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Fragments of Time: Ancient Glass in the Department of Greek and Roman Art

The Edward C. Moore Collection was one of the great gifts made to The Metropolitan Museum of Art in the late nineteenth century. Edward Moore was a talented silversmith based in New York, who in later life became the artistic director of silver manufacturing and chief designer at Tiffany & Co.¹ His collection comprised a wide variety of objects, numbering more than two thousand accessioned items. It is particularly famed for its Islamic ceramics, glass, and metalwork, but it also includes Japanese basketry, lacquerwork, metalwork, netsuke, pottery, and textiles.² Many of his silverware creations were inspired by Islamic and Japanese art. In addition, Moore amassed a sizable collection of Classical antiquities, mainly Greek (Attic), South Italian, and Etruscan vases, and ancient glass. There are two hundred intact or largely complete glass vessels, several of which are among the finest surviving examples of ancient glass in
the world. There is, for instance, the impressive mosaic jar that imitates semiprecious banded agate vessels (91.1.1303), the exceptional garland bowl (91.1.1402), and the fragmentary gold-band mosaic scyphus (91.1.2053). The Moore Collection also contributed as many as thirty-six examples to the Department of Greek and Roman Art’s holdings of core-formed glass vessels of the Classical and Hellenistic periods (late sixth through first century B.C.).

With all these riches it is, perhaps, not surprising that the 410 small fragments of ancient glass in the Edward C. Moore Bequest have been overlooked. Certainly, within the Department of Greek and Roman Art they have not previously been studied in any detail, and only one fragment (91.1.2033) has ever been published. There are no records of when and where the fragments were acquired by Moore, although some of the glass vessels were acquired from the sale of the Alessandro Castellani Collection in Rome on March 20, 1884. But the fragments themselves provide a number of clues to their probable provenance. Firstly, these small fragments, measuring on average less than two inches square (5 × 5 cm), were originally enclosed in cardboard mounts decorated with gilded edges (fig. 1). Secondly, almost all the fragments have been worked in modern times, with one surface having been ground and polished, leaving little or no trace of the weathered surface that had covered the glass since burial in antiquity (fig. 2). These two pieces of evidence suggest that the fragments were acquired in Rome, where there was a brisk trade in ancient glass fragments during the second half of the nineteenth century. David Grose was the first scholar to draw attention to the trade when he published a catalogue of part of the ancient glass collection in the Toledo Museum of Art. He recorded 315 vessel fragments that all came to that museum from the Thomas E. H. Curtis Collection, although they had been acquired in Rome by the American painter Charles Caryl Coleman (1840–1928).

Several other substantial groups are known—Grose listed those in the British Museum, the Victoria and Albert Museum, the Murano Museo Vetrario, the Museo Archeologico Nazionale in Florence, and the Kunsthistorisches Museum in Vienna. Another group is now in the National Museum of Scotland, acquired in 1879 from the Noresk Collection. In Rome itself there is a collection now in the American Academy, which belonged to another American painter, Elihu Vedder (1836–1923) and was presumably collected by him during his long residence there. But the largest collection of mosaic glass fragments in Rome forms part of the immense Gorga Collection. Giorgio Sangiorgi, a well-known antiques dealer in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries whose gallery was in the Palazzo Borghese in Rome, also amassed a sizable collection of fragments. Remarkably and at present inexplicably, in 1953 the Williams College Museum of Art in Williamstown, Massachusetts, acquired a collection of 591 glass fragments, most of which belong to cast mosaic vessels, although some are from cast monochrome and mosaic glass inlays. Only one fragment now has a gilded cardboard mount. Other collections probably remain to be located. Not all such fragments, however, come from Rome; for instance, an important group of finds comes from sites in northern Italy.
It has been suggested previously that such large numbers of fragments do not constitute random finds from various construction sites across Rome but rather form the remains of one or more substantial dumps of ancient broken glass. Such a view is supported by the fact that many of the fragments are of polychrome mosaic glass, which was unsuitable for recycling in ancient Rome. Instead, they were dumped, only to be found again in the second half of the nineteenth century. However, because of their bright colors and attractive patterns, it was then quickly realized that the fragments could be turned into small, highly portable souvenirs for tourists. A lively trade ensued but, it would seem, the appetite of some collectors was so great (and, presumably, the price of individual fragments so low) that the supply soon dried up. The trade probably lasted for no more than half a century, between 1860 and 1910. Apart from the Williams College material, no new large groups of such material are known to have come into any collection, public or private, in the last hundred years.

