to be associated. The specific coloring employed by Meissen for Harlequin figures varied enormously; often the palette used for the jacket was different from that used for the trousers (figs. 33, 34), and his costume was frequently divided in two with different colors or patterns applied for the left and right sides of the jacket or the trousers, or both.2

On stage, Harlequin traditionally wore a half mask that was considered an integral part of his costume, but Meissen treated the figures of Harlequin in a variety of ways in regard to the use of a mask. Some figures were provided with a full mask, as in this example, while others were given a half mask, or only highly theatrical makeup in the form of exaggerated mustaches, eyebrows, or beauty spots.3 In addition, Harlequin customarily wore a hat and carried a slapstick as his primary accessory. In this depiction of Harlequin, the slapstick is absent, but the figure clutches his hat while holding a lidded wine or beer jug in his other hand.

Harlequin was one of the *zanni*, the term used to describe the servant characters in the commedia dell’arte. His character was notably complex; he was simpleminded, yet often clever, clownish, and sometimes menacing. With the Museum’s figure, Harlequin’s relaxed posture, sweeping gesture, and the prominent jug reveal aspects of his personality that could also be playful, mischievous, and sometimes lecherous. He was depicted in a wide variety of models at Meissen, both individually and as part of a figure group, many of which were created by Johann Joachim Kändler (German, 1706–1775). Kändler, the author of this model, must have been drawn to the sculptural potential of this highly theatrical character, as evidenced by the large number of different Harlequin figures he modeled during the late 1730s and early 1740s.4 As Meredith Chilton has noted, the use of masks by many of the commedia dell’arte characters, such as Harlequin, necessitated oversize physical gestures on the stage to convey emotions.5 In addition, Harlequin’s expansive personality was conducive to bold and demonstrative poses, and thus, his character was well suited to furnish Kändler with an extensive range of possibilities for sculptural expression.

For this model Kändler has created one of his most successful compositions in the round; the twisting torso, outstretched arm, turned...
head, and raised leg contribute to a sense of great dynamism and movement, creating visual interest from every angle. From the expressive pose to the disturbing quality of his gaze transmitted through the mask, this Harlequin has a sculptural presence that belies its small size. While the precise date of this model is not known, it had been created by 1738, as a dated example in the Porzellanammlung, Staatliche Kunstsammlungen Dresden attests. Even though it is difficult to date Meissen figures based solely on their painted decoration, the Museum’s Harlequin with jug—and most of the other known examples of this model—are dated to around 1740.

By this date porcelain figures, such as this one, were used increasingly to decorate the dining table in aristocratic and court circles. Small-scale sculptures made of sugar had been employed for this purpose in Europe since the sixteenth century, but the growing production of porcelain figures at Meissen during the second half of the 1730s provided an alternative that was more durable and colorful. Two of the most important dinner services produced at the factory from 1735 to 1742 included porcelain figures, initiating a custom of using figures as table decoration that flourished for the next several decades. Porcelain figures were also produced as independent pieces of sculpture to be appreciated outside the context of dining. The term Kabinettstück (which can be loosely translated as “display piece for a cabinet”) was applied to certain models in the factory records, but it was the dining table where porcelain figures achieved their greatest popularity. When August III (1696–1763), elector of Saxony, king of Poland, wanted to reward Charles Louis Auguste Fouquet (1684–1761), duc de Belle-Isle, Maréchal de France, in 1741 for his diplomatic services, he presented the Maréchal with a substantial quantity of Meissen porcelain. This gift included an extensive dinner service that the Maréchal eventually divided between his residences in Paris and Versailles. An inventory of the portion of the service that he used at Versailles included 104 figures or groups, an indication of the prominence accorded to porcelain sculpture in the context of dining in the mid-eighteenth century.

2. For example, see Jansen 2001, vol. 1, p. 47, no. 22.
7. An example dated 1740 is in the Birmingham Museum of Art, Ala. (Wallwitz 2006, pp. 201, 202, fig. 8); for additional examples, see Abraham 2010, pp. 26–27; Bonhams, London, sale cat., December 8, 2010, no. 41.
9. For a fuller discussion of this gift, see Selma Schwartz in S. Schwartz and Munger 2007, pp. 144–47.
10. Ibid., p. 146.
24. Two Freemasons

**Meissen Factory, German, 1710–Present**
Modeled by Johann Joachim Kändler (German, 1706–1775)
ca. 1744
Hard-paste porcelain decorated in polychrome enamels and gold
8 ⁷⁄₈ × 9 ³⁄₈ × 6 in. (22.5 × 23.8 × 15.2 cm)
Gift of Irwin Untermyer, 1964 64.101.112

**Marks:** unmarked

**Construction/condition:** press-molded and assembled; break at proper left knee of standing figure, calipers replaced, handle of trowel repaired, breaks in apron of seated figure, break in base near capital

**Provenance:** Baron Max von Goldschmidt-Rothschild, Frankfurt; Irwin Untermyer (by 1956–64; to MMA)


**Literature:** Hackenbroch 1956, p. 96, fig. 86, pl. 54; Bursche 1980, p. 303, under no. 310; Duval 1992, pp. 75–76, no. 31, ill.

At the same time the Meissen factory was producing figures depicting characters from the commedia dell’arte (entry 23), it was also creating figures that portrayed men and women from the upper strata of society engaged in a variety of activities. The majority of works from this latter category depict a man and a woman in some sort of leisure pursuit, most of which have a decidedly amorous undercurrent. However, this figure group of Two Freemasons stands somewhat apart from many of the figures modeled in the mid-1740s with its representation of members of a fraternal organization, a marked contrast to those figure groups that portray fashionably dressed figures engaged in a daily activity, such as taking tea or writing a letter.

Freemasons achieved considerable prominence and influence during the eighteenth century, and what had originated as a guild for the Masonic Order evolved into a fraternity that accepted non-Masons who embraced its values. The rise of Freemasonry coincided with the growth of the Enlightenment, and while Freemasonry resists simple and succinct explanations, it is rooted in the belief in the existence of a god, in the value of self-knowledge, and in the importance of virtuous and charitable behavior to one’s fellow man. A certain degree of mystery surrounded the Freemasons in the eighteenth century, in part due to the initiation ceremony required for its new members, and for the various rituals and symbols associated with the Masonic Order. In 1738 Freemasonry was banned by Pope Clement XII (pontiff 1730–40) as a threat to the Catholic Church, but it is not clear how significantly this condemnation affected the status of Freemasons in Germany. Frederick Augustus Rutowski (1702–1764), Count Rutowski, the illegitimate son of August II (1670–1733), commonly known as Augustus the Strong, elector of Saxony, king of Poland, opened a fraternal lodge in Dresden in 1738; during that same year a Freemason Lodge was established in Berlin, which became a Freemason Grand Lodge in 1744 with the support of Frederick II (1712–1786), Frederick the Great.

This model of the Two Freemasons dates to 1744, the moment at which Freemasonry was beginning to flourish throughout the Continent and Britain. While the group was modeled by Johann Joachim Kändler (German, 1706–1775), it appears to be the reworking of a group of two Freemasons created in 1742 by another Meissen modeler, Johann Friedrich Eberlein (German, 1695–1749). Evidently, the original molds had become too worn, necessitating the refashioning of the model. Kändler undertook this work in 1744, although it is not clear how extensively he changed Eberlein’s original composition. In this model, Kändler has made explicit the identity of the two figures as Freemasons. Both men wear the symbolic white aprons that were
required of every Freemason when inside a Lodge. The standing figure holds one finger to his lips, signaling the need for discretion by all Freemasons, which is acknowledged with a hand gesture from the seated figure. The compass held by the standing figure is one of the primary emblems of Freemasonry, symbolizing the need for proper proportions as a requisite for architectural beauty, which embodies the Order’s principles. At the base of the pedestal that supports the globe is a square edge, a plumb bob, and a trowel, all of which refer to the work of a Mason, including the capital lying on the ground and the column behind the two figures. The seated figure wears a square edge from a ribbon around his neck, perhaps indicating his rank as a Master, and the pug resting at his feet was commonly interpreted as a Masonic symbol by the mid-eighteenth century.\(^5\) The compositional focus on the globe has been interpreted as symbolizing the Freemasons’ philosophical embrace of the Enlightenment, which they furthered through their humanitarian values.\(^6\)

Freemasonry in Germany attracted members from both the royalty and the aristocracy, and the luxurious clothing worn by the two figures in this group suggests their elevated social standing. The jackets worn by the two men, one gray and the other a rust color, are decorated with a diaper pattern of similar design, which might have been made of silk or cut velvet. Their jackets are trimmed in gold along the pockets, seams, buttonholes, and outer edges, and the prominent cuffs and waistcoats are painted to resemble costly fabrics of the period made of silk and metallic thread.\(^7\) Both the cut of the jackets and the fabrics that the decoration evokes are typical of what would have been worn by members of fashionable society in the mid-eighteenth century, and their hats and wigs also depict styles current at the time.\(^8\)

Kändler created other figures of Freemasons (fig. 35), most of whom are also dressed in a similarly luxurious manner, suggesting that Freemasonry was commonly associated with elevated social rank in Germany in the 1740s. It is possible that the Freemason figures modeled by Kändler reflected their intended clients and audience; the circles in which Freemasons moved would have immediately recognized all of the symbolism, and the depiction of Freemasons in the fashionable and expensive medium of porcelain may have been seen as affirmation of the status of this emerging fraternal order.

---

1. For information about Freemasonry in Europe in the eighteenth century, see Curl 1991, pp. 114–18.
2. I. Menzhausen 1993, p. 112.
5. The significance of the pug in regard to Freemasonry has been interpreted by James Stevens Curl in a number of ways. The dog, valued for its fidelity, was adopted as the symbol of a society founded in 1740 that had many parallels to the Freemasons but admitted both men and women. Curl 1991, pp. 76–77; see also Macoy 1989, p. 252.
7. For a very similar gold-ground floral fabric, see the portrait of Gerard Cornelis van Riebeeck by Matthaeus Verheyden in the Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam (SK-A-816). The portrait was executed ten years after the figure group, but the fabric is remarkably similar in design. I thank my colleague Melinda Watt, Curator, Department of European Sculpture and Decorative Arts, The Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York, for drawing my attention to this portrait.
8. I thank Melinda Watt for her observations regarding the men’s costumes and wigs.
One of the most distinctive models produced at the Meissen factory is this teapot in the form of a helmeted, bearded man. He holds a dolphin that forms a spout, while a mermaid, who is supported on the shoulders of a satyr, serves as the handle. The feet of the man emerge just above the base and rest on a shell that forms the foot. A gilt-metal chain looped around the spout and the top of the handle attaches to the finial on the lid, ensuring that the latter does not become separated from the teapot itself. The teapot is one of a small number of Meissen teapots of this design, several of which have been published. As Maureen Cassidy-Geiger has observed, a design by the French artist Jacques Stella (1596–1657) published in his Livre des Vases (1667) must have provided the inspiration for the teapot’s form, and it is likely that the Meissen model draws elements from other prints by him as well. While the design that relates most closely to the Meissen teapot is significantly different in several respects, most notably in its proportions, its primary compositional element of the helmeted, bearded man holding a spout is sufficiently close to that found on the Meissen pot to indicate its influence.

Cassidy-Geiger suggests that Meissen produced these teapots for display purposes rather than for their functional value, and therefore, it is entirely plausible that they were intended to be viewed more as precious objects than as objects for daily use. The design is far more sculptural than any other teapot produced at the factory, and stylistically, it is difficult to associate the teapot with any known model of teabowl produced by Meissen. It is not clear when teapots of this unusual design were first produced. A factory inventory from 1719 describes a teapot that has been identified with this particular model; additionally, factory records from 1722 to 1728 list “Theekrügel, Wassermann,” a reference also likely to apply to this type of teapot. The date of introduction is of interest, because it provides an indication to the person responsible for its creation. If these two archival references do pertain to this model, it suggests that the Dresden court goldsmith Johann Jacob Irminger (German, 1635–1724) devised its design, as he was the primary supplier of models to the factory during these years. However, it has also been proposed that Johann Gottlieb Kirchner (German, b. 1706) modeled the teapot, which means that it could not have been created until 1727, the year he joined the Meissen factory. In either case, the design of the teapot marks it as exceptional in Meissen’s production in the years 1719–27, and stylistically it is one of the most Baroque created by the factory.

The vast majority of known examples of this teapot form were decorated outside of the factory, which suggests the model was regarded as unfashionable, and thus sold to independent porcelain
painters. Most of these teapots are decorated with chinoiserie scenes executed entirely in gold (fig. 36), and the workshop run by the Seuter brothers in Augsburg is traditionally credited for this type of decoration. Augsburg was an important artistic center during the eighteenth century, renowned for its goldsmiths and printmakers, in particular, and much of the gilt decoration found on Meissen porcelain from the early 1720s is considered to have been applied in Augsburg.

It is rare, however, to find polychrome chinoiserie decoration on this model of teapot, and it is probable that this type of painting was executed by another family-run workshop in Augsburg. Established by the German goldsmith and Hausmaler (“independent decorator”) Johann Aufenwerth (ca. 1662–1728), the workshop developed a distinctive style of decoration in which chinoiserie scenes are usually accompanied by prominent gilt designs, such as those found on the Museum’s teapot. Very similar decoration found on a teapot of this same model is attributed to one of the three Aufenwerth daughters who worked in the family workshop, Anna Elisabeth Wald (née Aufenwerth; German, b. 1696). There are several pieces of porcelain decorated by Anna and her sister Sabina Aufenwerth (German, b. 1706), which bear their initials and theoretically provide a basis for making specific attributions to either sister. In reality, their painting styles are stylistically so similar that attributions to one or the other are very difficult to make. It has been proposed by Yvonne Hackenbroch that the decoration on the Museum’s
teapot is the work of Sabina, as one of the compositional elements on the teapot is also found on a coffeepot from a service in which all but one of the components are marked with Sabina’s initials. It is likely, however, that the Aufenwerth workshop had a collection of drawings or prints from which the painters chose motifs, so the reuse of certain figures or images does not indicate authorship. The chinoiserie scenes painted by Sabina and Anna are very much in the style of Johann Gregorius Höroldt (German, 1696–1775) (entry 14), and both the type of composition and style of painting that he promulgated at Meissen clearly served as models for the Aufenwerth workshop. While both sisters were accomplished porcelain decorators, neither painted at the level of Höroldt or the best Meissen factory painters. However, the spontaneity that characterizes their work coupled with the rich and extensive gilding that they commonly employed allowed the Aufenwerth workshop to be one of the most successful and prolific of the Hausmaler.

1. For example, see Meissen 1984, ill. no. 197; Sophie Motsch in Cabinet de porcelaines 2001, p. 38, no. 13; Sotheby’s, London, sale cat., June 5, 2007, no. 10.
2. Cassidy-Geiger 2002b, p. 152, figs. 41–43.
3. Ibid., p. 166, n. 55.
7. This observation was made by former Curator Clare Le Corbeiller, note in the curatorial files, Department of European Sculpture and Decorative Arts, The Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York. A teapot of this model with what appears to be factory decoration is illustrated in Meister 1967, vol. 1, pp. 108–9. I thank Julia Weber for bringing this object to my attention.
8. For another example, see Sotheby’s, Baden-Baden, sale cat., October 6–7, 1995, nos. 1308, 1333.
9. For more information on the Seuter workshop, see Ducret 1971–72.
26. Pair of vases

**MEISSEN FACTORY, GERMAN, 1710–PRESENT**
Decoration attributed to Ignaz Preissler (German, 1676–1741)
Manufactured ca. 1713–20; decorated ca. 1720–25
Hard-paste porcelain decorated in black enamel and gold
.145: 8 ¹¹⁄₁₆ × 4 ¾ × 3 ³⁄₁₆ in. (22.1 × 11.3 × 9.7 cm)
.146: 8 ⁹⁄₁₆ × 4 ¼ × 3 ¾ in. (21.7 × 11.3 × 9.5 cm)
Gift of Irwin Untermyer, 1964 64.101.145, .146

**MARKS:** both unmarked

**CONSTRUCTION/CONDITION:** wheel-thrown with applied molded decoration; abrasion to gilding throughout

**PROVENANCE:** Irwin Untermyer (by 1949–64; to MMA)

**EXHIBITION:** "Masterpieces of European Porcelain,"
The Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York, March 18–May 15, 1949

**LITERATURE:** C. L. Avery 1949b, no. 357; Hackenbroch 1956, pp. 126–27, fig. 113, pl. 69; Cassidy-Geiger 1989, pp. 241–42, figs. 24–27; Le Corbeiller 1990, pp. 11, 56, ill.

During the first several decades of operation, the Meissen factory sold undecorated porcelain to independent porcelain painters known as Hausmaler, or literally "painters [working] at home." The factory may have been motivated to make these sales for several reasons; chiefly, they generated revenue and provided a means of disposing of "seconds," or slightly flawed objects, as well as models no longer deemed fashionable. In turn, the Hausmaler must have anticipated that they could decorate the porcelains in their small, independent workshops and sell the completed products for lesser sums than those commanded by factory-decorated objects. In general, the Meissen "blanks" painted by Hausmaler exhibit a wide range of individual styles that distinguish them from works decorated at Meissen, which tended to adhere to the factory style promulgated at any given moment. While the work of some Hausmaler can appear less accomplished and sophisticated than the techniques practiced by the painters at Meissen, other Hausmaler were highly skilled porcelain painters who developed distinctive styles that allowed their works to compete with those produced at Meissen. In addition, independent painters could accommodate a client’s wishes in terms of specific decorative schemes more easily than the factory, a function that enhanced the appeal of Hausmalerei, the term used for independently decorated porcelain. In recognition of various threats to the factory’s financial success, in 1722 Meissen ensured that all porcelain sold bore the factory mark consisting of crossed swords painted under the glaze, and only defective white porcelain was made available to independent decorators.

The decoration on the two Museum vases is attributed to Ignaz Preissler (German, 1676–1741), one of the most talented and prolific of the Hausmaler. Porcelains decorated by Preissler are usually painted with black enamel in a style known as Schwarzlot (literally translated as "black lead"), in red enamel, or a combination of the two. He was particularly skilled in employing fine lines scratched into the enamel before firing to create a high level of detail, and the use of this technique is one of the distinguishing features of his style. In addition, Preissler frequently used gilding to highlight certain details, and the execution of the scenes on these two vases is typical of his finest work. The vases are so-called Böttger porcelain (entry 12), a term often used to describe the first porcelain body developed at Meissen by Johann Friedrich Böttger (German, 1682–1719). It has a distinctive off-white hue in contrast to the cooler, whiter porcelain paste developed in the early 1720s after Böttger’s death. Much of the Meissen porcelain decorated by Hausmaler dates from Böttger’s time; it is probable that undecorated pieces from this early period were regarded as inferior to the new, whiter porcelain and thus sold by the factory to independent decorators.
The form of these vases shares similarities with those of other vases produced at Meissen during the years 1713–20, in which a simple baluster form is enhanced with applied low-relief decoration,¹ in this instance, with acanthus leaves and a mask. However, the only other vases of this exact model known to the author are a pair now in the collection of the Art Institute of Chicago, which are slightly smaller in scale (fig. 37).⁶ The decoration on the two vases in Chicago can be firmly attributed to Preissler, and the shared type of decoration and gilding suggests that they and the Museum vases once formed a garniture, or a set of vases. The garniture almost certainly would have included a fifth and larger vase, probably of the same model, but no such vase is known.

All four vases are painted with naval battle scenes that are notable for the density of the compositions, the prominent billowing clouds of smoke, and the turbulent seas, which are rendered by fine lines scratched into the black enamel. Similar scenes in miniature are found just below
the rim and on the foot. The choice of these two areas for decoration is one indication that these vases were painted outside the factory, as scenes painted in these locations would be highly unusual on factory-decorated vases. It is a measure of Preissler’s skill as a painter that the primary scenes are composed to accommodate the two low-relief masks on each vase.

Maureen Cassidy-Geiger has persuasively suggested that the scenes on all four vases were inspired directly by a series of prints issued to commemorate the War of the Spanish Succession (1701–14). These prints were part of a much larger group depicting significant events associated with the war that appeared in *Repraesentatio Belli, ob successionem in Regno Hispanico* . . . published by Jeremias Wolff (German, 1663–1724) of Augsburg sometime after 1714. This album of oversize prints is likely to have been purchased by a knowledgeable and affluent collector rather than by an artist for practical use, and thus Preissler’s access to prints from the volume suggests the active involvement of a patron in the commissioning of these vases. This ability to execute decoration to customized orders was one of the factors that allowed Hausmaler to occupy a significant, if still underappreciated, role in the porcelain market in the first half of the eighteenth century, and the porcelain sold by the factory to these independent decorators represents an intriguing chapter in Meissen’s history.

---

2. The requirement to use the crossed swords was reinforced in March 1731; Cassidy-Geiger 1994, p. 6, n. 6.
5. See E. Zimmermann 1926, p. 24, fig. 8, Meissen 1984, ill. no. 180.
6. The two vases are now fitted with lids that presumably were intended originally for coffeepots. While the gilding and black enamel on the lids appear to relate to what is visible on the vases, it is not known when the lids were added. See Müller-Hofstede 1983, pp. 26–27.
8. Ibid., p. 252.
27. Coffeepot

MEISSEN FACTORY, GERMAN, 1710–PRESENT
Decoration attributed to Ignaz Bottengruber (German, active ca. 1720–ca. 1730, Breslau, ca. 1728–30)
Manufactured ca. 1715–20; decorated ca. 1728–30
Hard-paste porcelain decorated in polychrome enamels
8 ⁵⁄₈ × 5 ⁷⁄₁₆ × 4 ⁵⁄₈ in. (21.9 × 13.8 × 11.7 cm)
Gift of R. Thornton Wilson, in memory of Florence Ellsworth Wilson, 1950 50.211.17a, b

MARKS: unmarked

INSCRIPTIONS: incised on underside: x

CONSTRUCTION/CONDITION: wheel-thrown with molded spout and handle; slight chip to spout, slight chips to rim of pot, repair to footring

PROVENANCE: Dr. Ludwig Darmstaedter (until 1925; sale, Rudolph Lepke’s Kunst-Auctions-Haus, Berlin, March 24–26, 1925, no. 406); Otto Blohm; R. Thornton Wilson (until 1950; to MMA)


LITERATURE: Pazaurék 1925, vol. 1, p. 181, fig. 147; Rudolph Lepke’s Kunst-Auctions-Haus 1925, no. 406, pl. 88; C. L. Avery 1949b, no. 348; Early European Porcelain 1953, no. 112, colorpl. 34; Hackenbroch 1955, p. 408, fig. 5; Cassidy-Geiger 1998, pp. 255, 257, figs. 41, 42

OF THE MANY INDEPENDENT PORCELAIN PAINTERS, OR HAUSMALERs, active in Germany and Austria during the eighteenth century, Ignaz Bottengruber (German, active ca. 1720–ca. 1730, Breslau, ca. 1728–30) was one of the most accomplished in terms of ability, creativity, and originality. He is known to have worked in Breslau, Silesia (now Wrocław, Poland) in the late 1720s, and a signed and at least two dated pieces of porcelain locate him to Vienna in 1730. An unusual number of works decorated by Bottengruber bear his signature, enabling an understanding of his painting style that allows attributions of unsigned works to be made to his hand with considerable certainty. In addition, Bottengruber’s complex and dense compositions are unlike those of his contemporaries, and they reflect a degree of erudition that also distinguishes his work.

While this coffeepot is not signed, it exhibits all of the characteristics of Bottengruber’s style at its most sophisticated. Painted with three primary scenes within shaped cartouches that are visually linked to one another by a complex design of foliate scrolls, leafy branches, winding ribbons, and flowing drapery, each scene depicts an event in the life of Apollo, one of the most important gods in Greek and Roman mythology. In the central scene opposite the handle, Apollo is shown riding his chariot across the sky, causing the rising and setting of the sun; the two scenes on the sides illustrate Apollo pursuing Daphne and Apollo confronting the Python. Other allusions to the god, including his characteristic lyre and a laurel tree, are found throughout the dense composition, as are the various signs of the zodiac in the guise of putti and animals, each accompanied by a six-pointed star. While the decoration on this coffeepot is particularly ambitious, it reflects Bottengruber’s preference for mythological subjects that are rendered within a complex framework of prominent scrolls populated by small figures, animals, and birds, resulting in a richness of composition that was unmatched by other Hausmalers.

Bottengruber looked to a variety of engraved works for many of his compositions and motifs, although he appears to have used elements from printed sources with unusual selectivity rather than simply copying large passages from another artist’s work. Contemporary documents indicate that Bottengruber worked extensively for a learned patron in Breslau, Johannes Georgius Pauli (d. 1736), and it can be assumed that Bottengruber had access to Pauli’s library, which would have provided a wealth of sources for Bottengruber’s compositions. The success of Bottengruber’s work as a Hausmaler lay in his ability to combine disparate elements and to create a decorative framework that held equal weight with those of the primary scenes. On the coffeepot, this is evident in the frolicking putti and symbols of the zodiac that are seamlessly integrated into the proliferation of scrolls and the elaborate decorative frames that enclose the scenes portraying Apollo. The variety of motifs employed by
Bottengruber and the manner in which they are combined on this coffeepot reveal a remarkably sophisticated understanding of ornament and design, and the skillful adaptation of the composition to the profile of the coffeepot is a further reflection of his talent.

In addition, the restrained palette of the coffeepot is typical of Bottengruber’s work, although curiously, he has not employed gilding to enhance the decoration. Instead, he has used a yellow enamel throughout the various motifs, as well as in areas that might normally have been gilded, such as in the framing of the primary reserves. The muted colors in different shades of brown, yellow, and gray are particularly effective seen against the distinctive warm, off-white porcelain body of the coffeepot. The color of the porcelain indicates that the coffeepot dates from the factory’s early years when the first porcelain body developed by Johann Friedrich Böttger (German, 1682–1719) was characterized by a warm, creamy tone due to its high calcium content (entry 12).

It is not known if the Museum’s example was decorated to accompany a larger service that included cups and saucers. One tea bowl and saucer with decoration similar to the coffeepot survive in Vienna. However, these two pieces along with four other related bowls and saucers must have belonged to a different service, because their decoration includes gilding, unlike the coffeepot under discussion. Despite this difference, the coffeepot is linked to these tea bowls and saucers by the fact that all of them incorporate six-pointed stars in the painted decoration, a symbol that is associated with the Habsburg Emperor Charles VI (1685–1740), which suggests all were intended for his use. Bottengruber is known to have produced at least one object for the imperial family. A covered bowl with decoration firmly attributed to his hand in the Museum bears the entwined initials EC for the Empress Elisabeth Christine (1691–1750), the wife of Charles VI, and it can be assumed that it was commissioned from Bottengruber for presentation to the empress. This small group of objects, with probable imperial provenance, is an indication not only of Bottengruber’s status but also that of porcelain decorated by the finest independent painters from the second quarter of the eighteenth century.

1 Much of the current state of knowledge of Bottengruber’s career is due to Cassidy-Geiger 1998. See also Kuhn 2009, pp. 529–37. A dated waste bowl inscribed VIENNAE is illustrated in the latter publication on p. 535, fig. 6.30.
2 See, for example, a pair of Meissen bottles with decoration attributed to Bottengruber; Sotheby’s, London, sale cat., April 15, 1997, no. 128.
5 Ibid., p. 257, figs. 44, 45.
6 Ibid., p. 257.
28. Tulip vase from a garniture

**Claudius Innocentius Du Paquier Factory, Austrian (Vienna), 1718–44**

Ca. 1725

Hard-paste porcelain decorated in polychrome enamel and gold

6 ⁷⁄₁₆ × 8 ³⁄₈ × 6 ⁹⁄₁₆ in. (16.4 × 21.3 × 16.7 cm)

Gift of R. Thornton Wilson, in memory of Florence Ellsworth Wilson, 1954 54.147.94

**Marks:** unmarked

**Inscriptions:** in border framing scene with seated figure:

*China tuas ultra ignotas ne dixeris artes / en eûropaeô vinceris ingeniô. . . . viennae*[No longer, China, shalt thou say thy arts are unknown / Behold thou shalt be conquered by the European spirit]

**Construction/Condition:** molded; one handle reattached

**Provenance:** Oscar Bondy; Leopold Blumka; R. Thornton Wilson (until 1954; to MMA)


Established in 1718 in Vienna by Claudius Innocentius Du Paquier (d. 1751), the Du Paquier factory was the second in Europe to produce hard-paste porcelain.¹ Since the factory did not have the knowledge of the necessary ingredients or kiln technology to make porcelain, Du Paquier required the expertise of someone from Meissen, the only factory with the capability at this time. Through an intermediary in 1717 Du Paquier enticed Christoph Conrad Hunger (Germany, dates unknown), who was working at Meissen, to assist in his endeavors, and in May of the following year Du Paquier received a privilege from the Habsburg Emperor Charles VI (1685–1740) for the production of “porcelain, majolica, and similar fine Indian wares” for a twenty-five-year period.² Technical mastery had not been achieved by the date of the imperial privilege, however, and it took the involvement of another worker from Meissen, Samuel Stölzel (German, 1685–1737), to bring about improvements in both the porcelain paste and its successful firing. The young factory encountered numerous obstacles in its first few years, and not until the early 1720s were the technical challenges largely overcome. It is a testament to the desirability and commercial value of porcelain that an entrepreneur, such as Du Paquier, without firsthand knowledge of ceramic production, would persevere in his attempts to establish a porcelain factory despite multiple setbacks during the first several years in operation.

This vase was originally part of a remarkable garniture that celebrated Du Paquier’s accomplishment. As garnitures typically were composed of an odd number of vases, it is almost certain that the original set numbered five, of which four vases in two different sizes are known today.³ The painted decoration and inscriptions on each vase explicitly extol the superiority of Du Paquier’s porcelain over that produced in China, and each vase signals the new dominance of Vienna in the manufacture of this exotic material. This self-referential aspect of the decoration is highly unusual on European porcelain and underlines the magnitude of Du Paquier’s achievement.

The primary scene on the Museum’s vase depicts a man in a landscape seated at a round table with an altar-like rectangular table nearby. The man appears to be contemplating the two cups and saucers that rest on the round table in front of him, and several bowls, a vase, and what may be two candlesticks are placed on the larger table. The inscription that surrounds the scene reads in translation “No longer, China, shalt thou say thy arts are unknown / Behold thou shalt be conquered by the European spirit,”⁴ and this is followed by the inscribed *viennae* to specify where this development is taking place. The “arts,” to which the inscription refers, would have been interpreted as pertaining to porcelain, a medium that was both highly esteemed and inextricably linked to China. Claudia Lehner-Jobst has suggested that the seated figure represents
Du Paquier himself, an identification that seems plausible not only because of the vase's inscription but also because the inscriptions on the three other vases refer to the competition offered by Viennese porcelain to that made in China. The most direct expression of this theme is found in the scene and surrounding inscription on the vase from the garniture that matches in scale the example at the Museum but is now in the collection of Schloss Fasanerie, near Fulda, Germany. The scene depicts a figure clearly intended to be a Chinese man who gazes in amazement at a display of porcelain from the Du Paquier factory, and the inscription voices his concern that the Viennese wares are superior to those produced in China.

This garniture, with an overtly stated declaration of achievement, reflects the ambitions of the factory and of Du Paquier, and it is all the more impressive for dating to the period when the factory first achieved reliable technical success. The unusual form of the vases and the idiosyncratic nature of the decoration are indicative of the distinctive stylistic course that the factory was to follow for the next twenty years. While Meissen, and to a lesser extent Chinese and Japanese porcelain, would provide inspiration for models and decoration, much of Du Paquier's production is notably different stylistically from works made at Meissen, or else—where in Europe, in tin-glazed earthenware. The form of the Museum's vase, with its perforated top intended to support tulips, has been associated with Dutch delftware models, but the similarities seem to reside only in the presence of small, raised openings for flowers at the top. It is not clear if the singular artistic inspiration that runs through the factory's work is attributable to Du Paquier or to his workers, but this garniture signals the factory's enterprising intent to alter the course of porcelain production.

1 The history of the Du Paquier factory has been published in depth in Chilton 2009c; see especially Lehner-Jobst 2009a. The author is greatly indebted to the research of the many scholars who contributed to the chapters in the three volumes constituting this book.
2 Lehner-Jobst 2009a, p. 152.
3 The four vases are illustrated in ibid., pp. 169–76, fig. 2:17.
4 The Latin inscription reads CHINA TUEAS ULTRA IGNOTAE NE DIXERIS ARTES / EN EUROPAE VINCERIS INGENIÓ . . . VIENNAE.
6 Illustrated in Zelleke 2009a, p. 298, fig. 4.1.
7 The Latin inscription reads CERNENS HAS PHIALAS DE CHINIS ADIVNA DIXIT NEU! SUPERANT NOSTROS VASCULA VESTRA SCYPHOS . . . VIENNAE (“Woe is me,” said the traveler from China when he saw these vessels, “your wares are superior to ours” [Vienna]). See Lehner-Jobst in Chilton 2009c, vol. 3, p. 1321, no. 415.
8 See Zelleke 2009a, p. 356, fig. 4.75.
29. Stand for a small tureen

CLAUDIUS INNOCENTIUS DU PAQUIER FACTORY, AUSTRIAN (VIENNA), 1718–44

ca. 1730–35
Hard-paste porcelain decorated in polychrome enamels and gold
1 ¾ × 9 ¼ × 7 in. (3.5 × 23.2 × 17.8 cm)
Gift of R. Thornton Wilson, in memory of Florence Ellsworth Wilson, 1950 50.211.9

MARKS: unmarked

CONSTRUCTION/CONDITION: molded; slight abrasion to enamels in well of tray

PROVENANCE: Count A. Esterházy (in 1907); Heinrich Rothberger; [Max Glueckselig, New York, 1948; sold to R. Thornton Wilson]; R. Thornton Wilson (until 1950; to MMA)


The artistic vision manifested in the works produced at the Claudius Innocentius Du Paquier factory beginning in the early 1720s was distinct from any other ceramic enterprise at the time, although this vision defies easy categorization. As a result, the factory’s products are often immediately identifiable even though they reflect a variety of disparate decorative treatments. During the 1730s the factory employed richly patterned decorative schemes that were closely related to contemporary Viennese interior architecture, and this porcelain stand is a superb example of the particular genre. Its immediate visual impact is provided by the large-shaped panels enclosing trelliswork patterns painted both along the rim and in the center of the stand. In the latter, the panels are embellished by two tritons supporting baskets of flowers and a central urn with flowers and a bird underneath a baldachin. Swags of drapery, tassels, and foliate scrolls that link all of the decoration complete the composition. This type of overall decoration, which features interlaced scrollwork and often incorporates shaped panels of ornament, is known in German as Laub- und Bandelwerk ("leaf and strapwork"). Many of the Baroque interiors of grand Viennese residences and churches in the early eighteenth century featured Laub- und Bandelwerk decoration either painted or in relief. Large expanses of walls and ceilings were ornamented with panels of decorative strapwork that derived its name from a resemblance to cut straps, and these panels often enclosed trelliswork known as mosaisch ("mosaic").1 This type of decoration must have provided inspiration for the painters at Du Paquier, because variants of these schemes were rendered in much-reduced scale but in similar disposition on the factory’s wares. Ornament prints also provided a rich source of motifs for the factory’s painters, and it has been suggested by Letitia Roberts that an etching by the highly influential French-born artist Daniel Marot (1661–1752) may have been the inspiration for the two tritons on the Museum’s stand.2 The work of the Augsburg printmaker Johann Jacob Baumgartner (German, 1694–1744) has also been cited as an influence for this type of decoration practiced at the Du Paquier factory,3 since his densely composed bands of ornament have an angularity and visual rhythm similar to those found decorating this stand and other works in this same stylistic vein.

The elaborate decorative scheme on this stand and the skill with which it is painted are enhanced by the subtle but extensive use of gilding. Gold has been employed to highlight the trelliswork in particular, as well as other compositional elements, including the baldachin and the swags below, the central urn, and even the decorative drapery worn by the tritons. Though many works produced at the factory are decorated with a minimal amount of gilding, the generous use of gold on this stand is an indication of the ambitiousness of its decoration. This
stand is one of three very similar small oval shallow dishes, all of which are believed to have served as stands for small tureens. It is notable that the decoration of the center of each of the three stands is finely painted and sophisticated in composition, owing to the fact that each would have been largely obscured by the small tureen placed on top.

A remarkable feature of all three stands is the decoration of the underside of each, as enamel colors have been painted directly on the biscuit porcelain rather than on a glazed surface that was customary (detail, page 103). Painting on the biscuit produces a matte quality markedly different from that of the luminous effect of enamels applied over the glaze. It is unusual to find enamels painted in this manner on Du Paquier porcelain, and it is unclear why this decorative technique was chosen for the undersides. In addition, it is especially surprising to find designs of this prominence and boldness. On each stand, interlaced strapwork and acanthus leaves are painted in a striking palette of three colors, and the similarity of these compositions to those of contemporary formal gardens has been noted. As there would be no reason to turn over the stand of a small tureen, it is puzzling why a pattern, perhaps inspired by garden design, would have been chosen to decorate the least visible area of a tureen and stand. However, a distinguishing aspect of Du Paquier porcelain is the use of both forms and types of decoration that have no parallels in decorative arts made elsewhere in Europe at this time, and it is the presence of these unexpected features that contributes greatly to our appreciation of the factory’s works today.
30. Food warmer with insert

CLAUDIUS INNOCENTIUS DU PAQUIER FACTORY, AUSTRIAN (VIENNA), 1718–44
ca. 1730–35
Hard-paste porcelain decorated in polychrome enamels and gold
.a and .b assembled: 15¾ × 6¼ × 6¼ in. (39.5 × 16 × 17 cm); .c: 8¾ × 4¼ × 3¼ in. (21.7 × 10.8 × 8.9 cm)
Gift of Irwin Untermyer, 1964 64.101.269a–d

MARKS: unmarked

CONSTRUCTION/CONDITION: three components are molded; .c: large chip at base of liner

PROVENANCE: Irwin Untermyer (by 1952–64; to MMA)


This unusual vessel was made with an accompanying inner porcelain sleeve that is open at both the top and the bottom. When inserted, the sleeve rests on an inner ledge approximately four inches above the base of the vessel, and it extends slightly above the vessel’s top. The domed cover fits snugly over the projecting sleeve. The sleeve almost certainly supported a liner, now missing, probably made of metal.1 It is very likely that this vessel was intended to serve as a food warmer with the metal liner containing a porridge or soup kept warm by a candle burning beneath the sleeve at the base of the vessel. The open trelliswork design of the vessel’s lower section provided the necessary air for the candle to burn, while the faux trellis pattern on the cover continued this design element and at the same time allowed the contents to remain warm. Food warmers, such as this one, were intended for individual use, and this example and others made at the Claudius Innocentius Du Paquier factory almost certainly were produced as self-contained objects rather than as part of a larger set of dining wares.2 A food warmer would have been used in the private quarters of a house, where a simple meal could be consumed in the morning or evening independent of more ritualized dining customs.

Food warmers were made by a number of European porcelain factories in the eighteenth century, but those made at Du Paquier were distinctive in having the tall sleeve that required a presumably additional metal liner. The large size, complex form, and elaborate painted decoration of those produced at Du Paquier suggest that they were intended as much for display as for use. The singular design of the vessel, with its chamfered corners, prominent moldings, stepped base, trelliswork patterns, and tall domed cover, creates essentially a piece of small-scale porcelain architecture. Its vertical format and sense of monumentality, despite its size, recall the large ceramic stoves that were commonly found in European interiors in the mid-eighteenth century.3 The vessel’s architectural character is augmented by the four figures in the chamfered corners at the base. On this example, each of the male figures is dressed in Polish costume and holds either a mug or a crescent-shaped Viennese pastry, known as a Kipferl. The presence of the latter suggests that the food warmer may have been envisaged for breakfast use.

An unexpected decorative feature of the vessel and its sleeve is found in the boldly painted patterns on the upper inner rims of both components, as well as at the base of the sleeve. The decoration of the latter consists of a lozenge-patterned band with stylized rockwork and vertical leaves at each corner. The vibrancy of these areas derives from the application of enamels directly onto the biscuit porcelain rather than on the already glazed porcelain surface, as was customary. The Du Paquier factory employed this type of decoration for secondary areas
on some of its most ambitious products, but it is unclear why this aesthetic effect was pursued. As with other enamel-on-biscuit decoration on Du Paquier objects, these sections on the food warmer are painted in a very summary manner, and the freshness of this decoration contrasts with the very refined and detailed enamel painting on the vessel’s glazed surfaces.

All of the components of the Museum’s food warmer are painted with naturalistic flowers, including roses, morning glories, and forget-me-nots. The flowers are depicted with varying degrees of realism, often making identification difficult. In addition, the palette employed by the factory’s painters does not regularly correspond to the various flowers’ true colors. However, naturalistically painted flowers, such as these, were referred to in contemporary documents as *europäische Blumen* (“European flowers”) to distinguish them from the very stylized flowers inspired by decorations found on Chinese and Japanese porcelains.

Similar flower painting is found on four of the five known Du Paquier food warmers; the exception is decorated with clusters of fruit in a manner similar to that used for the flowers. It is not known how many food warmers were produced at Du Paquier, but it is possible that the number was limited. The technical challenges involved in making this vessel and its sleeve, and the expense involved in creating such a large and elaborate model, may have discouraged a sizable production, and it is probable that the cost of purchasing one was considerable. However, Du Paquier’s food warmer is emblematic of the factory’s clear desire to innovate in terms of form and decoration, and it epitomizes both the sophistication and the whimsy that distinguish so much of the factory’s production.

This food warmer displays the typical Du Paquier palette in which purple, iron-red, green, a distinctive grayish blue, and yellow predominate.
CLAUDIUS INNOCENTIUS DU PAQUIER FACTORY, AUSTRIAN (VIENNA), 1718–44

1735–40
.282a (tray): Hard-paste porcelain decorated in polychrome enamels with gold mounts, 8 1/4 × 5 1/4 × 1/2 in. (21.6 × 13.7 × 1.9 cm)
.282b (mount for beakers): Gold, lapis lazuli
.283a, b (glass beaker with gold mounts): Engraved glass with gold mounts, 4 1/4 in. (10.8 cm)
.284 (porcelain beaker): Hard-paste porcelain, 2 11/16 × 2 5/8 × 2 5/8 in. (6.8 × 6.7 × 6.7 cm)
assembled height tray, beaker, cover: 4 7/8 in. (12.4 cm)
Gift of Irwin Untermyer, 1968 68.141.282–284

MARKS: all unmarked

CONSTRUCTION/CONDITION: .282a (tray): molded;
.282b (gold mount for beakers): hammered sheet with pierced and chased decoration;
.283a, b (glass beaker with gold mounts): blown glass;
.284 (porcelain beaker): wheel-thrown

PROVENANCE: [S. J. Phillips Ltd., London; sold July 1, 1968, to Irwin Untermyer]; Irwin Untermyer (in 1968; to MMA)


LITERATURE: Hackenbroch 1969, p. 107, pl. 21; Lehner-Jobst 2005, p. 36, fig. 7; Chilton 2009a, pp. 692–93, fig. 8.21; Chilton 2009b, p. 245, fig. 3.22; Meredith Chilton in Chilton 2009c, vol. 3, p. 1239, no. 87, ill.

There is a small number of surviving works made by the Claudius Innocentius Du Paquier factory that are fitted with either gold or gilt-silver mounts.1 Interestingly, it appears that most, if not all, of these pieces of porcelain were created with the design of the mounts in mind in contrast to the more common practice of applying mounts that coordinated with but were not integral to the decoration of the porcelain. The addition of mounts made of precious metals was a long-established means of elevating or venerating a piece of porcelain, but designing the porcelain in concert with the mounts resulted in works of greater aesthetic harmony and extraordinary luxury.

This ensemble for hot chocolate consists of an oblong Du Paquier porcelain tray fitted with a gold rim engraved with landscape designs. Resting on the tray is an openwork gold frame with two openwork cages intended to hold beakers and a spoon holder in the form of an upright scallop shell in the center.2 A Du Paquier beaker and a gold-mounted glass beaker are contained within the two gold cages, and each beaker has a domed gold cover pierced with a trelliswork pattern. The spoon holder is supported by a small plaque of lapis lazuli that adds to the luxuriousness of the ensemble.

The painted decoration on the tray and the beaker frame the undulating lines of the gold mounts, and the areas left undecorated on the tray and the beaker are masked by the design of the gold. In contrast, the openwork sections of the mounts reveal coordinated painted decoration, and many of the motifs on the porcelain are echoed in the mounts. Most notable among these motifs are the classical heads painted on the beaker and on the tray, which appear underneath the two beakers, and similar heads form the primary decoration of the gold cages in which the beakers rest. These depictions done in profile clearly evoke cameos, and it is interesting to note that the gold mounts found on two other pieces of Du Paquier porcelain incorporate actual cameos.3 In addition to the prominent scrolling motifs found on the porcelain and in the gold, another subtle correspondence of design lies in the trellis pattern that appears painted at the base of the beaker and as openwork on the two gold covers. As Claudia Lehner-Jobst has observed, these two motifs relate closely to contemporary Austrian interior architecture.4

As the intent to coordinate the decoration of the mounts with that of the porcelain is clearly evident, it is likely the porcelain was produced first, and the mounts were then fabricated to correspond to the dimensions and decoration of the porcelain. One can assume either the goldsmith had the porcelain tray and beaker available to him or he was working from a detailed drawing of the porcelain components. In either case, the design and decoration of the gold mounts display a remarkable sensitivity to the design and decoration of the porcelain,
and the ensemble reflects an unusual collaboration between two distinct trades. Meredith Chilton has noted that none of the gold mounts found on Du Paquier are marked, suggesting they may be the work of a court goldsmith who was exempt from the requirement to mark his work.5

The glass beaker now included in the ensemble may be a replacement; the gold mounts at the base and rim of the beaker almost certainly do not date from the eighteenth century. If the glass, too, is later in date than the rest of the ensemble, it is likely that it replaces a beaker also made of glass. Hot chocolate was often served with a glass beaker for water in the eighteenth century, and a well-known pastel by the Swiss artist Jean-Étienne Liotard (1702–1789) illustrates this custom.6 The cool water would refresh after the warmth of the hot chocolate or serve as a corrective to its spicy taste,7 as contemporary recipes for hot chocolate commonly included spices.

The style and workmanship of the two pierced covers correspond favorably with those of the mounts on the tray, but it seems curious a porcelain beaker intended to contain hot chocolate would be furnished with a purely decorative cover that served no function. The other known gold-mounted Du Paquier chocolate beaker has a porcelain cover that is embellished by a mount of openwork design.8 The porcelain cover would have allowed the contents of the beaker to remain warm, while the design of the mount links the cover stylistically to the gold cage that holds the beaker. Even though one might suppose that the Museum’s beaker originally had a porcelain cover, there is no evidence in the interior of the gold cover to suggest it had ever been affixed to a porcelain component.

The Museum’s chocolate ensemble and the single chocolate beaker with stand, cited above, are emblematic of the status of hot chocolate as a beverage in the mid-eighteenth century. Despite the fact that this hot beverage was introduced to Europe by the Spanish in the sixteenth century, it was not until the end of the following century that it was consumed in any significant quantity throughout the Continent.9 While hot chocolate gained in popularity throughout the eighteenth century, it nevertheless remained a beverage for the upper strata of society due to its high cost. By combining gold with porcelain, the new luxury material of the eighteenth century, the Du Paquier factory eloquently underscored the prestige associated with this drink.

1 See Chilton 2009a, pp. 712–13, fig. 8:32 (set of tea bottles); Chilton 2009b, pp. 246–47, fig. 3:21 (tureen and stand); Zelleke 2009b, pp. 960–63, fig. 11:27 (tureen and stand), p. 964, fig. 11:28 (beaker on stand), pp. 966–67, fig. 11:29 (perfume set).
2 The bowl of the spoon would have been inserted between the two sections of the shell, allowing the spoon to stand vertically.
3 Zelleke 2009b, pp. 960–61, fig. 11:27, pp. 964–65, fig. 11:28.
4 Lehner-Jobst 2005, p. 36, fig. 6.
5 Chilton 2009a, p. 1098, n. 33.
6 Ibid., p. 691, fig. 8:19.
7 Ibid., p. 692.
8 Zelleke 2009b, pp. 964–65, fig. 11:28.
9 For a succinct history of hot chocolate in Europe, see Emerson 1991, pp. 10–11.
32. Harlequin

**HÖCHST FACTORY, GERMANY, 1746–92**
Model attributed to Johann Christoph Ludwig von Lücke (German, 1703–1780)
ca. 1750–53
Hard-paste porcelain decorated in polychrome enamels and gold
8 1/4 × 4 ¾ × 3 ⁹⁄₁₆ in. (21 × 11.1 × 9 cm)
The Jack and Belle Linsky Collection, 1982 1982.60.222

**MARKS:** painted on side of base: wheel in red enamel; incised on underside: AR

**CONSTRUCTION/CONDITION:** press-molded; repairs to Harlequin’s slapstick, proper right hand, losses to leaves

**PROVENANCE:** Jack and Belle Linsky (until 1982; to MMA)

**LITERATURE:** Clare Le Corbeiller in Metropolitan Museum 1984a, p. 278, no. 208, ill. p. 277

---

**THE FOURTH FACTORY IN EUROPE TO PRODUCE HARD-PASTE**
porcelain was established in 1746 in the town of Höchst, which lies to the west of Frankfurt. It was founded by the potter Adam Friedrich von Löwenfinck (German, 1714–1754) and two business partners, who submitted a proposal that year to the elector of Mainz, Johann Friedrich Carl von Ostein (1689–1763), in whose domain Höchst was located, requesting a privilege to make porcelain. The three men were quickly granted the privilege, which not only gave them the exclusive right to produce porcelain for a fifty-year period but also exempted them from paying duties on the most essential materials. Löwenfinck hired workers with expertise in making both porcelain and faience, yet despite their best efforts they were unable to develop an acceptable porcelain paste, and the factory made only faience during its first three years of operation. The arrival of new workers in 1750 led to the successful production of porcelain by the end of that year, and regardless of fluctuating financial stability over the next several decades, Höchst was to achieve a level of artistic and technical success seldom matched by the other German porcelain factories in the second half of the eighteenth century.

The Höchst factory was typical of most eighteenth-century porcelain enterprises both in its reliance on the expertise of workers trained elsewhere and its consistently shifting roster of employees. The factory’s modelers, kiln technicians, and painters were constantly changing, and it was not uncommon for people in key positions to remain for only a few years before moving on to another factory. The factory employed four different modelers in the early 1750s when the Museum’s figure of Harlequin was made, and the identity of its modeler has been the subject of debate.

The Harlequin was conceived as one of a series of commedia dell’arte figures that constituted the second set of such figures created at Höchst during the early 1750s. The first set was modeled by Johann Gottfried Becker (German, active at Höchst from 1746), who had previously worked at the Meissen factory, and his somewhat static commedia figures reflect the influence of Meissen models. It is surprising that the Höchst factory chose to produce a second series of commedia figures so shortly after the first, and notable that it turned to a different modeler even though Becker was still in the factory’s employ. Horst Reber suggests that this Harlequin and the other figures in the series are the work of Johann Christoph Ludwig von Lücke (German, 1703–1780), who was at Höchst very briefly in the early 1750s. Lücke was trained as a sculptor, and he worked with Balthasar Permoser (German, 1651–1732) in Vienna and with Johann Joachim Kändler (German, 1706–1775) at Meissen, as well as having been employed by the Imperial Porcelain Manufactory in Vienna. He is
known to have worked in ivory early in his career, and his ivory figures of Scaramouche and Columbine dated to around 1730 are in the collection of the treasure chamber in Dresden known as the Green Vaults.8 Lücke’s training as a sculptor is evident in this porcelain figure of Harlequin and in the other figures he modeled that compose the series.9 Although standing on a pedestal, Harlequin is depicted in motion, with weight on his left foot, his right arm raised, and his head and torso turning toward the viewer. He appears to be stepping off the pedestal, and his posture of leaning in the direction of the viewer adds further dynamism to an already animated pose. These same highly sculptural qualities characterize the other figures in Lücke’s commedia series; each figure appears to resist the confines of the pedestal on which he stands, and with the gestures created through the positioning of both arms and feet, the figures seem to move toward inhabiting the viewer’s space.

Another distinguishing feature of Lücke’s commedia dell’arte figures is the use of a pedestal to support each figure. The design of the pedestals, while generic, is similar to that commonly used to support lifesize stone sculptures, and thus, the pedestals reflect a marked departure from the very simple low bases with little definition customarily found on porcelain figures. Due to the height provided by the pedestals, the gestures of the porcelain figures are emphasized and their sculptural qualities enhanced. It is likely that a series of lifesize sculptures in the garden at Schönborn Garden Palace in Vienna provided the inspiration for this series of Höchst figures.10 The sculptures depict characters from the commedia dell’arte, and each rests on a pedestal similar in profile to that of the Museum’s Harlequin. It can be assumed that Lücke was familiar with the sculptures from his time working in Vienna. Perhaps equally important, Ostein, who had granted the privilege for the founding of the Höchst factory, would certainly have known these works, as he was the nephew of Friedrich Karl von Schönborn (1674–1746), for whom the palace was built. The circumstances of the creation of this series of figures remain unknown, but Reber has indicated that Lücke may have been brought to Höchst at the suggestion of Ostein, and that the latter may have commissioned the figures from the factory.11 The rarity of these particular commedia dell’arte figures and the ambition behind their creation, notable for a young factory, support this hypothesis.
**33. The Chinese Emperor**

**HÖCHST FACTORY, GERMAN, 1746–92**

Model attributed to Johann Peter Melchior (German, 1742/47–1825)

ca. 1766

Hard-paste porcelain decorated in polychrome enamels and gold

15 ¹⁄₁₆ × 13 ¹⁄₁₆ × 8 ⁹⁄₁₆ in. (39.8 × 33.2 × 21.7 cm)

Gift of R. Thornton Wilson, in memory of Florence Ellsworth Wilson, 1950. 50.211.217

**MARKS:** painted on underside: crowned wheel in underglaze blue

**CONSTRUCTION/CONDITION:** molded; losses to foliate decoration on canopy, losses to emperor’s hat

**PROVENANCE:** Frau Hedwig Ullmann (in 1925); [Rosenberg and Stiebel, New York, 1947; sold to R. Thornton Wilson]. R. Thornton Wilson (until 1950; to MMA)


This remarkable sculpture was almost certainly produced as the centerpiece for a grouping of figures made to decorate a dining table. In both scale and complexity, it is one of the most ambitious figure groups produced at Höchst, and it is further distinguished by its enamel decoration, which is more detailed and finer than that found on the four other known examples of this model.¹ The group depicts the Chinese emperor holding a scepter and seated beneath a baldachin on a stepped platform. The figure standing closest to the Chinese emperor presents the other two figures, both representing the Arts and, by extension, the enlightened patronage of the emperor. The other standing figure, who wears a laurel crown, holds a book under his arm and points to emblems of the arts, including a painter’s palette and the sculpted head of a putto, placed on the lower step of the platform. The kneeling and bowing figure holds an unfurled scroll with fanciful writing. The complexity of the figural composition is both enhanced and framed by the prominent architectural feature of the baldachin with an openwork roof, cascading drapery, and supports in the form of large, asymmetrical C-scrolls.

The authorship of this highly sophisticated composition has been debated,² but the group is commonly attributed to Johann Peter Melchior (German, 1742/47–1825), who began working at Höchst in 1765, the year before this model was created.³ Melchior was to become one of the most accomplished and prolific modelers in all of Europe, and The Chinese Emperor is his earliest known work. Because of the artistic and technical skill that the group represents, Horst Reber suggests that Melchior may have been aided by the modeler Laurentius Russinger (German, 1739–1810), who had served as head modeler at Höchst for six years at the time Melchior joined the factory.⁴ Melchior must have been inspired by another Höchst figure group, The Sultan of Turkey, which was created sometime before 1753.⁵ In this earlier group, the sultan sits on a throne with a small baldachin above, surrounded by attendants who appear to represent both African and Chinese servants. The exoticism of the group, which was modeled by Johann Christoph Ludwig von Lücke (German, 1703–1780),⁶ is heightened by the addition of a monkey climbing a palm tree located behind the figures. While the basic composition of Melchior’s The Chinese Emperor follows that of The Sultan of Turkey, the poses of Melchior’s figures, the skill with which they are modeled, and their spatial relationship to one another are far more accomplished, and the intended exotic nature of the subject is indicated more subtly.