Study of the 410 fragments in the Moore Collection was carried out during the summer of 2015; it forms part of a larger project to catalogue the entire collection of ancient glass in the Department of Greek and Roman Art. Some of the collection will likely feature in a printed volume, but all of it, some 2,762 accessioned items, can already be found on the Metropolitan’s website. The latter will be the primary source of information about each of the pieces, but the aim here is to draw attention specifically to the corpus of fragments in the Moore Collection and to comment on some of the more interesting examples.

A large majority of the fragments belongs to objects that were made by the casting or slumping technique. They include both vessel and inlay fragments and, as well as mosaic glass, there are pieces of monochrome glass in both categories. There are only two fragments of core-formed glass (91.1.1828, 91.1.2035) and five fragments of blown glass, one of which is a body fragment decorated with marvered blobs (91.1.1646); another is part of a mosaic bottle (91.1.2003), and the third is the bottom of a type of ribbed bowl known as a *Rippenschale* (91.1.1790; fig. 3). I will return to the other two blown examples later since they merit more detailed discussion. In addition, there is a fragment of banded agate inlay that was mistakenly inventoried as mosaic glass (91.1.1819), and two modern pieces (91.1.1782, 91.1.1960). Significantly, the collection does not contain a single fragment of mold-blown glass, although a certain number of mold-blown vessels probably made in the East found their way to Italy during the first century A.D. There are, however, eight examples of small mold-blown glass bottles, all of Eastern manufacture, among the vessels in the Moore Collection.

The inlay fragments are worth mentioning if only to note that the circumstances behind their disposal as broken pieces must have been different from the vessel
Frags of Time: Ancient Glass

Objects in jade green are less common; the Metropolitan Museum has a rare intact example, a small cup or bowl (13.198.2), said to have been found near Emesa (modern Homs) in Syria more than a century ago. By contrast, one of the fragments in the Moore Collection (91.1.1631) belongs to a large shallow bowl or dish with an estimated rim diameter of 6 ¾ in. (17 cm) (fig. 5). The fragment is significant because it has an elaborate carved profile that is not otherwise known, although some fragments of mosaic carinated bowls in Toledo display similar cut ridges. Another inlay fragment (91.1.1638) in the Moore Collection can be compared with the elegant cast jug in opaque light blue (17.194.170).

In all three groups the consistency in color is remarkable, implying that, at least in terms of opaque red, green, and blue glass, which required special recipes, makers obtained their raw material already colored. It is also possible that the same workshops produced both vessels and inlays, although this cannot be proven. Nevertheless, it would seem that the inlays and cast vessel fragments are contemporaneous, dating from the late first century B.C. to the mid-first century A.D.

Four inlay fragments (91.1.1648, 91.1.1711, 91.1.1744, and 91.1.1963) are in a vibrant marbled orange glass that can be compared with an unusual cast bowl in the Metropolitan’s collection (17.194.1481). The color choice may have been intended to imitate semiprecious stone; others certainly were, as in the case of four other

---

fig. 4 Left: Glass monochrome inlay fragment. Opaque red, L. 1½ in. (4.4 cm). The Metropolitan Museum of Art, Edward C. Moore Collection, Bequest of Edward C. Moore, 1891 (91.1.1709). Right: Glass monochrome dish fragment. Opaque red, L. 1¼ in. (4.3 cm); estimated Diam. of foot ring 6½ in. (16 cm). The Metropolitan Museum of Art, Edward C. Moore Collection, Bequest of Edward C. Moore, 1891 (91.1.1716)

fig. 5 Glass monochrome dish fragment. Opaque jade green, L. 3¾ in. (9.3 cm); estimated Diam. of rim 6¼ in. (16 cm). The Metropolitan Museum of Art, Edward C. Moore Collection, Bequest of Edward C. Moore, 1891 (91.1.1631)
inlays (91.1.1787, 91.1.1800, 91.1.1827, 91.1.1838) that resemble green porphyry (lapis lacedaemonius) and two (91.1.1856, 91.1.1880) that mimic Egyptian porphyry (fig. 6). Others may be attempts to copy rosso antico and bianco e nero marbles (91.1.1655, 91.1.1678 respectively). By contrast, the inlays (91.1.1650–.1651) in a bright turquoise blue may have been inspired by Egyptian faience tiles, terracotta figurines, and vessels. The Gorga Collection includes a large number of colored inlays in red, green, yellow, and blue.