It is almost certain that Melchior designed his composition with larger groupings in mind, and he modeled figures of Chinese musicians and, somewhat later, Chinese children that were intended to augment
the centerpiece. While it is not known how many figures were created, it is likely that their numbers and arrangement in relation to *The Chinese Emperor* varied each time the table was set. Sometime after 1766, Melchior created a second large porcelain group that depicts the Chinese emperor standing, which clearly was intended to supplement his first group as part of a large table display.

The painted and gilded decoration on the back of this example of *The Chinese Emperor* reflects its intended position in the center of a table, visible from all sides. The Museum’s *Chinese Emperor* is decorated with unusual elaboration, which is seen most readily in the profusion of dense patterns that delineate the textiles worn by the four figures. The robes and the decorative border of the textile that covers the platform are painted with considerable detail and precision, and they incorporate a more extensive use of gilding than is normally found. It is not inconceivable that this group was intended for the archbishop-elector of Mainz, Emmerich Joseph von Breidbach-Bürresheim (1707–1774), who actively supported the porcelain factory after assuming his title in 1763 until his death in 1774. Not only was the model of this group the most ambitious of any produced at Höchst up to this point but also the parallel suggested between the archbishop-elector’s rule and that of the cultivated Chinese emperor would not have been lost on anyone viewing this exceptional centerpiece. The particularly lavish decoration of this example would have made it suitable for a noble table.

---

1. Lessmann 2006, p. 75; Detroit Institute of Arts (51.59); collection of Höchst AG, Höchst (Jacob-Hanson 1998, pl. i); Reber 2005, pp. 34–36.
3. An example of *The Chinese Emperor* was fired in January 1766; Reber 2005, p. 34.
4. Ibid., pp. 34–35.
5. This group is illustrated in Morley-Fletcher 1993, vol. 1, pp. 70–71.
7. Lessmann 2006, p. 75. One of these figures is in the Victoria and Albert Museum, London (C.934–1919).
8. Reber 1997, p. 19, fig. 3.
10. For a less elaborately decorated example of this model, see Reber 1997, p. 16, fig. 2.
34. Coffeepot

HÖCHST FACTORY, GERMAN, 1746–92
Decorated by Louis-Victor Gerverot (French, 1747–1829)
ca. 1773–75
Hard-paste porcelain decorated in polychrome enamels and gold
9 1/2 × 6 ⁵⁄₈ × 4 ³⁄₄ in. (24.1 × 16.8 × 12.1 cm)
Purchase, Anita M. Linzee Bequest, 1940 40.169.7a, b

Marks: painted on underside: wheel in underglaze blue; painted over mark: crossed mill-sails, gerv. in dark purple enamel

Inscriptions: incised on base near foot rim: i p; inscribed on pediment in landscape: l. / v.s.

Construction/condition: wheel-thrown with applied molded handle and spout; small loss to enamel and gilding on lid

Provenance: [Neuberger & Beckhardt, New York, 1940; sold to MMA]

Exhibition: “Porcelain in the Age of Mozart from the Collection of The Metropolitan Museum of Art and Elise and Henry Clay Hofheimer II,” Chrysler Museum, Norfolk, Virginia, October 12–December 9, 1984

Literature: Ducret 1962, p. 165, fig. 58; M. D. Schwartz 1984, no. 33, ill.; Le Corbeiller 1990, pp. 35, 56, ill. p. 34; Jacob-Hanson 2007, p. 73, n. 27

The abbreviated signature on the underside of this coffeepot indicates that it was decorated by Louis-Victor Gerverot (French, 1747–1829), a highly skilled and unusually peripatetic porcelain painter who worked at a wide array of porcelain factories in Germany, the Netherlands, and England.1 Gerverot’s career reflects the itinerant nature of many who were involved in the ceramic industry in eighteenth-century Europe; both porcelain painters and those involved in the more technical aspects of production commonly moved from factory to factory, providing expertise to nascent operations or seeking better terms of employment. The constantly shifting workforce enabled the rapid growth of porcelain factories in Germany, in particular, during the second half of the eighteenth century, but it also meant that factory styles often shifted when they were dominated by the presence, however temporary, of a strong and unusually capable artistic personality.

Gerverot is best known for his expertise in painting birds, a skill that he appears to have acquired while working at the Weesp factory in the Netherlands and further developed during his time at Höchst.2 The bird painting found on Gerverot’s work at these factories and later at Loosdrecht in the Netherlands is characterized by the animated poses of the birds, their summary execution, and a notable degree of painterly fluidity.3 In contrast, Gerverot’s depiction of three figures in a landscape on this coffeepot has a high degree of detail and finish, with all of the compositional elements rendered with great precision. This is evident not only in the painting of the landscape and the primary architectural element but also in the subtle shading and detailing of the figures’ clothing. The coffeepot was originally part of a service that is now dispersed, but several of its components have been located.4 All of these pieces are decorated with similar subject matter, and for the coffeepot, Gerverot derived his composition from a print illustrating the month of October by the Augsburg artist Johann Esaias Nilson (German, 1721–1788).5 Gerverot has adapted Nilson’s composition with great fidelity, although he has extended the abbreviated landscape to either side with elements of his own invention to accommodate the shape of the coffeepot. Gerverot has also added the initials l. / v.s. to the circular disk that caps the architectural niche, and it is probable that these represent the intended owner of the service. Except when intended as a monogram, initials are rarely found incorporated into porcelain decoration, and since they are not those of Gerverot, it would seem by their prominence to refer to the patron who commissioned the tea and coffee service. The same initials also appear on the hot milk jug from the service,6 reinforcing the supposition that they indicate in abbreviated form the person for whom the service was created. It is
possible that the patron specified the type of decoration he preferred, which might account for Gerverot’s use of figural scenes rather than his more customary birds.

While the underside of the coffeepot bears the Höchst factory mark of a wheel executed in underglaze blue, Gerverot has painted gerv. and a windmill sail in dark purple enamel over the factory mark. It appears that most if not all of the components of the service are similarly marked, and it is likely that he decorated the porcelain after his departure from Höchst in 1773, at which time he began working in Schrezheim. It has been noted by Charlotte Jacob-Hanson that factory practice would not have condoned the use of a painter’s mark over that of the factory’s, so it is probable that Gerverot took undecorated porcelain, known as “blanks,” with him when he left the factory, or purchased the components after his departure. Both the trajectory of Gerverot’s career and the circumstances behind the creation of the service to which this coffeepot belongs reflect to an unusual degree the complex and multifaceted aspects of porcelain production in the late eighteenth century.

1 According to Clare Le Corbeiller, Gerverot is recorded as having worked at fourteen different faience and porcelain factories; Le Corbeiller 1990, p. 35. The most recent comprehensive studies of Gerverot’s career are Jacob-Hanson 2004; Jacob-Hanson 2007.
3 For examples, see Reber 1975; Jacob-Hanson 2004.
4 Jacob-Hanson 2007, p. 73, n. 27.
5 MMA 45.101.16.
6 Sotheby’s, New York, sale cat., February 24, 1978, no. 56.
7 Jacob-Hanson 2007, p. 63.
8 Gerverot notes in a letter that he purchased undecorated porcelain from Höchst while working in Schrezheim; ibid.
Franz Anton Bustelli (Swiss, d. 1763)
ca. 1755
Hard-paste porcelain
13 ¾ × 8 ¼ × 1 ¾ in. (34 × 21.1 × 4.4 cm)
Bequest of R. Thornton Wilson, in memory of his wife, Florence Ellsworth Wilson, 1977 1977.216.56

While Franz Anton Bustelli (Swiss, d. 1763) is best known for the commedia dell’arte figures he produced at the Nymphenburg factory (entry 36), he modeled a very small number of religious figures that are considered his finest and most sophisticated sculptural works. These figures of the crucified Christ, the Mourning Virgin, Saint John, and the Mater Dolorosa are all the more remarkable for being among the earliest works that he made at Nymphenburg. The skill and expressiveness with which they are modeled suggest Bustelli was an experienced sculptor when he arrived at the factory in 1754, although nothing is known of his career prior to that point. It has been suggested by Peter Volk that Bustelli may have trained with the Munich sculptor Johann Baptist Straub (German, 1704–1784), but no evidence has come to light that confirms this plausible hypothesis.

This figure of the crucified Christ, often referred to as a Corpus figure, was modeled by Bustelli in 1755. Bustelli’s figure of the crucified Christ not only is depicted with unusual detail and realism but exhibits a pronounced and graceful attenuation that accentuates its expressiveness. The musculature is clearly delineated, the veins protrude, and the fingers and toes are closely observed. Christ’s face, with its heavy-lidded but sightless eyes and open mouth, is the emotional focus of the composition, and the prominent and realistic crown of thorns heightens the impact of the imagery. The sense of stillness conveyed by the limp, hanging body is contrasted with the animation of the drapery around Christ’s loins. The complex folds and the design of the billowing lower section suggest that Bustelli may have had experience specifically in sculpting wood before joining the Nymphenburg factory.

The Corpus would have been mounted on a cross almost certainly made of wood, and the figure would have been attached through the holes that Bustelli has incorporated in Christ’s hands and feet, in keeping with traditional Crucifixion iconography. It can be assumed that a porcelain plaque, with the letters INRI, would have been mounted on the top of the cross, and a porcelain skull and crossbones would have been placed at the foot of the cross. Intended to accompany the Corpus figure, Bustelli’s figures of the Virgin Mary and of Saint John were modeled in 1756 with skilfully conceived poses to create a unified composition in which the three figures are visually and emotionally connected.

Only two of these Crucifixion groups are known today, and they are among the most accomplished porcelain sculpture produced during the eighteenth century. It is likely they were intended for private devotion rather than public veneration, and this supposition is reinforced by the remarkable survival of a cabinet made specifically to contain the Crucifixion group that remains mounted inside its upper section.
In 1759 Bustelli modeled a figure of the Virgin Mary as the grieving mother (Mater Dolorosa), which was intended as an alternative to the earlier Virgin Mary figure. These four figures constitute the only religious figures that Bustelli created, and it may have been the gravity of the subject matter that inspired the remarkable expressiveness of the Corpus and its accompanying figures. It appears that Bustelli reworked the model of the Corpus that he created in 1755, and the Museum’s figure reflects his minor revisions. The reworked Corpus figure has a more defined musculature, and the impression of suffering is heightened by the more sharply delineated features of the face, which are made more visible due to the higher position of the crown of thorns. A smaller version of the Dead Christ was created in 1758, suggesting that the earlier Corpus figures were a commercial success.

While Bustelli’s Corpus reflects the long history of depictions of the Dead Christ executed in ivory, wood, and bronze, the use of porcelain for religious sculpture was relatively uncommon. The Meissen factory had created a number of religious works during the 1730s and 1740s, but they make up an extremely small percentage of the factory’s figural production, and porcelain was not widely embraced in Europe as a medium for religious sculpture, despite its obvious visual similarity to ivory. The Munich sculptor Ignaz Günther (German, 1725–1775) modeled a porcelain Corpus in 1756, perhaps in response to Bustelli’s Corpus of the previous year, but these figures represent rare departures from the vast majority of porcelain sculpture that was made to decorate the dining table. Bustelli’s Corpus, and the figures of the Virgin Mary and Saint John produced to accompany it, ably demonstrated that porcelain was a suitable medium for the most serious sculptural expression.
36. Lucinda

NYMPHENBURG FACTORY, GERMAN, 1747–PRESENT
Model by Franz Anton Bustelli (Swiss, d. 1763)
ca. 1760
Hard-paste porcelain decorated in polychrome enamels and gold
8 ¼ × 4 ¼ × 3 ½ in. (20.6 × 10.8 × 8.9 cm)
The Lesley and Emma Sheafer Collection, Bequest of Emma A. Sheafer, 1973 1974.356.802

MARKS: impressed on base: shield highlighted in blue enamel and gold

INSCRIPTIONS: incised on underside: o

CONSTRUCTION/CONDITION: press-molded; replaced finger on proper right hand

PROVENANCE: Mr. and Mrs. Siegfried Kramarsky (by 1949–1955); [Rosenberg and Stiebel, New York (until 1959); sold to Sheafer]; Lesley and Emma Sheafer, New York (1959–73; bequeathed to MMA)


FIGURES AND FIGURE GROUPS WERE PRODUCED AT THE MAJOR porcelain factories in Europe during the middle decades of the eighteenth century, but the quality of sculptural production varied considerably from factory to factory. The popularity of figures as decoration for the dessert table motivated each concern to find talented modelers, but many of the sculptors who worked in porcelain were not able to fully exploit the possibilities posed by the challenging medium. In contrast, the work produced by Franz Anton Bustelli (Swiss, d. 1763) at the Nymphenburg factory in the years 1754–63 is unsurpassed in terms of its expressive quality and sculptural mastery, and Bustelli’s achievements, following those of Johann Joachim Kändler (German, 1706–1775) at Meissen, reaffirmed the viability of porcelain as a serious medium for sculpture.

Very little is known of Bustelli’s life other than he may have been born in the Italian region of Switzerland known as Ticino, and he was employed at the Nymphenburg factory from November 1754 until his death in April 1763.1 While it is improbable that Bustelli had not gained experience in another porcelain factory, nothing is known of his experience prior to his arrival at Nymphenburg. Alfred Ziffer has suggested that Bustelli trained with the Munich court sculptor Johann Baptist Straub (German, 1704–1784),2 but documentary proof has yet to be discovered. Bustelli’s talents must have been quickly apparent to the factory’s administrators, and he proved to be remarkably prolific, modeling approximately 120 figures and groups in his first six and a half years at the factory.3

Among these figures were sixteen drawn from the Italian comedy, and they are commonly regarded as some of the finest porcelain sculptures of the eighteenth century.4 Interestingly, Bustelli chose the characters to be represented from both the long-established commedia dell’arte and the more recent Théâtre italien, which emerged in France as that country’s response to the Italian form of popular theater.5 As a result, Bustelli’s sixteen figures do not conform to the standard roster of the commedia dell’arte but rather incorporate several lesser-known characters from the Théâtre italien. It is almost certain that Bustelli selected the names for these latter characters from prints depicting figures from the Théâtre italien, a supposition reinforced by the existence of two such prints published by Martin Engelbrecht (German, 1684–1756) with Bustelli’s signature and notations in his hand.6 While Bustelli derived the names and certain elements from these prints, the figures that he modeled are wholly original creations that reflect a sculptor thinking in three dimensions.

One of the novel aspects of Bustelli’s sixteen figures is that they were conceived as eight pairs. Linking the characters as they were customarily paired on the stage, Bustelli modeled the figures of each couple so that their poses and gestures reflected a specific interaction between them.
This was not the first instance two individual porcelain figures had been conceived as a pair engaging with one another, but it was novel to create a series in which all the figures were paired, with each couple communicating through gesture.

This figure of Lucinda represents a character from the Théâtre italien rather than the commedia dell’arte, and the figure with which she would have been paired, Pierrot, is also derived from the Théâtre italien. Lucinda was a minor character in the French version of the Italian comedy, and it is not clear why Bustelli chose her for depiction; however, the Engelbrecht print seems to have provided him with both her name and the idea to include her. Bustelli’s Lucinda turns to face her lover Pierrot and holds a rose close to her heart, which presumably he has given her. With her right hand, she points in the direction that she wishes to go. In contrast, Pierrot gestures in the opposite direction and holds a small lantern to light the way. While the couple gaze lovingly at one another, their conflicting gestures suggest the implied rendezvous will never take place. The pointing gesture made by each figure corresponds to the established hand signal of “indico,” or “I point out,” and treatises, such as John Bulwer’s Chirologia: of The Natural Language of the Hand (1644), provided diagrams to illustrate a code of gestural meanings available to artists that would be immediately understood by an educated audience. Bustelli has taken this simple hand gesture and, by slightly exaggerating the expressive poses of the two figures, has created a moment of quiet drama in which the two characters are actively involved in a negotiation.

Bustelli chose to depict all of his comedy figures unmasked, with the exception of Mezzetin, and the painted decoration of most of the female characters reflects stylish contemporary dress. The clothes worn by the Museum’s Lucinda are particularly elaborate, and the expense of the various components of her dress is suggested by the silk brocade of her jacket, the gold buttons of her bodice, and the gold braid along the hem of her skirt. The quality of the painting on this example of Lucinda indicates that it is one of the finest of Bustelli’s comedy figures, and the precision with which the hair and facial features are delineated, in addition to the detailed depiction of the clothing, reflects Nymphenburg factory decoration of the highest quality.

1 For more on Bustelli’s life, see M. Newman 1997, pp. 7–8; Hantschmann and Ziffer 2004.
2 Ziffer 2015.
4 All sixteen models are illustrated in Hantschmann and Ziffer 2004, pp. 272–73.
5 For more about the Théâtre italien, see M. Newman 1997, p. 10.
6 Ibid., p. 12.
7 The two Meissen figures, which compose The Thrown Kiss, were modeled ca. 1736; see MMA 1982.60.311, .312.
8 For an illustration of Pierrot, see Jansen 2001, vol. 1, p. 197, no. 206.
10 For an example of this figure, see M. Newman 1997, p. 48. The intended identity of this figure has been debated, and it has been described as both Harlequin (Le Corbeiller 1990, p. 56, cover ill.) and Mezzetin (M. Newman 1997, pp. 47–52; Katharina Hantschmann in Hantschmann and Ziffer 2004, pp. 477–78, no. 151).
Two dancers

LUDWIGSBURG FACTORY, GERMAN, 1758–1824

Model attributed to Joseph Nees (German, active at Ludwigsburg 1759–68)
ca. 1760–63
Hard-paste porcelain decorated in polychrome enamels and gold
5 ¹⁵⁄₁₆ × 6 ³⁄₈ × 3 ⁹⁄₁₆ in. (15.1 × 16.2 × 9 cm)
The Jack and Belle Linsky Collection, 1982 1982.60.191

MARKS: painted on underside: interlaced CCs in underglaze blue, incised on underside: UM-N.2; MN3; line and three dots

CONSTRUCTION/CONDITION: press-molded; losses to feathers of man’s cap

PROVENANCE: Lt. Col. the Hon. Henry Hope (until 1955); (sale, Christie’s, London, June 20, 1955, no. 23); Jack and Belle Linsky (until 1982; to MMA)

LITERATURE: Christie’s 1955, no. 23; Clare Le Corbeiller in Metropolitan Museum 1984a, p. 290, no. 233, ill. p. 291; Le Corbeiller in Metropolitan Museum 1984b, p. 44, ill.

THE FIGURES PRODUCED BY EUROPEAN PORCELAIN FACTORIES during the middle decades of the eighteenth century reflect a wide variety of themes, and the various forms of entertainment popular at this time provided a particularly fertile range of subject matter for the factories to explore. Figures from the commedia dell’arte were a primary focus for porcelain modelers (entries 11, 22, 23), but opera and dance figures also had considerable appeal. The figures of dancers produced at the Ludwigsburg factory during the early 1760s were not only a tangible indication of the status of ballet at this time but also a direct reflection of the interests of the factory’s founder, Karl Eugen (1728–1793), Duke of Württemberg.

Karl Eugen was an active patron of the arts, and his engagement with ballet led to the employment of French choreographer Jean-Georges Noverre (1727–1810) in 1760 to produce ballets for his court.1 Among the artists and performers hired to execute Noverre’s dances was the Frenchman Louis-René Boquet (1717–1814), a designer of costumes and sets. The elaborate costumes worn by the Ludwigsburg dancers, distinguished by their wide skirts, are typical of the type of costumes popular at this time. The Ludwigsburg group was created at the very moment when the highly structured costumes of Baroque dance were beginning to be superseded by less-formal apparel that allowed for greater freedom of movement (fig. 38).2 The stiff poses of the Museum’s two figures reflect the conventions of this earlier style of dance, and a more expressive form of movement would characterize the emerging ballet d’action (ballet with a plot).3 The Ludwigsburg factory produced a number of models of dancers depicted singly, in pairs, and in groups of three,4 and it can be assumed that the genesis for these works lay in Karl Eugen’s active patronage of ballet both in Stuttgart, the official seat of his family, and in nearby Ludwigsburg, to which he gradually moved his court.

Karl Eugen’s interest in the arts and his desire to create a cultured court must have been the motivation to establish a porcelain factory in 1758.5 Several unsuccessful attempts had been made as early as 1751 to produce porcelain under his patronage, and it was not until a year after he officially founded the factory that porcelain could be made on a commercial scale. The factory’s successful production was due to the hiring of Joseph Jakob Ringler (Austrian, 1730–1804), who had gained experience by working at a number of German factories, including those at Höchst and Nymphenburg. Within several months, the Ludwigsburg factory employed thirty-three workers, and from the beginning, figures and figure groups were an important focus of their production.6 It can be assumed that this emphasis reflects the taste of Karl Eugen, who subsidized the factory from its inception, and whose

fig. 38 Three Dancers, ca. 1763. Ludwigsburg factory, German, 1758–1824. Hard-paste porcelain decorated in polychrome enamels and gold, 6 ³⁄₄ × 6 ³⁄₄ in. (17.1 × 17.1 cm). The Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York, Gift of R. Thornton Wilson, in memory of Florence Ellsworth Wilson, 1950 (50.211.225)
engagement with the factory is reflected by its mark in the form of his initial in addorsed format. Unfortunately, the location of Ludwigsburg proved to be a poor choice as a site for a porcelain factory, due to not only the absence of high-quality clay but also the lack of extensive forests to provide the necessary firewood for fuel for the kilns. In addition, the factory’s site was not near a river that could facilitate the transportation of necessary ingredients and thus reduce costs. These shortcomings created ongoing financial problems for Ludwigsburg, and it survived largely due to Karl Eugen’s patronage.

Despite these challenges, the factory’s production by the early 1760s was extensive and reflected a high level of quality. A broad range of figure types was produced, and a number of modelers were employed by the factory during the 1760s. Most of the figures of dancers are attributed to the modeler Joseph Nees (German, active at Ludwigsburg 1759–68) and are datable to the years 1760–63, making them among the earliest figures produced at Ludwigsburg. Despite a certain awkwardness of pose and a tendency toward excessively long arms, the dancers modeled by Nees embody the sense of elegance and refined gesture that define ballet. Furthermore, they convey the feeling that a specific moment in an actual dance has been captured. The stances of the two dancers reflect close observation or knowledge of dance, suggesting the position known in ballet as *quatrième croisé devant*. Other Ludwigsburg modelers, such as Johann Christian Wilhelm Beyer (German, active at Ludwigsburg 1763–67) and Joseph Weinmüller (German, 1746–1812), created works demonstrating greater sculptural skill and sophistication, but the sense of immediacy inherent in Nees’s dancers marks them as among the factory’s most engaging works.

1 For more information about the duke’s involvement with opera, see Fauchier-Magnan 1958, pp. 184–92.
2 Clare Le Corbeiller in Metropolitan Museum 1984a, p. 290.
4 Flach 1997, colorpl. 13, and p. 515, nos. 97–102, ill.
5 For a history of the factory, see Hesse 2010; Nelson 2013, pp. 331–47.
6 Nelson 2013, p. 332.
7 Hesse 2010, p. 231.
9 I thank Rika Burnham, Head of Education, Frick Collection, New York, and Clinton Luckett, Assistant Artistic Director, American Ballet Theatre, New York, for their informed and very helpful observations.
38. Two soldiers shaking hands

KELSTERBACH FACTORY, GERMAN, 1761–68
Model attributed to Carl Vogelmann (German, active 1759–84)
1761–64
Hard-paste porcelain decorated in polychrome enamels and gold
7 ⁴⁄₁₆ × 5 ⁹⁄₁₆ × 3 ⁵⁄₈ in. (18.3 × 14.1 × 9.2 cm)
Gift of R. Thornton Wilson, in memory of Florence Ellsworth Wilson, 1950 50.211.256

MARKS: unmarked

CONSTRUCTION/CONDITION: modeled; cracks in base

PROVENANCE: Otto and Magdalena Blohm (by 1923); R. Thornton Wilson (until 1950; to MMA)


Germany witnessed a growing number of porcelain factories in different regions of the country during the mid-eighteenth century, and the circumstances of their founding often had much in common. Most of the new porcelain factories were created due to the interest of an aristocratic patron, and they relied on the financial subsidies provided by that patron to varying degrees. Typically, the technical expertise required to produce porcelain was supplied by potters who had learned their trade at another factory prior to their arrival, and workers were commonly hired away from other concerns to staff the new enterprise. The production of the factory often reflected the taste of the patron who founded it, and frequently the factory floundered financially when the patron died.

All of these circumstances applied to the Kelsterbach factory, which had its roots quite commonly in the production of faience and which struggled financially from its inception. It appears a faience factory was established in Königstädten in 1758 after receiving a charter that same year from Landgrave Ludwig VIII von Hessen-Darmstadt (1691–1768), in whose domain Königstädten was located. However, the factory moved to the nearby town of Kelsterbach later that year after a change of ownership. The factory’s faience production never became commercially viable, and in 1761 the Landgrave assumed ownership just as porcelain production became the factory’s sole focus.

It appears that the requisite technical knowledge at Kelsterbach was provided by Christian Daniel Busch (German, 1722–1790), who had been employed at Meissen both as a painter and as a developer of enamel colors. Busch’s career typifies the itinerant nature of many workers in ceramic factories in the eighteenth century, because he left Meissen to work at factories in Vienna, Munich, Künersberg, and Sèvres before arriving at Kelsterbach in 1761. He served as director of the Kelsterbach factory until 1764, at which time he returned to Meissen for the remainder of his career.

The modeler Carl Vogelmann (German, active 1759–84), who had been previously employed at Ludwigsburg in the years 1759–60, was hired by Kelsterbach at the outset, and while other modelers worked at the factory—notably Jakob (German, active at Kelsterbach 1763–64) and Johann Carlstadt (German, at Kelsterbach by 1764) —the majority of the figures produced by the factory are attributed to Vogelmann’s hand, and seventy-five plaster molds by him were listed in a 1769 inventory of the factory. His figures are characterized by their unusual and expressive faces, prominent eyes, and a certain ungainly quality to their modeling. One of the most distinctive features of his figural groups is the elaborate architectural frames in which the figures are placed. Composed of robust, highly sculptural C-scrolls, these quintessentially Rococo stage sets have as much visual presence as the figures that inhabit them.
This figure group depicting two soldiers displays all of Vogelmann’s stylistic traits, as well as his predilection for unconventional compositions. The two soldiers shake hands in front of a tent that covers a small table holding a bottle, two beakers, and a plate of bread. This scene is elevated on a stand composed of large, sinuous C-scrolls; two cannons and accompanying cannonballs rest on the base. The basic composition of the group may derive from a portrait of the Austrian military commander Gideon Ernst Freiherr von Laudon (1717–1790) by the printmaker Johann Esaias Nilson (German, 1721–1788). Von Laudon rose to prominence during the Seven Years’ War (1756–63) due to his military successes, and Nilson has included two soldiers in the foreground of the portrait in poses very similar to those in the Kelsterbach group. In both the print and the porcelain group it appears that a truce is being celebrated, although no specific event has been identified that might have been the impetus for the composition. The soldiers’ costumes do not immediately reveal their identities, although it has been suggested by Helmut Nickel that the soldier in the red jacket may be a Pandour (a member of the Croatian regiment of the Austrian army), while his blue-jacketed companion might be a dragoon officer from eastern Europe. While the unusualness of both the subject matter and composition might indicate a specific commission, Vogelmann used soldiers to personify the Four Elements and gave two soldiers a prominent position in a figure group depicting a man and a woman drinking coffee at a table, so it could be argued that soldiers were simply among the repertoire of types from which he drew.

The Kelsterbach factory focused production on figures and on small personal luxury objects, such as snuffboxes, scent bottles, and cane handles. Curiously, the factory appears to have made few, if any, dinner or dessert services; a factory inventory of 1769 lists no components for either type of service. This absence of tablewares suggests that either the Landgrave was uninterested in this aspect of production or he furnished his table with silver or with porcelain acquired elsewhere. This focus on figures and small luxury objects to the exclusion of wares was highly unusual for an eighteenth-century manufactory, as dinner and dessert services were standard products for most concerns. The seeming lack of interest in tablewares at Kelsterbach points to the very personal nature of many of the aristocratic porcelain factories, most of which were established due either to the founder’s passion for porcelain or to a desire to elevate the status of one’s court through such patronage. As these enterprises were rarely profitable in the eighteenth century, they required substantial infusions of funds from the founding patron or his heirs in order to survive. Kelsterbach was almost entirely dependent on Landgrave Ludwig VIII’s financial support, which came from his private income, and with his death in 1768, the factory was no longer able to continue.

---

1 Christ 2010.
3 Abraham 2010, p. 119, in which the author writes that “almost two-thirds of the figural production is attributed to the chief modeler Carl Friedrich Vogelmann.”
4 Christ 2011, p. 132.
5 See, for example, ibid., fig. 17.
6 Hofmann 1980, p. 286, under no. 113. A copy of the print is in the Museum (69.603).
7 Helmut Nickel, former Curator, Department of Arms and Armor, The Metropolitan Museum of Art, notes in the curatorial files, Department of European Sculpture and Decorative Arts, The Metropolitan Museum of Art.
8 Christ 2011, fig. 21.
9 Ibid., fig. 19.
10 Christ 2010.
11 Ibid.
39. Tomyris with the Head of Cyrus

Frankenthal Factory, German, 1755–1800
Attributed to Karl Gottlieb Lück (German, 1730–1775)
ca. 1773
Hard-paste porcelain decorated in polychrome enamels and gold
9 ⁷⁄₈ × 11 ¹⁄₄ × 7 ¹⁄₂ in. (25.1 × 28.6 × 18.4 cm)
The Jack and Belle Linsky Collection, 1982.1982.60.205

Marks: unmarked

Construction/Condition: base molded, figures press-molded and assembled; lower section of both swords missing

Provenance: Jack and Belle Linsky (until 1982; to MMA)

Literature: Honey 1947, p. 25, pl. 57; Rosenfeld 1949, p. 72, ill.; Clare Le Corbeiller in Metropolitan Museum 1984a, p. 288, no. 230, ill.

This figure group depicting Queen Tomyris with the Head of Cyrus is one of the most ambitious pieces of sculpture made by the Frankenthal factory or, indeed, produced by any German porcelain factory during the eighteenth century. Groups composed of more than two figures are uncommon, and one with as many as five figures, as seen here, is rare.¹ Within Frankenthal’s production, this group is also unusual in its depiction of a historical subject. The composition is derived from two paintings of this subject by Peter Paul Rubens (Flemish, 1577–1640).² The Rubens works differ both in scale and in the number of figures from those that appear in the Frankenthal composition, yet it appears that the modeler at Frankenthal used elements derived from each painting. Because of the specific placement and orientation of certain figures in the porcelain group, one can assume that the modeler had access to prints reproducing each of Rubens’s paintings of this subject. Works by highly successful and popular artists, such as Rubens, were commonly copied by printmakers, and at least eight different prints by various artists were made after the larger of the two paintings, which is now in the Museum of Fine Arts, Boston (fig. 39).³ As it presumably would have been easier to use only one print source, it is notable that both of Rubens’s compositions were referenced to create the porcelain group, thus making the modeler’s task more challenging.

The choice of Rubens’s depiction of the Tomyris legend for representation in a porcelain group is also unexpected, given the gruesome nature of the subject. Tomyris, queen of the Massagetae, watches while the severed head of the Persian king Cyrus, who was responsible for her son’s death, is placed in a basin of blood. An eager dog licks the edge of the basin, and the event is closely observed by a warrior in armor and two men in Turkish and Asian costumes, respectively. The grisly subject matter is somewhat counteracted by the group’s rich enamel decoration that covers almost the entire surface, and which is especially notable in the elaborately detailed costumes of Tomyris and the standing male wearing a turban. The group was also produced in a glazed but undecorated version, which makes the high quality and complexity of the modeling readily apparent.⁴

The modeling of the group has been attributed to two particularly talented sculptors at the Frankenthal factory: Franz Conrad Linck (German, 1730–1793) and Karl Gottlieb Lück (German, 1730–1775).⁵ The presence of these two modelers at the factory, along with that of Karl Gottlieb’s brother Johann Friedrich Lück (German, 1727–1797) and the modeler Johann Wilhelm Lanz (German, active at Frankenthal 1755–61), ensured figural production of unusually high quality at Frankenthal. However, unlike the Kelsterbach factory, which focused almost entirely on figures (entry 38), Frankenthal also excelled at the
production of wares, becoming one of the most accomplished German factories during its forty-four-year history. The factory was established in 1755 by Paul Anton Hannong (German, 1700–1760), a faience maker in Strasbourg who also began producing porcelain at his factory in the early 1750s. The royal monopoly that had been granted to the Vincennes factory by Louis XV (1710–1774), king of France, in 1745 for the production of porcelain (entry 55), however, forced Hannong to found a new factory beyond the French border. He moved to the region known as the Palatinate in southwestern Germany, and with the support of the Elector Karl Theodor (1724–1799), chose the city of Frankenthal for his new enterprise. The Frankenthal factory was staffed with workers from Strasbourg, who brought not only molds but also unfinished works from their former factory, allowing the new concern to become operational in a short period of time. Despite the elector’s financial support, the factory struggled with solvency, and Hannong’s eldest son, Joseph Adam Hannong (French, 1734–ca. 1800), sold it to Karl Theodor in 1762, whose entwined initials beneath an electoral coronet became the new factory mark.

The factory sought out an unusually wide variety of markets from which to sell its wares and figures, and depots were established in The Hague and in various locations throughout Germany, as well as in the French city of Nancy. Frankenthal flourished artistically under the direction of Adam Bergdoll (German, 1720–1797) and under the patronage of Karl Theodor, but the occupation of the city by French Revolutionary troops in 1794 forced the factory into a decline from which it never fully recovered. Karl Theodor died in 1799, and his porcelain factory was closed the following year by his successor, Maximilian IV Joseph (1756–1825).

1 An even larger and more ambitious group depicting a battle scene is in the Bayerisches Nationalmuseum in Munich; Kunst Porcelain Zu machen 2005, p. 188, no. 209.
2 See fig. 39; the other, from around 1620–25, is in the Musée du Louvre, Paris (inv. no. 1768).
3 Clare Le Corbeiller in Metropolitan Museum 1984a, p. 288. Prints in two different orientations of the Boston painting were done by Gaspar Duchange (French, 1662–1757), in the Victoria and Albert Museum, London (DYCE.2586), and Paulus Pontius (Flemish, 1603–1658), also in the Victoria and Albert Museum (DYCE.220).
5 Ibid., p. 451, no. 246, ill. p. 449.
6 For a history of the factory, see ibid., pp. 22–52; Beaucamp-Markowsky 2010; Agliano 2014, pp. 220–21.
7 Beaucamp-Markowsky 2010, p. 212.
8 The factory used the initials CT rather than KT, for “Carl” as an alternative version of “Karl.”
9 Beaucamp-Markowsky 2010, p. 212.
40. The Four Continents

FULDA FACTORY, GERMAN, 1764–88
1781–88
Hard-paste porcelain
.4 (Europe): 9 1/8 × 5 3/4 × 4 13/16 in. (23.2 × 14.6 × 11.3 cm)
.5 (America): 9 3/4 × 5 × 4 3/8 in. (24.9 × 12.7 × 11.6 cm)
.6 (Africa): 9 3/4 × 4 3/4 × 4 3/4 in. (24.9 × 12.4 × 11.6 cm)
.7 (Asia): 9 3/4 × 5 × 3 3/4 in. (25.1 × 12.7 × 9.5 cm)
Gift of Estate of James Hazen Hyde, 1959 59.208.4–7

MARKS: all painted on underside: crowned FF with cross above, all in underglaze blue

CONSTRUCTION/CONDITION: .4: press-molded; repair in back where horse joins base, repair to crown and flower, firing cracks in base; .5: press-molded; firing cracks in base, repairs to feather headdress, at neck, and both hands, repair to crocodile tongue; .6: press-molded, firing cracks in base, loss to drapery by cornucopia, loss to drapery on proper right shoulder, loss of fruits in cornucopia; .7: press-molded; firing crack in base, repair to floral garland on head, small break on proper left big toe

PROVENANCE: possibly Schlossmuseum, Berlin [Hermann Ball & Paul Graupe, Berlin, 1932; sold to Hyde]; James Hazen Hyde, New York (until d. 1959; to MMA)

and Elise and Henry Clay Hofheimer II,” Chrysler Museum, Norfolk, Virginia, October 12–December 9, 1984

LITERATURE: Le Corbeiller 1961, pp. 219, 221, fig. 15, cover, and frontispiece; Honour 1975, no. 150, ill.; M. D. Schwartz 1984, nos. 19–22, ill.; Le Corbeiller 1990, pp. 52, 56, ill. pp. 54–55; Fritzsche and Stasch 1994, p. 59, no. 24 (59.208.6), pp. 60–61, no. 26 (59.208.8), ill.; Sotheby’s 2003, p. 102, under no. 118

The circumstances around the founding of the porcelain factory at Fulda conform to the pattern established in earlier decades at other German factories. The production of porcelain was preceded by the production of faience, although in the case of Fulda, there was an interval of four years between the closure of the faience operation and the beginning of porcelain production; both the faience and porcelain enterprises were dependent on the expertise of workers from other factories; the factory was both established and then supported by an aristocratic patron; and lastly, the factory was not able to survive beyond the death of its founder.

The Fulda porcelain enterprise was founded in 1764 by Prince-Bishop Heinrich von Bibra (1711–1788), and it took over the buildings formerly occupied by a faience factory that had failed due to the death of its founder, Prince-Bishop Amand von Buseck (1737–1756), as well as to the vicissitudes of the Seven Years’ War (1756–63).1 It is not clear if von Bibra’s motivation in founding the porcelain factory derived from a particular passion for the medium itself or from the prospects of the economic gain to be derived from the successful production of porcelain.2 Nikolaus Paul (German, active at Fulda 1764–66), a worker from the Höchst factory, is credited with providing the technical mastery for the new enterprise that was soon producing both figures and wares of considerable technical and artistic accomplishment.3
The master modeler at Fulda was Wenzel Neu (Bohemian, 1707–1774), who had previously worked at the faience factory at Fulda and then worked at Kloster-Weilisdorf, where he served initially as the sole master modeler. He returned to Fulda to work in the new porcelain enterprise and remained there until his death. Neu was assisted at Fulda by other modelers, including Georg Ludwig Bartholome (German?, active at Fulda ca. 1770–88), Valentin Schaum (German?, 1714–1771), and Georg Schumann (German?, active at Fulda 1765–80), and therefore, it is not often clear who was responsible for the models of the many figures produced.

Factory records indicate that designs by the court painter Johann Andreas Herrlein (German, 1720–1796) were the inspiration for Fulda’s figures personifying the Four Continents, and Neu and Bartholome have been credited jointly with turning the two-dimensional designs into three-dimensional figures. Herrlein’s designs had been completed by December 1771, and it is not known how soon after that date the four figures were initially modeled. The Museum’s four figures bear a factory mark that was introduced at the beginning of the 1780s, but one of the Four Continents, which is now in the Landesmuseum, Kassel, has been attributed to around 1771–74, presumably due to the presence of an earlier factory mark. The porcelain body of the Museum’s figures is grayer than that commonly found on Fulda figures, and firing cracks are evident in each of the bases, perhaps indicating that the factory was experimenting with different formulas for the porcelain paste in its final decade.

The four figures are among the most ambitious produced at the Fulda factory, in part because each female figure personifying a continent is depicted with various identifying attributes. The figure of Europe, dressed in typically European clothes, wears a crown and stands in front of a recumbent horse. America wears her customary feather headdress and carries a quiver of arrows over her left shoulder; a crocodile lies at her feet. The figure of Africa wears an elephant headdress; her feather skirt and prominent jewelry also serve to distinguish her as exotic in the eyes of Europeans. She holds a cornucopia, and a lion crouches at her feet. Asia is depicted with an incense burner attached, somewhat awkwardly, to her hip, and she stands in front of a reclining camel.

These various attributes, especially the animals, would have immediately signaled the identity of the continent being depicted. The iconography of the Four Continents was well established by the early eighteenth century, and prints illustrating their personifications were widely produced and circulated. The Four Continents were a popular subject for representation in porcelain, and the Meissen examples produced between 1745 and 1747 are among the largest, most sculptural and elaborately decorated works made by that factory. These figures may have been an indirect influence on the examples made at Fulda, but other German factories produced figures of the continents, including Berlin (Wegley factory), Frankenthal, and Nymphenburg, prior to those made at Fulda, indicating the broad appeal of allegories, such as the Four Seasons and the Five Elements, during the second half of the eighteenth century.

---

1. For general information on the factory, see Stasch 2010; Nelson 2013, pp. 265–77.
6. Fritzsche and Stasch 1994, p. 58. A note in the curatorial files, Department of European Sculpture and Decorative Arts, The Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York, states that Ernst Kramer attributed the models for the figures to Georg Schumann in a letter to Clare Le Corbeiller of 1988, but the letter is missing from the file.
9. Fritzsche and Stasch 1994, p. 61, no. 25. It appears the mark on the figure of Asia in the Landesmuseum, Kassel (Fritzsche and Stasch 1994, p. 60, no. 25), has been published incorrectly, and the figure in fact bears the mark erroneously assigned to the Metropolitan’s America (Fritzsche and Stasch 1994, pp. 59–61, no. 26).
10. Ceasare Ripa’s Iconologia was first published in 1593 and was particularly influential as a catalogue of symbols and emblems.
12. MMA 59.208.16, 17.
13. MMA 59.208.11–14; Duval 1992, pp. 79–80, no. 34.
14. MMA 59.208.18–21.
41. Potpourri jar

ATTRIBUTED TO LOUIS POTERAT FACTORY, FRENCH (ROUEN), EARLY 1690S–96

ca. 1690–95

Soft-paste porcelain decorated in underglaze blue

$5 \times 5 \times 5$ in. ($12.7 \times 12.7 \times 12.7$ cm)

Gift of R. Thornton Wilson, in memory of Florence Ellsworth Wilson, 1950 50.211.186

MARKS: unmarked

CONSTRUCTION/CONDITION: wheel-thrown into a mold; cover missing

PROVENANCE: Xavier Roger Marie, comte de Chavagnac (by 1900–1911; sale,Hôtel Drouot, Paris, June 19–21, 1911, no. 4); Georges Vandermersch, Paris (after 1911–before 1948; sold to Dupuy); Mme Helen Dupuy, Paris and New York (until 1948; sale, Parke-Bernet Galleries, New York, April 2–3, 1948, no. 356; sold to Gaston Bensimon for $300); [Gaston Bensimon, 1948–before 1950; sold to R. Thornton Wilson]; R. Thornton Wilson (until 1950; to MMA)


LITERATURE: Exposition Universelle 1900, pp. 57–58, ill.; Hôtel Drouot 1911, p. 12, no. 4; Porcelaine française 1929, p. 2, no. 4; Alfassa and Guérin 1931, p. 35, pl. 33; Parke-Bernet 1948, no. 356, ill.; C. L. Avery 1949a, p. 427, ill.; C. L. Avery 1949b, no. 140, Honey 1950, p. 7, pl. 18; Wills 1958, ill. no. 5; “French Decorative Arts” 1989, pp. 56, 64, ill.; Le Duc 1996, ill. p. 301; Grandjean 1999, p. 63; Sotheby’s 2008, p. 21, fig. 10, under no. 501; C. A. Jones 2013, p. 95, fig. 3.2

THE FIRST SUCCESSFUL EFFORTS AT PRODUCING A SOFT-PASTE porcelain body in France took place in the city of Rouen in northwestern France during the closing decades of the seventeenth century. At this time, Rouen was a major center for the production of faience, the term applied to earthenware decorated with a tin glaze. As no porcelain was yet in production in France until at least 1670, tin-glazed earthenwares provided a viable alternative to Chinese and Japanese porcelains, since the white surface created by the addition of tin to the glaze allowed potters to decorate both monochromatically in cobalt blue or in a limited palette of enamel colors. However, faience lacked the durability, translucency, and thinness of porcelain, and it is likely that numerous faience makers experimented in order to develop a porcelain body, which was universally held to be superior.

Surviving documents suggest that the Poterat family of faience makers in Rouen was the first to discover how to successfully produce soft-paste porcelain. Although the ingredients necessary to make true porcelain in the manner of Chinese porcelain were not known at this time, the porcelain produced by the Poterats, and indeed by all of the ceramic enterprises in France in the late seventeenth century and first half of the eighteenth century, was an artificial porcelain known as soft paste that approximated the whiteness and durability of Chinese porcelains.

A partial picture of the various Poterat enterprises can be assembled due to a variety of contemporary documents. It is known that Edme Poterat (French, 1612–1687) was operating a faience factory on the outskirts of Rouen by the late 1640s. His two sons, Louis Poterat (French, 1641–1696) and Michel Poterat (French, ca. 1655–1745), became faience makers like their father, and in 1673 Louis was granted a royal privilege to produce porcelain in addition to faience. He established a new, independent ceramic factory in Rouen the following year, but its production of soft-paste porcelain remained on a very small scale during his lifetime, and probably ceased with his death in 1696. It appears that Louis learned how to make porcelain from his father, though it is not clear how much porcelain was made by Edme, or if his production can be distinguished from those works made by Louis. More significantly, it remains a mystery as to how Edme discovered a formula to produce soft-paste porcelain, owing to the fact that there is no evidence other factories were producing porcelain at this time, and whose efforts could be emulated.

At the time of this writing, nine pieces of soft-paste porcelain have been identified that are believed to have been made in Rouen at the end of the seventeenth century, and recent scholarship has attributed all of these pieces to Louis Poterat. On stylistic grounds, their date of manufacture is likely to be from the early 1690s, but the absence of factory marks on any of these objects makes their dating and authorship very complex.
The identification of Rouen as their place of manufacture is based upon the coat of arms that appears on one of the group. A small mustard pot in the Musée National de Céramique, Sévres, bears the arms of Jacques Asselin de Villequier (French, 1669–1728), counselor to the Parliament of Normandy in 1695. The appearance of his arms on numerous pieces of Rouen faience from the late seventeenth to the early eighteenth century links the soft-paste porcelain pot to this body of faience and all but confirms a Rouen origin for the pot and for those other pieces of porcelain with similar distinctive stylistic features. Most of the nine pieces are distinguished by the slightly gray-green tone of the ceramic body, which can be seen on the Museum’s potpourri jar. All are decorated solely in cobalt blue painted under the glaze, and the distinctive, finely stippled decoration found at the top and bottom registers of this potpourri occurs on four other pieces of Rouen porcelain.
In addition, the organization of the painted decoration within shaped panels on the Museum’s potpourri jar is a distinctive feature on the mustard pot now at Sévres, and it is found on two of the other pieces in this group.13

The potpourri fits neatly within this small group attributed to Louis Poterat, but its sophisticated low-relief designs—also found on a second Rouen potpourri of the same model14—distinguish it as a particularly ambitious piece of soft-paste porcelain. The holes on the potpourri’s shoulder are framed by motifs that recall a pinwheel or floral blossom with twisting petals. On the potpourri’s lower section, strapwork bands form panels that echo the shape of the painted decoration contained within. Floral motifs, including bellflowers, decorate the areas between the raised bands. While the low-relief motifs form an important aspect of the potpourri’s decoration, they are best appreciated at close hand, as are the delicately painted scrolls and floral motifs set against a finely stippled ground.

The complexity and detail of the decoration, coupled with the relatively small scale of the potpourri, suggest it was intended more for active use than for display, and it was meant to be handled and valued as a precious object. Moreover, the potpourri jar was likely made as an independent item rather than as part of a larger ensemble, and it may have been intended for use in the private rather than public quarters. While the potpourri would have been considered novel because it was made in the new medium of soft-paste porcelain, the design and decoration are indebted to a certain degree to French silver made during the late seventeenth century. The use of raised, shaped panels as decorative motifs, which appear on the lower register of the potpourri, was commonly employed by French silversmiths at the end of the century.15 At the same time, the potpourri’s painted stippled ground recalls the fine stippling found on contemporary silver, which provided a foil for the chased ornament.14

It remains difficult to account for both the aesthetic and technical sophistication of this potpourri jar and the other eight known pieces of Rouen porcelain given the experimental nature and very small scale of Louis Poterat’s enterprise. However, this potpourri can only be regarded as an extraordinary achievement by a potter thought to have been working entirely on his own. As a very early example of soft-paste porcelain made in France, the sophisticated low-relief decoration and delicate, skillfully executed underglaze blue painting mark it as one of the finest examples of eighteenth-century French porcelain.

1 For the most complete account of the history of Rouen porcelain, see Grandjean 1999.
2 Ibid., pp. 58–61.
5 The nine objects currently identified as Rouen porcelain are illustrated in Sotheby’s 2008, no. 501, and pp. 18–21, figs. 4–12. See also the listing in the Ferri, Drouot-Richelieu, Paris, sale cat., December 12, 2007, no. 97. A sugar bowl attributed to Rouen is illustrated in Lacomba 2006, fig. 4. While this bowl is not widely known, it is thought by several experts to be Rouen porcelain, which would bring the number of known pieces to ten. I thank Cyrille Froissart, a specialist on French ceramics, for his observations on this bowl.
8 For example, see a faience plate at the Victoria and Albert Museum, London (426-1870), a ewer and a plate illustrated in Chompret et al. 1933–35, vol. 3 (1933), pls. 24b (ewer) and 11b (plate); and a garniture of a vase and two ewers in Sotheby’s 2008, no. 511.
9 Soft-paste porcelains produced by both the Saint-Cloud factory and the small enterprise run by Antoine Pavi (entry 46) have been attributed in the past to Rouen, but the greenish cast to the paste of Rouen porcelain has served as an important identifying characteristic of this factory’s production; see Grandjean 1999, pp. 65–67.
10 These objects are the mustard pot at Sèvres (see note 7); a glass cooler in the Musée de la Céramique, Rouen; a potpourri of the same model as that in the Museum, now in a private collection; and the mustard pot in the sale at Sotheby’s, Paris, June 18, 2008, no. 501, all of which are illustrated in Sotheby’s 2008, no. 501 and pp. 18, 21, figs. 4, 5, 11. The glass cooler is also illustrated in Gay-Mazuel 2012, p. 210.
11 The other pieces of Rouen porcelain with decoration organized in this manner are the mustard pot at Sèvres, the glass cooler in Rouen, and the potpourri of the same model (see note 10).
12 A Rouen porcelain potpourri of the same model as that in the Museum with very similar painted decoration formerly in the Monmélien collection was at Hôtel Drouot, Paris, Paul Renaud, sale cat., December 6, 1983, no. 21. Now in a private collection, it is illustrated in Sotheby’s 2008, p. 21, fig. 11, under no. 501.
42. **Vase**

**ATTRIBUTED TO SAINT-CLOUD FACTORY, FRENCH, MID-1690S–1766**

ca. 1695–1710

Soft-paste porcelain decorated in underglaze blue

8 ¹⁄₁₆ × 6 ⁷⁄₈ × 6 ⁷⁄₈ in. (20.5 × 17.5 × 17.5 cm)

Gift of J. Pierpont Morgan, 1917 17.190.1911

**MARKS:** unmarked

**CONSTRUCTION/CONDITION:** wheel-thrown

**PROVENANCE:** Gaston Le Breton, Rouen; J. Pierpont Morgan, London and New York (until 1917; to MMA)


The Saint-Cloud factory was the first to produce soft-paste porcelain in France on a commercial basis. Established to make faience, or tin-glazed earthenware, the factory experimented with formulas for soft-paste porcelain that was in production by the early 1690s. This vase appears to be one of the earliest works produced at Saint-Cloud, and it belongs to a small group of objects made in the years between 1695 and 1710, which, in the absence of any factory marks, can only be attributed to Saint-Cloud, a factory still in its first period of porcelain manufacturing. A number of these works now believed to have been made at Saint-Cloud were attributed previously to the Poterat factory of Rouen (entry 41), but based on qualities of paste and glaze, as well as stylistic considerations, a Saint-Cloud origin is more persuasive. Nonetheless, the slightly pinkish aspect of the glaze of the present example distinguishes it from the more typical cool, slightly bluish cast of most early Saint-Cloud porcelain, serving as a reminder that attributions are challenging for objects made by small enterprises in their first years of production, especially in a nascent industry, such as porcelain manufacturing at the end of the seventeenth century.

It seems that the earliest products of Saint-Cloud were close imitations of Chinese blue-and-white porcelains, but the factory soon developed its own distinctive style that reflected a blend of Chinese and European motifs. A number of forms based on Chinese porcelains, particularly vases and beakers, were employed by the factory, and the monochromatic palette of cobalt blue applied under the glaze, which the factory used exclusively until the 1720s, was a direct reference to Chinese porcelains. Chinese motifs, such as bands of stylized vegetation and scrolls, were used both as primary decoration and for borders, but European motifs were introduced as early as the mid-1690s. As has been demonstrated by Clare Le Corbeiller, the earliest of these motifs were often taken directly from the work of the French designer and architect Jacques Androuet Du Cerceau (1511–1586). Du Cerceau’s ornament prints were enormously influential in France during the second half of the sixteenth century, and his series Petites Grotesques, first published in 1550, and his series Livre de Grotesques (1566), also known as the Grands Grotesques, widely disseminated a vast vocabulary of ornament designs that were employed by artisans working in a variety of media. His prints contain a seemingly endless repertoire of motifs in the so-called grotesque style that was rooted in Italian Renaissance imagery.

Bertrand Rondot has noted that within this small group of early Saint-Cloud objects decorated with Du Cerceau motifs, two different types of decorative schemes exist. In one type, the porcelain is painted
with small-scale motifs arranged symmetrically in a relatively dense manner, occupying much of the surface of the object. In the second type, the placement of the motifs is organized more loosely, and a greater area of the porcelain surface is left undecorated, resulting in compositions that are less dense and lighter in overall effect. It is to this second category that the Museum’s vase belongs.

The vase is decorated with three vignettes composed of motifs derived from Chinese porcelains of the Kangxi period (1662–1722). In each vignette, vases are supported by or grouped around low tables. Two of the vases are based on the ancient Chinese bronze gu form; the other, more familiar vase shapes support stylized flowers and vegetation. The most distinctive feature of the vase’s decorative scheme is the appearance of motifs in one of the vignettes that are taken either from Du Cerceau or from closely related imagery. A standing swan with outspread wings and a downward-curved neck is based on a larger composition in Du Cerceau’s *Livre de Grotesques*; the winged snail near the base and the two satyrs are strongly reminiscent of motifs found elsewhere in Du Cerceau’s work. It is unclear as to why these motifs would have been chosen for use in combination with imagery commonly found on Chinese porcelains of the seventeenth century, as the Du Cerceau motifs seem to exist entirely independent of the Chinese vases and tables that are the primary decoration of the vase.

Furthermore, it is difficult to explain why motifs from the works of Du Cerceau, which had been executed approximately one hundred and fifty years earlier, would have been selected for use on Saint-Cloud porcelain. While grotesque decoration was fashionable in French court circles during the late seventeenth century, it is unclear if Du Cerceau’s prints were still readily available at that time. It is even less clear how the painters at the factory would have had access to Du Cerceau’s works, especially as their use implies a level of sophisticated taste that is remarkable for a small, experimental enterprise in its first decade of production. In any event, Du Cerceau’s motifs disappear from the decorative vocabulary at Saint-Cloud by the second decade of the eighteenth century to be replaced by more Baroque ornamental schemes that reflect a different style of employing motifs derived from both Renaissance art and from Chinese porcelain.
43. Vase with cover

SAINT-CLOUD FACTORY, FRENCH, MID-1690S–1766
ca. 1695–1710
Soft-paste porcelain decorated in underglaze blue
9 ¹⁵⁄₁₆ × 5 ¹⁴⁄₁₆ in. (25.2 × 13.3 × 13.2 cm)
Gift of J. Pierpont Morgan, 1917 17.190.1912a, b

MARKS: unmarked

CONSTRUCTION/CONDITION: wheel-thrown; vertical crack on one side

PROVENANCE: Gaston Le Breton, Rouen; J. Pierpont Morgan, London and New York (until 1917; to MMA)


LITERATURE: Le Breton n.d., no. 193; C. L. Avery 1949b, no. 151; “French Decorative Arts” 1989, pp. 57, 64, ill.

It is likely that this covered vase was produced as part of a garniture, a grouping of vases of two or more different models intended to be used decoratively rather than to serve a functional purpose. The baluster form of the vase is derived from Chinese porcelains of the Transitional period (1620–83), and its blue-and-white decoration is a clear reference to the palette that defined Chinese porcelains for Europeans in the decades around 1700. However, the painted decoration on this vase is wholly European in spirit and reflects a stylistic shift that was present at the Saint-Cloud factory in the earliest years of the eighteenth century. The decoration consists of leafy scrollwork punctuated by stylized vases resting on canopies and flanked by swans. This type of ornament composed of continuously linking scrolls embellished by stylized foliate motifs and arranged symmetrically is often referred to as “arabesque decoration,” and it was highly fashionable in the decorative arts, as well as in domestic interiors in France during the late seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries. Many of the earliest works produced by the Saint-Cloud factory are decorated in this style, and there are subtle variations in the manner in which it was employed during the relatively brief period in which it was popular at the factory. As discussed previously, motifs taken from the works of designer Jacques Androuet Du Cerceau (French, 1511–1586) were integrated into arabesque designs in some of the first objects produced at Saint-Cloud (entry 42), but the borrowings from Du Cerceau diminished markedly by the end of the first decade of the eighteenth century. The influence of the French court designer Jean Bérain (1640–1711) became more dominant at Saint-Cloud in the first two decades of the eighteenth century, and Bérain’s prolific designs were employed, directly and indirectly, across the decorative arts as well as in interior design at this time.

The direct use of motifs from Bérain’s work on Saint-Cloud porcelain appears to be less than is commonly assumed, and the painters at the factory also looked to the prints of other, less well-known designers for their decorative vocabulary. Whereas the borrowing of motifs from Du Cerceau at Saint-Cloud was usually quite exact, the works of Bérain and his contemporaries served more as sources of inspiration with motifs from various sources combined, reinterpreted, and organized in innovative ways.

On this covered vase, the swans appear to derive from works by Du Cerceau, but the lacy scrollwork, canopies, and stylized vases are closer to the Bérainesque decorative vocabulary that emerged in the very early eighteenth century. It is likely that this vase dates to the first years in which this shift to Bérain-inspired decoration took place—around 1700—as the slight awkwardness seen in the execution of the scrolling designs suggests a certain lack of familiarity with the new,
looser interpretation of arabesque decoration. The intended symmetry of the scrolling patterns is not entirely successfully achieved, particularly in the lower section of the vase, serving as a reminder that the painters at the young factory were developing a new ornamental vocabulary and often struggled with both the technical and aesthetic challenges offered by the new medium of soft-paste porcelain.

1 A gouache rendering of the interior of a Chinese shop of ca. 1680–1700 depicts numerous blue-and-white vases of the type that must have inspired the form of the Museum’s vase. This gouache was brought to my attention by Corbin 2014. The gouache is illustrated in Lieffes and H. Young 2008, p. 11.

2 Closely related to arabesque decoration are grotesques, the French term for a type of ornament that commonly incorporates fantastic creatures, both human and animal, with strapwork (interlacing decorative bands), scrolls, and foliage.

3 For example, see Wolfram Koeppe in Kisluk-Grosheide, Koeppe, and Rieder 2006, pp. 50–53, no. 17.

4 Bertrand Rondot has noted that it was Bérain’s lesser-known prints for ceiling decoration in particular that were used at Saint-Cloud, perhaps because this specific type of ornamental work could be more readily adapted to porcelain painting; Rondot 1999b, p. 26.

5 One of the lesser-known artists whose designs were used at Saint-Cloud was P. P. Bacqueville (French, d. 1710); ibid.

6 A specific source in Du Cerceau’s work has not been located, but similar swans appear commonly in Du Cerceau’s prints; see plates from Petites Grotesques (second series; 1562) and Livre de Grotesques (1566); illustrated in Le Corbeiller 1999b, figs. 3.2–3.6.
44. **Glass cooler**

**SAINT-CLOUD FACTORY, FRENCH, MID-1690S–1766**

ca. 1725–30

Soft-paste porcelain decorated in polychrome enamels and gold

4 ⁵⁄₁₆ × 5 ¹¹⁄₁₆ × 4 ⁷⁄₈ in. (11 × 14.4 × 12.4 cm)

Gift of R. Thornton Wilson, in memory of Florence Ellsworth Wilson, 1950 50.211.136

**MARKS:** unmarked

**CONSTRUCTION/CONDITION:** molded with applied decoration

**PROVENANCE:** probably Gilbert Lévy, Paris; [Rosenberg and Stiebel, New York, until October 1948; sold to R. Thornton Wilson]; R. Thornton Wilson (1948–50; to MMA)


**LITERATURE:** C. L. Avery 1949b, no. 141; Savage 1960, p. 13, pl. 7a; Vivian S. Hawes in Hawes and Corsiglia 1984, pp. 160, 161, n. 3, under no. 52; Georges Brunel in Pagodes et dragons 2007, p. 246, no. 132, ill.; Gwilt 2014, p. 52, under no. 6

It is believed that the Saint-Cloud factory began using enamel colors in the 1720s, and the palette of five colors developed at the factory at this time allowed for a different style of decoration than what had been employed for porcelains painted solely with cobalt blue. For those pieces to be decorated with colored enamels, the painters at Saint-Cloud almost always took their inspiration from Chinese and Japanese art. They sometimes borrowed motifs directly from imported porcelains and lacquer work, but more frequently painters devised images and patterns intended to evoke Far Eastern culture, or combined borrowed motifs in a distinctly European manner. It is probable that the factory painters had access to Chinese and Japanese porcelains either through the collection of Philippe II (1674–1723), duc d’Orléans, who granted protection to the factory in 1702, or through the owners of the factory who sold imported porcelains in their capacity as marchands faienciers, or dealers in ceramics. Despite the availability of these works, there was little attempt to faithfully copy either Chinese or Japanese models. Motifs from imported porcelains were sometimes combined on the same object, and there was little consistent adherence to the color scheme of the source of the original motif. Most notably, imagery inspired by these models, or intended to suggest an imagined Far East, was employed by the factory on European forms almost exclusively. The factory’s production focused on functional objects, most of which were intended for use on the dining table, as part of a toilet service, or for the consumption of tea, and it is on these objects that Chinese or Japanese imagery is commonly found rather than on decorative vases derived from Far Eastern forms.

This glass cooler is decorated with unusually ambitious Far Eastern–inspired compositions of figures standing around a table and a landscape consisting of pavilions at the edge of the water with two figures rowing a boat. It has been suggested that the landscape recalls those found on Chinese lacquer.¹ The cooler is painted in the typical Saint-Cloud palette of a turquoise green, blue, purplish-brown, yellow, red, and black. Gilding has been used subtly but extensively to provide details in the robes of the figures, the fans, and throughout the landscape. This prominent role of gilding in defining the elements of the composition and the use of red enamel to provide additional detail reflects a very specific style of decoration at Saint-Cloud that seems to have been employed only on glass coolers and cream pots, for reasons that are not immediately apparent.² The enamels used at Saint Cloud were translucent due to the low level of mineral oxides in their composition,³ and this translucency made them especially suitable for Chinese-inspired motifs, recalling the colors found on Chinese famille verte porcelains (entries 15, 20, 87) in particular.⁴ This translucency is
especially apparent in the turquoise green used for the robes of three of the figures and in elements of the landscape. However, the translucent nature of some of the Saint-Cloud colors made them less appropriate for European subject matter as the lack of opacity made shading impossible, thus preventing the suggestion of depth and perspective that was central to Western compositions.

The scenes of figures around a table and a landscape with pavilions, which decorate the present example, are found on other Saint-Cloud glass coolers of the same model, and the very close similarity of the compositions on all of the examples suggests that a stencil for pouncing was employed. There are other instances when a stencil appears to have been used for a certain composition created at Saint-Cloud, and the close correspondence of images on certain pieces of Saint-Cloud porcelain and on some of the faience made in the northern French town of Sinceny, to which at least one Saint-Cloud worker is known to have moved, supports the hypothesis that pouncing was practiced with some frequency. Interestingly, the palette of five colors seems to have been employed identically for each of the compositions, which suggests that a colored print or other source was available to the painters at the factory.

It is likely that both glass coolers and bottle coolers were produced in sets at the Saint-Cloud factory, but little is known about the numbers of coolers typically found in a set, and it is not clear what number of objects composed a typical set. Madame de Pompadour’s (1721–1764) after-death inventory lists a substantial number of Saint-Cloud coolers: twenty-eight bottle coolers with relief decoration, four liqueur-bottle coolers, and forty-two glass coolers were recorded among her possessions at the Château de Compiègne, and twenty-six similar bottle coolers and thirty-two glass coolers were listed at the Château de Fontainebleau. At least fourteen other glass coolers with decoration matching the present example are known, but it is not clear if these were produced as part of one large set or in smaller groupings.

From surviving examples, it is evident that the Saint-Cloud factory produced bottle and glass coolers in sizable quantities, though most are not painted in enamels but rather are left white and have low-relief decoration consisting of stylized vegetation (fig. 40). Smaller in scale than bottle coolers, glass coolers such as this example allowed the base of the glass to rest on the rim of the cooler, permitting the bowl of the glass to be either chilled or rinsed in the icy water. Glass coolers were placed on the table within reach of the diner, a custom increasingly favored in the second half of the eighteenth century when a less-formal dining etiquette prevailed, and the role of the servant diminished as more intimate dinners became popular.
45. Two actors

**SAINT-CLOUD FACTORY, FRENCH, MID-1690S–1766**

ca. 1730–40

Soft-paste porcelain decorated in polychrome enamels and gold

10 (actor): 8 1/16 × 6 5/8 × 3 3/4 in. (20.5 × 16.2 × 14.6 cm)

11 (actress): 8 1/16 × 6 5/8 × 3 1/4 in. (20.5 × 16.8 × 13.3 cm)

Gift of R. Thornton Wilson, in memory of Florence Ellsworth Wilson, 1954 54.147.10, .11

**MARKS:** unmarked

**CONSTRUCTION/CONDITION:** 10: press-molded; both hands repaired, repair to tip of hat, repair at neck, crack in back of figure, crack at base near claw; 11: press-molded; repair to proper left hand and at wrist of proper right hand, repair to flower of cap, repair in base at proper left side

**PROVENANCE:** M. Léon Fould (in 1911); Baroness Fould-Springer (by 1929); [Rosenberg and Stiebel, New York, until January 1952; sold to R. Thornton Wilson]; R. Thornton Wilson (1952–54; to MMA)


**LITERATURE:** Guérin 1911, pl. 53.1; Porcelaine française 1929, p. 9, no. 97; Alfassa and Guérin 1931, p. 7, pl. 21a; Honey 1950, p. 16; Art Treasures 1955, no. 268, ill.; Winchester 1955, p. 419, fig. 19; C. L. Avery 1957, p. 198, ill. p. 195; C. M. Scott and G. R. Scott 1961, pl. 11b, figs. 416, 417; Briukova 1962, pp. 18–19, 302, 307, figs. 1, 2; Clare Le Corbeiller in Masterpieces of Fifty Centuries 1970, p. 280, no. 315, ill.; Meister and Reber 1983, p. 78, figs. 92, 93; Bertrand Rondot in Rondot 1999a, p. 227, no. 173, ill.; Dawson 2015, pp. 7–8, fig. 2

The production of the Saint-Cloud factory was focused primarily on utilitarian wares, although vases were made as well, especially in the first decades of the factory’s history (entries 42, 43). Most of the factory’s production was small in scale, and items such as pomade pots, snuffboxes, knife handles, potpourris, and cups and saucers appear to have constituted a sizable percentage of the factory’s output. It would seem that porcelain sculpture tested the technical and artistic limits of the factory’s capabilities, and relatively little sculptural work was produced during the seven or eight decades of the factory’s history.

These two figures are among the most ambitious of the sculptures made at Saint-Cloud. While most Saint-Cloud figures are characterized by a certain static quality and an absence of finely modeled detail, these two figures convey a degree of expressiveness and a sense of movement, and their modeling is of greater complexity than is commonly found in Saint-Cloud sculpture. Both figures are distinguished by their gesturing arms, and they occupy a three-dimensional space more fully than most figures made at the factory.

It is probable that the two figures represent actors dressed as Chinese characters, and thus the prominence of the figures’ gestures can be explained by their identity as theatrical subjects. The reading of the figures as being Chinese, however, is due primarily to the hat of the male figure and the bold patterning of the robes worn by both figures. His broad-brimmed, tall hat ending in a point is a variant on the type of hat that Europeans traditionally identified with male figures from the Far East, and his identity as a Chinese figure is enhanced by the prominent mustache and goatee that were often regarded in Europe as traditional attributes of both Chinese and Japanese men. The headdress worn by the female figure, however, is not one commonly associated with women from these countries but rather evokes a simplified version of the helmet type seen in depictions of the Greek goddess Athena. Her “Eastern” qualities seem to derive entirely from her patterned robe and by being paired with the more overtly Chinese male. The robes worn by both figures are not directly derived from Chinese or Japanese models but evoke a Far East design vocabulary in their motifs and in their palette, which is similar to that found on Japanese export porcelain.

Three other pairs of these figures are known. A second pair is also in the Museum (fig. 41), the third pair is in the Musée des Arts Décoratifs, Paris, and a fourth pair, present location unknown, was formerly in the Félix Doistau collection, Paris. The two pairs in the Museum have polychrome decoration; the examples in the Musée des Arts Décoratifs and formerly in the Doistau collection have been left white. There are subtle differences between the four pairs in the
modeling of the figures; most of the differences lie in the treatment of the rockwork and abstracted vegetation at the base,\textsuperscript{5} but it is difficult to ascertain if the minor variations in this area and elsewhere in the figures are due to the finish work done by the modelers before the first firing, or if the molds were modified in the course of the production of these models.\textsuperscript{6}

It has been suggested by Clare Le Corbeiller that the white porcelain figures produced in China in Dehua, Fujian province, during the early eighteenth century were the inspiration for the first figures produced at Saint-Cloud.\textsuperscript{7} These early Saint-Cloud sculptures, which appear in the first three decades of the eighteenth century, depict Chinese figures and are characterized by simple modeling, minimal detail, and the absence of any painted decoration.\textsuperscript{8} A second and different group of figures appears in the 1730s, to which the present examples belong. As noted above, these figures depict European actors wearing Chinese-inspired costumes, and the production of these figures may be due to the popularity in Paris of theatrical events with Chinese themes.\textsuperscript{9} These slightly later figures are commonly modeled in more complex poses and with greater detail\textsuperscript{10} than the earlier figures intended to depict Chinese men and women, albeit through the lens of the Saint-Cloud modelers.
It is probable that most of the Saint-Cloud figures of both categories were intended to be mounted in gilt bronze, sometimes serving as components of clocks or of candelabra, as in the case of the second pair at the Museum,\(^1\) or simply fitted with gilt-bronze bases to enhance their status as decorative objects, as can be seen in the pair at the Musée des Arts Décoratifs.\(^2\) It is likely that none of the figures were produced to decorate the dessert table, as this fashion did not take hold in Paris until the mid-1740s.\(^3\) The present pair of figures can be regarded as among the earliest porcelain sculpture to have been produced in Europe. While a few figures were produced at the Meissen and at Du Paquier factories prior to 1735, it was only in the second half of the 1730s that either of these factories began figural production on a significant scale, and it was those made at Meissen in the late 1730s and 1740s that achieved huge popularity as table decoration throughout Europe. These Saint-Cloud figures of actors can thus be seen as one of the first ambitious attempts to initiate a sculptural tradition in what was then the new medium of porcelain.

---


2. This pair is mounted in gilt bronze with porcelain flowers to form two three-branch candelabra; Le Corbeiller in Metropolitan Museum 1984a, p. 321, nos. 294, 295.


5. The most visible difference is that both Linsky figures have been modeled with a tree stump at the base, which is absent in the other three pairs.

6. This comparison was made using photographs of the Musée des Arts Décoratifs pair and of the pair formerly in the Doistau collection.

7. Le Corbeiller in Rondot 1999a, p. 293.

8. For example, see Rondot in ibid., p. 224, no. 170.

9. Le Corbeiller in ibid., p. 293.

10. Two other figures from this group were illustrated in the catalogue for the sale at Sotheby Parke Bernet, New York, December 5–7, 1974, no. 37.

11. See fig. 41.

12. See note 3.

46. Ewer

**ANTOINE PAVIE FACTORY, FRENCH (PARIS), CA. 1703–CA. 1727**

ca. 1710
Soft-paste porcelain decorated in underglaze blue
7 ⁷⁄₈ × 6 ³⁄₁₆ × 4 ³⁄₈ in. (20 × 15.7 × 11.1 cm)
Gift of J. Pierpont Morgan, 1917 17.190.1915

**MARKS:** painted on underside: AP in underglaze blue

**CONSTRUCTION/CONDITION:** molded; handle replaced, cracks in body and base, discoloration to glaze at rim

**PROVENANCE:** Gaston Le Breton, Rouen; J. Pierpont Morgan, London and New York (until 1917; to MMA)


**LITERATURE:** C. L. Avery 1949b, no. 139; Wills 1958, ill. no. 4; Savage 1960, pl. 1; Plinval de Guillebon 1993, p. 77, ill. pp. 72, 73; Plinval de Guillebon 1999, p. 91, fig. 7-10; Plinval de Guillebon 2010, p. 63, fig. 1

The successful production of soft-paste porcelain at the Saint-Cloud factory at the very end of the seventeenth century led to the founding of several ceramic enterprises in Paris during the first few decades of the following century.¹ All of these small-scale Parisian factories not only were inspired by the commercial success of Saint-Cloud but also either direct or indirect offshoots of that factory. Barbe Coudray (French, d. 1717), the owner of Saint-Cloud, had been awarded a privilege in 1702 that granted the factory the sole right to produce porcelain, and this privilege was extended to the children of Coudray (also spelled Coudret) and those of her late husband Pierre Chicaneau (French, 1618–1677). The small factories that were established in Paris shortly thereafter were founded either by one of the Chicaneau children or with the involvement of someone who had worked at the Saint-Cloud factory. Most of these factories operated on a very small scale, and the surviving production is extremely limited. Indeed, the identification of some of these factories and the correct interpretation of the marks that were implemented have occurred only in recent years, and what is now known comes as much from various contemporary documents as from surviving pieces of porcelain.

A very small group of porcelains made in Paris during the first quarter of the eighteenth century, which are marked with an AP on the underside, are now understood to be the products of an enterprise run by a potter named Antoine Pavie (French, d. 1727).² Pavie was the son of a faience maker in the Faubourg Saint-Antoine, but the degree to which Pavie himself was actively involved in the production of faience is not known. However, Pavie went into business in 1703 with a potter named Pierre Pélassié (French, 1678–1756) to produce “transparent porcelain in the Chinese manner such as is made at Saint-Cloud.”³ Pélassié, who had worked at Saint-Cloud, agreed to furnish the recipe for porcelain for the sum of 200 livres,⁴ and the agreement specified that the porcelain production was to take place on the premises of Pavie’s house and faience workshop. While the location of the enterprise is known, there is little evidence of the factory’s history other than the small number of surviving pieces of soft-paste porcelain bearing Pavie’s mark. Curiously, the soft-paste body developed by Pavie and his workers differs from that used at Saint-Cloud,⁵ leaving unexplained why an alternative soft paste was produced despite the expensive purchase of Saint-Cloud’s recipe.

The soft-paste porcelains bearing Pavie’s mark⁶ are characteristically small in scale and simple in form; known examples include three spice boxes,⁷ a mustard pot,⁸ a small beaker,⁹ two saucers,¹⁰ a salt,¹¹ a sauceboat,¹² a small covered pot,¹³ a cruet set,¹⁴ and the Museum’s ewer, which is the most ambitious surviving example of Pavie’s production.¹⁵ All of the known objects marked by Pavie are decorated solely in
underglaze blue, and the style of decoration and choice of motifs are influenced by those found on both contemporary Rouen faience and Saint-Cloud porcelain. Most of the forms employed by Pavie are derived from silver models, and many have simple gadrooned decoration, a type of molded convex vertical fluting that is commonly found on contemporary silver.¹⁶ The form of the Museum’s ewer and its gadrooned lower section almost certainly are based on French silver examples from the early eighteenth century, and it is the largest known surviving object from Pavie’s factory. In addition, its painted decoration is the most complex and sophisticated found in any of Pavie’s oeuvre. Rather than the simple scrolls and lambrequins⁷ typically found on Pavie porcelain, the shaped panels of painted decoration, in which flowers, leaves, and scrolls are densely interwoven, reflect a remarkable degree of skill in both conception and execution. The decoration is further enhanced by the finely painted birds that occupy the center of each defined white area created by the unusual motif of vertical bands that connect the shaped panels above and below. The painter responsible for the decoration on this ewer must have been aware of Rouen blue-and-white porcelain from the first quarter of the eighteenth century, but he has created an original decorative scheme rather than simply combining elements taken from other sources. It is likely the ewer was originally accompanied by a basin, and the decoration on both the basin and the ewer would have coordinated.¹⁹ The slight warping of the body of the ewer and its inelegant foot reflect the experimental nature of the Pavie workshop, but nevertheless it is one of the most significant testaments to the ambition to master porcelain production in early eighteenth-century France.

¹ This topic is explored thoroughly in Plinval de Guillebon 1999.
² Plinval de Guillebon 1993.
³ Plinval de Guillebon 1999, p. 89.
⁴ Régine de Plinval de Guillebon has cited the amount as 200 livres in Plinval de Guillebon 2010, p. 57, as well as in earlier publications (see, for example, Plinval de Guillebon 1994, p. 4).
⁵ Recent X-ray analysis characterized Pavie soft-paste porcelain as containing alkaline glass, whereas Saint-Cloud soft-paste porcelain contains an alkaline frit; Plinval de Guillebon 1999, p. 90.
⁶ The mark is either the initials AP or AP with a star painted in underglaze blue.
⁷ One is in the Musée National Adrien Dubouché, Limoges, Cité de la Céramique; Plinval de Guillebon 2010, fig. 3. A second is in the Cité de la Céramique, Sèvres; Plinval de Guillebon 1995, fig. 55; Plinval de Guillebon 1999, fig. 7-8. A circular spice box is in the Porzellanammlung, Staatliche Kunstsammlungen Dresden; Cassidy-Geiger 1999, fig. 8-1.
⁸ Musée des Arts Décoratifs, Saumur; Plinval de Guillebon 1995, fig. 57.
⁹ Cité de la Céramique, Sèvres; ibid., fig. 56; Plinval de Guillebon 1999, fig. 7-9.
¹¹ Cité de la Céramique, Sèvres; Plinval de Guillebon 2010, fig. 5.
¹² Musée des Arts Décoratifs, Paris; Plinval de Guillebon 1999, fig. 7-11.
¹³ Cité de la Céramique, Sèvres; Plinval de Guillebon 2010, fig. 9.
¹⁵ See Plinval de Guillebon 1994, pp. 1–30, which lists fourteen identified Pavie objects including marks and dimensions.
¹⁶ See, for example, Dennis 1994, vol. 1, pp. 186–87; nos. 275, 276.
¹⁷ A lambrequin is a motif that resembles a draped piece of cloth, often with tassels. The motif was commonly used in a variety of media in the late seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries, including ceramics, silver, and wood.
¹⁸ See, for example, a pair of potpourris in the Victoria and Albert Museum, London (Hildyard 1999, pp. 34, 136, fig. 36), and a ewer in The Metropolitan Museum of Art (17.190.1783).
¹⁹ The handle of the ewer is a modern replacement. Radiography of the ewer indicates that none of the original handle remains, and departmental files do not indicate if the current handle was already in place when the ewer entered the Museum in 1917.
47. Jar

**CHANTIILLY FACTORY, FRENCH, 1730–92**

ca. 1735–40

Tin-glazed soft-paste porcelain decorated in polychrome enamels

11 × 8 3/4 in. (27.9 × 22.2 cm)

Gift of R. Thornton Wilson, in memory of Florence Ellsworth Wilson, 1950 50.211.121

**MARKS:** painted on underside: hunting horn in red enamel

**CONSTRUCTION/CONDITION:** wheel-thrown into a mold; broken into numerous pieces and repaired

**PROVENANCE:** Mme Helen Dupuy, Paris and New York (until 1948; sale, Parke-Bernet Galleries, New York, April 2–3, 1948, no. 131); R. Thornton Wilson (1948–50; to MMA)


This large jar or urn is one of the most ambitious pieces produced by the Chantilly factory, which was founded in 1730 near the Château de Chantilly, the seat of Louis-Henri (1692–1740), duc de Bourbon, seventh prince de Condé. Louis-Henri purchased the land and buildings in 1730 expressly to establish a porcelain factory, and it is likely that the first products of the new enterprise appeared within a year or two after the factory’s founding. Similar to Saint-Cloud, the production was entirely of soft-paste porcelain, because the formula for true or hard-paste porcelain was unknown in France at that time. The early paste developed at the Chantilly factory must have been deemed insufficiently white, since tin was routinely added to the glaze in order to provide a whiter surface on which the enamel decoration would be applied. The presence of tin created a distinctive, opaque, cool white glaze that is a characteristic feature of Chantilly porcelain during the first twenty years of the factory’s history.

The Chantilly factory was awarded a letters patent in 1735, which suggests that its production was sufficiently accomplished by that date to merit recognition. The letters, which functioned as a royal privilege, were granted specifically to Cicaire Cirou (French, 1700–1755), the director of the fledgling factory. Relatively little is known of Cirou’s training, but it appears that he worked both at the Saint-Cloud factory and as a porcelain painter in Paris before arriving at Chantilly. The letters patent granted Cirou the right to produce “fine porcelain in all kinds of colors, types, shapes, and sizes imitating the porcelain of Japan” for a period of twenty years. The specification of the factory’s production to imitate Japanese porcelain can be viewed as an acknowledgment of the already established style of the factory’s porcelain, and it may also be regarded as a reflection of Louis-Henri’s interest in Asian porcelain. The duc de Bourbon had a large and notable collection of Asian works of art that he had both inherited and purchased. The collection of Asian ceramics, of which approximately 1,700 are listed in an inventory taken at the time of Louis-Henri’s death in 1740, was particularly strong in Japanese porcelains. The descriptions in the inventory are brief and their accuracy can be questioned, but Japanese porcelains in the Kakiemon style appear to make up the majority of the Japanese holdings.

The strong influence of Japanese Kakiemon-style porcelains on Chantilly’s early production reinforces the prevalence of this type of porcelain in Louis-Henri’s collection, and it also suggests that his Japanese pieces were made available to the workers in the factory. While some Japanese forms were copied at Chantilly, it was the motifs of Kakiemon wares that were most influential at the new factory. Decorative schemes taken from Kakiemon porcelains were both copied...
directly and interpreted by the factory’s painters; however, the primary influence of these Japanese porcelains was the embrace of asymmetry and spare decoration, which are two of the hallmarks of Japanese porcelain in the Kakiemon style.

Another source of motifs for the painters at Chantilly was a book of prints published in 1735 by Jean-Antoine Fraisse (French, ca. 1680–1739), entitled *Livre de desseins chinois, tirés d’après des originaux de Perse, des Indes, de la Chine et du Japon* . . . (Book of Chinese designs taken after the originals from Persia, India, China, and Japan . . .). 9 Fraisse, who lists himself as painter to Louis-Henri on the title page, dedicated the *Livre* to his employer and cited Louis-Henri’s collection of works of art from Asia as his source of inspiration. 10 The *Livre* contains a series of prints 11 that provided compositions and decorative motifs for copying by artisans working in a variety of media, and several of Fraisse’s designs were employed by the painters at Chantilly.

This jar, which originally would have had a cover, reflects these influences on Chantilly porcelain in the 1730s. Its form, including the fluted bands on the body and shoulder
of the vase, is directly derived from a Japanese Kakiemon example, and the painted decoration is inspired by the aesthetics of Kakiemon wares employing the same primary palette of blue, turquoise, red, and yellow, with the addition of brown and black for outlines and decorative details. The scene depicting five figures seated at a table closely copies a composition in Fraisse's Livre. The composition of the seated male with three attendants found on the opposite side of the jar is not derived from Fraisse, but the fact that the same scene appears on at least one other piece of Chantilly porcelain suggests that a print of this composition must have been available to the painters at the factory.

Both scenes depict figures either eating or drinking, but the significance of these two scenes and their pairing on this jar is unclear. While Fraisse's source for the composition of the seated figure with attendants is unknown, it is likely that it reflects his own invention, though perhaps ultimately rooted in an Asian work of art in Louis-Henri's collection. All of the figures decorating the jar are clearly intended to represent Asians, and the palette of colors and the sprays of Asian-inspired flowers are inspired directly by Japanese Kakiemon porcelains. However, despite these decorative features and the use of a Japanese form, the Chantilly jar only distantly evokes its Japanese models. The shaped decorative band painted just beneath the shoulder is not typically Japanese in style and the large scale of the figural decoration is uncharacteristic of true Kakiemon porcelains. A further departure from the Japanese models is the awkward fit of the composition of figures around the table and the decorative band above them. Nevertheless, the Museum's Chantilly jar can be regarded as a major achievement by a nascent factory aiming to produce soft-paste porcelain in the then-fashionable Japanese taste. Chantilly's production in the Kakiemon style was less concerned with absolute fidelity to Japanese models than it was to reinterpreting and making accessible a certain Japanese aesthetic for a sophisticated European clientele.

2 The factory began employing a clear lead glaze without the addition of tin by the early 1750s but did not completely abandon the use of tin glaze for several decades; Jeffrey H. Munger in Munger et al. 1992, pp. 223–24, no. 177.
3 Tin was also added to the glaze at the Villeroy factory; see entries 49–52 in this volume.
5 "porcelaine fine de toutes couleurs, espèces, façons et grandeurs à l’imitation de la porcelaine de Japon." Dawson 1994, p. 32.
7 The inventory is partially transcribed in "Inventaire du duc de Bourbon" 2011.
9 The full title is Livre de desseins chinois, tirés d’après des originaux de Perse, des Indes, de la Chine et du Japon, dessinés et gravés en taille-douce par le Sr Fraisse, peintre de S.A.S. Monseigneur le Duc, dédié a Son Altesse Serenissime (Paris: Ph. Nic. Lottin, 1735).
10 Garnier-Pelle 2011, p. 10.
11 Various versions of the Livre survive, each slightly different in terms of the number of prints and the order in which they appear; see S. Miller 1996.
12 See Finaz de Villaine and Garnier-Pelle 2011, p. 24, no. 28. This Japanese jar is now in the Musée Condé, Chantilly, as is a Chantilly copy of it (Finaz de Villaine and Garnier-Pelle 2011, p. 25, no. 29), but it is not certain if both were in the collections of Louis-Henri in the eighteenth century. There are similar Japanese examples at the Ashmolean Museum, Oxford (1985.49), and the Birmingham Museum of Art, Ala. (1980.431).
13 Overglaze brown enamel was used infrequently on Japanese Kakiemon-style porcelain; see Impey 1990, p. 140.
15 This seated figure does not appear in either the copy of the Livre in The Metropolitan Museum of Art (40.38) or Fraisse 2011 (facsimile reprint of the 1735 edition), but it is possible that it is included in one of the other versions of the Livre, as no two versions are identical.
16 A bottle cooler (seau à bouteille); Finaz de Villaine and Garnier-Pelle 2011, p. 27, no. 34.
17 The two scenes are also paired on a Chantilly jar with similar, though wider, fluted decoration (Le Duc 1996, ill. pp. 116–17), and the composition of the figures around a table is paired with a different scene, also taken from Fraisse’s Livre, on a Chantilly jar of the same model (Christie’s, London, sale cat., February 24, 1997, no. 190).
48. Shoulao

**CHANTILLY FACTORY, FRENCH, 1730–92**

ca. 1735–40
Tin-glazed soft-paste porcelain decorated in polychrome enamels
10¼ × 8¼ × 4½ in. (26 × 21.9 × 11.4 cm)
The Jack and Belle Linsky Collection, 1982 1982.60.371

**MARKS:** unmarked

**CONSTRUCTION/CONDITION:** press-molded with embedded metal bar on underside reinforcing the base; losses to unfired brown and black enamel throughout, old repair to fan

**PROVENANCE:** [Cartier, Paris (before 1910; sold to Morgan)]; J. Pierpont Morgan, London and New York (until 1944; sale, Parke-Bernet Galleries, New York, January 6–8, 1944, no. 492); Forsyth Wickes, Newport, R.I. (until 1960; sale, Christie’s, London, May 2, 1960, no. 149; to Clerke); Clerke (from 1960); Jack and Belle Linsky (until 1982; to MMA)


This porcelain figure depicts Shoulao, the Daoist god of longevity. Along with Fuxing (god of happiness and good fortune) and Luxing (god of wealth), Shoulao was frequently portrayed in paintings and on ceramic vessels beginning with the Ming dynasty (1368–1644) in China, during which time three-dimensional ceramic depictions of him began to appear as well (fig. 42). Shoulao’s most recognizable attribute is his elongated bald cranium, which symbolizes wisdom and long life. As in this example, representations of Shoulao commonly portray him as a smiling old man, his age indicated by his long beard. The pronounced earlobes in this example are not frequently found, though precedents exist. Other traditional attributes of Shoulao, including a deer, a crane, and a peach—all symbolizing long life or immortality—have not been included in this portrayal, which may reflect the lack of understanding of the true identity of this religious figure on the part of the Chantilly modeler. The Chantilly Shoulao holds a fan in his right hand, and in his left, a curving staff that extends behind him across his back. While the fan does not appear to have any symbolic meaning, the staff, with its irregular shape, may depict the branch of a peach tree, a reference to the Daoist fruit of longevity.

The prominent, elongated head of the Chantilly figure is accentuated by the unusual manner in which it has been decorated. Whereas the rest of the figure has been tin-glazed and decorated with enamel colors, the head and the arms have been painted with a brown pigment that has not been fired after application. A similar unfired black pigment has been used for the beard and eyebrows, and these unfired pigments have a matte surface that together distinguish them from the rest of the figure by drawing attention to the remarkable head and face. The use of a darker pigment or enamel for Shoulao’s head is not commonly found on Chinese representations of the deity, but examples decorated in this manner are known.

The Chantilly factory produced a sizable number of figures during the 1730s intended to represent Asian deities or figures, and often the line between the two is considerably blurred. The visual evidence offered by these figures indicates that fidelity to an Asian model was not the goal; rather, the intent seems to have been to evoke an exotic and romanticized Far East with its unfamiliar deities and inhabitants. Some of the Chantilly figures were clearly made as representations of Budai, the laughing monk, and Fuxing. Figures of Budai in glazed but undecorated porcelain from Dehua, located in the central Fujian province, and commonly known by the nineteenth-century term *blanc de chine,* were widely exported from China to Europe during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, and they served as both models and sources of inspiration for the modelers at Chantilly and other European...
factories. However, most of the Asian-style figures produced at Chantilly were only loosely inspired by Chinese or Japanese models, if at all, and it is often unclear if a deity or generic “Asian” figure is being portrayed. This lack of clarity regarding the identity of these figures is reflected in the two terms that were used, seemingly interchangeably, to categorize this type of object. Both pagodes and magots were the catchall French terms in the eighteenth century to describe figural sculpture that evoked Asian characters. The sale catalogue for the artist François Boucher’s (French, 1703–1770) collection included more than three pages of pagodes de pâtes des Indes, referring to various models of these figures, many of which were partially or entirely made of brown stoneware. Of particular relevance to the Chantilly factory, the inventory of the collection of the factory’s patron, Louis-Henri (1692–1740), duc de Bourbon, seventh prince de Condé, listed more than forty pagodes in a variety of media.

It is probable that several of these figures served as inspiration for the modelers at Chantilly, and the large number of such figures in Louis-Henri’s collection may account for the unusually wide array of pagode models produced by the factory. Seated figures with either globes or potpourri jars were especially popular, and both seated and standing figures with nodding heads were also produced. The sheer variety of pagodes made at Chantilly and the other French soft-paste porcelain factories at Saint-Cloud and Villeroy attest to the popularity of such figures in the middle decades of the eighteenth century in France, and even Denis Diderot’s Encyclopédie (vol. 9, 1765) mentions, with considerable disdain, the fascination with which these figures were held. While Chinese porcelain figures of Shoulao from earlier centuries were produced for domestic altars or shrines, as gifts, or even for burial with the deceased, the Chantilly figures of Shoulao, Budai, and other Chinese personages presumably were devoid of any symbolism or particular meaning at the time of their production. One may assume that they were intended to be playful evocations of an alluring but little-understood culture, and their decorative function is underlined by the fact that many may have been produced to be mounted in gilt bronze and to serve as fashionable objets de luxe, enhanced with touches of playful exoticism.

4 See Ayers 2002, p. 94, no. 45.
5 Alternatively, it may depict a ruyi scepter, a symbol of good fortune.
7 For examples, see Le Corbeiller in Le Corbeiller 2000, pp. 40–41, no. 17; William Rieder in Metropolitan Museum 1984a, pp. 240–41, no. 148.
8 Le Corbeiller in Roth and Le Corbeiller 2000, p. 41.
9 Ibid., p. 41, n. 5; Kisluk-Grosheide 2002.
11 Le Corbeiller in Roth and Le Corbeiller 2000, p. 41.
12 Le Corbeiller 2003.
13 Le Corbeiller in Metropolitan Museum 1984a, p. 324, no. 301.
16 Le Corbeiller in Metropolitan Museum 1984a, pp. 318–19, nos. 290, 291.
19 For example, see Le Duc 1996, ill. pp. 161, 164, 165. The latter two are in the Museum (1974.28.91; 1982.60.84).
20 Musée des Arts Décoratifs, Paris (GR 299).
49. Plate

VILLEROY FACTORY, FRENCH, 1734/37–48
ca. 1740–45
Tin-glazed soft-paste porcelain decorated in polychrome enamel
1 ¹⁄₈ × 8 ¹⁄₄ in. (2.9 × 21 cm)
Gift of R. Thornton Wilson, in memory of Florence Ellsworth Wilson, 1954 54.147.6

MARKS: painted on underside: .D.V. in underglaze blue

CONSTRUCTION/CONDITION: molded; small chips to scalloped rim

PROVENANCE: Gilbert Lévy, Olivier Lévy, [Rosenberg and Stiebel, New York, before 1954]; R. Thornton Wilson (until 1954; to MMA)


LITERATURE: Winchester 1955, p. 419, fig. 20

This dish is one of the relatively few surviving wares produced by the small ceramic factory established by a potter named François Barbin (French, ca. 1689–1765) in the hamlet of Villeroy, approximately twenty-five miles south of Paris, at some point in the years between 1734 and 1737. There is uncertainty as to the precise founding date of the factory, but contemporary documents indicate that in January 1737, Barbin was listed in the registers of the nearby parish of Mennecey as a “maker of faience and porcelain.” As the son of a furniture maker in Paris, it is not clear how Barbin learned to produce either faience or porcelain, but as early as 1733 he describes his profession in precisely the same terms. Barbin’s new factory was sited near the Château de Villeroy, the seat of François-Louis-Anne de Neufville (1695–1766), who became the fourth duc de Villeroy in 1734, and whose protection Barbin was eventually able to secure. Though Barbin’s factory produced both faience and soft-paste porcelain, its scale was small and only fifteen workers in total were employed during the relatively short time the factory was in existence.

Given the size of the factory, it is not surprising that its production was modest in terms of both ambition and scale, and a large percentage of the surviving works from Villeroy are small figures, many of which reflect the then-current fashion for chinoiserie. Some of these figures are intended to represent lohans, while others depict Chinese boys, often attired in improbable clothing, but the thread that unites all of these figures is the intention to evoke an exotic, if little understood, Far East. The interest in Asian themes is also apparent in some of the wares produced at Villeroy. A feeding bowl in the Museum’s collection (entry 51) is painted with chinoiserie figures, although the overall effect of the decoration is decidedly more European than Asian. A Villeroy glass cooler in a private collection reflects the adaptation of Japanese Kakiemon motifs that were popular in Chantilly porcelain in particular at this time, and in this case, it appears in the depiction of young boys dressed in robes. The decorative scheme of a squirrel sitting on a banded hedge eating grapes, a motif frequently found on Japanese Kakiemon porcelain, decorates a Villeroy potpourri in the Musée des Arts Décoratifs, Paris. A somewhat different example of Asian-inspired decoration is found on two glass coolers in the Cleveland Museum of Art, which are painted with scenes taken directly from prints by Jean-Antoine Fraisse (ca. 1680–1739), whose Le livre de desseins chinois (1735) was used by the painters at the Chantilly factory (entry 47).

A more direct dependence on Japanese ceramics is evident in this Villeroy dish. The molded fluting and the scalloped rim of the dish follow closely a model found frequently in Japanese Kakiemon porcelain, although the rim of Villeroy dish was created by cutting away the
unfired clay rather than being formed in the mold, as would have been done with the Japanese examples (fig. 43). The painted decoration on the Villeroy dish is also derived from Kakiemon porcelains. The scene depicts a young boy standing near two banded hedges from which emerge branches of prunus (flowering plum) and bamboo, and a yellow tiger crouches off to one side. These last three motifs have their origins in Chinese art and represent some of the most popular and durable of all motifs used to decorate Chinese porcelains. Appropriated by Japanese potters, these motifs became mainstays of Kakiemon-style porcelains, and a Japanese example decorated in this manner may have served as the model for the potters at Villeroy.

A Japanese saucer dish with a similar composition painted in reverse, though without the boy, is in the Ashmolean Museum, Oxford, and a particularly close comparison is offered by a Japanese dish with fluting, a scalloped rim, and the same composition, though again minus the boy, in the Musée Guimet, Paris. This decorative scheme from Japanese Kakiemon porcelain became popular at the Meissen factory in Germany around 1730, and the so-called Yellow Lion decor was employed, with variations, on Meissen services made for the Saxon court at this time. Interestingly, the decoration on the Museum’s dish is most similar to the one that appears on a Chinese porcelain dish made for export, as all of the motifs found on the
Museum’s example, including the boy, are incorporated, although it depicts three lions instead of one. The appearance of this composition on Chinese porcelain is an indication of the popularity of the Japanese examples with these various motifs, and it reflects the adaptability of the Chinese potters to the demands of the export market. As Chinese export plates decorated in this precise manner appear to be rare, it is more likely that either a Japanese Kakiemon plate or a Meissen example served as the model at Villeroy, but it is unclear how Barbin might have had direct access to Japanese or German porcelain. Little is known about the degree of involvement of de Neufville in the affairs of the factory, but there is no evidence to suggest that he played an active role, such as making pieces of porcelain available to be copied, as is believed to have occurred at Chantilly.

The Villeroy dish is remarkably well painted for an early product of a small, experimental factory. As with most if not all of the soft-paste porcelain produced at Villeroy, a tin glaze has been employed to provide a whiter surface for the enamel decoration than that provided by the slightly warm-toned paste used at the factory. The addition of tin to the lead-based glaze creates an opacity that is subtly different in appearance than the translucency of a typical lead glaze. Barbin eventually produced a soft paste of sufficient whiteness that a tin glaze was no longer necessary, but this occurred only after he closed the Villeroy factory in 1748 and established a new factory in nearby Mennecy in 1750.
50. Two dwarfs

**Villeroy Factory, French, 1734/37–48**
Ca. 1740–45
Tin-glazed soft-paste porcelain decorated in polychrome enamels

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Dimensions</th>
<th>Provenance</th>
<th>Marks</th>
<th>Construction/Condition</th>
<th>Provenance</th>
<th>Literature</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.275</td>
<td>4¼ × 2⅞ × 2⅛ in. (11.7 × 7.1 × 6.7 cm)</td>
<td>The Jack and Belle Linsky Collection, 1982</td>
<td>painted on underside: D.V. in pale orange-red enamel</td>
<td>both are press-molded; minor loss to brown enamel at base, loss to object held in proper right hand</td>
<td>Jack and Belle Linsky (until 1982; to MMA)</td>
<td>Clare Le Corbeiller in <em>Metropolitan Museum</em> 1984a, pp. 312–14, nos. 283, 284, ill.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.276</td>
<td>4⅞ × 2⅛ × 2⅛ in. (11.7 × 5.4 × 7.5 cm)</td>
<td></td>
<td>painted on underside: D.V. in pale blue enamel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**The Villeroy Factory produced a limited number of figures,** and most if not all of these fall into two main categories: depictions of “Chinese” figures, most of whom are boys; or of dwarfs, some of whom are also hunchbacks. While it may seem surprising today, the figures of dwarfs made by the factory appear to have been more popular than the chinoiserie figures, given the variety of models of dwarfs produced and the number of surviving examples. Some of the dwarflike figures made at Villeroy cannot be easily classified as either dwarfs or hunchbacks, but the obviously unusual proportions of the figures and their facial features indicate that the depictions were intended to represent those with some type of physical deformity.

As was true of most of the production at Villeroy, a tin glaze has been used for these two dwarfs, and each figure bears the letters D.V., a mark now commonly interpreted as that of the Villeroy factory (entry 51). Like many of the dwarfs produced at Villeroy, these two figures are derived from etchings by the French artist Jacques Callot (1592–1635). Callot’s *Varie Figure Gobbi* was published in 1616, and this suite of twenty etchings depicting dwarfs and other small deformed characters, often known as grotesques, proved to be so popular that it was reissued throughout the seventeenth century. In the early eighteenth century, various editions of prints inspired by Callot’s *Gobbi* were published, the best known of which is *Il Callotto resuscitato*.

It is difficult to identify with certainty the specific source among these prints for the two Villeroy figures, but they ultimately derive from two plates in Callot’s *Gobbi*. The dwarf with the pronounced stomach (MMA 1982.60.276) is based upon the etching entitled *Le Bossu à la canne*, while the dwarf with the upraised leg (MMA 1982.60.275) derives from the etching *L’homme raclant un gril en guise de violon*. The porcelain modelers have taken certain small liberties, the most notable of which is the elimination of the cooking grill that the dwarf plays as an instrument in *L’homme raclant*. The porcelain version is depicted in the same pose but originally held only a cane, now missing. The figure derived from *Le Bossu* is closer to the printed original, but he too has lost his cane through breakage. The porcelain figures have been provided with supports in the form of stylized tree trunks that do not appear in the etchings, and the distinctive costumes of the Villeroy dwarfs, which include a pattern composed of bird heads, are the inventions of the factory’s painters. The relative spareness of the enamel decoration on both figures may reflect the factory’s intent to emphasize the whiteness of its tin-glazed porcelain body.

The Italian word *gobbo* that appears in plural form in Callot’s title means “hunchback,” and it seems very likely that Callot was inspired to create this suite of etchings from observing the troupe of dwarfs and hunchbacks that routinely performed popular entertainments in the early seventeenth century in Florence, where Callot spent the years 1612–22. In his etchings, Callot has exaggerated the physical deformities of the figures, and his caricatures seem intended to amuse and entertain,
just as the theatrical troupes of dwarfs aimed to do for their audiences in Florence. Dwarfs had long provided entertainment at European courts, as well as at popular fairs, and by the time Callot executed his etchings, images of dwarfs were commonly regarded as vehicles for satire and ribald humor. For the title page to *Varie Figure Gobbi*, Callot chose to depict six dwarfs lifting the shirt of a seventh to prominently expose his ample rear end, above which appears the suite’s title.10

Despite the popularity of representations of dwarfs into the eighteenth century in Europe, Villeroy was the only French porcelain factory to produce figures of dwarfs. However, numerous porcelain factories outside of France included dwarfs in their sculptural repertoire. The Meissen Manufactory made a wide range of dwarf figures in the mid-1720s,11 and there is a small group of teapots, sugar boxes, and one waste bowl (for used tea leaves) made at Meissen in the early 1720s that are decorated with dwarfs, some of whom are depicted in equestrian scenes that are notable for the earthiness of their humor (entry 13).12 Meissen also made a series of mugs in the mid-1740s decorated with scenes depicting the months of the year and with images of dwarfs in various activities.13 The popularity of dwarfs produced in porcelain persisted into the second half of the eighteenth century, with examples made at Mennecey,14 Doccia,15 possibly Capodimonte,16 Vienna,17 and at Höchst,18 among other factories.

While it is not certain how the Villeroy dwarfs were intended to be used, it is likely that the figures were produced to be incorporated into small-scale, gilt-bronze furnishings, such as inkstands,19 candelabra,20 or clocks. There are numerous examples of bronzes d’ameublement (as this category of decorative objects was known) that incorporate porcelain animals or chinoiserie figures, and it appears that figures of dwarfs, unencumbered by the political sensitivity prevalent today, were regarded as yet another category of fanciful porcelain sculpture to be employed for decorative purposes.

1 See, for example, Le Duc 1996, ill. p. 315.
2 Eleven models have been identified by the author, which is the same figure published by Clare Le Corbeiller (in Roth and Le Corbeiller 2000, p. 63). Determining a precise number of models is complicated by the fact that some of the figures may have been produced either at Villeroy before the factory closed in 1748 or shortly after the successor factory was established at Mennecey in 1750. For examples, see Vivian S. Hawes in Hawes and Corsiglia 1984, pp. 165–67, no. 55.
3 See, for example, Le Duc 1996, ill. p. 315.
4 Eleven models have been identified by the author, which is the same figure published by Clare Le Corbeiller (in Roth and Le Corbeiller 2000, p. 63). Determining a precise number of models is complicated by the fact that some of the figures may have been produced either at Villeroy before the factory closed in 1748 or shortly after the successor factory was established at Mennecey in 1750. For examples, see Vivian S. Hawes in Hawes and Corsiglia 1984, pp. 165–67, no. 55.
5 See, for example, Le Duc 1996, ill. p. 315.
6 Eleven models have been identified by the author, which is the same figure published by Clare Le Corbeiller (in Roth and Le Corbeiller 2000, p. 63). Determining a precise number of models is complicated by the fact that some of the figures may have been produced either at Villeroy before the factory closed in 1748 or shortly after the successor factory was established at Mennecey in 1750. For examples, see Vivian S. Hawes in Hawes and Corsiglia 1984, pp. 165–67, no. 55.
7 For more information on the Gobbi, see Daniel Ternois in Jacques Callot 1992, p. 227.
8 The history of these later publications is succinctly summarized by Le Corbeiller in Metropolitan Museum of Art 1984a, p. 312.
9 For more information on the Gobbi, see Daniel Ternois in Jacques Callot 1992, p. 227.
15 Munger 2007a, fig. 14.
17 Le Corbeiller in ibid., p. 280, no. 214.
18 Le Corbeiller in ibid., p. 287, no. 287.
19 See, for example, Watson 1966, pp. 408–69, no. 264.
20 See, for example, Honey 1950, pl. 448.
51. Feeding bowl

VILLEROY FACTORY, FRENCH, 1734/37–48

1745
Tin-glazed soft-paste porcelain decorated in polychrome enamels
1 ⁷⁄₈ × 8 ³⁄₈ × 2 ⁵⁄₁₆ in. (4.8 × 21.3 × 5.9 cm)
Gift of R. Thornton Wilson, in memory of Florence Ellsworth Wilson, 1954 54.147.8

**MARKS:** painted on underside: anchor, followed by DV flanked by flourishes

**INSCRIPTIONS:** painted under mark: PIERE / BOU / QUET / 1745, in black enamel

**CONSTRUCTION/CONDITION:** molded; losses to tail and fin of fish, abrasions to enamels

**PROVENANCE:** [The Questers, New York, before 1954]; R. Thornton Wilson (until 1954; to MMA)

**LITERATURE:** Winchester 1955, p. 419, fig. 21; Dawson 1994, p. 48; J.-G. Peyre 2000, p. 92; Blaise 2001, p. 40, figs. 16, 17

This feeding vessel in the form of a fish is a remarkable object from the Villeroy factory. It is one of the most ambitious surviving sculptural works made at the factory, and the vessel is notable for being the only known dated piece of Villeroy porcelain. In addition, this work bears an extensive inscription not found on any other object produced at the factory. However, despite its date and inscription, certain aspects of the vessel remain obscure.

Modeled to depict a pike, or a freshwater fish, the vessel is distinguished by its razorlike teeth that are clearly delineated in the fish’s mouth. An oval opening in the upper section of the fish provides access to the hollow body, which would have probably contained a soup, broth, or some other type of liquid to be poured through the hole formed in the pike’s mouth. The tail of the fish would have allowed the vessel to be tipped in order for the liquid to be consumed. The head, gills, and tail are painted to evoke the corresponding areas of a pike’s body; at the same time, either side of the middle section of the fish is decorated with figures in an aquatic landscape. On one side, a woman is ferried in a boat by a male figure wearing a robe, presumably intended to represent a Chinese man. A large canister is located prominently in the front of the boat. On the other side, two figures wearing similar robes stand near a leaping doglike animal, the identification of which is difficult to determine.

The unusualness of these compositions suggests that the scenes have particular meanings, though their significance remains unclear. The choice of aquatic landscapes is logical given the form of the vessel, but the combination of images suggests a more specific symbolism. The depiction of an anchor on the underside is clearly linked to the vessel’s marine themes, but it is not known if the anchor relates to the name inscribed on the underside, serves as the mark of the vessel’s painter, or has some other as-yet undiscovered significance.

Even the name underneath and the letters used to spell it are open to interpretation. The name is read by this author as “Piere Bouquet,” with the two syllables of the last name inscribed on different lines, but the last name has been read by others as “Bonzuel,” and as “Bon[?] Ducet.” The understanding of the name is made more challenging by the painter’s use of flourishes to decorate certain letters. A further complexity is provided by the markings near “Piere,” which can be read either as a decorative flourish or as “Bon.”

It has not been possible to trace “Piere” with a last name corresponding to any of the three spellings from the mid-eighteenth century, and thus the identity of the person whose name is inscribed remains a mystery, as does the significance of its appearance on the vessel. If the vessel was intended for feeding an infant, it is probable that the name...
is for the child who would have used it, suggesting, too, that the vessel was made to commemorate a birth. If the Villeroy fish were made for feeding an invalid, it can be assumed that the inscribed name does not refer to the intended user but rather it must signify someone else. The lack of precedent for a painter at any porcelain factory to sign a work with this degree of prominence and the absence of any record of a worker at Villeroy with this name discount the possibility that the name can be interpreted as that of the person who decorated it.

The letters DV also appear prominently on the underside of the vessel, probably referring to the duc de Villeroy; it is not surprising that his initials would serve as the mark for the factory that had secured his protection. Similar to other markings on the underside, the DV mark is painted in black enamel, and other surviving Villeroy porcelain suggests that the DV mark was painted on most, if not all, of the factory’s production. In addition, the DV mark appears in incised form, which is more commonly found on works produced at Mennecy, the successor factory to Villeroy established in 1750 by François Barbin (French, ca. 1689–1765), two years after the Villeroy operation closed.