Several of the inlays are made in marbled mosaic glass with colors and patterns that, like the mono-

chrome fragments, match surviving vessels. For instance, two fragments (91.1.1684, 91.1.1705) have a deep purple ground that appears black, decorated with irregular opaque yellow lines and streaks; they resemble a fragment of a large ribbed bowl in Toledo. The Moore Collection contains forty-eight fragments of mosaic cast ribbed bowls, some of which may belong to deep footed bowls; it also includes a complete base ring of one such bowl (91.1.2049).

Several of these fragments are in striking patterns of opaque white threads on a translucent blue, purple, or honey brown ground, but worthy of special attention is a rim fragment
The assemblage also includes a good number of fragments from mosaic hemispherical or shallow bowls, with representative examples of the main types of decoration found on Roman cast mosaic vessels—those with striped mosaic, short-strip, and network patterns. Many of these fragments retain part of their applied rim (for instance, 91.1.1667, 91.1.1659–1660), and one is in an unusual translucent turquoise blue with a purple spiral thread (91.1.1688). Another fragment (91.1.2010) clearly comes from the bottom of a striped mosaic bowl with a quadripartite pattern.

Among the mosaic glass fragments, which display a plethora of different patterns, it came as a surprise to find seven (91.1.1848, 91.1.1850, 91.1.1928, 91.1.1930, 91.1.1995, 91.1.2020, 91.1.2023) that are decorated with gold foil encased between two layers of colorless glass (see fig. 8 for six of them). The Museum has a number of luxury vessels made in this gold-band mosaic technique, including, as well as the fragmentary gold-band mosaic scyphus (91.1.2053) already mentioned, part of the lid of a box (pyxis). The Moore Collection includes an intact glass box, complete with lid (91.1.1335), and a fragment of another box (91.1.1845), both in a marbled mosaic pattern. But there is also a fragment (91.1.2028) of another box that has been overlooked until now (fig. 9). The piece is of interest because it is decorated in a composite mosaic pattern of polygonal sections of different canes. Most of the surviving examples of cast pyxides (boxes) that have been recorded are in monochrome glass or in gold-band, marbled, or network mosaic glass. Only one parallel is known in composite mosaic glass, from a tomb at Amolara, near Adria in northern Italy.

In addition to the types of mosaic bowls listed above, the Moore Collection comprises a large number of vessel fragments in composite mosaic patterns. At least ninety can be identified as belonging to this type. Despite their small size, some can be distinguished further; twenty-five retain traces of carination below the rim, indicating that they are from Roman carinated mosaic bowls or dishes (for example, 91.1.2000). Only two fragments (91.1.1972, 91.1.2008) display part of the applied base rings that are often found on such vessels. In addition, a few fragments may be attributed to late Hellenistic mosaic bowls in terms either of the cane patterns or the presence of an applied coil rim (for example, 91.1.1974, 91.1.2031). It may also be noted that the size of the canes varies markedly; some are minute but others are unusually large.
Another fragmentary jug, described as in translucent blue with a three-ribbed yellow handle, was found in an ancient necropolis on the outskirts of Montebelluna (Treviso) in 1912. A fourth impressive example from an incineration grave at Dello, southwest of Brescia, dated to the Augustan period (27 B.C. – A.D. 14), is in a deep honey brown with white marbling on the body and many white streaks on the handle.