The unusual assortment of markings on the underside and the obvious importance attached to them suggest that the Villeroy fish was recognized as one of the factory’s most significant achievements at the time of manufacture. In terms of form and decoration, the fish reflects a degree of sophistication and technical skill that distinguish it from the rest of Villeroy’s production. Dated 1745, this object was made at a time when the factory employed only two workers, which makes the circumstances of its production even more puzzling. While further documentary research may answer some of the questions raised by this intriguing object, no additional information is needed to appreciate the Villeroy fish for the creativity and originality that it embodies.
52. Harlequin family

VILLEROY FACTORY, FRENCH, 1734/37–48
ca. 1740–45
Tin-glazed soft-paste porcelain
14 ⁵⁄₁₆ × 8 ³⁄₁₆ × 6 ³⁄₈ in. (36.4 × 20.8 × 16.2 cm)
The Jack and Belle Linsky Collection, 1982 1982.60.255

MARKS: painted on underside: .D.V. in black enamel

CONSTRUCTION/CONDITION: press-molded and assembled; problems in glaze firing along base and shoulders of figures, repair to Harlequin’s hat and slapstick

PROVENANCE: Jack and Belle Linsky (until 1982; to MMA)

LITERATURE: Clare Le Corbeiller in Metropolitan Museum 1984a, p. 329, no. 309, ill. p. 328; Le Corbeiller in Metropolitan Museum 1984b, p. 43, ill.; Dawson 2002, pp. 206, 211, n. 91

This remarkable figure group made of soft-paste porcelain is based directly on a Meissen porcelain sculptural group that was first modeled in 1738 (fig. 44).¹ Left in the white, it is likely this example was made at the Villeroy factory, but it has been suggested by Aileen Dawson that it may have been produced slightly later at Mennecy,² the successor factory to Villeroy that was founded in 1750 (entry 53). The underside of the group is marked with the letters DV painted in black enamel, a mark now believed to be that used at Villeroy.³ In addition, this group employs a tin glaze, the use of which is associated primarily with the production of the Villeroy factory rather than with works made at Mennecy.⁴

The Harlequin family group displays a number of technical flaws that also suggest an origin at Villeroy, a small-scale and experimental ceramic enterprise. Furthermore, the ceramic paste ranges in color from slightly gray to slightly buff and lacks the brilliant whiteness commonly associated with the soft-paste porcelain body made at Mennecy. The scale of the group and the ambitious composition identify it as an exceptional work from Villeroy, although it is difficult, if not impossible, to ascribe the group to either factory with certainty. The vast majority of the figures produced at Villeroy either depict “Chinese” boys or reflect a pronounced chinoiserie influence;⁵ therefore, this figure group is notable not only for the thoroughly different subject matter but also for the detail and complexity of modeling.

As in the Meissen model, this figure group depicts Harlequin with his inamorata Columbine, who holds their young child in her arms. Harlequin and Columbine are two of the principal characters in the commedia dell’arte, a form of comedic theatrical entertainment of Italian origin that enjoyed great popularity in Europe during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries.⁶ Each stock character composing the commedia dell’arte was known for particular personality traits and types of behavior, and most of the characters were immediately recognizable by their costumes. Harlequin, a simpleminded but conniving servant, could be instantly identified by his brightly colored, lozenge-patterned suit and distinctive brimmed hat, as well as by his slapstick and the mask that he commonly wore. Columbine, a coquettish servant, was usually depicted wearing a chemise under a bodice with a skirt and apron that indicated her status, as seen here.⁷ The couple’s child wears a suit also decorated with lozenges that reflects his identity as Harlequin’s son.

While the composition of the Villeroy group closely follows the Meissen original, the differences between the two are notable. Primarily, the Villeroy group does not have polychrome decoration, but the low-relief lozenge patterns for the costumes of Harlequin and his child skillfully evoke the characteristic multicolored clothing of Harlequin as
commonly depicted in the Meissen model and in other Meissen representations of this principal figure from the commedia dell’arte. The Villeroy figure group is approximately twice the size of the Meissen model, and its large scale distinguishes it not only from its source but also from other porcelain figure groups dating to the mid-eighteenth century. Most porcelain figures and groups were intended either to decorate the dining table or to be incorporated into gilt-bronze furnishings, such as clocks or candelabra, and they were customarily in the range of six to ten inches in height. The scale of this group suggests that it was to be regarded as a piece of sculpture independent of a larger ensemble, and its composition, which is conceived fully in the round, would have made it especially suitable as freestanding work.

Furthermore, the Villeroy group conveys a different emotional character than the Meissen original. As Clare Le Corbeiller has noted, the playful quality of the Meissen model has been replaced with a more somber aspect by which the distinctive face of Harlequin imparts a slightly menacing air in the Villeroy model. The character of Harlequin in the commedia dell'arte frequently wore a mask, or half mask, that accentuated his nose, mouth, and tufts of facial hair. The Harlequins modeled at Meissen often do not wear a mask, and their faces are made distinctive by exaggerated features heightened by painted details, such as overly large mustaches, eyebrows, and warts. It is unclear if the Harlequin in the Villeroy group has been modeled as if wearing a mask or with especially pronounced facial features, but the large beak nose, exaggerated cheekbones, sharp chin, and prominent warts convey a sinister quality that profoundly transforms the sense of family interaction from that found in the Meissen model.

While it is certain that the modeler at Villeroy (or perhaps Mennecy) based this group on a Meissen model, it is not clear how a worker at the factory had access to the Meissen original. Meissen porcelains, both figures and wares, were very popular as luxury goods in France in the mid-eighteenth century, and marchands merciers, including Lazare Duvaux (French, 1703–1758), were regularly importing Meissen from Saxony by the early 1750s. As Meissen porcelain was an expensive commodity, however, it is unlikely that François Barbin (French, ca. 1689–1765), the proprietor of the Villerooy and Mennecy factories, would have owned works from the famous Saxon factory. Although the duc de Villeroy offered protection to Barbin’s enterprise (entry 49), there is no evidence to suggest that he lent pieces of porcelain to the factory for copying.

In sum, many questions remain about this group, including how and why a Meissen model inspired the group, the reasons for the group’s outsized scale, its intended use, and even its place of origin. Nonetheless, this Harlequin family is indisputably one of the most impressive pieces of porcelain sculpture produced by any of the French factories during the mid-eighteenth century. It is not merely a copy of a Meissen model, but rather a reinterpretation and reimagining of a composition, which has resulted in a work of art with its own distinctive character.

1 See Chilton 2001, pp. 295–96, no. 70, and p. 197, fig. 314.
3 Le Duc 1987, p. 26; Duchon 1988, p. 129.
5 For example, see Clare Le Corbeiller in Metropolitan Museum 1984a, p. 323, no. 300.
6 For a history of the commedia dell’arte, see Pietropaolo 2001.
7 Meredith Chilton has noted that more highly decorated aprons were sometimes worn by women of higher social status at this time (Chilton 2001, p. 65). The second chapter in Chilton provides a comprehensive account of the principal characters of the commedia dell’arte and their costumes (Chilton 2001, pp. 33–103, 130–35).
8 A Meissen group of this model in the Museum (1982.60.297) measures 7⅛ in. (18.1 cm) in height, as opposed to the 14¾ in. (36.4 cm) height of the Villeroy group.
9 Le Corbeiller in Metropolitan Museum 1984a, p. 329, no. 309.
10 Chilton 2001, pp. 43–44, and see also figs. 48, 49.
13 As Barbin was referred to as a “marchand Fayencier porcelanier” (Le Duc 1987, p. 6), it is possible that he sold Meissen porcelain in addition to operating his porcelain factories, but no evidence has been published to support this hypothesis.
14 Another example of ambitious, large-scale porcelain sculpture is the figure of Amphitrite produced at Mennecy around 1750, now in the Wadsworth Atheneum, Hartford, Conn.; Le Corbeiller in Roth and Le Corbeiller 2000, pp. 65–67, no. 37.
Street vendor

MENNECY FACTORY, FRENCH, 1750–73
ca. 1755–60
Soft-paste porcelain
9 ¾ × 4 ¼ × 5 ¾ in. (23.8 × 11.7 × 13.2 cm)
Gift of R. Thornton Wilson, in memory of Florence Ellsworth Wilson, 1954 54.147.7

MARKS: incised on base: DV

CONSTRUCTION/CONDITION: press-molded; major losses to hat, walking sticks missing

PROVENANCE: possibly Olivier Lévy; [James A. Lewis and Son, New York, before 1954; sold to R. Thornton Wilson]; R. Thornton Wilson (until 1954; to MMA)


LITERATURE: Duval 1992, p. 97, no. 49, ill.; Dawson 2002, pp. 206, 211, n. 92, fig. 7; Meredith Chilton in Williams 2012, p. 328

François Barbin (French, ca. 1689–1765) was forced to close his ceramic factory at Villeroy in 1748 due to the increasing political influence of the newly established Vincennes factory that had received a royal privilege for the manufacture of porcelain three years earlier. In 1749, Barbin and his wife purchased a house in the nearby town of Mennecy, and in the following year they established a new porcelain factory “ditte de Villeroy établie au village de Mennecy.” As the factories at both Villeroy and Mennecy were run by the Barbin family, the two enterprises have traditionally been treated as a single entity, and it is sometimes difficult to distinguish the products of the earlier factory from that of the successor operation at Mennecy. Both factories used the same mark consisting of the letters DV, since they were under the protection of the duc de Villeroy. Genevieve Le Duc has argued persuasively that the mark generally appears in painted format on Villeroy’s production but incised on pieces from Mennecy, although exceptions to this practice exist.

The soft-paste porcelain body developed at Mennecy was generally whiter and more refined than the one used at Villeroy, and the tin glaze used to enhance the whiteness of most Villeroy porcelain was discontinued at the new factory. The scale of operation at Mennecy was considerably larger than at Villeroy, with the total number of workers employed at the factory in excess of one hundred and twenty. In addition, much of Mennecy’s factory production was both more ambitious and more technically accomplished than Villeroy’s, but nevertheless, its output remained modest in terms of form, scale, and decoration. The factory concentrated on making small objects, including snuffboxes, small covered pots for meat juices, pots for cosmetic ointments, cane handles, tea wares, and some smaller dining wares.

However, Mennecy produced a relatively wide range of figures and sculptural objects, such as potpourris, compared to those made at Villeroy, and these works were significantly more complex and skillfully made than the relatively simply modeled figures from the earlier factory. This figure of a mushroom seller is one of the most ambitious and accomplished of all the sculptures that Mennecy produced. First, it is notable for the bright white, soft-paste porcelain body and for its lustrous, glassy glaze, qualities that are characteristic of the best of Mennecy’s production. The scale of the figure is relatively large for Mennecy, and its modeling is particularly fine and detailed. The plight of the itinerant seller is conveyed through his tattered clothes, undone britches, ragged hat, and unbuckled shoe, and his stooped posture and expressive face reflect the hardships associated with his profession. He originally held a cane in each hand, which must have accentuated the sense of physical struggle. The seller carries a basket on his hip filled...
with mushrooms, but his listing pose appears due to arduous work rather than to the weight of the small caned basket.

This mushroom seller is one of several known similar figures made at Mennecy that must have originally belonged to a sizable group of street vendors produced by the factory. The most closely related figure to that in the Museum is one in the collection of the J. Paul Getty Museum, Los Angeles (fig. 45). The Getty vendor sells various produce and a fish held in an apron in front of his waist, but his pose is so similar to the Museum’s figure that the same model may have been employed for both figures with only minor alterations and additions. Two similar figures of vendors are in the Gardiner Museum, Toronto, one of whom sells prints, while the other offers old clothes. Other related figures are a vendor carrying a magic lantern on his back and a figure of a gardener in the collection of the Philadelphia Museum of Art that may have belonged to the same series. With the exception of the gardener, all figures are depicted with a stooped posture, leaning forward and to the left, with the left foot extended. All six figures wear tattered clothes.
The surprisingly realistic depictions of the street vendors made at Mennecy place them in marked contrast to the vendor figures produced by the Meissen factory in the mid-eighteenth century. Meissen produced several series of vendors during this period, but all of them reflect a considerably more romanticized portrayal of street sellers and tradespeople. The numerous vendor figures made by the Capodimonte factory, produced contemporaneously with those from Meissen, also seem intended to illustrate the wide variety of contemporary street sellers and tradespeople rather than to capture the realities of the lives of people forced to earn money in this manner. Despite their differences, all of the porcelain figures of vendors produced in mid-eighteenth-century Europe belong to a category known as the Cris de Paris (criers of Paris), who were described based on the manner in which they advertised their goods. Numerous print series of street sellers were widely circulated at this time, and well-known artists, including Edme Bouchardon (French, 1698–1762) and Christophe Huet (French, 1700–1759), produced drawings of street criers that served as models for figures created at the Meissen factory during the 1740s and 1750s. Specific sources for the Mennecy figures have not yet been identified, but given the vast numbers of two-dimensional images of street vendors available in the mid-eighteenth century, it is likely that prints or drawings provided the sources for the factory.

Assuming this to be the case, the accomplishments of the modelers at Mennecy are all the more remarkable due to the challenges of translating a two-dimensional image into three dimensions. The Museum’s figure is a piece of sculpture conceived fully in the round; indeed, it must be observed from the sides or the back in order to understand that the man is selling mushrooms from the basket that he carries. This requirement to be viewed from all sides suggests that the mushroom seller was intended for display on the dining table, where it could be fully visible. The group to which this figure and those previously cited might have belonged was probably displayed during the dessert course, when porcelain figures were most commonly employed as decorative embellishment. Despite their gritty realism, it is likely that the Mennecy street vendors nevertheless were regarded as objects to delight the diners at the table, serving the same function as their porcelain counterparts drawn from the commedia dell’arte, or those figures depicting the pursuits of fashionable society.
54. **Stand**

**MENNECY FACTORY, FRENCH, 1750–73**  
ca. 1760–65  
Soft-paste porcelain decorated in polychrome enamels  
$1 \frac{1}{2} \times 9 \frac{5}{16} \times 8$ in. ($3.8 \times 24.3 \times 20.3$ cm)  
The Charles E. Sampson Memorial Fund, 1984  
1984.121

**MARKS:** incised on underside: D, V followed by four incised lines

**CONSTRUCTION/CONDITION:** molded; slight wear to enamel decoration

**PROVENANCE:** Pauline Riggs Noyes (until 1947; sale, Parke-Bernet Galleries, New York, February 7–8, 1947, no. 64); Dr. William P. Harbeson (until 1972; sale, Sotheby Parke Bernet, New York, April 4, 1972, no. 168); (sale, Christie’s, Geneva, November 14, 1983, no. 19; [sold by Armin B. Allen, New York, in 1984 to MMA])

**LITERATURE:** Parke-Bernet 1947, no. 64, ill.; Sotheby’s 1972, no. 168, ill.; Christie’s 1983, no. 19, ill.

**THE MENNECY FACTORY PRODUCED A LIMITED NUMBER OF**  
tablewares, most of which appear to have been made as independent objects rather than as part of sets united by coordinated painted decoration. Like the Saint-Cloud and Chantilly factories, Mennecy did not attempt to produce entire dinner services, which were extremely expensive to create due to the number of forms required. In addition, the production of large objects, such as soup tureens, platters, and bowls for punch or for salad that were standard components of services, was beyond the factory’s technical capability. However, Mennecy made a limited number of less ambitious, independent dining wares, including wine coolers, sauceboats, sugar bowls and stands, salt cellars, and mustard pots with stands.

This shaped dish appears to have been made as a stand for a sugar bowl or small sauce tureen. It accompanied an oval covered bowl when it was sold at auction in 1947 and again in 1972; however, the dish was sold without the covered bowl when it reappeared at auction in 1983. The black-and-white photographs from the two earlier sale catalogues do not allow for easy identification of the function of the bowl, yet in both instances the bowl and stand were sold with a spoon that was clearly intended for sugar as the bowl of the spoon is perforated. While it is likely that the bowl that originally accompanied the dish was intended for sugar, it is somewhat surprising that Mennecy would have produced several models of sugar bowls given the relatively small scale of the factory’s production.

Just as most of the objects made at Mennecy were neither large nor complex in form, the vast majority of the factory’s wares are decorated with simple flower painting. Mennecy porcelains are often immediately identifiable due to their distinctive palette that is dominated by a claret-hued purple usually accompanied by blue, green, and yellow. A relatively small number of objects, such as ewers with basins, are painted with more ambitious and complex decorative schemes, and while bird painting is relatively uncommon on Mennecy porcelain, several pieces decorated in this manner reflect some of the finest work executed at the factory.

The decoration on this dish, hereafter referred to as a stand, depicts three birds, two of which appear in an abbreviated landscape with lush floral vegetation. The two larger and more exotic birds are rendered with considerable detail, complex coloration, and an elegance of line. While the birds are entirely fanciful, they are painted with a degree of precision and subtle shading that is rarely found in Mennecy decoration of any category. A similar sophisticated use of color in the bird painting on a Mennecy milk jug in the British Museum, London, also has been noted by Aileen Dawson. The central scene on the stand is framed by
a prominent border of continuous, attenuated C-scrolls punctuated by small sprays of flowers, all painted in Mennecy’s characteristic purple enamel. The strong, monochromatic color of the border complements the palette used in the central scene and gives prominence to the same purple enamel found in the depiction of the birds and the landscape.

However, the choice by the workers at the Mennecy factory to employ purple enamel for the border was determined less by aesthetic considerations than by political and commercial ones. In 1745 a royal privilege had been granted to the Vincennes factory, recently established in the medieval Château de Vincennes to the southeast of Paris, which gave the young enterprise the exclusive right in France to use gilding in the decoration of porcelain. The wording of the privilege, which is slightly ambiguous, also permitted Vincennes to be the sole French porcelain factory to include the human figure in its decorative schemes. The purple border on the Mennecy stand, and perhaps even the choice of birds for the central composition, reflects the factory’s creative response to the restrictions imposed by the privilege awarded to Vincennes.

Vincennes’s monopoly regarding these forms of decoration was granted for a twenty-year period. While the rights conferred by the privilege were not always respected by the other French factories, they nevertheless provided an advantage to Vincennes that, when combined with royal financial backing, patronage from the court, and talented artistic leadership, enabled the new factory to dominate the production of soft-paste porcelain in France during the second half of the eighteenth century.
55. *Hercules and Omphale*

**VINCENNES FACTORY, FRENCH, 1740–56**

ca. 1749–50

Soft-paste porcelain

8 ⁷⁄₈ × 9 ¹³⁄₁₆ × 9 ³⁄₈ in. (22.5 × 24.9 × 23.8 cm)

Gift of R. Thornton Wilson, in memory of Florence Ellsworth Wilson, 1943.43.100.33

**MARKS:** unmarked

**CONSTRUCTION/CONDITION:** press-molded; figures slumped in kiln, large firing crack in base at rear and repaired during glaze firing, holes drilled in base after firing, numerous small losses to leaves on base

**PROVENANCE:** [Alex Ball, New York, before 1943; sold to R. Thornton Wilson]; R. Thornton Wilson (until 1943; to MMA)


**LITERATURE:** C. L. Avery 1949b, no. 161; Hackenbroch 1971a, p. 406, fig. 8; Préaud 1977, p. 168, no. 486, ill.; Eriksen and Béliaigue 1987, p. 196, pl. 7; Préaud and Albis 1991, p. 170, no. 168, ill.

This figure group depicting two figures from Greek and Roman mythology, Hercules and Omphale, is one of the earliest sculptural models produced by the Vincennes factory. While the model first appears in the factory inventory of 1752, it seems almost certain that it was in production by the middle of 1749. On July 12, 1749, the account book of the famous Parisian marchand mercier Lazare Duvaux (French, 1703–1758) records the sale of “a large round gilt-bronze base for a Hercules made of Vincennes porcelain” to a Monsieur de Villeumont. As the Vincennes factory had only recently attempted the production of sculptural figures and groups, it is unlikely that there was another model of Hercules to which this notation in Duvaux’s account book could refer. Due to its size and the complexity of its composition, *Hercules and Omphale* is a surprisingly ambitious work for a factory that was founded in 1740 yet began production in earnest only in the years 1745–46.

The technical challenges to a young factory posed by a sculptural group of this scale are especially evident in the partial collapse of the two primary figures, both of which lean backward to a notable degree because of a problem that occurred during the kiln firing. One result of the slumping of the figures is the compression of the head of Hercules’s lion skin, one of the legendary hero’s primary attributes. This change in the figures’ original, upright, seated positions slightly alters the composition, introducing an element of languor that was unintentional. Another significant technical flaw is apparent in the large firing crack found at the base near the back of the figure. This crack, which must have occurred in the kiln during the first or biscuit firing, was filled with very small crushed pieces of fired porcelain mixed with glaze prior to the second or glaze firing; the very visible repair suggests that the goal was simply to avert further damage rather than mask the defect, which was presumably beyond the factory’s ability at this point. The awareness at the factory that sculpting and firing a group of this size would prove difficult is evident by the use of a large supporting brace installed underneath. Made from the same clay body as the group, the brace runs from one side of the base to the other, parallel to the frontal orientation of the figures. Despite the addition of this support, the soft-paste porcelain body of this group was clearly incapable of withstanding some aspect of the firing process with complete success.

Interestingly, neither of the two other known examples of this model exhibits the same technical problems. In both the group on the Paris art market at the time of this writing and the group in the Musée National Adrien Dubouché, Limoges, Cité de la Céramique, the figures are fully upright in their seated positions, and the firing cracks are very minor. Unlike the present example or the group in Paris, the Limoges group is mounted with a gilt-bronze, three-branch candelabrum that
appears to be original to the figure (fig. 46), which may once also have had a gilt-bronze base of the type cited in Duvaux’s account book. The candelabrum attaches to the porcelain figure by means of the two upright cylindrical elements modeled as partially hollowed-out tree trunks found at the back of each of the three known groups. Thus, it is likely that the Museum’s group originally was mounted with a similar candelabrum, and the three holes drilled in the base may have been intended to secure a gilt-bronze base. If the holes were created shortly after the group was made, it indicates that the technical shortcomings of the present example were not regarded as so disfiguring as to render it unsalable.

Figures from mythology were popular sculptural subjects for the Vincennes factory in its early years of production, and the choice of Hercules and Omphale for a figure group may have been prompted by the highly visible success of a painting of the same subject by one of France’s most successful artists, François Lemoyne (1688–1737). His Hercule et Omphale (1724) was exhibited in the Salon in 1725, having already served as inspiration for a poem published several months earlier in the Mercure de France, the influential literary journal. A print executed by Laurent Cars (French, 1699–1771) in 1728, after Lemoyne’s painting, further increased the popularity of Lemoyne’s composition. François Boucher (French, 1703–1770) chose the same subject matter for a painting executed in the years 1731–34, although it was never reproduced in print form, but Boucher’s drawing of a differently composed Hercule et Omphale was engraved and thus became available to a wider audience.
All of the compositions of Hercules and Omphale, including the Vincennes group, give primacy to the exchange of attributes between the two figures that encapsulates the story of these two lovers. In the recountsing by Ovid\(^\text{10}\) and by Apollodorus,\(^\text{11}\) Hercules was forced to sell himself into slavery to atone for a murder that he had committed. Purchased by the queen of Lydia, Omphale, Hercules served as both her slave and lover. Omphale’s domination of Hercules was so complete that he was rumored to have begun dressing in female attire and adopting female pursuits, such as weaving. Traditionally, Hercules is depicted holding Omphale’s distaff, used for spinning to produce thread, while Omphale holds Hercules’s club and wears his lion skin, reflecting her authority in the relationship. The modeler of the Vincennes group includes these attributes, although in this composition the two lovers rest on Hercules’s lion skin and a putto holds the spindle. Lemoyne’s painting has been cited as the source for the composition of the Vincennes group,\(^\text{12}\) both directly and through the intermediary of Cars’s engraving. Even though there are distinct similarities between the porcelain version and Lemoyne’s composition, a number of differences exist as well, and it is difficult to determine if these differences are due to the inevitable changes required in transferring a two-dimensional image into three dimensions, or if a different source was employed at the factory. Whatever the inspiration might have been for this porcelain group, *Hercules and Omphale* reflects the intention at Vincennes to produce works that expanded the range of porcelain sculpture beyond anything that had been attempted in France prior to this time.

---

1. Known in Roman mythology as Hercules, the famous hero of Antiquity, he was called Herakles by the Greeks.
3. Art Antiques London 2010, ill. p. 84.
4. Whitehead 1993, fig. 5.
5. The group in Limoges is known only through photographs and has not been examined by the author.
6. The glaze has chipped around the holes and no glaze is found within the holes, indicating that the holes were made after the final firing.
56. Vase (Urne Duplessis)

**VINCENNES FACTORY, FRENCH, 1740–56**

Model attributed to Jean-Claude Duplessis (Italian, ca. 1695–1774)

ca. 1752

Soft-paste porcelain decorated in polychrome enamels and gold

9 1/2 × 5 3/8 × 4 1/2 in. (24.1 × 13.7 × 11.4 cm)

Gift of Mrs. Morris Hawkes, 1924 24.214.4

**MARKS:** on underside: no visible mark, but plaster fill

**CONSTRUCTION/CONDITION:** molded with applied decoration; minor losses to flower petals

**PROVENANCE:** E. M. Hodgkins (in 1909); Mrs. Morris Hawkes (until 1924; to MMA)


Many of the features of Vincennes porcelain that made the factory’s products so highly valued and sought after during the eighteenth century are evident in this vase. The extreme whiteness of the soft-paste porcelain, the sculptural sophistication, the rich enamel colors, and the interrelationship of the painted decoration to the form reflect a porcelain factory operating at a high level of production despite its short period of operation prior to this vase being made. The history of the factory has been well documented. Established on an experimental basis in 1740, the operation began in the Château de Vincennes, located to the southeast of Paris, and within a year the factory had secured the backing and active participation of an influential intendant des finances (superintendent of finance), Jean-Henri-Louis Orry (1703–1751), comte de Fulvy. Orry de Fulvy’s knowledge of porcelain, gained in part through his position as commissaire du roi (king’s commissioner) of the French East India Company and his powerful connections to the French court—his half brother, Philibert Orry (1689–1747), comte de Vignory, was general controller of finance to Louis XV (1710–1774), king of France—gave the young factory numerous artistic and political advantages. With a very white porcelain paste in production by 1742, the factory was held in sufficient esteem by 1745 to be granted a royal privilege for the “manufacture of porcelain in the Saxon manner, painted and gilded with human figures.” This privilege essentially gave Vincennes a monopoly within France for the production of porcelain decorated with figures and gilding for a twenty-year period, and while the monopoly was not always respected, the advantage it provided to Vincennes was enormous. The factory was further aided not only by the infusion of funds from investors but also by the appointment of one of the king’s finance ministers to oversee its administration. The success of the factory was guaranteed by the increased participation of Louis XV, who initially acquired one-quarter of the factory’s shares in 1753 and eventually assumed complete ownership in 1759. By 1753 it was apparent that the factory would require new and larger facilities, and plans were put in place to construct a new factory at Sèvres, located to the southwest of Paris, to which the Vincennes operation moved three years later, ending the first chapter of the factory that had now become the Manufacture Royale de Sèvres.

While the factory flourished in large part because of its financial and political support, its success was ultimately due to its technological and artistic achievements. With the ability to produce a porcelain body that was whiter, and hence more desirable, than any of its competitors, Vincennes then developed a sizable range of colors that permitted a more sophisticated level of painted decoration as compared to other factories. By the end of 1748 the gilding technique was mastered; nonetheless, a
series of personnel appointments beginning in 1751 established the artistic character of the factory. The influence of Germany’s Meissen factory on the earliest production at Vincennes gave way to a wholly French style fostered by French artists who were hired to critical positions in the early 1750s. The accomplished goldsmith and designer Jean-Claude Duplessis (Italian, ca. 1695–1774) began providing the factory with models for vases and for useful wares in 1748. Jean-Jacques Bachelier (French, 1724–1806) was hired in 1751 to provide artistic oversight for painted decoration at Vincennes, as well as specific compositions to be copied by the painters at the factory. Beginning in 1753, Jean-Baptiste-Étatien Genest (French, 1722/23 or 1730–1789) assumed leadership of the painting workshop, but it was the influence of artist François Boucher (French, 1703–1770) that had the most profound impact on the decorative schemes of
Vincennes. Prints made after Boucher’s paintings provided innumerable compositions and motifs for the painters at the factory, and many of his works were translated from two dimensions into figural sculpture. The scenes derived from Boucher were often painted within a shaped reserve set off by a ground color, and the various ground colors, developed first at Vincennes and later at Sèvres, became a defining feature of porcelain made at the royal manufactory. The elaborate gilding that was perfected at Vincennes and used in combination with rich ground colors, in addition to the painted scenes derived from works by major French artists, established a new standard for porcelain in mid-eighteenth-century Europe.

This vase was made at the moment when the influence of Meissen was waning and the transition to an entirely French style had begun. Floral decoration based on woodcuts had been popularized by Meissen and employed by Vincennes in the 1740s, but flowers painted in a more naturalistic style were increasingly favored, and the French factory introduced a new element by combining the painted flowers with sculpted ones applied to the surface of the vase. The earliest successful products made at Vincennes were three-dimensional flowers sculpted with considerable realism, and by 1748, shortly before this vase was made, they constituted the principal output of the factory. The extraordinary aspect of this vase is the extremely sophisticated transition from the two-dimensional flowers to the sculpted ones; one seamlessly melds into the other. The visual effect of the three-dimensional flowers is further enhanced by the flowers’ integration with the sinuous, twisting handles around which the morning glories are entwined. The naturalism of the vase’s decoration is amplified by the foliage at the base, which literally and visually connects the traditional vase form to the irregular base, modeled to look like rockwork.

The design of this vase model is attributed to Duplessis, and the elegance of line, the pronounced sculptural qualities of the form, and the sophisticated expression of Rococo design are entirely consistent with his style. All of the models created at the factory were given names; it is probable that this model was called either vase Duplessis or urne Duplessis. Factory sale records indicate that vases of this model were sold singly, in pairs, and in sets of three. This vase entered the Museum’s collection with two smaller vases or urnes Duplessis. The painted decoration on the small vases and the painted decoration found on the large vase align it with a small number of works made at Vincennes, all of which are considered among the factory’s finest production. The depth of the purple and blue enamels, the subtle shadings of all the colors, and the fluidity of line found in the green leaves and stems on this vase mark this flower painting as exceptional, and these qualities have close parallels with the decoration found on a pair of potpourri vases at the Wadsworth Atheneum, Hartford, Connecticut, a potpourri vase in the Gardiner Museum, Toronto. It has been proposed by Linda H. Roth that the Vincennes painter responsible for the decoration on all of these works was Pierre-Louis-Philippe Armand (French, active 1749–88), known as Armand le jeune, who was considered the finest flower painter at the factory.

The difference in quality between the painted decoration on the small vases and the painted decoration found on the large vase is particularly apparent due to the extraordinary skill of the execution on the latter. The style and quality of the flower painting on the large vase align it with a small number of works made at Vincennes, all of which are considered among the factory’s finest production. The depth of the purple and blue enamels, the subtle shadings of all the colors, and the fluidity of line found in the green leaves and stems on this vase mark this flower painting as exceptional, and these qualities have close parallels with the decoration found on a pair of potpourri vases at the Wadsworth Atheneum, Hartford, Connecticut, a potpourri vase in the Gardiner Museum, Toronto. It has been proposed by Linda H. Roth that the Vincennes painter responsible for the decoration on all of these works was Pierre-Louis-Philippe Armand (French, active 1749–88), known as Armand le jeune, who was considered the finest flower painter at the factory.
57. Broth bowl with cover and stand (Écuelle ronde et plateau rond)

**VINCENNES FACTORY, FRENCH, 1740–56**

ca. 1752–53

Soft-paste porcelain decorated in polychrome enamels and gold

.168a (bowl), b (cover): 5¼ × 8 × 6¾ in. (13.2 × 20.3 × 16.2 cm)

.169 (stand): 1½ × 8¼ × 8¾ in. (3.8 × 21.7 × 21.7 cm)

Gift of R. Thornton Wilson, in memory of Florence Ellsworth Wilson, 1950 50.211.168a, b, .169

**MARKS:** both painted on underside: interlaced Lls with dot above in blue enamel

**CONSTRUCTION/CONDITION:** .168a, b: molded; one small chip in rim .169: molded; small chip to tail of fish on lid

**PROVENANCE:** possibly Earl of Jersey; [James A. Lewis and Son, New York, before 1950; sold to R. Thornton Wilson]; R. Thornton Wilson (until 1950; to MMA)


**LITERATURE:** C. L. Avery 1951, p. 455, fig. 9, Préaud 1989a, pp. 112–13, figs. 12, 14; Préaud and Albis 1991, pp. 150–51, no. 115, ill., and frontispiece; Bellaigue 2009, vol. 3, p. 937, n. 9, under no. 262; Jeffrey H. Munger in Kisluk-Grosheide and Munger 2010, pp. 190–91, no. 95, ill.

**COVERED, TWO-HANDED BOWLS, SUCH AS THIS ONE, WERE known in France as ecuelles, and they were intended to contain broth or soup. An ecuelle was usually accompanied by a stand on which bread may have been placed.1 The two-handled design of ecuelles allowed the broth to be sipped rather than consumed with a spoon, and the ecuelle’s cover would have kept the contents warm.2 Broth or clear soups commonly served as morning beverages before coffee or tea had gained widespread popularity, and they were consumed in the private quarters of a residence, including the bedroom or boudoir.3 Ecuelles and stands were produced as individual objects rather than as parts of dinner services, and as stand-alone wares, their decoration was often more elaborate and ambitious in comparison to components of services.

The Vincennes factory produced a variety of models of ecuelles and stands,4 and its successor factory at Sèvres produced an even larger number of ecuelle designs, attesting to the widespread practice of consuming broth or soup in this manner. Frequently, ecuelles made in silver provided the basic models for the form in porcelain.5 This model of ecuelle and stand follows the standard format of a round bowl with two handles, a domed cover with a finial, and a circular stand, but the design of the sinuously twisting handles and the finial, in particular, exploits the medium of porcelain in a skillful manner. The finial is formed from a fish, two shells (a scallop and a conch), a leek, and a mushroom, and it has been suggested by Rosalind Savill that these elements might refer to the ingredients of the broth or soup served in the ecuelle.6 While this small, three-dimensional still life may or may not have been indicative of the ecuelle’s contents, it reflects a mastery of both composition and execution, and it represents one of the most sculptural finial designs produced at Vincennes. On a practical level, however, the finial is difficult to grasp and to hold onto, making it surprising that this and other known examples have survived in good condition.

The extraordinary quality of the painted decoration on this ecuelle and stand distinguishes it as one of the finest works produced at Vincennes. The bowl, cover, and the stand are decorated with vignettes of marine creatures placed on large shells that serve as a type of stage for presentation. Different varieties of vegetation emerge from around the shells to suggest abbreviated landscapes that, paradoxically, the sea creatures appear to inhabit. The most notable example of these imagined environments is found in the center of the stand, where a lobster traverses a plant and rock-strewn ground. The various fish and sea creatures, which seem to be only partially based on real marine life, are painted with a remarkable degree of animation, and there is an anthropomorphic quality to their expressions. The compositions of the vignettes are complex and highly sophisticated, particularly the two on
the cover in which a shell and a stylized rockwork formation each function as a kind of proscenium arch framing the creatures below.

A distinctive feature of the decoration on the écuelle and stand is the use of gilding, which is employed extensively, though with great subtlety, throughout the vignettes to highlight various details, particularly the shells that play such an important compositional role. The style of the painted decoration and the use of gilding in this manner link this écuelle to a small number of other works made at Vincennes that are painted either with similar sea creatures or with birds. The closest parallel to the Museum’s écuelle and stand is offered by an example of the same model in the Musée des Arts Décoratifs, Paris, which is decorated with similar vignettes of marine creatures. Despite the pronounced resemblance of the scenes on the two objects, none of the compositions appears twice, which raises the question of possible sources for this remarkable decoration. No sources have yet been identified, though the prominent use of shells, rockwork, and fountains reflect the primary motifs of the Rococo style that was popularized by numerous prints in wide circulation at this time.

Other works produced at Vincennes with closely related decoration include three tureens and stands, and three écuelles and stands, and the painting on all of these objects is attributed to Louis-Denis Armand l’aîné (French, active 1746–88). The factory mark of crossed LLs painted with a distinctive fluidity and with small flourishes, which appears on both the écuelle and the stand, has been securely linked to Armand. His painting on this group of works is exceptional and distinguished by the ambitiousness of the compositions, the quality of execution, and the distinctive palette dominated by cool tonalities. Armand’s decoration on these objects has been described by Geoffrey de Bellaigue as having “a precision worthy of the finest miniaturist,” and it surpasses in quality the work of any other painter at the factory at this time. Armand’s style and palette evolved over his long career, and his proficiency at painting birds was unequaled during his years at Sèvres. However, his early work, as seen on this écuelle and stand and on the related works cited above, remains among his most outstanding achievements.

---

1 Savill 1988, vol. 2, p. 642. At least three different types of bread were made in eighteenth-century France to be consumed with soup; see Wheaton 1983, pp. 181–83.
3 Ecuelles were also used for feeding broth or soup to the sick; Chilton 2012, p. 48.
See, for example, Fuhring, Bimbenet-Privat, and Kugel 2005, vol. 1, no. 100.


The Musée des Arts Décoratifs eeuille and stand (25189AB) are smaller than the Museum’s example and have a different finial.

The author has not located any sources, and a letter of February 20, 1989, from Tamara Préaud, Archivist at the Sèvres Manufactury, in the curatorial files in the Department of European Sculpture and Decorative Arts, The Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York, states that she was unable to identify sources for the decoration on 50.211.168ab,169.

Musée Nationale des Sèvres, Cité de la Céramique, Sèvres (MNC 21570, MNC 21573); Cleveland Museum of Art (1952.3ab); Christie’s, London, sale cat., July 4, 2013, no. 45.


See Peters 2005, vol. 1, p. 15. It was Bernard Dragesco who first interpreted this mark, which sometimes appears with a crescent, to be that of Louis-Denis Armand l’aîné.

Two bottle coolers from the Louis XV service (Seau à bouteille)

**VINCENNES FACTORY, FRENCH, 1740–56**

Model attributed to Jean-Claude Duplessis (Italian, ca. 1695–1774)

1753 (1970.230.5)
1754 (1970.230.4)

Soft-paste porcelain decorated in polychrome enamels and gold

- **.4:** $7 \frac{7}{8} \times 10 \frac{3}{8} \times 7 \frac{13}{16}$ in. ($20 \times 26.4 \times 19.8$ cm)
- **.5:** $7 \frac{11}{16} \times 10 \frac{3}{8} \times 8$ in. ($19.5 \times 26.4 \times 20.3$ cm)

Gift of Mr. and Mrs. Charles Wrightsman, 1970. 1970.230.4, .5

**MARKS:**
- **.4:** painted on underside: interlaced LLs with dot above and below enclosing date letter A (for year 1754) in blue enamel; incised on foot rim:
- **.5:** painted on underside: interlaced LLs with dot above and below enclosing two dots and two lines in blue enamel

**CONSTRUCTION/CONDITION:**
- both molded
- **.5:** abrasion to gilding at base and vertical crack starting at rim

**PROVENANCE:**
- Louis XV, king of France (about 1753–74);
- private collection (until 1969);
- (sale, Property of a Lady, Sotheby’s, London, June 3, 1969, nos. 117, 118);
- Clements (from 1969);
- Charles and Jayne Wrightsman, New York (until 1970; to MMA)

**EXHIBITION:**

**LITERATURE:**

One of the most influential and renowned porcelain dinner services made during the eighteenth century was the first produced for Louis XV (1710–1774), king of France, by the Vincennes factory in France. Commissioned in 1751 to include both dinner and dessert wares, the service was sufficiently extensive in scale and challenging to produce that it necessitated delivery in three major installments over a three-year period, which began in 1753. Because it was the first service of significant scale produced at Vincennes, it required the development of many new models, and it was the first to employ the turquoise ground color, known as bleu céleste, that the factory had just developed. The goldsmith Jean-Claude Duplessis (Italian, ca. 1695–1774), known as Duplessis père to distinguish him from his son Jean-Claude-Thomas Duplessis (French, ca. 1730–1783), was the artistic director at Vincennes and thus responsible for the factory’s models. In this capacity, he produced designs for most of the new wares created for the service, many of which remained in production for at least the next twenty-five years. The Louis XV service, as it became known, significantly enhanced the prestige of the young porcelain factory, while at the same time creating a basic template for the dinner services that were subsequently produced at both Vincennes and Sèvres. The quality and importance of the service were recognized immediately; the first installment was displayed at a public exhibition in Paris before its delivery to Versailles.

The use of bleu céleste became the primary distinguishing characteristic of the Louis XV service, and the popularity of this color helped to establish the importance of ground colors in creating a factory style that evolved at Vincennes and reached maturity at Sèvres. While the Meissen factory employed various ground colors for vases and tea wares, the dinner wares produced by the German factory were rarely decorated with a colored ground. As the French competitors to Vincennes did not have the technical expertise to successfully use ground colors, the services made at Vincennes were especially distinctive for the richness of the saturated colors that often covered much of the porcelain body.

Those areas not covered by the ground color, known as the reserves, were customarily framed by gilding, and many of the components of the Louis XV service are decorated with a distinctive gilt design of imbricated discs of graduated sizes, husks, and trailing bands of flowers, as seen on these bottle coolers. All of the reserves on the pieces in the service are decorated with flowers or fruit, or the two in combination, and the best-quality painting is commonly found on the larger, more expensive components, such as the tureens, wine coolers, and mortars.
While both of the Museum’s wine coolers have very similar decoration, there are subtle differences in their forms, in their flower painting, and in their gilding. The two coolers, which represent the largest size of this model produced at Vincennes and Sèvres, have subtly different dimensions and profiles, and more notably, their molded rims are of slightly different design. Vincennes factory records indicate that this basic form of cooler was redesigned in 1753, with the modified version given a different molding at the rim and slightly reduced height and width. While one of the wine coolers (MMA 1970.230.4, above left) seems to correspond to the revised design in its slimmer proportions, slight differences in the profile of its molded rim to those found on post-1753 coolers make it difficult to determine with certainty if it reflects the original or the revised model. The marks on the underside of each cooler do not provide conclusive answers. The factory mark of interlaced LLs enclosing two comma-like marks and a dot (MMA 1970.230.5, above right) suggests a date prior to 1754, the year the system of date letters was introduced, and the presence of the date letter A (MMA 1970.230.4), now proposed as denoting 1754, suggests that it was decorated slightly later than the other cooler.

It is clear that the quality of the flower painting on the dated cooler is superior to that found on the presumably earlier example. The composition of the cluster of flowers and fruit, its relationship to the undecorated white space of the reserve, and the execution of the individual elements of the composition reflect an extremely high level of skill. The flowers appear to explode from the center of the reserve and achieve a level of compositional balance and tension that is absent from the decoration on the other cooler. It is possible that the flower painting on the dated cooler (MMA 1970.230.4) was executed by Pierre-Louis-Philippe Armand (French, active 1749–88), known as Armand le jeune, the highest-paid flower painter at Vincennes and later at Sèvres. The style of the painting of the interlaced LLs on this example has similarities to those attributed to Armand, and the high quality of the decoration is commensurate with other work known to be by him. Lastly, the scale of the reserve and the manner in which it is situated on this example are more successful than that of its counterpart on the other cooler where the reserve sits uncomfortably close to the rim and appears slightly too large in relation to the size of the cooler. It is suggested by this author that the dated cooler (MMA 1970.230.4) could be seen as achieving a resolution of some of the aesthetic issues posed by the cooler with which it is now paired (MMA 1970.230.5), and thus is slightly later in date.

It remains unclear as to when these two coolers were delivered to Versailles. If one accepts that the cooler without the date letter is the earlier of the two, it is likely to have been one of four that arrived at Versailles during the first shipment in December 1753. Assuming the letter A (MMA 1970.230.4) indicates a date of 1754, it is probable this cooler was delivered during the second installment on December 31, 1754. No bottle coolers were included in the third shipment of December 1755, and the four additional bottle coolers acquired by Louis XV in December 1756 were presumably marked with date letters for that year. The subsequent history of the service is both complex and obscure. In 1757 the king sold a significant portion of the service to Étienne-François de Stainville (1719–1785), later duc de Choiseul, who was appointed ambassador to Austria that same year, and the service that remained at Versailles was supplemented several times by both Louis XV and Louis XVI (1754–1793). Much remains unknown about the history of the service in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, and today the service is widely dispersed, with the largest surviving portion of the original service now at Boughton House, Northamptonshire, England.
The Louis XV service can be seen as a reflection of the extraordinary ambitions of the Vincennes factory, which began producing soft-paste porcelain on a commercial basis only several years before this service was initiated in 1751. The three deliveries of the service to Versailles between 1753 and 1755 totaled a staggering 1,749 pieces at a cost of 87,272 livres, which represented a vast sum in the eighteenth century. The service was innovative in every aspect of its form and decoration, and its success helped to establish soft-paste porcelain as the fashionable new medium for dinner services for the remainder of the eighteenth century.

1 The history of this service has been thoroughly studied and published, most notably in Grégory 1982; Grégory 1988; Peters 1993, pp. 110–12; Savill 1993; Peters 2005, vol. 2, pp. 283–90.
6 Some of the models in the service are decorated with less-elaborate gilding, but many of the pieces, from mustard pots to large platters, are gilded with variants of these three motifs.
8 Linda H. Roth in Roth and Le Corbeiller 2000, p. 254.
9 Comparison of both of the coolers to others in the Museum's collection (1976.153.80 of 1771–72 and 37.20.32 of 1782) reveals that the molded rims differ slightly on each of the four coolers, suggesting that this design feature alone does not provide an accurate measure for the dating of the model.
10 The mark is very similar to that illustrated in Gwilt 2014, pp. 179, 251, no. 116.
11 See Peters 2014.
12 See ibid., p. 4.
13 However, these overglaze painted marks customarily indicate the date that the decoration was applied rather than the date that the object itself was produced.
14 Armand was the younger brother of the better-known Sévres painter Louis-Denis Armand, known as Armand l’aîné (French, active 1746–88), who specialized in bird painting.
16 In addition, the letter A within the factory mark is painted in a very similar manner to another mark associated with Armand le jeune (see ibid.), but as the A appearing on MMA 1970.230.4 is presumably a date letter, this similarity may be coincidental.
17 David Peters dates 1970.230.5, with no explanation, to around 1787 (Peters 2005, vol. 2, p. 289), presumably on the assumption that it was one of the supplements to the service of 1787. However, all of the stylistic and technical aspects of 1970.230.5 indicate a date of around 1773, and it differs notably from the coolers produced to supplement the service in the 1780s; see Sotheby Parke Bernet, London, sale cat., March 22, 1977, no. 183.
20 The pieces now at Boughton House are presumably those sold to Étienne-François de Stainville in 1757; see Grégory 1988, p. 58.
21 Of the 1,749 pieces in the service, 493 were tablewares and 1,266 were table decoration; Savill and Dewsnop 2014, p. 144. It is possible that the correct number of tablewares is 483.
59. Potpourri vase (Pot-pourri gondole)

**SÈVRES FACTORY, FRENCH, 1756–PRESENT**

Model attributed to Jean-Claude Duplessis (Italian, ca. 1695–1774)
Decoration attributed to Charles-Nicolas Dodin (French, 1734–1803)

1757

Soft-paste porcelain decorated in polychrome enamels and gold

- **.88a.** (body with lid): 12 ¾ × 14 ¾ × 7 in. (32.2 × 37.3 × 18.0 cm)
- **.88b.** (base): 2 ⅜ × 9 × 5 ½ in. (5.9 × 22.9 × 13.3 cm)

Assembled: H. 14 ¼ in. (35.9 cm)

Gift of Samuel H. Kress Foundation, 1958 58.75.88a–c

---

**MARKS:** a: painted on underside: interlaced LLs and script date letter D. (for year 1757), both in blue enamel; b: unmarked; c: underside obscured by plaster fill

**CONSTRUCTION/CONDITION:** all molded; a: small firing cracks in main body; c: broken with extensive repair along part of rim; plaster infill in well of stand

**PROVENANCE:** possibly Madame de Pompadour; Sir Charles Mills, Baronet; The Lords Hillingdon; The Samuel H. Kress Foundation (until 1958; to MMA)


This model of potpourri vase, known as a *pot-pourri gondole*, was designed in 1756, the same year in which the Vincennes factory moved to larger and superior quarters at Sèvres, located to the southwest of Paris on the road to Versailles. The success of the Vincennes factory had made it apparent as early as 1753 that it required more and better space, and the increasing patronage of the French court, King Louis XV’s (1710–1774) financial involvement, and a series of loans made it feasible to build a much more modern and suitable factory in 1756.¹ The new enterprise at Sèvres was a continuation in artistic terms of the operation established at Vincennes, but the ownership structure evolved with Louis XV’s increasing financial support of the factory, culminating in his purchase of the entire establishment in October 1759.²

The complexity and sophistication of this potpourri vase reflect how far the Vincennes factory had advanced technically and artistically by 1756 when this model was created.³ The lid is composed of four pierced panels, each formed by a different pattern of low-relief flowers modeled with great precision. The upper section of the main body of the vase is pierced with an elaborate design and with four holes, possibly intended to support bulbs, and the vase rests on a separate stand supported by four scroll feet. The pierced designs of the lid and upper section of the vase are remarkably skillful in terms of their compositions and their execution. The challenges of creating and then firing a vase with such intricate and extensive pierced work would have been enormous, and it may account in part for why so few *pot-pourris gondoles* were produced.

Today, four potpourri vases of this model are known, all produced in either 1757 or 1758. Three of the four are decorated with a green ground; in addition to the Museum’s example, the other green-ground potpourri vases are in the State Hermitage Museum, Saint Petersburg,⁴ and in the Wallace Collection, London.⁵ The fourth known potpourri vase of this model, decorated with a pink ground, is in the British Royal Collection.⁶

The Sévres factory archives indicate that two green-ground potpourri vases were sold in 1757 to the preeminent Parisian art dealer, or marchand-mercier, Lazare Duvaux (French, 1703–1758) for the considerable sum of 1,200 livres each.⁷ One of these was purchased from Duvaux by Louis XV, who gave it to Princess Johanna Elisabeth of Holstein-Gottorp (1712–1760), later Princess of Anhalt-Zerbst, the mother of Catherine II (1729–1796), known as Catherine the Great, empress of Russia, in January 1758;⁸ it is this potpourri that is now in the Hermitage. The second vase bought by Duvaux is most likely the Museum’s example. A third green-ground potpourri was sold by the factory in 1759 to an anonymous buyer for 960 livres, along with a pair...
of elephant-head vases, and this example appears to be the one now in the Wallace Collection. The pink-ground potpourri vase of 1758, now in the Royal Collection, was still listed in the factory’s salesroom in January 1774, evidently having failed to find a buyer.

An inventory taken of Madame de Pompadour’s (1721–1764) possessions after her death indicates that she owned a green-ground pot-pourri gondole, and it may have been Madame de Pompadour who acquired the potpourri vase and the two elephant-head vases sold in 1759. It has been suggested by Rosalind Savill that the pot-pourri gondole in the Wallace Collection and two elephant-head vases in the same collection can be identified as those once owned by Louis XV’s famous mistress. An alternative possibility is that the Museum’s potpourri vase, accompanied by two different elephant-head vases, now also in the Wallace...
Collection,13 were the examples once in the possession of Madame de Pompadour.

While the Museum’s potpourri vase had a functional use, the fact that it was likely part of a garniture indicates that it was intended primarily to be decorative. The design of the potpourri is attributed to Jean-Claude Duplessis (Italian, ca. 1695–1774), and its sinuous lines and highly sculptural quality are hallmarks of Duplessis’s style in the 1750s. Duplessis, trained as a goldsmith, learned quickly how to exploit the plasticity of soft-paste porcelain at Vincennes, creating a form that could only be produced in porcelain for this vase. The basic shape of this vase is based upon a nef,14 and it was a form that Duplessis employed with slight variations for at least three other models at the factory.15 The green ground that decorates the Museum’s example is distinctive, as the shade of green is both lighter and closer to a shade of turquoise than the green ground typically employed in 1756.16 The painting of the reserve, which depicts two cherubs on clouds holding symbols of music, has been attributed to Charles-Nicolas Dodin (French, 1734–1803), who was regarded as one of the most talented painters at the Vincennes and Sèvres factories. Curiously, the quality of Dodin’s painting is not matched by that of the flower painting that decorates the back reserve and the narrow vertical panels, but the painting of the low-relief flowers composing the openwork lid is executed with a subtlety and skill that mark this vase as truly exceptional. The visual impact of the potpourri is further enhanced not only by the elaborate gilding that frames the primary reserve but also by the gilding accentuating the prominent curving lines that make this potpourri vase one of the most manifestly rococo works produced at Sèvres.

1 For a fuller description of the new factory, see Whitehead 2010, pp. 96–97.
2 For a history of the Sèvres factory in the eighteenth century, see Eriksen and Bellaigue 1987, pp. 35–39.
5 Biriukova and Kazakevich 2005, pp. 74–75, no. 4.
8 Ibid.
9 Ibid.
10 The potpourri vase was sold with two other Sèvres pink-ground vases of the same date to George IV in 1809; Bellaigue 2009, vol. 1, pp. 143–47, no. 18.
11 Cordey 1939, p. 61, no. 672.
14 See Versailles et les tables royales en Europe 1993, ill. p. 97. A nef is a boat-shaped table ornament intended to contain various dining implements or accessories.
15 Terrine gondole (see Eriksen and Bellaigue 1987, p. 307); cuvette à masques (Savill 1988, vol. 1, pp. 91–97, no. C225); and the bottom section of a pot-pourri à vaisseau (Bellaigue 2009, vol. 1, pp. 122–27, no. 12).
16 Green grounds, introduced in 1756, were initially slightly blue in color, but beginning in 1757, the typical green ground became warmer and slightly more yellow in tonality. The green on this example is more pale turquoise in color and is similar to the color known as petit verd, which, however, does not seem to have been used at Sèvres until the very early 1760s. It is possible that the color on the Museum’s vase was the unintended result of some aspect of the firing process. A similar ground color is found on two elephant-head vases in the Wallace Collection, which supports the supposition that they might have been paired with the Museum’s pot-pourri gondole; Savill 1988, vol. 1, pp. 154–62, nos. C246, C247.
60A. Potpourri vase (*Pot-pourri à vaisseau*)

**SÈVRES FACTORY, FRENCH, 1756–PRESENT**
Jean-Claude Duplessis (Italian, ca. 1695–1774)
1758
Soft-paste porcelain decorated in polychrome enamels and gold
17 ⁵⁄₈ × 14 ³⁄₄ × 7 ⁵⁄₈ in. (44.8 × 37.5 × 19.4 cm)
Gift of Samuel H. Kress Foundation, 1958 58.75.89a, b

**MARKS:** painted on underside: interlaced LLs, with date letter E. (for year 1758) below, both in blue enamel

**CONSTRUCTION/CONDITION:** molded

**PROVENANCE:** Louis-Joseph de Bourbon, prince de Condé; Sir Charles Mills, Baronet; The Lords Hillingdon (in 1888); The Samuel H. Kress Foundation (until 1958; to MMA)


60B–C. Two vases from a garniture (*Vase à tête d’éléphant*)

**SÈVRES FACTORY, FRENCH, 1756–PRESENT**
Jean-Claude Duplessis (Italian, ca. 1695–1774)
ca. 1758
Soft-paste porcelain decorated in polychrome enamels and gold
-.90a, b: 15 ⁹⁄₁₆ × 10 ¹⁄₈ × 6 ³⁄₁₆ in. (39.5 × 25.7 × 15.7 cm)
-.91a, b: 15 ⁷⁄₁₆ × 10 ⁵⁄₁₆ × 6 ¹/₄ in. (39.2 × 26.2 × 15.9 cm)
Gift of Samuel H. Kress Foundation, 1958 58.75.90a, b–.91a, b

**MARKS:** both incised: M [‐] L

**CONSTRUCTION/CONDITION:** both vases are molded; -.90a, b: base extensively broken and repaired; -.91a, b: minor repairs to base

**PROVENANCE:** Louis-Joseph de Bourbon, prince de Condé; Louise-Marie-Thérèse-Bathilde d’Orléans, duchesse de Bourbon, Princess Sophia; Sir Charles Mills, Baronet; The Lords Hillingdon; The Samuel H. Kress Foundation (until 1958; to MMA)


**LITERATURE:** W. Chaffers in Robinson 1862, p. 112, nos. 1,272, 1,273; Chaffers and J. C. Robinson in Robinson 1863, p. 117, nos. 1,272, 1,273; Marryat 1868, p. 422, pl. 111, no. 6; Bibesco 1933, ill. p. 121; Three French Reigns 1933, p. 64, no. 468; Phillips 1958, pp. 61, 62; Dauterman 1960, pp. 287, 290–91, fig. 15; Carl Christian Dauterman in Parker, Standen, and Dauterman 1964, pp. 202–3, no. 36a, b, figs. 145, 146; Dauterman 1969, pp. 25, 27, fig. 13; Brunet 1972, p. 3, fig. 2; M. D. Schwartz 1984, no. 51, ill.; Baulez 1987, p. 57, n. 55; Savill 1988, vol. 1, pp. 155–56, 161, n. 3 (e), under nos. c246 and c247, p. 197, n. 33, under no. c256; Clare Le Corbeiller in Treasures from the Metropolitan Museum 1989, p. 116, no. 59, ill.; Marie-Laure de Rohan in Musée du Louvre 2003, pp. 134–35, fig. 78b; Jeffrey H. Munger in Kisluk-Grosheide and Munger 2010, pp. 194–96, no. 99, ill.; Guillaume Séret in Durand, Bimbenet-Privat, and Dassas 2014, p. 326, under no. 125
These three vases were originally accompanied by two additional vases to form a set, or garniture, that was one of the most extraordinary and expensive garnitures produced at Sévres during the eighteenth century. The boat-shaped vase, known at the factory as a pot-pourri à vaisseau or a pot-pourri en navire, would have occupied the central position in the grouping flanked by the two elephant-head vases (vase à tête d’éléphant) and two vases with ear-shaped handles (vase à oreilles) now at the Musée du Louvre, Paris.  

The garniture is remarkable not only for its originality of the vase forms but also for its novel and extremely high-quality decoration. The body of the center vase is in the shape of a boat with marine masks at both ends and truncated bowsprits emerging from the mouths of the masks. The lid, which is formed from shrouds or rigging that alternate with pierced panels to represent sails, is a separate upper section of the vase that includes a pennant descending from the masthead.  

The form of this remarkable potpourri vase evolved from two earlier vase shapes made at Sévres, but the concept—a vase in the form of a boat with sails—was entirely new. The design for the pot-pourri à vaisseau is attributed to Jean-Claude Duplessis (Italian, ca. 1695–1774), the creative head of the sculpture workshop at Sévres who was responsible for many of the factory’s most innovative designs. This model of potpourri vase was first produced in 1758, and the Museum’s example is one of the first created. The lid in the form of sail rigging must be one of the most technically challenging designs made at Sévres, based on the extensive and intricate perforations incised in the clay while only partially dry. If successfully executed in this so-called leather-hard state, the lid could have been damaged, or it could have collapsed during the firing due to fragility in the unfired state.

It appears that very few of these potpourri vases were made, probably because of the technical difficulties in fabricating them, and hence, the costs involved. Only four of this model can be identified in the factory’s sales records, and ten are known to have survived today. In addition, factory records indicate that these boat-shaped vases were only produced for a seven-year period, since after 1764 their very Rococo design would no longer have been fashionable.

The elephant-head vase, introduced at Sévres two years before the boat-shaped vase, was equally innovative in form. Duplessis is known to have supplied the design for the vase, which was intended to support candles in addition to being decorative. Elephant-head vases were made in three sizes, of which this pair represents the largest, and the vase design was modified in minor ways during the relatively short period that it was in production (1756–62). The handles that appear under the elephants’ trunks reflect one modification, added presumably to provide extra support for the trunks.

The source of inspiration for Duplessis’s design, and for the prominent elephant heads in particular, has been much debated, including discussions of Chinese, Japanese, and Meissen porcelains as possible models. A plausible model may lie in either the Japanese so-called birdcage vases that were avidly collected by August II (1670–1733), commonly known as Augustus the Strong, elector of Saxony, king of Poland, or in the Meissen copies of the Japanese originals, but these vases are only distantly related to Duplessis’s design, which is one of the most unexpected of all those produced at Sévres. While the elephant-head vases were made in larger quantities than the boat-shaped vases, their high cost, which ranged from 360 to 960 livres, necessarily limited the scope of production.
The boat-shaped vase, the two elephant-head vases, and the two vases now at the Louvre were among the porcelains included in the sale held in King Louis XV’s (1710–1774) private apartments at Versailles in late December 1758. Sales of the latest production from Sèvres, which took place annually at Versailles in late December and early January, had been initiated by Louis XV to encourage the factory’s sales, and the event proved lucrative for the royal manufactory.

Among the highest-priced purchases made that year was by Louis-Joseph de Bourbon (1736–1818), prince de Condé, for the five vases. The factory’s sales records show that he paid 1,200 livres for the boat-shaped vase, 1,680 livres for the two elephant-head vases, and 1,440 for the two vases now in the Louvre. This total of 4,320 livres was an enormous sum, exceeding the annual salary of a typical professional worker in France at this time. Louis-Joseph may have been drawn to the extraordinary shapes of the five vases, or to the striking pink ground color newly developed at the factory, which was described at the time as “very fresh and greatly pleasing.” It seems that the first porcelains decorated with this new ground were introduced at the same sale at Versailles in December 1758, and the visual impact of this startling color must have been considerable. The boat-shaped vases and the two Louvre vases are decorated with reserves of putti with various attributes, while the two elephant-head vases are painted solely with interlaced pink ribbons together with small bouquets of flowers in the interstices. Because it was common factory practice for the decoration to be coordinated among the components of a garniture, the absence of reserves with putti on the elephant-head vases is slightly surprising. It is possible that the elephant-head vases were not produced to accompany the other three vases, and the five vases, united by their pink ground color, were assembled by Louis-Joseph to create a garniture.

It is likely that Louis-Joseph purchased the vases for his wife, Charlotte Godefride Élisabeth de Rohan (1737–1760), since they are listed among the contents of her bedroom in an inventory taken after her death.
indicates that four of the five vases were at that time in the possession of Louise-Marie-Thérèse-Bathilde d’Orléans (1750–1822), duchesse de Bourbon, and the daughter-in-law of Louis-Joseph. The pair of elephant-head vases and the pair of vases now in the Louvre were placed on a commode in her bedroom in the Palais Bourbon;\(^1\) the boat-shaped vase was not listed with them, presumably having been placed elsewhere in the residence. At the time of the French Revolution (1789–99), many of the Bourbon possessions seized by the government were sold, but the five vases were among the finest objects retained by the Commission temporaire des Arts.\(^{2,0}\) Eventually given to a “citoyenne Denor,” the vases were sold at auction in 1797.\(^{2,1}\) They were separated at some point during the first half of the nineteenth century, because the pair of vases with ear-shaped handles appeared alone at auction in London in 1855.\(^{2,2}\)

The three vases at the Museum are among the most extravagant creations of the factory, reflecting its willingness to expand the boundaries of taste through bold and innovative design. The popularity of the pink ground color, known as rose at the factory, waned after 1764, the year in which the last of the boat-shaped vases is recorded in the sales records and approximately two years after the elephant-head vases ceased to be produced. Both the forms of the two vase types and the pink ground color are manifestations of the full-blown Rococo style at Sévres; by the mid-1760s, the emerging taste for Neoclassicism favored more restrained shapes and less-brilliant colors.
61. Two wall sconces (Bras de cheminée)

**SÈVRES FACTORY, FRENCH, 1756–PRESENT**

Model attributed to Jean-Claude Duplessis (Italian, ca. 1695–1774)
ca. 1761

Soft-paste porcelain decorated in polychrome enamel and gold, gilt bronze
17 ¾ x 11 x 7 ¼ in. (44.1 x 27.9 x 18.4 cm)

Gift of R. Thornton Wilson, in memory of Florence Ellsworth Wilson, 1954 54.147.20a–d, .21a–d

**MARKS:** unmarked

**CONSTRUCTION/CONDITION:** both molded; .20a–d: extensive breaks in central branch and proper left branch; .21a–d: extensive breaks in all three branches and back support

**PROVENANCE:** Duke of Buccleuch; R. Thornton Wilson (until 1954; to MMA)

**LITERATURE:** Winchester 1955, p. 419, fig. 22; Dauterman 1969, p. 22, fig. 10; Pierre Ennès in Musée du Louvre 1990, p. 184, under no. 86; Jeffrey H. Munger in Kisluk-Grosheide and Munger 2010, p. 198, no. 101, ill.

**SHORTLY AFTER THE FIRST PORCELAIN PLAQUES WERE MADE AT SÈVRES FOR THE PURPOSE OF EMBELLISHING FURNITURE, THE FACTORY FURTHER EXPANDED THE ROLE OF PORCELAIN IN THE REALM OF FURNISHINGS BY PRODUCING WALL SCONCES THAT SERVED A FUNCTIONAL PURPOSE IN ADDITION TO A DECORATIVE ONE. THE FACTORY ARCHIVES INDICATE THAT JEAN-CLAUDE DUPLESSIS (ITALIAN, CA. 1695–1774), WHO WAS RESPONSIBLE FOR NEW MODELS AT SÈVRES, PROVIDED A DESIGN FOR A WALL SCONCE IN 1760.**

Duplessis’s training as a goldsmith and bronze founder is evident in the highly sculptural and boldly scrolling forms of the design, which clearly derives from the gilt-bronze wall-sconce designs from the years 1750–60. The attenuated scrolling vegetal forms punctuated with berries that compose the porcelain model reflect a direct borrowing of the standard elements also used for rococo gilt-bronze wall sconces, although the porcelain version does not incorporate the asymmetry that characterizes many of the gilt-bronze examples.

Duplessis pushed the technical limits of soft-paste porcelain by creating a design in which three arms spring from a central shaft with minimal structural support, requiring the medium to function more like metal than a relatively fragile ceramic body. The demands on the porcelain are evident in the small firing cracks visible where the curvature of the arms is most extreme. The factory’s willingness to create a form that previously had been executed only in metal reflects the spirit of innovation that characterized the factory’s production in the middle decades of the eighteenth century. The wall sconces were not the first objects made at Sèvres intended to support candles. The model for the elephant-head vase with candleholders (vase à tête d’éléphant) was designed in 1756, and a potpourri vase with candle-holders (pot-pourri à bobèche) appeared in 1759; both are almost certainly the work of Duplessis. Because each object served a primarily decorative purpose, the candelabrum function was secondary. For both models the candle socket is made of porcelain, and due to the fragility of this component, very few candle sockets survive on the elephant-head vases, and some, if not all, of those on the potpourri vases show evidence of multiple repairs. The choice of gilt bronze for the candle sockets on the wall sconces reflects the more straightforward functional role of these objects.

Despite the intended usefulness of the wall sconces, they are first and foremost objects of extraordinary luxury, which derive at least some of their sumptuous quality from the implausibility of their medium for their purpose. It appears that the factory produced relatively few pairs, perhaps due to the technical challenges involved in making them. It has been suggested by Marie-Laure de Rochebrune that approximately twenty pairs were sold between 1761 and 1768, by
which date their overtly rococo quality would have been largely out of fashion. The sconces were priced at substantial sums that ranged from 300 livres to 480 livres per pair, which made them roughly comparable in price to many of the midsize vases produced by the factory. From the factory’s sale records it is clear that this model found favor with Louis XV (1710–1774), king of France, and his mistress, Madame de Pompadour (1721–1764). The latter purchased a pair of wall sconces in green and gold for 384 livres in 1761, and Louis XV acquired five pairs with a green ground for a total of 1,920 livres the following year. The after-death inventory of Madame de Pompadour’s belongings indicates that she owned at least one other pair, which is today in the Musée du Louvre, Paris. This pair is distinguished by the use of three ground colors (pink, green, and dark blue), which makes them the most elaborately decorated of the known surviving wall sconces. The color scheme was intended to harmonize with a garniture of five vases that Madame de Pompadour kept in the bedroom of her Paris residence, the Hôtel d’Évreux, which is described in the inventory previously cited.

Six pairs of Sèvres wall sconces are known to exist today, and two pairs are in the collections of the Museum. One pair is decorated with a turquoise (bleu céleste) ground; the other has a green ground (fig. 47). Rochebrune has suggested that this latter pair is the one purchased by Madame de Pompadour in 1761, which she kept in the grand cabinet in her Château de Ménars. While the Museum’s green sconces correspond in terms of decoration to those listed among Madame de Pompadour’s purchases in the sales records, it is
difficult to know if this pair originally belonged to her, to Louis XV, or to an unknown buyer. It appears that the gilt-bronze candle sockets on both pairs now in the Museum are replacements. While unlikely that any of the wall sconces initially had drip pans in addition to sockets, the ornately cast, gilt-bronze additions to the green-ground sconces dramatically alter their proportions. The attenuated leaf-shaped sockets on the bleu céleste sconces are probably closer to the design of the original mounts, but this is a matter of conjecture. The gilt-bronze candle sockets now found on the five pairs of published wall sconces vary considerably, making it difficult to ascertain which, if any, might be original.

Although few pairs of Sèvres wall sconces survive, they provide striking examples of Duplessis’s extraordinary creativity and the factory’s ambition to produce works that expanded the repertory of forms for which porcelain could be employed. The sconces also speak eloquently to the intense interest in furnishings, luxury goods, and interior architecture that established France as the preeminent influence on design in eighteenth-century Europe.

1 Pierre Ennès in Musée du Louvre 1990, pp. 182–84, no. 86.
2 See Gérard Mabille in Alcouffe, Dion-Tenenbaum, and Mabille 2004, p. 56, no. 20; Baarsen 2013, pp. 144–51, nos. 31, 32.
3 On MMA 58.75.65, 66, the graduated oval motifs executed in gold that decorate both sides of the central spine must be derived from similar motifs commonly found in French gilt bronze of the mid-eighteenth century; see Baarsen 2013, p. 143.
5 Eriksen and Bellaigue 1987, p. 320, no. 133.
6 This is true on the pair in the Museum (58.75.94, 95), and on the pair in the J. Paul Getty Museum, Los Angeles (Sassoon 1991, p. 42, no. 9).
8 Ennès in Musée du Louvre 1990, p. 184.
9 Archives, Cité de la Céramique, Sèvres, Vy 3, fol. 85.
10 Archives, Cité de la Céramique, Sèvres, Vy 3, fol. 114.
14 The posthumous inventory of Madame de Pompadour describes the gilt-bronze component simply as “trois bobèches de cuivre doré d’or moulu . . .” without further details (Cordey 1939, p. 158, no. 1942).
15 The author has not examined any of the sconces outside the Museum at close hand.
16 In addition to the pair at the Musée du Louvre, Paris, and the two pairs at the Museum, there is a pair in the Musée Nissim de Camondo, Paris, with a dark-blue ground (Gasc and Mabille 1991, ill. p. 83), and a pair in the Victoria and Albert Museum, London, with a green and dark-blue ground (467&A-1895). A sixth pair, with a turquoise ground, was listed as being in a private Parisian collection in 1964 (Carl Christian Dauterman in Parker, Standen, and Dauterman 1964, p. 214).

fig. 47 Wall Sconce (Bras de cheminée) (one of a pair), ca. 1761. Sèvres factory, French, 1756–present. Model attributed to Jean-Claude Duplessis (Italian, ca. 1695–1774). Soft-paste porcelain decorated in polychrome enamel and gold, gilt bronze, 17 × 10 1/2 in. (43.2 × 26.7 cm). The Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York, Gift of Samuel H. Kress Foundation, 1958 (58.75.65)
62. Vase (Cuvette à fleurs Courteille)

**SÈVRES FACTORY, FRENCH, 1756–PRESENT**

Charles-Nicolas Dodin (French, 1734–1803)

1762

Soft-paste porcelain decorated in polychrome enamels and gold

5¼ x 9¼ x 5¼ in. (15.1 x 25.2 x 13.5 cm)

Gift of R. Thornton Wilson, in memory of Florence Ellsworth Wilson, 1954 54.147.24

**MARKS:** painted on underside: interlaced LLs enclosing date letter I (for year 1762), painter’s mark K (for Charles-Nicolas Dodin), all in blue enamel

**CONSTRUCTION/CONDITION:** molded; crack across base, some abrasion to gilding

**PROVENANCE:** Prince Anatole Demidov, husband of Jerome Bonaparte’s daughter Mathilde (in 1840); [his sale, Prince Anatole Demidov, Villa of San Donato, March 15, 1880, and following days, no. 462); private collection, France (sold to Bensimon); [Gaston Bensimon, New York, before 1954; sold to R. Thornton Wilson]; R. Thornton Wilson (until 1954; to MMA)


**THIS FLOWER VASE BELONGS TO A SMALL GROUP OF OBJECTS MADE at Sèvres, which share a very particular type of chinoiserie decoration that distinguishes them from other Sèvres porcelain executed in the chinoiserie taste. All of these works are either marked by the painter Charles-Nicolas Dodin (French, 1734–1803) or securely attributable to him due to the highly distinctive style of painting. Dodin’s chinoiserie scenes are executed with a remarkable precision and painterly skill that are unlike any of the work practiced by his contemporaries at the factory, and the singular quality of these objects has made them the study of numerous articles.1**

Dodin’s chinoiseries appear to have been painted during a four-year period (1760–63) only, and twenty-seven works by him in this style have been identified.2 Factory sales records indicate that fifteen of these pieces were acquired by Madame de Pompadour (1721–1764) and five by King Louis XV (1710–1774), indicating the popularity of Dodin’s work in this vein at the French court. Many of the factory’s more exuberant and expensive models were chosen for Dodin to decorate in this style, such as the pair of potpourri vases (pot-pourri fontaine) at the J. Paul Getty Museum, Los Angeles,3 a pair of elephant-head vases (vase à tête d’éléphant) at the Walters Art Museum, Baltimore,4 and four vases and a clock forming a garniture now divided between the Musée du Louvre, Paris, and the Walters Art Museum.5

By contrast, the design of the Museum’s flower vase is quite restrained. Its form is basically rectangular, with shaped panels forming the short sides and four C-scrolls serving as feet. This model was termed a cuvette à fleurs Courteille at Sèvres, named for Louis XV’s minister in charge of the factory, Jacques Dominique de Barberi (1696–1767), marquis de Courteille. The French title for the vase indicates that it was intended for flowers, but those flowers might have been either natural or made of soft-paste porcelain, one of the factory’s earliest specialities developed at Vincennes in the years 1746–47 (entry 56). However, the decorative element provided by real or porcelain flowers was clearly secondary to the impact of the richness of the painted decoration itself. The reserve on the front of the vase depicts a Chinese woman with a child standing just inside a building open to a garden where a second Chinese woman and child converse with them.6 All elements of the composition are rendered with elaborate detail and a striking emphasis on pattern; the robes of the women and children, the trees, and the architectural elements are depicted with a richness of motifs rarely encountered in the finest painting found on Sèvres porcelain. The reserve is also notable for having a surface that is entirely painted with no white porcelain left visible. This is in contrast to many of the chinoiserie scenes painted by Dodin in which the Chinese figures
are silhouetted against the white porcelain,\(^7\) and it has been observed that Dodin’s work in this genre can be subdivided into phases in which the fully painted surface represents the final one.\(^8\) A pair of flower vases (vase hollandois nouvelle forme) in the Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam, with four reserves painted by Dodin in this manner bear the date letter for 1763,\(^9\) reinforcing the supposition that the densely painted reserves reflect the final phase of his chinoiserie style.

The sources for a number of Dodin’s chinoiseries lie in the prints of Gabriel Huquier (French, 1695–1772) executed after works by François Boucher (French, 1703–1770),\(^10\) but the sources for scenes, such as that on the Museum’s cuvette, the Rijksmuseum’s vases, and the other similarly painted reserves, remain elusive. It has been suggested persuasively that these compositions do not appear to be a French evocation of a Chinese scene but rather are Chinese in character, indicating that Dodin had access to original Chinese works. Both Chinese porcelain made for export and Chinese enamels have been cited as possible sources, and examples in both media exist that exhibit the same minutely detailed, highly patterned painting style that characterizes Dodin’s work in this manner.\(^11\) In addition, Dodin’s extensive use of black line to define all elements of the composition is typical of Chinese painting on both porcelain and enamel of the Yongzheng period (1723–35) and early Qianlong period (1736–95). The distinctive palette of Dodin’s “late” chinoiseries, which employs vibrant colors, surprising juxtapositions, and extremely subtle shading, does not readily reveal whether Chinese export porcelains or enamels were the most probable source, as Dodin’s palette has affinities with each. The number of enamel colors used by Dodin is unusually large, and Reinier Baarsen has indicated that he may have developed a palette specifically for these chinoiserie scenes.\(^12\) All of the porcelains painted by Dodin in this manner are also decorated with reserves of stylized flowers on the reverse side, and the extreme stylization of these floral compositions clearly indicates that they were intended to be read as “Chinese.” Both the highly linear quality of the flowers and the distinctive palette ally them stylistically with the chinoiserie scenes on the other side. In the case of the Museum’s cuvette, the nonnaturalistic painted flowers would have created a surprising juxtaposition with the flowers, real or porcelain, contained within the vase.

It has been noted by Baarsen that most of Dodin’s chinoiseries are found on pieces of Sèvres porcelain decorated with striking ground colors and/or patterns, some of which were rarely used.\(^13\) The Museum’s cuvette has a ground known at the factory as rose marbré (marbled pink) that is created by painting a dense arrangement of irregular abstract shapes in blue and carmine over a pink ground, with small gilt dots in the interstices. The same distinctive ground treatment is found on a pair of vases of a different shape, known
as a cuvette Mahon, in the British Museum, London, which are also decorated with chinoiserie scenes and stylized flowers painted by Dodin. These vases are the only other known ones with the same decorative scheme for both the reserves and the ground similar to that found on the Museum’s vase, and it is likely that the three originally formed a garniture, especially due to the fact the three share the same date letter indicating the year 1762. Because the three vases are very similar in height, they would have formed an unconventional garniture, though there may have been two additional vases of greater height with related decoration, now lost. However, even the two British Museum vases and the Museum’s vase displayed together would have conveyed an extraordinary visual richness in which some of the finest painting ever executed at Sèvres was set off by a ground decoration reflecting the startling originality that characterized the factory’s production in the 1760s.

1. This group was most recently published in Rochebrune 2012, pp. 79–81, 84–95, nos. 26–32, pp. 98–99, no. 34. Other studies include Dauterman 1966; Freyberger 1970–71; Préaud 1989b; Baarsen 2013, pp. 300–305, no. 73.
2. Rochebrune 2012, p. 79.
4. Rochebrune 2012, p. 81, fig. 1.
5. See Rochebrune 2000, p. 528, pl. ix. The pair of vases pots-pourris à feuillage are in the Walters Art Museum, Baltimore, and the potpourri vases (pots-pourris à bobèches) and the clock (pendule de Romilly) are in the Musée du Louvre, Paris.
6. The mother and child on the right of the composition are repeated with variations on a pot-pouri à bobèche of around 1762 now in the Musée du Louvre (OA 11307).
7. For example, the pair of potpourri vases (pot-pouri triangle) in the Detroit Institute of Arts; see Clare Le Corbeiller in Detroit Institute of Arts 1996, pp. 156–58, no. 41.
13. Ibid. The most notable of these are the two elephant-head vases in the Walters Art Museum, which employ pink, green, and turquoise ground colors; see Rochebrune 2012, p. 81, fig. 1.
15. The suggestion was made both by Rosalind Savill (1988, vol. 1, p. 45) and by Marie-Laure de Rochebrune (2012, p. 80).
63. Plaque (Tableau)

SEVRES FACTORY, FRENCH, 1756–PRESENT
Charles-Nicolas Dodin (French, 1734–1803)
1761
Soft-paste porcelain decorated in polychrome enamels
9 ⁷⁄₈ × 7 ⁹⁄₁₆ in. (25.1 × 19.2 cm)
Gift of R. Thornton Wilson, in memory of Florence Ellsworth Wilson, 1954 54.147.19

MARKS: painted on back: interlaced LLs enclosing date letter H (for year 1761), painter’s mark K (for Charles-Nicolas Dodin), both in blue enamel; painted over the interlaced LLs: 1761/Dodin in purple enamel

CONSTRUCTION/CONDITION: molded; abraded at upper left edge, chip in upper rim on back

PROVENANCE: possibly Baron Max von Goldschmidt-Rothschild; [Rosenberg and Stiebel, New York]; R. Thornton Wilson (until 1954; to MMA)


In the late 1750s, the Sèvres factory began producing plaques to be mounted as decoration on pieces of furniture, and this novel use of porcelain must have given rise to the idea of creating plaques as independent works of art that could function as wall paintings. Producing a flat piece of soft-paste porcelain to serve as a “canvas” was more technically challenging than it might first appear, due to the significant possibility of warping during the kiln firing. The decision to create paintings on porcelain suggests that the factory’s administrators must have felt great confidence in its most skilled painters and with its kiln masters, for every aspect of the production of these painted plaques required enormous technical skill.

The Sèvres factory archives make a distinction between the plaques produced to be applied to furniture and those intended to be sold as independent paintings. The latter are recorded as tableaux, the French term for picture or painting, in contrast to the plaques destined to decorate pieces of furniture. It is possible that this tableau was the first to be produced at Sèvres, as it is marked on the reverse with the date letter H indicating the year 1761, as well as 1761 written as an integral part of the factory mark of interlaced LLs. The factory records indicate that a plaque entered the glaze kiln in October 1760, and it is likely that this same plaque was purchased by Madame de Pompadour (1721–1764) in December 1761. A second plaque, described as a “tableau avec Portrait du Roy,” was sold on the same date to Étienne-François de Choiseul (1719–1785), and there is every indication that these were the first two tableaux produced by the factory.

The back of the plaque also bears the painter’s mark for Charles-Nicolas Dodin (French, 1734–1803), and he has also incorporated his last name within the factory mark just below the upper juncture of the LLs. Dodin signed a number of his tableaux in this manner, but many were marked simply with the more conventional date letter and painter’s mark. It is tempting to speculate that Dodin understood that his work on this plaque, probably his first, reflected a significant achievement, and therefore, he included his name and the year to mark his accomplishment.

For the composition on this plaque, Dodin has selected elements from a painting entitled La Halte de chasseurs (The Hunters’ Rest), by the Flemish artist Carel (Charles-André) van Falens (1683–1733). This painting, now in the Musée du Louvre, Paris, was one of two presentation pieces (morceaux de réception) submitted by Van Falens in 1726 in order to gain admission to the Académie Royale de Peinture et de Sculpture, Paris. Dodin has focused his composition on one figural grouping from the larger painting, and he has eliminated one figure and substituted another from a different section of Van Falens’s work. The reasons for Dodin’s alterations to the composition are not immediately
clear, though the reduced compositional focus may be explained by the vertical format of the porcelain plaque in contrast to the horizontal format of the painting. Dodin returned to Van Falens's composition on at least four other occasions to decorate both plaques and vases. The substitution of the figures is found only on the Museum's plaque; Van Falens's original grouping of the seated woman with figures in attendance is found on a Sèvres vase (pot-pourri Hébert) of 1762 at Waddesdon Manor, Buckinghamshire, England, a vase (pot-pourri feuilles de mirte) from around 1762 at the Huntington Library, Art Collections, and Botanical Gardens, San Marino, California, and on a plaque mounted on an early nineteenth-century fall-front secretary. Another plaque with the same scene, now serving as the top of an early nineteenth-century table, is reputed to be at Syon Park, Middlesex, England.

The similarity of the compositions on the two vases and the three plaques, despite the minor variation on the Museum's example, raises the question of the source used by Dodin and the painters of the other two works. Since the orientation of the figures on all of the Sèvres porcelain matches those found on Van Falens's painting, it is likely that the painting, which was in the collection of the Académie Royale de Peinture et de Sculpture, was made available to the factory for copying. However, the palette used by the painters at Sèvres for the figures' clothing varies on each object, and none reproduces exactly the palette used in the oil painting, making this supposition difficult to prove.

The majority of the plaques painted by Dodin to serve as tableaux during the 1760s and 1770s had their source in paintings by other artists or in prints made after those paintings. Some of Dodin's tableaux derived from works by contemporary artists.
French artists, such as Carle (Charles-André) Vanloo (1705–1765) or Jean-Baptiste Marie Pierre (1714–1789), while others were based upon prints after paintings by popular Dutch and Flemish artists, such as Van Falens, whose work was prized in France in the eighteenth century. On at least two occasions, however, Dodin originated his own compositions, and both of these record intimate domestic scenes. Several of Dodin's tableaux served as royal gifts, indicating the esteem in which these porcelain paintings were held, but it was King Louis XVI's (1754–1793) order in 1779 for nine tableaux to decorate the dining room in his private apartments at Versailles that fully reflects the prestige accorded to these paintings on porcelain. Dodin was assigned two of the nine plaques, all of which were based on designs by the French artist Jean-Baptiste Oudry (1686–1755) that had been created to serve as cartoons (painted designs) for tapestries woven at the Gobelins manufactory in Paris. The very substantial cost of 24,000 livres for the nine plaques and their prominent placement on the walls of Louis XVI's private dining room attest to the achievement of the Sèvres factory in radically expanding the boundaries of the role of porcelain.

1 Daniel Alcouffe in Sources du design 2014, pp. 166–69, no. 46.
3 The subject matter of the plaque was not specified; Savill 2002b, p. 429.
4 Eriksen and Bellaique 1987, p. 130.
5 The second plaque can be identified with the one now in the State Hermitage Museum, Saint Petersburg, Rochebrune 2012, pp. 168–69, no. 69.
6 See, for example, ibid., pp. 180–81, no. 75.
7 Ibid., p. 166, no. 67.
8 Eriksen 1968, pp. 144–47, no. 51.
10 Sotheby's 1992, no. 306. The plaque was not able to be removed from its mount, but the author of the entry for the lot in the sale catalogue assumes that it dates from the 1760s and was painted by Dodin. It is not known when the plaque was added to the secretary.
11 Ibid., p. 210, under no. 306. The author has not found an illustration of this plaque. An undated note by Clare Le Corbeiller in the curatorial files, Department of European Sculpture and Decorative Arts, The Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York, lists the dimensions of the Syon plaque as 11 × 17 in. (27.9 × 43.2 cm) and remarks on the similarity of the composition of the left half of the plaque to that of the Museum's example, though the former does not include the architectural element of MMA 54.147.19. Le Corbeiller indicates that she believed the Syon plaque was not painted by Dodin.
12 The vase in the Huntington is unmarked, and the marks, if any, on the plaque mounted in the secretary are not known, so the painters are not readily identifiable.
13 The Museum's plaque and the vase at Waddesdon Manor, the two works known to have been painted by Dodin, share a very similar palette.
14 It has been suggested that Dodin copied a print by Jean Moyreau (French, 1690–1762) made after Van Falens's painting (Rochebrune 2012, p. 164), but it is unlikely that Dodin would have reversed the figures' orientation in the print to that found in the original work.
15 Ibid., pp. 173–75, no. 72.
16 Ibid., pp. 178–79, no. 74.
18 Ibid., p. 184, no. 78, p. 185, no. 79.
64. Pair of covered vases (Vase en tour)

SÈVRES FACTORY, FRENCH, 1756–PRESENT
ca. 1763
Soft-paste porcelain decorated in polychrome enamels and gold
.1a–c: 20 ¾ × 8 ⅞ × 8 ⅞ in. (51.3 × 21.1 × 21.1 cm)
.2a–c: 20 ¹⁄₈ × 8 ¼ × 7 ⁷⁄₈ in. (51.1 × 21 × 20 cm)
Gift of R. Thornton Wilson, in memory of Florence Ellsworth Wilson, 1956 56.80.1a–c, .2a–c

MARKS: unmarked

CONSTRUCTION/CONDITION: both molded; gilded band at base abraded on each; .2a–c: extensive repairs to gallery

PROVENANCE: Baroness Mathilde de Rothschild, Grüneburg Castle, Frankfurt am Main; Baron Albert von Goldschmidt-Rothschild, Grüneburg Castle, Frankfurt am Main (until 1933; sale, Hermann Ball & Paul Graupe, Berlin, March 14, 1933, no. 106); [Duveen Brothers (1934–before 1955; sold to R. Thornton Wilson)]; R. Thornton Wilson (until 1956; to MMA)


The repertory of vase forms developed at the Sévres factory during the eighteenth century was unmatched among contemporary European porcelain manufactories. New models of vases were in continuous production, reflecting the factory’s ongoing quest for innovation. While the forms of tablewares rarely changed due to the cost of introducing new models for different services, vases served as the factory’s vehicle for reflecting current fashions.

This model of vase in the form of a fortified tower must rank among the most original and unexpected of all the types of vases produced at Sévres, and it is the most specifically architectural in concept. In the shape of a round tower, the vase is modeled with arched buttresses, an openwork balustrade, and a high-domed lid surmounted by a cupola with four projecting dormer windows. The lid is modeled to suggest overlapping tiles that are delineated by crescent-shaped perforations. Beneath the arched buttresses are alternating projecting cannons and circular openings.¹

Known in the Sévres factory records as both pot-pourri entouré and, with different spelling, vase entouré,² the model for this extraordinary if slightly eccentric tower vase was introduced in 1762. Only one other pair of tower vases, now commonly known by the French title vase en tour, exists and resides in The Huntington Library, Art Collections, and Botanical Gardens in San Marino, California (fig. 48).³ As both pairs of vases are decorated with military trophies, it is tempting to link these vases, and indeed the model itself, to a specific military event. The Museum’s vases are not marked, and the date letter on the Huntington vases, while abraded, has been interpreted as 1762. The Huntington vases are known to have been sold as part of a garniture in 1763,⁴ which allows the Museum’s vases to be dated to approximately the same year. It has not been possible to connect either pair of vases with a patron or with a military campaign, which would have taken place at least one year before the Huntington vases were sold, due to the length of time it took to bring a new model into production.⁵ Despite the reasonable supposition that both sets of vases might have been made as gifts for a military hero or to commemorate a specific battle, no plausible candidate or event has come to light.

If the impetus behind the creation of these vases remains elusive, it is clear that they were intended to be unusually ambitious in terms of both form and decoration.⁶ The scale of the vases, and the complex modeling of the lids in particular, reflects the remarkable technical mastery achieved by the factory workers by the early 1760s. Most notably, the perforation of the lids, in order to allow the vases to serve as potpourris, is evidence of the level of skill attained by those employed in the modeling workshop (detail, left). The series of...
crescent-shaped cuts in each lid would have been made while they were in the so-called leather-hard state, in which the unfired clay had started to dry but was still malleable. Had the cuts been too large, the lids might have collapsed either before firing or in the kiln itself, and there is no evidence of warping or distortion.

The quality of the painted decoration is equally impressive. The body of each vase is painted with trophies, alternating and linked by floral garlands. The term “trophy” refers to an assemblage of motifs arranged decoratively that symbolize or refer to a specific subject, and this type of decoration was frequently employed at the factory. While most of the trophies on Sèvres vases are used for the secondary reserve, located on the back of the vase, they form the primary decoration on the Museum’s vases, as well as on those at the Huntington. The six trophies on the two New York vases are composed of a variety of arms and armor, including helmets, shields, quivers of arrows, a sword, and scabbard. The trophies also incorporate a number of less-common motifs related to military endeavors, such as maps, plans, measuring implements, and a shield with the crescent of Turkey. While it is tempting to try to discern a specific iconographical program conveyed by the trophies, it is more likely that the trophies were selected without regard to a larger overall significance. At least three of the trophies are adaptations of compositions conceived by Jean-Charles Delafosse (French, 1734–1789), and engraved by Pierre François Tardieu (French, 1711–1771). Entitled Attributs de Guerre (Attributes of war), Tardieu’s prints appear to have been in circulation by the early 1760s, even though they were not published until the second half of the 1770s, and it is possible that the additional three trophies on the Museum’s vases also have their source in works by Delafosse. Delafosse was an extremely prolific designer of various types of ornament, and his compositions for trophies that symbolize a wide range of subjects were widely available through prints. On the Museum’s vases, the trophies derived from the three prints after Delafosse have been altered and simplified, and it appears that the painter at Sèvres used elements from Delafosse’s compositions selectively without aiming for fidelity to the original source.

In contrast to the Huntington vases, there is no record in the factory sales records that the Museum vases were sold, and it appears that they remained at the factory. It is highly probable that they can be identified as the pair of vases entourrés vert, guirlandes et attributs still listed in the factory inventory of January 1, 1774, and it has not been possible to trace their history after this date. These highly original and architectural vases may have been perceived as too unconventional in comparison to other vases produced by Sèvres during this period to have enticed a buyer.

1 See the more extensive description of this model by Jeffrey Weaver in Bennett and Sargentson 2008, pp. 211–22.
2 Ibid., p. 221.
3 Weaver in ibid., pp. 221–24, no. 87.
4 The Huntington vases were sold with a vase decorated with goats’ heads (vase à tête de bouc); see Weaver in ibid., pp. 218–21, no. 86.
5 See Weaver’s discussion of the Seven Years’ War (1756–63) in connection with the Huntington vases; ibid., p. 222.
6 The Huntington vases were listed at the substantial price of 600 livres each in the factory sales records in April 1763 (ibid., p. 221); the Museum’s vases were valued at 432 livres each in 1773 (see note 11 below).
7 Maureen Cassidy-Geiger appears to have been the first to connect the trophies on the Museum’s vases with prints after Delafosse (notes, curatorial files, Department of European Sculpture and Decorative Arts, The Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York). See Oeuvre de Delafosse 1907, vol. 1, pls. 93, 95. vol. 4, pl. 37.
8 The chronology of prints executed after Delafosse and their publication dates are both uncertain and complex; see Laing 2006.
9 Similar military trophies engraved by Tardieu after compositions by Delafosse were published as Attributs Militaires.
10 In contrast, the trophies after compositions by Delafosse that decorate a pair of vases in the British Royal Collection reflect only relatively minor changes; see Bellaigue 2009, vol. 1, pp. 179–83. Bellaigue suggests that the trophies may have been painted by either Charles Buteux (French, 1719–1782), Louis-Gabriel Chulot (French, 1736–1824), or possibly Jean-Louis Morin (French, 1732–1787). Bellaigue 2009, vol. 1, p. 151.
11 Brunet and Préaud 1978, p. 78, pl. xxx. At this time the vases were valued at 432 livres each.
65. Tea service (Déjeuner Duplessis)

SÈVRES FACTORY, FRENCH, 1756–PRESENT
François-Joseph Aloncle (French, 1734–1781)
1767
Soft-paste porcelain decorated in polychrome enamels and gold

(A) TEA POT (THÉIÈRE CALABRE)
4⅛ × 5¾ × 3¼ in. (10.5 × 13.5 × 7.9 cm)
Gift of Irwin Untermyer, 1964.64.101.361a, b

MARKS: painted on underside: interlaced LLs enclosing date letter O (for year 1767), painter’s mark N (for François-Joseph Aloncle), both in blue enamel

CONSTRUCTION/CONDITION: molded; repair to tip of spout

(B) SUGAR BOWL (POT À SUCRE HEBERT)
3⅛ × 2⅞ × 2⅜ in. (9.2 × 7.1 × 7.1 cm)
Gift of Irwin Untermyer, 1964.64.101.362a, b

MARKS: painted on underside: interlaced LLs enclosing date letter O (for year 1767), painter’s mark N (for François-Joseph Aloncle), both in blue enamel

CONSTRUCTION/CONDITION: molded

(C) MILK JUG (POT À LAIT À TROIS PIÉDS)
3¼ × 3¼ × 2½ in. (7.9 × 8.6 × 6.4 cm)
Gift of Irwin Untermyer, 1964.64.101.363

MARKS: unmarked

CONSTRUCTION/CONDITION: molded

(D) CUP AND SAUCER (GOBLET HEBERT ET SOUCOÛPE)
.364: 2¼ × 3¼ × 2⅝ in. (5.4 × 8.3 × 6.7 cm)
.365: 1⅛ × 4⅛ × 4¼ in. (3 × 12.4 × 12.4 cm)
Gift of Irwin Untermyer, 1964.64.101.364, .365

MARKS: .364: painted on underside: interlaced LLs enclosing date letter O (for year 1767), painter’s mark N (for François-Joseph Aloncle), both in blue enamel; .365: painted on underside: interlaced LLs enclosing date letter O (for year 1767), painter’s mark N (for François-Joseph Aloncle), both in blue enamel

INSCRIPTIONS: .364: incised on underside: £; .365: incised on underside: £

CONSTRUCTION/CONDITION: molded

(E) CUP AND SAUCER (GOBLET HEBERT ET SOUCOÛPE)
.366: 2¾ × 3¼ × 2½ in. (5.4 × 8.3 × 6.7 cm)
.367: 1⅛ × 4⅛ × 4¼ in. (3 × 12.4 × 12.4 cm)
Gift of Irwin Untermyer, 1964.64.101.366, .367

MARKS: .366: painted on underside: interlaced LLs enclosing date letter O (for year 1767), painter’s mark N (for François-Joseph Aloncle), both in blue enamel; .367: painted on underside: interlaced LLs enclosing date letter O (for year 1767), painter’s mark N (for François-Joseph Aloncle), both in blue enamel

INSCRIPTIONS: .366: incised on underside: oo; .367: incised on underside: £

CONSTRUCTION/CONDITION: molded

(F) TRAY (PLATEAU DUPLESSIS)
1¾ × 12¼ × ¾ in. (4.4 × 32 × 2.3 cm)
Gift of Irwin Untermyer, 1964.64.101.368

MARKS: painted on underside: interlaced LLs enclosing date letter O (for year 1767), painter’s mark N (for François-Joseph Aloncle), both in blue enamel

INSCRIPTIONS: incised on underside: PJ; FR

CONSTRUCTION/CONDITION: molded

PROVENANCE: (sale, Christie’s, London, January 18, 1901, no. 65; probably this service, sold to Harding); Harding (in 1901); Otway (until about 1918; sale, American Art Association, New York); Irwin Untermyer (by 1956–64; to MMA)


LITERATURE: probably Christie’s 1901, no. 65; Hackenbroch 1956, p. 234, fig. 221, pl. 146; Savill 1988, vol. 2, p. 569, n. 24, under nos. C374–C376; Linda H. Roth in Roth and Le Corbeiller 2000, p. 199, n. 9, under no. 93
BIRDS WERE DEPICTED ON VINCENNES AND THEN SÈVRES

porcelain from the earliest years of production at Vincennes, but they were painted as fanciful creations and employed as decorative elements with no concern for fidelity to actual birds. Most of these early painted creatures had little delineation and their coloring was entirely arbitrary. It was not until the late 1760s that the painters at Sèvres began depicting birds that were accurate representations of those found in nature, rendered with specificity and accurate coloration. The impetus for this change was the availability of hand-colored etchings of birds published in George Edwards’s (British, 1694–1773) A Natural History of Birds (1743–51) and his Gleanings of Natural History, issued in a series of volumes between 1747 and 1764.¹ The first pieces of Sèvres porcelain decorated with birds copied from Edwards’s prints were produced for Charles Lennox (1735–1806), 3rd Duke of Richmond, who had lent his own copies of Edwards’s volumes to the factory to serve as models.² A dessert and tea service with ornithological decoration derived from Edwards’s works was completed in 1766 for Richmond initiating a fashion for this new type of bird painting that was to last only a relatively short time.

The most ambitious of the bird painting produced at Sèvres in the 1760s is found on a dessert service made for the Russian Count Kyril Razumovsky (1728–1803).³ Produced in 1767, the service comprised 108 pieces that included plates, bowls of different shapes, footed stands, sugar bowls, bottle and glass coolers, and ice cream cups, each of which was decorated with at least one reserve of a bird in an abbreviated landscape, with some of the larger pieces in the service having more elaborate compositions with two birds. Five of the seven volumes of Edwards’s Natural History and Gleanings were used as sources by the painters at Sèvres.⁴ A distinguishing feature of the Razumovsky service is the presence of inscriptions in black enamel on the underside of each piece indicating the name of the bird depicted and, in most instances, the part of the world in which it lived. This eighteenth-century interest in the actual species and their habitat was a reflection of the Enlightenment’s preoccupation with understanding the natural world, and the exotic origins of many of Edwards’s subjects further enhanced the appeal of this subject matter.

The substantial effort required to inscribe the names of the birds and their origin on the undersides of objects with bird paintings must have proved too time-consuming and thus too costly for the factory, and not all of the Sèvres porcelain decorated with birds after Edwards have this identification. Most of the works made at the factory with this type of ornithological decoration are wares for dinner
services, but at least three tea services painted in this manner are known. The earliest of these tea services was produced for Richmond, cited above, and two were produced in 1767, including the Museum’s tea service.5

A source in Edwards has not yet been identified for the various birds depicted on the Museum’s service, but the format of each reserve on the tea wares closely follows the one established by the decoration on the Razumovsky service. A bird, usually depicted in profile, rests on a tree branch, and the tree’s leaves are carefully placed so as not to obscure the bird’s features.6 Additional vegetation is included to suggest a landscape, with the scale of the reserve determining the amount of detail. A single bird is painted on each of the components of the tea service with the exception of the tray, which depicts three birds in one of the more elaborate compositions to be found within the entire genre of bird painting after Edwards as practiced at Sèvres. All the pieces in the tea service, excluding the milk jug, bear the mark of François-Joseph Aloncle (French, 1734–1781), one of the most accomplished bird painters at the factory. Aloncle was one of four Sèvres painters specializing in birds who worked on the Razumovsky service, and his decoration of the tea service must have been more or less simultaneous with his work on the Razumovsky objects. The quality of Aloncle’s bird painting varied in the course of his long career at Sèvres,7 but the reserves on this tea service represent some of his finest work. Aloncle’s painting is effectively enhanced by the unusual treatment of the ground used for the service. Composed of overlapping scales painted in dark blue and gold on a pale blue ground, the resulting pattern achieves a tonality that perfectly complements the artist’s cool palette. In addition, the scales suggest stylized peacock feathers, subtly reinforcing the subject matter of the reserves. This type of ground decoration was used rarely at Sèvres,8 perhaps because it would have been so costly to create in terms of labor. On all the pieces of the service, the scales are graduated in size to align with the changing proportions of each component. This is particularly noticeable on the tray where the scales increase in size as they spread toward the rim, skilfully accommodating the tray’s undulating profile.

Linda H. Roth has persuasively argued that this model of tea service was called a Déjeuner Duplessis at the factory,9 where the name of the model of the tray was applied to the tea service itself. While there is no documentary evidence to prove that Duplessis designed the tray, its sinuous, undulating profile and its subtly twisting handles create a sense of movement and a sculptural presence that are hallmarks of the factory’s prodigiously talented designer of three-dimensional models.

1 For a thorough exploration of this subject, see S. Schwartz 2005.
3 The service, its production, and its history are explored at length in S. Schwartz 2005.
4 Ibid., p. 17.
5 The second is a tea service comprising a teapot, sugar bowl, milk jug, and four cups and saucers with decoration by Antoine-Joseph Chappuis (French, active 1761–87) in the Frick Collection, New York (18.9.21–18.9.31).
7 Aloncle was active at Sèvres from 1758 to 1781; Peters 2005, vol. 1, p. 15.
8 The most ambitious examples of Sèvres porcelain with this ground known to the author are three vases composing a garniture in the Victoria and Albert Museum, London (171-1879, 172&A-1879); other examples include a tea service in Ader Tajan/Hôtel George V, Paris, sale cat., November 18, 1992, no. 62; a tray in Christie’s, New York, sale cat., October 21, 2005, no. 140; a cup and saucer in Christie’s, New York, sale cat., October 21–22, 2010, no. 625. A closely related ground was used for a tea service in the State Hermitage Museum, Saint Petersburg; Biriukova and Kazakevich 2005, pp. 300–302, nos. 1148–51.
9 Linda H. Roth in Roth and Le Corbeiller 2000, pp. 197–99.
66. Tureen and stand (Terrine épis de blé or épis en or et plateau)

SÈVRES FACTORY, FRENCH, 1756–PRESENT
François-Antoine Pfeiffer (French, active 1771–1800)
Nicolas Sinsson (French, active 1773–1795)
Gilded by Henri-François Vincent (active 1753–1806)
ca. 1777
Hard-paste porcelain decorated in polychrome enamels and gold.

.3a, b (tureen): 13 3/4 x 16 1/4 x 11 3/4 in. (35 x 41.6 x 29.5 cm)
.4 (stand): 3 x 24 1/4 x 18 1/16 in. (7.6 x 61.6 x 47 cm)

The F. O. Matthiessen Collection, Gift of Mrs. Emma Matthiessen, in memory of her husband, 1904. 04.6.3a, b .4

MARKS: .3a, b: painted on underside: crowned foliate interlaced LSs, letter F (painter’s mark for François-Antoine Pfeiffer) and 2000 (gilder’s mark for Henri-François Vincent) below, both in gold; painted on underside: 322 (possibly 239), in red enamel. .4: painted on underside: crowned foliate interlaced LSs with laurel wreath (painter’s mark for Nicolas Sinsson) and 2000 (gilder’s mark for Henri-François Vincent) below, in gold; painted on underside: N333, in red enamel.

CONSTRUCTION/CONDITION: both molded; .3a, b: very slight wear to gilding throughout.

PROVENANCE: F. O. Matthiessen; Emma Matthiessen (until 1904; to MMA).


DINING ETIQUETTE IN EIGHTEENTH-CENTURY FRENCH Aristocratic households required the table to be set with an array of serving dishes arranged in a decorative pattern. The diners helped themselves from the dishes and vessels close at hand, and servants reset the table for each course. This style of dining, in which all the components of a course were displayed on the table rather than presented by servants to the diners, was known as the service à la française (service in the French manner), as the custom was codified in France in the seventeenth century. It became the dominant mode of fashionable dining in Europe until the early nineteenth century, when it was supplanted by the service à la Russe (service in the Russian manner), in which the guests no longer served themselves but rather were waited upon by servants.

An important component of the first course of a dinner was commonly a stew or a soup, and the tureens in which they were served were the most prominent feature of the table setting. The imposing scale and elaborate decoration of this porcelain tureen and stand reflect the role it played not only as a vessel to contain an important element of the meal but also in terms of providing a focal point in the decorative placement of dishes on the table. For especially important dinners at court or in aristocratic households in the eighteenth century, drawings were made to demonstrate the proper arrangement of serving dishes on the table for each course; these drawings indicate serving dishes of various shapes were commonly grouped symmetrically around the tureen, which dictated placement and the layout of the table.

The tureens used in court circles during the second half of the eighteenth century would have been made either of silver or of porcelain, and in both media tureens were produced in two basic shapes. A round tureen was known in France as a pot à oille (service à la française), as the custom was codified in France in the seventeenth century. It became the dominant mode of fashionable dining in Europe until the early nineteenth century, when it was supplanted by the service à la Russe (service in the Russian manner), in which the guests no longer served themselves but rather were waited upon by servants.

While both pots à oille and terrines were customarily produced at Sèvres as parts of dinner services, they were also made as independent objects, clearly intended for use with nonmatching dinner wares. This particular model of terrine was known at the factory as terrine épis de blé, due to a prominent motif of sheaves of wheat in low relief that
decorate both the terrine and its stand. Along with its matching pot à oille, it was one of the largest and most richly decorated of the tureens made at Sévres, and very few of either the round or oval models were produced. The factory archives indicate that all of the pots à oille and terrines of this design were made independent of a dinner service, and it is possible that they were intended to be used with wares made of gilt silver rather than of porcelain. According to the factory sales records, all of the tureens of the épis de blé design made at Sévres were either presented as gifts to foreign monarchs or were acquired by Louis XVI (1754–1793), king of France. While gilt silver was frequently the preferred medium for royal dinner services, porcelain became increasingly popular during the second half of the eighteenth century, and the two media may have been used together, as the extensive gilding on the Sévres terrine would have made it visually compatible with gilt-silver tablewares.

The earliest of the tureens of this model are the two pots à oille and two terrines given by Louis XVI in 1777 to his brother-in-law Joseph II (1741–1790), the Holy Roman Emperor. Joseph II had traveled to France that year to visit his sister Marie-Antoinette (1755–1793), and one of the diplomatic gifts he received was an extensive green-ground Sévres dinner service, as well as a variety of other pieces from the factory, including the four épis de blé tureens, two of each shape. The two pots à oille and two terrines were each valued at 900 livres, making them among the most expensive tureens produced at the factory.

This model of tureen must have found favor with Louis XVI, as four pots à oille épis de blé were purchased by the monarch in 1777. In contrast to the two different shapes of tureen given to Joseph II, the four acquired by Louis XVI were round, as indicated by the use of the term pots à oille. The last appearance of this model of tureen in the factory sales records occurs in connection with a gift made by Louis XVI to Gustav III (1746–1792), king of Sweden, in 1784. As in the case of Joseph II, the Swedish monarch was presented with a large Sévres dinner service, as well as numerous other pieces of Sévres porcelain unrelated to the service itself. Among the additional gifts were two oval tureens (“terrines à Épis de Bled” [sic]), also valued at 900 livres each. While the terrines were presented to Gustav III in 1784, it has been suggested by David Peters that they may have been produced around the same time as the tureens cited above, and thus were selected from unsold stock at the Sévres factory in order to augment the gift to the Swedish king.

It is possible that the Museum’s terrine may have been one of the two sent to Sweden in 1784. Two terrines and one pot à oille from the gift to Joseph II survive at the imperial palace in Vienna, known as the Hofburg; the second pot à oille was damaged in the nineteenth century. Unless a mistake was made in recording the purchase by Louis XVI in 1777, the Museum’s terrine cannot be identified as having been owned by the French monarch, as all of his were of the round model. Neither of the two terrines given to Gustav III is known to have survived in Sweden. A terrine now in the Designmuseum Danmark, Copenhagen, may be one of these, but this cannot be proven, and its replaced lid and stand complicate the understanding of its history. A terrine of this model with similar decoration but without its stand
was offered at auction in 1981 in Copenhagen;\(^1\) it, too, may have been one of those owned by the Swedish king. However, two other very similar terrines were sold in 1911\(^2\) and 1971,\(^3\) respectively, and each of these also could have a royal Swedish provenance.

It appears that there are more terrines of this model, all of which have similar decoration consisting of trophies of agricultural implements and lush clusters of flowers, than are recorded in the sales records,\(^4\) so a more complete history of the Museum’s tureen may never be known. The group of both round and oval tureens are among the most impressive tablewares produced at Sèvres, not only in terms of scale but also in regard to the quality of their painted decoration and their extensive use of gilding, all of which made them appropriate for use on a royal table.

\(^2\) See, for example, Peters 2005, vol. 2, p. 283, for a list of the components and their prices in a service supplied to Louis XV (see entry 58 in this volume). Punch bowls with accompanying mortiers (mortars) could also be as expensive as tureens with stands. The punch bowl and mortar in the service cited above were valued together at 1,000 livres, exceeding the 800 livres assigned to each of the two oval tureens and stands.
\(^3\) The design for this model is attributed to Jean-Claude Thomas Duplessis (French, 1730–1783); see Brunet and Préaud 1978, p. 196, under fig. 217. See also Whitehead 1999, pp. 2–5.
\(^4\) Archives, Cité de la Céramique, Sèvres, Vy 6, fol. 207v. See Peters 2005, vol. 3, pp. 561–63, for a full account of the history of this service.
67. Vase with cover (Vase des âges)

SÈVRES FACTORY, FRENCH, 1756–PRESENT

Charles-Nicolas Dodin (French, 1734–1803)
Gilded by Henri-Martin Prévost (French, active 1757–97)

1782

Soft-paste porcelain decorated in polychrome enamels and gold

19 × 10¹¹⁄₁₆ × 8⁹⁄₁₆ in. (48.3 × 27.1 × 21.7 cm)

Bequest of Celine B. Hosack, in memory of her husband, Alexander E. Hosack, M.D., 1886

86.7.2a, b

MARKS: painted on underside: interlaced foliate LLs enclosing date letter ee (for year 1782); decorator’s mark K (for Charles-Nicolas Dodin); gilder’s mark HP (Henri-Martin Prévost), all in gold; incised on underside: 3 o A; / O .

CONSTRUCTION/CONDITION: molded with applied handles

PROVENANCE: possibly owned by Louis XVI, king of France, by 1783; David Hosack; Celine B. Hosack (until 1886; bequeathed to MMA)


This model of vase was intended to be the largest and central one in a garniture of five. It originally would have been flanked by two vases on either side of graduated size. These flanking vases were of the same basic model, but they were fitted with different handles. Intended to represent the three ages of man, the handles on all the vases are in the form of heads on abbreviated busts. The head of an older man forms the handle on the largest size, a female head is used on the middle size, and that of a young boy appears on the smallest. Appropriately, the model for all three vases representing the ages of man was known at the factory as vase des âges. The handles are striking not only for the skill with which the miniature busts are modeled but also for the overall gilding that must have been intended to evoke the gilt-bronze mounts often used to embellish both Sèvres and imported porcelains.