If the handle fragments do indeed come from Rome, along with all the other pieces in the Moore Collection, they would constitute a significant addition to the distribution map. However, in addition to these examples from Italy, some jugs with similar handles can be found in the East. There is a jug in purple glass with marbled white veins for both body and handle in the Musée du Louvre (fig. 13) that is recorded as having been acquired in Greece in 1889. Unfortunately, the handle is described as “drawn from the shoulder and applied against the middle of the neck,” which is obviously not the case. Another example from the eastern Mediterranean comes from Cyprus; it is a translucent monochrome blue jug that the Fitzwilliam Museum in Cambridge acquired from Luigi Palma di Cesnola in 1876. Finally, there is an unusual example, also in blue, that has a flattened spherical body.

This type of jug has been misleadingly attributed to Isings form 14 and equated with other jugs decorated...
with marvered blobs, numerous examples of which have been found in northern Italy (fig. 14).  

Yet, in the case of the mold-blown vessels signed by Ennion, it is clear that some have handles attached to the body and drawn up to the neck or rim. This technique is the norm, for the handles on most Roman blown glass vessels are applied after the vessel has been detached from the blowpipe. The vessel is then held from the bottom to finish the rim, after which the handles are applied to the vessel body and drawn up to the neck or rim away from the glassworker’s body. This fundamental difference in technique might suggest that the two types were made in different workshops. Certainly, it has been noted that some types of early mold-blown glass have handles that were attached to the rim and drawn down to the body; they have been attributed to the Workshop of the Floating Handles, which has been located in the region of Sidon. Yet, in the case of the mold-blown vessels signed by Ennion, it is clear that some have handles applied from rim to body but others have handles drawn up from the body; compare, for example, the Metropolitan’s two-handled cup (17.194.225) and the one-handled jug (17.194.226). Interestingly, there is another glass jug from the same tomb at Dello that appears to have a floating handle. It is, therefore, difficult to argue that the difference necessarily indicates separate workshops or attests to a specific regional style of production. Rather, the differences would seem to indicate that glassblowers were experimenting with alternate ways to apply handles. Perhaps initially they attached the handles while the glass was still on the blowpipe and then (slightly) later adopted an easier method whereby the handles were added as the last stage in the manufacturing process.

---

**fig. 12** Glass jug (olpe), blown. Translucent blue and opaque white, H. 5 ¾ in. (15 cm). Museo Archeologico Nazionale di Aquileia (AQ 2005/4). Rings show the relative positions of the Moore Collection handle fragments in figs. 10 (bottom) and 11 (top).

**fig. 13** Glass jug (olpe), blown. Translucent purple and opaque white, H. 7¾ in. (18.3 cm). Musée du Louvre, Paris (MNC 1040)
The Moore Collection fragments can be seen to comprise a fascinating range of different types and reward close study. It is difficult to explain why the collection contains odd strays, such as the core-formed fragments and the blown examples, when it is otherwise very homogeneous. It may, perhaps, be that they reflect the motley nature of the ancient dump where they were found but, equally, they may represent assorted fragments from different sources. Clearly, Moore himself did not distinguish between them or indeed between vessel and inlay fragments; and fortunately, since the assemblage arrived at the Metropolitan Museum, no one has sorted through it and removed the extraneous material. Whether or not it was found in Rome itself, the collection of fragments gives a valuable insight into the glass that was available in Roman Italy during the late first century B.C. and early first century A.D. It attests to the vibrant nature of the industry that developed there in response to Roman interest in and appetite for all things glass. These 410 glass fragments in part represent the reason behind and the success of the invention of glassblowing, which was by any standards a revolutionary technological breakthrough, setting the Roman glass industry on a path to lasting fame and influence.

Christopher S. Lightfoot
Curator, Department of Greek and Roman Art,
The Metropolitan Museum of Art
NOTES

1. There is a portrait of Edward C. Moore by the artist Charles Calverley in the Metropolitan Museum (94.28, Gift of C. T. Cook and friends, 1894).

2. I thank Medill Higgins Harvey, assistant curator of American Decorative Arts at the Metropolitan Museum, for providing background information about Edward Moore and his collection.


6. Castellani sale 1884, p. 59, lots 399, 401–3. It may be noted that the Onassis Library copy of the 1884 sale collection is recorded as a gift of Edward C. Moore. I owe this reference to Andrew Oliver Jr.; Oliver 1967, p. 26n32.