The Museum’s vase, which dates to 1782, was donated to the Museum with a second vase des âges of the same size and with extremely similar decoration but produced six years later, in 1788 (fig. 49). The factory marks indicate the painted decoration on each vase was by Charles-Nicolas Dodin (French, 1734–1803), and Henri-Martin Prévost (French, active 1757–97) was responsible for the elaborate gilt decoration on both. Despite these shared characteristics, it is probable that the 1782 vase was originally part of a garniture with four vases now in the British Royal Collection, and that the vase made in 1788 belonged to a different garniture, the history of which has not yet been traced.

The reserve on the front of the Museum’s earlier vase des âges depicts a couple with their baby seated on a bench in a lush and verdant outdoor setting with two women in attendance. The composition closely follows a print entitled Les Délîces de la Maternité (Maternal pleasures) by Isidore Stanislas Henri Helman (French, 1743–1806/9?) executed in 1777 after a work by Jean Michel Moreau (French, 1741–1814), frequently referred to as Moreau le jeune (the younger). The subject of the composition—the delights of motherhood—links the Museum’s vase thematically to the four vases in the British Royal Collection. The reserves of three of these four vases are also decorated with compositions after Moreau, and the subjects of all of the reserves concern love, seduction, and pregnancy. The combination of the four vases in the Royal Collection with the Museum’s vase depicting a happy couple with their child would have presented a coherent iconographic program concerning the joys of matrimony. The reserves on the back of the five vases composing the presumed garniture are painted with elaborate floral arrangements held in vases resting on marble tops, and the consistency of this treatment of the secondary reserves reinforces the likelihood that the five vases were intended to form a grouping. The
one inconsistency between the Museum’s vase and the four in the Royal Collection is found in a small detail. The tooling of the gilding of the band encircling the front reserve on the New York vase does not match that found on the comparable locations on the other four vases, but it is likely that this can be explained simply as human error.\(^4\)

There are several references in the Sévres factory archives that almost certainly pertain to these five vases,\(^5\) the most intriguing of which regards their purchase. During the end-of-year sales at Versailles in 1783, Louis XVI (1754–1793), king of France, purchased a garniture of five vases with a dark-blue ground and painted decoration described as mignature,\(^6\) along with a coffeepot, for the enormous price of 3,000 livres.\(^7\) While the garniture under discussion cannot be identified with that purchased by Louis XVI with certainty, the descriptions of the ground color and reserve painting correspond, and the high price of Louis XVI’s purchase would have been appropriate for the garniture now divided between the Royal Collection and New York. If Louis XVI’s purchase can be identified with the garniture under discussion, it would have been the second set of five blue-ground vases des âges acquired by the monarch. In November 1781, Louis XVI purchased a five-piece garniture of this model with unusually lavish decoration.\(^8\) In addition to the reserves painted with scenes derived from the book Les Aventures de Télémaque (1699),\(^9\) each of the vases is decorated with patterns of so-called jewelings, in which tiny dots of colored enamel are set into small roundels of stamped gold foil in imitation of jewels. Largely due to the costs associated with this technique, this garniture, now divided between the J. Paul Getty Museum, Los Angeles,\(^10\) and the Walters Art Museum, Baltimore,\(^11\) cost the enormous sum of 6,000 livres. It can be assumed that the monarch prized this set of “jeweled” vases, as he kept it in his private library at Versailles.\(^12\)

2. The works after Moreau were published in the Seconde suite d’estampes (1777); the one scene not by Moreau, “Le Petit Jour,” reproduces an engraving by Nicolas de Launay (French, 1733–1792) after Sigmund Freudenberg (Swiss, 1745–1801). Bellaigue 2009, vol. 1, p. 417.
3. This is discussed in greater detail in Bellaigue 2009, vol. 1, p. 417.
5. The painters’ ledger indicates that Bouillat was responsible for the flower painting on a garniture of five vases corresponding in decoration to the five under discussion in this entry; Bellaigue 2009, vol. 1, p. 417.
6. This term refers to reserves painted with miniature scenes, usually with figural compositions, that were often derived from paintings.
7. “1 Garniture de cinq vases beau bleu et peinte en mignature.” Archives, Cité de la Céramique, Sévres, Vy 9, fol. 78v.
9. Les Aventures de Télémaque (The adventures of Telemachus) was written by François de Salignac de La Mothe-Fénelon (1651–1715).
12. Ibid., p. 133.
one of the most remarkable sculptural projects of the eighteenth century was conceived by Charles Claude de Flahaut (1730–1809), comte d’Angiviller, in 1776. D’Angiviller, minister of buildings and the head of the royal manufactories, as well as the head of the academies of art and architecture to King Louis XVI (1754–1793), expressed his desire in a letter dated March 14, 1776, to Jean-Baptiste Marie Pierre (French, 1714–1789), the first painter to the king, to commission a series of lifesize marble sculptures representing the illustrious men of French history. Instead of choosing military heroes as the focus of this project, the series was intended to celebrate men distinguished by “their virtues, talents, and genius.” While there was already a long tradition in sculpture of venerating great men, the selection of figures renowned primarily for their intellect and civic virtue represented a novel focus and must have been intended to reflect, however indirectly, the glories of the Bourbon monarchy. Known in contemporary records both as the Grands Hommes de la France (Great Men of France) and the Hommes Illustres de la France (Illustrious Men of France), the series of sculptures was intended for the Grande Galerie of the Louvre, Paris, although this placement was never realized. In initiating this ambitious sculptural project, d’Angiviller selected the historical figures to be represented, and Pierre chose the artists to execute the sculptures. Many of the prominent artists in France were awarded commissions for the “Great Men,” including Jean-Jacques Caffieri (French, 1725–1792), Clodion (Claude Michel, French, 1738–1814), Étienne-Pierre Gois (French, 1731–1823), Jean-Antoine Houdon (French, 1741–1828), and Augustin Pajou (French, 1730–1809) (fig. 50). Twenty-seven marble sculptures were ultimately produced, which are housed today among the Louvre, the Institut de France, and Versailles.

D’Angiviller must have been pleased with the sculptures that had been created by late 1781, since he indicated his desire that the Sèvres factory produce reduced versions of the marble sculptures with biscuit porcelain in a letter from January 1782 to Monsieur Regnier, the factory’s director. The appearance of white marble was closely approximated by biscuit porcelain, the term used to denote fired but unglazed porcelain, which allowed for crisp and detailed modeling in the absence of glaze. In this letter, d’Angiviller stated his belief that the small biscuit-porcelain versions would meet with significant commercial success and would be enthusiastically received by the public. This proved not to be the case, but the series of biscuit sculptures that resulted from this undertaking rank among the factory’s most impressive achievements.

The sculptors of the lifesize marbles were requested to provide small terracotta versions of their works, from which the modelers at Sèvres could make piece molds in order to reproduce them in porcelain. The instructions to the sculptors were precise: a height of 20 pouces...
(approximately 20 inches) for each terracotta was specified, and each sculptor was required to supervise the execution of the molds taken from his terracotta model. Work on the biscuit-porcelain series proceeded rapidly, as indicated by Louis XVI’s purchase of twelve “Great Men” at the end of 1783, the first examples to be produced. The factory’s sales records indicate that each of these figures acquired by the king was accompanied by a base decorated with a dark blue (bleu beau) ground color and simple gilding, and each figure with its base was valued at 600 livres, which was a very considerable sum. The factory continued to produce different figures from the “Great Men” series in biscuit porcelain, eventually producing twenty-three before the end of the ancien régime, and Louis XVI appears to have purchased an example of each model.

The biscuit figure of Charles-Louis de Secondat (1689–1755), baron de La Brède et de Montesquieu, the famous writer and political philosopher, may have been acquired by Louis XVI with the third delivery of the “Great Men” figures to Versailles. The sculptor Clodion had provided his terracotta of Montesquieu to the Sèvres factory during the second half of 1784, after his marble sculpture had been exhibited at the Salon of 1783. The marble had been well received critically, including particular praise for the technical skill with which it had been executed.

The remarkable range of surface treatments in the marble sculpture of Montesquieu, seen especially in the depiction of the different fabrics and the pages of the book, has been skillfully reproduced in the biscuit-porcelain version. The dignity and psychological presence given to the sitter in the marble have not been diminished by the reduction in scale or change of medium. Just as the marble reflects a tour de force of carving, the porcelain figure represents an astonishing feat of mold-making, assemblage, and detailed finish work. The sale price, without base, of 480 livres for this figure and for many of the other “Great Men” makes them among the most expensive sculptures produced by the factory, and given the complex compositions of all these figures, it is not surprising that their cost was so high.

Louis XVI’s biscuit figure of Montesquieu was displayed on a large round table in his private library at Versailles, along with figures of Pierre Corneille (French, 1606–1684), Henri François d’Aguesseau (French, 1668–1751), Jean de La Fontaine (French, 1621–1695), Mathieu Molé (French, 1584–1656), and Molière (French, 1622–1673), all on blue-and-gold porcelain bases. Other porcelain figures of the “Great Men” were placed on console tables and on a mantelpiece in other rooms in Versailles.

Louis XVI employed porcelain figures of the “Great Men” as diplomatic gifts, most notably to Gustav III (1746–1792), king of Sweden, and to Prince Henry of Prussia (1726–1802). The prominence thus accorded to these figures can be read as reflecting a growing acceptance of porcelain as a serious sculptural medium. While the factory began producing accomplished biscuit figures and groups after compositions by François Boucher (French, 1703–1770) and Étienne-Maurice Falconet (French, 1716–1791) in the 1750s, as well as larger-scale busts of the French monarchs in succeeding decades, the “Great Men” series displays a degree of ambition surpassing that found in other works.

3. The sculptures were stored in the Salle des Antiques in the Louvre, Paris, until the fall of the monarchy; Scherf 1992.
8. Scherf in Poulet and Scherf 1992, p. 288; Préaud and Scherf 2015, p. 255. However, the sales records for January 4, 1785, list four “figures des grands hommes” among the king’s purchases without specifying who was depicted, Archives, Cité de la Céramique, Sèvres, VV 9.
11. Ibid.
69. Bowl from the Rambouillet service (Jatte écuelle)

SÈVRES FACTORY, FRENCH, 1756–PRESENT
Model attributed to Jean-Jacques Lagrenée (French, 1739–1821)
1787
Hard-paste porcelain decorated in polychrome enamels
3 × 10 × 7 1/2 in. (7.6 × 25.4 × 19.1 cm)

MARKS: painted on underside: interlaced LLs enclosing date letters kk (for year 1787) in purple enamel

INSCRIPTIONS: incised on underside: Rn (probably for the modeler Ravinet)

CONSTRUCTION/CONDITION: molded with applied handles; chip in foot rim

PROVENANCE: possibly Marie-Antoinette, queen of France; [John Whitehead, London, until 1997; sold to MMA]


This bowl belongs to one of the most significant services to have been made at Sévres during the eighteenth century, even though very few pieces from the service are known today and the surviving documentation concerning its production is slight. The circumstances surrounding the genesis of the service have been well published.1 King Louis XVI (French, 1754–1793) acquired the Château de Rambouillet from Louis Jean Marie de Bourbon (French, 1725–1793), duc de Penthièvre, in 1783 in order to expand his hunting grounds. Since the outmoded château was not to the liking of Queen Marie-Antoinette (1755–1793), it is thought the king commissioned the construction of a pleasure dairy2 on the grounds in order to make the property more appealing to her. The responsibility for conceiving the new dairy was given to Charles Claude de Flahaut (French, 1730–1809), comte d’Angiviller, Louis XVI’s minister of buildings who also served as the head of the royal manufactories and the head of the academies of art and architecture.3 d’Angiviller was perfectly placed to engage the most accomplished artists in France in the design and execution of this structure and its contents, and it provided him an opportunity to promote a more rigorous Neoclassical style in all aspects of its design, which he believed would be beneficial to the arts in France.4
The interior of the dairy was intended to be sparsely furnished, but a special porcelain service was commissioned to reflect the nature of a pleasure dairy. D’Angiviller clearly wanted the service to embody the more austere Neoclassicism that he favored, and both the shapes and the decoration express this new taste. One major influence on the service’s design was the extensive collection of Greco-Roman pottery acquired by the archaeologist, writer, and administrator Dominique-Vivant Denon (French, 1747–1825), which was stored at Sèvres beginning in 1785 before its intended transfer to the new museum being planned at the Louvre, Paris. A second influence was the factory’s purchase in 1786 of one of the most famous publications of the late eighteenth century, Pierre-François Hugues d’Harcamville’s (French, 1719–1805) *Antiquités étrusques, grecques, et romaines tirées du cabinet de M. Hamilton* (1766), which illustrated the collection of ancient vases owned by Sir William Hamilton (1730–1803), the British ambassador to Naples. The Denon vases and the d’Harcamville volumes thus furnished the factory with a wealth of antique sources that could serve as inspiration for both shapes and types of decoration.

The co-artistic director at Sèvres, Jean-Jacques Lagrenée (French, 1739–1821), was responsible for providing the decorative schemes for the service, and it is likely that he advised on shapes as well. The well-known painter Hubert Robert (French, 1733–1808) appears to have provided artistic oversight for the service’s design, and Louis-Simon Boizot (French, 1743–1809), the director of the factory’s sculpture workshop, was involved both directly and indirectly with the shapes chosen for the service. To varying degrees, the Greco-Roman vases now available to the factory’s designers influenced all but two of the shapes created for the service, but few were directly borrowed without alteration from the ancient prototypes. As has been observed by Selma Schwartz, the simplicity of form of the Denon and Hamilton vases served as the governing principle of design rather than a desire to specifically copy the ancient models.

In terms of the decoration of the service, the fidelity to Greco-Roman pottery was considerably less direct. Rather than restrict the decorative schemes to the red-and-black palette of ancient pottery, the designers at Sèvres employed a range of both enamel and ground colors, though the latter were largely restricted to much paler colors than those for which the factory was famous. The desire to produce a service that was closer to the perceived spirit of ancient pottery was manifested in two ways. On all of the surviving pieces, the white porcelain body is given a greater degree of prominence than usual, and the decorative schemes are more restrained than on other contemporary wares made at Sèvres. Most significantly, none of the pieces have any gilding, which represented a radical departure stylistically for the factory. The motifs chosen to decorate the pieces of the service reflect the pastoral theme of the dairy, and most of the known surviving examples are painted with cows, goats, different
types of vegetation, and figures in classical dress. Scrolling arabesques, anthemia, and other highly stylized vegetal motifs complement the figural compositions on a number of pieces, but they serve as the sole form of decoration on the Museum’s bowl, making it one of the most austere of the service.

This bowl, known as a jatte écuelle in the factory records, relies on the simplicity of its form and on the arched, bifurcated handles for much of its aesthetic effect. The elegant sculptural lines of the handles are continued by the painted decoration extending the joins of the handles to the bowl by scrolling black lines that terminate in an attenuated grasslike motif. The other painted decoration on the bowl consists of simple, stylized decorative bands painted on the white ground beneath the rim and on the pale-blue ground of the bottom two-thirds of the bowl. The low form of the bowl would have made the plain white interior especially prominent, with the split handles being the other most noticeable feature.

The Museum’s bowl was one of four based on this shape produced for the dairy. While two were delivered to Château de Rambouillet on May 25, 1787, it is not clear if the bowl now in New York was one of those or if, in fact, it was ever sent to the dairy. The intended size of the service was reduced from 108 pieces to 65 in 1788, perhaps due to financial reasons, and it is unclear how many of the completed pieces were delivered to the château. It is not known with certainty if Marie-Antoinette visited the dairy in 1787, and there is no indication that she went to Rambouillet the following year; it is possible that she may not have seen all or even some of the Rambouillet service.

The stylistic innovations reflected by the service and the factory’s new and more serious interest in antiquity never took hold because of the disruptions of the French Revolution (1789–99). The small number of surviving wares from the Rambouillet service, now thought to number seventeen, provide a tantalizing indication as to how taste at the factory might have evolved had the Revolution not altered its history.

1 Most of what is known about the service is due to the research of Selma Schwartz; see S. Schwartz 1992; S. Schwartz 2002; Selma Schwartz in Marie-Antoinette 2008, pp. 238–41, nos. 166a–f. The author is deeply indebted to her work on this service, which forms the basis for this entry.
2 For more information on pleasure dairies, see Schwartz in Marie-Antoinette 2008, p. 285.
4 For a fuller description, see ibid., pp. 260–62.
5 For information about the dairy, see C. C. Young 2000.
6 The involvement of the various artists is discussed in greater detail in S. Schwartz 2002, pp. 262–63.
7 Ibid., p. 263.
10 Ibid., pp. 263–65.
70. Pair of vases (Vase chinois)

SÈVRES FACTORY, FRENCH, 1756–PRESENT
Louis-François L’Écot (French, active 1764–1802)
1791
Hard-paste porcelain decorated in black enamel, platinum, and two tones of gold; gilt metal; interior metal rod
.23: 15 ¼ × 5 ½ × 5 in. (38.4 × 14 × 12.7 cm)
.24: 15 ⁵⁄₈ × 5 ¹³⁄₁₆ × 5 ⁵⁄₈ in. (39.7 × 14.8 × 14.3 cm)
Gift of Mr. and Mrs. Charles Wrightsman, 1971
1971.206.23, .24

MARKS: both painted on underside: interlaced LLs enclosing date letters oo (for year 1791), painter’s mark L (for L’Écot), both in gold

CONSTRUCTION/CONDITION: both in three sections: foot, body, and neck attached by metal rod secured to gilt-metal mount inserted in mouth, with decorative gilt-metal sleeve at join of foot to body

PROVENANCE: possibly owned by Louis XVI, king of France; Henry Nyberg, Aldbourne, England (until 1966; sale, Sotheby’s, London, November 8, 1966, no. 100); Mr. and Mrs. Charles Wrightsman, New York (until 1971; to MMA)


THE FINAL EXPRESSION OF THE FASHION FOR CHINOISERIE decoration at Sèvres in the eighteenth century occurred in the years between 1790 and 1793 when a remarkable group of objects was produced in imitation of Japanese and Chinese black lacquer. The majority of the works decorated in this style were tablewares, or tea wares, but a small number of vases were produced as well. The shared characteristics of these porcelains are scenes painted in gold and platinum on a black ground. The gold was usually applied in several subtly different tones, which made the compositions more legible and even more luxurious in appearance. These pieces of so-called black lacquer porcelain are among the most lavishly decorated objects produced at the factory, and there is a certain irony that they were made during the years when France was in political and economic turmoil due to the French Revolution (1789–99). The factory’s client base, drawn from the French court and aristocracy, was either vanishing or unable to purchase objects of this substantial cost, and the virtual disappearance of this type of expensive decoration in the years immediately following 1793 can be attributed to the changes wrought by the Revolution.

The black-ground pieces in this group are decorated with chinoiserie scenes, and it has been suggested by Selma Schwartz that these decorative schemes fall into one of three categories. The largest category includes those works decorated with what she has described as generic chinoiserie motifs or compositions that do not derive from a single source. The two smaller categories are composed of those works that employ motifs by Jean-Baptiste Pillement (French, 1728–1808) or those works that are inspired by Chinese lacquers or woodcuts. While the compositions that decorate the Museum’s two vases are clearly not adapted from either Japanese or Chinese works of art, sources in the works of Pillement have not been located either, and it is likely that the decoration of the vases belongs to the first and largest category cited above. Curiously, the gilders and painters at Sèvres appear to have rarely looked to Asian lacquer as a source of motifs; it was the aesthetic of black lacquer rather than specific compositions or designs that inspired this type of decoration.

Furniture incorporating imported Japanese or Chinese black lacquer became fashionable in French court circles during the middle of the eighteenth century, and its popularity never altogether diminished in the succeeding decades. However, Queen Marie-Antoinette’s (1755–1793) fondness for lacquer initiated a renewed interest in this material in the early 1780s, and much of the finest furniture produced for royal and aristocratic clientele through the early 1790s was decorated with Japanese black lacquer. Several of the most extraordinary pieces of furniture decorated in this manner were delivered to Marie-Antoinette, and the court’s obvious appreciation of furniture.
embellished with lacquer must have influenced the decision to make black-lacquer-style porcelain at Sèvres.

The ability to successfully produce a black ground color was clearly a prerequisite for making porcelain in imitation of imported lacquer, and it was not until 1781 that this technical challenge was mastered. The early attempts to emulate lacquer on porcelain at Sèvres employed both gold and silver for the various compositional elements, but the inevitable tarnishing of the silver made it ineffective for decoration. The process to precipitate platinum, which does not tarnish, was discovered at the factory in about 1790, and this development, coupled with the ability to produce gold in varying shades, provided the gilders with a limited but rich palette from which to create their chinoiserie compositions and motifs. The vast majority of the models chosen at Sèvres to be decorated in this manner are entirely European in origin and character, and there seems to have been little attempt to evoke Chinese or Japanese forms. Teapots, cups and saucers, bottle coolers, and ewers with basins are among the traditionally European shapes to be decorated in this manner, and even most of the vase models selected for decoration in imitation of black lacquer are not closely related to common Asian forms.

Despite the European character of the form of the Museum’s vases, this model of vase was known at the factory as a *vase chinois* (Chinese vase). This designation was originally given to a different model of vase, but it was applied by extension to this model as well, because pairs of this design...
were used to flank the "true" vase chinois to form a garniture. 16 Two such garnitures are known to have survived, the earlier of which was made in 1780. 17 The three vases that make up the 1780 garniture are decorated with a red ground and with chinoiserie scenes, some of which are based upon works by Aléxis Peyrotte (French, 1699–1769) and Pillement. 18 Probably dating from the same year is a yellow-ground garniture also decorated with chinoiserie scenes and now in the Gardiner Museum, Toronto. 19 A pair of vases of the same model as those in the Museum, alternatively known as vase chinois de côté (adjacent Chinese vase), date from 1781: 20 they are decorated with a simulated lapis-lazuli ground that completely covers the surface except for those elements, such as the handles, which are gilded. It is very possible that these two vases were originally part of a garniture, but their early history remains speculative. 21

There is no indication that the Museum’s vases were made to accompany a larger central vase, as was the case with the two earliest pairs of vases chinois, and it is possible that the black lacquer vases were produced as a self-contained pair. Factory records reveal that two vases chinois with a black ground and chinoiserie decoration by the painter Louis-François L’Écot (French, active 1764–1802) entered the kiln for firing in November 1791. 22 It is tempting to link this reference to an entry in the factory’s sales records indicating that two vases chinois were sold to King Louis XVI (1754–1793) at the end-of-year sale that took place at Versailles from December 22, 1791, to January 13, 1792. 23 The vases acquired by Louis XVI are not described in the entry, but their substantial cost of 1,920 livres indicates that their decoration must have been unusually elaborate. It is plausible that the Museum’s vases, with their extensive decoration in shades of gold and platinum and marked for 1791, are those purchased by the monarch, but this remains conjecture. If indeed owned by the king, these vases would have been one of his last significant purchases from the Sèvres factory before he was taken from the Palais des Tuileries, Paris, to be imprisoned in the Temple in August 1792.

1 For the most comprehensive study of this subject, see S. Schwartz 2004.
2 There was a minor resurgence of interest in black-lacquer-style decoration at Sèvres in the years around 1800–1805; see ibid. For examples, see MMA 61.165.35, 38, 40, 41, 43a–c.
3 Ibid., pp. 101–2.
4 Ibid., p. 102.
5 Ibid.
6 Baarsen 2013, p. 447.
7 Frequently, the proportions of the furniture necessitated the augmentation of the Japanese lacquer with sections of domestically produced lacquer, usually referred to as vernis Martin.
8 See a writing table now in the Musée du Louvre, Paris (Bastien 2014, fig. 8), and a commode and secretary in the Museum (William Rieder in Kislik-Grosheide, Koepepe, and Rieder 2006, pp. 198–101, nos. 82, 83).
11 Selma Schwartz in Schwartz Porcelain 2003, pp. 218–19, nos. 102, 103a, b.
13 Pinot de Villechenon 1993, p. 43, no. 43.
15 The Museum’s two vases almost certainly have undergone a minor alteration. The gilt-metal mount that connects the socle foot to the body of the vase, the thin rope twist mount at the top of body, and the gilt-metal insert that covers the mouth of the vase are not found on the other examples of this model, and it is likely that they were added to facilitate the assembly of the vase. The vase, made in three parts (foot, body, neck), was designed to be assembled without the aid of a central metal rod, but damage to those porcelain elements that served to connect the three components necessitated the addition of a rod, which extends downward from the metal insert at the top to the base where it is secured by a nut underneath. The vases have lost the rings that were originally suspended from the mouths of the dragon-headed handles.
17 Ibid., pp. 446–53, no. 103.
18 Ibid., pp. 451–52.
19 The vases (G83.1.1074.1, 2–3) are dated ca. 1780 by the Gardiner Museum, Toronto. Geoffrey de Bellaigue dates them specifically to 1780; ibid., p. 452.
20 Ibid., pp. 454–57, no. 104.
21 Ibid. See also Vincent Bastien in Rochebrune 2014, pp. 246–47, no. 88.
22 Archives, Cité de la Céramique, Sèvres, Vi, fol. 196v.
23 Archives, Cité de la Céramique, Sèvres, Vv 11, fol. 97v.
71. **Rape of Proserpine**

**ATTRIBUTED TO ORLÉANS FACTORY, FRENCH, 1753–82**

ca. 1760–70
Soft-paste porcelain
19 ⁷⁄₈ × 14 ¹⁄₄ × 15 ³⁄₄ in. (50.5 × 36.2 × 40 cm)
The Charles E. Sampson Memorial Fund, 1967.67.113

**MARKS:** unmarked

**CONSTRUCTION/CONDITION:** press-molded and assembled; repairs to horses’ limbs and tails, repair to putto’s proper left arm

**PROVENANCE:** Chrysler Art Museum, Norfolk, Virginia (until 1967; sold to MMA)


**LITERATURE:** Penelope Hunter in Metropolitan Museum 1975, p. 279, ill.; Froissart 2005, p. 67, figs. 11, 12

**OF THE FRENCH SOFT-PASTE PORCELAIN FACTORIES PRODUCING** on a significant scale in the eighteenth century, the Orléans factory, established in 1753, is the least known and the least understood. The factory was in existence for slightly less than thirty years, and its particular focus was on figures and groups. However, the factory’s sculptures and wares are often not easily recognized, in large part due to the scarcity of marked objects. Many of the factory archives have been lost, and our knowledge of its history and production derives from several documents published before World War II, when much of the archival material was destroyed. Recent scholarship has greatly advanced our knowledge of the factory, but Orléans remains less well known than France’s other soft-paste porcelain enterprises.

While the factory was founded in 1753, it is unclear when the production of porcelain actually began. The petition to establish the factory stated that its goal was to produce fine white earthenware, commonly known as creamware, rather than porcelain, thus avoiding a violation of the monopoly on porcelain production that had been granted to the Vincennes factory. Nonetheless, it is also possible that the aim was, in fact, to produce both types of ceramic bodies without drawing attention to the quest for soft-paste porcelain. The factory employed twenty workers to produce flowers in 1756, and in view of the fact that no creamware flowers are known to exist, it seems almost certain that soft-paste porcelain was in production at least by that date.

It is not known why the factory made sculptural work its priority, since the production of figures was customarily secondary to the production of tablewares and vases at other French soft-paste factories. An inventory of records from 1759 shows the impressive total of 547 figures and groups stored at the factory, with the number increasing to 1,000 in an inventory taken two years later. There was a wide variety of subject matter for the modelers to depict, but most Orléans sculpture is modest in ambition, consisting of one or two figures and typically six to twelve inches in height. In contrast, the Rape of Proserpine, at a height of almost twenty inches, is one of the largest soft-paste porcelain groups produced in France during the eighteenth century, and it is the most artistically and technically challenging work by the Orléans factory known to have survived.

The group depicts an event from classical mythology as described in *Metamorphoses* (8 CE) by the Roman poet Ovid, in which Pluto, god of the underworld, abducts Proserpine. Pluto stands in a chariot with Proserpine carried over his left shoulder, and a figure of Cupid reclines at his feet. The water nymph Cyane, positioned behind the chariot, attempts to grasp it with her outstretched arm to prevent its descent to the underworld (detail, page 225). The group illustrates the moment in
the story just before the chariot with Pluto and Proserpine plunges into the abyss; the horses have broken free from the chariot and leap away, and their orientation in the opposite direction from Pluto denies the group a dominant point of view. The explosive action embodied by the figures, chariot, and horses expands in all directions, and the sense of dynamism is reinforced by the extraordinary base of rockwork on which all the figures are supported. Large, irregular, and craggy expanses of rock extend out as if exploding from the center, and the randomly applied tufts of vegetation and flowers enhance the visual complexity of the landscape. Typical of most Orléans sculpture, the quality of the modeling does not match that found on contemporary Sévres figures, and there is a slight awkwardness to the poses and an ungainliness in the proportions of the horses, in particular. Despite these minor deficiencies, few porcelain groups made during this period exhibit the bravura found in this composition, and the energetic rendering of the horses and the rocky terrain on which they leap have few parallels in porcelain sculpture.

The subject of the Rape of Proserpine was popular at Orléans, as indicated by the listing of five such groups in the factory inventory from 1759; the presence of another five in the 1761 inventory; and seventeen Proserpine groups included among the many Orléans porcelains sold at auction in Amsterdam in 1773. It is likely these groups were considerably smaller in scale and less complex than the Museum’s example and consisted of only the figures of Pluto and Proserpine supported on a far simpler base. The elaborately constructed base of the Museum’s group is highly unusual within Orléans figural work, not only for its scale but also because of the absence of prominent rococo scrolls that serve as a distinguishing feature on the bases of much of the factory’s sculpture. With so few marked works to serve as touchstones, the use of unusually tall bases composed of pronounced C-scrolls and pierced areas often point to an Orléans origin, as seen in the group personifying Europe and America.

While the published factory documents reveal a considerable amount of information about the production at Orléans, there has been relatively little linkage between known factory models and surviving examples. The Museum’s group was attributed to the Tournai factory in present-day Belgium as recently as 1990, and it was only through a rigorous stylistic analysis and simultaneous process of elimination that an Orléans origin was proposed and accepted in the relatively recent past. It is known that the factory produced extensive numbers of porcelain flowers; 24,000 examples were in the factory’s shop when Louis-Stanislas-Xavier (1755–1824), comte de Provence (also known after 1795 as Louis XVIII, king of France), visited in 1777, yet surviving flowers have not been identified. Despite the factory’s impressive levels of production, it closed upon the death of its owner Claude-Charles Gérault d’Arauver (1716/17–1782), and the extent of its impact on and contribution to French eighteenth-century soft-paste porcelain has yet to be fully appreciated.

1 Only seven marked objects are known; see Froissart 2005, p. 48.
3 The request was to produce “fayance de terre blanch purifiée”; Froissart 2005, p. 51.
4 Ibid., p. 54.
5 Ibid., p. 55.
6 Ibid., p. 62.
7 See Geneviève Le Duc in Musée National de Céramique 1989, pp. 115–16, no. 151.
8 MMA 59.208.10.
9 Dawson 1994, p. 244.
72. Bust of Louis XV

TOURNAI FACTORY, BELGIAN, 1750/51–99
ca. 1756
Soft-paste porcelain
12 ⁵⁄₈ × 10 ¹⁄₈ × 5 ⁵⁄₈ in. (32.1 × 26.7 × 14.3 cm)
Bequest of R. Thornton Wilson, in memory of his wife, Florence Ellsworth Wilson, 1977 1977.216.5a, b

**MARKS:** unmarked

**CONSTRUCTION/CONDITION:** molded; firing crack in hair at neck level, filled before glaze firing, chip on drapery at back, small firing cracks in base

**PROVENANCE:** Ruth Teschner Costantino; R. Thornton Wilson (until 1977; bequeathed to MMA)


**THIS BUST IS ONE OF THE MOST REMARKABLE PORCELAIN sculptures produced in the eighteenth century.** It was made in the late 1750s in Tournaï, a town located in present-day Belgium but part of the Austrian Netherlands at the time of the bust’s manufacture. The factory was established in 1750 by François-Joseph Peterinck (French, 1719–1799), who may have acquired the technical knowledge required to produce soft-paste porcelain from the French potters Robert Dubois (French, 1709–1759) and Gilles Dubois (French, b. 1713). The Dubois brothers had worked at Chantilly, Vincennes, and the Rue de Charenton factory in Paris before going to Tournaï, and their experience at those factories appears to have been instrumental in the Tournaï factory’s founding.

The bust depicts Louis XV (1710–1774), king of France, and it is likely that it was produced at Tournaï around 1756, when he was approximately forty-six years old. This date seems probable for the bust due to the close stylistic similarity and scale to another one made at Tournaï that portrays Charles de Lorraine (Duchy of Lorraine, 1712–1780), which appears to be the bust cited in a letter from 1756. The Museum’s bust of Louis XV is one of six known to have been made at Tournaï, and these busts, along with the bust of Charles, reflect an exceptional technical and artistic accomplishment for a factory founded less than a decade before their manufacture. Technically, the busts are remarkable for their size and for the difficulties of firing soft-paste porcelain on this scale. The technical challenges posed by the kiln are illustrated by the prominent firing crack that runs through the monarch’s wig at the back of his neck. The crack appears to have occurred during the first or so-called biscuit firing, and it was repaired shortly thereafter by inserting a mixture of ground-up porcelain and glaze that hardened during the second firing when the glaze was applied. It is a measure of the difficulty of producing porcelain sculpture of this scale and complexity that an obvious flaw, though repaired, was considered acceptable at the time of the bust’s manufacture.

The skill with which the bust is modeled, particularly evident in the details of the costume and in the expansive drapery that terminates at the torso of the king, provides a sense of movement and drama when seen from the back (detail, page 228). Few porcelain sculptures were produced of comparable scale and with an integral socle and base during the eighteenth century; it was more common for the base to be produced separately and then attached to the torso that it supported. The format of the Tournaï busts of Louis XV closely follows the format established in the previous century for portraits of the monarch. Customarily executed in marble, royal portraits commonly depicted the sitter in a heroic mode wearing a cuirass, or armor breastplate, to
symbolize military superiority. The positioning of the slightly lifted head, seen in three-quarter view, subtly communicates the monarch's inherent nobility and authority.

It is highly likely that the model for the Tournai busts is derived from a lifesize marble bust of Louis XV by the French sculptor Jean-Baptiste Lemoyne the Younger (French, 1704–1778). In 1730 Lemoyne inherited from his father the commission for an equestrian monument to honor the French king, and he soon became the monarch’s favorite portraitist, producing an extensive series of busts from the early 1730s through Louis XV’s death in 1774. While the Museum’s bust corresponds in format and style to several of Lemoyne’s portraits of the king, it is not a reduced version of any surviving marble or bronze bust. The Tournai bust bears similarities to Lemoyne’s marble portrait of Louis XV from 1757, which is now in the Museum, but the Lemoyne marble differs in several specific aspects, and it appears to portray an older sitter whose face has filled out with the passage of time. It may be that the modeler at Tournai had access to a print of an earlier bust of Louis XV by Lemoyne, and while the porcelain bust was produced in the second half of the 1750s, it depicts the king at a younger age. The portrait of the king in the Tournai bust has more affinity with Lemoyne’s marble bust of Louis XV of 1749 than with his later bust, despite its being almost contemporaneous in date.

A marble bust of Louis XV made by Lemoyne in 1745 may have served as the model for a porcelain bust made at Chantilly and for a similar bust produced in faience fine (white-glazed earthenware) at the Rue de Charenton factory, and it is likely the busts were produced at both ceramic factories to honor the king at the height of his popularity. The Chantilly factory produced a second portrait of the king approximately ten years later, and Sèvres made a variety of models of portrait busts of the king that were issued in different sizes. It is not surprising that busts of the monarch were produced in several French ceramic factories; it is less clear why a factory in the Austrian Netherlands would choose to create an image of the French king with whom the country had recently been at war. It is possible that the Tournai factory wished to demonstrate its technical and artistic mastery, hoping to compete in a French market as well as prosper in a local one. This potential explanation is undermined, however, by the dominance of the French factories at Vincennes and at Sèvres after 1756, which must have been perceived as overwhelming competition to a young factory in the Austrian Netherlands without active royal patronage. In any event, Tournai continued to produce sculpture of high quality into the 1770s, but it rarely attempted to create a work of the scale or ambition as seen in its portrait of the French monarch.

1 For a history of the Tournai factory, see Blazy 1987, p. 25; Jottrand 1987; Dumortier and Habets 2015; Dumortier and Habets 2015, pp. 31–43.
2 It is tempting to link the Dubois brothers with the production of the Tournai Louis XV bust and its source in a bust by Jean-Baptiste Lemoyne the Younger, as the brothers had worked at two ceramic factories (Chantilly, Rue de Charenton) that made busts after Lemoyne models, but the periods in which the brothers worked at those factories do not coincide with the production of the busts. See Clare Le Corbeiller in Roth and Le Corbeiller 2000, p. 49, n. 12.
3 Dumortier and Habets 2015, p. 180, n. 33, and pp. 30, 186, fig. F.
4 There are examples in the Musée des Beaux-Arts, Dunkirk (Blazy 1987, p. 116, no. 101, ill.), the Musée Royal de Mariemont, Belgium (Deroubaix 1958, p. 227, no. 1942, pl. 60), and the National Museum of American History, Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D.C. (J. J. Miller 1967, pp. 67–69, fig. 1); one was formerly in the Maurice Fenaille Collection (Hôtel Drouot, Paris, sale cat., June 12, 1941, no. 122), and another was in the sale at Sotheby’s, Monaco, June 15, 1996, no. 82.
5 Raggio 1967, p. 220.
6 Ibid., figs. 1, 4.
7 Réau 1927, pl. XXX.
9 Jeffrey Weaver in Droth 2009, pp. 44–47, no. 9.
10 Le Corbeiller in Roth and Le Corbeiller 2000, pp. 46–49, no. 20.
11 See, for example, Dawson 1994, pp. 119–21, no. 106.
12 An exception is the large allegorical group The Apotheosis of Charles d’Outremont, Prince-Bishop of Liège of 1763–64 (private collection); Jottrand 1989, pp. 30, 32, pl. 7.
73. Pair of vases

DIHL ET GUÉRHARD FACTORY, FRENCH (PARIS), 1781–1828
ca. 1795–98
Hard-paste porcelain decorated in polychrome enamels and gold
.1: 18 3/4 × 7 1/4 × 7 1/4 in. (46.2 × 18.4 × 18.4 cm)
.2: 18 5/16 × 7 1/4 × 7 1/4 in. (46.5 × 18.4 × 18.4 cm)
Wrightsman Fund, 2014 2014.68.1, .2

MARKS: both unmarked

CONSTRUCTION/CONDITION: both molded in three sections connected by internal metal rod

PROVENANCE: [Bernard Baruch Steinitz, Paris, until 2001; sold to Sacerdot]; Philippe Sacerdot, London, 2001–14; sold to MMA


LITERATURE: Claudia Lehner-Jobst in Haag, Leeuw, and Becker 2011, pp. 286–87, no. 113; Jeffrey H. Munger in “Recent Acquisitions” 2014, p. 50, ill.; Moon 2016, pp. 112–27, figs. 1, 2, 4

In the closing decades of the eighteenth century, a number of porcelain factories were established in Paris that offered both commercial and artistic competition to the Sèvres factory, despite the latter’s royal status and the patronage of its products as encouraged by Louis XVI (1754–1793), king of France. Many of these newly founded factories had royal protectors who allowed them to operate regardless of the monopoly that Sèvres continued to enjoy, and the majority of the Paris enterprises focused solely on the production of hard-paste porcelain. One of the most successful of these factories was first known by the name of its protector, Louis-Antoine d’Artois (French, 1775–1844), duc d’Angoulême (Manufacture de Monsieur Le Duc d’Angoulême), and later known as the Dihl et Guérhard factory at the time of the French Revolution (1789–99).

The factory was founded in 1781 by Christophe Dihl (German, 1753–1830), a potter from Neustadt, in collaboration with Antoine Guérhard (French, d. 1793), who, along with his wife Louise-Françoise-Madeleine Croizé (French, 1751–1831), provided the funds and assumed the administrative responsibilities for the new firm.1 Critically, the factory was able to acquire the patronage of the duc d’Angoulême despite the fact that he was only five at the time that his protection of the factory was granted. By 1785, the factory was sufficiently successful to be able to employ thirty painters and twelve sculptors,2 and it soon outgrew its original quarters on the rue de Bondy and moved to new premises on the rue du Temple in 1789. Dihl’s technological expertise must have been considerable, because the quality of the factory’s products was unusually high, and the level of decoration practiced by the factory’s painters made its wares among the finest of any of the Parisian firms. The factory became known for its skill in painting grounds in imitation of a variety of hardstones, and Dihl was particularly interested in developing improved enamel colors, eventually presenting his experiments and research to the Académie des Sciences et des Beaux-Arts, Paris, in 1797. A well-known porcelain plaque painted with Dihl’s portrait from the same year reflects his various ceramic priorities, including a palette of colors, materials for making porcelain, and several pieces of porcelain that represent some of the factory’s achievements.3 Dihl et Guérhard had already developed a distinguished clientele by this time, and the American diplomat Gouverneur Morris (1752–1816) made repeated visits to the factory in the years 1789–93, often acting on behalf of President George Washington (1732–1799) and noting that “We find that the porcelain here is more elegant and cheaper than it is at Sèvres.”4 Dihl appears to have been a skillful entrepreneur as well, as evidenced by his negotiations with the London merchant Thomas Flight (British, 1726–1800) to sell the factory’s porcelains in England for a six-year period beginning in 1789.5
Both the technical quality and artistic innovation that characterize the best of Dihl et Guérhard’s production are evident in the Museum’s vases. They are decorated with a ground of brilliant yellow, one of the colors that Dihl learned to fire successfully on hard paste, which often proved challenging in regard to ground colors. The yellow sections of each vase are decorated in black enamel with delicately rendered scrolls, peacocks, garlands of flowers, and, most prominently, with female terms, or half-length figures, alternating with birds resting in baskets of flowers. This type of decoration is commonly known as “grotesque,” a reference to motifs painted in ancient Roman grottoes, which were rediscovered during the Renaissance. Grotesque decoration became popular again in late eighteenth-century France, where it was employed in either painted or carved form in fashionable interior architecture.

The most startling aspect of the vases’ decoration, however, is the uninterrupted landscape encircling each vase. Painted in grisaille, or monochrome gray, both scenes depict storms: one on land and one at sea. The continuous nature of each scene allows for small vignettes that illustrate the various effects of each storm; the common element to both is the harsh impact on the small human figures exposed to the turbulent weather. The painter of the two vases has captured in great detail the atmospheric effects of the howling wind, driving rain, and crashing waves, while also conveying the battering experienced by the figures attempting to move through the tempestuous landscapes.

Storms were a popular subject in late eighteenth-century landscape painting, especially as the concept of the Sublime or the awareness of powerful natural forces beyond man’s control was increasingly embraced by the educated classes at this time. Land- or seascapes depicting natural disasters and the immensity of nature compared to man were a common choice of subject for artists, but such paintings were often paired with a work representing the calm before or after a storm, continuing a centuries-long tradition of illustrating nature in both its benign and hostile aspect. The fact that the Dihl et Guérhard factory chose to pair a storm at sea with a storm on land raises the possibility that a specific meaning was intended by this unusual selection, especially given the rarity of this subject matter on porcelain.

It is conceivable that these two stormy scenes can be interpreted as reflections of the political turmoil enveloping France in the late 1790s. King Louis XVI and Queen Marie-Antoinette (1755–1793) had been guillotined in 1793; the Reign of Terror had paralyzed the country from 1793 to 1794; and under the Directoire (1795–99), the country’s finances were in total disarray, religious institutions were under attack, and political tides were constantly shifting. It is plausible that the depiction of a turbulent and harsh natural world, where men and women are buffeted by forces outside of their control, is a statement about the extreme instability of the political and social climate in which the vases were produced. The factory’s location in close proximity to the Temple, where the royal family had been imprisoned before being executed, may have influenced the perception of pervasive insecurity and volatility.

Even if this possible interpretation cannot be substantiated, the pair of vases reflects a level of quality and innovation that was unsurpassed at this time. Dihl et Guérhard employed some of the finest porcelain painters working in France during this period, and due to the success of its export business, the factory was able to pursue new forms of decoration and create new models while other ceramic enterprises, including Sèvres, were striving to remain solvent. Dihl et Guérhard’s standing among the French porcelain manufacturers is best reflected by a letter written in 1800 on behalf of the Spanish Queen Maria Luisa (1751–1819), indicating her interest in patronizing the factory rather than Sèvres, because the porcelain “would be in a taste more modern and more pure.”

2 Dawson 1994, p. 358.
3 Plinval de Guillebon 1995, fig. 63.
4 Plinval de Guillebon 1972, p. 300.
6 Neither vase is marked, but the pair is attributed to Dihl et Guérhard on the basis of stylistic similarity to a pair of marked vases in the Onslow Collection, Clandon Park, Surrey, England; Ferguson 2016, pp. 174–75.
7 Similar grotesque decoration is found on a Dihl et Guérhard vase in the Victoria and Albert Museum, London (309.1. 2-1876), and on the pair of vases in Clandon Park (see note 6).
8 Plinval de Guillebon 1992, p. 133.
74. Pair of vases (Vase Médicis)

SÈVRES FACTORY, FRENCH, 1756–PRESENT
Decorated by Jean-François Robert (French, 1778–1832)
1811
Hard-paste porcelain decorated in polychrome enamels and gold, gilt bronze

.545: 27 1/4 x 18 1/2 x 18 1/2 in. (69.2 x 47 x 47 cm)
.546: 27 1/4 x 18 1/2 x 18 1/2 in. (69.2 x 47 x 47 cm)

Purchase, Rogers and 2011 Benefit Funds, and Gift of Dr. Mortimer D. Sackler, Theresa Sackler and Family, 2011
2011.545, 546

Marks: .545: incised in the interior near the rim: script D L with three dots between each letter; 9 over two slashes / R/No 4. .546: incised c in the interior near the rim: script D L with one dot after each letter

Inscriptions: .545: at lower right of reserve, signed: Robert. .546: at lower right of reserve, signed: Robert 1811

Construction/Condition: .545: molded in two pieces, joined with gilt-bronze mount; .546: molded in two pieces, joined with gilt-bronze mount; chips in rim

Provenance: given by Napoléon Bonaparte to Jérôme Bonaparte (delivered in 1812); Prince Anatole Demidov, husband of Jerome’s daughter Mathilde (in 1840); [his sale, Prince Anatole Demidov, Villa of San Donato, March 15, 1880, and following days, no. 123]; Palais Galliera, Paris, December 9, 1963, no. 39; Fabius Frères (until 2011; their sale, Sotheby’s, Paris, October 26–27, 2011, no. 178; sold to MMA)


NAPOLÉON I’S (1769–1821) PATRONAGE OF THE ARTS IN FRANCE IN THE early nineteenth century did much to revive the various industries that had suffered during the turmoil of the French Revolution (1789–99), and the Sèvres factory was a major beneficiary of Napoléon’s expenditures on his own behalf and for works of art to be given as diplomatic gifts.¹ The first fifteen years of the nineteenth century saw the development of a new style at Sèvres that reflected the evolving grandeur of Napoléon’s reign as emperor of France, and the richness of the decorative schemes and the scale of many objects distinguish the porcelain of this period from those works produced at the factory during the closing decades of the eighteenth century. In addition, the artistic creativity and technical refinement of Empire-period Sèvres reestablished the factory as one of the most prominent in Europe.

All of the attributes of Sèvres’s finest production of this period are evident in this pair of vases.² Their form derives from the famous Medici vase, a marble vase dating to the first century a.d., which was owned by the Medici family by the end of the sixteenth century. While the factory had used variants of this form since its founding,³ the size of these vases reflects the preference during the Empire period for imposing scale.⁴ The vases are decorated with a mottled brown glaze imitating tortoiseshell, known as fond écaille at the factory. While this ground color had been introduced at Sèvres in about 1790, it was rarely used because of the technical difficulties that it posed.⁵ The color had to be applied in differing degrees of saturation in order to achieve the varied tonality of real tortoiseshell, and when done successfully, it resulted in an illusion of depth and an almost shimmering surface, as seen on these vases. However, the fond écaille did not adhere as well to convex surfaces as it did to concave or vertical surfaces, which could cause noticeable differences in degrees of tonality, evident on these vases in the contrast between the rounded section of the waist and the vertical areas above it. This minor defect aside, the tortoiseshell ground is an unusually rich foil for the elaborate gilding that is one of the distinguishing features of these vases.

The backs of the vases are decorated with a variety of gilded motifs, the most prominent of which is a pair of confronted griffons separated by a bowl with flames on a tall pedestal (detail, left). Unusually, the motif of the griffons is the same scale as that of the painted reserve on the front of the vase, which gives the gilded decoration on the vases an atypical prominence. The gilding is further emphasized by the subtle but extremely effective contrast between the matte and burnished areas, creating a remarkable degree of both definition and nuance in all of the motifs. These vases reflect a relatively rare instance in which the gilding plays a major rather than merely supporting role in the visual impact of the overall decorative scheme.⁶
The front of each vase is painted with a large reserve depicting Napoléon and an entourage in an informal outdoor setting. In one vase (MMA 2011.545), Napoléon rides in a carriage with the Empress Marie-Louise (1791–1847) and another female, perhaps Princess Pauline (1780–1825), Napoléon’s sister. Among the entourage accompanying the carriage is Roustam Raza (ca. 1782–1845), Napoléon’s mamluk bodyguard, who is recognizable by his distinctive turban. The carriage passes in front of the south wing of the Château de Saint-Cloud, seen behind the elaborate fountain known as the Bassin du Fer-à-cheval. On the second vase (MMA 2011.546), Napoléon is depicted riding with companions, including Raza, in the Parc de Saint-Cloud with the hills of Bellevue and Meudon in the distance. The riders are about to embark on a hunt and wear the green livery of the imperial hunt.

Both reserves are signed “Robert,” indicating that they are the work of Jean-François Robert (French, 1778–1832), one of the most talented painters at Sévres in the early nineteenth century. Robert painted on canvas as well as on porcelain, and he frequently exhibited in the Salons, which were an integral part of official artistic life in Paris. Robert specialized in landscapes and hunting scenes, and his proficiency in the latter area prompted Alexandre Brongniart (French, 1770–1847), director of the Sévres factory, to request permission for Robert to attend the imperial hunts in order to sketch them. Robert was one of the few painters at Sévres who frequently created his own compositions rather than simply copying those provided to him on porcelain. Robert’s skill as an artist brought him the patronage of Élisa Bonaparte (1777–1820), Grand Duchess of Tuscany and sister of Napoléon, as well as Charles-Ferdinand de Bourbon (1778–1820), duc de Berry, who appointed Robert as peintre des chasses (painter of hunts) in 1819. Robert’s abilities as a porcelain painter are evident in the two reserves on these vases, which are simultaneously very detailed and highly atmospheric. The skillful handling of light in particular creates an impression of great depth in the landscape in the hunt reserve and makes the sky a major compositional element in the reserve depicting Saint-Cloud.

The subjects of the two reserves were almost certainly chosen to appeal specifically to Napoléon. A letter written in 1810 by Pierre Daru (French, 1767–1829), the head of the imperial household, noted that “His Majesty seemed to take pleasure in paintings on porcelain representing landscapes in the environs of Sévres, St-Cloud, and other imperial palaces, decorated with His Majesty’s promenades and hunts.” This known preference on the part of Napoléon must account for the selection of these two more informal compositions on the Museum’s vases rather than the more traditional official portraits customarily found on objects of this scale and importance.
The informal depictions of Napoléon would have made the vases seem especially appropriate to include among the large gift of works of art sent to Jérôme Bonaparte (1784–1860), the emperor’s youngest brother, on February 12, 1812. Napoléon had named Jerome the king of Westphalia in 1807, and after Jérôme’s marriage to Princess Catherine of Württemberg (1783–1835), the royal couple established their residence in Kassel, the capital of Westphalia. The shipment of art sent to Jérôme included numerous pieces of Sèvres porcelain, and the value of all the works of art exceeded the enormous sum of 43,000 francs. It is likely that the vases remained in Kassel only a short time, however, because Jérôme and Catherine were forced to flee Westphalia due to Napoléon’s military defeats in 1813. They eventually settled in Florence, presumably with many of their possessions, which reputedly filled one hundred and fifty wagons when they left Kassel.

The vases almost certainly accompanied the royal couple to Florence, because they appear in an 1880 auction held at the Villa of San Donato, located outside of Florence. Mathilde Bonaparte (1820–1904), the only daughter of Jérôme and Catherine, married Anatole Demidov (1812–1870), the enormously wealthy Russian entrepreneur and art collector, in 1840. Although Mathilde and Anatole separated several years after their marriage, it appears that Anatole kept many of the Bonaparte family possessions, including the vases. At the time of the marriage, Demidov had paid Jérôme a substantial sum with which to settle the latter’s debts, and Demidov acquired many of the family’s works of art in return. Anatole died in 1870, and with no children from the marriage, he made his nephew Paul the heir. Paul held a series of auctions from the Villa of San Donato in 1880, from which the Museum’s two vases were sold as number 122.

1 See, for example, Tamara Préaud in Préaud et al. 1997, no. 141, pp. 354–55.
2 The pair of vases has been published in greater depth by the present author in Munger 2015.
4 An earlier example of a Sèvres vase of enormous scale derived from the Medici vase is the Grand Vase of 1783, now in the Musée du Louvre, Paris (OA 6627).
5 I am grateful to Tamara Préaud for this observation.
6 It is almost certain that the gilding on the vases was executed by both François-Antoine Boullemier (French, 1773–1838), known as Boullemier the Elder (Archives, Cité de la Céramique, Sèvres, Vj’ 17, fol. 38, September 1810), and his brother, Antoine Gabriel Boullemier (French, 1781–1842), known as Boullemier the Younger (Archives, Cité de la Céramique, Sèvres, Vj’ 17, fol. 39, April and May 1810).
7 Cyrille Froissart, a ceramics expert in Paris and consultant to the 2011 sale at Sotheby’s, suggests this identification. See entry for these vases in Sotheby’s 2011, no. 178.
8 This same scene, with minor variations, was painted by Robert on an ice pail of 1811 now in the British Museum, London, and on a porcelain table top executed between 1813 and 1817; see Munger 2015, p. 309.
9 Robert first participated in the Salon of 1812, where he exhibited three landscapes (Landon 1812, vol. 2, p. 70), and he continued to exhibit at the Salon through the 1820s (Bellier de La Chavignerie and Auvray 1882–85, vol. 2, p. 394).
11 Quoted by Préaud in ibid.
12 Archives, Cité de la Céramique, Sèvres, Vbb 4, fol. 7, February 13, 1812.
13 For a description of the shipment, see Roth 1995, pp. 2–4.
14 Ibid., pp. 3–4.
16 Catalogue des objets d’art et d’ameublement 1880, pp. 29–30, no. 122. The purchaser of the vases at the Villa of San Donato sale is not known, and the next known appearance of the vases is in 1963; see Palais Galliera 1963, no. 39.
75. Teapot (Théière chinoise)

SÈVRES FACTORY, FRENCH, 1756–PRESENT
1832–34
Hard-paste porcelain decorated in polychrome enamels and gold, silver, ivory
7 1/4 × 5 ¹⁄16 in. (18.4 × 12.9 cm)
Purchase, Louis V. Bell Fund and Friends of European Sculpture and Decorative Arts Gifts, 2007 2007.408a, b

MARKS: printed on underside: circle enclosing star, SEVRES 32 in blue enamel (faint); painted on underside: M30av in gold

INSCRIPTIONS: incised on underside: 9 31.12

CONSTRUCTION/CONDITION: molded with applied spout and bases for handle; several leaf tips of handle replaced

PROVENANCE: Queen Marie-Amélie de Bourbon (delivered August 21, 1837); (sale, Perrin, Royère, Lajeunesse, Versailles, November 10, 1991, no. 60); (sale, Étude Tajan, June 22, 1999, no. 39); (sale, Sotheby’s, Paris, March 29, 2007, no. 123); [Dragesco-Cramoisan, Paris, until 2007; sold to MMA]


The fascination with Chinese and Japanese works of art and with an imagined notion of a distant and exotic Asia was an important stylistic impetus in Europe throughout the eighteenth century, and the taste for chinoiserie, as this artistic category came to be known, survived into the early years of the nineteenth century, albeit to a lesser degree. At the Sèvres factory, a resurgent interest in Asian art and in chinoiserie decoration appeared in the 1820s through the 1840s. The factory produced both forms and decoration that mixed Chinese- and Japanese-inspired motifs, often misunderstood, with European ones, while also displaying a more serious interest in genuine Asian sources.

The interest in both models and types of decoration evoking a fanciful Far East was present at Sèvres in the first two decades of the nineteenth century, but it flourished beginning in the 1820s and lasted another approximately twenty years. Alexandre-Évariste Fragonard (French, 1780–1850) had supplied a design for a théière Chinoise à pans (a shaped teapot in the Chinese style) as early as 1818, but he and other designers at the factory created a series of models and decorative schemes in the 1830s that reflected an exuberant chinoiserie style unlike any to precede it. Whereas earlier works in the chinoiserie taste were usually defined by painted decoration that included Chinese-inspired figures and motifs, the objects produced at Sèvres in the second quarter of the nineteenth century in this style attempted to integrate Asian-inspired forms and decoration to create objects that were more overtly non-European in appearance, even if the results bore little resemblance to genuine Asian works of art.

In 1832 Fragonard, the son of the painter Jean-Honoré Fragonard (French, 1732–1806), received payment from the Sèvres factory for a “drawing of a round Chinese Teapot only for the decoration,” and his watercolor design survives in the archives at the Sèvres factory. It is not clear if Fragonard designed the model of the teapot itself or just submitted a possible decorative scheme for it, but the teapot depicted in his watercolor relates very closely in form, although not in decoration, to the teapot in the Museum. Entitled théière Chinoise ronde (round Chinese teapot) at the factory, the example now in New York is one of eleven of this model known to have been produced between 1832 and 1846, and it appears that the painted decoration varied considerably among the eleven examples made. The factory marks on the Museum’s teapot indicate that it was fabricated in 1832, but archival records indicate that it did not enter the factory salesroom until December 31, 1834. The reasons for this two-year interval are not evident, but the fabrication of the silver and ivory handle may have played a factor in the delay, because the bill for the handle was not submitted until earlier that month. It appears that most if not all of
the teapots of this model were fitted with similar silver and ivory handles, and both the shape and design of the handle were clearly intended to evoke Chinese teapots and connote an “exotic” style.

Much of the teapot’s originality lies in its deliberate use of Chinese motifs, while employing them in a decidedly non-Chinese manner. The more overtly Chinese references include the lotus leaves at the terminations of the handles, the conjoined lotus flowers where the handles join the porcelain body, the scrolling cloud pattern of the ivory handle, the lotus leaf from which the spout emerges, and the spout that suggests an elephant’s trunk. While the elephant is not native to China, it was viewed as a symbol of an exotic East, and thus may have been considered suitable as a motif on a “Chinese teapot.” Less clearly Chinese in origin but presumably intended to evoke foreignness are the yellow ground color, closely identified with Chinese ceramics, and the prominent butterfly painted on each side (detail, page 235), a well-known symbol in Chinese art. In addition, the stylized wave motif at the base of the spout and the abstract scrolling pattern flanking the butterfly recall similar motifs in Chinese ceramics.

The tall arching handle, often referred to as a bail handle, was frequently used on Yixing stoneware teapots, and it has been suggested by Tamara Préaud that a Chinese porcelain teapot sold at auction in Paris in 1826 may have been a direct influence on the théière Chinoise ronde. The collection of an artist and art dealer named Sallé attracted considerable attention when it appeared at auction in April of that year, for not only was the collection formed with the serious intent of representing the range of Chinese ceramics, but the works were classified with a more scholarly focus than was common at that time. Number 374 in the sale was “a teapot with a handle above” (une théière, anse en dessus), and it is likely that it was seen by the Sèvres director, Alexandre Brongniart (French, 1770–1847). Brongniart was clearly aware of the importance of Sallé’s collection, since he requested purchase funds to acquire “several pieces of Chinese porcelain remarkable with regard to technical processes and that are lacking in this part of the manufactory’s collection.” A museum for ceramics created by Brongniart, assisted by the museum’s director, Denis-Désiré Riocreux (French, 1791–1872), reflects the increasing interest at the factory in having access to a wide range of historical and contemporary ceramics from which technical knowledge and artistic inspiration could be gleaned.

However, despite the prevalence of Chinese motifs and influences evident on this teapot, its appearance remains steadfastly European, no matter how startling and innovative it must have appeared in the 1830s. The scale of the motifs, the manner in which they are employed, and the palette of strong colors mark the teapot as entirely European in its aesthetic. While the interest in Asian models and decoration was increasing in the 1830s and 1840s, this latest embrace of chinoiserie was merely one stylistic current to pursue among the many available to the designers and painters at Sèvres. When Brongniart and Riocreux published their catalogue of the Musée Céramique in 1845, they illustrated a théière Chinoise ronde that has the same form as that of the Museum’s teapot, but its decoration is far removed from any Chinese influence. The large-scale floral decoration, as seen in the illustration, is wholly European in nature, and the ivory grip of the handle reflects the neo-Rococo style that gained popularity beginning in the 1830s. The only other known surviving théière Chinoise ronde appeared at auction in 2015. Made in 1846, its outsized floral painting is equally European in style, and any influence of Chinese works is remote. Possibly the last teapot of this model made at the factory, it reflects the passing of this particular phase of chinoiserie taste at Sèvres.

---

1 Tamara Préaud in Préaud et al. 1997, p. 228, no. 47.
2 See, for example, Préaud in ibid., p. 264, no. 73.
3 Préaud in ibid., p. 266, no. 75.
4 The primary difference lies in the shape of the handle, which is six-sided in the watercolor, as well as in small details, such as the stepped foot and dentilated decoration of the spout, which are absent in the Museum’s teapot.
5 Préaud in Préaud et al. 1997, p. 266.
6 Two examples that entered the salesroom on December 31, 1832, were decorated with “colored flowers”; Ibid.
7 The teapot remained in the salesroom until August 21, 1837, at which time it was delivered to Queen Marie-Amélie de Bourbon (1782–1866); Archives, Cité de la Céramique, Sèvres, Vf 41, fol. 99v.
8 The handle was fabricated by Louis-Honoré Boquet (French, d. 1860); Archives, Cité de la Céramique, Sèvres, Vf 41, fol. 299v.
9 See Ströber 2011, pp. 96, 98–99, no. 34.
10 For the latter, see Zhou Lili in Keizerlijk porselein 2011, p. 120, nos. 83, 84; Ströber 2011, pp. 100–101, no. 35.
12 Préaud in Préaud et al. 1997, p. 266.
13 Slitine 1996, p. 54.
14 Catalogue . . . composant le cabinet de M. F. Sallé 1826, p. 40.
15 Quoted in Préaud 1997, p. 87.
17 Brongniart and Riocreux 1845, pl. iv.
76A–D. Partial coffee service (Déjeuner “Culture et Récolte du cacao”)

(A) COFFEEPOT (CAFÉTIÈRE “CAMPANIENNE”)
SÈVRES FACTORY, FRENCH, 1756–PRESENT
Decorated by Jean-Charles Develly (French, 1783–1849)
Gilded by Pierre Riton (French, active 1821–60)
1836
Hard-paste porcelain decorated in polychrome enamels and gold
7 ⁷⁄₈ × 4 ⁷⁄₈ × 4 ¹⁄₁₆ in. (19.2 × 17.6 × 10.8 cm)
Purchase, The Charles E. Sampson Memorial Fund and Gift of Irwin Untermyer, by exchange, 1986 1986.281.1a, b
MARKS: painted on underside: crowned l P, SEVRES 1836 (factory mark 1834–45), in blue enamel, painted on underside: R (gilder's mark of Riton) and W (unidentified), both in gold

CONSTRUCTION/CONDITION: molded with applied handle and spout

INSCRIPTIONS: incised on underside: 32-12 (production mark for December 1832); j–a (unidentified workman's mark); script miii (thrower's mark of Nicolas Fischer, dates unrecorded)

(B) MILK JUG (POT À LAIT OVOÏDE)
SÈVRES FACTORY, FRENCH, 1756–PRESENT
Decorated by Jean-Charles Develly (French, 1783–1849)
Gilded by Pierre Riton (French, active 1821–60)
1836
Hard-paste porcelain decorated in polychrome enamels and gold
7 ⁵⁄₈ × 5 ⁷⁄₈ × 4 ¹⁄₁₆ in. (14.3 × 13.3 × 10.3 cm)
Purchase, The Charles E. Sampson Memorial Fund and Gift of Irwin Untermyer, by exchange, 1986 1986.281.4
MARKS: printed on underside: crowned l P, SEVRES 1836 (factory mark 1834–45), in blue enamel

INSCRIPTIONS: incised on underside: script le (mark of the molder J. C. Leguiller, 1778–ca. 1848); 31-5 (production mark for May 1831); inscription below scene: CULTURE ET RÉCOLTE DU CACAO; signed at lower left: c de velly 1836 in black enamel

CONSTRUCTION/CONDITION: molded

PROVENANCE: Queen Marie-Amélie de Bourbon (from 1837); [sold by Armin B. Allen, New York, in 1986 to MMA]


The interest in depicting foreign and exotic locations on Sèvres porcelain tea and dinner services begins in the earliest years of the nineteenth century, propelled in part by French Emperor Napoléon I’s (1769–1821) expedition to Egypt in 1798–99. The fascination with Egypt was both profound and long lasting, and some of the factory’s most inventive work is found on services that utilize Egyptian motifs in both two and three dimensions. The curiosity about foreign lands extended far beyond Egypt, however, and the taste for depictions of exotic places lasted into the 1840s. The popularity of this type of subject matter coincided with a growing interest in creating thematic programs for multi-piece services. In a letter from 1834, Alexandre Brongniart (French, 1770–1847), director of the Sèvres factory, stated his belief in the importance of linking sets of objects together by theme, as well as by decorative motifs, which would enhance their quality and appeal. Numerous dinner services and tea or coffee services (déjeuners) were produced in the 1820s and 1830s that illustrate subjects for which both the primary compositions and the secondary decoration were carefully considered and clearly specified. The range of themes was extensive; services depicting subjects as diverse as the départements of France, famous forests throughout the world, and the industrial arts in France indicate the diversity of decorative programs devised by the factory.

Déjeuners provided a more limited scope for thematic programs due to the smaller number of components, but a similarly broad range of subjects was chosen to iconographically unite the tray, teapot, milk jug, and a varying number of cups and saucers that formed a typical déjeuner. Depictions of locations within France, both historic and scenic, were increasingly chosen to decorate déjeuners, but foreign lands and customs remained a popular subject, and the Museum’s service, with its views of South America and cacao production, is one of the most remarkable of this genre.

This déjeuner is known by the title Culture et récolte du cacao (Cultivation and harvest of cacao), which appears beneath the scene on the tray. Consisting of a tray, coffee or chocolate pot, milk jug, and sugar bowl, the service originally had two cups and saucers, now missing. All of the components depict some aspect of the cultivation of cacao and the preparation of hot chocolate from the cacao beans. The déjeuner, which dates to 1836, was the second to be decorated with this theme, suggesting that the first déjeuner of 1833 illustrating this exotic subject had been especially well received. The factory’s project description for the earlier déjeuner lists the various scenes to be painted on the different components, most of which appear to have been reemployed with little variation on the present service.

The scale of the scene on the tray allows for the most complex depiction of various activities involving cultivation. In the left middle ground, cacao pods are being picked while the owner reclines in a hammock. In the left foreground, the pods are opened to allow fermentation, and hot chocolate is heating in a large ceramic pot over a fire. On the right, a trader is waiting for the cacao beans to be loaded onto his donkey. The scene is set in a South American landscape in which the tropical vegetation and a snowcapped mountain
The coffeepot, milk jug, and sugar bowl are decorated with scenes depicting different aspects of selling and preparing the cacao beans, or with figures preparing or consuming hot chocolate. The factory records indicate that the two cups would have had scenes illustrating the preparation and consumption of hot chocolate in Spain. All of the compositions were both conceived and executed by Jean-Charles Develly (French, 1783–1849), one of the most talented artists at Sèvres in the first half of the nineteenth century. Typically, the factory’s artists copied compositions that were provided to them rather than create their own, and Develly was one of the relatively few who routinely originated the scenes that he then painted on porcelain. Develly’s skill as an artist is evident in his design, executed in gouache, for the scene on the tray that survives at the Sèvres factory. The visual impact of Develly’s complex and layered compositions is enhanced both by the amount of white porcelain left undecorated, which provides a marked contrast to the restrained palette of the reserves, and by the brightly colored bands of ornament that evoke Aztec designs. These different patterns, which are distinguished by their variety, palette, and graphic boldness, are among the most original of any of those found on Sèvres porcelain of these years (detail, above). Some of them are derived from a book written by the German naturalist Alexander von Humboldt (1769–1859), who traveled extensively in South America in the years 1799–1804. His Vue des Cordillères, et monumens des peuples indigènes de l’Amérique (Views of the Cordilleras and Monuments of the Indigenous Peoples of the Americas, 1810) has been identified as the source for several of the designs, but the majority of the designs have not been traced and may reflect the imagination of the painters at the factory. Interestingly, Develly’s gouache design for the scene on the tray bears the inscription composé par / Mr. Develly, d’après les indications de M. de Humboldt et Rugendas (composed by Mr. Develly after the directives of Misters Humboldt and Rugendas). However, none of the scenes on the déjeuner can be located in any of Humboldt’s publications, and they may have been entirely conceived by Develly.

Both the 1833 and the 1836 déjeuners depicting the cultivation of cacao found favor with the French royal family. The earlier déjeuner was presented in 1835 by Louis-Philippe (1773–1850), king of France, to Manuel Pando Fernández de Pinedo (1792–1872), marqués de Miraflorés, a distinguished Spanish diplomat, while the Museum’s service was delivered to Queen Marie-Amélie de Bourbon (1782–1866) on August 21, 1837, perhaps also intended to serve as a diplomatic gift.

2 See, for example, the jewel coffer of 1842 presented to Queen Victoria; Pierre Ennès in Âge d’or des arts décoratifs 1991, p. 406, no. 228.
3 Préaud 1997, pp. 81–82.
4 Ibid., p. 82.
5 For example, the project description sheet for a service depicting non-European views (Service des vues de pays hors d’Europe) was very precise concerning all aspects of the decoration; cited by Khelissa in Wittwer 2007, p. 322.
6 Ennès 2002.
7 Khelissa in Wittwer 2007, pp. 284–93, no. 89.
9 For example, see Khelissa in Wittwer 2007, pp. 314–16, no. 97.
11 Only the sugar bowl from the earlier déjeuner is known today, Barbe 1990, pp. 62–63.
13 Clare Le Corbeiller in Metropolitan Museum 1987c, pp. 31–32. It is notable that the palette of the borders on the service corresponds exactly to that of the ornament illustrated in Humboldt’s book.
14 Préaud in Préaud et al. 1997, p. 277, no. 83. Johann Moritz Rugendas (1802–1858) was a German engraver who worked in collaboration with von Humboldt.
15 Préaud in ibid., pp. 374–75.
77. Pair of vases (Vase gothique Fragonard)

SÈVRES FACTORY, FRENCH, 1756–PRESENT
Model designed by Alexandre-Évariste Fragonard (French, 1780–1850)
Decorated by Jacob Meyer-Heine (French, 1805–1879)
Manufactured 1832, decorated 1844
Hard-paste porcelain decorated in polychrome enamels and gold, gilt bronze
.1: 14 ⁵⁄₁₆ × 12 ⁷⁄₈ × 7 ⁷⁄₈ in. (36.4 × 32.7 × 20 cm)
.2: 14 ⁵⁄₁₆ × 12 ³⁄₄ × 7 ³⁄₈ in. (36.4 × 32.4 × 18.7 cm)
Wrightsman Fund, 1992 1992.23.1, .2

MARKS: both with printed on interior: crowned monogram LP, SÈVRES 1844, in blue enamel; signed inside foot: J.M.H. in red enamel

INSCRIPTIONS: .1: incised inside foot: 32-3 (production mark for March 1832); LS in script (unidentified workman’s mark); inscriptions: below Copernicus in banderoles: COPERNIC. SYSTEME PLANÉTAIRE; MOTU/OCTAVE SPHERAE; in shield above: THOM. Below Gutenberg in banderoles: GUTTENBERG INVENTE L’IMPRIMERIE EN 1446; ABCDEFGHILMN/O/. . . ECELLIS; .2: incised inside foot: 32-3 (production mark for March 1832); LS in script (unidentified workman’s mark); inscriptions: below Bacon in banderoles: ROGER BACON DÈCOUVRE LA POUDRE, 1260; MCCXIII / MCCXII; below Gioja in banderoles: FLAVIO GIOIA INVENTA LA BOUSSOLE, VERS 1302; MCCXII / MCCXII INVE.

CONSTRUCTION/CONDITION: both vases are molded in two sections with molded and applied handles

PROVENANCE: (sale, Arcole, Paris, June 27, 1989, no. 82); Guy Stair Sainty; [Didier Aaron, New York; to MMA]


These two vases decorated in the neo-Gothic taste embody the eclecticism that characterizes so much of the art produced in mid-nineteenth-century France. The model for this vase was designed by Alexandre-Évariste Fragonard (French, 1780–1850), one of the most prolific designers at the Sèvres factory during the 1820s and 1830s. Given the title vase gothique Fragonard at Sèvres, the model transforms a Medici vase shape (entry 74) with the addition of prominent scrolling handles that are embellished with trefoils and stylized vegetation in low relief. The elaborate profile of the handles diminishes the essentially Neoclassical character of the vase’s form, and instead, the form combines harmoniously with the painted neo-Gothic decoration to suggest, however loosely, a work of art made in the late fifteenth century.

Nonetheless, the Gothic quality of the vase’s design is slight. When the model was exhibited shortly after its introduction at the 1823–24 New Year’s exhibition at the Musée du Louvre in Paris, and during the years in which it was in production, it was described as having a twelfth-century form and decorated in a variety of styles in addition to neo-Gothic.

The Museum’s vases are painted in gray and white with gilt highlights on a dark blue ground in a manner that intentionally evokes Limoges enamels from the sixteenth century. This stylistic borrowing was acknowledged at the factory where the painters’ records describe these vases as “in imitation of Limoges enamels,” and it is testimony to the designers and painters at Sèvres that the late Gothic and Renaissance styles are synthesized seamlessly. The decorative scheme of the two vases celebrates four significant inventions or discoveries by portraying the four men believed to be responsible for these accomplishments. On one vase Nicolaus Copernicus (Polish, 1473–1543) and Johann Gutenberg (German, ca. 1398–1468) are depicted on the two sides, and a band below each figure indicates the discovery of the planetary system and the invention of the printing press, respectively. The other vase portrays Roger Bacon (English, ca. 1214–1292) and Flavio Gioja, or Gioia (Italian, early 14th century), with the bands below crediting the invention of gunpowder and of the compass, respectively. The four figures, each accompanied by two assistants, stand within Gothic arches that evoke choir screens, and the blue ground of each vase is painted with a wealth of Gothic tracery and gilt highlights throughout. As has been observed by Clare Le Corbeiller, the profusion and variety of ornament on the vases have been executed with a degree of order that gives the overall composition a certain lightness and legibility despite the abundance of detail.

Alexandre Brongniart (French, 1770–1847), the director of the factory, was keenly interested in chemistry, technology, and scientific matters in general, and he would have determined the subject matter...
for the vases. In addition, Brongniart would have selected their decorative style. The Gothic revival in France was in its maturity when these works were painted, and they are among the most overtly neo-Gothic works produced at Sèvres. While other historic revival styles, especially the neo-Renaissance, were more popular at the factory, those made in the Gothic style fully embraced the motifs associated with the late Gothic period. Two cups and saucers from 1816 are among the earlier works produced at Sèvres in this style, and more designs in this idiom were produced until the 1840s.9

A distinguishing feature of these vases is the use of a technique associated with Renaissance metalwork to execute Gothic motifs on porcelain. It has been suggested by Bernard Chevallier the Louvre’s acquisition of collections in the 1820s that included Limoges enamels stimulated interest in this material, and a gueridon (pedestal table) made at Sèvres in 1830 is among the earliest works to employ Limoges-style decoration on porcelain.11 The development of this technique at Sèvres is closely linked to the factory painter Jacob Meyer-Heine (French, 1805–1879), who had trained as an enameler prior to his employment at Sèvres.12 Meyer-Heine’s first work in the Limoges-enamel style on porcelain appears to be on a vase dated 1840–41,13 and he decorated a series of vases in the early 1840s, including those under discussion, in this technique.14 Brongniart’s interest in the process of decorating porcelain using this style led to the creation of a new workshop at Sèvres devoted to enameling on copper. With the support of French King Louis-Philippe (1773–1850), Brongniart established the specialized workshop specifically to “produce works enameled in the manner of the Limousins,” and Meyer-Heine was appointed as its head in 1845. Due to the new focus of enameling on copper at Sèvres, the factory ceased to employ this technique for the decoration of porcelain, and the Museum’s vases are among the last works produced in this style.

The pair of vases entered the factory salesroom on December 31, 1844.16 In April 1845 the two vases were delivered to Louis-Philippe to be presented as gifts, though the intended recipient is unknown. In their use of Gothic motifs and a Renaissance-inspired technique to pay homage to historical figures who lived over a span of four centuries, the vases artfully reflect the century’s fascination with the past as an infinite resource to be mined for both content and style.

1 This pair of vases has been published in detail by Clare Le Corbeiller, and I am much indebted to her research and observations. See Le Corbeiller 1999a.
Equally successful aesthetically are a pair of vases gothique Fragonard with similar decoration in Entre cour et jardin 2007, p. 189, no. 188, ill.


Archives, Cité de la Céramique, Sèvres, Vf 51 (1844), fol. 72, Meyer.

Le Corbeiller 1999a, p. 146

Extremely little is known about Flavio Gioja, and his role, if any, in the invention of the compass is uncertain; ibid., pp. 148–50.

Ibid., p. 147.


Le Corbeiller 1999a, p. 147.

For an in-depth study of Meyer-Heine, see Massé 2011.

For example, see a pair of vases Adélaïde of 1844 now in the Musée du Louvre, Paris (Pierre Ennès in Âge d’or des arts décoratifs 1991, p. 410, no. 231), and a coupe Henri II, 1842–43, in the Wadsworth Atheneum, Hartford, Conn. (Roth 2007, p. 213).

“la fabrication des pièces émaillées à la manière des Limousins”; Exposition des manufactures royales 1846, p. 31, quoted by Ennès in Âge d’or des arts décoratifs 1991, p. 410.

Archives, Cité de la Céramique, Sèvres, Vv 4, fol. 34, no. 15 (feuille no. 80).

Archives, Cité de la Céramique, Sèvres, Vbb 11, fol. 2v, April 24, 1845, priced at 750 francs each.
78. Plaque depicting Bernard Palissy

**SÈVRES FACTORY, FRENCH, 1756–PRESENT**

Decorated by Nicolas-Marie Moriot (French, 1788–1852)

Enamelled copper decoration by Jacob Meyer-Heine (French, 1805–1879)

Biscuit figures modeled by Jean-Baptiste-Jules Klagmann (French, 1810–1867)

1846

Frame by Armand Feuchère (French, dates unknown)

Hard-paste porcelain decorated in polychrome enamels, with a gilt-bronze, polychrome enamel, and biscuit-porcelain frame

19 1/2 × 17 3/4 × 2 ⁵⁄₈ in. (49.5 × 45.1 × 6.7 cm)

Purchase, The Isaacson-Draper Foundation Gift, 2007 2007.221

**MARKS:** signed at lower left: Moriot 1846 d’après Debacq, in black enamel; frame lower right scroll signed: Mme Rle de Sévres; the lower left scroll signed: Meyer-Heine.

**INSCRIPTIONS:** inscriptions around medallion: ESPRITZ DE PAVENIR. POVRETE EMPECHE LES BONS; identifying inscriptions on oval enamel plaques on sides of frame: (on right): CONSEILS SUR L’AGRICULTURE; (on left): BREVET RECVD D’VL BLE DE MONTMORENCY; inscribed on the socle supporting the bust of Palissy: B. DE PALISSY

**CONSTRUCTION/CONDITION:** molded; losses to proper right arm of female figure at top, thumb of male figure missing, enamel plaques missing top and bottom

**PROVENANCE:** purchased by M. Cast de Clarc from the factory on October 4, 1856, private collection, England (consigned to Sotheby’s, London, by 2006); (Sotheby’s, London, sold to MMA)


**LITERATURE:** Exposition des manufactures royales 1846, p. 32, no. 38; Préau 1997, p. 91; Sotheby’s 2006, no. 29, ill., and frontispiece (detail); Jeffrey H. Munger in “Recent Acquisitions” 2007, p. 42, ill.; Wittwer 2007, ill. p. 183, under no. 20; Massé 2011, pp. 108, 113, n. 38, fig. 3

**THIS FRAMED PORCELAIN PLAQUE IS EXCEPTIONAL NOT ONLY FOR the quality of the plaque’s painted decoration but also for the complex and elaborate frame that was created for it. Various artists were commissioned to design the different components of the frame, and the complexity of the project represents an unusually ambitious undertaking on the part of the Sèvres factory. The frame is all the more remarkable as its design relates directly to the subject matter of the plaque, and its various elements were intended to embellish the portrayal of the plaque’s central character.**

The plaque depicts an episode from the life of the potter Bernard Palissy (French, 1510–1590), whose name became synonymous with French Renaissance ceramics. Palissy, in the center of the composition, holds a ceramic ewer ready to be placed in the kiln in front of him. He stands amid broken pieces of furniture that he has destroyed with the axe at his feet in order to provide wood for the kiln. His wife, who is seated behind him, conveys her dismay at this demolition with her outstretched arm, and a creditor standing next to her gestures explicitly toward Palissy’s unpaid bills. Depicted in profile, Palissy’s dignified bearing and calm determination convey the impression of an artist willing to sacrifice his material possessions for the sake of his artistry. This composition is based on a painting by Charles-Alexandre Debacq (French, 1804–1853), which was exhibited in the Salon of 1837.¹ The event depicted by Debacq was based upon Palissy’s own writings in which he described the sacrifices he had to make in order to fire his kiln.² The romantic notion of the artist that this description conveyed had inspired Alexandre-Évariste Fragonard (French, 1780–1859) to paint this scene in 1829,³ and Palissy attained an almost mythical status in the middle decades of the nineteenth century.⁴

Little was understood of Palissy’s work as a potter at the time,⁵ and he was celebrated primarily for the sacrifice he described, as well as for his principled devotion to the Protestant faith that had led to his imprisonment and eventual death. While Palissy’s actual ceramic production was barely known, he was the only identifiable potter recorded from the sixteenth century, and his elevation to national status coincided with a growing fascination with the French Renaissance after the revolution of 1830.⁶ The interest in this period of France’s history was manifested at Sèvres by a series of works deemed to be in the Renaissance style. A vase de la Renaissance was recorded in December 1832, which appropriately was delivered in 1838 to the Château de Fontainebleau,⁷ the most significant Renaissance palace in France. Other works, such as the standing cups known as Coupe de François Ier,⁸ named after the French king most closely identified with the French Renaissance, and the Coupe Chénard,⁹ were produced in
the second half of the 1830s, but it could be argued that the Museum’s plaque is the ultimate tribute both to Palissy and to French Renaissance art itself.

While the scene of Palissy sacrificing his furniture had been used in 1840 to decorate the tray of a tea service depicting the great potters,¹⁰ the same scene on the Museum’s plaque takes on additional layers of meaning due to its elaborately decorated frame. Made of gilt bronze, the frame incorporates seven oval plaques, six of which illustrate scenes from the life of Palissy. These enamel-on-copper plaques are painted tones of gray (grisaille) with gilt highlights, and the style of their painting is intended to evoke sixteenth-century Limoges enamels, one of the most important luxury arts of the French Renaissance. The plaques were painted by Jacob Meyer-Heine (French, 1805–1879), who had been appointed head of the workshop in 1840 and charged with reviving this earlier technique of enamel painting on copper.¹¹ The designs for the plaques were supplied by Alexandre Laemlein (French, 1813–1871), whose lifesize drawings both for the plaque and for the frame survive at the factory.¹² The same technique is used to decorate the two small kylix-shaped cups surmounting the frame at either end, but the motifs employed here are directly derived from Limoges enamels of the mid-sixteenth century rather than simply inspired by them. The green-and-gold enamel decoration of the frame recalls Renaissance
ornament prints in which animals, real and fantastic, emerge from scrolling vegetation, and the gilt-bronze dragons entwined with strapwork on the sides of the frame refer to the architectural vocabulary of the same period. At the top of the frame two figures flank a bust of Palissy, who receives a laurel wreath from the male figure. The white biscuit porcelain employed for these figures, as well as for the two putti at the base of the frame, may have been intended to evoke the white stucco figures that play a prominent role in the interior decoration at Fontainebleau.

Thus, all the elements of the frame allude to the various arts that defined the French Renaissance, and the variety and richness of the materials employed underscore Palissy’s stature as one of its most celebrated artists. In addition, it is possible that another more abstract allusion to this period was intended by the design of the porcelain plaque and its frame. The latter’s brilliant gilding and enamel colors, as well as its format, recall pieces of Renaissance jewelry, particularly the pendants made in the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries. Despite the enormous difference in scale, the framed plaque assimilates the precious, luxurious, and colorful qualities characteristic of the jewelry of this period, making this work one of the most sophisticated and multilayered of all those in the Renaissance-revival style.13

1 Préaud 1997, p. 91. See also Inventaire général des richesses d’art 1891, p. 8.
3 Ibid., fig. 170.
4 Ibid., pp. 189–92. See also Roth 2007, p. 222. As one example of Palissy’s celebrity in the middle decades of the nineteenth century, an over-lifesize sculpture of the potter in hard-paste porcelain was produced by the Parisian factory of Gilles in 1867; Chantal Meslin-Perrier in Meslin-Perrier and Paul 2008, pp. 96–97.
5 As Leonard N. Amico points out, the fragments of the famous ceramic grotto that Palissy created for Catherine de’ Medici in the Tuileries had not been excavated at this time; Amico 1996, p. 189. The excavation of the Tuileries grotto and kilns took place in 1855, 1865, and 1878; Schnitzer 1983–84, p. 48, n. 14.
6 Préaud 1997, p. 91.
8 Tamara Préaud in Préaud et al. 1997, p. 294, no. 94.
9 Préaud in ibid., p. 288, no. 91.
11 For more information, see Massé 2011. Pascal Massé notes the framed plaque sold for 4,500 francs on October 4, 1856, to a Monsieur Cast de Clar; Archives, Citè de la Céramique, Sèvres, Vz 9 (register of cash sales from 1856 to 1879), fol. 20 (B15), cited in Massé 2011, p. 113, n. 38. It had entered the salesroom on November 17, 1846; Archives, Citè de la Céramique, Sèvres, Vv 4, fol. 81, no. 5, cited in Sotheby’s 2006, p. 38.
12 Sotheby’s 2006, pp. 38, 40.
13 Not surprisingly, the framed plaque bears stylistic similarities to Renaissance-revival jewelry; for examples, see Greweng 2006, pp. 142–43, 196–97. I thank Wolfram Koepp, Marina Kellen French Curator, Department of European Sculpture and Decorative Arts, The Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York, for bringing these objects to my attention.
79. Finch

**CHELSEA FACTORY, BRITISH (LONDON) CA. 1744–70, TRIANGLE PERIOD, 1745–49**

1745–49

Soft-paste porcelain

7 1/2 × 3 1/2 × 3 1/4 in. (19.1 × 8.9 × 8.3 cm)


**MARKS:** unmarked

**CONSTRUCTION/CONDITION:** molded; numerous losses to applied leaves

**PROVENANCE:** Thomas Burn, Rous Lench Court, Worcester, England; Rous Lench Court, England; (Christie’s, London, May 29–30, 1990, no. 347; sold to English private collector); private collection, England (to Brian Haughton); [Brian Haughton Gallery, London, until 2014; sold to MMA]

**EXHIBITION:** “Loan Exhibition of Chelsea China,” Royal Hospital, Chelsea, London, June 20–July 21, 1951

**LITERATURE:** Tilley 1950, p. 15, fig. 3; *Chelsea China* 1951, p. 9, no. 22, ill. p. 15; Austin 1977, p. 110, under no. 103; Christie’s 1990, no. 347, ill.; *Nature’s Triumph* 2011, p. 21, fig. 15

The factory that was to dominate the high end of porcelain production in Britain for much of the eighteenth century was established in the London suburb of Chelsea around 1744.1 This location proved to be well suited for an enterprise that aimed to make luxury goods, since Chelsea was a fashionable residential area, and the factory site was close to the Ranelagh Gardens, which quickly became popular with the affluent classes after its founding in 1746. Unlike the majority of porcelain factories established on the Continent by royal or noble patrons, the Chelsea factory was founded by a silversmith, designer,2 and entrepreneur, Nicholas Sprimont (Walloon, 1716–1771), who emigrated from Liège to London around 1742. While some of the silver made by Sprimont, or on which he collaborated, are among the most important works produced in England in the mid-eighteenth century,4 surviving works by him are rare, although he continued to work as a silversmith while directing the Chelsea factory. It is clear that Sprimont was an astute businessman, however, and his involvement in the London silver trade equipped him well to serve the luxury market in the new medium of porcelain.

It appears that Sprimont was assisted by Charles Gouyn (French, d. 1785), a Huguenot from Dieppe, in establishing the factory, but Gouyn left by 1749 to found his own factory (entry 85).5 Nonetheless, it was Sprimont who set the artistic direction at Chelsea, and his work as a silversmith and designer determined the character of the forms and sculptural motifs that distinguish Chelsea porcelain from its earliest days.6 In addition, Sprimont’s keen entrepreneurial sense kept the factory attuned to changes in taste, which allowed Chelsea to remain at the forefront of the porcelain market in England for the first twenty years or so after its founding. He also must have fully understood the need for technical innovation, because the compositions of the soft-paste body and the glaze used at Chelsea were repeatedly altered in the quest for a better and more durable porcelain. The factory changed the mark it employed on three occasions, but the timing of the introduction of new marks does not seem to correspond to changes in the porcelain and glaze recipes.7

This figure of a finch on a tree stump dates from the earliest years at Chelsea, which are known as the Triangle period due to the incised triangle mark that was in use from 1745 to 1749. This finch is not marked, but it corresponds in several important aspects to other works from this period that do bear this mark.8 The soft-paste porcelain made at Chelsea during the Triangle period is characterized by its whiteness, an effect that was sometimes enhanced by the addition of tin to the glaze, which was practiced at some of the French soft-paste porcelain factories at this same time (entries 47–52). Chelsea’s ability to produce
a soft-paste body of this quality so soon after it was established was a remarkable achievement, and while the factory would continue to experiment with ingredients, the first soft paste made at Chelsea allowed it to produce both wares with ambitious low-relief decoration and porcelain sculptures with the degree of detail seen in this figure of a finch. The modeling of the finch is notable for the precise rendering of the bird’s head, which conveys a sense of alertness and intelligence, and for the subtle forms of the bird’s body in which both the structure and feathers are skillfully suggested. The finch sits on a tree stump that, too, has been modeled with an unusual degree of realism, making the stump an important part of the composition rather than simply a support for the bird. The extreme naturalism with which the finch is depicted relates closely to the naturalism found in many of the factory’s works from these years when the applied flowers, leaves, and various creatures play an innovative and outsized role in the decoration. The finch was left “in the white,” as were many of the wares produced during the Triangle period, which suggests the factory recognized the quality of the porcelain it was able to produce.

Despite the technical and artistic success embodied by the finch, the factory appears to have produced only a small number of examples of this figure, and the sculptural production in general was quite limited during the Triangle period, with tablewares and tea wares seemingly dominating production. Although the quantity of the factory’s output was modest during its first few years, it had already attracted sufficient attention for the newspaper the Daily Advertiser to state in March 1745, “We hear that China made at Chelsea is arriv’d to such Perfection, as to equal if not surpass the finest old Japan, allow’d so by the most approved Judges here; and that the same is in so high Esteem of the Nobility, and the Demand so great, that a sufficient Quantity can hardly be made to answer the Call for it.” Four years after this assessment appeared in the press, the factory moved to larger quarters nearby, a reflection of its initial success. Reopening in May 1750, Chelsea had already advertised a range of new models and designs, indicating that it would display “a Taste entirely new.” The ceramic body and glaze were modified as well, and a new mark was introduced consisting of an anchor in relief raised on a small circle. An anchor in various forms would serve as the mark for the remainder of the factory’s history, and its adoption coincided with the factory’s shift into a more mature phase.

1 For a general history of the factory, see Spero 1995, pp. 3-11; Adams 2001; Adams 2010. This author is much indebted to the research of these two scholars.
2 According to testimony from Sprimont’s wife, he was actively involved in training workers at the factory in modeling and decorating; Mallet 1996.
3 Sprimont was from Liège in what is now eastern Belgium, and as the region is known as Wallonia, its residents are called Wallonians.
4 For example, see the Ashburnham centerpiece, Victoria and Albert Museum, London (M.46.1, 2-1791); the kettle on stand with a burner in the State Hermitage Museum, Saint Petersburg (Lopato 2015, pp. 137-43, no. 45/1); and the Neptune centerpiece in the British Royal Collection (RCIN 59282). Sprimont’s exact role in the creation of these objects remains a topic of debate.
5 Gouyn’s role may have been more extensive than previously realized; see Dragesco 1993, pp. 14-19.
6 While the products reflected Sprimont’s vision, the degree to which he modeled the figures and wares in the period before the arrival of the modeler Joseph Willems (Flemish, 1715/16–1766) in 1748 is not yet known. It has been suggested that Sprimont may have been responsible for everything during these years; Mallet 1984, p. 237; H. Young 1999, p. 36.
7 Spero 1995, p. 4.
8 Tilley 1950.
9 Other known examples are in the Museum of Fine Arts, Boston (1988.781), and Colonial Williamsburg, Williamsburg, Va. (1963-64). There were two figures of a finch in the Rous Lench Collection, of which one is MMA 2014.565 (both are illustrated in Tilley 1950, fig. 3).
10 Spero 1995, p. 4. Simon Spero notes that Sprimont may have influenced the wording of the announcement.
80. La Nourrice

CHELSEA FACTORY, BRITISH (LONDON), CA. 1744–70, RED ANCHOR PERIOD, CA. 1752–58

Model attributed to Joseph Willems (Flemish, 1715/16–1766)

ca. 1753–55

Soft-paste porcelain decorated in polychrome enamels and gold

7 ⁹⁄₁₆ × 4 ¹⁄₄ × 4 in. (19.2 × 10.8 × 10.2 cm)

Purchase, Friends of European Sculpture and Decorative Arts Gifts, 2012 2012.506

MARKS: painted on base on proper left side: anchor in red enamel

CONSTRUCTION/CONDITION: slipcast

PROVENANCE: A. C. J. Wall Esq., Oxfordshire (until 1970; sale, Christie’s, London, October 19, 1970, no. 119); [E & H Manners, London, until 2012; sold to MMA]

LITERATURE: Christie’s 1970, no. 119, frontispiece

THE PRODUCTION OF FIGURES WAS A MAJOR FOCUS FOR THE Chelsea factory for much of its history, and the prominence accorded to figural work coincided with the arrival of the modeler Joseph Willems (Flemish, 1715/16–1766) at the factory in 1748, at which time his name is first recorded. Like Nicholas Sprimont (Wallon, 1716–1771), Willems was from the Low Countries, and it is clear that he was a capable sculptor by the time of his arrival in England, although nothing is known of his training prior to 1748. It appears that Willems assumed complete responsibility for the factory’s porcelain sculpture upon his employment, and all of the models introduced between around 1749 and 1766 are regarded as his work. Willems’s versatility is evident by the types of figures he created, including the Italian commedia dell’arte, street merchants, chinoiserie figures, birds and animals, and figures personifying the Five Senses. Although he frequently looked to the work of other artists, and to the figures of Johann Joachim Kändler (German, 1706–1775) at Meissen in particular, Willems’s skill as a mod- eler ensured that his figures transcended mere copying.

Willems’s seated woman nursing a baby was one of the most popular figures made at Chelsea and produced over a number of years. The model first appeared during the Raised Anchor period (1749–52); however, the majority of surviving examples date from the second half of the 1750s and thus bear the red anchor mark used during those years. This model of a nursing woman is known as La Nourrice, and its French name derives from the seventeenth-century French pottery figures of the same composition, one of which must have served as the source for Willems’s figure. It seems that a sizable number of lead-glazed earthenware examples of a seated woman nursing a child were produced in the early years of the seventeenth century. These figures are thought to have been made in Fontainebleau, the site of one of the most important royal châteaux, or in neighboring Avon, and a variety of names have been proposed as the author of the model (fig. 51). Guillaume Dupré (French, 1579–1640), sculptor to Henry IV (1553–1610), king of France, is often credited with creating the model for this figure, but this attribution remains speculative. The French versions of La Nourrice are dated to the early seventeenth century due to a document that records the gift in 1608 of a pottery figure of a nurse, presumably of the same model, to the daughter of Madame de Montpensier. It is not known who actually made the figures of La Nourrice, although the names of several potters are known who were producing ceramics for the upper strata of society, including those of Claude Bérault (French, dates unknown), Claude

Berthélémy (French, ca. 1555–1626), and Berthélémy de Blènod (French, active early 17th century). Very little is known about these men or their workshops, and it is possible that figures of *La Nourrice* were made at more than one pottery, especially given the clear popularity of the model. This supposition is strengthened by the fact that the two French examples of *La Nourrice* from the early seventeenth century in the Museum show subtle but significant differences in terms of their modeling, detailing, and types of glazes used. However, it is not impossible that these differences can be explained by the reworking of molds necessitated by extensive use, resulting in small differences created by each reworking.

While much remains to be discovered about the French pottery examples of *La Nourrice*, it seems clear that one of them must have been made available to Willems at Chelsea. Willems’s figure closely follows all the compositional elements of the French models, and the similarity of the treatment of the back of Willems’s figure to that of the French versions indicates that he had access to a three-dimensional model rather than having to work from a print. The availability of a French example raises many questions, including why and when did one or more of these figures go to England, who would have acquired one and where, and how was one made available to the Chelsea factory. In regard to the last question, it is possible that one of Sprimont’s wealthy clients or backers owned a French example of *La Nourrice* and either suggested that it be copied at Chelsea or requested a version in soft-paste porcelain, but this is entirely speculative. The creation of *La Nourrice* at Chelsea proved to be an astute business decision, as the numerous surviving examples attest to its considerable popularity, which was long-lived. The molds for the figure would have required reworking numerous times due to the many examples produced, which may explain the slight differences visible between the Museum’s Raised Anchor version of the early 1750s (fig. 52), and the version made in the mid to late 1750s in the following Red Anchor period (ca. 1752–58). The later figure is more crisply modeled and defined, and those qualities, in combination with the accomplished but restrained enamel decoration, result in a much more refined piece of porcelain sculpture.

It is not clear why the figure of a wet nurse with a suckling child, based upon an early seventeenth-century French pottery model, exerted appeal in England in the mid-eighteenth century, but its popularity was such that the model was copied at the Liverpool factory of Richard Chaffers (British, d. 1765) around 1760, and it was also produced in Staffordshire in creamware (lead-glazed earthenware).10

1 Sprimont was from Liège in what is now eastern Belgium, and as the region is known as Wallonia, its residents are called Walloons.
2 The terracotta figure *Man in Ragged Clothes* signed and dated 1736 by Willems measuring H. 29 1/4 in. (74.3 cm) was acquired by the Metropolitan Museum in 2013 (2013.601).
3 H. Young 1999, p. 106.
4 Ibid.
5 The various periods at Chelsea are defined by the factory marks employed, but there is a lack of consensus in the Chelsea literature in defining the parameters of each period. Hilary Young (1999, p. 197) suggests the following: Triangle period, 1745–49; Raised Anchor period, 1749–52; Red Anchor period, ca. 1752–58; and Gold Anchor period, 1758–69.
6 Wardropper 2004, p. 44; Viennet 2010, p. 92.
7 Wardropper 2004, p. 44. In this instance, Madame de Montpensier refers to Henriette Catherine de Joyeuse (1585–1656).
8 MMA 17.190.2057; 1974.356.303.
81. Chinese Musicians

CHESA FACTORY, BRITISH (LONDON), CA. 1744–70, RED ANCHOR PERIOD, CA. 1752–58

Model attributed to Joseph Willems (Flemish, 1715/16–1766)
c. 1755/56

Soft-paste porcelain decorated in polychrome enamels
14 1/2 × 14 1/2 × 14 ⅜ in. (36.8 × 36.8 × 37.1 cm)
Gift of Irwin Untermyer, 1964 64.101.474

MARKS: painted on upper base: anchor in red enamel

CONSTRUCTION/CONDITION: molded and modeled; numerous losses to leaves and flowers on base; restoration to hat of male figure, to his pigtail, and to the fingers of all figures; glaze flaws in several areas.

PROVENANCE: Frank Stoner, London (in 1924); W. E. Hurcomb, London (until 1930; to Mrs. Francis P. Garvan); Mrs. Francis P. Garvan, New York (from 1930; Irwin Untermyer (by 1941–64; to MMA)


LITERATURE: Blunt 1924, pp. 26–27, no. 3a, pl. 12a; King 1925, frontispiece; China Trade 1941, fig. 46; Downs 1941, p. 12; Jourdain 1941, p. 110, fig. 3; French and English Art Treasures 1942, no. 591; C. L. Avery 1949b, no. 61, pl. XVIII; Hackenbroch 1957, pp. 53–55, fig. 39, pl. 29–31; Yvonne Hackenbroch in Metropolitan Museum 1977, p. 137, no. 263, ill.; Metropolitan Museum 1983a, p. 231, no. 70, ill.; Metropolitan Museum 1994, p. 295, no. 88, ill.

THE LARGE GROUP NOW KNOWN AS THE CHINESE MUSICIANS represents one of the towering achievements of the modeler Joseph Willems (Flemish, 1715/16–1766) at Chelsea and indeed of the factory itself. Composed of four figures, one of which represents a child, the group is the largest and most complex of any produced at Chelsea or at any other eighteenth-century porcelain factory in England. Because of its scale and the number of figures, the group would have entailed a highly laborious process to model and to assemble, and to fire it successfully would have presented additional challenges revealed in the small firing cracks and in the areas in which the enamel decoration appears slightly scorched. One other example of the Chinese Musicians exists, and it is likely that very few were produced due not only to the difficulty of fabricating it but also to the high price at which it had to be sold.

One Chelsea factory sale catalogue from April 1756 lists “A most magnificent LUSTRE in the Chinese taste, beautifully ornamented with flowers and a large groupe of Chinese figures playing on music,” which must refer to this model. The term “lustre” indicates that it was made to serve as a lighting device, and the central openings in both surviving groups were probably created to accommodate a candelabrum, which was made of either porcelain, gilt bronze, or tole (painted tin or other metal). Willems composed the group without a primary vantage point, and it is clear that it is intended to be seen in the round, since there is equal visual interest from every perspective. It is likely that the group was made to decorate a dessert table, and, given the scale and elaborate composition, the Chinese Musicians must have served as the centerpiece. The ambitiousness of the composition is matched by the quality of the painted decoration, and the larger figures wear costumes decorated with patterns of unusual complexity, which are executed with extraordinary skill.

While Willems frequently looked to both three- and two-dimensional models, either to copy or for inspiration, the figures in this group appear to be his creations and notable for both the grace and expressiveness of their poses. Each figure either rings a bell or plays a tambourine, and he or she turns in space, serving to animate the composition. The four figures are linked together by their gestures, and Willems has imparted an almost dancelike rhythm to their arrangement, which reinforces the impression of music making. It is possible that Willems was influenced by prints done after paintings by the French artist François Boucher (1703–1770), who produced a large number of works in the 1740s with chinoiserie subject matter that exhibit a similar sense of fantasy, elegance of pose, and emphasis on decorative effect as found in Willems’s group, but there is no evidence of direct borrowing from any of Boucher’s compositions. While Willems
modeled other “Chinese” figures, this group represents his tour de force in this stylistic vein.

The fashion for chinoiserie was at its maturity in England in the mid-eighteenth century, and works reflecting this taste appeared in all media. The Chelsea factory had incorporated chinoiserie motifs in its decorative vocabulary for painted decoration from the factory’s inception, and some of Chelsea’s earliest, more sculptural wares specifically evoked Chinese figures. Chinese- and Japanese-inspired motifs and forms influenced the soft-paste porcelain factories in England, and chinoiserie scenes were among the most popular types of decoration on Staffordshire salt-glazed stonewares at this precise time. Within this context, it is not surprising that Willems chose Chinese figures as the theme for his most ambitious work, but it has been suggested that a specific theatrical event may have served as the impetus.

The ballet Les Métamorphoses Chinoises (also known as The Chinese Festival) was presented at the Theatre Royal, Drury Lane, in London in November 1755 under the auspices of David Garrick (1717–1779), the well-known British actor and producer. This production was a restaging of Jean-Georges Noverre’s (French, 1727–1810) Les Fêtes Chinoises, which had achieved great success and established the career of its choreographer at the Opéra Comique in Paris. The lavish sets and costumes of both productions epitomized the taste for a chinoiserie that embodied a highly fanciful vision of China, as well as a concomitant sense of luxury, and the ballet was initially very well received in London. Political tensions between England and France quickly doomed the London production, but the ballet served to further raise the visibility of the fashion for chinoiserie. As Willems was presumably modeling the Chinese Musicians in late 1755 or early 1756, it is not impossible that the artistic success of both productions of the ballet prompted his choice of subject matter for this group. In addition, the stage depiction of an exotic Far East evoked through dance, music, and costume may have influenced the unusually theatrical aspect of Willems’s composition in which music is being made and dance is suggested, albeit through the medium of porcelain.

3 See, for example, Roland Michel 2003, pp. 116–17, and fig. 78.
4 Adams 2001, fig. 9.1.
5 See, for example, Spero 1995, p. 16, no. 6.
6 A notable example is the tea caddy made in the form of a seated Chinese man, ca. 1745–49 (MMA 64.101.415a, b).
7 This suggestion was made by Clare Le Corbeiller in a letter to J. V. G. Mallett, Keeper, Department of Ceramics, Victoria and Albert Museum, London, January 26, 1984, curatorial files, Department of European Sculpture and Decorative Arts, The Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York.
8 Ou Hsin-yun 2008.
82. Botanical plate with spray of lilies

CHELSEA FACTORY, BRITISH (LONDON), CA. 1744–70, RED ANCHOR PERIOD, CA. 1752–58

ca. 1755
Soft-paste porcelain decorated in polychrome enamels
1 1/4 × 11 × 11 in. (3.2 × 27.9 × 27.9 cm)
Purchase, Sidney R. Knafel Gift, in honor of Jeffrey Munger, 2016 2016.223

MARKS: painted on underside: anchor in red enamel

CONSTRUCTION/CONDITION: molded; slight wear to enamel decoration

PROVENANCE: private collection, England; [Brian Haughton Gallery, London, until 2016; sold to MMA]

LITERATURE: unpublished

IN THE EARLY 1750S THE CHELSEA FACTORY BEGAN LOOKING TO botanical prints as sources for its painted decoration. The plants, flowers, fruits, and vegetables chosen to decorate many of the factory’s wares over an approximately five-year period beginning in 1752 constitute one of the most recognized and appreciated types of decoration employed at Chelsea during the factory’s history. Other porcelain factories, notably Meissen, had practiced botanical decoration prior to its appearance at Chelsea, but the Chelsea painters used this subject matter in an entirely original manner, which remains viewed as one of the factory’s greatest achievements. The style of the flower painting executed at Meissen in the 1740s was typically very precise and controlled, and motifs were used sparingly on large expanses of white porcelain. In contrast, the botanical decoration at Chelsea was much freer and more loosely painted and often with a sensuous and almost exuberant quality. The scale of the motifs tended to be large, taking up much of the surface of the object in question, with various insects and leaves or flowers inserted around the primary motif. Leaves, flowers, fruit, and vegetables were rarely confined to the center of a plate; the borders offered additional space onto which leaves or flowers might extend or insects hover.

The porcelains produced at Chelsea and decorated in this manner have become known as the “Hans Sloane wares,” a reference to the great physician, botanist, and collector who played a highly prominent role in the cultural life of London during the first half of the eighteenth century. In 1713, Hans Sloane (Irish, 1660–1753) purchased a large tract of land in Chelsea, which included the famous botanical garden, the Chelsea Physic Garden, founded in 1673, and where Sloane had studied in the 1680s. While Sloane had no direct role in the production of the wares now associated with his name—and indeed, he died in 1753 just as the earliest wares in this style were being made—his patronage of the garden was to prove influential to their creation.

While both dinner and tea wares were produced with botanical decoration at Chelsea, the vast majority of objects decorated in this manner were plates, dishes, and oval serving dishes, presumably because their largely flat surfaces were more conducive to the botanical compositions. The standard format for these wares featured a large botanical specimen that was accompanied by related attributes, such as blossoms, fruit, or seedpods with one or more butterflies or other insects added for decorative effect. Most of the primary motifs were based on botanical prints, and the painters strove for accuracy, but only to a certain extent. Leaves from another plant might have been substituted if they improved the composition, the colors of blossoms were occasionally changed, particularly if they were white, and the specimen’s accompanying attributes were sometimes fanciful.
A variety of publications must have been available to the factory’s painters, but the work of one man in particular not only links a number of these publications but also reflects the influence of the Chelsea Physic Garden. Georg Dionysius Ehret (1708–1770) was a German artist who made a specialty of botanical illustration. He worked throughout Europe and eventually in England, painting and drawing thousands of specimens. His concern for scientific accuracy, coupled with his artistic skills and talent, ensured his professional success during a period in which the appreciation of the natural sciences grew exponentially. He provided illustrations for numerous botanical publications written by different authors, and several of these publications served as source material at the factory. Ehret made his first trip to England in 1735, at which time he met both Sloane and Philip Miller (British, 1691–1771), who held the title of Curator of the Garden of Chelsea. Ehret, who soon married Miller’s sister-in-law, had extensive access to the Chelsea Physic Garden, where he drew many plants, a sizable percentage of which came from countries other than England.

It is highly likely that one of Ehret’s drawings or watercolors inspired the depiction of the lily that is the subject of
the Museum’s plate, one of ten Chelsea botanical wares acquired by the Museum in 2016.5 Ehret produced at least three different watercolor illustrations of this type of lily, which he identified as a Martagon Lily, 6 and one of his drawings was reproduced in Christoph Jacob Trew’s Plantae Selectae, a botanical publication issued in installments beginning in 1750,7 which served as a source at the factory. The decoration on the Museum’s plate is closely related to that found on two Chelsea plates in private collections,8 but it is not clear if all three illustrate the same type of lily, or if the differences between the depictions can be explained by artistic license on the part of the factory painters. None of the plates faithfully copies the colored engraving in Trew’s publication, but this may be due to the selective choice of motifs, or because a different source was used.

The association of Sloane with Chelsea wares and botanical decoration dates from July 1, 1758, when an advertisement appeared in a Dublin newspaper regarding the sale of a tureen decorated “in curious Plants, with Table Plates, Soup plates, and Desart Plates, enamelled from Sir Hans Sloan’s Plants. . . .”9 This sale was one of three that took place in Dublin in 1758 in which porcelain from the Chelsea factory was auctioned, and these sales have been viewed as the factory’s effort to dispose of old stock in a market not as current in terms of fashion as that of London’s.10 It has been suggested by Sally Kevill-Davies that linking porcelain with botanical decoration with Sloane’s name added an element of prestige to these wares, given the renown of the late patron of the Chelsea Physic Garden.11 If the former assumption is accurate, it is notable that the popularity of botanical decoration was already fading by 1758, approximately six years after the first wares decorated in the manner were produced. By the late 1750s, changes in taste embraced more elaborate forms of decoration. Gilding and the use of ground colors were employed increasingly by the factory, and the influence of Sèvres porcelain was to play an important role in the factory’s next chapter (entry 84).