7. There are four exceptions, all inlays (91.1.1725, 91.1.1896–1897, 91.1.1901).


9. Ibid., p. 244.


11. Bonfante and Nagy 2016, p. 370 and fig. 9.3.4.


14. The collection, which can be viewed online at http://emuseum .williams.edu:8080/emuseum/view/objects/asitem/248/22, also includes at least one painted fragment. There is no information in the museum’s object or donor files about where and when the glass fragments were obtained by Mrs. J. P. Baxter, the wife of James Phinney Baxter III, Williams College president (1937–1961), although it is clear that they were donated to Williams College in 1953. I am grateful to Elizabeth E. Gallerani, curator of Mellon academic programs at the Williams College Museum of Art, for providing background information about the fragments.

15. Facchini 2011.

16. Lightfoot 2007, pp. 7–8, 26n32.


18. Individual items can be found at www.metmuseum.org by searching the appropriate accession number.

19. For the techniques involved in making mosaic and cast glass, see Gudenrath 1991, pp. 219–22, figs. 36–64.

20. The Moore Collection includes six bowls of this type: 91.1.1247, 91.1.1268, 91.1.1279, 91.1.1284, 91.1.1320, 91.1.1346.

21. For other agate inlay fragments found in Rome, see Belli Pasqua 1989, p. 109, nos. 35–56. The composition of 91.1.1600 appears to be consistent with sixteenth- to seventeenth-century Venetian glass. Analysis of the piece was carried out by Mark Wypyski, research scientist, Department of Scientific Research. The fragmentary cameo medallion of a maenad (91.1.1782) may be compared with mid-nineteenth-century Italian jewelry; see, for example, a cameo brooch of carved shell in the Newark Museum (51.83).

22. For examples at Aquileia, see Buora and Moretti 2013, pp. 42–43, 75, figs. 25, 26, 55.

23. They are 91.1.1250, 91.1.1295, 91.1.1317, 91.1.1356, 91.1.1357, and 91.1.1508–1510.


25. Two other similar fragments are in the Toledo Museum of Art; see ibid., pp. 368–69, nos. 659 and 663.

26. Similar vessel fragments are 91.1.1668, 91.1.1751, 91.1.1915, 91.1.1970, and 91.1.2012. The inlay fragment, 91.1.1709, could be taken as part of the bottom of a flat dish, but the gritty encrustation on the underside resembles fine mortar. Similar encrustation is visible above the weathering on the underside of another fragment (91.1.1693).
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Protecting Fertility in Fra Filippo Lippi’s Portrait of a Woman with a Man at a Casement: figs. 2, 4, 11: Scala / Art Resource, New York; fig. 3: drawing by Anandaroop Roy; fig. 5: © Ashmolean Museum of Art and Archaeology, University of Oxford; fig. 6: Alfredo Dagli Orti / The Art Archive at Art Resource, New York; fig. 7: National Gallery of Art, Washington, D.C.; fig. 8: Courtesy of the Department of Antiquities, © Cyprus Museum, Nicosia; fig. 9: © Massimo Pizzotti, provided by AGE Photostock; fig. 10: © Albertina, Vienna; fig. 12: © RMN-Grand Palais / Art Resource, NY; fig. 13: V&A Images, London / Art Resource, NY; fig. 15: © Trustees of The British Museum

A Palace for Louis XVI: Jean Augustin Renard at Rambouillet: figs. 1, 4–8: © RMN-Grand Palais / Art Resource, NY

Jean Pillement: Shipwrecks and the Sublime: fig. 3: © Lyon, MTMAD - Pierre Verrier; fig. 4: Courtesy National Gallery of Art, Washington, D.C.; fig. 6: Philadelphia Museum of Art, Purchased with the Alice Newton Osborn Fund, object number: 1986-11-1; fig. 7: © Besançon, musée des Beaux-Arts et d’Archéologie, Pierre Guenat; fig. 10: © Musées de Béziers

A Disputed Pastel Reclaimed for Degas: Two Dancers, Half-Length: figs. 2, 9c: Heather Johnson, The Photograph Studio, MMA; figs. 3, 5: © RMN-Grand Palais / Art Resource, NY; fig. 6: Marjorie Shelley; figs. 7, 9b: Angela B. Campbell; fig. 8: digital overlay by Rachel Mustalish