1 For example, see Cassidy-Geiger 2008, pp. 462–63, nos. 205a, b.
2 The most comprehensive treatment of the so-called Hans Sloane wares made at Chelsea is found in Kevill-Davies 2015, to which the author is much indebted.
3 Spero 1995, p. 43, no. 36.
4 Calmann 1977.
5 MMA 2016.217–.226.
6 Kevill-Davies 2015, pp. 152–53, no. 45.
7 Trew 1750–73, Decuria ii (1751), Tab. xi, ill. in Kevill-Davies 2015, p. 152.
9 Advertisement from Faulkner’s Dublin Journal, July 1, 1758, quoted in Kevill-Davies 2015, p. 46.
10 Adams 2001, p. 112.
11 Kevill-Davies 2015, p. 46.
83. Pair of peacocks

**CHELSEA FACTORY, BRITISH (LONDON), CA. 1744–70, RED ANCHOR PERIOD, CA. 1752–58**

ca. 1755–58

Soft-paste porcelain decorated in polychrome enamels

.480: 18 ⁷⁄₈ × 10 × 6 ¾ in. (47.9 × 25.4 × 17.1 cm)

.481: 18 ¾ × 10 ³⁄₄ × 6 ¹³⁄₁₆ in. (47.6 × 27.3 × 17.3 cm)

Gift of Irwin Untermyer, 1964 64.101.480, .481

**MARKS:** unmarked

**CONSTRUCTION/CONDITION:** .480: press-molded; numerous losses to leaves and flowers on base, repair at join between feather and head; .481: press-molded; numerous cracks in tail, repairs at neck, restoration of feathers on top of head, numerous losses to leaves and flowers on base

**PROVENANCE:** Sir Ivor Maxse (until 1946; sale, Sotheby’s, London, February 1, 1946, no. 32); Irwin Untermyer (by 1957–64; to MMA)


**LITERATURE:** Sotheby’s 1946, no. 32; Hackenbroch 1957, p. 63, fig. 47, pl. 12; Yvonne Hackenbroch in Metropolitan Museum 1977, p. 135, no. 259, ill.; Sotheby’s 2013, p. 38, under no. 436

**Figures of birds were produced at the Chelsea factory from its earliest years (entry 79), and they accounted for an important category of the sculptural work done by the factory in its first decade or so. The vast majority of birds were made during the Raised Anchor period (1749–52), and it appears that approximately half of all figural models created during these years represent various types of birds.** Most of them are small in scale, modeled with relatively little detail, and supported on sturdy tree-trunk bases, but typically their enamel decoration animates their simple forms. At least twenty-two of the models are based on plates from *A Natural History of Uncommon Birds, and of Some Other Rare and Undescribed Animals, Quadrupeds, Fishes, Reptiles, Insects, &c. (1743–51)*, the influential publication by British ornithologist George Edwards (1694–1773), which appeared sequentially in four volumes beginning in 1743. Edwards’s renderings of hundreds of species of birds were distinguished by the accuracy with which they were portrayed, including their coloration. This concern for scientific rigor was uncommon, and Edwards helped establish ornithology as a serious discipline.

It is notable that the Chelsea factory elected to use Edwards’s prints as a source, reflecting the factory’s serious intent and artistic ambitions. The first two volumes of *A Natural History*, which provided the sources for the Raised Anchor period birds, represented the most up-to-date and scholarly ornithological research, and the factory’s awareness of new information concerning the natural world was to inform the decoration of the so-called botanical plates that appeared only a few years later (entry 82).

The birds produced during these years must have been commercially successful given the large number of models created, but for reasons that are not clear, the popularity of these figures declined in the following Red Anchor period (ca. 1752–58), and relatively few new models appeared. This pair of peacocks, while unmarked, must date to these same years, since the only other known pair of this model bears the Red Anchor mark (fig. 54). The peacocks are considerably larger than any of the birds produced during the preceding period, and they are significantly more ambitious in their modeling and complexity. It is not clear how the small birds of the Raised Anchor period were intended to be displayed, but the scale of the peacocks suggests that they most likely were regarded as independent sculptures and not destined to decorate the dessert table. While both peacocks are fully modeled and decorated in the round, the direction in which the heads face is clearly the primary view. No source has been found for their design, and while Edwards included a peacock in volume two of *A Natural History*, the resemblance between his rendering and either of the Chelsea peacocks is only generic.
The modeler at Chelsea clearly conceived the two peacocks as a pair, as indicated by their complementary poses. Ornithological accuracy does not seem to have been a concern, based on the fact that if the modeler wished to depict a male and a female peacock correctly, the latter would have been notably smaller than the male. In addition, the coloration of both porcelain peacocks is very similar, whereas in nature, the female peacock, more accurately known as a “peahen,” would normally have much more muted feathers. The painted decoration of both birds gives prominence to the “eyes” of the tail feathers, which are the most distinctive aspect of the male peacock. The circles of pale blue, yellow, and purple enamel augmented by fine lines in red create an almost luminous effect that skillfully evokes the iridescence of a male peacock’s feathers. Each bird’s body is left mostly undecorated with the plumage only suggested by areas of purple, yellow, and pale blue. There are slight differences in the decoration of the two birds, and it appears they may have been decorated by two different painters at the factory.

The peacocks would have presented technical challenges to both model and fire, particularly because of the attenuated lower section depicting the tail feathers. While the bodies of the birds are supported by a sturdy tree trunk, a branch from the trunk provides the only brace for the large expanse of feathers. Not surprisingly, the tail-feather sections of each bird have suffered damage over time and have been repaired, but to have attempted this compositional element speaks to the factory’s confidence in its technical capabilities. After the tail feathers, the elongated necks would have been the most difficult to model, yet the sinuous line that begins at the head, descends through the neck, and terminates with the tail feathers makes these peacocks among the most remarkable of all of Chelsea’s figural production.

2. Ibid.
3. Sotheby’s 2013, no. 436. The major difference between the peacocks that were at Sotheby’s and those at the Museum are that the former are decorated primarily with fruit rather than leaves on their tree-trunk bases.
4. Edwards 1743–51, vol. 2 (1747), pl. 67, where the bird is described as a “Peacock Pheasant from China.” It is colored in a range of muted browns, as is typical of most female peacocks, in contrast to the enamels used to decorate the Chelsea birds.
**84. Pair of vases**

**CHELSEA FACTORY, BRITISH (LONDON), CA. 1744–70, GOLD ANCHOR PERIOD, 1758–69**

ca. 1762–63

Soft-paste porcelain decorated in polychrome enamels and gold

1a, b: 23 1/4 x 12 ⁵⁄₁₆ x 9 in. (59.1 x 31.3 x 22.9 cm)

2a, b: 23 1/₂ x 12 ⅛ x 9 in. (59.7 x 32.1 x 22.9 cm)

Gift of Irwin Untermyer, 1970 1970.313.1a, b- .2a, b

**MARKS:** 1a, b: painted on underside: anchor in purple enamel, 2a, b: painted on underside: anchor in gold (faint)

**CONSTRUCTION/CONDITION:** 1a, b: molded with applied decoration; loss to proper right handle, slight abrasion to gilding on foot, 2a, b: molded with applied decoration

**PROVENANCE:** sold in Nicholas Sprimont’s last sale of Chelsea porcelain, Christie’s, London, February 17, 1770, nos. 60, 61; Hon. P. J. Locke King, MP; William Ward, 1st Earl of Dudley, offered at sale at Christie’s, London, May 21, 1886, no. 200; Sotheby’s, London, November 26, 1963, no. 68; Irwin Untermyer (until 1970; to MMA)

**LITERATURE:** Christie’s 1770, fourth day of sale, nos. 60, 61; Christie’s 1886, no. 200, ill.; Sotheby’s 1963, no. 68, ill., and frontispiece; Mallet 1965, pp. 29–37, figs. 9–12; Hackenbroch 1971a, pp. 414, 416–17, fig. 23.

No works better express the rich style characteristic of the porcelain produced at Chelsea during the Gold Anchor period (1758–69) than these two elaborately decorated vases. Their ambitious enamel painting, extensive gilding, sculptural embellishments, and large scale reflect the taste associated with Gold Anchor Chelsea at its most lavish, and also indicate the strong influence of Sèvres porcelain from the late 1750s and 1760s. The products of the French royal manufactory from these years are distinguished by their vivid ground colors, richly applied gilding, and masterly enamel decoration, as well as by the use of novel shapes. Because the Sèvres factory became the taste setter in Europe following the decline of the Meissen factory during the Seven Years’ War (1756–63), numerous porcelain factories, including Chelsea, looked to Sèvres for inspiration.

The deep-blue ground color of these vases closely copies a similar blue used at Sèvres that was known as bleu lapis (lapis blue), and it seems to have been perceived in England as emblematic of high-style French porcelain in the 1770s. The abundant use of gilding on the vases also reflects the influence of Sèvres, where gild decoration was employed as a major decorative element rather than being completely subordinate to the enamel painting. On these vases, the gilding frames the reserves, accentuates the feet and rims, lightens the visual effect of the dark-blue ground, and contributes significantly to their rich visual impact. The most direct borrowing from Sèvres is seen in the use of compositions by the French artist François Boucher (1703–1770) to decorate the reserves on the primary sides of the vases. Prints made after works by Boucher, which were widely circulated in the mid-eighteenth century, were among the sources most commonly used by the painters at Sèvres, and Boucher’s compositions were adapted for biscuit sculpture as well. The painters at Chelsea used prints after Boucher’s L’Agréable Leçon (The enjoyable lesson) and Les Amants Surpris (The surprised lovers) for the fronts of the vases. Although Boucher had painted L’Agréable Leçon in 1748, it was not engraved until 1758. After the engraving became available, the composition was used frequently for painted decoration at Sèvres, but most known examples depicting L’Agréable Leçon date from 1765 or later. Thus, the appearance of this subject on Chelsea porcelain is surprisingly early and reflects the factory’s desire to be in the forefront of fashion.

While the prints after Boucher were closely copied, the palette employed at Chelsea is very different from the one used at Sèvres, and the muted, slightly muddy colors create a very different effect than those produced by similar reserves painted at the French factory. This distinction also applies to the secondary reserves of the two vases that are decorated with birds in a landscape. The same muted palette dominated...
by browns and purples is used, and the dense compositions of multiple birds among extensive vegetation are far removed from the style of bird painting practiced at Sévres. The small amount of sky depicted on these vases is filled with purple clouds, which, in combination with the birds and foliage, results in compositions with almost no white porcelain visible, in contrast to the airy, abbreviated landscapes that the Sévres birds typically inhabit (entry 65).

Perhaps the most striking feature of the Museum’s two vases is the handles and the finials of the lids. The handles are composed of elongated leafy scrolls arranged in curving, sinuous lines that overlap and intertwine. Their design embodies the Rococo style in its embrace of exaggerated curves, asymmetry, and the use of abstracted natural motifs, and the finials exhibit the same qualities. The handles are more sculptural in form and larger in scale than would normally be found on a Sévres vase of this period, and it has often been suggested that the handles on these and similar Chelsea Gold Anchor period vases are deliberately evoking the gilt-bronze mounts that were frequently applied to porcelain vases in France in the mid-eighteenth century. The mid-eighteenth century witnessed the height of the fashion for embellishing with gilt bronze, and the mounts of this period were typically Rococo in design and considerably more elaborate than the porcelain handles applied to vases. Even though it is plausible that Gold Anchor period handles such as these were a response to gilt-bronze mounts, it is curious that these handles and those on other vases of the period are not entirely gilded but rather simply highlighted in gold.
This last observation underscores one of the curious contradictions of these two vases and others produced in the same taste at Chelsea. While the design sources and influences are entirely French, the interpretation, execution, and resulting aesthetic effect are completely English. No single component of the design of these vases could be mistaken for French, despite the overwhelmingly French taste that informs them. Interestingly, this pair of vases, along with a closely related pair, was in the collection of William Ward (1817–1885), 1st Earl of Dudley, by the third quarter of the nineteenth century. The related vases, known as the Foundling Vase and the Chesterfield Vase, due to their early owners, were acquired by the earl in 1869 and 1868 respectively, but it is not known when the Museum’s vases entered the Dudley collection. All four vases were offered at auction in 1886 but failed to sell at their reserve prices (the price below which they would not be sold), which were unrealistically high. The Earl of Dudley was one of the most important and avid collectors of eighteenth-century Sévres porcelain in the years between 1870 and 1885, spending extraordinary sums to acquire some of the most significant examples of porcelain from the ancien régime. It can be assumed that the earl knew that he was acquiring Chelsea Gold Anchor vases in the French taste rather than actual pieces of Sévres porcelain, especially as three of the four vases bear the Chelsea factory mark clearly on the base, and it is notable that he deemed them worthy to be displayed among the porcelains that ultimately inspired them.

1. A very similar pair of vases is now in the Victoria and Albert Museum, London. One of these, known as the Foundling Vase, provides a touchstone for dating the four vases, as it is documented as having been donated in 1763 to the Foundling Hospital in London. It is now reunited with its mate, known as the Chesterfield Vase, from which it was separated early in their histories. An additional two similar vases are known to have survived. See Hilary Young in Baker and Richardson 1997, pp. 312–14, nos. 143, 144.
2. The bleu lapis ground color was replaced at Sévres by a similar blue known as bleu nouveau in 1763, approximately at the time the Museum’s vases were made.
4. René Gaillard (French, ca. 1719–1790) etched and engraved both L’Agréable Leçon and Les Amants Surpris.
5. As the composition had been used at Sévres as early as 1752, it is probable either that the factory had a copy of the painting or that Boucher had provided a drawing of it to the factory. Savill 1988, vol. 1, p. 228.
6. One of Chelsea’s best-known figure groups also derives from Boucher’s composition. Entitled The Music Lesson, it was first produced in about 1765, for an example, see MMA 64.102.519.
**85. Mourning Britannia**

_ST. JAMES’S FACTORY, CHARLES GOUYN, BRITISH (LONDON), CA. 1748/49–59_

1751
Soft-paste porcelain
6⅜ × 7⅝ × 4⅜ in. (17.3 × 17.9 × 11.4 cm)
Gift of Irwin Untermyer, 1964 64.101.417

**MARKS:** unmarked

**CONSTRUCTION/CONDITION:** slipcast and molded; small chip in outer edge of medallion, minute loss to one claw on lion’s paw

**PROVENANCE:** Mrs. Radford (by 1924–43; sale, Sotheby’s, London, November 3–5, 1943, no. 92); Irwin Untermyer (by 1949–64; to MMA)


**LITERATURE:** Blunt 1924, pp. 58–59, no. 213, pl. 2; Esdaile 1928, pl. xx, b; Sotheby’s 1943, no. 92; C. L. Avery 1949b, no. 44; Grigaut 1954, p. 51, no. 138, cover ill.; Hackenbroch 1957, pp. 15–16, fig. 9, pl. 1

**THIS FIGURE GROUP WAS CREATED TO COMMEMORATE FREDERICK, Prince of Wales, who died at the age of forty-four in 1751. Frederick was the heir apparent to the British throne, and his early death meant that his father, George II (1683–1760), king of Britain and Ireland, was succeeded by Frederick’s son, who reigned as George III (1738–1820). In this figure group, the reclining female represents Britannia, the personification of the British Isles, and she holds an oval medallion with the profile portrait in low relief of Frederick. The figure of Britannia rests on a globe with her shield to one side and a lion lying at her feet. The shield alludes to her might, the globe represents the dominions over which she prevails, and the lion is the traditional symbol of England. The female figure’s head is bowed in grief, and she dries one eye while a tear falls from the other.**
The different components of the group are skillfully combined, creating a harmonious and successful composition despite the fact that the modeling of Britannia herself is somewhat rudimentary and naive. Her elongated body, small feet, and distinctive facial features link this figure stylistically with a small number of figures and groups that display similar characteristics. None of these works bears a factory mark, and their place of manufacture was much debated until documentation emerged in the early 1990s that answered several basic questions about their origin. It is now believed that these figures were produced at a small London factory run by Charles Gouyn (French, d. 1785), who had worked at the Chelsea factory. This information is revealed by a manuscript written in 1759 by a French scientist, Jean Hellot (1685–1766), who states that Gouyn, whom he describes as a founder of the Chelsea factory, left to establish his own factory in St. James’s Street where he made “very beautiful small porcelain figures.” Other documentary evidence indicates that Gouyn had severed his relationship with Chelsea by early 1748 and was producing porcelain at the new factory by 1749.

Many of the porcelains now thought to have been made by Gouyn’s factory had previously been attributed to Chelsea, but then they were tentatively understood as being distinct from Chelsea’s production and labeled “Girl in a Swing” porcelains after a well-known figure in the Victoria and Albert Museum, London, as no factory name was known. Advertisements from the early 1750s underscore the rivalry between Gouyn and his former colleague Nicholas Sprimont (Walloon, 1716–1771), director of the Chelsea factory, left to establish his own factory in St. James’s Street where he made “very beautiful small porcelain figures.” Other documentary evidence indicates that Gouyn had severed his relationship with Chelsea by early 1748 and was producing porcelain at the new factory by 1749.

In fact, the St. James’s factory, as it is now often termed, appears to have been a small operation that lacked the resources available to Chelsea, and its production focused on figures and what were known as “toys,” small scent bottles, patch boxes, seals, and etuis. Very few wares survive that are attributed to Gouyn’s factory, suggesting that they constituted a small part of its production.

It is possible that Gouyn focused on making figures primarily during the early years of his factory, and some of these appear to have been directly based on Chelsea models, which is not surprising given his former role at that factory. Mourning Britannia, however, was not derived from an earlier Chelsea work, and it is a remarkably sophisticated example of porcelain sculpture. As has been noted by Elizabeth Adams, the high lead content of the porcelain paste used at the St. James’s factory could lead to sagging when fired, and thus figures tended to be modeled so that limbs did not project but rather were supported. This has been skillfully accomplished in the figure of Britannia, as her graceful pose does not reveal the constraints of the medium. The modeler of Mourning Britannia has imparted a sense of monumentality to the group, despite its small size. Margaret Zimmermann has suggested that the composition was influenced by a large-scale monument sculpted by John Michael Rysbrack (Flemish, 1694–1770) in 1742 for Westminster Abbey, London, which prominently features a mourning female figure. The similarities between the porcelain group and Rysbrack’s sculpture are too few to support this suggestion convincingly, but the group’s indebtedness to large-scale funerary monuments of the period is evident. The work of another sculptor has also been suggested as the source for the portrait medallion of Frederick. Isaac Gosset (British, 1713–1799) specialized in modeling small-scale portraits in wax with the sitter depicted in profile, and he produced a number of portraits of members of the royal family. His depiction of Frederick, Prince of Wales, now in the British Royal Collection, is very similar to the one found on the porcelain medallion, but it has been dated to about 1760, approximately nine years after Mourning Britannia was produced. It is fully possible, however, that Gosset modeled other portraits of the Prince of Wales closer to the time of his death in 1751, and one of these may have influenced the modeler at Gouyn’s factory. While the sources for this figure group may never be identified, it is clear that Gouyn and his modeler had high ambitions for their porcelain sculpture. Approximately thirty models of figures or groups attributed to the factory are known, reflecting the importance ascribed to sculptural production within this small enterprise.

1 Dragesco 1993.
2 Quoted in English translation in ibid., p. 14; see p. 15, fig. 2, for an illustration of this passage in the original French-language manuscript.
6 The factory is also referred to as “St. James’s factory, Charles Gouyn” to acknowledge both names by which it has been called.
7 Manners 2004, pp. 400–401.
8 The Chelsea factory created its own model of Britannia lamenting the death of the Prince of Wales in ca. 1751; see Adams 2001, fig. 7.34.
9 Ibid., p. 49.
10 M. Zimmermann 2003, pp. 81–82, fig. 7.
12 Adams 2001, p. 52.
86. Plate

**Bow Factory, British (London), ca. 1747–76**

ca. 1755

Soft-paste porcelain decorated in polychrome enamels

1 × 9 × 9 in. (2.5 × 22.9 × 22.9 cm)

Purchase, Gift of Mrs. George Whitney, Mrs. William C. Breed and funds from various donors, by exchange, 2014

2014.600

**Marks:** unmarked

**Construction/Condition:** molded; slight abrasion to enamels in center and to brown enamel on rim

**Provenance:** Graham & Oxley, London (to Strenger); Laurence Strenger, New York (before 1994; to Harkins); [Michele Beiny Harkins, New York, until 2014; sold to MMA]

**Literature:** unpublished

The importance of Chinese porcelain, both for the founding of the Bow factory and for its considerable commercial success in the following decades, is embodied by this Bow plate that dates from around 1755. The plate is painted with a scene of two Chinese women in robes standing in an abbreviated landscape that includes a deer, part of a fence, and rockwork from which a pine tree emerges, and the border is decorated with sprays of peonies. The palette of enamel colors is dominated by a strong rose pink and includes yellow, manganese, and two shades of both green and blue. Both the composition and the distinctive palette closely copy those of a Chinese porcelain plate (fig. 55) made for export approximately twenty to thirty years earlier during the Yongzheng period (1723–35) of the Qing Dynasty (1644–1911). The palette of colors employed for the Chinese plate is customarily identified in the West by the French term *famille rose*, a designation of nineteenth-century origin that reflects the prominence of the rose-pink enamel. The painter at Bow must have had access to a Chinese plate similar to the Museum’s example due to the remarkable fidelity of the composition and the enamel colors to Chinese originals.

The Bow factory had been established around 1747, and porcelain appears to have been produced as early as the following year, as indicated by a bill dated February 1748. While Bow porcelain was advertised in August 1748, little is known about the factory’s production prior to 1750, although a second patent was issued in November 1749 to one of the original founders, Thomas Frye (Irish, ca. 1710–1762). The patent lists Frye’s claim that he is able to produce “a certain ware which is not inferior in beauty and fineness and is rather superior in strength than the earthenware that is brought from the East Indies and is commonly known by the name of China, Japan or porcelain ware.” A number of references in the early documents concerning the factory make explicit its aim to produce porcelain in the manner of the Chinese. A bill from 1749 identifies Bow porcelain as that made at “New Canton,” and a Bow inkpot now in the British Museum, London, is inscribed *made at New Canton 1750.* Not only did the factory identify itself with the Chinese city most associated with porcelain production but it also constructed its first factory to resemble the East India warehouse in Canton, which must have appeared as an unusually exotic edifice in Stratford, East London, in the late 1740s.

In its early years, the factory, which was the first built expressly for ceramic production in England, made useful and ornamental wares in the Chinese taste to compete with the porcelain arriving in vast quantities from China by the mid-eighteenth century. Much of Bow’s early production was decorated in underglaze blue that evoked the blue-and-white porcelains for which China was best known, and the scenes and motifs chosen for these wares reflect the chinoiserie vocabulary of the day. Bow also made white wares decorated with applied prunus.

![Plate](image-url)
branches in imitation of the so-called blanc de chine produced at Dehua in Fujian province, which represented another highly popular category of imported Chinese porcelains. For the porcelain it produced for decoration in polychrome enamels, Bow looked to imported Chinese famille rose wares for its primary inspiration. The Chinese first developed the deep-rose pink enamel in the early 1720s, and a palette revolving around this color dominated export wares for the next several decades. It is likely that Bow chose famille rose wares to imitate since the other English porcelain factories at this time were more influenced by either Chinese famille verte wares, as at Worcester, or by Japanese Kakiemon-style wares, which inspired the painters at Chelsea in the 1750s. Famille rose–style decoration remained popular at Bow until the early 1760s, at which time flower painting in a European manner became ascendant.

The Bow factory’s focus on Asian-inspired decoration found a receptive market among Britain’s middle and upper classes, in contrast to the Chelsea factory, which aimed its products primarily to the upper strata of society. The factory incorporated calcinated bone ash in its soft-paste porcelain body, which made its products whiter and allowed them to withstand the heat of the firing more reliably, and this more durable porcelain paste contributed to the factory’s success as well. While Bow produced figures in considerable quantities, the various tablewares that it made ensured the factory’s prosperity during the 1750s and the early 1760s. By about 1760 Bow employed around three hundred workers, making it the largest porcelain factory in England at the time. Not long after, the taste for Asian-inspired decoration faded, and the factory began to encounter financial difficulties that ultimately led to its demise in the late 1770s. However, the factory’s early successes helped to firmly establish England as a major producer of porcelain in the 1750s, making the importation of Chinese porcelain no longer necessary.

1 Gabszewicz 2000, p. 13. For more information about the factory, see Spero 1995, pp. 53–56; H. Young 1999, p. 197. See also Gabszewicz 2010; this short history ascribes an earlier founding date for the factory of 1744. 8 Gabszewicz 2000, p. 13. 3 Quoted in ibid., p. 15. 4 British Museum, London (1887, 0307, 1.61). A similar inkpot with the same inscription and the date of 1751 is in the Victoria and Albert Museum, London (2864-1901). 5 Spero 1995, p. 53. 6 Ibid. 7 For more information about the use of opaque enamels, including pink, see Sargent 2012, pp. 237–38. 8 Kakiemon-inspired decoration was also popular at Bow; see, for example, Gallagher 2015, p. 194, no. 124. 9 This information appears in an inscription written in about 1790 by Thomas Craft (British?, dates unknown), a decorator at Bow, inside the lid of box containing a bowl he decorated that is now in the British Museum (1.60). See Gabszewicz 2000, p. 16.
87. Garniture of three vases

WORCESTER FACTORY, BRITISH, 1751–2008

ca. 1752–53
Soft-paste porcelain decorated in polychrome enamels
-32: 10 3/8 x 4 3/8 x 4 3/8 in. (26.7 x 12.4 x 11.4 cm)
-33: 8 1/2 x 3 1/2 x 3 1/2 in. (21.3 x 8.9 x 8.6 cm)
-34: 8 3/4 x 3 1/2 x 3 3/4 in. (22.4 x 8.9 x 8.6 cm)

Gift of Mrs. Constance D. Stieglitz, in memory of her husband, Marcel H. Stieglitz, 1964 64.142.32–34

MARKS: all unmarked

CONSTRUCTION/CONDITION: press-molded; .32: tiny chip in rim; glazing flaws at foot. .33: repair to rim with original fragments

PROVENANCE: Marcel H. Stieglitz by 1947 (until 1964; to MMA)

LITERATURE: Stieglitz Collection 1947, no. 4, pl. 11

NO FACTORY BETTER ILLUSTRATES THE ENTREPRENEURIAL underpinnings of the ceramic industry in England during the eighteenth century than the one established at Worcester in 1751.1 Created by a deed of partnership, it was an ambitious and risky undertaking, because the city of Worcester did not have the various resources and potential clientele offered by London. However, the founders of the factory astutely focused on types of products that were not available from the factories established at Chelsea and at Bow several years earlier. Chelsea’s production was aimed primarily at the luxury market, and it included a large number of decorative objects and figures. Bow sought to compete with imported Chinese porcelains and to reach a more middle-class clientele. In contrast, Worcester aimed to provide utilitarian wares that were not made by the other English factories, and it developed styles of decoration that further distinguished its production. From the outset, Worcester relied heavily on English silver forms for a number of its wares, and in its early years, much of its production was painted with different types of Asian-inspired motifs combined in innovative ways. In addition, the factory excelled at finely executed, low-relief molding, which it employed more extensively than other factories in England.

Shortly after the Worcester factory was founded, it purchased another porcelain factory that would profoundly benefit the young enterprise. In 1752, Worcester merged with the Bristol factory, established by Benjamin Lund (British, d. 1768) three years earlier, and it acquired all of Bristol’s equipment, stock, and, most significantly, the lease of Lund’s soapstone mine. The lease made it possible for Worcester to incorporate soapstone in its ceramic body, a practice initiated by Lund at Bristol. The inclusion of soapstone made the soft-paste porcelain more durable, allowing it to tolerate the temperature of boiling water much more readily than the other soft-paste porcelain bodies produced in England at this time. This constituted an enormous advantage, particularly as the custom of tea drinking was rapidly expanding and fueling a demand for porcelain tea wares. In addition, Lund appears to have provided expertise to the Worcester factory for a year after the two concerns merged, and his involvement, in combination with the acquisition of the tangible assets from Lund’s factory, meant that Worcester did not have to endure years of experimentation as was typically the case for new factories.2 This was particularly important because any porcelain factory founded in England needed to achieve commercial success as quickly as possible. Without the aristocratic patronage that underpinned the porcelain enterprises on the Continent, English factory owners were required to be nimble entrepreneurs, mastering technical challenges, anticipating changes in taste, and supervising a solvent business.
These three vases, which date to the years 1752–53, are among the earliest products of the Worcester factory. Their matched decoration indicates that they almost certainly were made as a garniture, or decorative set of vases, and the larger, middle vase once had a lid, now missing, that would have provided additional visual rhythm to the arrangement. While the painted motifs are different on each panel of the four-sided vases, they are consistently positioned on each of the three vases, indicating the intention that the vases be displayed together. The form of the two beaker vases derives ultimately from archaic Chinese bronzes but through the intermediary of Chinese porcelain, whereas the baluster shape of the central vase was used globally by the mid-eighteenth century, although it, too, had its roots in Chinese porcelain. Both this particular baluster shape and the beaker shape are very rare in Worcester porcelain, and the other known examples of both forms exhibit the same warping in the kiln as do the Museum’s vases (fig. 56). Despite the expertise acquired with the purchase of Lund’s factory, it is clear that Worcester experienced technical challenges at the outset, and it is notable that these vases were decorated even though they had warped in the initial firing.

All four sides of each vase are decorated with floral motifs arranged vertically to skillfully accommodate the format of the panel on which they are painted. Rather than deriving from a specific source, these floral compositions are an amalgam of at least two influences that have been so well integrated that they read as a distinctive type of flower painting. As Simon Spero and John Sandon have pointed out, this manner of floral decoration practiced in the early years of Worcester’s history combines both motifs and palette associated with Chinese famille verte porcelains, in which green enamel is the dominant color, with the Asian-inspired flowers often found on Meissen porcelain from the 1730s that are known as indianische Blumen (Indian flowers). By the later 1750s, this type of flower painting was replaced by a more naturalistic depiction of European flowers, but Asian-inspired motifs and compositions remained popular at Worcester into the 1780s. Several years after this garniture was produced, the factory achieved proficiency in a variety of styles and techniques, which it was able to practice simultaneously, ensuring a success that endured long after most of its competition had gone out of business.

1. For a history of the Worcester factory during the eighteenth century, see Spero 1984; Spero and Sandon 1996; Spero 2005; Dawson 2007. The author is particularly indebted to Simon Spero for his thorough and insightful research into this factory’s production.
3. Examples of this rare form that retain their lids are in Marshall 1954, p. 129, no. 85, ill. p. 127, pl. 5; Spero 2005, pp. 98–99, no. 20.
5. Ibid., p. 38.
88. Jar with cover

WORCESTER FACTORY, BRITISH, 1751–2008
ca. 1770
Soft-paste porcelain decorated in polychrome enamels, gold, and underglaze blue ground
16 ¹¹⁄₁₆ × 7 ⁵⁄₁₆ × 6 ⁹⁄₁₆ in. (42.4 × 18.6 × 16.7 cm)
Gift of Irwin Untermyer, 1964 64.101.786a, b

MARKS: painted on underside: fretted square in underglaze blue

CONSTRUCTION/CONDITION: molded; old repairs to neck

PROVENANCE: Alfred Trapnell, Clifton, Gloucestershire (Christie’s, London, July 6–7, 1899, no. 329); Ralph E. Lambton (Christie’s, London, June 21, 1922, no. 100 to Albert Amor); [Albert Amor]; Humphrey W. Cook (Christie’s, London, March 18, 1948, no. 22); Irwin Untermyer (by 1949–64; to MMA)


LITERATURE: Christie’s 1899, no. 329; Christie’s 1922, no. 100, ill.; Christie’s 1948, no. 22, ill. (center vase); Greig 1948, pp. 130–31, ill. (center vase); C. L. Avery 1949b, no. 98; Hackenbroch 1957, pp. 232–33, fig. 303, pls. 113–15 (center vase); O’Connell 2010, p. 137, fig. 7 (center vase)

AS THE ENGLISH PORCELAIN FACTORIES DID NOT ENJOY THE aristocratic or princely patronage that supported their Continental counterparts, they needed either to remain at the forefront of fashion or to make their products available to a sufficiently large segment of the population. The Worcester factory was able to do both, excelling at developing new modes of decoration, while also continually expanding the market for its products. In regard to the former, the deep-blue ground colors that were introduced in the 1760s are one of the identifying features of Worcester’s production during the late eighteenth century, even though the popularity of these grounds survived less than twenty years. The first of these blue grounds, known as powder blue, was introduced around 1760, and it was followed about six or seven years later by a blue-scale ground that is commonly regarded as one of Worcester’s most significant achievements. The rich, dark blue that decorates the Museum’s covered vase is usually termed *gros bleu*, known as “wet blue,” and its appearance in the years between 1768 and 1770 coincided with the demise of the Chelsea factory with which Worcester was aiming to compete. It is probable that the development of the *gros bleu* color was in direct response to the success of Chelsea’s similar blue ground, known at that factory as mazarine blue. Both factories in England were responding to the influence and popularity of Sévres porcelain, as well as the porcelain made at its predecessor factory at Vincennes, where a similar saturated dark blue, known as *bleu lapis*, had been employed. However, in this instance it is likely that Worcester’s inspiration to develop blue ground colors came more from Chelsea than from Sèvres, as the former’s closure presented new opportunities.

The decorative and ornamental wares made at Worcester with dark-blue grounds usually bore elaborate gilding, especially those with the *gros bleu* grounds. The large expanses of the deep, saturated blue were relieved visually by the gilt designs that both framed the reserves and overlay areas of the ground. This combination of the blue ground with extensive gilding created an extremely rich visual impact, and Worcester’s products decorated in this manner were intended to appeal to the luxury market that had been dominated by Chelsea. However, the blue-ground vases made at Worcester were significantly simpler in form than most of the vessels produced at Chelsea during the Gold Anchor period (1758–69) (entry 84), making them less expensive to fabricate and hence affordable to a larger clientele. In addition, Worcester employed the blue ground on a wide range of useful wares that had not been produced at Chelsea, further expanding its market beyond the upper strata that had been Chelsea’s focus.

Much of the accomplished enamel painting done at Worcester is found on vases decorated with the *gros bleu* ground and ambitious
gilding, and the reserves on these vases are commonly painted either with figural scenes and European subject matter or with large exotic birds in landscapes. Two painters at the factory are associated in particular with vases bearing European scenes, and rare, signed examples of their work often allow attributions to one hand or the other. The best known of these painters is Jefferyes Hamett O’Neale (Irish, 1734–1801), who had worked at Chelsea before being employed by Worcester. His fable scenes, usually based on tales from Aesop’s Fables, are found on both Chelsea and Worcester porcelain and constitute the subject matter with which he is most closely identified.\(^3\) However, three vases that bear his signature depict multifigure hunt scenes, and the presence of his abbreviated signature in each reserve suggests particular pride in these works.\(^4\) The other prominent painter working at Worcester in this genre was John Donaldson (British, 1737–1801). Like O’Neale, he was a miniaturist and worked at Chelsea before arriving at Worcester, although his involvement with Chelsea was less extensive than that of O’Neale’s. At Worcester, Donaldson specialized in compositions after works by François Boucher (French, 1703–1770),\(^5\) but he also painted scenes in the style of David Teniers the Younger (Flemish, 1610–1690).\(^6\)

This covered hexagonal vase in the Museum is decorated with tall reserves that include characters from the commedia dell’arte, a relatively uncommon source of subject matter for the English porcelain factories in contrast to those on the Continent (entry 32). The two-figure compositions of each reserve are skillfully conceived with each pairing of figures actively engaged in some sort of negotiation or activity, which is communicated by their expressive poses. The costumes of the figures are closely observed, and the landscapes in which they are placed are rendered with great precision. The extremely fine painting on this vase may be the work of either O’Neale\(^7\) or Donaldson.

The Museum’s vase entered the collection with two slightly smaller Worcester vases with very similar decorative schemes (fig. 57). It was long thought that the three vases had been conceived as a garniture based on these similarities, but this assumption is open to question due to slight differences in their gilded decoration and to the absence of commedia dell’arte figures from the figural compositions on the two smaller vases.\(^8\) In addition, each reserve on the large vase floats above an area of porcelain left white with only gilded decoration, whereas the reserves of the smaller vases fill the entire panel. It is not clear if this discrepancy is an indication that these vases did not originally accompany the larger one.\(^9\) On the other hand, the rarity of the elongated oval form of the reserves suggests that the vases were, in fact, produced as a garniture.\(^10\) The painted decoration on the three vases appears to be by the same hand, although the decoration on the larger vase is more finely executed. Whether or not the three vases were intended to form a set, the richness and quality of their decoration reflect the Worcester factory’s success in competing with the best of Chelsea’s Gold Anchor production.

---

2. Ibid., p. 256.
3. For example, see Spero 1995, p. 132, no. 131.
7. O’Connell 2010, p. 137, fig. 7.
8. Prior to the three vases being sold in 1948 as the property of Humphrey W. Cook (Christie’s, London, March 18, 1948, no. 22), the taller vase had been owned by Alfred Trapnell and then Ralph E. Lambton, and was combined with the two smaller vases “acquired by [Albert] Amor from Mrs. Cox,” Hackenbroch 1957, pp. 232–33, fig. 303, pl. 113–15.
9. To further complicate this issue, there is a Worcester vase of the same model with extremely similar decoration that includes commedia dell’arte figures at Cité de la Céramique, Sèvres, though the gilded decoration does not exactly match that on the Museum’s vase.
10. The three vases are referred to as a garniture by Sheila O’Connell (2010, p. 137, fig. 7). It is possible, however, that O’Connell is simply repeating the terminology used by Yvonne Hackenbroch (see note 8). I am grateful to Meredith Chilton for her observations regarding these vases.
89. Vase with cover

**LONGTON HALL FACTORY, BRITISH (STAFFORDSHIRE), CA. 1749–60**

ca. 1755–57
Soft-paste porcelain decorated in polychrome enamels and gold
16 ⁷⁄₁₆ × 19 × 6 ¹⁵⁄₁₆ in. (41.8 × 48.3 × 17.6 cm)
Gift of Irwin Untermyer, 1964 64.101.791a, b

**MARKS:** unmarked

**CONSTRUCTION/CONDITION:** molded with applied decoration; numerous losses to flowers throughout

**PROVENANCE:** Irwin Untermyer (by 1957–64; to MMA)


**LITERATURE:** Hackenbroch 1957, p. 235, fig. 305, pl. 119; Watney 1957, colorpl. d; Yvonne Hackenbroch in Metropolitan Museum 1977, p. 143, no. 275

---

The factory established at Longton Hall in Staffordshire, England, around 1749 was the first concern to make porcelain in a region long renowned for its production of earthenware and stoneware. The ambition to produce porcelain in an area with a thriving pottery industry reflects the high esteem in which the new ceramic medium was held, as well as the aspirations for its commercial success. The factory was founded by William Jenkinson (British, d. 1771), who “had obtained the Art Secret of Mystery of Making a Certain porcelain Ware in Imitation of China Ware,” though it is not known with certainty where he gained this knowledge. The person who was to prove crucial to the success of the enterprise, however, was William Littler (British, 1724–1784), a potter with extensive experience in the medium of salt-glazed stoneware. Equipped with knowledge of both clay and kiln technology, Littler served as manager of the factory from his arrival in 1751 to the factory’s closure in 1760.

Initially, the factory focused on the production of figures, and the technical and artistic challenges that it encountered are reflected in the figures’ rather crude modeling and stiff poses. While the factory continued to make figures, around 1754 it began to produce the wares for which it is best known today: those characterized by an exuberant naturalism and a pronounced sculptural quality. The factory embraced the asymmetry of the Rococo, and many of its decorative objects, such as the Museum’s covered vase, are distinguished by the forceful curving lines that are the signature of this style. A wide array of small tureens and stands, teapots, serving dishes, sauceboats, and plates were produced, most of which were composed of vegetal forms with low-relief molded decoration painted with a considerable degree of naturalism (fig. 58). While Meissen porcelain in this vein and their Chelsea copies must have served as the primary source of inspiration, Longton Hall produced works of great originality, which incorporate a sense of both naïveté and whimsy not present in any of the prototypes.²

The Museum’s vase is one of a small number of similar works made at Longton Hall, which are among the most ambitious of the factory’s production.³ Not only are these works made at a scale larger than most Longton Hall porcelain but their design also reflects the factory’s use of motifs drawn from nature at its most extreme. The curving lines of the vase’s volute handles and the lack of symmetry of the cartouches on each side reveal the influence of the Rococo; yet it is the extraordinary incrustation of flowers and birds that distinguishes this vase and the related examples. The form of the vase is partially obscured by the applied, high-relief flowers, and the cover is all but subsumed by the

---

dense application of floral motifs among which are four small birds and a standing female figure barely visible due to the wealth of vegetation.

The flowers are modeled with considerable detail and realism, and the labor involved to create and apply them would have presumably made this covered vase one of the most expensive of all of Longton Hall’s products. The delicacy of the floral modeling was possible only in the medium of porcelain, because the nature of both earthenware and stoneware would not have allowed for the requisite thinness for realistic floral blossoms. This vase must have appeared particularly notable when compared to the typical production of the pottery factories from the region, since it displays a level of technical virtuosity that could not be attained by the other ceramic bodies. The proprietors of the factory must have taken satisfaction in 1757 when they advertised “Flowers of all Sorts, made exactly to Nature, allow’d by the best Judges to be the finest in England,” even if the nature of advertising encouraged a degree of exaggeration.

Despite the technical skill reflected by the flowers on this vase, neither the figures nor the wares made at Longton Hall attained with consistency the level of quality that characterizes the production at Chelsea or at Bow, and it is not uncommon to find a range of technical flaws that included thick potting and firing cracks. Due to the competition offered by the other English porcelain factories, and perhaps also to poor marketing, Longton Hall struggled financially through the latter half of the 1750s, and the factory closed in 1760 after losing the support of one of its major shareholders. The factory stock, consisting of more than 90,000 objects, was sold off, bringing to a close one of the most inventive and idiosyncratic of England’s early porcelain enterprises.

1 Watney 1957, p. 52.
2 Spero 1995, p. 76.
3 Similar covered vases are in the British Museum, London (1940.0401.3); Mint Museum, Charlotte, N.C. (Gallagher 2015, pp. 206–7, no. 132); and the Victoria and Albert Museum, London (414:36/A-1885). The latter two vases have pierced covers and must have been intended as potpourris.
5 Peirce 1988, p. 142.
6 Ibid.
90. Bust of George II

FACTORY UNKNOWN (BRITISH)

ca. 1760
Soft-paste porcelain
7 ¹⁄₁₆ × 12 ⁵⁄₈ × 6 ⁷⁄₈ in. (17.9 × 32.1 × 17.5 cm)
Gift of Irwin Untermyer, 1964 64.101.418a, b

MARKS: unmarked

CONSTRUCTION/CONDITION: press-molded; chips to bottom edge of drapery on proper right side; abrasion to glaze at base of torso, loss to proper left-front corner of socle, small firing crack in hair, small loss to proper left edge of socle near top

PROVENANCE: Arthur Hurst (until 1940; his sale, Sotheby’s, London, November 28, 1940, no. 41); Irwin Untermyer (by 1957–64; to MMA)


LITERATURE: Sotheby’s 1940, no. 41; Hackenbroch 1957, p. 17, fig. 10, pl. 4; Bimson 2009, p. 550; Daniels, R. Ramsay, and G. Ramsay 2013, p. 47, no. d/2013–8, fig. 51

This large-scale portrait bust depicting George II (1683–1760), king of Britain, is one of nineteen examples known, and these busts are commonly regarded as among the most ambitious porcelain sculpture attempted in eighteenth-century England. Remarkably, however, very little is known about the busts, including where and when they were made, the source of the model for the portrait, and for whom they might have been produced. The group has been the subject of considerable scholarly debate for many decades, and as is often pointed out, the busts have been attributed to almost every soft-paste porcelain factory operating in England in the mid-eighteenth century. The complete absence of comparable porcelain busts of this scale from any English factory makes an attribution particularly challenging.

A persuasive approximate dating of the bust might provide a key to further understanding the history of the model, but on this point there is no unanimity of opinion. A date of manufacture close to the time of George II’s death in 1760 would allow consideration of several different factories as a place of origin, whereas a date of the mid-1740s, as has been proposed, would indicate that the busts were almost certainly made at the Bow factory, the only plausible possibility at this time.

At least three of the busts are accompanied by porcelain wall brackets, of which one is considered original to the bust. The design of the wall brackets incorporates two children who represent Fame and Britannia (fig. 59). It has been argued that these two figures were intended to symbolize one of George II’s most significant military triumphs, the Battle of Culloden (1746), at which the Jacobites were defeated. According to this logic, the iconography of the bracket indicates that the busts, and hence the bust, were made around 1746. Furthermore, it is proposed that the busts accompanied by these brackets are additional versions of a bust first made about a year or so earlier to commemorate George II’s victory at the Battle of Dettingen (1743) in Germany. In all of the busts, George II is portrayed wearing a piece of armor known as a cuirass, and it has been suggested that the inclusion of this breastplate is a reference to Dettingen, the last battle in which the king actually participated. The conclusion of these hypotheses is that the busts must date to the years 1745–46 and were produced in response to both military victories.

An alternative suggestion is that the design of the bracket symbolizes the British military victories of 1759, indicating a date of production either in 1759 or 1760, just prior to the king’s death in October 1760, or just after to commemorate his death. The previous year witnessed a series of military triumphs, and it was dubbed the *annus mirabilis*, or “year of miracles,” to honor these victories. It is plausible the design of the bracket was intended as a reference to these
successes. The age of the king as portrayed in the bust would seem to provide an approximate date for its manufacture, but his age as depicted has been contested. Does the portrait represent a sitter in his early sixties or in his late seventies, as he would have been in 1759? Attempts to decipher the king’s age are complicated by the relative lack of detail in the rendering of his face, and by the fact that royal portraits were often deliberately vague about the age of the sitter.

Another avenue of investigation has involved testing the composition of the soft-paste porcelain body of the busts, because certain ingredients were known to have been used by some factories and not by others. Not all busts have been analyzed, but the common component among the ones that have is soapstone, and the busts according to one study have been classified as having a magnesium-lead body, soapstone being rich in manganese. The limitations of this analysis, however, lie in the inconsistencies in the testing protocol and, additionally, in the lack of consensus in regard to which ceramic bodies were made at certain factories and at what time.

It is not clear exactly what type of information has to emerge in order for a persuasive attribution for these busts to be made that will gain general acceptance. A number of scholars and institutions have tentatively suggested the Vauxhall factory in London as a place of manufacture, which would indicate a date of about 1760, while others fervently attribute the busts to the Bow factory and date them to around 1745–47. It is not inconceivable that the busts were produced at a London factory about which nothing is known at present, as new information on the English ceramic industry is discovered with regularity. The busts are remarkably accomplished pieces of porcelain sculpture, and while a number of them reveal the technical challenges involved in their production, their ambitiousness indicates a place of manufacture of considerable proficiency that presumably will be discovered at some point. The portrait is a powerful one; the modeling of the king’s features suggests a definite personality, and the tilt of his head and the careful rendering of his wig, cloak, and cuirass contribute to the portrait’s vigor and boldness. It is probable that a sculptor provided the model for the busts rather than a modeler at one of the porcelain factories, which further complicates the task of identifying the place of origin for this remarkable work.

1 Daniels, R. Ramsay, and G. Ramsay 2013, p. 58.
5 Ibid., p. 14.
6 Ibid., p. 51.
7 Ibid., p. 2.
8 If this were the case, the production of the busts would parallel the circulation of prints issued shortly after the king’s death. For example, see Charles Spooner’s (Irish, d. 1767) mezzotint after Thomas Worlidge (British, 1700–1761) printed in May 1761 (National Portrait Gallery, London, NPG D9201).
10 The one exception appears to be the bust in the Los Angeles County Museum of Art, but the results of the testing have been questioned; Daniels, R. Ramsay, and G. Ramsay 2013, p. 63.
11 Ibid., p. 9.
12 Ibid., pp. 27–30.
13 This possibility was raised by Errol Manners, E & H Manners, London, in conversation with the author.
14 The bust now in Temple Newsam, Leeds, displays several problems encountered during firing; Daniels, R. Ramsay, and G. Ramsay 2013, pp. 39–49.
Precise and verifiable dates for a factory’s history are often unknown, and the date for a factory’s founding frequently differs from its first successful production, making it difficult to establish a beginning date. This complexity can also apply to a factory’s closing date when production sometimes ceased before the official closure, or the factory was sold and became a different operation despite the semblance of continuity. The town or city where each factory was founded often provides the name by which the factory is recognized today; locations are given when this is not the case.

The factories are arranged in alphabetical order by present-day country as listed by nationality. Within these countries factories are organized according to the date of founding, except in instances where one factory evolved into another (for example, the Villeroy factory closed and reestablished at Mennecy).

**Austrian**
Claudius Innocentius Du Paquier factory (Vienna), 1718–44

**Belgian**
Tournai factory, 1750/51–99

**British**
Chelsea factory (London), ca. 1744–70
Bow factory (London), ca. 1747–76
St. James’s factory, Charles Gouyn (London), ca. 1748/49–59
Longton Hall factory (Staffordshire), ca. 1749–60
Worcester factory, 1751–2008

**French**
Louis Poterat factory (Rouen), early 1690s–96
Saint-Cloud factory, mid-1690s–1766
Antoine Pavie factory (Paris), ca. 1703–ca. 1727
Chantilly factory, 1730–92
Villeroy factory, 1734/37–48
Mennecy factory, 1750–73
Vincennes factory, 1740–56
Sèvres factory, 1756–present
Orléans factory, 1753–82
Dihl et Guérhard factory (Paris), 1781–1828

**German**
Meissen factory, 1710–present
Höchst factory, 1746–92
Nymphenburg factory, 1747–present
Frankenthal factory, 1755–1800
Ludwigsburg factory, 1758–1824
Kelsterbach factory, 1761–68
Fulda factory, 1764–88

**Italian**
Medici porcelain workshop (Florence), ca. 1575–87
Carlo Ginori factory (Doccia), 1737–present
Capodimonte factory (Naples), 1740/43–59

**List of Manufactories**
(Represented by works in this volume)
Garnitures are traditionally composed of three, five, or more decorative sets, commonly with coordinated decoration.

Bone china. A soft-paste porcelain to which bone ash has been added. Formulated in England during the late eighteenth century, bone china also contains kaolin (white china clay) and petuntse (feldspathic rock), two of the essential ingredients that form hard-paste porcelain.

Chinoiserie. A term used to describe a wide variety of European artisans and painters.

Creamware. An off-white earthenware body with a clear lead glaze. Developed in England during the second half of the eighteenth century, it quickly achieved considerable commercial success and offered competition to the more expensive medium of porcelain.

Earthenware. A ceramic body composed of clay that does not vitrify when fired, thus requiring a glaze to make it nonporous. The firing temperatures traditionally range between 800 and 1,000 degrees Celsius. The earthenware body usually ranges from buff to red in color.

Enamel colors. Pigments used to decorate porcelain, which are created by combining metallic oxides with a flux. Generally, enamels are applied on top of the glaze and fired at a lower temperature.

Factory marks. Markings applied to a ceramic object that identify the factory where it was produced. In eighteenth-century Europe, marks were most frequently painted on the underside of an object or on its base, but marks were also incised or impressed.

Faience. A term used to denote tin-glazed earthenware.

Famille rose. A term applied to a category of Chinese porcelains on which a pink enamel is used in the painted decoration. This pink color reached widespread use in China during the Yongzheng period (1723–35). As with famille verte, the appellation came into use in Europe in the eighteenth century.

Famille verte. A term dating to the nineteenth century, the appellation came into use in Europe in the nineteenth century.

Feldspar. A common mineral formed from aluminium, silica, potassium, and oxygen. Feldspar was used not only as an ingredient in hard-paste porcelain but frequently as a component of glazes.

Firing crack. A crack in the ceramic body sustained during the firing process.

Flux. An ingredient, such as potash, borax, or soda, added to the glaze mixture in order to lower the melting point of the glaze. Lead glazes are commonly translucent.

Gilding. Decoration in gold applied to porcelain, usually as a secondary component intended to enhance the enamel painting.

Glaze. A coating applied to a ceramic body that produces a glassy surface. Depending on the ingredients, a glaze can be either transparent or opaque, and it creates a nonporous surface when applied to lower-fire ceramic bodies.

Ground or ground color. A monochromatic color applied to a significant portion of the surface of a ceramic object.

Hard paste. A porcelain made from white china clay (kaolin) and a feldspathic rock (petuntse) that is fired at high temperatures (1,250–1,350 degrees Celsius). Hard paste is characterized by its cool white color, translucency, and durability.

Hausmaler. Translated literally from the German as “house painter,” this term is applied to independent porcelain decorators who acquired blanks or undecorated porcelain from factories, such as Meissen or Du Paquier. A Hausmaler would paint and gild at home or in small workshops.

Kakiemon. A type of decoration named after the Kakiemon family of potters in Japan. Typical Kakiemon-style decoration leaves much of the porcelain surface unpainted and features asymmetrical compositions rendered in a palette dominated by iron red, blue, turquoise, and yellow.

Kaolin. Also known as china clay, it is a white aluminum silicate clay that serves as an essential ingredient in true or hard-paste porcelain.

Lead glaze. A glaze in which lead oxide serves as the flux to lower the melting point of the glaze. Lead glazes are commonly translucent.

Model. The term may refer to either the source of inspiration for a ceramic object or to the actual model or prototype from which multiple versions are created. The word is also used more generally to denote a specific form, shape, or design produced by a manufactory (as in “this model of vase”).

Mold. A clay or plaster form, often composed of numerous pieces, used to create ceramic objects.

Paste. A term for the white clay body that applies to both soft- and hard-paste porcelain.

Petuntse. A clay formed from feldspathic rock composed of quartz, feldspar, and mica that served as a critical ingredient of true or hard-paste porcelain.

Press mold. The technique of forming a ceramic object by pressing pliable clay into a plaster mold composed of two or more parts. Press molding customarily involves greater amounts of clay than slip-casting for which liquid clay is employed. Most porcelain sculpture is formed by one of these two techniques.

Reserve. An area of the ceramic surface deliberately left uncovered by a ground color.

Slip cast. A process of molding in which liquid clay is poured into a plaster mold that absorbs much of the moisture; any remaining liquid is poured out. The resulting layer of clay, when mostly dried, is removed and fired.

Soft paste. A type of porcelain body produced in imitation of true or hard-paste porcelain. Lacking the essential ingredient of kaolin, soft-paste porcelains were made in the eighteenth century with a variety of formulas intended to achieve the whiteness of hard paste; common ingredients included a mixture of frit, white clay, chalk, and parchment glue, the combination of which was fired at lower temperatures than hard paste (less than 1,250 degrees Celsius).

Stoneware. A ceramic body composed of clays that vitrify when fired at high temperatures (usually above 1,200 degrees Celsius), thus becoming nonporous.

Tin glaze. A lead-based glaze to which tin oxide has been added in order to whiten it, which also renders the glaze opaque.

Underglaze. Decoration applied to a ceramic body in either the unfired or biscuit state, hence occurring underneath the glaze rather than on top of it. Cobalt blue is the most common pigment used for underglaze decoration.
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Porcelain imported from China was the most highly coveted new medium in sixteenth- and early seventeenth-century Europe. Its pure white color, translucency, and durability, as well as the delicacy of decoration, were impossible to achieve in European earthenware and stoneware. In response, European ceramic factories set out to discover the process of producing porcelain in the Chinese manner, with significant artistic, technical, and commercial ramifications for Britain and the Continent. Indeed, not only artisans, but kings, noble patrons, and entrepreneurs all joined in the quest, hoping to gain both prestige and profit from the enterprises they established.

This beautifully illustrated volume showcases ninety works that span the late sixteenth to the mid-nineteenth century and reflect the major currents of European porcelain production. Each work is illustrated with glorious new photography, accompanied by analysis and interpretation by one of the leading experts in European decorative arts. Among the wide range of porcelains selected are rare blue-and-white wares and figures from Italy, superb examples from the Meissen factory in Germany and the Sévres factory in France, and ceramics produced by leading British eighteenth-century artisans. Taken together, they reveal why the Metropolitan Museum’s holdings in this field are among the finest in the world.
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